IO1 – A2 Digital Accessibility Survey for stakeholders

Certified Digital Accessibility Training Project

(Project reference number: **KA2-VET-16/18**)

Delivery day: **28. 02. 2018**

Author (s): **INUK Institute for Advanced Communication Management, University of Maribor, Siedlce University, Centre for Sustainable Development ''HORIZONS'', STP Europa, Best Cybernetics**

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Certified Digital Accessibility Training - project

Erasmus+ Key Action 2: Cooperation for innovation

Publication date: 25 February 2019

AUTHORS

Name/Organisation name

Tina Lešnik Zwane, *INUK Inštitut za napredno upravljanje komunikacij*

Darja Ivanuša Kline, *INUK Inštitut za napredno upravljanje komunikacij*

Boštjan Šumak, *Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Maribor*

Andrej Šorgo, *Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Maribor*

Katja Kous, *Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Maribor*

Saša Kuhar, *Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Maribor*

Alen Rajšp, *Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Maribor*

Marek Szajczyk, *Siedlce University*

Mariusz Cielemęcki, *Siedlce University*

Marzena Wójcik-Augustyniak, *Siedlce University*

Tomasz Wota, *Centrum Zrownowazonego Rozwoju HORYZONTY*

Marta Munoz, *Soluciones Tecno-Profesionales Consulting*

Raul Gonzalo, *Soluciones Tecno-Profesionales Consulting*

Nicole Georgogianni, *Nikoletta Georgogianni Best Cybernetics Single Member Private Company*

Gerolimos Zontos, *Nikoletta Georgogianni Best Cybernetics Single Member Private Company*

Dumitrita Szajczyk, Centrum Zrownowazonego Rozwoju HORYZONTY

PROJECT PARTNERS

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Contents

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

1 Introduction

The internet has become an inevitable part of our everyday lives, and it is highly integrated in our working and home environment. This has created opportunities for the majority, but a huge obstacle for people with disabilities, who cannot properly access all parts of the web (e.g. Brophy & Craven, 2007; European Parliament, 2014; European Commission, 2015). Digital accessibility has therefore become necessary. Accordingly, the WCAG standard was developed and European legislation, Directive (EU) 2016/2102 (which is about making websites and mobile apps of public sector bodies more accessible) was passed in 2016. This means that the websites and mobile apps of public sector will need to be accessible to all by the year 2020. The question is, how do we accomplish that?

In order to meet the specifications of the European legislation, Directive (EU) 2016/2102, developing internationally recognized and Certified digital accessibility training for diverse groups of key stakeholder as a response for increasing labor market needs for experts in the field of digital accessibility in Europe is a must. The project aiming to develop such training will contribute to better access of training and qualifications for all, through making all material free to download from a web portal. Furthermore, this kind of project will have an impact on social inclusion of people with disabilities by promoting and encouraging learning about accessible websites and applications. Additionally, it will strengthen the professional development of trainers and teachers. The project will improve the quality of training (initial education and continuous development), the quality of teachers, trainers and other professionals in the sector, and it will make courses more relevant to the labor market.

To develop such training, an online Digital Accessibility survey was conducted to investigate the current state of awareness and knowledge of the key stakeholders (managers, web designers, web content authors and editors, people from the field of marketing and PR, IT developers, and policy makers) related to the digital accessibility field in 4 European countries - Slovenia, Poland, Spain, and Greece.

The aim of this paper is to present the research findings of the online Digital Accessibility survey, which will, together with a previously conducted analysis of skills related to digital accessibility (see IO1 – A1 Desktop research: The analysis of digital accessibility skills, trainings, job roles, best practices), serve as a base for developing certified digital accessibility training.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

2 Method

2.1 Participants

The Survey of stakeholders reached the sample of 3049 respondents, however 2616 left the survey already at the beginning probably due to complex nature of the survey. A total of 435 participants answered the online Digital Accessibility Survey for stakeholders using the online environment of 1KA Oneclick Survey tool. However, by the end of the survey 191 participants dropped-out of the survey, which means that only 244 participants chose to complete the entire survey. Therefore, the demographic variables are only known for the participants who completed the survey. This excludes their field of occupation and chosen language, which were indicated at the beginning of the survey. As a result, all percentages in the report relating to question analysis (unless stated) refer to number of participants who answered the particular question instead of the total number of participants.

