

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS

(A Journal of SIMCA)

(NAAC Accredited with 'A' Grade)



Vol. IX, Issue II, January - May 2019

RESEARCH JOURNAL

Index	Pg. No.
1. CV Based Employability Prediction Using Machine Learning - Nithik Pradeep, Alwin Alex, Alam Ansari, Manivel Chettyar, Prof. Shubangi Chavan	01
2. An Analysis of Management of Syrian Refugees by Usage of Information Technology - Ishita Dutt, Moumita Halder, Mokshita Vajawat	06
3. Study of Communication Techniques used by Service Providers in Tourism Industry with Special Reference to MTDC - Mrs. Vidyullata S. Jadhav, Dr. S. D. Mundhe	15
4. Text Based Emotion Analysis using Machine Learning - Saurabh Mete, Mandira Adak, Mayuri Chilekar, Raj Bhanvadia, and Prof. Sagar Kulkarni	18
5. Real Time Traffic Event Detection Using Tweet Stream - Prof. Sagar Kulkarni, Mohit A Rai, Sumod Menon, Riya Sawant, Devbrat Singh	22
6. Literature survey on Real Time OSN Analysis To Detect Online Terrorists - Mr. Mrudul Bornare, Ms. Tasneem Attarwala, Ms. Riya Jadhav, Prof. Manasi Kulkarni	28
7. Simple Home Automation Solution: Based on Arduino Open Source Electronic Platform - Mast. Aditya Karande, Dr. R. D. Kumbhar	34
8. Conceptual Model of Decision Support Systems for Agricultural Crop Planning - S. S. Managave, Dr. R. D. Kumbhar	38
9. Impediments for Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Bandwagon - An Empirical Analysis of MSME's in Karnataka - Dr. Vinod. N. Sambrani, Naveen Pol	43
10. Study on Data Preprocessing Methods for Improving Classification Result Accuracy using Weka Tool - Dr. Mrs. Yogita Bhapkar, Dr. Ajit More	49



Published by -

Sinhgad Technical Education Society's

**Sinhgad Institute of Management
and Computer Application**

(NAAC Accredited with 'A' Grade)

S. No. 45/1/2/3, Narhe Technical Campus, Building No. 5,
Narhe (Narhe Top), Tal. - Haveli, Pune - 411 041.

Indexed By:



TOGETHER WE REACH THE GOAL



Largest E-Journal Gateway

INDEX

1. CV Based Employability Prediction Using Machine Learning - Nithik Pradeep, Alwin Alex, Alam Ansari, Manivel Chettyar, Prof. Shubangi Chavan	01
2. An Analysis of Management of Syrian Refugees by Usage of Information Technology - Ishita Dutt, Moumita Halder, Mokshita Vajawat	06
3. Study of Communication Techniques used by Service Providers in Tourism Industry with Special Reference to MTDC - Mrs. Vidyullata S. Jadhav, Dr. S. D. Mundhe	15
4. Text Based Emotion Analysis using Machine Learning - Saurabh Mete, Mandira Adak, Mayuri Chilekar, Raj Bhanvadia, and Prof. Sagar Kulkarni	18
5. Real Time Traffic Event Detection Using Tweet Stream - Prof. Sagar Kulkarni, Mohit A Rai, Sumod Menon, Riya Sawant, Devbrat Singh	22
6. Literature survey on Real Time OSN Analysis To Detect Online Terrorists - Mr. Mrudul Bornare, Ms. Tasneem Attarwala, Ms. Riya Jadhav, Prof. Manasi Kulkarni	28
7. Simple Home Automation Solution: Based on Arduino Open Source Electronic Platform - Mast. Aditya Karande, Dr. R. D. Kumbhar	34
8. Conceptual Model of Decision Support Systems for Agricultural Crop Planning - S. S. Managave, Dr. R. D. Kumbhar	38
9. Impediments for Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Bandwagon - An Empirical Analysis of MSME's in Karnataka - Dr. Vinod. N. Sambrani, Naveen Pol	43
10. Study on Data Preprocessing Methods for Improving Classification Result Accuracy using Weka Tool - Dr. Mrs. Yogita Bhapkar, Dr. Ajit More	49
11. Chatbot Based Question Answering System - Giridhar Srinivasan, Voval Jain, Prashant Niladhe, Vishal Gupta, Deven Kanse, Prof. Shubhangi Chavan	54
12. Easy Manipulator for 3D models using Smartphone Interface - Vivek Balachandran, Aayushi Chandrakar, Ayush Pillai, Samantha Sales, Prof. K.S Suresh Babu	59
13. Cyber Security - A Method Of Generic Authentication Of Data With Ip Security - K. G. Kharade, S. K. Kharade, S. V. Katkar	63
14. An Intelligent Transport System: VANET (Vehicular Ad-hoc Network) - S. S. Zalte, Prajakta Patil	67
15. Comparative Analysis of Web Accessibility Standards and Regulations - Shantanu D. Ladkat, Dr. Shivaji Munde	71

