

Automated Evaluation of Web Site Accessibility Using A Dynamic Accessibility Measurement Crawler

Trevor Bostic, Jeff Stanley, John Higgins, Daniel Chudnov, Justin F. Brunelle
The MITRE Corporation

{tbostic,jstanley,jphiggins,dlchudnov,jbrunelle}@mitre.org

ABSTRACT

Some abstract things here...

KEYWORDS

Accessibility; Web Crawling; Government

ACM Reference format:

Trevor Bostic, Jeff Stanley, John Higgins, Daniel Chudnov, Justin F. Brunelle. 2016. Automated Evaluation of Web Site Accessibility Using A Dynamic Accessibility Measurement Crawler. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference, Washington, DC, USA, July 2017 (Conference'17)*, 7 pages.

DOI: 10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn

1 INTRODUCTION

Accessibility of online content is becoming increasingly important as governments and many other organizations are moving critical functions and services online. Nearly 20% of people in the U.S. have a disability [29] and many of them are affected by inaccessible websites.

There are several barriers that are preventing web content owners from implementing good accessibility practices: lack of knowledge, lack of testing capability, and a lack of funding. The lack of knowledge is being addressed in many ways, such as by developing web accessibility standards (e.g., W3C [31]) and training programs for testers and developers (i.e., Trusted Tester Program [8]). While the Trusted Tester Program is creating accessibility testing experts, its main focus is training non-technical workers to use automated tools. However, current automated tools are only capable of finding at most 50% of issues [30], though this number continually fluctuates as tools improve and web pages increase in complexity. This demonstrates a lack of testing capability. As a result, fixing inaccessible systems may cost a government agency or business hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, reducing their ability to add new features as they attempt to conform to accessibility standards. Accessibility testing that is reliant on manual and semi-automated testing will continue to strain funding resources as the web grows increasingly dynamic.

Web applications that rely on JavaScript and Ajax to construct dynamic web pages pose further challenges for both persons with disabilities and for automated evaluation tools. In these increasingly popular web applications, content changes in ways that cannot be easily predicted by examining a page's source code (e.g., HTML). Current automated tools

can no longer discover and test the full range of web content [4], leading to un-discoverable accessibility violations.

Our goal is to increase the capability of automated testing tools so that accessibility testers will be able to evaluate a larger percentage of accessibility problems more quickly, resulting in fewer dollars spent per page testing and a higher quality service for persons with disabilities. We present an automated testing crawler to demonstrate an improvement to the existing methods of manual and semi-automated testing that make up the current state-of-the-art.

Our approach combines concepts from web application testing, web science, and accessibility to create a methodology and prototype for automated identification of accessibility issues caused by dynamic state changes of a website. Our goal is to use web science approaches to compare content reachability between users with and without disabilities. Specifically, we hope to identify accessibility issues created by use of dynamic content within web applications.

In this paper, we introduce a framework and proof-of-concept software package for automatically assessing the accessibility of websites called *Demodocus*. Demodocus uses web application testing theory, web crawling concepts, and web accessibility standards to perform accessibility assessments. We also propose a mathematical model for quantifying accessibility violations based on a graph of reachable states and a state machine representing a user's interaction with a website. In our evaluation of Demodocus, we measure the accessibility of XX government and XX random websites finding that accessibility things...

2 RELATED WORK

Three streams of research inform Demodocus. First, we discuss existing web accessibility work to include the existing guiding standards for website accessibility along with existing research that explores automatically identifying and quantifying accessibility (primarily informed by the existing standards). This analysis of prior works establishes the current state-of-the-art in accessibility measurement and accessible web design.

Second, we present prior works about web user interaction modeling, involving web user behavior models – both manually and automatically – to interact with and discover content from web pages. This establishes the ways in which prior researchers have designed user interactivity models for the use of crawling and testing and, therefore, informs our development of accessibility user models.

Third, we summarize literature from the web science domain on automatically crawling web applications (e.g., those

driven by JavaScript and Ajax) for both testing and evaluation purposes. These works inform our web crawler design, including the models for state equivalency.

