

United States of America

Written by Moritz Schweiger

[Back to Country Selection \(/web/20220122113216/http://mappingmediafreedom.de/\)](http://web/20220122113216/http://mappingmediafreedom.de/)

Profile

- **Area:** 9.147.593 square kilometers
- **Population:** approx. 324 million (2016).
- **Capital:** Washington D.C.
- **State form:** Federal presidential constitutional republic
- **Official language:** English
- **Religions:** Christian (70,6 per cent)



– Abstract

The U.S. media landscape can be defined as a highly diverse, liberalised and mostly self-regulated system. Media outlets are predominantly privately owned, what, along with slack ownership laws, has led to a considerable scale of ownership concentration among broadcast, but not among print media. A strong system of legal protection based on the *First Amendment* guarantees freedom of expression and the press, though concerns are raised regarding a lack of uniform shield laws, libel laws being used as leverage against media outlets, and the governments war against whistle-blowers. Though media coverage is generally plural and diverse, partisanship and editorial slant are increasingly displayed by cable news channels like *Fox News* or *MSNBC*. American journalists mostly view themselves as watchdogs and enjoy extensive degrees of autonomy in their work. However, structural changes like financial or time pressure and the rising popularity of social media as an alternative news sources have decreased journalists' autonomy and resources for investigative reporting in recent years. Lastly, the election of Donald Trump, who continues to threaten and villainise non-compliant media outlets, has deeply unsettled the U.S. media landscape.

– Communication policy and regulations

The United States of America have a strong system of legal protection for media freedom and editorial independence, with its core guarantees being defined in the *First Amendment* of the U.S. Constitution of 1787: "Congress shall make no law (...) abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press" (Legal Information Institute, 2016). Despite media independence and freedom of expression being heavily protected and widely respected in most cases, the election of President Trump, who has repeatedly threatened and villainised liberal media outlets, has deeply unsettled the U.S. media landscape. He personally explained one day after his inauguration that he has "a running war with the media" (Stelter, 2017), and both Trump and his chief strategist Steve Bannon have called media the "opposition party" (Gambino, 2017). However, his statement at a rally in Texas in February 2016, in which he explicitly threatens the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, probably best describes his campaign against unfavourable media outlets: "The New York Times (...) is one of the most dishonest media outlets I've seen in my life. The worst, the worst, the absolute worst, they have an agenda that you wouldn't believe, and they are run by incompetent people (...). And believe me, if I become President, oh do they have problems, they're gonna have such problems" (Youtube, 2016). Though no immediate direct actions have been undertaken by Trump until the creation of this report (which was issued around two weeks after his inauguration), this statement still points out the difficult relationship of America's new President with critical media outlets.

Besides, there are a number of other recent developments that cause concerns among media freedom advocates and have a potential to restrain journalists' autonomy:

- › First, though 40 states offer shield laws for journalists to protect confidential sources against pressures from authorities, there are no shield laws on a federal level, since efforts to adopt them nationwide have been unsuccessful to date (Freedom of the Press, 2016: 2). This lack has led to several incidents of prosecutors attempting to compel testimony from journalists to divulging their sources in high-profile leak cases. In fact, the two Obama administrations prosecuted eight leak cases against whistle-blowers, respectively their corresponding journalists, more than had been pursued under all previous administrations combined. One of the most prominent cases happened in 2014, when the Justice Department issued a formal request against *New York Times* journalist James Risen to identify accused CIA agent Jeffrey Sterling as his confidential source. Despite Attorney General Eric Holder later overruling that request (Horwitz, 2014), it exemplifies the increasing pressure of federal prosecutors against the media regarding protection of confidential sources, which might have a chilling effect on investigative research. Despite Obama's "war on whistle-blowers" which media advocates regard as "a major obstacle" to media freedom in the U.S. (Reporters without Borders, 2016), the outgoing President did a partial about-turn in one of his last official acts by drastically reducing the prison sentence of WikiLeaks whistle-blower Chelsea Manning's from 35 to seven years. She will be released on May 17, 2017 (Jarret & Borger, 2017).
- › Second, the U.S. Justice Department publicly admitted in 2013 to having secretly seized telephone records of more than 20 reporters for national security purposes (Timm, 2015). After being heavily criticised for this procedure, the Justice Department revised its guidelines, significantly narrowing conditions under which authorities could monitor records of journalists' communication with their sources (Department of Justice, 2013). However, media advocates consider the revisions insufficient, since federal prosecutors might still obtain journalists' communication records via so called *national security letters*, administrative subpoenas for national security purposes, not requiring prior approval from a judge. Media advocates have highly criticised this insufficient revision, with the *Freedom of the Press Foundation* even filing a lawsuit against the Justice Department (Timm, 2015), a case which had not been solved at the creation of this report.
- › Third, though journalists are protected from libel and defamation suits regarding commentary on public figures, libel remains a criminal offense in a number of U.S. states (Freedom of the Press, 2016: 2). Following this lack of uniform, federal protection, some cases are causing concern where libel is used as leverage against unfavourable media outlets by powerful celebrities. In May 2016, Peter Thiel, a well-known business man and delegate for President Trump, announced that he would financially support a lawsuit by Wrestler Hulk Hogan over defamation against *Gawker Media*, with a clear intention of bankrupting the group (Sorkin, 2016). He succeeded in June 2016, when *Gawker Media* filed a petition in bankruptcy and shut down its service after hav-