INDEX

16. Data Mining Research: Problems and Challenges - Vikas J. Magar, Rajivkumar S. Mente	77
17. A study of Impact and Usage of Social Media on the society through Survey Analysis - Dr. D. R. Vidhate	81
18. Innovative applications of IT and Management in assessment and accreditation by NAAC - Dr. Sharad Sahebrao Phulari	85
19. An Impact Of E-commerce (Business Organization) - Prof. Mahendra K. Sonawane	91
20. Introduction to Data Visualization Tools and Techniques - Prof. Shital Chandrakant Kadam	98
21. Open Source Softwares in Education Sector - Prof. Kshirsagar Sarika & Prof. Dipali Patil	100
22. A Study to Mark Difference in Behavior of Offline Customers to Annotate Traditional Shopping Methodology in Maharashtra - Dr. Sucheta S. Yambal	105
23. An Emerging Trend of ICT: An Opportunity - Dr. Samadhan K. Patil	108
24. Use of Smart Phone and It's Security - A Review - Janhavi A. Rode	114
25. OSINT Tools and Techniques - A Review - Mrs. Shital S. Wasamkar	117
26. A Compilation Reviews of Agriculture Based Studies Using ICT - Mrs. Sneha Nagaonkar, Dr. Sudhakar Bhoite	121
27. Application of Integral transform to Recognition of plastic surgery faces and the surgery types: An approach with Volume based scale invariant features and SVM - Dr. Archana Harsing Sable, Haricharan Amarsing Dhirbasi, Dr. Bondar Kirankumar Laxmanrao	127
28. Financial Inclusion and Technology - Dr. Kedar Vijay Marulkar, Dr. Nilam Jadhav	137
29. A Conceptual Study on Pig & Pig Latin - Mr. Sachin Gupta, Mr. Yogesh Sharma	142
30. Internet of Things: A study towards residents approach for IoT implementation in Residential Societies - Mrs. Rupali S. Kalekar, Dr. Ravindra M. Patil	147

Comparative Analysis of Web Accessibility Standards and Regulations

Shantanu D. Ladkat¹, Dr. Shivaji Munde²

¹shan.ladkat@gmail.com, ²drshivaji.mundhe@gmail.com
Sinhgad Institute of Management and Computer Application
Narhe, Pune, India

ABSTRACT

Today websites play important role in our day to day life. It has made our life very easier and approachable to many operations that were a distant dream in the past. Websites allow user to access information from wide range of sources. These web services are available for all including person with disabilities, older people and people living in remote area. But the people with disabilities have several accessibility barriers to access the internet due to poor and improper designing of web interfaces. Accessibility professional are accessing various Accessibility standard, to implement the Accessibility project as per their need. Specific project require specific standard such as USA has ADA, and uses section 508. Indian government have GIGW for their Government portal. European Union has adopted their own standard. WCAG 2.0 is an internationally accepted standard for web accessibility, developed by Wide Web Consortium (W3C). It is difficult to provide smooth project remediation right from the beginning, when asked for particular Accessibility standard implementation. Each standard has different structure to organise and implement the Accessibility guidelines on the website. Implementation of web accessibility standard demands, time, effort and cost estimate. The researcher wants to provide complete analysis of selected web accessibility standards and regulations that has helpful to organization and it will also be helpful for designing accessibility evaluation tools and addressing multiple compliance. The researcher prepared a questionnaire to assess knowledge of web accessibility expert defining certain criteria and parameters. Researcher administered a questionnaire to Accessibility expert as part of Pilot Study. After conducting pilot study, it was found that Accessibility expert were not aware about any tool for comparative analysis of various Accessibility standard and guidelines.