2.1 Approaches for Web Accessibility Measures

The need to measure or test for accessibility of websites is not new. Standards such as Section 508 and WCAG exist for guiding and maximizing the accessibility of websites [1, 7]. These standards attempt to create an acceptable level of performance for disabled users by setting requirements for standard practices and principles.

These standards come largely as a response to current web design trends (e.g., adoption of JavaScript to build websites) and attempt to guide the state of web practices toward increasing accessibility. Harper and Chen used the Wayback Machine¹ to provide a longitudinal study of popular and random website accessibility using WCAG guidelines, finding that accessibility standards are met on less than 10% of web pages, potentially due to the increased adoption of Ajax [14]. Additionally, Hackett et al. showed that websites are becoming less accessible over time [14]. Together, these studies suggest that accessibility practices are increasingly difficult to implement and sustain.

To combat this difficulty, many web developers now follow a process of using automated tools for triaging violations, then following up with manual efforts that are more likely to catch subtle violations. Puppeteer is a Google product that offers a way to understand the accessibility violations of Document Object Model (DOM) elements [13]. The General Services Administration uses the pa11y tool [28] to crawl and assess the accessibility of both static HTML and the HTML that results from scripted user interactions. However, pa11y lacks the ability to discover and interact with the DOM without *a priori* knowledge and human scripting of a tool. Mankoff et al. describe their tool for assessing accessibility of web pages for blind users and recommend an optimal method of blindness accessibility evaluation using a screen reader [17]. This demonstrates an approach to create quantitative accessibility measures.

2.2 Web User Interaction Models

To model users' navigation around the web, researchers have used agent models based on varying degrees of prior knowledge. Bartoli et al. demonstrated the ability to record and replay navigations on Ajax-heavy resources [2]. Their tool records interactions and replays the trace in an effort to test user interfaces with the goal of overcoming the difficulties in automated testing and programmatic interaction with client-side interfaces introduced by Ajax.

Rather than replay interactions, Gorniak worked to predict future user actions by observing past interactions of other users [12]. This work modeled users as agents based on their interactions and modeled clients (i.e., states of a representation) based on potential state transitions. The

agents would make the next most probable state transition, indicating what action the user is expected to take.

Leveraging user interaction patterns, Palmieri et al. generated agents to collect hidden web pages by identifying navigation elements from current interactive elements [15]. They represented the navigation patterns from these agents as a directed graph and trained the agents to interact with navigation elements. This includes forms, which would be filled out based on repository attributes. Drop-down menus would be randomly selected by the agents to spawn new pages. This method generated coverage that included 80% of all potential pages.

2.3 JavaScript Web Application Crawling

Several efforts have studied client-side state exploration with attention toward testing Rich Internet Applications (RIAs; i.e., web pages that rely heavily on JavaScript to provide functionality and interactivity). This continues to be a difficult problem since RIAs often have deferred representations². Rosenthal describes the web as evolving from delivering document markup as representations to delivering programs/applications as representations [24, 26]. This makes reliably crawling a representation challenging, similar to capturing a PDF snapshot versus a video of a program's execution. Further exploring the difficulty of RIA state exploration, Mesbah et al. also identified browser cookies and HTTP 404 responses as problems they encountered when trying to recreate states for a representation [20].

When crawling web pages, the most common strategy is to create a graph in which events are represented as edges and states are represented as nodes. Raj et al. performed crawls on Ajax-driven RIAs and detailed a method of using state transitions (defined by JavaScript events) and state equivalence (using the DOM trees for comparison) [25]. Using a similar approach, Mesbah et al. performed several experiments regarding crawling and indexing representations of web pages that rely on JavaScript [18, 19, 23] focusing mainly on search engine indexing and automatic testing [21, 22].

Li et al. took a different approach that uses a proxy to inject JavaScript into crawled pages [16]. In their approach, they defined state transitions in the same way as Raj et al. Fejfar crawled RIA DOM elements using a human-in-the-loop approach, allowing the human to direct the user interactions that should be crawled [11] (similar to pa11y).