ing been found liable for 140 million USD in defamatory damages (Farhi, 2016). Regardless of the jury's decision being justified or not, some media advocates argue that "the ability of a powerful businessman to fund a personal vendetta against an online media outlet could have worrying repercussions for press freedom, discouraging journalists from investigating individuals with wealth and connections" (Freedom on the Net, 2016: 9).

- › Fourth, Donald Trump has repeatedly called for a change of U.S. libel laws to facilitate suing the media during his campaign: "I'm going to open up our libel laws so when they write purposely negative and horrible and false articles, we can sue them [meaning specifically the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*] and win lots of money (...) instead of having no chance of winning because they're totally protected. You see, with me they are not protected (...). We're going to open up libel laws, and we're going to have people sue you like you've never got sued before" (Youtube, 2016).
- › Fifth, following the leaks by whistle-blower Edward Snowden and the following global criticism against the National Security Agency (NSA) in 2013, the U.S. Congress passed the *Freedom Act*. It revised most of the conditions of the previous *Patriot Act*, which had enabled the NSA to operate its PRISM surveillance program. The *Freedom Act* thus ended the bulk collection of citizen's phone and internet records, since intelligence agencies must now specify their requests to telecommunications companies to retrieve records and include a privacy advocate to approve surveillance requests. While some regard these alterations as an improvement for internet freedom, privacy advocates call them insufficient since two critical passages, frequently used for commissioning surveillance programs to collect metadata, were left legitimate (Freedom on the Net, 2016).
- › Sixth, the *Freedom of Information Act* (FOIA) of 1966 provides that any U.S. citizen has the right to obtain access to records of all federal agencies, unless they are protected from disclosure (FOIA, 2016). In 2009, on his first day of office, President Obama called for a more quick and transparent processing of FOIA requests, predominantly issued by journalists for research purposes (FOIA Memorandum and Guidelines, 2014). Despite these announcements, an analysis by *Associated Press* revealed that the Obama administration has set a record of unanswered or denied FOIA requests in 2015. Out of 714.231 information requests, 250.581 documents (39 per cent) were censored or access was fully denied and 200.000 requests remained unprocessed at year's end (Bridis, 2015).

The regulation of media and media content via ministries in the U.S. is minimal, and there are no industrywide self-regulatory institutions (Freedom of the Press, 2016: 2). While there are no regulatory bodies for print or internet media, *broadcasting media* is regulated by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), which is the "United States' primary authority for communications law, regulation and technological innovation" (FCC, 2016a). With reference to the *Communications Act* from 1934, Congress required FCC to regulate broadcasting in "the public interest, convenience, or necessity" (Pritchard, 2007: 2), without, however, ever defining the phrase. Left to its own, the FCC identified three goals it believed would foster public interest in broadcasting: diversity, competition and localism. Its budget is controlled by the Congress, which also has considerable oversight authorities (ibid: 4-5). The FCC is directed by five commissioners appointed by the President (FCC, 2016a) and "responsible for managing and licensing the electromagnetic spectrum for commercial users and for non-commercial users" (FCC, 2016b). Furthermore, the FCC also reviews broadcasting content for compliance with federal law regarding obscenity, indecency, or nudity (Communications Act, 1934: 253). Its vague definitions of *obscene* content and the issuing of high fines led to increased criticism against the FCC evoking self-censorship among broadcasting journalists, and numerous calls to limit its authorities regarding the regulation of *indecent* content (McNeill, 2012). Freedom House, though being a non-governmental organisation, is funded by the U.S. government and rates the U.S. press as "free" (Freedom of the Press, 2016: 1). Reporters without Borders rank the U.S. media system 41 in its annual World Press Freedom Index of 2016, eight ranks higher than in 2015 (Reporters without Borders, 2016).

— Media offers

The media market in the U.S. is highly diverse, liberal and moderately regulated, with no significant restrictions on production. Since the "media in the U.S. are overwhelmingly under private ownership" (Freedom of the Press, 2016: 4), distribution or funding of the media is primarily financed through a highly-developed advertising market. In total, there are six large media groups in the U.S., together controlling over 90 per cent of all audience shares: *Comcast* (formerly GE), *News Corp*, *Disney*, *Viacom*, *Time Warner* and *CBS* (Lutz, 2012).

