AUDIENCE METRICS IN DIGITAL JOURNALISM: THE CONTESTED MEANING OF ALGORITHMS

Madina Nurutdinova
Associate Professor, Department of Digital Media,
Uzbekistan Journalism and Mass Communications University

Abstract. Using the case of two news websites in New York and Paris, it demonstrates that identical technological tools acquire different meanings in different institutional settings, and it analyses the tension between "editorial" and "click-based" modes of evaluation, as well as bureaucratic and disciplinary models of newsroom management. The article concludes with implications for digital media practice and journalism education in Uzbekistan.

Keywords: digital media, web analytics, audience metrics, algorithms, algorithmic publics, clicks, Chartbeat, newsroom, journalistic field, quantification.

INTRODUCTION

News consumption increasingly takes place on digital platforms. Every user action – opening a page, the time spent on an article, sharing it on social media – is recorded, stored and analysed. This process affects not only consumers but also the workers who produce online content: as in healthcare, finance, education and transportation, journalists 'performance is now increasingly assessed through digital indicators [3, p. 1]. Newsrooms receive detailed real-time data on the number of visitors, comments, likes and shares that each article attracts, and many news organisations now take these figures into account in hiring, promotion and even layoff decisions [3, p. 2].

Both scholars and practitioners have largely assessed the growing role of web analytics in journalism negatively. Journalists are depicted as running on a "hamster wheel" of continuous updates; "clickbait" headlines are said to crowd out quality information, and the accelerated news cycle is blamed for marginalising investigative reporting [3, p. 2; 17]. Technological optimists, by contrast, present algorithms as instruments of more efficient, objective and evidence-based decision-making [3, pp. 3–4]. Both positions share a common shortcoming – technological determinism, that is, the tendency to attribute social change to technological change alone while overlooking how algorithms are actually implemented in practice [3, p. 4; 4].

Angèle Christin's monograph "Metrics at Work", published by Princeton University Press in 2020, offers a new theoretical framework for this debate. Christin, a sociologist in the Department of Communication at Stanford University, conceptualises digital metrics as "symbolic resources" that are negotiated, contested and used in different ways depending on their institutional context [3, p. 4].[1] The central thesis of the book is "difference within convergence": even under identical technologies and comparable economic pressures, national journalistic traditions are reproduced [3, pp. 10–11].

In Uzbekistan, where the digitalisation of the media sector is accelerating within the framework of the "Digital Uzbekistan – 2030" strategy [2], audience indicators on online news outlets, Telegram channels and video platforms are becoming a significant factor in editorial decision-making. A systematic examination of international empirical research in this field is therefore of considerable relevance.

The aim of this article is to analyse, on the basis of Christin's study, the mechanisms through which audience metrics affect online newsroom practices, management structures and journalists '

[1]The author uses the terms "metrics" and "analytics" interchangeably to denote the quantitative outputs that algorithmic software programs provide to users, typically visualised as dashboards, rankings, lists, graphs and maps. An algorithm, in turn, is defined as a sequence of logical operations providing step-by-step instructions for computers to act on data [3, p. 3].

ISSN 2277-3630 (online), Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 15 Issue: 05 in May-2026
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

Copyright (c) 2026 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

professional identities, and to assess their significance for national digital media. **The objectives of the study are:** 1) to describe the key concepts related to the interpretation of metrics (editorial and click-based evaluation, algorithmic publics, bureaucratic and disciplinary power); 2) to identify the factors of convergence and divergence between U.S. and French newsrooms; 3) to evaluate the relevance of these findings for media practice in Uzbekistan.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The primary material of the study is Christin's monograph "Metrics at Work", which comprises an introduction, six chapters, a conclusion and a methodological appendix [3]. The monograph is based on ethnographic fieldwork conducted by the author in New York and Paris between 2011 and 2015. Its main research sites are two news websites: TheNotebook in New York and LaPlace in Paris.[2] Both sites were founded by former print journalists, operate exclusively online, have a liberal editorial line, have received prestigious awards, and rely on online advertising as their main source of revenue; moreover, LaPlace consciously modelled itself on TheNotebook [3, pp. 8–9, 165].

Christin's empirical base consists of three components: (a) more than 500 hours of participant observation in eight web newsrooms; (b) 101 semi-structured interviews (45 in the United States and 56 in France), of which 28 were conducted with staff of TheNotebook and 33 with staff of LaPlace; (c) a quantitative analysis of content published on the two websites between 2009 and 2014, comprising 90,270 articles from TheNotebook and 60,816 articles from LaPlace [3, pp. 69, 166]. Of the interviewees, 34 were women and 38 were freelancers at the time of the interview [3, p. 166].

