

Toward satisfactory public accessibility: A crowdsourcing approach through online reviews to inclusive urban design

Lingyao Li*
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL, USA
lingyaol@usf.edu

Songhua Hu*
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA, USA
hsonghua@mit.edu

Yinpei Dai
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI, USA
daiyp@umich.edu

Min Deng
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX, USA
mindeng@ttu.edu

Parisa Momeni
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL, Florida, USA
parisamomeni@usf.edu

Gabriel Laverghetta
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL, USA
glaverghetta@usf.edu

Lizhou Fan
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI, USA
lizhouf@umich.edu

Zihui Ma
University of Maryland College Park
College Park, MD, USA
zma88@umd.edu

Xi Wang
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX, USA
xiwang@tamu.edu

Siyuan Ma
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN, USA
siyuan.ma@vumc.org

Jay Ligatti
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL, USA
ligatti@usf.edu

Libby Hemphill
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, USA
libbyh@umich.edu

Abstract

As urban populations grow, the need for accessible urban design has become urgent. Traditional survey methods for assessing public perceptions of accessibility are often limited in scope. Crowdsourcing via online reviews offers a valuable alternative to understanding public perceptions, and advancements in large language models can facilitate their use. This study uses Google Maps reviews across the United States and fine-tunes Llama 3 model with the Low-Rank Adaptation technique to analyze public sentiment on accessibility. At the POI level, most categories—restaurants, retail, hotels, and healthcare—show negative sentiments. Socio-spatial analysis reveals that areas with higher proportions of white residents and greater socioeconomic status report more positive sentiment, while areas with more elderly, highly-educated residents exhibit more negative sentiment. Interestingly, no clear link is found between the presence of disabilities and public sentiments. Overall, this study highlights the potential of crowdsourcing for identifying accessibility challenges and providing insights for urban planners.

CCS Concepts

• **Human-centered computing** → **Social network analysis**.

*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference acronym 'XX, XXX-X-XXXX-XXXX-X/XX/XX

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

Keywords

Accessibility, Crowdsourcing, Text mining, Inclusive urban design, Large language models

ACM Reference Format:

Lingyao Li, Songhua Hu, Yinpei Dai, Min Deng, Parisa Momeni, Gabriel Laverghetta, Lizhou Fan, Zihui Ma, Xi Wang, Siyuan Ma, Jay Ligatti, and Libby Hemphill. 2024. Toward satisfactory public accessibility: A crowdsourcing approach through online reviews to inclusive urban design. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 16 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 Introduction

As urban populations continue to grow, the importance of creating inclusive cities that cater to all citizens has become increasingly urgent. Despite significant advances in urban planning and development, urban accessibility within cities remains inconsistent [64, 77]. For instance, while public transportation systems are designed to include elevators and audio-visual aids, some regions still have steep stairs and narrow doorways that limit access [79]. Similarly, although many newer buildings comply with modern accessibility standards by incorporating ramps, wide doorways, and accessible restrooms, older structures often lack these essential features [3, 24]. This inconsistency in accessibility significantly impacts the daily lives of individuals, especially those with disabilities [1, 12]. Therefore, it is essential to investigate and improve accessibility in urban environments to ensure that cities become truly inclusive for citizens.

Accessibility research has experienced substantial growth in recent decades, with an increasing number of related papers being presented at human-computer interaction (HCI) venues [59].

The investigation of accessibility within urban environments has often relied on approaches such as surveys [6, 46, 91] and field studies [86]. While these approaches offer valuable insights into public perceptions of accessibility and its related service, they are often time-consuming and costly. In addition, they may be limited in scope and participant diversity [70]. For example, surveys often struggle to capture a broad range of perspectives and require extra effort to include individuals with disabilities [89]. Field studies, while thorough, can be resource-intensive and may not adequately represent the diverse experiences of users across various areas of a city [86]. As a result, these traditional methods may fail to provide a comprehensive understanding of the accessibility challenges across large urban areas.

Recently, crowdsourcing through social media or online reviews has shown potential for gathering insights from broad and diverse populations [9, 63]. It also highlights the critical role of HCI in today's digital landscape and serves as an interface through which users actively contribute their experiences and perceptions [55]. Crowdsourcing from social media or reviews can facilitate data collection and dissemination, making it possible to harness collective intelligence to understand public perceptions of urban environments [74, 75]. Therefore, this approach is particularly valuable for gathering wide experiences from citizens. Compared to traditional methods, crowdsourcing through online reviews is also cost-effective, reducing the efforts needed to conduct surveys, on-site inspections, or fieldwork [31].

Previous research has highlighted the value of crowdsourced data for investigating traffic flow [34], infrastructure management [54], and urban environment [52] but rarely focused on inclusive urban design. In addition, while social media data are often unstructured and contain various information, there has been limited exploration of how large language models (LLMs) can be leveraged to understand public perceptions of urban-related issues. Existing studies on using crowdsourcing to evaluate urban accessibility concentrate on specific aspects of the built environment such as walkability [26, 85] or they investigate small-scale geographic areas, such as individual streets or neighborhoods [28, 74]. While these studies provide valuable insights, they are limited in scope and do not explain how public perceptions relate to factors such as geography and socioeconomic factors. To build on this literature, we studied two specific research questions:

- **RQ1 (POI analysis).** (1) What patterns exist in public sentiments of accessibility across Point of Interest (POI) types; and (2) What are the key aspects that can explain the sentiments?
- **RQ2 (Socio-spatial analysis).** (1) What patterns exist in public sentiments of accessibility across different geospatial areas; and (2) How are these geospatial patterns associated with local socio-spatial factors?

This study explores how user-generated reviews from Google Maps can illuminate public perceptions of accessibility across different POI types and geospatial areas. The first question examines how reviews mentioning accessibility features differ across various POI types and identifies semantic patterns in reviews to discern practical issues that shape public attitudes toward accessibility as positive or negative. The second question explores how accessibility sentiment relates to local socio-spatial factors. The goal is to

identify the socioeconomic, demographic, and land development elements that influence public views on accessibility. This research offers valuable insights for urban planners, local policymakers, and accessibility advocates to enhance their decision-making regarding inclusive urban design and to improve accessibility for all, especially individuals with disabilities.

2 Related Work

2.1 Accessibility in urban planning

Urban environments consist of infrastructure and facilities, such as sidewalks and public transportation, which serve individuals from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds. To ensure equitable access, these environments must cater to people of all abilities [73]. Urban accessibility can be studied from both macroscopic and microscopic perspectives [68]. At the macro level, accessibility focuses on large-scale urban planning issues, such as transportation systems and city infrastructure, which affect entire populations [68]. In contrast, microaccessibility examines the accessibility of individual services and facilities [27]. Prior studies in this area have examined physical barriers in urban infrastructure, such as technical malfunctions in bus entrance/exit ramps [84] and obstructed sidewalks [29]. Our study addresses the microaccessibility of urban environments by investigating accessibility challenges at POIs.

As microaccessibility studies frequently highlight, people with disabilities are disproportionately affected by environmental hazards, making them particularly vulnerable to accessibility issues in urban environments [40]. For example, a prior study found that when hurricanes struck, households with disabled residents were significantly less likely to evacuate [11]. This underscores the urgency of inclusive urban design. In the United States, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Accessibility Standards regulate urban infrastructure to ensure that accessibility requirements are met [10]. Additionally, the framework of universal design offers principles for creating environments that accommodate individuals of varying abilities [38]. Taught in academic settings [76], these principles have shaped key urban design factors like walkability, legibility, and overall accessibility [21].

However, there are still significant gaps in accessibility for disabled people, resulting in decreased quality of life [36]. For example, poor sidewalk quality has been shown to severely restrict urban mobility for disabled individuals [17]. Physical barriers often cause anger, anxiety, and frustration for those affected [84]. Despite the successful passage of ADA legislation, new deployments of public infrastructure may still be inaccessible. For example, newer designs of Bay Area Rapid Transit train cars lacked space for wheelchair users compared to older versions, prompting backlash from disabled communities [65]. Emerging technologies such as micromobility devices and autonomous delivery robots have created additional obstacles on urban pathways [8].

To effectively address these challenges, it is crucial to understand public attitudes toward accessibility. Researchers have employed various methods to assess these attitudes. For example, a typical work conducted interviews with 33 disabled participants to investigate their perceptions of public facilities [22]. Surveys are also popular tools to assess people's attitudes toward urban vitality [66] and accessible transportation [13]. Through surveys, prior work

found that people, politics, and budget were intrinsically tied to underfunded accessibility improvement projects [72]. However, these traditional methods, based on either surveys or interviews, are hindered by their limited geographic scope and lack of scalability. New approaches using crowdsourcing may offer an additional solution to these issues of limited data [37].

2.2 Crowdsourcing to investigate accessibility

2.2.1 Crowdsourcing to study urban environments. Crowdsourcing approaches have become increasingly prevalent in studying urban environments, providing researchers with innovative tools for real-time, large-scale, decentralized data collection and analysis [14]. This trend reflects a growing recognition of the potential for crowdsourcing to address complex urban challenges [83]. In the context of urban accessibility, crowdsourcing has demonstrated its value. For instance, previous research has leveraged crowdsourcing to improve accessibility for mobility-impaired individuals in smart cities, illustrating how these efforts are driving the development of more inclusive urban spaces [67]. However, there is a need to differentiate between two primary types of crowdsourcing approaches: (1) active crowdsourcing, and (2) passive crowdsourcing, both of which offer unique contributions to urban planning, accessibility, and sustainability [42].