From all participants (*N* = 435), 40% (*N* = 173) spoke Slovene, 31% (*N* = 135) Polish, 20% (*N* = 89) Greek, 8% (*N* = 35 Spanish), and 1% (*N* = 3) English. 43% of participants (*N* = 190) worked in the field of IT, web developing and programing, 10.3% (*N* = 45) were from the field of web design, 10.8 (*N* = 47) from the field of management, 5.3% (*N* = 23) from the field of PR and marketing, and 8.5% (*N* = 37) were VET teachers or trainers. The rest of 21.4 % (*N* = 93) worked in other occupational or study fields such as law, accessibility research, administration, public administration, local government administration, web accessibility consultancy and auditing, finances, geodesy, leadership for people with disabilities, media communication, journalism, writing technical articles, PCPR, social assistance, office work, social work, local government, university, EU projects, promotion, poviat self-government, archive, health and rehabilitation of disabled people, website management, buisiness management, electrical engeneering, history of art.

Table 1

Crosstabulation: Profession and language

Field of occupation or studies oz.	Slovene	Polish	Greek	English	Spanish	Total
IT/Web development/ programming	125	24	31	0	10	190
Design/web design	22	2	14	0	7	45
Management	3	25	10	2	7	47
PR/marketing	10	6	5	1	1	23
VET teaching/training	0	16	20	0	1	37
Other	13	62	9	0	9	93
Total	173	135	89	3	35	435

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 2
Participants' gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	148	60.6
Female	79	32.4
I prefer not to say	17	7.0
Valid total	244	100.0

Note. Missing N=191, Total N=435.

From the participants (*N* = 244) who completed the survey, 60% (*N* = 148) were male, 32.4% (*N* =79) were female, and 7% (*N* = 17) did not want to indicate their gender (Table 2).

Table 3
Participants' age

Age	Frequency	Percent
Between 18 - 24 years old	64	26.2
Between 25 - 34 years old	52	21.3
Between 35 - 44 years old	80	32.8
Between 45 - 54 years old	29	11.9
55 years old and more	7	2.9
I prefer not to say	12	4.9
Valid total	244	100.0

Note. Missing N=191, Total N=435.

26.2% of the participants (*N* = 64) were aged between 18 – 24 years, 52 21.3% (*N* = 52) were between 25 – 34 years, 32.8% (*N* = 80) were between 35 – 44 years, 11.9% (*N* = 29) were between 45-54 years old, 2.9% (*N* = 7) were more than 55, and 4.9% (*N* = 12) did not want to indicate their age (Table 3).

Table 4
Participant's country

Age	Frequency	Percent
Slovenia	96	39.3
Poland	63	25.8
Greece	57	23.4
Spain	23	9.4
Other	5	2.0
Valid total	244	100.0

Note. Missing N=191, Total N=435.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

39.3% (*N* = 96) of respondents were from Slovenia, 25.8% (*N* = 63) were from Poland, 23.4% (*N* = 57) were from Greece, 9.4% (*N* = 23) were from Spain, and 2.0% (*N* = 5) were from other European countries (Table 4).

Table 5
Participants' level of education (based on International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) (UNESCO Institute of Statistics, 2011))

Level of education	Frequency	Percent
ISCED level 3 – Upper secondary education	30	12.3
ISCED level 4 – Post-secondary non-tertiary education	28	11.5
ISCED level 5 – Short-cycle tertiary education	11	4.5
ISCED level 6 – Bachelor's or equivalent level	75	30.7
ISCED level 7 – Master's or equivalent level	83	34.0
ISCED level 8 – Doctoral or equivalent	12	4.9
Other	5	2.0
Valid total	244	100.0

Note. Missing N=191, Total N=435.

The education level (Table 5) of 12.3% (*N* = 30) of the participants was equivalent to ISCED level III, 11.5% (*N* = 28) had ISCED level IV, 4.5% (*N* = 11) had ISCED level V, 30.7 % (*N* = 75) had ISCED level VI, 34% (*N* = 83) had ISCED level VII, 4.9% (*N* = 12) had ISCED level VIII, and 2.0% (*N* = 5) did not categorize themselves in any of the above mentioned ISCED levels (for more information about ISCED levels, see UNESCO Institute of Statistics, 2011).