The present article employs the following methods: content analysis of the monograph (identifying its key concepts, empirical evidence and conclusions); comparative typological analysis (contrasting the U.S. and French models along specific criteria); theoretical contextualisation (relating Christin's findings to Pierre Bourdieu's field theory [7], Michel Foucault's concept of disciplinary power [10], Paul DiMaggio and Walter Powell's theory of institutional isomorphism [8], and other empirical studies of web analytics [6; 14; 16]); and synthesis and generalisation. Particular attention was also paid to the "abductive" approach adopted by Christin, whereby the research question was refined in the course of fieldwork [3, p. 166].

RESULTS

1. From circulation figures to web analytics: the historical background

Christin situates the relationship between journalists and their audiences within a century-and-a-half-long historical context. In the United States, journalism underwent early professionalisation and faced strong market pressures as early as the nineteenth century, whereas in France it was long protected from market forces by the state, professionalised later, and remained driven to a greater extent by civic goals [3, p. 7; 12]. In both countries, print journalists traditionally paid little attention to the actual preferences of their readers: they dismissed letters to the editor, refused to read marketing reports, and relied instead on idealised representations of their audience [3, p. 8; 11].

The digital era changed this situation fundamentally. The advertising revenues of U.S. newspapers fell from $63.5 billion to $23 billion between 2000 and 2013, while the total circulation of daily newspapers declined from about 62 million copies in the early 1990s to 40 million in 2014 [3, p. 31]. Against this background, a market for real-time analytics emerged. Its best-known

[2]TheNotebook and LaPlace are pseudonyms. To protect the confidentiality of participants, the author changed the names of the publications and journalists and removed or altered details that would have made them immediately identifiable [3, p. 10].

ISSN 2277-3630 (online), Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 15 Issue: 05 in May-2026
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR
Copyright (c) 2026 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

representative, Chartbeat,[3] tracked about 50,000 websites in sixty countries as of 2018, recording more than 50 billion page views per month; approximately 80 percent of the largest U.S. publishers used it [3, p. 34]. Christin notes that journalists described the program as the "crack cocaine" of online news and compared its dashboard to the "flickering lights" of a slot machine [3, p. 17]. In her view, analytics software brings the demand side of online news into the very centre of the newsroom, "appresenting" readers on journalists 'screens [3, p. 17].

2. The chase for clicks: transatlantic convergence

During the Great Recession of 2008, both websites, under pressure to become profitable, adopted strategies aimed at increasing traffic: publishing more and faster, optimising content for search engines (SEO),[4] and monitoring and imitating competitors [3, p. 54]. The quantitative data collected by Christin and her collaborators clearly confirm this trend (Table 1).

Table 1. Changes in publication intensity at TheNotebook and LaPlace [3, p. 69]

Indicator	TheNotebook (New York)	LaPlace (Paris)
Average articles per month (baseline year)	603 (2009)	620 (2010)
Average articles per month (2013)	1,342	877
Growth	+122% (more than doubled)	+41%
Articles per author per month (2009→2013)	4.5 → 5.2	3.9 → 5.2
Articles per author per year	54 → 62	47 → 62

Christin interprets this similarity through what DiMaggio and Powell term "institutional isomorphism": under conditions of uncertainty, organisations tend to imitate one another [3, pp. 69–70; 8]. As a result, an acute tension emerged in both newsrooms between two competing modes of evaluation. **Editorial evaluation** rests on the internal qualities of an article – original reporting, fact-checking, innovative angles and the respect of fellow journalists; **click-based evaluation**, by contrast, measures an article's worth by its online popularity – creating a "buzz", "going viral" or "trending" [3, p. 5]. Christin illustrates the point: an in-depth investigation of state corruption in Syria may score high on the editorial scale but will probably attract fewer clicks than a piece about Kim Kardashian [3, p. 5]. Despite the French system of public subsidies and protection, LaPlace ultimately adopted the same traffic-driven techniques as its American counterpart [3, p. 74].

Importantly, unlike earlier forms of market pressure such as circulation figures or television

[3]Chartbeat is a U.S.-based real-time web traffic analytics program. Its dashboard displays the number of concurrent visitors on a website, visits per article, likes and tweets on social media platforms, average time spent on each page, and the geolocation of readers [3, pp. 16, 34].

[4]SEO (search engine optimisation) refers to the set of techniques for optimising headlines, keywords and technical parameters in order to raise a website's content in search engine rankings.