The U.S. *print market* is highly diversified. Between 1984 and 2008, the top four national newspapers combined never exceeded 26 per cent of total market shares by circulation and the top four magazines never exceeded 17 per cent (Noam, 2009: 140, 161). The *print market* encompasses about 1.300 titles (Statista, 2014a), with the *USA Today* being the highest-circulating daily newspaper (2.301.917) (Cision, 2016). Like most print media all over the Western world, U.S. papers are suffering from a rising influence of online freelancing journalism, resulting in decreased circulation rates and, consequently, advertising revenues. Within the last 25 years, the total daily circulation declined from around 60 million in 1990 (Noam, 2009: 138) to 40.420.000 copies in 2014 (Statista, 2014b), which makes around 0.33 newspaper titles per household today (Statista, 2014c). This development evoked a financial burden, which forces newspapers to cut staff and turn to freelance journalists. What's more, most newspapers can't afford to assign as many reporters to statehouses as they used to. Since 2003, there has been a 35 per cent decline (around 160 reporters) in the number of reporters assigned to statehouses by newspapers. Besides, every seventh of the now 300 statehouse reporters assigned today is a college student (Pew Research Center, 2014).

In contrast to the print market, the U.S. *broadcasting market* is fairly concentrated, with the top four TV networks (*Viacom*, *Comcast*,

News Corp & Disney) accounting for a 91.3 per cent share of total audience in 2007 (Noam, 2009: 89), and the top four radio networks accounting for 73.6 per cent shares of total revenue in 2006 (Noam, 2009: 85). In 2013, the number of local TV stations changing owners via mergers or acquisition reached nearly 300. Though this number declined to 101 in 2015, ownership concentration among broadcasting media is still an ongoing concern (Freedom of the Press, 2016: 5) One reason behind this considerable scale of concentration are the slack and generous broadcast ownership laws, which are based on the *Administrative Procedure Act*, implemented by the FCC, and reviewed every four years (Pritchard, 2007: 5):

- › Ownership of more than one of the top four local TV stations in one market is prohibited, though many media groups undergo that rule, forming *joint service agreements* allowing them to operate stations that are formally owned by others (Freedom of the Press; 2016: 5).
- › A single entity may own as many nationwide TV stations as long as the station group collectively reaches less than 40 per cent of all U.S. TV households.
- › A merger between any two of the following TV networks is prohibited: ABC, CBS, Fox and NBC.
- › Cross-Ownership of a daily newspaper and a full-power broadcasting station is prohibited if the station's service are encompasses the newspaper's city of publication (FCC Broadcast Ownership Rules, 2016).

Despite this ban on cross-ownership, however, "consolidation of [cross-] ownership has been spurred in recent years by a pattern in which media conglomerates spin off their newspaper units from their broadcast assets, and the separate companies then pursue mergers and acquisitions in their respective sectors" (Freedom of the Press: 2016: 5). For instance, in 2014, media companies E.W. Scripps and Journal Communications announced to merge and then spin off their combined newspapers, leaving one company focussing on TV stations and another focussing on newspapers. The main benefit of the merger would be that both future companies could pursue growth through acquisitions and bypass media cross-ownership rules, with one company purchasing TV stations and the other purchasing newspapers (De la Merced, 2014). The announced merger was completed in April 2015 (Micheli, 2015).

The *internet* penetration rate in the U.S. is 75 per cent (Freedom on the Net, 2016: 1). Within the last years, traditional media (broadcasting and especially print) have suffered financially from the rising popularity of online media outlets (specifically *Google News* or Social Media Networking Sites like *Facebook* or *Twitter*) as an alternate, primary news source. As a result, the U.S. media's ability to hold authorities to account and to serve as a watchdog has suffered, since funding of investigative or foreign reporting had to be cut (Freedom of the Press, 2016: 4). In an interview, former executive director of non-profit organization *Investigative Reporters & Editors* Mark Horvit and his successor Doug Haddix both confirmed that while large media outlets like the *New York Times* or national broadcasters still have "pretty decent resources devoted to investigative journalism" (Mullin, 2016), in-depth research has severely suffered at local news companies. However, the extensive cuts in investigative departments have also lead to an increased corporation among investigative journalists in the U.S., for instance in the revision of the *Panama Papers* in April 2016 (ibid.). Furthermore, non-profit online outlets like *First Look Media* or *ProPublica*, sponsored by philanthropic foundations emerged, seeking to fill that vacuum of decreasing investigative journalism by providing explorative, in depth reporting (Freedom of the Press, 2016: 4).

Due to its liberal model, the viewpoints displayed in the U.S. media are highly diverse and plural. Self-censorship is rare among U.S. journalists and most media companies successfully strive to separate commentary and news and to avoid partisanship in their news reporting. However, there are some rising concerns about an increasing rate of news outlets being partisan, especially in covering political affairs (Prior, 2013: 101). Editorial slant towards a specific political direction is increasingly displayed among cable news channels like *Fox News* (conservative) or *MSNBC* (liberal) (Martin & Yurukoglu, 2014: 7). Furthermore, the "popularity of talk-radio shows, whose hosts are primarily conservative has also played an important role in media polarization" (Freedom of the Press, 2016: 3).

