Article

Digital Humanities as a Catalyst for Inclusive Urbanization: A Multinational Analysis of Technological Integration and Social Equity

Maria Elena Rodriguez*

Department of Digital Humanities, University of Barcelona, Barcelona 08001, Spain

ABSTRACT

This study explores the intersection of digital humanities (DH) and inclusive urbanization across 12 countries, analyzing how DH methodologies address social inequities in rapidly urbanizing contexts. By examining 37 DH projects implemented between 2021–2024, the research identifies three core mechanisms: data-driven participatory planning, digital cultural preservation, and accessible knowledge mobilization. Findings reveal that DH tools enhance marginalized communities' agency in urban development, though effectiveness varies by national digital infrastructure and policy frameworks. The paper concludes with a framework for integrating DH into urban governance to promote equitable growth.

Keywords: Digital Humanities; Inclusive Urbanization; Social Equity; Technological Integration; Urban Governance; Multinational Research

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Urbanization has accelerated globally, with 56% of the world's population residing in urban areas (United Nations, 2022). However, this rapid growth often exacerbates social disparities, including unequal access to resources, cultural erasure, and limited community participation in urban planning (Satterthwaite et al., 2023). Digital Humanities (DH), an interdisciplinary field combining computational methods with humanistic inquiry, offers innovative approaches to address these challenges (Burdick et al., 2021). By leveraging data analytics, digital archiving, and participatory technologies, DH enables scholars, policymakers, and communities to collaborate on urban issues through a human-centered lens.

1.2 Research Gap

Existing literature on DH and urbanization primarily focuses on single-country case studies or technical applications, lacking a comparative analysis across diverse national contexts (Gardner & Kazansky, 2022). Additionally, few studies systematically evaluate how DH contributes to inclusive urban development metrics, such as social inclusion, cultural preservation, and participatory governance (Lamb et al., 2023).

This research fills these gaps by examining DH projects in 12 countries across Africa, Asia, Europe, and Latin America, assessing their impact on inclusive urbanization.

1.3 Research Questions

How do DH methodologies facilitate inclusive urbanization across different national contexts?
What are the key enablers and barriers to implementing DH-driven inclusive urban projects?
Can a cross-national framework be developed to guide DH integration into urban governance?

1.4 Significance

This study contributes to both DH and urban studies literatures by providing empirical evidence of DH's role in fostering inclusive urbanization. The cross-national analysis offers insights for policymakers, urban planners, and DH practitioners seeking to implement contextually appropriate solutions. Additionally, the proposed framework can inform future research and policy development aimed at leveraging digital technologies for equitable urban growth.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Digital Humanities: Definitions and Methodologies

Digital Humanities encompasses a range of computational methods applied to humanistic research, including text mining, digital archiving, geographic information systems (GIS), and participatory digital platforms (Berry & Fagerjord, 2021). Core DH methodologies emphasize interdisciplinary collaboration, open access to knowledge, and user-centered design—principles that align with inclusive urbanization goals (Nowviskie, 2022). Recent advancements in DH, such as artificial intelligence (AI)-powered data analysis and immersive digital experiences, have expanded its potential to address complex urban challenges (Schreibman et al., 2023).

2.2 Inclusive Urbanization: Key Concepts and Metrics

Inclusive urbanization is defined as a process that ensures all urban residents, particularly marginalized groups, have equal access to opportunities, resources, and decision-making processes (UN-Habitat, 2022). Key metrics include social inclusion (e.g., reduced inequality, increased community participation), cultural preservation (e.g., protection of heritage sites, promotion of local cultures), and environmental sustainability (e.g., green infrastructure, climate resilience) (Parnell & Pieterse, 2023). Traditional urban planning approaches often prioritize economic growth over inclusion, leading to the marginalization of low-income communities, ethnic minorities, and indigenous populations (Roy, 2022).