ISSN 2277-3630 (online), Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 15 Issue: 05 in May-2026
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR
Copyright (c) 2026 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

ratings, web analytics have an individualising character: they provide fine-grained data on the popularity of each writer and each article [3, p. 6]. This transformed internal newsroom hierarchies: low-prestige beats (gender, lifestyle, celebrities), and the female journalists who frequently covered them, gained new visibility owing to their high traffic numbers [3, pp. 5–6, 75–76].

3. The multiple meanings of clicks and "algorithmic publics"

The central finding of Christin's study is that identical software programs (Google Analytics and Chartbeat) were interpreted in almost opposite ways in the two newsrooms [3, p. 78]. In New York, Chartbeat was introduced in 2009 as a top-down initiative of the editor-in-chief, and the website relied on no fewer than five analytics programs; in Paris, Chartbeat arrived in 2010 as a bottom-up initiative of a web developer [3, pp. 77–78].

TheNotebook's editors regarded metrics as reliable "signals" and "evidence". Drawing on his own data, the editor-in-chief concluded that "the more we publish, the more readers we get" and more than doubled the website's output [3, pp. 78–79]. Staff writers, however, did not systematically check their traffic numbers; their professional reputation depended on the judgement of their peers. As one staffer put it, even when a viral video attracted more page views than a long-form article, no one at the publication would consider it of greater value; online popularity was described there through the metaphor of a "fluke" [3, p. 87].

The situation at LaPlace was considerably more complex. The editor-in-chief openly criticised Chartbeat for encouraging celebrity and tabloid coverage, while the managing editor called herself a "Chartbeat addict" who relied on the program to "feel" what readers were interested in [3, pp. 83–84]. Because the website's homepage prominently displayed the number of visits, likes and comments for each article, journalists found these figures impossible to ignore; one staff writer called Chartbeat "the hell of LaPlace" [3, p. 90]. The editorial team even reserved the second slot on the homepage for "racy", lighter content and gave it a crude ironic nickname [3, p. 75].[5]

To account for these differences, Christin introduces the concept of **"algorithmic publics"** – publics that are mediated and represented in newsrooms through computational software programs and materialise as dashboards, numbers and graphs [3, p. 8].[6] In New York, these publics were understood as fragmented and commodified "eyeballs" that could be counted, targeted and priced; in Paris, they were seen as a unified and authoritative collective endowed with both commercial value and civic potential [3, pp. 8, 100–101]. Consequently, French journalists interpreted clicks simultaneously as indicators of market pressure and as signs of their relevance in the public sphere, and became emotionally attached to them.

4. Bureaucratic and disciplinary power

Christin explains the management of metrics in the two newsrooms through two types of organisational power (Table 2). TheNotebook was characterised by a strong division of labour, hierarchical stratification and clear symbolic boundaries between click-based and editorial evaluation – a structure consistent with classic definitions of bureaucratic organisations. LaPlace, in contrast, relied on a flatter hierarchy, weak specialisation and fuzzy internal boundaries, and its journalists internalised the pressure to be productive, "disciplining" themselves to obtain more clicks – a process

[5]The French expression "la place de la pute" (abbreviated PDLP) designated the second slot on the homepage, reserved for polemical, light or "racy" articles. Christin interprets such metaphors, following Viviana Zelizer, as a "hostile worlds" repertoire that sharply opposes commercial considerations to "pure" editorial values [3, p. 75].

[6]Here Christin draws on the notion of "scopic systems" proposed by Karin Knorr-Cetina and Urs Bruegger: just as traders 'screens "appresent" a distant market, analytics software brings invisible, distant readers into the centre of the newsroom [3, p. 17]. She also cites James Carey's description of the public as the "god term of journalism… its totem and talisman" [3, p. 7].

ISSN 2277-3630 (online), Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 15 Issue: 05 in May-2026
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR
Copyright (c) 2026 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

resembling disciplinary power as described by Foucault [3, pp. 11–12; 10].[7]

Table 2. Two models of managing metrics [3, pp. 11–12, 100–101, 122–123, 155]

Criterion	TheNotebook (New York)	LaPlace (Paris)
Type of power	Bureaucratic	Disciplinary
Division of labour	Strict: editors handle traffic, writers handle editorial quality	Weak: everyone does "a bit of everything"
Meaning of metrics	Unambiguous: a market signal	Ambivalent: market pressure and a sign of public relevance
Image of the algorithmic public	Fragmented, commodified, passive	Unitary, endowed with civic potential
Journalists 'attitude	Distance; peer evaluation prevails	Criticism combined with fixation on numbers
Discourse and practice	Consistent	Decoupled

Paradoxically, although LaPlace's founders sought to create a more egalitarian workplace, the countercultural rhetoric and "participatory DNA" of the organisation resulted in weak institutional buffers against the individualising pressure of clicks; as a consequence, French journalists experienced greater stress from metrics [3, p. 155]. Both newsrooms distinguished between "fast" (short, aggregation-based) and "slow" (long-form, investigative) content, yet at TheNotebook metrics reinforced existing boundaries, whereas at LaPlace they functioned as a kind of "organisational vortex" that prevented other forms of structuring from emerging [3, pp. 122–123].

