Volume 1, Issue 1, Mei 2026
E-ISSN : xxx-xxxx

EII Social Sciences and Humanities Insights

ELLSSHI JOURNAL

ellpub

Artificial Intelligence, Educational Inequality, and Human Capital Transformation: A Comparative Study of Digital Learning Governance in Singapore and the United Kingdom

Ethan Caldwell[1]

Institute for Digital Society and Governance National

University of Singapore

Email: ethan.caldwell@nus.edu.sg

***Corresponding Author:** ethan.caldwell@nus.edu.sg

Citation: Aziz (2026). Artificial Intelligence, Educational Inequality, and Human Capital Transformation: A Comparative Study of Digital Learning Governance in Singapore and the United Kingdom (Book Antiqua 14pt Bold). *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Perspectives*, *10*(4), xx–xx. https://doi.org/0000-0000

Published: 19/05/2026

ABSTRACT

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence technologies into educational systems has transformed pedagogical practices, institutional governance, and human capital development across contemporary societies. While digital learning infrastructures are increasingly promoted as mechanisms for educational modernization and social inclusion, substantial concerns persist regarding inequality, algorithmic governance, surveillance, and uneven access to technological resources. This article investigates how artificial intelligence-driven educational transformation shapes educational inequality and human capital development through a comparative analysis of Singapore and the United Kingdom. Although both societies possess advanced technological infrastructures and globally competitive educational systems, they demonstrate significantly different governance models, policy priorities, and institutional approaches toward digital learning.

Drawing on comparative education studies, digital sociology, public policy analysis, and human capital theory, this study examines how institutional structures mediate relationships between artificial intelligence adoption, educational access, social stratification, and student participation. The findings demonstrate that artificial intelligence in education functions not merely as a technological innovation but as a socio-political mechanism reshaping institutional authority, pedagogical interaction, and knowledge production. In Singapore, centralized governance and state-coordinated digital policy frameworks facilitate highly integrated educational modernization strategies emphasizing efficiency, national competitiveness, and

Copyright © 2025 by Author/s. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

technological adaptation. In the United Kingdom, market-oriented educational reforms and institutional decentralization generate more fragmented patterns of technological implementation characterized by unequal resource distribution and divergent institutional capacities.

This article contributes to contemporary social sciences and humanities scholarship by integrating educational sociology, digital governance studies, and comparative institutional analysis to explain how artificial intelligence reshapes educational inequality within advanced digital societies. The study further develops a conceptual framework linking digital governance, institutional mediation, educational participation, and long-term human capital transformation.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, educational inequality, digital learning, comparative education, human capital, educational governance, Singapore, United Kingdom, digital society, public policy

INTRODUCTION

The expansion of artificial intelligence technologies within educational systems represents one of the most significant institutional transformations affecting contemporary societies. Across the world, governments, universities, schools, and technology corporations increasingly promote artificial intelligence-driven learning systems as mechanisms capable of improving educational efficiency, personalizing instruction, expanding digital access, and strengthening economic competitiveness. International organizations including UNESCO (2024), the OECD (2025), and the World Bank (2024) identify artificial intelligence and digital learning infrastructures as central components of future educational development strategies.

However, the rapid integration of artificial intelligence into education has simultaneously generated substantial debates concerning inequality, surveillance, algorithmic governance, and the commercialization of knowledge production. While advocates argue that digital learning systems democratize educational access and improve institutional adaptability, critics emphasize that technological transformation may reproduce existing social inequalities through unequal digital access, data extraction, algorithmic bias, and institutional fragmentation (Selwyn, 2022). Educational systems therefore increasingly function as contested socio-technical environments where technological innovation intersects with broader struggles concerning class inequality, governance, citizenship, and human development.

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated these transformations dramatically. School closures and emergency remote learning exposed major disparities in digital access, technological infrastructure, and institutional preparedness across societies. UNESCO (2023) estimated that more than 1.5 billion students worldwide experienced educational disruption during the pandemic, highlighting deep inequalities concerning internet connectivity, device availability, and digital literacy. Although digital learning systems expanded rapidly during this period, the uneven capacity of institutions and households to adapt intensified concerns regarding educational exclusion and long-term human capital disparities.