2.3 DH and Inclusive Urbanization: Existing Studies

Several studies have highlighted the potential of DH to support inclusive urbanization. For example, GIS-based DH projects have mapped informal settlements, enabling policymakers to allocate resources more equitably (Elwood & Leszczynski, 2021). Digital archiving initiatives have preserved urban cultural heritage threatened by gentrification (Kidd & McDougall, 2022). Participatory DH platforms, such as citizen science apps and digital storytelling projects, have enhanced community engagement in urban planning (Bowser & Coughlin, 2023). However, these studies are often limited to specific regions or project types, and few provide comparative analysis across national contexts.

2.4 Cross-National Variations in Urbanization and DH Adoption

National contexts play a critical role in shaping DH implementation and urbanization outcomes. Factors such as digital infrastructure, policy frameworks, cultural values, and economic resources influence the adoption and effectiveness of DH projects (Miller et al., 2022). For example, countries with robust digital infrastructure and supportive policies, such as South Korea and Germany, have successfully integrated DH into urban governance (Kim & Lee, 2023). In contrast, low-income countries face challenges related to limited internet access, inadequate funding, and capacity gaps (Moyo & Chigona, 2022). This variation underscores the need for contextually adaptive DH approaches.

2.5 Interdisciplinary Dialogues: DH, Urban Studies, and Social Justice

The intersection of digital humanities with urban studies and social justice scholarship creates a fertile ground for interdisciplinary innovation. Critical urban theorists (e.g., Harvey, 2022; Lefebvre, 2021 [reissued]) emphasize that urban space is a social product shaped by power dynamics, and DH methodologies offer new tools to unpack these dynamics through data-driven critique. For instance, text mining of urban planning documents has revealed hidden biases against low-income communities in zoning policies (Raj et al., 2023), while network analysis of social media data has mapped how marginalized groups mobilize for urban justice (Chen & Jackson, 2022). These examples illustrate how DH bridges the gap between abstract urban theory and tangible social practice, enabling scholars to translate critical insights into actionable interventions.

Social justice scholars have also highlighted the importance of centering marginalized voices in DH projects, cautioning against "technocolonialism"—the imposition of Western digital tools on non-Western contexts without cultural adaptation (Tuhiwai Smith et al., 2023). This critique aligns with DH's evolving focus on inclusive design, as seen in projects like the "Indigenous Digital Urban Archive" in New Zealand, which integrates Māori cultural protocols into digital archiving practices (Walker et al., 2022). By engaging with social justice frameworks, DH projects avoid reinforcing existing inequalities and instead become vehicles for transformative urban change.

2.6 Technological Advancements in DH and Urban Applications

Recent technological advancements have expanded DH's capacity to address complex urban challenges. Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) have enabled more sophisticated analysis of urban data, such as predicting gentrification hotspots using spatial-temporal data (Zhang et al., 2023) or identifying patterns of social exclusion in public transportation networks (Lee & Kim, 2021). Immersive technologies, including virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR), have transformed public engagement with urban planning—for example, VR simulations of proposed developments allow community members to visualize changes before construction, fostering more informed feedback (Garcia & Lopez, 2023).

Blockchain technology, though less commonly associated with DH, has emerged as a tool for transparent urban governance. In Lagos, Nigeria, the "Blockchain Urban Land Registry" project uses decentralized ledgers to secure land rights for informal settlement residents, reducing corruption and displacement (Okafor & Moyo, 2023). These technological innovations demonstrate DH's adaptability, as practitioners integrate cutting-edge tools with humanistic principles to address context-specific urban issues. However, they also raise ethical concerns, such as data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the concentration of technological power, which must be addressed through inclusive governance frameworks (Noble, 2022).

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study employs a mixed-methods research design, combining quantitative analysis of DH project data with qualitative case studies. The cross-national approach includes 12 countries: South Africa, Nigeria, China, India, Japan, South Korea, Spain, Germany, the United Kingdom, Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina. These countries represent diverse regions, income levels, and urbanization rates, enabling a comprehensive analysis of DH and inclusive urbanization.

3.2 Data Collection

3.2.1 Sample Selection

DH projects were selected using a systematic search of academic databases (JSTOR, ProQuest, Google Scholar), DH repositories (Digital Humanities Now, Humanities Commons), and international organizations (UN-Habitat, UNESCO). Inclusion criteria included: (1) implementation between 2021–2024, (2) focus on urban issues, (3) explicit commitment to inclusive development, and (4) availability of project documentation (e.g., reports, peer-reviewed articles, project websites). A total of 37 projects were selected for analysis.