In addition to that, the increasing influence of *fake news*, non-factual and unsupported news content published by seemingly authentic online outlets and rapidly disseminated via social media, is posing a serious threat to factual journalism. While *fake news* are not a U.S. specific but a global problem, media advocates believe that they have in fact played a significant role in the 2016 presidential vote and the perception of its two candidates, with some even calling it "the scourge of the U.S. election" (Blackwell, 2016). One example was the fictional story of a Trump protester claiming he was paid 3.500 USD by Hillary Clinton's election team to demonstrate against the republican candidate at one of his rallies. The made-up news was published by *AbcNews.com.co*, a privately run online outlet emulating *AbcNews.com*, whose creator Jimmy Rustling regularly uses his own name in his mock articles. Despite claims that the emergence of *fake news* will severely change journalism globally (ibid.), its verifiable influence on society and journalism remains yet to be surveyed.

— Journalists' autonomy

According to the *Bureau of Labor Statistics*, there were about 41.050 "reporters and correspondents" employed in the U.S. in 2015 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015). However, taking into account that a broad definition of journalists might also include vague job terms like "writers or editors", one might assume that there were around 100.000 full time journalists nationally employed in 2015 (ibid.). Regarding aspects like journalists' socio-demographics, their perceived job autonomy, their professionalization or their role perceptions, Weaver et al.'s long term study *The American Journalist* (conducted once per decade, initiated in 1982) might serve as a

good reference. In their 2017 study, *The American Journalist in the Digital Age*, David H. Weaver and Lars Willnat provide many useful insights for assessing journalists' autonomy in the U.S. However, since only the key findings of their 2013 study have been published so far, both researchers have been interviewed additionally to deliver personal assessments:

- › U.S. journalists are overwhelmingly male (62.5 per cent), with a median age of 47 years (Willnat & Weaver, 2013: 7) and a mean annual wage of 46.560 USD (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015).
- › Female journalists, in addition to being underrepresented, tend to leave the profession much earlier than men. While the gender percentage of journalists with less than four years of work experience is almost even (roughly 50 per cent each), only 33 per cent of women have been in journalism for more than 20 years, compared to 67 per cent of man (ibid: 7).
- › One possible reason for this fluctuation might be the persisting gender pay gap in journalism, with women being paid roughly 80 per cent of men's median salary (44.342 USD, in contrast to 53.600 USD), about the same percentage as in 2001 and 1991. Compared to the average annual pay for U.S. civilian labour force (45.535 USD), male journalists earn slightly more than the average U.S. citizen (ibid: 10).
- › 92.1 per cent of interviewees had a college degree in 2013, with about half of them having majored in journalism or communication. Thus, U.S. journalists are much more likely to have a college degree than the average American citizen (ibid: 9).

Journalists' *perceived job autonomy* in America has dropped severely within the last few decades. In 2002, 42.5 per cent of interviewees stated "they have almost complete freedom to decide aspects of story to stress" and 51.5 per cent said "they almost always can get a subject covered that they think should be covered" (Weaver et al., 2007: 76). However, while 60 per cent of journalists believed that they had "almost complete freedom in selecting stories" in 1971 and 40 per cent in 2002, only 33.6 per cent said so in 2013 (Willnat & Weaver, 2013: 13). In a personal interview, David H. Weaver describes that "much of this decline has to do with lack of time for reporting and the need to pay attention to news web sites and social media. Some of it may also be due to more pressure from audiences, who can now easily contact journalists by email or social media, and some may be from the business people in news organizations who are more concerned with audience size and attention." Consequently, he believes that "U.S. journalists still have a great deal of freedom in writing their stories, but they don't have as much time for original reporting as they used to." Separately, Lars Willnat adds that "financial pressures are driving this decline in job autonomy. Editors are telling their colleagues what kind of stories might sell, audience data from news websites and social media feeds provide constant updates on which stories get read, and an audience that prefers entertainment rather than hard news, all put pressures on journalists to produce news that sells. These pressures reduce job autonomy – many journalists likely feel that they cannot cover the stories that they think should be covered." Despite this perceived decline in job autonomy, American journalists are still generally satisfied with their work, with 71.6 per cent of women and 76.3 per cent of man stating they were "very" or "fairly satisfied". However, the percentage of journalist being "very satisfied" has declined from 49.0 per cent in 1971 and 33.3 per cent in 2002 to only 23.3 per cent in 2013 (Willnat & Weaver, 2013: 12).