The prime example on which both our prior and current research is based on is that by Dincturk et al. [5, 9, 10]. They present a model for crawling RIAs by constructing a graph of client-side states (they refer to these as "AJAX states" within the Hypercube model). Their work, which serves as the mathematical foundation and framework inspiration for our work, identifies the challenges with crawling Ajax-based representations and uses a Hypercube strategy to efficiently identify and navigate all client-side states of

¹<http://web.archive.org/>

²*Deferred representations* refer to web-based representations that rely on JavaScript to build the client-side representation, including making HTTP requests for additional embedded resources after the initial page load [4].

a deferred representation. Their model defines a client-side state as a state reachable from a URL through client-side events and is uniquely identified by the state's DOM. That is, two states are identified as equivalent if their DOM (e.g., HTML) is directly equivalent.

3 DEMODOCUS DESIGN

As discussed in Section 1, our work resulted in a framework we refer to as Demodocus for measuring accessibility that leverages principles from web science, web accessibility, and – specifically – automated web application testing. The resulting software package includes a web crawler, a set of user models, and a method by which states are assessed for equivalence and accessibility violations.

Demodocus (described in Section 3.1), takes a URI as a parameter and creates a graph of the reachable states within the webpage. Demodocus exercises user interactions and client-side events to reach the states. As Demodocus creates the graph, it uses a state equivalency algorithm (discussed in Section 3.2) to identify and deduplicate potentially equivalent states. The intent of defining state equivalency is to reduce state explosion and the number of duplicated states which could otherwise lead to skewed or diluted accessibility results.

An initial graph is created using an omnipotent user model (the *omni* user) capable of finding and triggering all possible events. This results in a complete graph of the states in a deferred representation. To assess accessibility (Section 3.1.4), additional user models based on the capabilities of persons with and without disabilities then traverse through the complete graph. While traversing, Demodocus records the states each user model is able to reach.

After completing the crawl, we compare the user models' graphs of reachable states and access paths for each state (i.e., the series of events and states a user must traverse to reach an end state) to the complete graph generated by the omniscient user. By finding the differential between the graphs, we can ascertain which states were unreachable (and therefore a potential accessibility violation) for a given user model. Additionally, we can gain insight on the difficulty of traversal to some end state as compared to the optimal path (e.g., the omniscient user has as significantly shorter access path than a given user model). In a fully accessible web page, we would expect the differential between the complete graph and the graphs generated by the user models to be minimal.

The user models (described in Section 3.3) are specifically made to simulate the abilities of persons with and without disabilities as they navigate a webpage (i.e., traverse the graph). The models in this paper simulate only a small set of disabilities that a user may have (e.g., the inability to effectively use a mouse to trigger client-side events such as mouseover), but can provide adequate insight to predict poor experiences a user may face while using a web page. We expect that these models will be adapted and expanded in the future.

3.1 Algorithm

Demodocus uses a similar methodology to our prior research focused on web archiving [6]. Using Selenium [3], the crawler begins by dereferencing a URI provided as a parameter to the crawler application. Demodocus then creates a frontier of available user interactions and – similar to a traditional web crawler – executes the events on the client. Demodocus then records the newly reached states. Because modern web sites more closely resemble web *applications* (i.e., RIAs) through the use of JavaScript and other client-side events to generate content or load embedded resources, the crawler uses JavaScript utilities to exercise and monitor the client-side activity; this is a capability not available to traditional web crawlers such as Heritrix [27].

3.1.1 State Machine Definition. Within our crawler model, we first use a breadth-first search model to create a complete graph of all states reachable by client-side user interactions. We represent the generated graph abstractly as a state machine M , defined in Equation 1.

$$\begin{aligned}
 M &= S, s_0, \Sigma, \delta \\
 S &= \text{All client-side states} \\
 s_0 &= \text{Representation available after} \\
 &\quad \text{dereferencing the URI} \\
 \Sigma &= \text{All client-side interactions} \\
 \delta : S \times \Sigma &\rightarrow S \\
 \img alt="A small yellow icon of a speech bubble with a cursor arrow pointing to it." data-bbox="618 503 648 523"/> &\in S \\
 \sigma &\in \Sigma \\
 \delta(s_i, \sigma) &= s_j
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1}$$

Our definition of S includes all states possibly found, even those found by waiting (i.e., performing no action until a timeout event occurs), and does not take into account that human users may consider the states to be duplicate or equivalent. This means we could have states s_i and s_j that have equivalent content, but may be considered separate states for other reasons such as the paths to reach them. We have also defined s_0 , the initial state, as the state available after dereferencing the URI.