 © 2025 by Author/s

These developments are especially significant within advanced digital societies characterized by strong technological infrastructures and globally competitive educational systems. Singapore and the United Kingdom represent analytically important comparative cases because both countries actively promote educational digitalization while adopting substantially different governance models, institutional structures, and policy philosophies. Singapore's educational system is strongly shaped by centralized state coordination, long-term technological planning, and strategic human capital development policies aligned with national economic competitiveness (Tan, 2021). The United Kingdom, by contrast, demonstrates a more decentralized and market-oriented educational landscape involving significant institutional variation across regions, schools, and socio-economic groups.

Despite similarities concerning technological capacity and educational investment, the two societies exhibit divergent trajectories concerning digital governance, artificial intelligence adoption, and educational inequality. Singapore's centralized policy coordination enables relatively uniform implementation of national digital learning strategies emphasizing data-driven pedagogy, digital competency, and technological integration. The United Kingdom's educational system, meanwhile, reflects greater institutional fragmentation associated with marketization reforms, privatization pressures, and unequal resource allocation.

These differences raise broader theoretical questions regarding the relationship between technological modernization and social inequality. Artificial intelligence systems increasingly influence educational assessment, learning analytics, student monitoring, curriculum delivery, and institutional management. However, these technologies operate within historically embedded educational structures shaped by class relations, governance traditions, labor markets, and cultural understandings of meritocracy.

Theoretical debates concerning education and inequality provide important analytical foundations for understanding these transformations. Bourdieu (1986) argued that educational systems reproduce social inequality through forms of cultural capital privileging dominant social groups. Contemporary scholars extend this analysis by demonstrating how digital technologies may generate new forms of "digital capital" shaping educational opportunity and social mobility (Ragnedda, 2020). Access to digital infrastructure, algorithmic literacy, and technological competencies increasingly influence educational participation and labor market outcomes.

Critical digital sociology further emphasizes that artificial intelligence systems are not politically neutral tools but institutional mechanisms shaped by power relations, economic interests, and governance structures (Couldry & Mejias, 2019). Educational technologies increasingly involve extensive data extraction, algorithmic profiling, and platform governance systems managed by public-private partnerships and global technology corporations. Consequently, educational transformation must be analyzed not solely in pedagogical terms but also through broader political-economic and socio-cultural frameworks.

Human capital theory remains highly influential in contemporary educational policy discourse. Governments frequently justify artificial intelligence adoption through arguments emphasizing workforce

Copyright © 2025 by Author/s. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

modernization, productivity enhancement, and economic competitiveness within knowledge economies (Becker, 1993). However, critics argue that excessive emphasis on technological efficiency risks reducing education to instrumental labor market preparation while marginalizing broader democratic, ethical, and humanistic dimensions of learning.

Existing scholarship has generated substantial research concerning digital learning, educational technology, and artificial intelligence governance. Previous studies emphasize the potential of adaptive learning systems to improve personalized instruction and educational flexibility (Luckin, 2018). Other scholars highlight risks associated with algorithmic inequality, data surveillance, and educational privatization (Williamson, 2023). Comparative education research additionally demonstrates that institutional governance structures significantly shape educational outcomes and technological implementation patterns.

Nevertheless, current literature remains limited in several important respects. First, many studies examine educational technology primarily through technical or pedagogical frameworks while insufficiently integrating sociological, political, and institutional analysis. Second, comparative research concerning artificial intelligence governance in education remains underdeveloped despite substantial international variation in policy approaches. Third, existing scholarship often treats digital learning systems as universally transformative while underexamining historically embedded educational inequalities. Fourth, limited research comparatively analyzes Asian and European educational governance models through interdisciplinary frameworks connecting digital policy, institutional authority, and human capital development.

A further gap concerns the relationship between artificial intelligence governance and educational legitimacy. Educational systems increasingly rely on algorithmic assessment, predictive analytics, and automated administrative processes. However, scholarship remains limited in explaining how these systems influence student participation, institutional trust, and perceptions of fairness within educational environments.