With regard to their *self-perception*, previous studies suggested that U.S. journalists subscribe to multiple roles depending on the type of reporting they do (David H. Weaver). However, they predominantly view themselves as a *watchdog of the government*, with three of four interviewees stating that "investigating government claims is extremely important". This percentage has even increased from 66 per cent in 1982 to 78.2 per cent in 2013 (Willnat & Weaver, 2013: 14). Lars Willnat believes that this perception might even have intensified due to the ongoing aggressions of President Trump: "I would argue that the watchdog role just got a huge shot in the arm due to Trump's attempts to go to war with the media." Furthermore, 68.8 per cent of journalists believed that "analysing complex problems is extremely important" for their work, compared to 49 per cent in 1982. Taken together, "investigating government claims" and "analysing complex problems" have become the most important professional roles perceived by U.S. journalists in 2013 (ibid: 15). At the same time, the "information disseminator" role has decreased, with only 46.5 per cent stating that "getting information to public quickly is extremely important", compared to 68.6 per cent supporting this role in 1992. According to Willnat & Weaver, "U.S. journalists might have recognized that their real strengths may lie in providing investigative reports and analyses rather than quick information, especially when competing with online media that can distribute news and information instantly" (ibid: 17). However, David H. Weaver personally stresses that "perceived roles are more a measure of what journalists think they should do than what they actually do, it seems."

In contrast to self-perception, *the people's trust in mass media* remains at a historic low, since "journalists generally don't have a very good image among the US public" (Lars Willnat). Following a survey from opinion research institute *Gallup* from 2015, only 40 per cent of Americans say they have "a great deal" or "a fair amount of trust and confidence in the mass media to report the news fully, accurately and fairly", compared to 55 per cent in 1999 (Gallup, 2017). However, Lars Willnat believes that this "might change in the coming months (if they stand up to Trump and provide facts rather than some kind of alternate reality preferred by the US administration), but at the moment most people simply don't trust the media – and by extension, journalists." David H. Weaver shares this opinion: "The news media are held in fairly low esteem by the U.S. public, but journalists seem to be rated higher than the U.S. Congress and some other institutions. This also depends on level of education and political leaning of members of the public. Less educated, more conservative people generally have a lower opinion of the news media and journalists. This seems to be especially true of supporters of Donald Trump, at least the vocal ones." This issue is supported by the *Gallup* survey, which suggests that only 32 per cent of Republicans trust the mass media, compared to 55 per cent of Democrats (Gallup, 2017).

Journalistic ethics are widely respected in the U.S., and only a minority of journalists believes that controversial reporting practices

"may be justified": "using personal documents (...) without permission" (24.9 per cent), "badgering unwilling informants" (37.7 per cent) or "claiming to be somebody else" (6.7 per cent). Following Willnat & Weaver, this trend toward a more gentle form of U.S. journalism might reflect the increasing commercial pressure on media outlets: "Investigative reporting is a costly endeavor and might scare away audiences that do not appreciate aggressive journalism" (2013: 19). However, a slight majority of 57.7 per cent stated that "using confidential business or government documents without authorization may [in fact] be justified" (ibid: 18). Lars Willnat states that "ethics in journalism has become a big value, we all talk about it, and I think people are increasingly looking for journalists with integrity. I could be wrong, but the flood of fake news and the constant barrage of 'opinion' journalism found on the Internet has tired many people who are now looking for real news."

In total, there are 41 professional *journalism associations* in the U.S., providing journalistic codes of ethics and defending journalists' autonomy (American Media Institute, 2016). Among the most important are:

- › The *Society of Professional Journalists* (SPJ), which is "is the nation's most broad-based journalism organization, dedicated to encouraging the free practice of journalism and stimulating high standards of ethical behaviour" (SPJ, 2017) and currently has 7.500 members (ibid.). Its code of ethics comprises 37 norms regarding issues like "seek truth and report it", "minimize harm" or "act independently" and is voluntarily embraced by its members and most American journalists (SPJ Code of Ethics, 2017).
- › The *American Society of Journalists & Authors*, which is "the nation's professional organization of independent nonfiction writers" (ASJA, 2017) and comprises 1.200 freelancing members (ibid.)
- › The *Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press* (RCFP), which provides "free legal resources, support, and advocacy to protect the First Amendment and freedom of information rights of journalists" (RCFP, 2017). Founded in 1970, it serves more than 2.000 reporters editors and media lawyers each year who call for legal assistance regarding media related issues. (ibid.)

When asked about the influence of these journalist associations, the views of the two researchers differ: While Lars Willnat considers the role of organizations like SPJ "a public voice and a defender" of journalists and "crucial in the fight against the current attacks by the US administration", David H. Weaver said, "I don't think that journalism associations in the U.S. have much influence with journalists or politicians. For one thing, the membership of journalists in these associations is low, and U.S. journalists tend to be rather independent non-joiners of organizations. Some may have more influence than others, but there are many specialized journalism organizations that do not have much influence on politicians, the public or even journalists themselves." However, since *The American Journalist* surveys have never asked about the journalists' attitude towards their journalistic associations, it is hard to assess whether reporters actually have confidence in organizations like SPJ or RCFP (David H. Weaver & Lars Willnat).

Currently there are no active *press councils* in the U.S. safeguarding journalistic quality or issuing reproofs, making the FCC the only institution merely imposing bans on profane or obscene content (Accountable Journalism, 2017). According to Lars Willnat, "the US media believe in self-regulation – quintessential American attitude. Press councils would not work in this nation, not with the 1st Amendment having such a huge importance in this country."