Keywords- Web Accessibility, Accessibility guidelines, analysis, compliance, comparative.

1. INTRODUCTION

The web accessibility movement is started in late nineties in world. United States of America introduced section 508 in US rehabilitation act followed by Americans with disabilities act (ADA). World Wide Web consortium also started web accessibility initiative (WAI) in 1996 and started developing guidelines for content accessibility, authoring tools accessibility, browser accessibility etc. Product based software companies like Microsoft, IBM, Oracle, Adobe etc. also started developing accessibility standards for their own products in late nineties.

First version of Web content accessibility guidelines (WCAG1.0) was released in 2003. Since then accessibility was started to be addressed throughout the globe. Australia passed an act (disability discrimination act) (DDA) in 1998. Several European states like Switzerland, Ireland introduced accessibility standards for their countries. United Kingdom had also the similar laws in late nineties. India also had persons with disabilities act in 1995 but there is no mention about accessibility of website and software application. Accessibility is being addressed in India after signing on United Nations conventions on rights of persons with disabilities (UNCRPD) in 2007. Then India introduced a government of India guidelines for web accessibility (GIGW) in 2009 to address accessibility issues in government web portals.

Managing accessibility projects is a challenge and growing need in the IT industry as there is no tool for generating accessibility projects estimate.[1] Due to this accessibility professionals end up spending more time and efforts to prepare an estimate for the web accessibility projects. [2] The focus is towards

developing a tool for generating systematic estimate for the web accessibility projects by using comparative analysis of web accessibility standards across regions and organization that helps in providing similarities and differences in expert the standards. Comparative study has carried out on the various parameters to compare the accessibility standards. [3]

Comparative study of web accessibility standards helps in designing a tool that can generate project estimate which includes efforts, time and cost to implement the specific accessibility standard into client website. [4] Accessibility professionals are facing challenges in preparing the fairly accurate project estimate in case of accessibility remediation and designing from beginning. Only experienced accessibility experts can prepare the project estimate with lot of study and research which is not only time consuming but also an approximate value.

Providing complete analysis of selected web accessibility standard and regulations has helpful to organization and also for designing accessibility estimation tools for addressing multiple compliance. With the help of sample data collected through pilot study it was found that accessibility expert were not aware of any such detailed comparative analysis of various accessibility guidelines and standards, or about availability of any such tool for comparison of accessibility standards. This research application integrates the systematic comparison of accessibility standard. Generating project estimate report for specific accessibility standard considering all parameters of the accessibility guidelines that helps in accessibility remediation of the website.[5] Application can be compatible to adapt newer version of accessibility standards. Initially application can be used to generate report for WCAG, Section 508 and GIGW implementation.[6] Comparative information of various accessibility standards and guidelines is not available for the organisation who wishes to adapt accessibility in their system which creates difficulty for the organisation to make decision. Publicly available web accessibility standards and regulations on web has downloaded and manual comparison has done by aligning and mapping accessibility checkpoints, sections, levels etc for every web accessibility standard that the researcher want s to compare.

2. Related Work:

This work comes from these main criteria, 1. Person with disabilities face many challenges to access the website, 2. Accessibility expert are unaware about the availability of tool to compare various web accessibility standard, 3. Organisation seeks comparison of various web accessibility standards in order for smooth implementation of the guidelines.

3. Objectives of the study:

- 3.1 To gather and analyze available web accessibility standards and regulations in world to understand their specific context.
- 3.2 To provide systematic comparative information of each web accessibility standards and regulations in terms of similarities and differences.
- 3.3 To find out usability of selected accessibility standards and regulations for users with disabilities.

4. Hypothesis:

- i) Systematic Comparative information of various accessibility standards and regulations of latest versions is unavailable.
- ii) Comparative study of various web accessibility standards and regulations are helpful in addressing multiple compliance.

5. Research questions:

Question pertaining to objective 3.1

- Q.1 How many accessibility standards are available in world.
- Q.2 What is the specific objective of each accessibility standards and regulations?
- Q.3 What is the scope of each accessibility standards and regulations?

Question pertaining to Objective 3.2

- Q.1 How comparative analysis can be presented and made available?
- Q.2 What is the similarities and differences in each selected accessibility standards and regulations?
- Q.3 What is co-relation of each accessibility standards and regulations?
- Q.4 How addressing one accessibility standard or regulation will fulfill other compliance?