3.2.2 Data Sources

Quantitative Data: Project metrics (e.g., number of participants, geographic scope, funding sources), national indicators (e.g., digital infrastructure index, urbanization rate, Gini coefficient) from the World Bank, United Nations, and International Telecommunication Union (ITU).

Qualitative Data: Project reports, stakeholder interviews (n=54), and policy documents. Interviews were conducted with DH practitioners, urban planners, community leaders, and policymakers via video conferencing between March–September 2023.

3.3 Data Analysis

3.3.1 Quantitative Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize project characteristics and national indicators. Correlation analysis was conducted to explore relationships between DH project features (e.g., technology type, funding) and inclusive urbanization outcomes (e.g., community participation rates, cultural preservation efforts).

3.3.2 Qualitative Analysis

Thematic analysis was applied to qualitative data, identifying key themes related to DH implementation, enablers and barriers, and impact on inclusive urbanization. NVivo 12 software was used to code and analyze interview transcripts and project documents.

3.4 Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Boards of all participating institutions. Informed consent was obtained from all interview participants, and anonymization was used to protect their identities. Project data was collected from publicly available sources or with permission from project leaders.

3.5 Sampling Strategy: Ensuring Diversity and Representativeness

To ensure the sample of 37 DH projects was representative of global diversity, a stratified sampling approach was adopted. Countries were grouped by region (Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America) and income level (high-income, upper-middle-income, lower-middle-income, low-income) based on World Bank classifications (World Bank, 2022). Within each stratum, projects were selected to reflect varying scales (local, national, regional), funding sources, and technological approaches. This strategy minimized selection bias and ensured that the study captured a wide range of contextual factors influencing DH implementation.

For example, in Africa, projects included the low-tech "SMS Urban Feedback System" in Kenya (low-income, local scale) and the high-tech "Smart Heritage Preservation Platform" in South Africa (upper-middle-income, national scale). In Asia, the sample included China's "Digital Urban Planning Portal" (high-income, national scale) and India's "Grassroots Digital Storytelling Project" (lower-middle-income, local scale). This diversity allowed for robust cross-national comparisons and ensured that the findings were not limited to specific contexts.

3.6 Data Validation and Triangulation

To enhance the credibility of the findings, triangulation was employed across multiple data sources and methods. Quantitative data from project reports was cross-validated with national statistics (e.g., digital infrastructure indices) to ensure accuracy. Qualitative interview data was triangulated with project documentation, such as meeting minutes and community feedback forms, to confirm key themes. Additionally, member checking was conducted with 12 interview participants, who reviewed draft summaries of their responses to ensure alignment with their intended meaning (Lincoln & Guba, 2021 [revised]).

A peer debriefing process was also implemented, where two independent scholars (one specializing in DH and one in urban studies) reviewed the data analysis and findings. Their feedback helped refine the thematic coding and ensure that the interpretations were objective and grounded in the data. These validation strategies strengthened the study's rigor and reduced the risk of researcher bias.

4. Results

4.1 Overview of DH Projects

The 37 DH projects analyzed varied in focus, methodology, and scale (Table 1). Key project types included: (1) participatory planning tools (n=12), (2) digital cultural heritage preservation (n=10), (3) data-driven urban analytics (n=8), (4) digital storytelling for marginalized communities (n=5), and (5) inclusive digital infrastructure (n=2). Most projects (68%) were collaborative efforts between academic institutions, civil society organizations, and local governments. Funding sources included government grants (43%), international organizations (32%), and private foundations (25%).

4.2 DH Mechanisms for Inclusive Urbanization

Three core mechanisms through which DH contributes to inclusive urbanization were identified:

4.2.1 Data-Driven Participatory Planning

DH tools, such as interactive GIS maps and citizen science platforms, enabled marginalized communities to contribute data and insights to urban planning processes. For example, in Mumbai, India, the "Urban Voices" project used a mobile app to collect community feedback on informal settlement upgrades, leading to the inclusion of 12 community-proposed infrastructure improvements in the city's

development plan (Patel et al., 2023). Correlation analysis showed a significant positive relationship between the use of participatory DH tools and community participation rates (r=0.72, p<0.01).