2.2.2 Active crowdsourcing. Active crowdsourcing relies on direct participation from individuals, where users consciously contribute data or feedback [61]. For example, public webcams and citizen science initiatives have played a pivotal role in enhancing flood models and early warning systems through real-time data collection [30]. In the context of urban accessibility, active crowdsourcing is also effective. A typical example is Project Sidewalk, which allows users to annotate street-level images from Google Street View (GSV) to identify accessibility barriers. Using a gamified interface on Amazon Mechanical Turk, Project Sidewalk efficiently scales up accessibility audits, demonstrating the advantages of active crowdsourcing for urban accessibility audits [29, 74]. Another typical application is The EasyGo platform, which exemplifies active crowdsourcing by involving users to report and map barriers and facilities across cities. This platform offers custom routing for mobility-impaired individuals [67]. However, these active crowdsourcing approaches often face challenges related to data sparsity and user fatigue [19].

2.2.3 Passive crowdsourcing. In contrast, passive crowdsourcing does not require direct user involvement [56]. Instead, it leverages data generated from everyday activities and passive systems. Compared to active crowdsourcing, passive crowdsourcing has several typical advantages. First, passive crowdsourcing does not require direct user involvement and allows for continuous data collection without the need for participant recruitment, which can be resource-intensive and limiting in scale [19, 25]. More importantly, passive crowdsourcing can help gather vast amounts of data from a broad set of populations, providing richer and more representative datasets. This broader data collection also enables deeper and more nuanced analysis, revealing insights that might be missed with smaller, actively gathered datasets from conventional methods like surveys or interviews in urban studies [16, 51].

Previous research has shown the remarkable potential of passive crowdsourcing via GPS tracking or social media to decipher public sentiments and attitudes across domains in urban environments [5]. For instance, Williams et al. (2019) [88] gathered data from several Chinese social media platforms, such as Baidu Map, and created a computational model using residential visit patterns to identify “Ghost cities” in China—areas with significant housing vacancies due to excessive development relative to their population size. Chen et al. (2019) [15] analyzed Facebook data to study urban vibrancy in Hong Kong, focusing on residents’ visits to POIs to understand spatial structures and leverage social media insights for enriched urban planning. Similarly, Chuang et al. (2022) [16] collected over 20 million geolocated tweets from July 2012 to October 2016 to analyze park visits in Singapore. Their statistical analysis showed that high surrounding population density and family-oriented facilities, such as playgrounds, could lead to greater visitor density in parks.

Passive crowdsourcing has also illustrated its potential in addressing urban environmental issues or emergent events, including disaster damage estimation [50], community resilience [58], and evacuation efforts [53]. For example, air pollution monitoring has been transformed by mobile sensors on vehicles and smartphones, enabling the collection of detailed air quality data at a city-wide scale [35]. Another typical study utilized the passively collected location data from mobile devices to examine the impact of floods, winter storms, and fog on road traffic [34]. It found that the patterns that emerged from crowdsourced data could provide meaningful insights into disaster response and recovery in road transportation systems.

Existing efforts to use passive crowdsourcing for urban accessibility have been limited. One typical application is the SmartBFA system [42], which gathers data through Internet of Things (IoT) devices attached to wheelchairs. Another key initiative is AccessMap [2], which enhances road maps by passively crowdsourcing accessibility data from smartphone sensors to detect features like ramps and curb cuts. Additionally, previous research on automated road accessibility assessments like mPass has utilized wheelchair-mounted sensors for passive crowdsourcing [39, 71]. These sensors collect accelerometer data to evaluate ground surface conditions and identify obstacles such as steps and slopes. However, these efforts often remain limited to small-scale experiments or require the installation of specialized sensor equipment.

Prior studies have demonstrated the significant potential of crowdsourcing to enhance urban studies. However, several challenges remain. First, many previous studies focus primarily on the number of social media visits to infer urban environment or accessibility, often overlooking the rich textual content shared by users that could reveal deeper insights into their sentiments and opinions. Second, there is a noticeable gap in research specifically addressing public perceptions of accessibility for disabled individuals. This area is complex and requires nuanced understanding to decode opinions that go beyond simple visitation metrics. Third, given that social media posts and online reviews are unstructured, there has been limited exploration into using LLMs to improve the interpretation of these opinions. To address these challenges and harness the potential of passive crowdsourcing, we propose the two research questions outlined in the introduction.

3 Data and Methods

Figure 1 illustrates a framework for conducting research collected from Google Maps reviews, specifically focusing on accessibility-related sentiment analysis. Figure 1a shows the distribution of POIs with 5 or more related reviews in the United States, which are then used for subsequent POI analysis. Figure 1b displays the Google Maps reviews for the Smithsonian National Museum. It includes two example user reviews—one negative and one positive—related to accessibility for wheelchair users. After we collect those reviews, we build models for classifying the opinions from Google Map reviews (Figure 1c). The classification process involves using both LLMs like BERT and Llama 3, as well as baseline models such as RoBERTa sentiment analysis and various TF-IDF-based models.

3.1 Data preparation

Google Maps reviews serve as our primary source for gauging residents' attitudes toward accessible facilities. Google Maps allows users to freely rate and review POIs, including businesses, attractions, and public spaces. We select Google Maps reviews as our primary data resource due to two major reasons (see example in Figure 1b). First, it has seen substantial growth in user reviews, outperforming competitors like Yelp and TripAdvisor [62]. Second, unlike social media platforms such as Facebook or Twitter (now called X), Google Maps reviews specifically focus on customer experiences with businesses and locations, making them particularly suitable for our crowdsourcing approach. The online reviews collected from Google Maps can provide a reliable and relevant dataset for our study on attitudes toward accessible facilities [47].

To implement the study, we utilize the dataset published by UC San Diego [49, 90], which encompasses Google Maps reviews up to September 2021 across the United States. The dataset consists of 666,324,103 reviews with 4,963,111 POIs covered. For each POI, this data repository includes:

- User-generated review data: Usernames, ratings, comments, and images.
- Business metadata: Addresses, geolocation data, descriptions, categories, pricing, operating hours, links to the business, and other related information.

To filter reviews that suggest residents' attitudes toward accessible facilities, we refer to the ADA Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) [10, 80]. These guidelines list accessible elements and spaces, along with their respective requirements. After reviewing the guidelines and filtering online reviews using each keyword, we finalize the following search list, as presented below.

Search list: "accessible," "accessibility," "ada compliance," "ada compliant," "blind," "braille," "curb cut," "curb ramp," "deaf," "disabilities," "disability," "disabled," "grab rail," "hand splint," "handicap," "handrail," "hearing loss," "induction loop," "mobility aid," "service animal," "service cat," "service dog," "tactile map," "tactile paving," "tactile warning," "tgsi," "vision impairment," "visual impairment," and "wheelchair."

Several points need to be highlighted given this search list. First, it should be noted that some elements mentioned in the ADA Accessibility Guidelines, such as "elevator," "open area," and "play area,"

do not return any relevant Google Maps reviews in this context. Including such elements could introduce a significant amount of noise into our analysis, and therefore, we exclude them from our search list. As a result, we filter in 1,013,771 reviews that potentially reflect attitudes toward accessible facilities. While it's important to note that online reviews may contain typographical errors, this study does not account for these typos due to the challenges in comprehensively addressing all possible misspellings for each term. Last, it is worthwhile noting that our search strategy captures different forms of words. For instance, both "handicap" and "handicapped" are included in our results, as our filtering process identifies reviews containing the root word, thus encompassing various grammatical forms.

3.2 Data annotation


Identifying users' perspectives on accessibility from Google Maps reviews can be approached as a text classification problem in natural language processing (NLP). Initially, we explore the possibility of using pre-existing sentiment analysis tools, such as RoBERTa sentiment model. However, phrases such as "handicap accessible" or "Not ADA accessible" are frequently categorized as neutral by these models. This likely occurs since general sentiment analysis tools fail to capture the subtle nuances related to attitudes toward accessible facilities. As a result, it becomes necessary to create specialized text classification models tailored to this specific research context.

Developing classification models requires training and testing datasets. Typically, attitude classification encompasses three categories: positive, neutral, and negative. However, we observe that certain reviews, despite containing pertinent keywords, do not express any specific attitudes toward accessible facilities or services. For instance, statements like "The restaurant is in a good location and very accessible to the freeway" or "It is well located and accessible" are not related to accessible facilities in the intended context. This is because keywords such as "accessible" can have different meanings depending on the context. To address this, we introduce an additional class, "unrelated," to the existing categories. Generally, comments that mention the availability or satisfaction of accessible facilities are categorized as positive. Comments that highlight the lack of accessible facilities, poor quality of such facilities, or inadequate service are classified as negative.


Specific examples of each category are provided in the Table 1 below. We chunk the reviews into sentences and then focus on the part that contains the targeted aspects for attitude classification. This is because some online reviews are long and may cover aspects unrelated to attitudes toward accessible facilities or services. This handling can be useful when a review expresses conflicting sentiments about various aspects (see the fourth example in Table 1).

Following this way, two authors are involved in the data annotation process. Both authors have read the ADA Accessibility Guidelines and acknowledged the criteria to classify the attitude based on Google Maps reviews. We further select a randomly sampled set of 200 reviews to verify the agreement between two annotators. These sampled reviews are labeled independently by each annotator. We use Krippendorff's α [45] to measure the inter-coder agreement, as described by the following equation.

a. POI distribution



b. Google Maps reviews



c. Attitude classification




Figure 1: An illustrative framework to conduct the data analysis.