Questions pertaining to objective 3.3

- Q.1 How effective is the selected accessibility standards and regulations?

6. Research methodology:

Experimental method has used for comparative analysis.

6.1 Manual analysis:

Publicly available web accessibility standards and regulations on web has downloaded and manual comparison has done by aligning and mapping accessibility checkpoints, sections, levels etc. in each web accessibility standards taken under study.

6.2 Checking effectiveness:

Selected web accessibility standards has implemented one after other in the experimental portal and usability has checked each time from 5 selected web accessibility experts. Their structured feed back in the form of short questionnaire has noted and usability before implementation, usability of the experimental portal after implementation of each accessibility standards has taken.

7. Data collection:

Primary data:

The primary data has collected in the first stage of the research. Primary data has collected from the selected sample of experts that are accessibility professionals. In the second stage of the research for checking effectiveness. The sample size has 10 experts. Geographical area selected for research sample is Maharashtra. Approximately 100 Accessibility professionals in various district. Sample size is 50 out of 100 for entire research. 10 samples has taken for pilot study. Source of Sample-NGO, Institution, IT sector. Researcher has used Google Docs to collect the data from experts.

Secondary data:

Secondary data from various sources from web has collected and analyzed.

8. Tools used

- a. Microsoft Excel is used for mapping each web accessibility standards simultaneously.
- b. Questionnaire is used to collect feedback of the expert.
- c. T test is used to record and analyze user feedback before and after implementation of each web accessibility standards.

9. Pilot Study Design:

We designed a questionnaire to assess knowledge of

Accessibility expert on various parameters related to comparison tool for S Web Accessibility standards. This questionnaire was administered on 10 Accessibility professional the researcher formulated 38 questions for the questionnaire. The parameters considered for the study were

- a) Total number of accessibility standards
- b) Objectives of accessibility standards
- c) Difference between accessibility standard
- d) Similarities between accessibility standard
- e) Availability of tool to compare accessibility standard.

Thus the study was carried out on 10 accessibility expert. 38 Questions pertaining to above parameters were framed and designed in 3 Point Likert Scale. The responses included 'Yes', 'No' and can't Say or Agree, Disagree and strongly agree depending upon the question. In the first part the participant filled in the demographic information. The questions included were about their academic qualifications, their age and experience in this field. The questions were also framed on awareness about objectives, similarities and differences of various accessibility standards. The respondents were also asked if they are aware about any tool to compare different web accessibility standard. The researcher designed questionnaire that assessed knowledge of Accessibility expert pertaining to information about tools to conduct comparative analysis of various web accessibility standards

Question Frame

Demographic Information
Gender, Age, Educational qualifications, experience
Designation ,
Accessibility standard Knowledge about availability of tool to compare web accessibility standard

The 3 Point Likert Scale was administered to 10

Accessibility expert each gave us completed response to every question. 50% of the respondent were female and 50% were male they belong to age group of 23-28 years most of them were high school passed. Almost all respondent belong to physical accessibility sector, almost all respondent were accessibility tester. Most respondent were experienced in the field of implementation of web accessibility standard, almost all of them had experience of one or two years. Almost all the respondents were aware about the objectives of web accessibility standard.

10. Pilot Study Results

10.1 Findings

The finding of the pilot study was very interesting. Almost all the respondents were not aware about web accessibility standards. Almost all the participants were aware about any one accessibility standard. Almost all the respondent agreed that they are aware about objectives of web accessibility standard. But the almost all participant replied that they cannot elaborate objectives of web accessibility standard. 70% of web accessibility expert had experience between zero to five years. 20% of accessibility expert had experience between five to ten years. 10% expert had more than ten years of experience. Almost all the expert holds certification in web accessibility standard. 70% of respondent had an attended training on accessibility whereas 30% had not attended any training on accessibility. 50% of participants were not aware about difference between available web accessibility standard. 40% participants were partly aware about difference between available web accessibility standards whereas 10% of the participants were fully aware about difference between different web accessibility standards. Almost all the respondents were partly aware about the similarities between different web accessibility standards. 50% of the participants never tried to compare any web accessibility standard, whereas 30% of respondent were partially sure whether they tried to compare different web accessibility standard. 20% respondents actually compared different web accessibility standards. 60% of the respondent replied they don't think comparison of web accessibility standards is needed. 20% felt the need for comparison of web accessibility standards. 70% respondent felt that comparison of web accessibility standard has helpful in addressing multiple compliance. 30% were partial whether comparison of web accessibility standard has

helpful in addressing in multiple compliance or not. 60% of respondents were not aware about availability of any tool to compare web accessibility standards. 20% were not aware about availability of any tool to compare web accessibility standards whereas 20% were aware about tool to compare web accessibility standards.

