

Arica Conrad

ENGL& 235 – Technical Writing

January 15, 2021

Audience Technical Rewrite

1. Properly cite the article.

According to the link given, the computer science field of study uses the Chicago style for citations. I chose the “Chicago Author-Date” version from the drop-down choices for citing the article within the UW library’s website. I chose the “Chicago Author-Date” version, because from what I have seen on the internet, this style tends to be used by the sciences.

Aizpurua, Amaia, Harper, Simon, and Vigo, Markel. 2016. “Exploring the Relationship Between Web Accessibility and User Experience.” *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 91. Elsevier Ltd: 13–23. doi:10.1016/j.ijhcs.2016.03.008.

2. Why did you choose the article?

I chose this article because it incorporated my interests in technology, the internet, user experience (UX), and accessibility. I am very interested in making technology accessible for all users. One of the main reasons I thought this article was credible was because there was a “Peer Reviewed” tag next to the article on the library website. Not all of the articles that came up in my search results had this peer-reviewed tag, so this article stuck out more to me. Articles that are peer reviewed tend to be more credible, as someone would have had to review the article to determine if the facts were scientifically valid in order to be published in a journal. Some of the criteria I used to choose that article instead of others were if the article was peer-reviewed and if the title included computer science concepts that I am familiar with. I have studied web development before, so I have more knowledge in this area, unlike topics such as artificial intelligence or robots. My major is in mobile application development here at Cascadia College, and one of the prerequisites for that program was taking web development classes, so this article relates closely to my major.

3. Select a 200 to 300-word section of the article to rewrite. Include it here.

“We evaluated the final four Web sites against the AA conformance level of WCAG 2.0. The selected Web sites contained different features and problems: in general, W1 and W2 satisfied more AA level success criteria (SC) than W3 and W4. The homepages of W1, W2, W3 and W4 satisfied respectively 73%, 69%, 52% and 36% of the SC for the AA level of WCAG 2.0. The most severe accessibility problem of W3 was that the seven links that conform the navigation menu, all of them have the same text which is ‘image’. In the case of W4, the main accessibility problem is about Flash content which is not accessible using a screen reader.

“Regarding the above-mentioned selection criteria with respect to branding, W1 and W3 represent internationally well-known restaurants with an innovative character and a culinary style based on research and creativity. In contrast, W2 and W4 Web sites correspond to restaurants that are locally popular and their style is based on traditional Basque cuisine. The visual design of the Web sites is in line with the style of the restaurant. The Web sites of the internationally well-known restaurants (W1 and W3) have more stylised visual layouts, as they have had their typographies designed and make use of high-quality close-up pictures. In contrast, the Web sites of the traditional-style restaurants (W2 and W4) have more basic and less elaborated visual aesthetic designs (see a snapshot of their homepages in Fig. 1).”

4. Rewrite it so it is clear to a non-technical audience.

The final four websites were evaluated using the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (recommended best practices for making websites accessible for all users). The chosen websites all had different features and problems, and some websites were more accessible than others. One website’s main accessibility problem was that the seven different links in the navigation bar all would be read and said aloud as “image” by a screen reader, instead of the actual text. (A screen reader is a tool for sight-impaired users that reads images and text displayed on a screen out loud to the user.) Another website’s main accessibility problem was the prevalent use of Adobe Flash, a tool for seeing certain types of digital content, which screen readers are unable to read.

Two of the websites represent well-known restaurants who value innovation, research, and creativity in planning their menu. The other two websites represent local restaurants whose food is based on traditional Basque (a southern European ethnic group) cuisine. The design of each of the websites matches the personal style of the restaurant. The websites of the well-known restaurants have a customized text font and numerous high-quality photos. The websites of the traditional restaurants have a more basic design scheme (the homepages of each website are shown in Fig. 1).