4.2.2 Digital Cultural Preservation

DH projects preserved urban cultural heritage threatened by gentrification and development. In Barcelona, Spain, the "Digital Barrio" project created a 3D digital archive of historic neighborhoods, enabling residents and policymakers to visualize the impact of urban renewal projects on cultural sites (Garcia et al., 2022). Similarly, in Cape Town, South Africa, the "Heritage Hub" project digitized oral histories and cultural practices of informal settlement communities, fostering cultural identity and challenging narratives of urban decay (Okafor et al., 2024).

4.2.3 Accessible Knowledge Mobilization

DH platforms made urban planning knowledge and data accessible to non-experts, empowering communities to advocate for their needs. For example, the "Urban Data Lab" in Mexico City provided open-access data visualizations on air quality, housing affordability, and public transportation, enabling community organizations to lobby for policy changes (Mendez et al., 2023). Projects that prioritized multilingual access and low-tech alternatives (e.g., SMS-based data collection) were more successful in engaging marginalized groups with limited digital literacy.

4.3 Cross-National Variations

4.3.1 Enablers

Digital Infrastructure: Countries with high internet penetration rates (e.g., South Korea, Germany) had more scalable DH projects, while low-income countries (e.g., Nigeria, Kenya) relied on low-tech DH solutions.

Policy Support: National policies promoting open data (e.g., United Kingdom's Open Data Strategy) and inclusive urbanization (e.g., China's National New-Type Urbanization Plan) facilitated DH implementation.

Collaborative Ecosystems: Projects in countries with strong partnerships between academia, government, and civil society (e.g., Spain, Brazil) were more sustainable and impactful.

4.3.2 Barriers

Digital Divide: Limited internet access and digital literacy in low-income countries hindered participation in DH projects.

Funding Instability: Short-term funding cycles (common in Latin America and Africa) limited project scalability and long-term impact.

Cultural and Linguistic Barriers: Projects that failed to adapt to local languages and cultural practices had low community engagement.

4.4 Framework for DH-Driven Inclusive Urbanization

Based on the results, a four-step framework was developed:

Context Assessment: Evaluate national digital infrastructure, policy frameworks, and community needs.

Co-Design: Collaborate with marginalized communities to develop DH tools that address local priorities.

Implementation: Adopt hybrid (high-tech/low-tech) approaches to ensure accessibility.

Evaluation: Use inclusive metrics (e.g., community participation, cultural preservation) to assess impact and adapt strategies.

4.5 In-Depth Case Studies of Exemplary DH Projects

To illustrate the core mechanisms identified, three exemplary case studies are detailed below, representing diverse national contexts and project types:

Case Study 1: Data-Driven Participatory Planning in Seoul, South Korea

Seoul's "Citizen-Led Urban Regeneration" project (2022–2023) used a DH platform integrating GIS, AI, and participatory budgeting to engage residents in redeveloping the Dongdaemun district. The platform allowed citizens to propose projects (e.g., community gardens, pedestrianized streets) via a mobile app, which used AI to analyze feasibility based on spatial data (e.g., land use, population density). Residents then voted on proposals through the platform, with results directly informing the city's regeneration plan.

Key outcomes included: (1) a 40% increase in community participation compared to traditional planning processes, (2) the implementation of 18 resident-proposed projects, and (3) a 25% reduction in complaints about the regeneration process. Success factors included Seoul's high digital infrastructure (98% internet penetration rate), supportive open data policies, and a long history of citizen participation in urban governance (Kim et al., 2023). This case demonstrates how DH can streamline participatory planning in high-income contexts with robust digital ecosystems.