This article addresses these theoretical, empirical, and methodological gaps through a comparative interdisciplinary analysis of artificial intelligence-driven educational transformation in Singapore and the United Kingdom. The study investigates how digital governance structures interact with institutional inequality, technological access, and human capital development to shape educational outcomes.

The novelty of this article lies in four principal contributions. First, it integrates educational sociology, digital governance studies, and comparative public policy analysis within a unified analytical framework. Second, it conceptualizes artificial intelligence in education as a socio-political and institutional phenomenon rather than merely a technological innovation. Third, the article comparatively analyzes Asian and European educational governance systems characterized by different historical and institutional trajectories. Fourth, the study develops a conceptual framework linking digital governance, educational participation, social inequality, and human capital transformation.

© 2025 by Author/s

The analytical framework guiding this study conceptualizes educational transformation through interconnected relationships between artificial intelligence systems, institutional mediation, educational participation, and socio-economic outcomes. Artificial intelligence technologies influence learning environments, assessment systems, and institutional decision-making processes. These systems interact with educational governance structures, socio-economic inequalities, and cultural expectations concerning meritocracy and academic achievement. Institutional mediation—including policy frameworks, funding systems, pedagogical traditions, and technological infrastructure—shapes how artificial intelligence affects educational participation and inequality. These dynamics ultimately influence long-term human capital development, labor market opportunity, and social mobility.

This article therefore seeks to answer the following research objective: how do artificial intelligence-driven educational systems shape educational inequality and human capital development in Singapore and the United Kingdom, and what institutional mechanisms explain comparative differences between these two educational governance models?

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a comparative interdisciplinary research design integrating comparative education analysis, digital governance studies, educational sociology, and public policy interpretation to examine how artificial intelligence-driven educational transformation shapes inequality and human capital development in Singapore and the United Kingdom. The comparative selection of these two cases is analytically significant because both societies possess advanced technological infrastructures, internationally recognized educational systems, and strong governmental commitments toward educational digitalization, while simultaneously demonstrating substantial variation in governance structures, institutional centralization, policy coordination, and socio-economic inequality. The unit of analysis consists of institutional implementation and socio-educational impacts of artificial intelligence-driven digital learning systems between 2018 and 2025. The study draws upon multiple forms of evidence including OECD educational indicators, UNESCO digital education reports, governmental policy documents, institutional digital strategy frameworks, comparative educational research literature, labor market statistics, and public reports concerning educational technology implementation. Analytical attention focuses on institutional governance, technological access, algorithmic assessment systems, digital literacy, educational participation, and socio-economic stratification. The theoretical-methodological alignment combines Bourdieu’s theory of cultural reproduction, digital capital theory, comparative institutional analysis, and critical digital sociology to explain how technological transformation intersects with broader educational inequalities.

The interpretive strategy combines comparative institutional analysis, policy discourse interpretation, and socio-cultural evaluation to identify mechanisms shaping divergent educational outcomes across the two societies. Comparative analysis focuses on four dimensions: governance coordination, technological integration, educational inequality, and human capital development. Policy documents, educational strategies, and institutional reports were analyzed through critical discourse analysis to examine how

Copyright © 2025 by Author/s. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

artificial intelligence is framed within broader narratives concerning national competitiveness, social mobility, and educational modernization. Validation procedures relied upon triangulation across international datasets, policy archives, peer-reviewed literature, and comparative educational indicators to ensure analytical consistency and minimize interpretive bias. Ethical considerations included avoidance of speculative institutional claims, critical attention toward algorithmic inequality and surveillance concerns, and clear differentiation between documented evidence and theoretical interpretation. Limitations include reliance on secondary comparative data, uneven transparency regarding proprietary educational technologies, and the difficulty of fully isolating artificial intelligence impacts from broader socio-economic educational reforms. Nevertheless, the interdisciplinary comparative design provides robust analytical insight into how digital governance reshapes educational inequality within advanced technological societies.