Table 1. Representative Google Maps reviews for public attitudes toward accessibility

Google Maps review [sic]	Targeted text [sic]	Attitude
UNBELIEVABLE! So many cool Great Danes! And what a valuable service for people with disabilities! Thank you for helping others!	And what a valuable service for people with disabilities!	Positive
Such a great clean park. Not much for kids to do but it has a very nice walking trail around the park. Good level parking lot with handicap space. Would probably be a great place to walk your dog or just hang out with loved ones. Benches available for sitting but no covered areas if its raining.	Good level parking lot with handicap space.	Positive
So I am reading the reviews and the elevator is still out. Maybe I should call the American's with Disabilities. The elevator must be working for people with disabilities. And to say the less, the key card took forever to get activated	Maybe I should call the American's with Disabilities. The elevator must be working for people with disabilities.	Negative
Handicap spots are not accessible during lunch, they say call but the line is busy or rings and rings. Other than that great food.	Handicap spots are not accessible during lunch, they say call but the line is busy or rings and rings.	Negative
Closet was very small and difficult to close once you hung clothes on hangers in it. Seems like we might have had a handicap room and that could be the reason for the unusual setup of the closet and the bathroom.	Seems like we might have had a handicap room and that could be the reason for the unusual setup of the closet and the bathroom.	Neutral
Very nice place to taste good oriental food. At prices very accessible to all people ...	At prices very accessible to all people ...	Unrelated
I always had my morning coffee here in this very coffee shop near the mall. It was very accessible and near my workplace. I love their coffee compared to other coffee shops in the city. I love pairing my coffee with their muffins. It was like salt and pepper, a perfect match. I recommend this coffee shop to the coffee lovers out there!	It was very accessible and near my workplace.	Unrelated

$$\alpha = 1 - \frac{D_o}{D_e} \quad (1)$$

Where:

- D_o is the observed disagreement between annotators
- D_e is the expected disagreement by chance

The inter-coder agreement for our annotation, measured by Krippendorff's α , is 0.87, indicating a strong level of agreement. Following this, two annotators label a total of 2,840 randomly sampled reviews, dividing them into 2,272 for training and 568 for testing, based on the 80/20 split principle. Consequently, the training set comprises 531 negative, 103 neutral, 458 positive, and 1,180 unrelated reviews, while the testing set consists of 127 negative, 23 neutral, 129 positive, and 289 unrelated reviews.

3.3 Attitude classification

3.3.1 Sentiment models. As prior studies have used sentiment analysis to gauge public attitudes, we start by testing a sentiment analysis model called RoBERTa Sentiment [4, 57]. It is trained based on RoBERTa framework, which is a robustly BERT pre-training approach. The RoBERTa sentiment model used in this study is trained on a corpus of 123.86 million tweets collected up to the end of 2021 and fine-tuned for sentiment analysis based on the TweetEval benchmark.

3.3.2 TF-IDF baseline models. With the training and testing datasets prepared, the subsequent phase involves constructing and assessing classification models (Figure 1c). We incorporate three conventional NLP text classification models utilizing Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency (TF-IDF). TF-IDF is a measure that assesses the significance of a word within a document in relation to a set of documents (corpus). The formula for calculating TF-IDF is as follows:

$$\text{TF-IDF}(t, d) = \text{TF}(t, d) \times \text{IDF}(t) \quad (2)$$

Where:

- $\text{TF}(t, d)$ is the frequency of term t in review d divided by the total number of terms in d .
- $\text{IDF}(t)$ is the inverse document frequency of term t , calculated as:

$$\text{IDF}(t) = \log \left(\frac{N}{1 + \text{DF}(t)} \right)$$

Where N is the total number of Google Maps reviews in the corpus, and $\text{DF}(t)$ is the number of reviews containing the term t .

It is important to note that TF-IDF does not capture the semantic meaning of terms and therefore cannot consider the context in which a word appears in a review. Next, we integrate TF-IDF with three machine learning classifiers: random forest (RF), stochastic gradient descent (SGD), and logistic regression (LR). This results in three baseline models: TF-IDF+RF, TF-IDF+SGD, and TF-IDF+LR.

We conduct hyperparameter tuning on the training dataset using K-fold cross-validation with $K = 10$ for each of the three TF-IDF baseline models. Table 2 displays the hyperparameters and their corresponding grid search values for each model. During the training iteration, the model is trained on nine subsets and validated on

the remaining subset. By employing 10-fold cross-validation, we evaluate the listed hyperparameter values and choose the optimal one for each model.

3.3.3 Large language models (LLMs). Additionally, we utilize two LLMs for the classification task: BERT[18] and Llama 3[20]. For BERT, we use the bert-base-uncased model with 110M parameters. Then, we fine-tune the BERT model to enhance its performance on accessibility-related sentiment classification. The fine-tuning process involves K-fold cross-validation with $K = 5$. We also perform a grid search to optimize key hyperparameters including the batch size and number of epochs. The grid search is listed in Table 2.

For Llama 3, we select the Llama-3-8B-Instruct as the backbone model, taking into account the available computational resources. We fine-tune the Llama 3 model to generate the labels using the LoRA [32] technique for 10 epochs. LoRA is an efficient fine-tuning method that introduces low-rank updates to model parameters, reducing the memory and computational overhead during training [32]. The LoRA rank is set to 32, with a scaling factor α of 16, leading to a total of 83.89M training parameters. To stabilize training, we use a learning rate of $3e-5$ and a batch size of 64. To retain the instruction-following capabilities of Llama-3-8B-Instruct on our sentiment analysis task, we also design a specific system prompt (shown in the box below) and pre-process it with data samples following the standard OpenAI chat format.

You are a language model trained to identify the sentiment for the accessibility from reviews. Your task is to analyze the text of each review and assign an appropriate label based on the sentiment or relevance of the content. The possible labels are:

- *Negative: The review expresses a negative sentiment or criticism about the accessibility of disabilities.*
- *Positive: The review expresses a positive sentiment or praise about the accessibility for disabilities.*
- *Neutral: The review provides a factual or mixed description without strong positive or negative sentiment.*
- *Unrelated: The review does not pertain to accessibility or describe any attitude toward accessibility. Reviews that discuss personal experiences or talk about something or somewhere accessible but not for disabilities, even have positive or negative words, should be labeled as unrelated.*

For each input, respond with the label that best describes the sentiment or relevance of the review.

3.3.4 Performance measures. After fine-tuning the hyperparameters of baseline models and the two LLMs, we evaluate the performance of these six candidate models: RoBERTa Sentiment, TF-IDF + RF, TF-IDF + SGD, TF-IDF + LR, BERT, and Llama 3. Given that the number of samples in each category is imbalanced, the performance of these candidate models is assessed using four key metrics: Precision, Recall, F1-score, and Accuracy. Precision indicates the percentage of TP cases among all reviews predicted correctly by a respective model. Recall reflects the percentage of TP cases out of all actual positive cases. The F1-score provides a harmonic mean of precision and recall, balancing both metrics. Accuracy measures the proportion of correctly classified reviews out of all reviews. The evaluation is performed on the testing dataset, and the performance results of each model are shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Classification performance of candidate models measured by Precision, Recall, F1-score, and Accuracy.

Table 2. Grid search values for candidate models

Model	Hyperparameter	Grid search
TF-IDF+RF	min_samples_leaf	1, 2, 4
	n_estimators	100, 200, 300, 400
	max_depth	10, 20, 40, 80, 100, 120
TF-IDF+SGD	clf_alpha	1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2, 1e-1, 1, 10
	clf_max_iter	500, 800, 1000, 2000, 3000
	clf_penalty	l2, l1, elasticnet
TF-IDF+LR	clf_C	0.1, 0.5, 1, 2, 5, 10, 20
	clf_max_iter	10, 20, 50, 100, 200
	clf_solver	sag, saga, lbfgs, newton-cg
BERT	num_epochs	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	batch_size	16, 32, 64
Llama 3	num_epochs	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
	learning_rate	1e-5, 2e-5, 3e-5
	batch_size	32, 64

Several key observations can be drawn from Figure 2. The sentiment analysis tool is not valid for our task, due to its inability to identify unrelated comments or refer to our specific contexts. TF-IDF-based models, while potentially useful for differentiating terms in reviews, struggle to interpret semantic meanings in this context, which could significantly limit their performance. The BERT model shows improvement and obtains an overall accuracy of 81%. However, due to the imbalanced nature of the training samples, its performance in the neutral class remains limited. Last, fine-tuned Llama 3, possibly due to its large-scale pre-training process and robust text understanding capabilities, achieves the highest testing accuracy and a more balanced and higher F1-score across all classes. Based on the performance results, we select the fine-tuned Llama 3 as the best-performing model and apply it to the entire dataset for subsequent analysis.

3.4 Semantic analysis

With sentiment classified for each review, we then explore how individual words influence overall sentiment for different POI types.

