

INFO2222 Weekly assignment 4, Accessibility.

Using the google chrome 'lighthouse' accessibility rating tool, the following are a list of three websites, one scoring highly above a 90 accessibility rating, one a decent rating and one below 60 (poor accessibility rating). The accessibility tool essentially gives a rating on a scale of 0-100 that aims to present the level of access, not just for the regular or targeted users, but for those 'forgotten users', examples including those who are either permanently, temporarily or momentarily impaired in one of their senses normally required to use the websites.

1st Website: Good accessibility, above 90:

<https://www.abc.net.au/>

This website performed very well in the lighthouse accessibility with a perfect score of 100. Mentioning that it has good colour contrast, understandable names, has many different languages and the website is well structured.

2nd Website: Okay accessibility, 60-90:

<https://stackoverflow.com/>

This website has a relatively good accessibility score, with a result of 79. The things that the audit came up with in regard to undesirable features include improving the website so that it could improve assistive technology like a screen reader, along with links not having discernable names, and background and foreground colours not having a sufficient contrast which could damage the accessibility for users with eye issues. Overall the accessibility is okay however in comparison to the high ranking accessibility website above there is much to be improved.

3rd Website: Bad usability: Below 60:

<http://www.georgermartin.com/>

The lighthouse program ranked all aspects of this website poorly, particularly accessibility with a score of 49. There are many things that don't go well for this website some of which including, the HTML coding is poor and could be greatly improved to help accessibility, along with poor naming of elements making it hard for programs such as screen readers to run, colour contrast being unsatisfactory, elements are poorly structured meaning it is hard to access this website in a useable form across different hardware.

What this means for someone with different needs:

Comparing the results of accessibility between the websites, for someone with different needs such as those who are permanently impaired i.e. being blind, colour blind, no arms, deaf etc, would mean the poor website would be much less accessible for these types of users, as mentioned above the websites that rank highly account for things such as colour contrast for those who have vision problems, software that accounts for screen reading software so for people like this it makes sense that the government news website wants to be able to communicate their sources to all kinds of users, being available in a readable and useable form across many platforms and hardware. The opposite can be said for those websites that don't account for these kinds of users, as they don't necessarily prioritise the needs of these users in the same way that the highly accessible websites do. This could potentially inconvenience these groups causing them to rely on others more for inaccessible websites, especially for an essential service or other kind of necessity.