Case Study 2: Digital Cultural Preservation in Lagos, Nigeria

The "Lagos Heritage Digital Archive" (2021–2024) addressed the erasure of cultural heritage in informal settlements threatened by rapid urbanization. Given Nigeria's low internet penetration rate (47%), the project adopted a hybrid approach: community members documented cultural practices (e.g., traditional festivals, oral histories) using low-cost mobile phones, and data was uploaded to a digital archive via solar-powered community hubs. The archive was also made accessible offline through USB drives distributed to local schools and community centers.

Outcomes included: (1) the digitization of 500+ cultural artifacts and oral histories, (2) increased awareness of informal settlement heritage among policymakers, and (3) the inclusion of heritage preservation in Lagos' 2024 Urban Development Plan. Key enablers were partnerships with local NGOs (which provided training in digital documentation) and the use of low-tech solutions to overcome the digital divide. Barriers included limited funding (the project relied on a single international grant) and challenges in sustaining community engagement after initial training (Okafor et al., 2023). This case highlights the importance of context-adaptive DH approaches in low-income countries.

Case Study 3: Accessible Knowledge Mobilization in Buenos Aires, Argentina

Buenos Aires' "Urban Equity Data Hub" (2022–2023) aimed to make urban data accessible to marginalized communities, particularly low-income neighborhoods and immigrant groups. The platform provided data on housing affordability, public transportation, and access to healthcare in Spanish, English, and Quechua (a indigenous language spoken by 1.2 million Argentines). It also included low-tech alternatives, such as SMS-based data requests and printed data booklets distributed at community centers.

Outcomes included: (1) a 35% increase in community organizations using data to advocate for policy changes, (2) the passage of a city ordinance requiring affordable housing in new developments (informed by data from the hub), and (3) improved digital literacy among 800+ residents who participated in training workshops. Success factors included multilingual design, partnerships with immigrant organizations, and sustained funding from the city government. Barriers included initial resistance from policymakers

unfamiliar with DH tools and challenges in maintaining the platform's multilingual content (Lopez & Garcia, 2024). This case demonstrates how DH can empower marginalized communities through accessible knowledge mobilization in middle-income contexts.

4.6 Long-Term Impact Indicators

While most projects were implemented within the past three years, preliminary long-term impact data was collected for 12 projects that had been operational for at least two years. Key indicators included: (1) policy integration (whether DH-generated insights were incorporated into long-term urban plans), (2) community capacity building (whether residents developed skills to continue using DH tools independently), and (3) cultural continuity (whether digital preservation efforts led to increased recognition of marginalized heritage).

Results showed that 75% of these projects had policy impacts, 67% reported sustained community capacity building, and 83% achieved cultural continuity outcomes. For example, the "Mumbai Urban Voices" project (Case Study 1) led to the establishment of a permanent citizen participation unit in the Mumbai Municipal Corporation, while the "Lagos Heritage Digital Archive" (Case Study 2) resulted in the training of 20 community members as permanent digital archivists. These indicators suggest that DH projects can have lasting effects when supported by strong partnerships and context-adaptive implementation.

5. Discussion

5.1 Key Findings

This study demonstrates that DH methodologies contribute to inclusive urbanization through data-driven participatory planning, digital cultural preservation, and accessible knowledge mobilization. The cross-national analysis highlights the importance of context adaptation—DH projects that align with national policies, digital infrastructure, and cultural practices are more effective in fostering social equity. The proposed framework provides a practical guide for integrating DH into urban governance, emphasizing collaboration, accessibility, and continuous evaluation.

5.2 Theoretical Implications

The findings expand the theoretical understanding of DH as a tool for social change, moving beyond technical applications to emphasize its role in inclusive development. By linking DH to inclusive urbanization metrics, this study bridges the gap between digital humanities and urban studies literatures. The cross-national perspective also contributes to theories of comparative urbanism, highlighting how global digital trends interact with local contexts to shape urban outcomes.

5.3 Practical Implications

For policymakers, the framework offers a roadmap for integrating DH into urban planning policies, including investments in digital infrastructure, open data initiatives, and capacity building for DH practitioners. Urban planners can use DH tools to enhance community engagement and data-driven decision-making, while DH practitioners should prioritize accessibility, cultural sensitivity, and long-term sustainability in project design.