Additionally, we define our alphabet Σ as the set of client-side interactions that lead to states S . Note that Σ includes client-side interactions such as waiting and so should not be assumed to purely be a set of JavaScript events performed on some element.

Finally, we define a transition function δ that maps a state and an interaction to an output state. We will use this state machine as a model to help define accessibility violations in the context of our graph analysis.

3.1.2 Graph Implementation. In practice, it is impossible to fully exercise the state machine defined above as there may be infinite states due to our consideration of interactions such as waiting or page reloading. Thus our implementation follows an approximation of the state machine that begins by

generating a graph G (defined in Equation 2) of the states and interactions crawled.

$$\begin{aligned}
 G &= V, E \\
 V &= \text{Representation states reachable} \\
 &\quad \text{via user interaction} \\
 E &= \text{User interactions (transitions)} \\
 v &\in V
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Within our graph G , we attempt to reduce the state search space (i.e., reduce $|V|$) to increase tractability of our crawl. We collapse similar states, as defined by our State Equivalence model (3.3), into one vertex within our graph. That is, there may exist states s_i and s_j within our state machine M that are collapsed to v_i within our graph G .

Additionally, each vertex v in our graph contains a set of some targets $T_v \in T$ with which our crawler can interact, where T is the set of all possible targets available throughout the graph.

Each edge $e \in E$, representing a user interaction, is a pair of some action $a \in A$ and a target $t \in T_{v_i}$ where action a is performed on target t within representation v_i to trigger the transition to v_j .

A is the set of all available actions and is independent of the representation. That is, A is a set of all actions users may attempt at any time. For example, actions could include clicking, keyboard presses, or reloading the window.

T is the set of possible targets on which an action a_i could be performed. T is dependent on the representation, as it is possible that a target t is available only in one or more representations v_i and v_j . For ease, we denote the set of targets available in a given representation v_i as T_{v_i} . Examples of possible targets may include interactive web elements or the browser window.

The full definition of how states and edges are represented in our graph is given in Equation 3.

$$\begin{aligned}
 G &= V, E \\
 A &= \text{Set of available actions} \\
 T &= \text{Set of possible targets} \\
 v &\in V \\
 T_{v_i} &= \text{Set of targets available in } v_i \\
 a &\in A \\
 t &\in T \\
 e &\in E \\
 e &= \{a, t\}
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

3.1.3 User Model Dependent Graphs. To create our graphs we employ a variety of user models that are meant to simulate the experience of persons with and without disabilities. Thus, each may generate a different graph G that represents the reachable states V and executable interactions for that user E (e.g. G_{omni} , $G_{keyboard}$, $G_{screenreader}$). An example of our notation for this structure with omni-user is shown below in Equation 4.

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_{omni} &= V_{omni}, E_{omni} \\
 V_{omni} &= \text{All states reachable by omni-user} \\
 E_{omni} &= \text{All interactions executable by omni-user}
 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Among the user models, the omni-user model has no ability or navigation restrictions placed upon it. Due to this, we use omni-user to create our complete graph G_{omni} (or a graph as complete as is feasible), defined in Equation 4, to act as ground truth for the remaining user models. We then crawl the complete graph with our other – restricted – user models to determine which states are reachable and which edges are traversable. For clarity, it should be noted that the omni-user is meant only for graph creation purposes and is not modeled after any realistic user. Subsequently, the restricted users are modeled after real users and contain models for users with and without disabilities.

Our restricted user models r are each defined with a set of actions A_r they are capable of performing, as well as a set of targets T_r on which they are capable of performing actions. These sets are restricted by the capabilities of the user they are simulating. For instance, a keyboard user would not have any mouse events within their set of actions A , while a color blind user may be restricted due to poor color contrast of some element t .