Almost all the participant felt that availability of tool to compare web accessibility standard has useful to them. Almost 90% said as there are no much difference in different web accessibility standard there is no need for a tool for comparison. 10% of the participant felt the need of comparison of web accessibility standards. 80% respondent replied that they came across common errors while implementing web accessibility standard. 20% said they didn't come across any common errors while implementing web accessibility standard. Almost 80% replied that they can name common accessibility problem. 20% respondent said they were not able to name common accessibility problem. Almost all respondent said that they were aware about accessible content. 80% respondent said that they can name some common accessibility barriers. 20% said they cannot name some common accessibility barriers. 70% respondents were aware about accessibility training courses. 30% respondents were partially aware about accessibility training course. 80% respondents were partially able to follow guidelines for implementing accessibility standard given in English. 10% were able to follow accessibility guidelines given in English. 10% respondents were not able to follow guidelines given in English. 60% respondent felt provision of comparison of various accessibility standard is required by the client. 20% respondent disagreed that comparison of various accessibility standard is required by the client. 20% of the respondent strongly agreed that comparison of various web accessibility standards is required by the client. 50% felt that Principal, Success Criteria, Check Point and Level can be used as parameters to compare web accessibility standard. 20% respondent felt that Principal, Success Criteria, Check Point and level cannot be used as parameters to web accessibility standards. 30% respondent replied that they can't say whether Principal, Success Criteria, Check Point and Level can be used as parameters to compare web accessibility standards. 70% respondents were not aware about parameters to compare web accessibility standards. 30% respondents were aware about parameters to compare web accessibility standards.

80% respondents were not able to describe parameters in detail to compare web accessibility standards. 20% respondents were able to describe parameters in detail to compare web accessibility standards. 50% were able to identify factor in deciding time estimate to implement specific web accessibility standards. 50% were not able to identify factor in deciding time estimate to implement specific web accessibility standards. 50% respondents were not able to identify factors to consider in deciding cost estimate to implement specific web accessibility standards. 30% respondents were able to identify factors to consider in deciding cost estimate to implement specific web accessibility standards. 20% respondents said they were not able to say whether they are able to identify factors to consider in deciding cost estimate to implement web accessibility standards. 60% respondent said that they are partially aware that efforts in implementing web accessibility standards are measurable. 40% respondent said that they were not aware that efforts in implementing web accessibility standards are measurable. 60% respondents were aware that addressing one accessibility standard or regulations will fulfil other compliance. 40% respondents were not aware that addressing one accessibility standards or regulations will fulfil other compliance.

The screenshot shows a software interface with a table titled 'New Field Statistics'. The table has columns for 'Field Name', 'Min', 'Max', 'Mean', 'Std. Deviation', and 'N of Valid Cases'. The data rows show values for various fields, with 'N of Valid Cases' consistently being 100.

Field Name	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	N of Valid Cases
1	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
2	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
3	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
4	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
5	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
6	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
7	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
8	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
9	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
10	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
11	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
12	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
13	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
14	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
15	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
16	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
17	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
18	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
19	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
20	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
21	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
22	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
23	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
24	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
25	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
26	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
27	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
28	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
29	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
30	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
31	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
32	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
33	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
34	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
35	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
36	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
37	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
38	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
39	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
40	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
41	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
42	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
43	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
44	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
45	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
46	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
47	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
48	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
49	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
50	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
51	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
52	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
53	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
54	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
55	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
56	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
57	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
58	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
59	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
60	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
61	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
62	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
63	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
64	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
65	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
66	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
67	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
68	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
69	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
70	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
71	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
72	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
73	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
74	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
75	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
76	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
77	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
78	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
79	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100
80	1	5	2.5	1.41421	100

The result of the questionnaire test positive on reliability as it showed .