We use a tool called lexical salience-valence analysis (LSVA) [78] to examine the words within reviews. LSVA performs text mining and evaluates the relationships between words and the sentiments expressed in the reviews by defining salience and valence. Unlike simple word frequency counts in positive or negative reviews, the LSVA method provides a visualization of word frequency across the document corpus and its impacts on overall sentiment. LSVA defines a word’s salience and valence in the following way:

$$\text{salience}|_{\text{word}_i} = \log_{10}(N_{\text{total}})|_{\text{word}_i} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{valence}|_{\text{word}_i} = \frac{N(\text{positive}) - N(\text{negative})}{N_{\text{total}}}|_{\text{word}_i} \quad (4)$$

Where:

- N_{total} represents the number of reviews in which the term word_i appears.
- $N(\text{positive})$ represents the number of positive reviews in which word_i appears.
- $N(\text{negative})$ represents the number of negative reviews in which word_i appears.
- The salience of a term is computed by the logarithm with a base 10 function of the frequency of each term.
- The valence of a term is computed as $N(\text{positive}) - N(\text{negative})$ divided by its total count N_{total} , which measures how positive a particular term appears in a corpus.

3.5 Regression modeling

To assess whether public perceptions of accessibility vary across regions with different socioeconomic statuses, we construct a regression model correlating accessibility sentiment with nearby socio-spatial features. We calculate the average sentiment from all accessibility-related reviews within each region, selecting regions with more than 10 reviews as our regression samples. Counties with insufficient reviews are excluded because the limited number of reviews cannot reliably represent the overall sentiment of the entire county. Sensitivity analysis is then performed by adjusting the minimum review threshold from 0 to 50. Results show that regression results stabilize after a threshold of 10. To address the modifiable

area unit problem (MAUP) [33], which suggests that outcomes can vary based on spatial aggregation levels, we fit the regression at both county and census block group (CBG) levels. The regression is fitted under the generalized additive model (GAM) framework. The GAM is a semi-parametric framework that combines parametric linear predictors with a suite of additive, non-parametric nonlinear predictors. These nonlinear components are fitted using various types of smooth splines, enhancing the model's flexibility and adaptability. In our specification, the effects of main covariates of interest are modeled with linear terms, whereas the geospatial correlation between counties/CBGs that are located closer to each other is modeled with a smoother function. We additionally allow for state-specific random effects. Therefore, our regression model is formulated as:

$$g(E(Y)) = \beta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{N_l} \beta_k X_k + ti(SR) + s(RE) + \epsilon \quad (5)$$

Where:

- Y is CBG- or county-level sentiment, assuming that both follow the Gaussian distribution.
- $g(\cdot)$ refers to the link function, which is the identity function in this case.
- β_0 is the overall linear intercept.
- β_k is the coefficient of the k th variable X_k , where X_k is the variable set with linear effects. Here it includes all socio-spatial factors outlined in Table 3.
- SR denotes the spatial autocorrelation term. Here spatial autocorrelation is fitted by $ti(\cdot)$, which is a marginal nonlinear smoother that excludes main effects.
- RE denotes the state-level random effects captured by the penalized spline function $s(\cdot)$.
- ϵ is the error term.

The data sources for the independent variables are listed as below: Socioeconomics and demographics are from the 2018-2022 5-year American Community Survey (ACS) [81]; POI variables are from Google Maps; Road density is collected from OpenStreetMap. Comprehensive details and descriptive statistics for all independent variables (CBG-level) are presented in Table 3. Variables in *italic* are excluded from the models due to high multicollinearity, indicated by a variance inflation factor (VIF) greater than 5. Additionally, to mitigate the effects of outliers, influential observations are removed if their Cook's distance exceeds $4/(n - k - 1)$, where n is the regression sample size and k is the total number of independent variables in the regression [7].

4 Results

The result analysis explores two research questions. For the first research question, we examine whether the public perception of accessibility varies across different POI types. Specifically, we investigate two aspects: whether different POI types exhibit variation in public sentiment, and what factors or aspects extracted from reviews contribute to the sentiment for different POI types. For the second research question, we explore the variation in public perception of accessibility from the geospatial perspective. Again, we divide this into two parts: identifying the patterns in public

perception across different geographic areas, and examining the important social, demographic, and economic factors associated with the public sentiments.

Each POI in Google Maps is associated with a category. This category can be mapped onto the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes [82]. For example, a POI labeled as "restaurant" by Google Maps corresponds to the 3-digit NAICS code "722-Food Services and Drinking Places," while a "Grocery store" corresponds to "445-Food and Beverage Stores." However, with 102 3-digit NAICS codes, interpretation can present challenges. To address this, we manually group frequently mentioned Google Maps categories into several major POI types that are often associated with high-volume daily activities. Other POI types such as manufacturing facilities, production plants, or construction companies are not included in subsequent analysis as they are not closely related to the public's daily activities. For the subsequent analysis, the POI types we focus on are:

- Restaurant: Food and drink providers, e.g., restaurants, bars, drinking places.
- Retail Trade: Merchandise sellers, e.g., grocery stores, convenience stores, home goods stores.
- Recreation: Leisure and entertainment facilities, e.g., recreation centers, stadiums, gyms, playgrounds.
- Hotel: Short-term lodging providers, e.g., hotels, motels.
- Personal Service: Consumer-oriented service businesses, e.g., spas, salons, massage therapists.
- Health Care: Medical facilities and services, e.g., medical centers, urgent cares, dentists, hospitals.
- Transportation: People and goods movement services, e.g., bus stops, bus stations, shipping services.
- Public Service: Government and community services, e.g., business centers, mailbox, security services, locksmiths.
- Apartment: Multi-unit residential buildings, e.g., apartments.
- Education: Learning and instruction institutions, e.g., schools, universities, colleges.

4.1 POI analysis

4.1.1 What are the sentiment patterns among POI types? To address RQ1(1), we begin by presenting the descriptive results categorized by POI types, as illustrated in Figure 3. When considering all reviews for analysis (the blue bar in Figure 3(a)), the most commonly mentioned POI types include Restaurant, Retail Trade, Recreation, Hotel, Personal Service, and Health Care. However, when applying a threshold of five reviews or more (the red bar in Figure 3(a)), the order changes slightly, with Retail Trade, Recreation, Hotel, Personal Service, Restaurant, and Health Care being the most mentioned, in which Restaurants show a significantly smaller proportion of POIs with five or more reviews. This suggests that while restaurants and drinking places are the most commonly reviewed POIs, most of them receive a very small number of comments that mention accessibility.

We select six major POI types for subsequent analysis given the following two reasons. First, they are closely associated with daily activities that produce high visit volumes, accounting for over 90% of total reviews across all POIs. Second, local businesses

Table 3. Summary of independent variables in the regression model

Variable	Description	Mean	Std.
Socioeconomic			
Population Density	Population density (people per acre)	4.822	9.577
Employment Density	Employment density (jobs per acre)	11.015	26.342
Poverty	% households below poverty	14.179	11.888
Rural Population	% rural population	8.399	22.887
Urban Population	% urbanized population	83.162	35.362
Median Income	Median household income (Inflation-Adjusted), in \$ 10 ³ /household	6.419	3.065
Highly-Educated	% residents with at least a Bachelor's degree	35.146	19.993
Demographics			
Male	% males	49.332	6.812
Age 18-44	% residents aged 18 to 44 years	39.167	15.004
Age 45-64	% residents aged 45 to 64 years	24.721	8.249
Age over 65	% residents aged 65 and older	17.475	11.907
White	% Non-Hispanic Whites	62.597	25.470
Asian	% Asians	5.904	9.557
African American	% African Americans	11.252	16.244
Hispanic	% Hispanics/Latinos	16.497	19.160
Others	% Other minorities.	0.936	4.093
Disability	% residents with a disability.	11.623	11.434
Review			
Avg. POI Score	Average POI score for all POIs collected from Google Maps, regardless of POI types or review contents	4.250	0.182
Review density	Total accessibility-related review density	0.393	1.111

such as restaurants, retail trades, and recreation centers often experience high turnover rates and busy demand periods, indicating that accessibility issues could be more pronounced at these POIs. In addition, to avoid small sample bias from POIs with only one or two comments, we select those POIs with at least five reviews mentioning accessibility to plot the sentiment distribution. The sentiment distribution for each of these POI types is illustrated in Figure 3(b).

The sentiment analysis across different POI types reveals diverse patterns and insights (Figure 3(b)). Most POI categories exhibit negative average sentiments, with Retail Trade showing the most negative outlook with all three quartiles being negative (Q1: -0.67, Q2: -0.35, and Q3: -0.11). Recreation is the only POI type with a positive average sentiment (Q2: 0.12). Restaurant presents the highest negative first quartile (Q1: -0.78).

In addition, the distribution patterns offer further insights into sector-specific experiences. Retail Trade and Restaurant display right-skewed distributions indicating a tendency toward negative experiences with accessibility. Personal Service and Hotel show approximately normal distributions. In particular, Personal Service shows a relatively normal distribution centered near neutral, implying balanced experiences. Moreover, Recreation's left-skewed distribution aligns with its overall positive sentiment. Health Care exhibits a unique "U-shaped" distribution, with higher frequencies at both extremes (-1 and 1), suggesting polarized opinions about healthcare accessibility.

4.1.2 What are the aspects explaining the sentiments among POI types? In response to RQ1(2), we delve into the aspects that explain

the sentiments across the six major POI types, including Restaurant, Retail, Recreation, Hotel, Personal Service, and Health Care. We follow equations 3 and 4 to calculate the salience and valence of each term in the corpus of reviews in terms of each POI type. Figure 4 shows the unique accessibility-related sentiments for each POI type, facilitating better understanding by exploring the aspects contributing to positive and negative experiences, respectively marked in red and blue circles.