5.4 Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, the sample of 37 projects may not be representative of all

DH initiatives globally. Second, data on long-term impact was limited, as most projects were implemented within the past three years. Third, the mixed-methods approach, while comprehensive, required balancing depth and breadth across 12 countries. Future research should include longer-term follow-up studies and focus on underrepresented regions, such as Central Asia and the Pacific Islands.

5.5 Addressing Ethical Challenges in DH-Driven Urbanization

While DH offers significant potential for inclusive urbanization, it also raises ethical challenges that must be addressed to avoid reinforcing inequalities. One key challenge is **data privacy**, as DH projects often collect sensitive data from marginalized communities (e.g., location data, personal narratives). To mitigate this risk, projects should adopt privacy-by-design principles, such as anonymizing data, obtaining informed consent, and involving communities in data governance (Price & Cohen, 2022). For example, the "Buenos Aires Urban Equity Data Hub" (Case Study 3) established a community data council to oversee data collection and use, ensuring that residents had control over their information.

Another ethical concern is **algorithmic bias**, as DH tools (e.g., AI-powered data analysis) can replicate or amplify existing inequalities if training data is biased. To address this, practitioners should use diverse, representative datasets and involve marginalized communities in developing and testing algorithms (Benjamin, 2023). The "Seoul Citizen-Led Urban Regeneration" project (Case Study 1) included a diverse advisory board in algorithm design, ensuring that the platform did not prioritize wealthier neighborhoods in project feasibility assessments.

Finally, **technological dependency** is a risk, as communities may become reliant on external DH practitioners or funding. To promote sustainability, projects should prioritize capacity building, such as training local residents in digital documentation and data analysis (Smith et al., 2022). The "Lagos Heritage Digital Archive" (Case Study 2) addressed this by training community members to manage the archive independently, reducing reliance on external partners.

5.6 Policy Recommendations for Inclusive DH Implementation

Based on the findings, four policy recommendations are proposed to support DH-driven inclusive urbanization:

Invest in Digital Infrastructure for Marginalized Communities: Governments should prioritize expanding internet access and digital literacy programs in low-income neighborhoods and informal settlements. This includes deploying low-cost technologies (e.g., solar-powered Wi-Fi hubs) and providing training in digital skills relevant to urban participation (e.g., data analysis, digital storytelling).

Develop Inclusive Open Data Policies: National and local governments should adopt open data policies that prioritize data relevant to marginalized communities (e.g., housing affordability, access to services) and ensure that data is available in multiple languages and formats (including offline). Policies should also include safeguards for data privacy and community control over data.

Fund Long-Term, Community-Led DH Projects: Funding bodies should move beyond short-term grants to support sustained DH initiatives, with a focus on community-led co-design and capacity building. This includes providing flexible funding for context-adaptive approaches and evaluating projects based on inclusive metrics (e.g., community participation, cultural preservation) rather than technical outputs.

Strengthen Interdisciplinary Partnerships: Governments, academic institutions, civil society organizations, and communities should collaborate to develop DH projects that address local needs. This includes establishing interdisciplinary research centers focused on DH and inclusive urbanization, as well as

creating platforms for knowledge sharing between practitioners across countries.

These recommendations align with global policy frameworks such as the UN's Sustainable Development Goal 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities) and the New Urban Agenda, which emphasize inclusive, participatory, and technology-enabled urban development (UN-Habitat, 2023). By implementing these policies, countries can leverage DH to create more equitable and sustainable cities.

6. Conclusion

Digital Humanities has significant potential to foster inclusive urbanization by centering community voices, preserving cultural heritage, and making urban knowledge accessible. However, its effectiveness depends on contextually adaptive implementation, strong collaborative ecosystems, and a commitment to social equity. The cross-national framework developed in this study provides a blueprint for leveraging DH to address urban disparities, offering a path toward more inclusive, sustainable, and human-centered cities. As urbanization continues to reshape our world, DH will play an increasingly critical role in ensuring that no community is left behind.

References

[1] Berry, D. M., & Fagerjord, A. (2021). *Digital humanities: Knowledge and critique in a digital age* (3rd ed.). Polity Press.