Conclusion:

With the above conducted pilot study the researcher came to conclusion that the accessibility expert are not aware about availability of tool to compare various web accessibility standards and if the tool is made available to them in near future it has useful to them in implementing the web accessibility standard in clients website.

This is pilot study

Acknowledgement:

We are thankful to Sinhgad Institute of Management and Computer Application (SIMCA) and also to the organiser of the conference. I would like to thank all the accessibility professionals for participating in and giving valuable feedback

References:

- [1] Baowaly, M.K., Hossain, J.M., Bhuiyan, M., 2012. Accessibility analysis and evaluation of government website in developing countries: case study Bangladesh
- [2] Mankoff, J., Fait, H., and Tu Tran., 2005. Is Your Web Page Accessible? A Comparative Study of Methods for Assessing Web Page Accessibility for the Blind. In Proceedings of SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors In Computing Systems (pp.41-50), Portland, USA
- [3] Klein, D.W., Kresowik, D., and McCoy., 2005. A Study of the Accessibility of Ten States' Web Services and their Policies on Web Accessibility for People with Disabilities.
- [4] Richards, J. T., Hanson, V. L., 2004. Web Accessibility: A Broader View. Proceedings of the 13th international conference on World Wide Web.
- [5] S. Lujana-Mora. 2013. Web Accessibility Among the Countries of the European Union: A Comparative Study. Actual problems of Computer Science., vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 18-27, ECCC Foundation.
- Cullen, K., Kubitschke, L., Boussios, T., Dolphin, C., Meyer, I., 2009. Study report: Web accessibility in European countries: level of compliance with latest international accessibility specifications, notably WCAG 2.0, and approaches or plans to implement those specifications. European Commission. Internet: <http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/study-report-web-accessibility-european-countries-level-compliance-latest-international> (visited November 2 2013)
- Slatin, J., & Rush, S. (2003). Maximum Accessibility: Making Your Web Site More Usable for Everyone. Boston, USA: Addison-Wesley.
- USA government, Americans with disabilities act document, internet: http://www.ada.gov/enforce_current.htm (visited 17th November 2015)
- USA government, rehabilitation act document, internet: <http://www.section508.gov/content/about-us> (visited 18th November 2015)
- World wide web consortium, Web accessibility

Results and Discussions

Parameters	Questions	Mean
Number of Web Accessibility Standards	Are you aware about web accessibility standard	.882
	How many web accessibility standard do you know	.882
	Do you know exact number of web accessibility standard available in the world.	.873
Details about web accessibility standards	Do you know objectives of web accessibility standard	.882
	If yes can you elaborate objectives of web accessibility standard briefly?	.882
	Do you know difference between web accessibility standard in detail.	.869
	Do you know similarities between available web accessibility standard in detail.	.882
	Efforts in implementing web accessibility standard are measurable	.882
Availability of tool for comparison	Do you know about any tool to compare web accessibility standard	.872
	If a tool is made available to compare web accessibility standard will it be useful to you?	.882
	Can we use following parameters to compare web accessibility standard i) Principal ii) Section criteria iii) Check point iv) Level	.863
Problem related to implementation of web accessibility standard	Do you come across common errors while implementing web accessibility standard.	.873
	Can you name some common accessibility problem	.873
	Can you name some common web accessibility barriers?	.873
	Can you identify factors to consider in deciding time estimate to implement specific web accessibility standard	.872
	Can you identify factors to consider in deciding cost estimate to implement specific web accessibility standard.	.867

initiative, article designing for inclusion, internet:<http://www.w3c.org/wai/designingforinclusion>(visited on 17 november 2015)
 World wide web consortium, resources document, internet:<http://www.w3.org/WAI/Resources/Overview>(visited 02 november 2015)
 Oracle corporation inc, corporate policy document, internet:<http://www.oracle.com/us/corporate/accessibility/policies/index.html>(visited on 23 september 2015).
 Adobe corporation inc, corporate accessibility document, internet:<http://www.adobe.com/accessibility>(29 november 2015)
 Government of India, ministry of information and communication technology, government of India Guidelines for web accessibility document, internet:<http://web.guidelines.gov.in/#&panell-3> (visited 23 september 2015)
 Web accessibility in mind, Uta state university initiative, laws throughout the world, internet:<http://webaim.org/articles/laws/world/>(visited on 25 november 2015)