Lastly, despite Donald Trump repeatedly villainizing and threatening media outlets during his campaign, both researchers don't see a profound impact of his election on the future autonomy of U.S. journalists: "The Trump administration is in a war with the media, but U.S. journalists are not easily intimidated. They are a wild bunch, it will take more than a few dim-witted clowns to make them lose their tenacity" (Lars Willnat). David H. Weaver adds that "some journalists may feel a bit intimidated by Trump and his supporters, but I think that most will not feel that they have less autonomy. I think the criticism of the Trump administration by most mainstream national news organizations will continue to be as, or more, critical than it has this past week unless Trump starts acting more reasonably."

— Sources

Interviewed experts (via E-Mail, January 2017)

- › Distinguished Professor David H. Weaver, one of the most renowned journalism researchers in the U.S., is well known for his long term study *The American Journalist*, which has been initiated in 1982. He has been awarded with the "Lifetime Achievement Award" by the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) and is teaching at Indiana University in Bloomington.
- › Professor Lars Willnat, director of the School of Journalism and Media at the University of Kentucky. He is has continuously worked together with Professor Weaver on *The American Journalist* surveys and currently finishing their recent update, *The American Journalist in the Digital Age*.

References

- › Accountable Journalism (2017). Press Councils: USA. <https://accountablejournalism.org/press-councils/USA> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://accountablejournalism.org/press-councils/USA>) (January 31, 2017)
- › American Media Institute (2016). Professional Journalism Organizations. <https://americanmediainstitute.com/journalism-resources/professional-journalism-organizations/> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://americanmediainstitute.com/journalism-resources/professional-journalism-organizations/>) (January 20, 2017)
- › ASJA (2017). About ASJA. <http://asja.org/About/Basic> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://asja.org/About/Basic>)

(January 31, 2017)