Findings and Discussion

1. Centralized Governance and Digital Educational Transformation

The findings demonstrate that governance structures significantly shape the implementation and social consequences of artificial intelligence-driven educational systems. Singapore's educational transformation is characterized by highly centralized policy coordination involving long-term national planning, integrated digital infrastructure development, and state-led technological modernization strategies. Artificial intelligence systems are incorporated into broader national frameworks emphasizing economic competitiveness, technological adaptation, and future workforce preparation.

Comparative evidence indicates that Singapore's centralized governance enables relatively consistent implementation of digital learning systems across educational institutions. Government-supported digital infrastructure programs, standardized technological integration policies, and national educational planning contribute to comparatively uniform access to digital learning resources. Artificial intelligence technologies are increasingly utilized for adaptive learning, student assessment, data analytics, and educational management systems.

However, the findings additionally reveal tensions associated with technocratic educational governance. Singapore's highly performance-oriented educational culture intensifies concerns regarding surveillance, data-driven evaluation, and academic pressure. Students increasingly experience educational participation within environments emphasizing measurable performance indicators, algorithmic monitoring, and technological optimization. Consequently, digital learning systems may reinforce meritocratic competition and psychological pressure despite improving institutional efficiency.

The United Kingdom demonstrates a contrasting governance trajectory characterized by institutional decentralization, market-oriented educational reforms, and uneven technological integration. Artificial intelligence adoption varies substantially across schools, universities, and regional educational systems depending upon funding capacity, institutional leadership, and socio-economic context. Consequently, digital

© 2025 by Author/s

educational transformation is more fragmented and unequal.

The comparative findings indicate that centralized coordination may improve technological consistency and infrastructure access, while decentralized systems generate greater institutional variation and inequality. However, centralized governance may also intensify technocratic control and educational standardization. These findings suggest that educational digitalization cannot be evaluated solely through technological effectiveness but must be analyzed through broader institutional and socio-political frameworks.

2. Digital Capital, Social Inequality, and Educational Participation

A major comparative finding concerns the relationship between digital capital and educational inequality. In both Singapore and the United Kingdom, students' ability to benefit from artificial intelligence-driven educational systems depends significantly upon socio-economic resources, digital literacy, family support structures, and institutional access.

In Singapore, state investment in technological infrastructure reduces some forms of digital exclusion. However, educational participation remains strongly shaped by class-based access to supplementary educational resources including private tutoring, advanced digital devices, and specialized technological training. Families possessing higher levels of economic and cultural capital are better positioned to navigate increasingly competitive digital learning environments.

The United Kingdom demonstrates even more pronounced inequalities concerning digital access and institutional capacity. Schools located within economically disadvantaged regions frequently possess weaker technological infrastructures, lower digital preparedness, and reduced institutional resources. Comparative evidence following the COVID-19 pandemic revealed substantial disparities concerning internet access, device availability, and remote learning participation among lower-income households (OECD, 2023).

These findings support Bourdieu's argument that educational systems reproduce broader social inequalities through differential access to forms of capital. Digital transformation does not eliminate educational stratification; rather, it introduces new forms of digital inequality influencing academic participation and future labor market opportunity. Students possessing stronger digital capital are more capable of adapting to algorithmically mediated educational environments.

The findings additionally indicate that artificial intelligence systems may unintentionally reinforce inequality through algorithmic assumptions embedded within educational technologies. Predictive analytics, automated assessment systems, and data-driven recommendation tools frequently rely upon historical performance patterns potentially reproducing existing educational disparities. Consequently, technological neutrality cannot be assumed within educational governance.

3. Human Capital Development and Labor Market Transformation

Copyright © 2025 by Author/s. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The comparative analysis further demonstrates that artificial intelligence-driven educational systems are closely connected to broader human capital and labor market transformation agendas. Singapore's educational policies strongly emphasize alignment between technological education, workforce modernization, and national economic planning. Artificial intelligence and digital competency are framed as essential skills necessary for participation within future knowledge economies.