[2] Bowser, B., & Coughlin, J. F. (2023). Citizen science and digital humanities: Collaborative approaches to urban research. *Journal of Urban Technology*, 30(2), 45–67.

[3] Burdick, A., et al. (2021). *Digital humanities: Tools, methodologies, and research practices.* MIT Press.

[4] Elwood, S., & Leszczynski, A. (2021). Feminist digital humanities and urban planning: Centering justice in spatial data. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 111(3), 789–806.

[5] Garcia, M., et al. (2022). Digital preservation of urban heritage: The case of Barcelona's El Raval neighborhood. *Journal of Digital Humanities*, 11(1), 34–52.

[6] Gardner, H., & Kazansky, K. (2022). Digital humanities and urban studies: A systematic review. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 44(5), 890–908.

[7] ITU. (2023). *Measuring digital development: Facts and figures 2023*. International Telecommunication Union.

[8] Kidd, W., & McDougall, J. (2022). Digital storytelling as resistance: Preserving marginalized urban histories. *Discourse Processes*, 59(4), 231–248.

[9] Kim, H., & Lee, S. (2023). Digital humanities and smart city governance in South Korea. *Government Information Quarterly*, 40(2), 101789.

[10] Lamb, R., et al. (2023). Inclusive digital humanities: Evaluating the impact of urban DH projects on social equity. *Social Sciences*, 12(7), 389.

[11] Miller, S., et al. (2022). National contexts shaping digital humanities adoption: A cross-country comparison. *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, 37(3), 765–782.

[12] Mendez, L., et al. (2023). Open data and inclusive urban planning: The Urban Data Lab in Mexico City. *Data & Policy*, 5(1), e32.

[13] Moyo, N., & Chigona, A. (2022). Digital humanities in African cities: Challenges and opportunities. *African Journal of Information Science and Technology*, 12(4), 156–172.

[14] Nowviskie, B. (2022). The future of digital humanities: Toward a more inclusive and equitable field. *P

[15] Nowviskie, B. (2022). The future of digital humanities: Toward a more inclusive and equitable field. *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, 16(3), 1–18.

[16] Okafor, A., et al. (2024). Digitizing informal settlement heritage: The Heritage Hub project in Cape Town. *Urban Forum*, 35(1), 89–107.

[17] Parnell, S., & Pieterse, E. (2023). Inclusive urbanization in the global South: Rethinking metrics and approaches. *Progress in Planning*, 168, 100654.

[18] Patel, R., et al. (2023). Participatory digital tools for informal settlement upgrading: The Urban Voices project in Mumbai. *Habitat International*, 132, 102689.

[19] Roy, A. (2022). Urban marginality and the politics of inclusion: A global perspective. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 46(2), 289–306.

[20] Schreibman, S., et al. (2023). *A new companion to digital humanities* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.

[21] Satterthwaite, D., et al. (2023). Urban inequality and the SDGs: Progress and challenges. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 98, 104892.

[22] United Nations. (2022). *World urbanization prospects: The 2022 revision*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

[23] UN-Habitat. (2022). *State of the world's cities report 2022: Inclusive urbanization for sustainable development*. United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

[24] Acosta, L., & Marquez, J. (2022). Digital humanities and cultural identity in Latin American cities. *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies*, 31(4), 512–529.

[25] Ahmed, S., & Khan, M. (2023). GIS-based digital humanities for equitable urban planning in Karachi. *Pakistan Journal of Urban and Regional Planning*, 15(2), 67–83.

[26] Bailey, C., & Davis, K. (2021). Accessible digital humanities: Designing for marginalized communities in urban contexts. *Journal of Accessibility and Design in the Digital Age*, 8(1), 23–41.

[27] Bhan, G., & Srinivasan, S. (2023). Digital storytelling and urban activism in Delhi's informal settlements. *Antipode*, 55(3), 876–894.

[28] Böhme, G., & Schmidt, T. (2022). Smart cities and digital humanities: Balancing technology and social inclusion in Berlin. *European Planning Studies*, 30(7), 1345–1364.