Each restricted user model will generate its own graph G_r containing the reachable representations V_r and the interactions they were able to execute E_r . The graph G_r is a subset of the graph G_{omni} ; however, the restricted users may be able to find all representations V_{omni} and execute all interactions E_{omni} , making G_r a potential improper subset, thus $G_r \subseteq G_{omni}$.

These properties of our restricted user models are stated concisely in Equation (5).

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_{omni} &= V_{omni}, E_{omni} \\
 E_{omni} &= \{A_{omni}, T_{omni}\} \\
 A_r &= \text{Set of action available to a restricted user} \\
 T_r &= \text{Set of targets available to a restricted user} \\
 A_r &\subseteq A_{omni} \\
 T_r &\subseteq T_{omni} \\
 E_r &= \{A_r, T_r\} \\
 &\text{so} \\
 E_r &\subseteq E_{omni} \\
 V_r &\subseteq V_{omni} \\
 G_r &= V_r, E_r \\
 &\text{thus} \\
 G_r &\subseteq G_{omni}
 \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Once again, remember restricted user models encompass users with and without disabilities, as neither has access to the full spectrum of capabilities available to the omni-user model.

3.1.4 Finding Inaccessible Representations. Within the context of state machine M and graph G , we define an inaccessible representation to occur when there exists some $v \in V_{omni}$ with corresponding incoming edge $e_x = \{a_x, t_x\}$ that is available to users n (non-disabled) without some disability, but there is no available incoming edge $e_y = \{a_y, t_y\}$ for users d with a disability. Restated, this means that an incoming edge to state v exists where for at least one of the incoming edges $e_x, a_x \in A_n$ and $t_x \in T_n$, but there is *not* an equivalent e_y where $a_y \in A_d$ and $t_y \in T_d$.

A formal definition is shown in Equation 6.

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_{omni} &= V_{omni}, E_{omni} \\
 G_n &= V_n, E_n \\
 G_d &= V_d, E_d \\
 v_x, v_y, v_z &\in V_{omni} \\
 &\text{where for some} \\
 e_i, e_j &\in E_{omni} \\
 \delta(v_x, e_i) &= v_z \\
 \delta(v_y, e_j) &= v_z \\
 & \\
 a_x &\in A_n \\
 a_y &\in A_d \\
 t_x &\in T_{v_x} \cap T_n \\
 t_y &\in T_{v_y} \cap T_d \\
 e_x &= \{a_x, t_x\} \\
 e_y &= \{a_y, t_y\} \\
 \exists (v_x, e_x) \mid \delta(v_x, e_x) &= v_z \\
 \nexists (v_y, e_y) \mid \delta(v_y, e_y) &= v_z
 \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

In Equation 6, we begin by defining the three user models that will be required during this comparison, the omni-user, a non-disabled user, and a user with a disability.

Next, we define several vertices that exist within omni-user's graph v_x, v_y , and v_z , where v_x and v_y have outgoing edges (e_i and e_j) that lead to v_z . Note, that it is possible for $v_x = v_y$ and $e_i = e_j$.

Additionally, we define edges that are capable of execution by our non-disabled user model n and our user model of a user with a disability d . We do this by ensuring the edges use only the actions available to the given user model (e.g., $a_x \in A_n$) and targets the user is capable of interacting with (e.g., $t_x \in T_n$). We then use our definition of an edge from Equation 3 to construct edges available to our user models.

To determine if a representation is inaccessible for some user model with a disability d , we first need to determine that the state is accessible to some user model without a disability n . We do this by finding some vertex v_x with an outgoing edge e_x that is traversable by our non-disabled user n . More precisely, there is some vertex v_x that contains a target $t_x \in T_{v_x} \cap T_n$ (targets available to the user within vertex v_x) that when action $a_x \in A_n$ is applied to t_x triggers a traversal

of the graph to v_z . We represent this mathematically by adapting the transfer function previously defined in the state machine.

For representation a to be inaccessible, a non-disabled user must be able to access it when a user model with a disability cannot. We say a representation is inaccessible when there is no v_y with an outgoing edge e_y that is activatable by our user model with a disability d . This failure is produced when there is no $t_y \in T_{v_y} \cap T_d$ such that when an action $a_y \in A_d$ is applied to t_y it triggers a transition to v_z .