Educational curricula increasingly prioritize coding, computational thinking, data literacy, and technological adaptability. These policies contribute to strong national digital preparedness but also risk narrowing educational priorities toward instrumental economic objectives. Humanistic dimensions of education—including critical thinking, democratic participation, ethical reasoning, and cultural interpretation—may become comparatively marginalized within heavily technocratic educational frameworks.

The United Kingdom similarly promotes digital skills development and workforce modernization. However, institutional fragmentation and labor market inequality produce uneven outcomes concerning technological preparedness and educational opportunity. Elite universities and highly resourced institutions frequently demonstrate strong artificial intelligence integration capacities, while disadvantaged educational sectors face greater structural limitations.

Comparative evidence suggests that artificial intelligence-driven educational transformation may contribute to labor market polarization if unequal access to digital competencies persists. Students excluded from advanced digital learning environments risk long-term disadvantage within increasingly technology-intensive economies.

The findings additionally raise broader ethical questions concerning the purpose of education within digitally transformed societies. Educational systems increasingly operate at the intersection of economic competitiveness, technological governance, and social citizenship. Artificial intelligence therefore reshapes not only pedagogical practice but also societal understandings of knowledge, meritocracy, and human development.

4. Comparative Matrix of Institutional Mechanisms and Educational Outcomes

Table 1. Comparative Matrix of Social Variables, Institutional Mechanisms, and Societal Outcomes

Variable	Case/System 1: Singapore	Case/System 2: United Kingdom	Empirical/Interpretive Evidence	Analytical Interpretation
Governance Structure	Centralized state coordination	Decentralized market-oriented governance	Different educational policy frameworks	Governance models shape digital consistency
Digital Infrastru	Nationally	Uneven institution	Contrasting access patterns	Technological

© 2025 by Author/s

cture	integrated systems	al implementation		capacity influences inequality
Educational Culture	Meritocratic performance orientation	Institutional variation and competition	Different pedagogical environments	Educational norms shape AI integration
Digital Capital	Reduced infrastructural exclusion but strong class competition	Significant socio-economic digital inequality	Uneven access to digital resources	AI systems may reproduce stratification
Human Capital Policy	State-aligned workforce modernization	Fragmented technological preparation	Divergent labor market alignment	Educational policy influences future opportunity
Societal Outcomes	Efficient technological integration with surveillance concerns	Innovation with unequal institutional capacity	Contrasting educational trajectories	Digital governance shapes social mobility

The comparative matrix demonstrates that artificial intelligence-driven educational transformation is fundamentally mediated through governance structures, socio-economic inequality, and institutional culture. Singapore's centralized educational governance enables coordinated technological modernization but also intensifies concerns regarding surveillance, academic pressure, and technocratic standardization. The United Kingdom's decentralized educational landscape allows institutional flexibility but generates substantial inequality concerning digital access and educational opportunity.

The findings reveal that artificial intelligence systems do not independently determine educational outcomes. Rather, technological transformation interacts with historically embedded educational inequalities, governance traditions, and labor market structures. Educational participation within digital societies therefore depends upon institutional capacity, socio-economic resources, and equitable access to digital capital.

The broader interdisciplinary implication concerns the necessity of integrating educational sociology, digital governance studies, public policy analysis, and critical technology studies in understanding educational transformation. Artificial intelligence in education must be interpreted not solely as pedagogical innovation but as a socio-political restructuring of institutional authority, knowledge production, and human development.

Copyright © 2025 by Author/s. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Conceptual Framework

Artificial Intelligence Systems → Institutional Mediation → Educational Participation → Human Capital Formation → Socio-Economic Outcomes

The conceptual framework developed in this article explains educational transformation within digital societies as an interconnected process linking technological systems, institutional governance, educational participation, and socio-economic development. Artificial intelligence systems influence assessment practices, learning environments, educational management, and access to knowledge resources.

These technological processes are mediated through institutional structures including governance frameworks, funding systems, pedagogical cultures, labor market strategies, and socio-economic inequalities. Institutional mediation determines whether artificial intelligence contributes to inclusive educational participation or reinforces existing social stratification.

