

Accessibility

Accessibility testing

1. Deque Systems, 2021
2. Abou-Zahra et al., 2017
3. Sane, 2021
4. Thornton et al., 2022
5. Rybin Koob et al., 2022
6. Ismailova and Inal, 2022
7. Campoverde-Molina et al., 2021
8. S. Kumar et al., 2020
9. S. (1.) Kumar et al., 2021
10. Seetha and Ayyadurai, 2022

Theme list

- a11y testing methods
- auto-test tools compared
- measuring a11y

(Vigo et al., 2013)

What could be the harm in relying on automated testing? This research look at number of available automated evaluation tools and compares their output to that of a team of experts in regard to the coverage, completeness and correctness. Results show that relying on tools alone is not recommended, because even if the right tool is used only 6 out of 10 violations would be caught. Tools seem to be more effective on very inaccessible sites.

****TODO:** Take a look at some concrete numbers

References

- Abou-Zahra, S., Steenhout, N., & Keen, L. (Eds.). (2017). *Selecting Web Accessibility Evaluation Tools*. Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1061811.1061830>
- Campoverde-Molina, M., Lujan-Mora, S., & Valverde, L. (2021). Process model for continuous testing of web accessibility. *IEEE Access, Access, IEEE*, 9, 139576–139593. <http://ezproxy.tlu.ee/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsee&AN=edsee.9551272&site=eds-live>
- Deque Systems. (2021). *Developing axe-core rules* [original-date: 2015-06-10T15:26:45Z]. Retrieved 02/18/2023, from <https://github.com/dequelabs/axe-core/blob/develop/doc/rule-development.md>
- Ismailova, R., & Inal, Y. (2022). Comparison of Online Accessibility Evaluation Tools: An Analysis of Tool Effectiveness. *IEEE Access, Access, IEEE*, 10, 58233–58239. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3179375>
- Kumar, S. (1.), Biswas, P. (1.), & Shree Dv, J. (2.) (2021). Comparing ten wcag tools for accessibility evaluation of websites. *Technology and Disability*, 33(3), 163-185 –185. <http://ezproxy.tlu.ee/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edselc&AN=edselc.2-52.0-85113988259&site=eds-live>
- Kumar, S., DV, J., & Biswas, P. (2020). Accessibility evaluation of websites using wcag tools and cambridge simulator. <http://ezproxy.tlu.ee/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsarx&AN=edsarx.2009.06526&site=eds-live>
- Rybin Koob, A., Ibacache Oliva, K. S., Williamson, M., Lamont-Manfre, M., Hugen, A., & Dickerson, A. (2022). Tech Tools in Pandemic-Transformed Information Literacy Instruction: Pushing for Digital Accessibility. *Information Technology & Libraries*, 41(4), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ital.v41i4.15383>
- Sane, P. (2021). A brief survey of current software engineering practices in continuous integration and automated accessibility testing. *2021 Sixth International Conference on Wireless Communications, Signal Processing and Networking (WiSPNET)*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/wispnet51692.2021.9419464>
- Seetha, J. (1.), & Ayyadurai, M. (2.) (2022). Performance evaluation of accessibility checker tool for educational websites. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, 34(24). <http://ezproxy.tlu.ee/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edselc&AN=edselc.2-52.0-85135050528&site=eds-live>
- Thornton, M., Mushtare, R., Rescigno, F., & Brightman, K. (2022). Accessibility of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) marketplace websites. *Journal of Communication in Healthcare*, 15(4), 316–323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17538068.2022.2046899>
- Vigo, M., Brown, J., & Conway, V. (2013). Benchmarking web accessibility evaluation tools. *Proceedings of the 10th International Cross-Disciplinary Conference on Web Accessibility*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2461121.2461124>