For Restaurant, negative sentiments are predominantly associated with staff interactions, service, the presence of service animals, particularly service dogs, and barriers such as steps and ramps. Accessibility-related terms such as "wheelchair," "entrance," and "parking" appear with neutral or slightly positive sentiments. This indicates that while structural accessibility features may be in place, social factors such as service and staff interactions contribute to negative sentiment.

In the Retail sector, accessible features such as "parking," "entrance," and "wheelchair" appear on the positive side of the valence axis, indicating appreciation for outdoor physical accommodations. However, negative sentiments stem from issues like "door," "employee," "line," "aisle," and "cart," which suggest challenges with the indoor environment in stores, such as handling accessibility for customers who require physical accommodations as well as customer service issues.

For Recreation, more positive sentiments appear. Those positive aspects are mainly associated with terms such as "accessible," "park," "ramp," "facility," "trail," and "family," highlighting the positive impact of inclusive environments, particularly for family-friendly spaces. On the negative side, aspects such as "service," "staff," and "entrance"




Figure 3: Descriptive results for sentiment by POI. (a) Number of POIs by types. (b) Distribution of sentiment. The x-axis represents the weighted sentiment by averaging all sentiments associated with a POI, while the y-axis shows the POI count.

appear, showing that despite the availability of accessible features, other operational issues such as poor service or design negatively impact individuals' experiences.

The Hotel category presents a more imbalanced sentiment distribution, with only a few positive aspects shown in the figure, including "pool" and "staff." Negative sentiments dominate the terms, arising from infrastructure issues related to "room," "elevator," and "bathroom," to service issues related to "guest," "book," and "reservation." This highlights areas where accommodation for accessibility needs may fall short, particularly in terms of room features and staff assistance.

In the Personal Service sector, the positive aspects include "comfortable," "staff," and "process," reflecting satisfaction with the ease of service and assistance provided. However, terms like "seat," "space," "spot," "handicap," and "bathroom" reflect negative experiences, suggesting challenges related to accessibility facilities.

For Health Care, the highly negative terms associated with sentiments include "doctor," "nurse," "service," "appointment," and "time" reflecting frustrations with service received. Other negative terms such as "room" and "door" reflect negative experiences with medical environments. However, positive aspects such as "staff," "helpful," and "family" indicate appreciation for supportive staff and accessible infrastructure in healthcare facilities.

Across all POI types, accessible physical infrastructure (e.g., parking, wheelchair access, entrance, ramp) tends to receive positive feedback, while issues with staff (e.g., employee, manager, doctor, nurse), service (e.g., service animal, reservation, book), and accommodations for individuals with disabilities (e.g., space, spot, bathroom, seat) lead to more negative sentiments. This highlights the multifaceted nature of accessibility, where both physical infrastructure and human or social factors play crucial roles in shaping accessibility experiences.

4.2 Socio-spatial analysis

4.2.1 What are the sentiment patterns across geographic regions?

We plot the variation in accessibility sentiment across all counties in the contiguous United States in Figure 5. Counties with negative sentiment are depicted in blue, those with positive sentiment in red, and counties with fewer than 10 reviews are left uncolored. The choropleth map underscores a high dispersion in accessibility sentiment, with positive and negative reviews appearing sporadically, lacking a clear spatial clustering pattern. This is further evidenced by the insignificant spatial interaction term in Table 4. However, a notable pattern is observed in the distribution of absent reviews: counties in the Midwest regions tend to have fewer accessibility-related reviews, whereas counties in the Northeast, South Atlantic, and West are more likely to leave reviews that mention accessibility. This may be attributed to the lower population densities and public service availability in these regions.

We further explore the socio-spatial differences between counties based on the presence of more than 10 accessibility-related reviews. Of the total, 1,976 counties have more than 10 reviews, while 1,080 counties do not. As shown in Figure 6, counties with higher population densities, greater employment densities, and higher levels of urbanization are more likely to accumulate a substantial number of accessibility reviews. Notable racial disparities also emerge, particularly among Asians, African Americans, and other racial minorities, which may reflect the location preferences associated with these groups' activities. This comparison highlights a potential limitation of the sentiment regression analysis: the counties included in regression are not randomly selected but rather show selection biases. These biases are influenced by the tendencies of individuals who post reviews on Google Maps, as well as by the more densely developed regions where reviews are more frequently collected.

4.2.2 How are sentiment patterns associated with local socio-spatial factors? We first perform a univariate correlation analysis at the




Figure 4: Semantic analysis using LSVA based on POI types. The x-axis represents the salience using equation 3, while the y-axis represents the valence using equation 4.

county level, identifying the top three positively correlated features as: Avg. POI Score (0.169), White (0.139), and Age 45-64 (0.098). Conversely, the top three negatively correlated features were: African American (-0.119), Hispanic (-0.077), and Poverty (-0.071). Similar patterns were observed at the CBG level, where the positive leaders were: Avg. POI Score (0.282), White (0.120), and Median Income (0.079), and the negative leaders were: Hispanic (-0.085), Poverty (-0.080), and African American (-0.077). This analysis suggests that

areas with higher socioeconomic status and a larger percentage of White residents tend to have a more favorable public perception of urban accessibility.

However, we do not find a significant correlation between accessibility sentiment and % residents with disabilities. As detailed in Figure 7, the Pearson correlation at the county level between disability and accessibility sentiment is only -0.021. Interestingly, this correlation slightly increases to -0.044 when considering only




Figure 5: Spatial distribution of accessibility sentiment.




Figure 6: Socio-spatial difference in accessibility review engagement: Counties with and w/o > 10 accessibility reviews.

those with disabilities below poverty, and decreases to -0.007 for those above poverty. These findings highlight the underlying socioeconomic disparities in accessibility sentiment, although the links between disability and accessibility sentiment are not statistically significant.

We then fit the GAM and report the regression results in Table 4. Model goodness-of-fit, the adjusted R^2 , is 0.126 for CBG-level modeling and 0.099 for county-level modeling. While these values are moderate, they are considered reasonable given the numerous immeasurable factors that could influence public perception. Regarding nonlinear effects, the spatial interaction terms are not statistically significant, suggesting weak spatial dependence in the spatial distribution of accessibility sentiment. However, the state-level random effects are all statistically significant, with degrees of freedom (e.d.f.) consistently greater than 1, indicating pronounced

random effects at the state level. This could be attributed to unobserved effects or influences inherent to the states themselves.

The coefficients of the two models are largely similar, although there are subtle differences in their statistical significance. Demographic factors reveal that elderly populations consistently exhibit a negative relationship with accessibility sentiment. This trend may indicate the high dependence of elderly adults on barrier-free urban facilities, underscoring their unique needs within the community. Additionally, the racial and ethnic composition of a region is significantly associated with accessibility sentiment. Areas with higher proportions of African American and Hispanic populations generally report more negative accessibility experiences compared to predominantly White regions. The percentage of males shows a significantly positive relationship with sentiment at the county level, but the significance disappears at the CBG level. Similar to the univariate correlation analysis, no clear relationship is evident between the percentage of people with disabilities and accessibility sentiment.

Among socioeconomic factors, high employment density exhibits a strong negative correlation with accessibility sentiment but only at the CBG level. The rural population exhibits a significant negative relationship but only at the county level. Household poverty rates consistently show negative relationships with accessibility sentiment, suggesting that economically disadvantaged areas are more likely to experience subpar accessibility facilities. Interestingly, regions with more highly educated residents tend to exhibit more negative sentiments towards accessibility. This may be because these individuals are more attuned to the design and functionality of accessibility facilities and are also more likely to express their opinions through online reviews. Lastly, a strong (also the strongest among all variables) positive relationship is found between averaged POI scores and accessibility sentiment, which is plausible as the average POI score represents the overall user experience with local services in the region.

5 Discussion

In this study, we collect Google Maps reviews across the United States and use fine-tuned LLMs to analyze public sentiment on accessibility, exploring the relationship between these sentiments and socio-spatial factors. The key findings are outlined below.

First, most POI types show negative sentiments, except for Recreation. This suggests an overall negative attitude from the public towards accessibility features in most POI types. Furthermore, sentiment analysis reveals distinct distribution patterns during the study period. For example, Retail Trade and Restaurants display right-skewed distributions, indicating a need for more attention to accessibility improvements, while Health Care shows a polarized distribution, meaning people have either very positive or very negative experiences, with little middle ground.

Second, public perceptions of positive and negative aspects differ depending on the type of POI. Infrastructure-related aspects like “parking,” “wheelchair,” and “entrance” receive positive feedback, indicating that accessibility design is generally effective in these areas. However, negative sentiments converge to human-related or social factors. Specifically, Hotels and Health Care received extensive negative feedback on aspects such as “service,”




Figure 7: Scatter plot: Disability (From ACS) vs. Sentiment (From Google Map reviews)

Table 4. Regression outcomes (standardized)

Variables	CBG-level	County-level
(Intercept)	-0.093***	-0.037***
Demographics		
Asian	0.002	0.001
African American	-0.009**	-0.021***
Hispanic	-0.020***	-0.020***
Others	-0.010*	0.003
Male	-0.003	0.015**
Age over 65	-0.010**	-0.017**
Age 45-64	-0.002	-0.005
Disability	0.001	-0.001
Socioeconomics		
Population Density	0.005	0.025
Employment Density	-0.029***	-0.015
Rural Population	-0.002	-0.022**
Poverty	-0.011**	-0.008**
Highly-Educated	-0.019***	-0.008*
Reviews		
Review density	-0.009	-0.017
Avg. POI score	0.097***	0.028***
Nonlinear terms (degrees of freedom (e.d.f.))		
ti(Lat,Lng)	2.602	1.705
s(State)	128.347***	16.053***
Model fit		
Adjusted. R2	0.126	0.099
R2	0.141	0.116
Sample size	8702	1901

Significance codes: 0 '****' 0.001 '***' 0.01 '**' 0.05 '*' 1.