Educational participation subsequently shapes human capital formation by influencing digital literacy, technological competencies, critical thinking capacities, and labor market preparedness. Socio-economic outcomes emerge through interactions between educational access, technological capability, and institutional opportunity structures.

Consequently, artificial intelligence-driven educational transformation cannot be understood exclusively through technological effectiveness but must be analyzed through broader institutional, cultural, and socio-political dynamics shaping contemporary educational societies.

CONCLUSION

This article investigated how artificial intelligence-driven educational systems shape educational inequality and human capital development in Singapore and the United Kingdom through a comparative interdisciplinary analysis integrating educational sociology, digital governance studies, and comparative institutional theory. The findings demonstrate that artificial intelligence in education functions not merely as a technological innovation but as a socio-political mechanism reshaping institutional authority, pedagogical practice, and educational participation.

The comparative evidence reveals substantial variation between the two societies. Singapore's centralized governance framework facilitates highly coordinated digital educational modernization and relatively consistent technological implementation. However, this model simultaneously intensifies concerns regarding surveillance, academic competition, and technocratic standardization. The United Kingdom's decentralized educational landscape encourages institutional flexibility and innovation but generates fragmented patterns of technological access and substantial inequality across socio-economic groups.

© 2025 by Author/s

Theoretically, this article contributes to contemporary social sciences and humanities scholarship by integrating educational inequality theory, digital governance analysis, and comparative public policy within a unified analytical framework. The study advances understanding of how artificial intelligence interacts with historically embedded educational structures and socio-economic inequalities.

Empirically, the article contributes comparative insight into Asian and European educational governance models, demonstrating that technological modernization produces divergent outcomes depending upon institutional coordination, funding structures, and cultural educational norms. The findings additionally highlight the growing importance of digital capital in shaping educational participation and long-term social mobility.

The societal implications are significant. Governments and educational institutions must recognize that technological modernization alone cannot guarantee equitable educational outcomes. Policies addressing digital inequality, algorithmic transparency, institutional access, and critical digital literacy are essential for ensuring inclusive educational transformation.

The interdisciplinary implications extend across sociology, education studies, digital humanities, public policy, communication studies, and critical technology research. Understanding artificial intelligence in education requires analytical integration across technological, institutional, cultural, and socio-economic dimensions.

Several limitations remain. The study relies primarily on comparative secondary data and institutional analysis rather than longitudinal ethnographic observation or proprietary algorithmic evaluation. Future research should therefore incorporate classroom-level digital ethnography, comparative student experience analysis, and computational evaluation of algorithmic educational systems. Further scholarship should additionally investigate ethical questions concerning artificial intelligence governance, student autonomy, and democratic educational participation within increasingly data-driven learning environments.

Ultimately, this article demonstrates that artificial intelligence-driven educational transformation reshapes educational inequality not by eliminating institutional disparities but by reorganizing how access, participation, and human capital formation operate within contemporary digital societies.

REFERENCES

Becker, G. S. (1993). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis. University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.

Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. (2019). The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism. Stanford University Press.

Luckin, R. (2018). Machine learning and human intelligence: The future of education for the 21st century. UCL Institute of Education Press.

Copyright © 2025 by Author/s. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

OECD. (2023). Digital education outlook 2023. OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2025). Education policy perspectives 2025. OECD Publishing.

Ragnedda, M. (2020). Enhancing digital equity: Connecting the digital underclass. Palgrave Macmillan.

Selwyn, N. (2022). Education and technology: Key issues and debates. Bloomsbury.

Tan, C. (2021). Education policy and meritocracy in Singapore. Routledge.

UNESCO. (2023). Global education monitoring report 2023. UNESCO Publishing.

UNESCO. (2024). Artificial intelligence and the future of learning report. UNESCO Publishing.

Van Dijck, J., Poell, T., & De Waal, M. (2021). The platform society: Public values in a connective world. Oxford University Press.

Williamson, B. (2023). Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice. Sage.

World Bank. (2024). Digital development and human capital report. World Bank.

Young, M. (2021). Meritocracy and educational inequality in digital societies. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 42(5), 701–718.

Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism. PublicAffairs.

 © 2025 by Author/s