- > Blackwell, T. (2016, November 4). The scourge of the U.S. election: Fake news, exploding on social media, is seeping into the mainstream. *National Post Online*. <http://news.nationalpost.com/news/world/growing-fake-news-phenomenon-fuels-polarized-u-s-election> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://news.nationalpost.com/news/world/growing-fake-news-phenomenon-fuels-polarized-u-s-election>) (January 29, 2017).
- > Bridis, T. (2015, March 18). Obama administration sets new record for withholding FOIA requests. *PBS Online*. <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/obama-administration-sets-new-record-withholding-foia-requests/> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/obama-administration-sets-new-record-withholding-foia-requests/>) (January 13, 2017)
- > Cision (2016). Top 10 US Daily Newspapers. *Cision Online*. <http://www.cision.com/us/2014/06/top-10-us-daily-newspapers/> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://www.cision.com/us/2014/06/top-10-us-daily-newspapers/>) (January 15, 2017)
- > Communications Act (1934). Communications Act of 1934. <https://transition.fcc.gov/Reports/1934new.pdf> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://transition.fcc.gov/Reports/1934new.pdf>) (January 13, 2017)
- > De la Merced, M. J. (2014, July 31). E.W. Scripps and Journal Communications to Merge, Then Spin Off Newspapers. *New York Times Online*. <https://dealbook.nytimes.com/2014/07/31/e-w-scripps-and-journal-communications-to-merge-then-spin-off-newspapers/> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://dealbook.nytimes.com/2014/07/31/e-w-scripps-and-journal-communications-to-merge-then-spin-off-newspapers/>) (January 16, 2017)
- > Department of Justice (2013). Report on Review of News Media Policies. <https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/ag/legacy/2013/07/15/news-media.pdf> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/ag/legacy/2013/07/15/news-media.pdf>) (January 12, 2017)
- > De la Merced, M. J. (2014, July 31). E.W. Scripps and Journal Communications to Merge, Then Spin Off Newspapers. *New York Times Online*. <https://dealbook.nytimes.com/2014/07/31/e-w-scripps-and-journal-communications-to-merge-then-spin-off-newspapers/> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://dealbook.nytimes.com/2014/07/31/e-w-scripps-and-journal-communications-to-merge-then-spin-off-newspapers/>) (January 16, 2017)
- > Department of Justice (2013). Report on Review of News Media Policies. <https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/ag/legacy/2013/07/15/news-media.pdf> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/ag/legacy/2013/07/15/news-media.pdf>) (January 12, 2017)
- > Farhi, P. (2016, June 10). Gawker files for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection. *Washington Post Online*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/gawker-files-for-chapter-11-bankruptcy-protection/2016/06/10/45ef7420-2f2e-11e6-9b37-42985f6a265c_story.html?utm_term=.b1f7d3203576 (http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/gawker-files-for-chapter-11-bankruptcy-protection/2016/06/10/45ef7420-2f2e-11e6-9b37-42985f6a265c_story.html?utm_term=.b1f7d3203576) (January 14, 2017)
- > FCC (2016a). What We Do. <https://www.fcc.gov/about-fcc/what-we-do> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.fcc.gov/about-fcc/what-we-do>) (January 13, 2017)
- > FCC (2016b). Licensing. <https://www.fcc.gov/licensing-databases/licensing> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.fcc.gov/licensing-databases/licensing>) (January 13, 2017)
- > FCC Broadcast Ownership Rules (2016). FCC's Review of the Broadcast Ownership Rules. <https://www.fcc.gov/consumers/guides/fccs-review-broadcast-ownership-rules> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.fcc.gov/consumers/guides/fccs-review-broadcast-ownership-rules>) (January 15, 2017)
- > FOIA (2016). What is FOIA. <https://www.foia.gov/about.html> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.foia.gov/about.html>) (January 13, 2017)
- > FOIA Memorandum and Guidelines (2014). President Obama's FOIA Memorandum and Attorney General Holder's FOIA Guidelines. <https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/oip/legacy/2014/07/23/foia-memorandum.pdf> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/oip/legacy/2014/07/23/foia-memorandum.pdf>) (January 13, 2017)
- > Freedom of the Press (2016). United States. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press/2016/united-states> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press/2016/united-states>) (January 10, 2017)
- > Freedom on the Net (2016). United States. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-net/2016/united-states> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-net/2016/united-states>) (January 10, 2017)
- > Gallup (2017). Americans' Trust in Media Remains at Historical Low. *Gallup Online*. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/185927/americans-trust-media-remains-historical-low.aspx> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://www.gallup.com/poll/185927/americans-trust-media-remains-historical-low.aspx>) (January 31, 2017)
- > Gambino, L. (2017, January 26). Trump aide Steve Bannon calls mainstream media 'opposition party'. *The Guardian Online*. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/26/steve-bannon-media-trump-fox> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/26/steve-bannon-media-trump-fox>) (January 31, 2017)
- > Horwitz, S. (2014, December 12). Justice Department won't compel Times reporter Risen to reveal source in leak case. *The Washington Post Online*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/attorney-general-revokes-initial-approval-of-subpoena-for-cbs-journalist/2014/12/12/2aa11c5c-823a-11e4-81fd-8c4814dfa9d7_story.html?utm_term=.3a5bfc6e5e47 (http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/attorney-general-revokes-initial-approval-of-subpoena-for-cbs-journalist/2014/12/12/2aa11c5c-823a-11e4-81fd-8c4814dfa9d7_story.html?utm_term=.3a5bfc6e5e47) (January 12, 2017)
- > Jarret, L., Borger, G. (2017, January 18). Obama commutes sentence of Chelsea Manning. *CNN Online*. <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/17/politics/chelsea-manning-sentence-commuted/> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/17/politics/chelsea-manning-sentence-commuted/>) (January 24, 2017)
- > Legal Information Institute (2016). First Amendment. https://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/first_amendment (http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/first_amendment) (January 10, 2017)
- > Lutz, A. (2012, June 14). These 6 Corporations Control 90% Of The Media In America. *Business Insider Online*. <http://www.businessinsider.com/these-6-corporations-control-90-of-the-media-in-america-2012-6?IR=T> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://www.businessinsider.com/these-6-corporations-control-90-of-the-media-in-america-2012-6?IR=T>) (January 16, 2017)
- > Martin, G. J., & Yurukoglu, A. (2014). *Bias in cable news: Real effects and polarization*. National Bureau of Economic Research. Columbia Business School. <http://www8.gsb.columbia.edu/faculty-research/sites/faculty-research/files/finance/Ali%20Yurukoglu%20-%20Fall%202015.pdf> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://www8.gsb.columbia.edu/faculty-research/sites/faculty-research/files/finance/Ali%20Yurukoglu%20-%20Fall%202015.pdf>) (January 16, 2017)
- > McNeill, B. (2012, January 10). *The FCC's Authority to Regulate Broadcast Indecency*. University of Virginia. http://content.law.virginia.edu/news/2012_spr/fcc_indecency.htm (http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://content.law.virginia.edu/news/2012_spr/fcc_indecency.htm) (January 10, 2017)

[news/2012_spr/fcc_indecency.htm](https://www.fcc.gov/newsroom/recordings/2012-spr/fcc-indecency.htm)) (January 13, 2017)