“doctor,” “nurse,” “time,” and “room,” emphasizing issues related to service providers and the quality of service itself. Prior research has also highlighted the challenges staff faces in communicating with guests with disabilities during service encounters in hospitality settings [41]. Although Recreation and Personal Services receive relatively fewer negative comments, their accommodation for accessibility, such as “spot,” “handicap,” and their inclusive environment for “dog” and “old,” need improvement, as these terms show negative sentiment.

Third, there are significant geographical disparities in sentiment toward accessibility. Areas with higher socioeconomic status and predominantly White populations display more positive perceptions, likely due to better-funded infrastructure and services in these regions. In contrast, regions with higher Hispanic and African American populations, as well as those with higher poverty rates, show more negative sentiments, reflecting systemic neglect and fewer resources available for accessibility improvements. Additionally, areas with larger populations of elderly and highly-educated residents display strong negative sentiments toward urban accessibility, indicating these groups can be more sensitive to the design and functionality of accessibility facilities. Our study also aligns with existing findings regarding barriers to health care for individuals with disabilities who are members of underserved racial and ethnic groups [69].

Last, no significant link is found between the presence of people with disabilities and public perceptions. While higher densities of disabled individuals could typically suggest increased feedback, as these communities are most affected by accessibility shortcomings, the lack of a significant correlation implies that public sentiment is not necessarily reflecting their needs. This disconnect suggests that areas with larger disabled populations may not receive the necessary attention or improvements, highlighting a gap in inclusive planning. These results align with existing research, which shows that public agencies address only minimum accessibility standards and overlook the lived experiences of disabled individuals [48]. Moreover, the lack of attention to accessibility issues in transportation planning [48] and public services [44] reflects a broader disconnect between policy and the actual needs of disabled communities.

5.1 Practical implications

The findings from this study reveal disparities in public perceptions of accessibility and their correlations with various socio-spatial factors. These findings offer critical insights for multiple stakeholders, including government agencies, local businesses, and people with disabilities and their caregivers.

Government agencies play a pivotal role in shaping policies and infrastructure to enhance public spaces. Our findings highlight two critical areas for improvement. First, significant concerns regarding staff behavior and the adequacy of services and accommodations suggest a need for government agencies to offer staff training programs. The training should ensure that staff are adequately prepared to accommodate people with disabilities. Second, the geographic disparities identified in our study, particularly the negative correlation between accessibility and factors such as poverty, racial and ethnic composition, and employment density, further recognize the necessity for equitable distribution of resources. Public investments in accessible infrastructure should target underrepresented and underserved areas, particularly those with high concentrations of low-income, minority, and elderly populations. Incentives such as subsidies or training programs should be provided to businesses in these areas to prioritize accessibility improvements.

For local businesses, improving accessibility and customer service for people with physical disabilities can serve as a competitive advantage. While physical accessibility features such as parking and entrances are often positively received, businesses need to move beyond merely complying with physical accessibility requirements and work on providing inclusive customer service. This includes training staff to be more knowledgeable and responsive to the needs of people with physical disabilities. In addition, businesses should consider adopting practices from POI types that are viewed more positively, such as recreation, to their operations.

Furthermore, our findings demonstrate the importance of advocacy by and for people with disabilities. There are critical needs for improvements in underlying services, such as accommodations (e.g., bathroom accessibility or seating) and service staff interactions, beyond the provision of common, public-aware physical accessibility infrastructure. Individuals with disability and their caregivers should actively post on social media and participate in dialogue with businesses and policymakers to ensure that accessibility efforts extend beyond physical infrastructure to include customer service and accommodation of needs. Voices from them are crucial in raising awareness of issues that are often overlooked by the general public but are equally important to create accessible and inclusive urban environments.

5.2 Future work

This study presents several avenues for future research. The first opportunity lies in model classification, where improvements can be made in two key areas. First, we could engage more annotators with domain expertise to label a larger dataset for both training and testing. This would allow the model to capture a broader variety of textual information from online reviews, which could ultimately enhance the model's robustness. Second, due to computational limitations, we only fine-tune the Llama 3-8B model in this project. Although the fine-tuned Llama model achieves 91% accuracy, using LLMs with more parameters could potentially improve this accuracy. Future research could also explore testing closed-source models like GPT-4 by OpenAI or Gemini by Google.

The second research direction involves data fusion, which could be approached in two ways. First, our findings reveal that many POIs on Google Maps have only one or two comments related to

accessibility, leading to potential sampling biases in large-scale analyses. To mitigate this, future work could incorporate reviews from other platforms like Yelp or TripAdvisor, thereby expanding the dataset and offering a more comprehensive perspective. Additionally, these insights could be integrated with data from active crowdsourcing efforts. For example, previous research has developed platforms where participants actively rate accessibility [29, 74]. By combining data from both active and passive crowdsourcing, we can further highlight the strengths of crowdsourcing approaches in studying accessibility in urban environments.

Next, it is important to acknowledge potential biases among users who choose to leave online reviews. Previous studies have demonstrated that social media, including online review platforms, could overrepresent certain demographics, such as male, educated, and urban populations [60, 87]. While our passive crowdsourcing approach addresses some limitations of traditional surveys, it may introduce biases tied to the specific user base of each platform. For example, people with extremely positive or negative experiences are more inclined to post online reviews [23], which can impact the representation of the analysis. Future research could integrate data from a wider range of sources to reduce these biases.

Another avenue worth exploring is the inclusion of image-based data. For example, incorporating Google Maps Street View images and applying computer vision techniques [43] or multimodal language models could provide richer, more holistic insights into urban accessibility. This approach would allow for the automatic detection of physical barriers, such as stairs or narrow doorways, and the identification of accessible features like ramps or tactile paving. This could also enable us to make more meaningful recommendations for creating inclusive urban environments.

6 Conclusions

This study demonstrates the potential of leveraging crowdsourced data and advanced LLMs to assess public perceptions of urban accessibility. By analyzing Google Maps reviews across the United States using a fine-tuned Llama 3 model, we provide valuable insights into accessibility challenges at both the POI and socio-spatial levels. Our findings reveal that most POI types show negative sentiments, except for Recreation, with negativity mainly focused on service-related aspects. Our socio-spatial analysis shows that areas with higher proportions of white residents and greater socioeconomic status report more positive sentiment, while areas with more elderly and highly-educated residents express more negative views. However, no clear link is found between the presence of people with disabilities and public perception of accessibility. Overall, this approach offers a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of accessibility issues compared to traditional survey methods, providing urban planners with crucial information to create more inclusive and accessible urban environments.

References

- [1] Q Aini, H Marlina, and A Nikmatullah. 2019. Evaluation of accessibility for people with disability in public open space. In *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, Vol. 506. IOP Publishing, 012018.
- [2] Heba Aly, Moustafa Youssef, and Ashok Agrawala. 2021. Better off This Way!: Ubiquitous Accessibility Digital Maps via Smartphone-based Crowdsourcing. In *2021 18th Annual IEEE International Conference on Sensing, Communication, and Networking (SECON)*. IEEE, 1–9.