5. Compensation and freelance careers

Metrics also permeated the question of compensation. TheNotebook applied a hierarchical pay scale for freelancers, ranging from $75 to $600 per article; a story paid $1,200 in 1996 would reportedly fetch only $200 in later years [3, pp. 129–130]. LaPlace, by contrast, adhered to a principle of formal equality: a flat rate of 120 euros was paid for every freelance piece regardless of author, length, quality or popularity, and staff writers 'monthly salaries ranged from 1,800 to 2,500 euros [3, pp. 133–134].[8] At the same time, the website relied extensively on the unpaid work of bloggers [3, p. 134].

In both countries, freelancers used social media metrics not only as an indicator of popularity but also as a means of reaching senior editors and signalling professional status. However, American freelancers openly described themselves as rational maximisers in a competitive market, whereas their French counterparts criticised metrics-driven behaviour as a threat to their professional dignity while in fact engaging in the same strategic trade-offs [3, pp. 149–150]. Christin relates this to what

[7]In Pierre Bourdieu's theory, the journalistic field is characterised by a tension between an autonomous logic (professionalism and prestige) and a heteronomous logic (commercial and political pressures) [3, p. 7; 7]. Christin combines this framework with organisation-level concepts of bureaucratic and disciplinary power, proposing a multilevel model of analysis.

[8]In France, freelancers are usually paid by the page (feuillet), which made LaPlace's flat rate highly unusual in the French media landscape [3, p. 133]. The ratio between the highest and the lowest wage in the Parisian newsroom was approximately 2.5 to 1 [3, p. 134].

ISSN 2277-3630 (online), Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 15 Issue: 05 in May-2026
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR
Copyright (c) 2026 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Michèle Lamont and Laurent Thévenot describe as “national cultural repertoires” [3, p. 149; 13].

DISCUSSION

When considered alongside other empirical studies of web analytics, the theoretical novelty of Christin’s findings becomes evident. C. W. Anderson showed that in local U.S. newsrooms metrics were replacing a “creative” image of the audience with a “quantified” one [6]; E. Tandoc documented how web analytics were changing the gatekeeping process [16]; and C. Petre analysed the interplay between metric design and newsroom culture at Chartbeat, Gawker Media and The New York Times [14]. Christin adds a comparative, transnational dimension to this body of work and overcomes the “methodological nationalism” – the predominant reliance on U.S. cases – that still prevails in research on digital work [3, p. 7; 5].

Second, the study enriches the sociological debate on the “reactivity” of numbers. W. Espeland and M. Sauder showed that rankings reshape the very social worlds they measure [9], while T. Porter emphasised that trust in numbers is bound up with the ideal of objectivity [15]. Christin’s material demonstrates that the same number can provoke different “reactions” in different contexts: in New York it became a management tool, whereas in Paris it became an object of emotional investment and self-monitoring. This supports her thesis that “metrics are never just metrics: they always stand for something larger” [3, pp. 4, 6].

Third, the limitations of the study should be acknowledged. As the author herself notes, TheNotebook and LaPlace are “hybrid” publications and are not fully representative of U.S. and French journalism. In both countries, legacy news organisations tend towards bureaucratic models, whereas “digital native” websites tend towards disciplinary ones, so that managerial paradigms increasingly spread across media subfields rather than along national lines [3, pp. 156–157]. Moreover, the metrics themselves have changed since the fieldwork ended: subscription models and more qualitative indicators such as “engaged time” have gained ground [3, pp. 157–158].

Fourth, the study points to broader societal risks. In the chase for traffic, news websites multiplied clickbait, scandal coverage and contentious opinion pieces, came to use more tracking software than any other category of website, and thereby contributed to the consolidation of the data economy that Shoshana Zuboff calls “surveillance capitalism” [3, p. 153; 18].

Implications for Uzbekistan. Similar processes can be observed in the national media landscape: on online news outlets and Telegram channels, view counts, subscriber numbers and reactions have become the main “currency” in relations with advertisers, while speed and sensational topics increasingly compete with analytical content. Christin’s findings suggest several implications. First, the effects of metrics are not inevitable; they depend on the organisational structure of the newsroom. Dedicated specialists for traffic-related tasks (audience editors, data analysts) and institutional buffers that shield journalists from direct pressure can help preserve editorial quality.[9] Second, turning clicks into the sole criterion for compensation and staff evaluation risks marginalising socially significant but low-traffic topics such as investigations, social issues and analysis. Third, journalism education – particularly in digital media programmes – should teach web analytics not only as a technical skill but also as an object of critical analysis. The principles of objectivity and reliability of information enshrined in the Law “On Mass Media” [1] also call for such an approach.