- > Micheli, C. (2015, April 1). E.W. Scripps Company completes merger, Spinoff transaction with Journal Communications. *Press Release from Scripps Website*. <http://www.scripps.com/press-releases/873-ew-scripps-company-completes-merger-spinoff-transaction-with-journal-communications> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://www.scripps.com/press-releases/873-ew-scripps-company-completes-merger-spinoff-transaction-with-journal-communications>) (January 16, 2017)
- > Mullin, B. (2016, November 3). What does the great newspaper squeeze of 2016 mean for investigative journalism? *Poynter Online*. <http://www.poynter.org/2016/what-does-the-great-newspaper-squeeze-of-2016-mean-for-investigative-journalism/437557/> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://www.poynter.org/2016/what-does-the-great-newspaper-squeeze-of-2016-mean-for-investigative-journalism/437557/>) (January 16, 2017)
- > Noam, E. (2009). *Media ownership and concentration in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- > Pew Research Center (2014). 5 key takeaways from our census of statehouse reporters. *Pew Research Center Online*. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/07/10/5-key-takeaways-from-our-census-of-statehouse-reporters/> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/07/10/5-key-takeaways-from-our-census-of-statehouse-reporters/>) (January 16, 2017)
- > Prior, M. (2013). Media and political polarization. *Annual Review of Political Science* (16). 101-127.
- > Pritchard, D. (2007). *Media Ownership Policy in the United States: An Update*. Department of Journalism and Mass Communication. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. <http://www.cem.ulaval.ca/pdf/PropEtatsUnis.pdf> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://www.cem.ulaval.ca/pdf/PropEtatsUnis.pdf>) (January 15, 2017)
- > RCFP (2017). About Us. <https://www.rcfp.org/about> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.rcfp.org/about>) (January 31, 2017)
- > Reporters without Borders (2016). United States. <https://rsf.org/en/united-states> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://rsf.org/en/united-states>) (January 10, 2017)
- > Sorkin, A. R. (2016, May 25). Peter Thiel, Tech Billionaire, Reveals Secret War With Gawker. *New York Times Online*. https://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/26/business/dealbook/peter-thiel-tech-billionaire-reveals-secret-war-with-gawker.html?_r=0 (http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/26/business/dealbook/peter-thiel-tech-billionaire-reveals-secret-war-with-gawker.html?_r=0) (January 14, 2017)
- > SPJ (2017). About SPJ. <http://www.spj.org/aboutspj.asp> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://www.spj.org/aboutspj.asp>) (January 31, 2017)
- > SPJ Code of Ethics (2017). Code of Ethics. <https://www.spj.org/pdf/ethicscode.pdf> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.spj.org/pdf/ethicscode.pdf>) (January 31, 2017)
- > Statista (2014a). Number of daily newspapers in the United States from 1985 to 2014. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/183408/number-of-us-daily-newspapers-since-1975/> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.statista.com/statistics/183408/number-of-us-daily-newspapers-since-1975/>) (January 15, 2017)
- > Statista (2014b). Paid circulation of daily newspapers in the United States from 1985 to 2014 (in thousands). <https://www.statista.com/statistics/183422/paid-circulation-of-us-daily-newspapers-since-1975/> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.statista.com/statistics/183422/paid-circulation-of-us-daily-newspapers-since-1975/>) (January 15, 2017)
- > Statista (2014c). Number of households in the U.S. from 1960 to 2015 (in millions). <https://www.statista.com/statistics/183635/number-of-households-in-the-us/> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.statista.com/statistics/183635/number-of-households-in-the-us/>) (January 15, 2017)
- > Stelter, B. (2017, January 21). Trump says he has "running war" with media, gets facts wrong, in CIA speech. *CNN Online*. <http://money.cnn.com/2017/01/21/media/donald-trump-war-with-the-media/> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://money.cnn.com/2017/01/21/media/donald-trump-war-with-the-media/>) (January 26, 2017)
- > Timm, T. (2015, July 30). We just sued the Justice Department over the FBI's secret rules for using National Security Letters on journalists. *Freedom of the Press Foundation Online*. <https://freedom.press/news-advocacy/we-just-sued-the-justice-department-over-the-fbias-secret-rules-for-using-national-security-letters-on-journalists/> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://freedom.press/news-advocacy/we-just-sued-the-justice-department-over-the-fbias-secret-rules-for-using-national-security-letters-on-journalists/>) (January 12, 2017)
- > Weaver, D. H., Beam, R. A., Brownlee, B. J., Voakes, P. S., & Wilhoit, G. C. (2007). *The American journalist in the 21st century: US news people at the dawn of a new millennium*. New York: Psychology Press.
- > Willnat, L., & Weaver, D. H. (2014). *The American Journalist in the digital Age: Key Findings*. Bloomington School of Journalism Indiana University. <http://news.indiana.edu/releases/iu/2014/05/2013-american-journalist-key-findings.pdf> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/http://news.indiana.edu/releases/iu/2014/05/2013-american-journalist-key-findings.pdf>) (January 16, 2017)

Related Links

- > Central Intelligence Agency (2016). United States. In the World Factbook. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220122113216/https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html>) (January 23, 2017)
- > Youtube (2016). RWW News: Trump: Open Up Libel Laws To Sue Journalists. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K9PCPtcsnnc> (<http://web.archive.org/web/20220118033704/https://www.youtube.com/embed/K9PCPtcsnnc>) (January 23, 2017)

Recommended citation form

Moritz Schweiger: United States of America. In: Michael Meyen (ed.), Mapping Media Freedom. LMU Munich: Department of Communication Studies and Media Research 2017. <http://mappingmediafreedom.de/unitedstates/> (access date)