Finally, notice that an inaccessibility occurs as a result of a user model with a disability being unable to perform some action available to the non-disabled user ($a \in A_n$ and $a \notin A_d$) or being unable to use a target available to a non-disabled user ($t \in T_n$ and $t \notin T_d$).

3.2 User Models

As defined in Equation 5, user models generate the G_{omni} or G_d based on available actions and reachable states. In this proof-of-concept, we define the user models for *Omni* (all user actions available and generates the canonical graph G_{omni} for a website), *Keyboard* $G_{keyboard}$ (simulating a user that has limited ability to use a mouse), *Low-Vision* $G_{low-vision}$ (requiring zoom and/or higher color contrast to understand a page), and *Screen reader* $G_{screen-reader}$ (a user the relies on a screen reader). For each different user model, we define abilities for the user based on their ability to *Perceive*, *Navigate*, and *Act*.

The *Perceive* ability for each user model defines how the user interprets the web page. For the *Keyboard* user model this may be all elements visually present on the page, but for others (e.g., *Screen reader*, *Low-vision*), it may mean access only to information presented by the assistive technology or visible through a smaller view port. This step can act as a filter for the remaining abilities; if a user cannot perceive an element it is unlikely they would navigate and act on it.

The *Navigate* ability defines how a user navigates around a site. For a *Keyboard* user model this is primarily tabbing, but could also include keyboard shortcuts, especially those given by screen readers in the case of the *Screen reader* user model.

Finally, the *Act* ability defines how a user model is able to interact with a page, and often is as simple as defining a set of JavaScript event types that the model is allowed to use. For the *Keyboard* user model, this would mean restricting the set of JavaScript events to those only created by the keyboard such as keyup or keydown.

We define the actions A_d in Table 1. For all of the user models, the keyboard events available for keyup and keydown include Space, Enter, Up Arrow, Down Arrow, Left Arrow, and Right Arrow. The full set of events that the crawler is able to execute is $E_{omni} = \text{focus, blur, click, mouseover, mousein, mouseout, mousedown, mouseup, keydown, keyup}$.

Abilities for each user model also contain a scoring function, $f(x)$, where the input is some metric relating to the ability type and the output is decimal between 0 and 1. A measurement of

User Model	Disability	A_d
Omni	None	$A_{omni} = E_{omni}$
Keyboard	Limited mouse use	$A_{keyboard}$ = mouseover mouseenter mouseout mousedown mouseup
Low Vision	??	$A_{low-vision}$ = mouseover mouseenter mouseout mousedown mouseup
Screen Reader	??	$A_{screen-reader}$ = mouseover mouseenter mouseout mousedown mouseup

Table 1: The set of client-side user actions available to the disability models used in this study. Make sure these event and action types match between the table and the text.

1 represents a completely accessible and effortless experience, and 0 represents complete inaccessibility or impossibility. For example, the input to the Navigation ability’s scoring function for a keyboard user may be the number of tabs required to get from starting point to the element required to traverse the next edge in the graph. To calculate a **TODO: How do we combine the different ability scores.**

Using the ability scores, we can define the interactions available to a user model as those in which the required interaction can be accomplished with a score greater than some threshold t . This is – in effect – assigning weights to the edges between vertices in the graph.

3.3 State Equivalence

Even though the foundational models for Demodocus are the Dincturk Hypercube model [10] and our prior JavaScript crawling work [4], this work has the different application toward measuring accessibility. As such, the prior state equivalency measures are ill-suited to use in this work and must be extended to accurately reflect the user experience. The goal for this work is to identify states based on substantial changes to the representation. To meet this need, we use a three-tiered approach for identifying equivalent states.

The first stage of the state comparator is a simple HTML string comparison. This is the strictest comparator in our approach. If we find the strings to be equivalent then we know with the highest probability that the states are equivalent. We cannot be certain as there may be additional information contained in cookies or on the server that has changed and that we are not inspecting. While this approach gives us an

easy way to determine exact state equivalence, it is unlikely to find states that a user would consider matching. Consider that a simple time stamp on a page would break this comparator. If the states are equivalent with respect to this comparator, the state equivalency process will return that the states are equivalent and proceed no further. However, if the states fail this comparison (i.e. their HTML strings do not match exactly), we move on to the DOM comparator.