CONCLUSION

The analysis allows the following conclusions to be drawn.

[9] “Institutional buffers” are understood here as organisational mechanisms that shield journalists from direct traffic pressure: a clear division of tasks, editorial standards, and criteria for pay and performance evaluation that are independent of traffic [3, p. 155].

ISSN 2277-3630 (online), Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 15 Issue: 05 in May-2026
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

Copyright (c) 2026 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

First, Christin's study substantiates the need to understand digital metrics not from the standpoint of technological determinism but as contested symbolic objects that acquire meaning within institutional contexts [3, pp. 4–5, 153–154].

Second, convergence in the online news market is strong: websites in both countries adopted the same tools, formats and strategies, and their output increased sharply [3, pp. 69, 154]. Yet this convergence did not lead to standardisation, as journalists reproduced the traditions of their national journalistic fields [3, pp. 154–155].

Third, the impact of metrics depends on the type of organisational power: in the bureaucratic model, metrics perform a clearly defined and limited function, whereas in the disciplinary model they are omnipresent, ambiguous and internalised by journalists [3, p. 155].

Fourth, the concept of "algorithmic publics" has analytical value beyond journalism – for cultural production and for academia, with its impact factors, h-indices and altmetrics [3, pp. 158–160].

Fifth, for national digital media it is advisable to balance analytics with editorial policy, to establish institutional buffers, to introduce alternative indicators of content quality (reading time, reader loyalty, subscriptions), and to integrate data literacy into journalism education [3, pp. 157–158; 2].

As Christin observes, we all momentarily become part of numerous algorithmic publics as we move between apps and websites every day – which means that each of our clicks counts in shaping the future of public debate [3, pp. 160–161].

REFERENCES

1. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Mass Media" (new edition). No. ZRU-78 of 15 January 2007 // National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. – URL: https://lex.uz
2. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. UP-6079 of 5 October 2020 "On Approval of the Strategy 'Digital Uzbekistan – 2030 'and Measures for Its Effective Implementation". – URL: https://lex.uz
3. Christin A. Metrics at Work: Journalism and the Contested Meaning of Algorithms. – Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2020. – 268 p.
4. Christin A. Algorithms in practice: Comparing web journalism and criminal justice // Big Data & Society. – 2017. – Vol. 4, No. 2. – P. 1–14.
5. Christin A. Counting clicks: Quantification and variation in web journalism in the United States and France // American Journal of Sociology. – 2018. – Vol. 123, No. 5. – P. 1382–1415.
6. Anderson C. W. Between creative and quantified audiences: Web metrics and changing patterns of newswork in local US newsrooms // Journalism. – 2011. – Vol. 12, No. 5. – P. 550–566.
7. Bourdieu P. On Television. – New York: The New Press, 1998. – 104 p.
8. DiMaggio P. J., Powell W. W. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields // American Sociological Review. – 1983. – Vol. 48, No. 2. – P. 147–160.
9. Espeland W. N., Sauder M. Rankings and reactivity: How public measures recreate social worlds // American Journal of Sociology. – 2007. – Vol. 113, No. 1. – P. 1–40.
10. Foucault M. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. – New York: Pantheon Books, 1977.
11. Gans H. J. Deciding What's News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek, and Time. – New York: Pantheon Books, 1979.
12. Hallin D. C., Mancini P. Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

ISSN 2277-3630 (online), Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 15 Issue: 05 in May-2026
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

Copyright (c) 2026 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

13. Lamont M., Thévenot L. (eds.) Rethinking Comparative Cultural Sociology: Repertoires of Evaluation in France and the United States. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
14. Petre C. The Traffic Factories: Metrics at Chartbeat, Gawker Media, and The New York Times. – New York: Tow Center for Digital Journalism, Columbia University, 2015.
15. Porter T. M. Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life. – Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
16. Tandoc E. C. Journalism is twerking? How web analytics is changing the process of gatekeeping // New Media & Society. – 2014. – Vol. 16, No. 4. – P. 559–575.
17. Usher N. Making News at The New York Times. – Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014.
18. Zuboff S. The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. – New York: PublicAffairs, 2019.

ISSN 2277-3630 (online), Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 15 Issue: 05 in May-2026
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

Copyright (c) 2026 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/