[29] Brown, A., & Wilson, L. (2023). Funding digital humanities for inclusive urbanization: Lessons from international grants. *Research Policy*, 52(6), 104532.

[30] Chen, L., & Zhang, H. (2022). Digital humanities and new-type urbanization in China: Policy integration and practice. *China City Planning Review*, 31(3), 45–58.

[31] Clark, D., & Moore, R. (2021). Artificial intelligence in digital humanities: Ethical considerations for urban research. *Journal of Digital Ethics*, 7(2), 89–105.

[32] Dutta, R., & Roy, S. (2023). Low-tech digital humanities: Addressing the digital divide in rural urban peripheries of India. *Technology in Society*, 72, 102189.

[33] Evans, H., & Foster, C. (2022). Open data policies and digital humanities: Enabling inclusive urban governance in the UK. *Public Administration Review*, 82(4), 789–798.

[34] Ferreira, M., & Silva, C. (2023). Collaborative digital humanities projects in Brazilian cities: Partnerships between academia and civil society. *Latin American Research Review*, 58(2), 345–362.

[35] Gupta, A., & Mehta, S. (2022). Digital archiving of urban heritage in Jaipur: A case study of the Pink City Digital Project. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 17(5), 612–628.

[36] Hansen, K., & Olsen, J. (2023). Digital humanities and climate resilience in Copenhagen's urban planning. *Sustainability*, 15(8), 6543–6561.

[37] Huang, Y., & Liu, J. (2021). Multilingual digital humanities platforms for inclusive urban communication in Singapore. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 42(9), 789–805.

[38] Iqbal, Z., & Shah, F. (2023). Digital humanities capacity building in Pakistani cities: Challenges for early-career researchers. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 49(3), 102589.

[39] Jackson, R., & Thompson, S. (2022). Digital humanities and social justice: Case studies from US urban communities. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 47(3), 678–699.

[40] Jimenez, R., & Cruz, M. (2023). Inclusive digital infrastructure in Mexican cities: Lessons from the Digital Barrio project. *Urban Technology*, 30(4), 98–117.

[41] Kamau, N., & Njoroge, J. (2022). Mobile-based digital humanities for community participation in Nairobi's slum upgrading. *African Geographical Review*, 41(3), 245–261.

[42] Lee, H., & Park, S. (2023). Digital humanities and smart city inclusion in Seoul: The role of open data platforms. *Government Information Quarterly*, 40(3), 101823.

[43] Lopez, A., & Gomez, L. (2022). Digital storytelling as a tool for cultural preservation in Buenos Aires' historic neighborhoods. *Journal of Urban Cultural Studies*, 9(2), 123–141.

[44] Martin, P., & Hughes, D. (2023). Evaluating the impact of digital humanities projects on urban social equity: A framework for assessment. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 95, 102087.

[45] Mbithi, E., & Ochieng, J. (2022). Digital humanities and inclusive urban planning in Kenya: The case of Kisumu's waterfront development. *Habitat International*, 129, 102615.

[46] Nelson, C., & Carter, J. (2021). Immersive digital humanities experiences for urban heritage preservation in Edinburgh. *Journal of Digital Media & Culture*, 10(1), 34–52.

[47] Ochoa, J., & Alvarez, M. (2023). Policy barriers to digital humanities adoption for inclusive urbanization in Colombia. *Policy Studies Journal*, 51(2), 456–473.

[48] Peters, T., & Rogers, M. (2022). Digital humanities and participatory budgeting in Amsterdam: Enhancing community engagement. *Urban Affairs Review*, 58(6), 1789–1814.

[49] Qureshi, A., & Ali, S. (2023). Digital literacy and inclusive digital humanities in Lahore's urban communities. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 26(2), 156–172.

[50] Ribeiro, S., & Costa, A. (2022). Digital humanities and environmental justice in Rio de Janeiro's favelas. *Environmental Politics*, 31(4), 789–812.

[51] Santos, J., & Mendes, P. (2023). Cross-national collaboration in digital humanities for inclusive urbanization: The EU-Latin America Urban DH Network. *International Journal of Digital Humanities*, 4(1), 56–73.