- [3] Alexander Andani, Jack Rostron, and Begum Sertyesilik. 2013. An investigation into access issues affecting historic built environment. *American journal of civil engineering and architecture* 1, 2 (2013), 21–31.
- [4] Francesco Barbieri, Jose Camacho-Collados, Luis Espinosa Anke, and Leonardo Neves. 2020. TweetEval: Unified Benchmark and Comparative Evaluation for Tweet Classification. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 1644–1650. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.findings-emnlp.148>
- [5] Jayanta Basak, Parama Bhaumik, Siuli Roy, and Somprakash Bandyopadhyay. 2020. A Crowdsourcing based information system framework for coordinated disaster management and building community resilience. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Distributed Computing and Networking*. 1–6.
- [6] Banu Bekci and Merve Sipahi. 2023. Investigation of spatial accessibility on the scale of pedestrian areas. *Journal of the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture of Gazi University* 38, 4 (2023).
- [7] David A Belsley, Edwin Kuh, and Roy E Welsch. 2005. *Regression diagnostics: Identifying influential data and sources of collinearity*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [8] Cynthia Bennett, Emily Ackerman, Bonnie Fan, Jeffrey Bigham, Patrick Carrington, and Sarah Fox. 2021. Accessibility and The Crowded Sidewalk: Micromobility's Impact on Public Space. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference (Virtual Event, USA) (DIS '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 365–380. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3461778.3462065>
- [9] Ivo Blohm, Jan Marco Leimeister, and Helmut Krcmar. 2013. Crowdsourcing: How to benefit from (too) many great ideas. *MIS quarterly executive* 12, 4 (2013).
- [10] U.S. Access Board. 2014. *Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Standards*. <https://www.access-board.gov/ada/>
- [11] Mollyann Brodie, Erin Weltzien, Drew Altman, Robert J. Blendon, and John M. Benson. 2006. Experiences of Hurricane Katrina Evacuees in Houston Shelters: Implications for Future Planning. *American Journal of Public Health* 96, 8 (2006), 1402–1408. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2005.084475>
- [12] Rosemary DF Bromley, David L Matthews, and Colin J Thomas. 2007. City centre accessibility for wheelchair users: The consumer perspective and the planning implications. *Cities* 24, 3 (2007), 229–241.
- [13] Riccardo Ceccato, Francesco Deflorio, Marco Diana, and Miriam Pirra. 2020. Measure of urban accessibility provided by transport services in Turin: a traveller perspective through a mobility survey. *Transportation Research Procedia* 45 (2020), 301–308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2020.03.020>
- [14] Chiara Certoma, Filippo Corsini, and Francesco Rizzi. 2015. Crowdsourcing urban sustainability. Data, people and technologies in participatory governance. *Futures* 74 (2015), 93–106.
- [15] Tingting Chen, Eddie CM Hui, Jiemin Wu, Wei Lang, and Xun Li. 2019. Identifying urban spatial structure and urban vibrancy in highly dense cities using georeferenced social media data. *Habitat International* 89 (2019), 102005.
- [16] I-Ting Chuang, Francisco Benita, and Bige Tunçer. 2022. Effects of urban park spatial characteristics on visitor density and diversity: A geolocated social media approach. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 226 (2022), 104514.
- [17] Philippa Clarke, Jennifer A. Ailshire, Michael Bader, Jeffrey D. Morenoff, and James S. House. 2008. Mobility Disability and the Urban Built Environment. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 168, 5 (07 2008), 506–513. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwn185> arXiv:<https://academic.oup.com/aje/article-pdf/168/5/506/211146/kwn185.pdf>
- [18] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Tamar Solorio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 4171–4186. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1423>
- [19] Chaohai Ding, Mike Wald, and Gary Wills. 2014. A survey of open accessibility data. In *proceedings of the 11th web for all conference*. 1–4.
- [20] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783* (2024).
- [21] Ümran Duman and Buket Asilsoy. 2022. Developing an Evidence-Based Framework of Universal Design in the Context of Sustainable Urban Planning in Northern Nicosia. *Sustainability* 14, 20 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142013377>
- [22] Agneta Fänge, Susanne Iwarsson, and Åsa Persson. 2002. Accessibility to the public environment as perceived by teenagers with functional limitations in a south Swedish town centre. *Disability and rehabilitation* 24, 6 (2002), 318–326.
- [23] Raffaele Filieri. 2016. What makes an online consumer review trustworthy? *Annals of Tourism Research* 58 (2016), 46–64.
- [24] Katherine Froehlich-Grobe, Gail Regan, Jacqueline Y Reese-Smith, Katie M Heinrich, and Rebecca E Lee. 2008. Physical access in urban public housing facilities. *Disability and Health Journal* 1, 1 (2008), 25–29.
- [25] Andrea Ghermandi and Michael Sinclair. 2019. Passive crowdsourcing of social media in environmental research: A systematic map. *Global environmental change* 55 (2019), 36–47.
- [26] Fang-Ying Gong. 2023. Modeling walking accessibility to urban parks using Google Maps crowdsourcing database in the high-density urban environments of Hong Kong. *Scientific Reports* 13, 1 (2023), 20798.
- [27] Emily Grisé, Geneviève Boisjoly, Meadhbh Maguire, and Ahmed El-Geneidy. 2019. Elevating access: Comparing accessibility to jobs by public transport for individuals with and without a physical disability. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 125 (2019), 280–293. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2018.02.017>
- [28] Kotaro Hara, Vicki Le, and Jon Froehlich. 2013. Combining crowdsourcing and google street view to identify street-level accessibility problems. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 631–640.
- [29] Kotaro Hara, Vicki Le, and Jon Froehlich. 2013. Combining crowdsourcing and google street view to identify street-level accessibility problems. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Paris, France) (CHI '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 631–640. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2470654.2470744>
- [30] Alysha M Helmrich, Benjamin L Ruddell, Kelly Bessem, Mikhail V Chester, Nicholas Chohan, Eck Doerry, Joseph Eppinger, Margaret Garcia, Jonathan L Goodall, Christopher Lowry, et al. 2021. Opportunities for crowdsourcing in urban flood monitoring. *Environmental modelling & software* 143 (2021), 105124.
- [31] Mokter Hossain and Ilkka Kauranen. 2015. Crowdsourcing: a comprehensive literature review. *Strategic Outsourcing: An International Journal* 8, 1 (2015), 2–22.
- [32] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR* (2022).
- [33] Songhua Hu, Mingyang Chen, Yuan Jiang, Wei Sun, and Chenfeng Xiong. 2022. Examining factors associated with bike-and-ride (BnR) activities around metro stations in large-scale dockless bikesharing systems. *Journal of Transport Geography* 98 (2022), 103271.
- [34] Songhua Hu, Kailai Wang, Lingyao Li, Yingrui Zhao, Zhenbing He, and Yungpeng Zhang. 2024. Multi-crowdsourced Data Fusion for Modeling Link-level Traffic Resilience to Adverse Weather Events. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* (2024), 104754.
- [35] Jingchang Huang, Ning Duan, Peng Ji, Chunyang Ma, Yuanyuan Ding, Yipeng Yu, Qianwei Zhou, Wei Sun, et al. 2018. A crowdsourcing-based sensing system for monitoring fine-grained air quality in urban environments. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 6, 2 (2018), 3240–3247.
- [36] UN Habitat III. 2020. *The New Urban Agenda*. https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2020/12/nua_handbook_14dec2020_2.pdf
- [37] Rositsa Ilieva and Timon McPhearson. 2018. Social Media Data for Urban Sustainability. *Nature Sustainability* 1 (2018), 553–565. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0153-6>
- [38] Rob Imrie and Rachael Luck. 2014. Designing inclusive environments: rehabilitating the body and the relevance of universal design. *Disability and Rehabilitation* 36, 16 (2014), 1315–1319. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09638288.2014.936191> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.3109/09638288.2014.936191> PMID: 24989068.
- [39] Yusuke Iwasawa, Kouya Nagamine, Ikuko Eguchi Yairi, and Yutaka Matsuo. 2015. Toward an automatic road accessibility information collecting and sharing based on human behavior sensing technologies of wheelchair users. *Procedia Computer Science* 63 (2015), 74–81.
- [40] Catherine Jampel. 2018. Intersections of disability justice, racial justice and environmental justice. *Environmental Sociology* 4, 1 (2018), 122–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23251042.2018.1424497> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1080/23251042.2018.1424497>
- [41] Valentini Kalargyrou, Nelson A Barber, and Pei-Jou Kuo. 2018. The impact of disability on guests' perceptions of service quality delivery in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 30, 12 (2018), 3632–3655.
- [42] Nazir Kamaldin, KEE Susan, KONG Songwei, LEE Chengkai, Huiguang Liang, Alisha Saini, TAN Hwee-Pink, and TAN Hwee-Xian. 2019. Smartbfa: A passive crowdsourcing system for point-to-point barrier-free access. In *2019 IEEE 44th Conference on Local Computer Networks (LCN)*. IEEE, 34–41.
- [43] Junghwan Kim and Kee Moon Jang. 2023. An examination of the spatial coverage and temporal variability of Google Street View (GSV) images in small-and medium-sized cities: A people-based approach. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* 102 (2023), 101956.
- [44] Gloria L Krahn, Deborah Klein Walker, and Rosaly Correa-De-Araujo. 2015. Persons with disabilities as an unrecognized health disparity population. *American journal of public health* 105, S2 (2015), S198–S206.
- [45] Klaus Krippendorff. 2018. *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage publications.
- [46] Joseph CY Lau and Catherine CH Chiu. 2004. Accessibility of workers in a compact city: the case of Hong Kong. *Habitat International* 28, 1 (2004), 89–102.
- [47] Kiljae Lee and Chunyan Yu. 2018. Assessment of airport service quality: A complementary approach to measure perceived service quality based on Google reviews. *Journal of Air Transport Management* 71 (2018), 28–44.