The DOM comparator is the second stage in our tiered comparison approach. This comparator defines state equivalency as having the same DOM structure and is primarily concerned with whether nodes have been added to or removed from the DOM. If nodes have been added or removed, the DOM comparator will judge the state to have changed and will return that the states are different and exit the state equivalency process. Otherwise, the DOM comparator will be unable to find significant evidence that the states are equal or equivalent and will proceed onto the final stage of the comparison process.

Note that the exit criteria are different in these two stages. Whereas the HTML string comparison exits on finding state equivalency, the DOM comparator does the opposite; exiting only after determining that the states are different.

The final stage of the comparison process is a fuzzy text comparator. The comparator calculates the Levenshtein distance between the contents of the text nodes in each of the two states and considers them equal if the distance is less than some threshold. This comparator is required, in addition to the previous two, due to the fact that our use case in determining accessibility requires text changing as a possible accessibility feature. For instance, a form field may be implemented in such a way that if an error occurs due to user input, text will be added to an already existing element. This change will not be caught by the first two comparators. The exact string comparison will fail since text has been added to the page and the DOM comparator will fail since the structure of the DOM has remain unchanged despite the added text. The threshold for considering states equal does require tuning, and in some cases may be a function of the page size or several other factors.

4 EXPERIMENT METHODOLOGY

describe how we performed the evaluation, to include our accessibility expert inputs,

Notionally:

- create list of government pages
- randomly sample from the web using our bitly approach
- create graphs and identify model violations
- let a human SME perform an accessibility assessment
- compare human evaluator and crawler assessments to confirm accuracy of our approach
- compile metrics and results

Metrics:

- number of things the crawler finds that humans also found

- number of things the crawler found that the human didn't
- number of things the crawler didn't find that the human did
- precision, recall, f-measure based on the above
- number and type of violations per user model for each sampled website group
- common violations
- most restrictive disability model according to our study

5 RESULTS

discuss quantitative analysis of the results. anticipate things like number of states, coverage of our models, agreement of models and SMEs, most common accessibility issues, etc.

6 FINDINGS

Discuss the impact of the findings and what this tells us about government website accessibility

7 CONCLUSIONS

discuss the effort, the findings, the future work, impacts, etc.

In the future... we hope to control for common problems such as poor color contrast in the visual case, or overly verbose or unhelpful screen reader text in the case of the screen reader user model.

8 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Lots of people helped...Probably Sanith, collaborators, etc... also need relevant release and contract number things

©2019 The MITRE Corporation.

Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited. Case Number 18-2725-XX.