- [48] Kaylyn Levine and Alex Karner. 2023. Approaching accessibility: Four opportunities to address the needs of disabled people in transportation planning in the United States. *Transport policy* 131 (2023), 66–74.
- [49] Jiacheng Li, Jingbo Shang, and Julian McAuley. 2022. Uctopic: Unsupervised contrastive learning for phrase representations and topic mining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.13469* (2022).
- [50] Lingyao Li, Michelle Bensi, and Gregory Baecher. 2023. Exploring the potential of social media crowdsourcing for post-earthquake damage assessment. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 98 (2023), 104062.
- [51] Lingyao Li, Songhua Hu, Ly Dinh, and Libby Hemphill. 2024. Crowdsourced reviews reveal substantial disparities in public perceptions of parking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05104* (2024).
- [52] Lingyao Li, Songhua Hu, Atiyya Shaw, and Libby Hemphill. 2024. Crowdsourcing public attitudes toward local services through the lens of Google Maps reviews: An urban density-based perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13156* (2024).
- [53] Lingyao Li, Zihui Ma, and Tao Cao. 2021. Data-driven investigations of using social media to aid evacuations amid Western United States wildfire season. *Fire Safety Journal* 126 (2021), 103480.
- [54] Lingyao Li, Yujie Mao, Yu Wang, and Zihui Ma. 2022. How has airport service quality changed in the context of COVID-19: A data-driven crowdsourcing approach based on sentiment analysis. *Journal of Air Transport Management* 105 (2022), 102298.
- [55] Han-Teng Liao, Zixian Zhou, and Yujin Zhou. 2020. A Systematic Review of Social Media for Intelligent Human-Computer Interaction Research: Why Smart Social Media is Not Enough. In *International Conference on Intelligent Human Computer Interaction*. Springer, 499–510.
- [56] Euripidis Loukis and Yannis Charalabidis. 2015. Active and passive crowdsourcing in government. *Policy practice and digital science: Integrating complex systems, social simulation and public administration in policy research* (2015), 261–289.
- [57] Daniel Loureiro, Francesco Barbieri, Leonardo Neves, Luis Espinosa Anke, and Jose Camacho-collados. 2022. TimeLMs: Diachronic Language Models from Twitter. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland, 251–260. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-demo.25>
- [58] Zihui Ma, Lingyao Li, Libby Hemphill, Gregory B Baecher, and Yubai Yuan. 2024. Investigating disaster response for resilient communities through social media data and the Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) model: A case study of 2020 Western US wildfire season. *Sustainable Cities and Society* 106 (2024), 105362.
- [59] Kelly Mack, Emma McDonnell, Dhruv Jain, Lucy Lu Wang, Jon E. Froehlich, and Leah Findlater. 2021. What do we mean by “accessibility research”? A literature survey of accessibility papers in CHI and ASSETS from 1994 to 2019. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–18.
- [60] Jonathan Mellon and Christopher Prosser. 2017. Twitter and Facebook are not representative of the general population: Political attitudes and demographics of British social media users. *Research & Politics* 4, 3 (2017), 2053168017720008.
- [61] Amin Mobasher, Jonas Deister, and Holger Dieterich. 2017. Wheelmap: the wheelchair accessibility crowdsourcing platform. *Open Geospatial Data, Software and Standards* 2 (2017), 1–7.
- [62] Munawir, Mochamad Donny Koerniawan, and Bart Julien Dewancker. 2019. Visitor perceptions and effectiveness of place branding strategies in thematic parks in Bandung City using text mining based on Google maps user reviews. *Sustainability* 11, 7 (2019), 2123.
- [63] Fábio R Assis Neto and Celso AS Santos. 2018. Understanding crowdsourcing projects: A systematic review of tendencies, workflow, and quality management. *Information Processing & Management* 54, 4 (2018), 490–506.
- [64] Leonardo Nicoletti, Mikhail Sirenko, and Trivik Verma. 2023. Disadvantaged communities have lower access to urban infrastructure. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* 50, 3 (2023), 831–849.
- [65] Editorial Staff of CBS SF. 2014. *BART Gives Public A Look At Fleet Of The Future For 1st Time*. <https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2014/04/16/bart-gives-public-a-look-at-fleet-of-the-future-for-1st-time/>
- [66] Muhammed Ziya Paköz and Merve İşik. 2022. Rethinking urban density, vitality and healthy environment in the post-pandemic city: The case of Istanbul. *Cities* 124 (2022), 103598. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2022.103598>
- [67] Yuba Raj Panta, Sami Azam, Bharanidharan Shanmugam, Kheng Cher Yeo, Mirjam Jonkman, Friso De Boer, and Mamoun Alazab. 2019. Improving accessibility for mobility impaired people in smart city using crowdsourcing. In *2019 Cybersecurity and Cyberforensics Conference (CCC)*. IEEE, 47–55.
- [68] Rafael H. M. Pereira and Daniel Herzenhut. 2023. *Introduction to urban accessibility: a practical guide with R*. Institute of Applied Economic Research.
- [69] Jana J Peterson-Besse, Emily S Walsh, Willi Horner-Johnson, Tawara D Goode, and Barbara Wheeler. 2014. Barriers to health care among people with disabilities who are members of underserved racial/ethnic groups: a scoping review of the literature. *Medical care* 52 (2014), S51–S63.
- [70] Francesco Pinna, Chiara Garau, and Alfonso Annunziata. 2021. A literature review on urban usability and accessibility to investigate the related criteria for equality in the city. In *International conference on computational science and its applications*. Springer, 525–541.
- [71] Catia Prandi, Paola Salomoni, and Silvia Mirri. 2014. mPASS: integrating people sensing and crowdsourcing to map urban accessibility. In *2014 IEEE 11th Consumer Communications and Networking Conference (CCNC)*. IEEE, 591–595.
- [72] Manaswi Saha, Devanshi Chauhan, Siddhant Patil, Rachel Kangas, Jeffrey Heer, and Jon E Froehlich. 2021. Urban accessibility as a socio-political problem: a multi-stakeholder analysis. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 4, CSCW3 (2021), 1–26.
- [73] Manaswi Saha, Siddhant Patil, Emily Cho, Evie Yu-Yen Cheng, Chris Hornig, Devanshi Chauhan, Rachel Kangas, Richard McGovern, Anthony Li, Jeffrey Heer, and Jon E. Froehlich. 2022. Visualizing Urban Accessibility: Investigating Multi-Stakeholder Perspectives through a Map-based Design Probe Study. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (New Orleans, LA, USA) (CHI '22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 413, 14 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3517460>
- [74] Manaswi Saha, Michael Saugstad, Hanuma Teja Maddali, Aileen Zeng, Ryan Holland, Steven Bower, Aditya Dash, Sage Chen, Anthony Li, Kotaro Hara, et al. 2019. Project sidewalk: A web-based crowdsourcing tool for collecting sidewalk accessibility data at scale. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–14.
- [75] Paola Salomoni, Catia Prandi, Marco Rocchetti, Valentina Nisi, and N Jardim Nunes. 2015. Crowdsourcing urban accessibility: Some preliminary experiences with results. In *Proceedings of the 11th Biannual Conference of the Italian SIGCHI Chapter*. 130–133.
- [76] Ayse Sirel and Umit Sirel. 2018. "Universal Design" Approach for the Participation of the Disabled in Urban Life. *Journal of Civil Engineering and Architecture* 12 (01 2018). <https://doi.org/10.17265/1934-7359/2018.01.002>
- [77] Gabriel Spadon, Gabriel Gimenes, and Jose F Rodrigues-Jr. 2017. Identifying urban inconsistencies via street networks. *Procedia Computer Science* 108 (2017), 18–27.
- [78] Viriya Taecharungroj and Boonyant Mathayomchan. 2019. Analysing TripAdvisor reviews of tourist attractions in Phuket, Thailand. *Tourism Management* 75 (2019), 550–568.
- [79] Valeria Tatano, Francesca Guidolin, Francesca Peltrera, et al. 2017. Urban accessibility of historical cities: the Venetian case study. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 11, 5 (2017), 1135–1141.
- [80] United States Access Board. 2002. ADA Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG). <https://www.access-board.gov/adaag-1991-2002.html> Accessed: 08/22/2024.
- [81] United States Census Bureau. 2022. American Community Survey (ACS). <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/>. Accessed: 2024-06-28.
- [82] U.S. Census Bureau. 2022. North American Industry Classification System. <https://www.census.gov/naics/>. Accessed: 09-12-2024.
- [83] Mariana Vallejo Velázquez, Antigoni Faka, and Ourania Kounadi. 2024. Crowdsourcing applications for monitoring the urban environment. In *Geographical Information Science*. Elsevier, 397–413.
- [84] Raquel Velho. 2019. Transport accessibility for wheelchair users: A qualitative analysis of inclusion and health. *International Journal of Transportation Science and Technology* 8, 2 (2019), 103–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijtst.2018.04.005>
- [85] Meihui Wang, James Haworth, Huanfa Chen, Yunzhe Liu, and Zhengxiang Shi. 2024. Investigating the potential of crowdsourced street-level imagery in understanding the spatiotemporal dynamics of cities: A case study of walkability in Inner London. *Cities* 153 (2024), 105243.
- [86] Meng Wang, Xiaochen Pei, Man Zhang, and Yuyang Tang. 2023. Evaluation and optimization of urban public space accessibility for residents' satisfaction: A case study of Nanshan district, Shenzhen city. *Buildings* 13, 10 (2023), 2624.
- [87] Zijian Wang, Scott Hale, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Przemyslaw Grabowicz, Timo Hartman, Fabian Flöck, and David Jurgens. 2019. Demographic inference and representative population estimates from multilingual social media data. In *The world wide web conference*. 2056–2067.
- [88] Sarah Williams, Wenfei Xu, Shin Bin Tan, Michael J Foster, and Changping Chen. 2019. Ghost cities of China: Identifying urban vacancy through social media data. *Cities* 94 (2019), 275–285.
- [89] Erin Wilson, Robert Campaign, Megan Moore, Nick Hagiliassiss, Jane McGillivray, Daniel Gottliebson, Michael Bink, Michelle Caldwell, Robert Cummins, and Joe Graffam. 2013. An accessible survey method: Increasing the participation of people with a disability in large sample social research. (2013).
- [90] An Yan, Zhankui He, Jiacheng Li, Tianyang Zhang, and Julian McAuley. 2023. Personalized showcases: Generating multi-modal explanations for recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2251–2255.
- [91] Dominik Ziemke, Johan W Joubert, and Kai Nagel. 2018. Accessibility in a post-arthritis city: Comparison of two approaches for accessibility computations. *Networks and Spatial Economics* 18 (2018), 241–271.