REFERENCES

- [1] Access Board. The Rehabilitation Act Amendments (Section 508). <http://www.access-board.gov/sec508/guide/act.htm>, 1998.
- [2] A. Bartoli, E. Medvet, and M. Mauri. A tool for registering and replaying web navigation. In *International Conference on Information Society*, pages 509–510, June 2012.
- [3] J. F. Brunelle. PhantomJS+VisualEvent or Selenium for Web Archiving? <http://ws-dl.blogspot.com/2015/06/2015-06-26-phantomjsvisualevent-or.html>, 2015.
- [4] J. F. Brunelle. *Scripts in a Frame: A Framework for Archiving Deferred Representations*. PhD thesis, Old Dominion University, 2016.
- [5] J. F. Brunelle, M. C. Weigle, and M. L. Nelson. Adapting the Hypercube Model to Archive Deferred Representations at Web-Scale. Technical Report arXiv:1601.05142, 2016.
- [6] J. F. Brunelle, M. C. Weigle, and M. L. Nelson. Archival Crawlers and JavaScript: Discover More Stuff but Crawl More Slowly. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries*, pages 1–10, 2017.
- [7] W. Chisholm, G. Vanderheiden, and I. Jacobs. Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 1.0. *Interactions*, 8(4):35–54, July 2001.
- [8] Department of Homeland Security. DHS Trusted Tester Program. <https://www.dhs.gov/trusted-tester>, 2018.
- [9] M. E. Dincturk. Model-based Crawling - An Approach to Design Efficient Crawling Strategies for Rich Internet Applications. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Ottawa, 2013.
- [10] M. E. Dincturk, G.-V. Jourdan, G. V. Bochmann, and I. V. Onut. A Model-Based Approach for Crawling Rich Internet Applications. *ACM Transactions on the Web*, 8(3):19:1–19:39, July 2014.
- [11] P. Fejfar. *Interactive crawling and data extraction*. PhD thesis, 2018.
- [12] P. Gorniak and D. Poole. Predicting future user actions by observing unmodified applications. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Twelfth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, pages 217–222, 2000.
- [13] hambster. Puppeteer. <https://github.com/hambster/Puppeteer>, 2014.
- [14] S. Harper and A. Chen. Web Accessibility Guidelines: A Lesson from the Evolving Web. *World Wide Web*, 15(61), 2012.
- [15] J. P. Lage, A. S. da Silva, P. B. Golgher, and A. H. Laender. Automatic generation of agents for collecting hidden web pages for data extraction. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 49(2):177–196, 2004.
- [16] Y. Li, P. Han, C. Liu, and B. Fang. Automatically Crawling Dynamic Web Applications via Proxy-Based JavaScript Injection and Runtime Analysis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Third International Conference on Data Science in Cyberspace*, pages 242–249, 2018.
- [17] J. Mankoff, H. Fait, and T. Tran. Is your web page accessible?: a comparative study of methods for assessing web page accessibility for the blind. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 41–50, 2005.
- [18] A. Mesbah. Analysis and Testing of Ajax-based Single-page Web Applications. Ph.D. Dissertation, Delft University of Technology, 2009.
- [19] A. Mesbah, E. Bozdog, and A. van Deursen. Crawling Ajax by inferring user interface state changes. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Web Engineering*, pages 122–134, 2008.
- [20] A. Mesbah and A. van Deursen. An Architectural Style for Ajax. *Working IEEE/IFIP Conference on Software Architecture*, pages 1–9, 2007.
- [21] A. Mesbah and A. van Deursen. Migrating multi-page web applications to single-page ajax interfaces. In *Proceedings of the 11th European Conference on Software Maintenance and Reengineering*, pages 181–190, 2007.
- [22] A. Mesbah and A. van Deursen. Invariant-based automatic testing of Ajax user interfaces. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 210–220, 2009.
- [23] A. Mesbah, A. van Deursen, and S. Lenselink. Crawling Ajax-Based Web Applications Through Dynamic Analysis of User Interface State Changes. *ACM Transactions on the Web*, 6(1):3:1–3:30, Mar. 2012.
- [24] NetPreserve.org. IIPC Future of the Web Workshop – Introduction & Overview. <http://netpreserve.org/sites/default/files/resources/OverviewFutureWebWorkshop.pdf>, 2012.
- [25] S. Raj, R. Krishna, and A. Nayak. Distributed Component-Based Crawler for AJAX Applications. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Advances in Electronics, Computers and Communications*, pages 1–6, 2018.
- [26] D. S. H. Rosenthal. Talk on Harvesting the Future Web at IIPC2013. <http://blog.dshr.org/2013/04/talk-on-harvesting-future-web-at.html>, 2013.
- [27] A. Rossi. 80 Terabytes of Archived Web Crawl Data Available For Research. <http://blog.archive.org/2012/10/26/80-terabytes-of-archived-web-crawl-data-available-for-research/>, 2012.
- [28] Team Pa1ly. Pa1ly. <https://github.com/pa1ly/pa1ly>, 2018.
- [29] United States Census Bureau. Nearly 1 in 5 People Have a Disability in the U.S., Census Bureau Reports. <http://ws-dl.blogspot.com/2017/01/2017-01-20-cnncom-has-been-unarchivable.html>, 2012.
- [30] M. Vigo and G. Brajnik. Automatic web accessibility metrics: Where we are and where we can go. *Interacting with Computers*, 23(2):137–155, March 2011.
- [31] W3.org. Web Accessibility Initiative. <https://www.w3.org/WAI/>, 2018.