Table 6
Participants' employment status

Employment status	Frequency	Percent
Student	63	25.8
Employed	166	68.0
Unemployed	8	3.3
Other (freelancer, self-employed, contract worker, student and employee)	7	2.9
Valid total	244	100.0

Note. Missing N=191, Total N=435.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

25.8% (*N* = 63) of participants were students, 68% (*N* = 166) were employed, 3.3% (*N* = 8) were unemployed, and 2.9% (*N* = 7) did not fit any of the mentioned categories (Table 6). From the employed participants 50.6% (*N* = 84) were working in the public sector, and 53.6% (*N* = 89) were in the private sector (7 participants were working for both, private and public companies). 27.1% of participants (*N* = 45) were employed in the micro companies, 19.9% (*N* = 33) were in small companies, 24.7% (*N* = 41) were in middle-sized companies, and 28.3% (*N* = 47) were in big companies.

10.2% of participants (*N* = 25) indicated themselves as having some sort of disability such as seeing problems, hearing problems, tetraplegia, deafness, physical, motoric and psychological disability. 89.8% of respondents (*N* = 219) indicated themselves as being without any disability.

2.2 Measures

2.2.1 Demographic variables

The used survey assessed the demographic variables, spoken language, field of occupation, the country of origin, age, gender, educational level, and employment status. All demographic variables apart from spoken language and field of occupation were assessed at the end of the survey. The level of education was assessed with categories based on the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) (UNESCO Institute of Statistics, 2011).

2.2.2 Digital accessibility

The digital accessibility survey for stakeholders was created for the purpose of a Certified Digital Accessibility Project and was available in 5 languages: Slovenian, Greek, Spanish, Polish, and English. The survey consisted of 49 items measuring 3 domains: (1) Part I: *Digital accessibility awareness and proficiency*; (2) Part II: *Current practices*; (3) Part III: *Learning and training* preferences of stakeholders related to digital accessibility. The survey is based on the self-reported frequency about the awareness, skills, practices and learning preferences related to digital accessibility and it contains items such as (1) ‘‘*How important is it to provide accessibility of the web in your opinion?''; ''Please rate your knowledge in making the following parts of web pages accessible.''; (2) ''Does your website/organization's website meet any Conformance Level according to the WCAG 2.0/2.1 standard? Which one?'' ; and (3) '' If there was available training on web accessibility near you, would you join it?''.* Furthermore, the number of questions answered by an individual depended on their employment status and their line of work. Participants from the field of IT, programming, and web development had a few additional questions to answer that did not concern other participants. Employed participants from these fields also answered a few more questions compared to their unemployed counterparts.

The internal consistency and reliability were not measured in our current study.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

2.3 Procedure

The survey was programmed and conducted using the online 1KA Oneclick Survey tool and it took approximately 30 minutes. Participants were recruited, and the data was collected using the same online environment which was distributed through emails targeting associations of professionals (e. g. marketing and PR professionals, IT professionals, web content authors etc.) and through social media websites such as Facebook and LinkedIn.

3 Results

3.1 Part I: Digital Accessibility Awareness and Proficiency

In the first part of the questionnaire participants were asked about their awareness and proficiency related to digital accessibility.

Table 7
Question 1: How well are you familiar with the concept of web accessibility?
(1 - Not familiar at all, 5 - Very familiar)

Familiarity	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not familiar at all (I have never heard of it)	6	1.6
Not familiar	33	8.4
Somewhat familiar	126	32.1
Familiar	166	42.3
Very familiar	61	15.6
Valid total	392	100.0

Note. Mean(SD)=3.62 (0.9), Missing N=43, Total N=435.

The majority of respondents were familiar with the concept of web accessibility (Table 7).

Table 8
Question 2: How important is to provide accessibility of web in your opinion?
(1 - Not important at all, 5 - Very important)

Importancy	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not important at all	2	0.5
Not important	5	1.3
Somewhat important	33	8.5
Important	162	41.9
Very important	185	47.8
Valid total	387	100.0

Note. Mean(SD)=4.35 (0.73), Missing N=48, Total N=435.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Almost 90% of participants thought that providing accessibility of the web was either important (41.9%, *N* = 162) or very important (47.8%, *N* = 185). Around 2% of participants thought it was not important (Table 8).

Table 9

Question 3: Are you aware of the EU directive 2016/2102 on the accessibility of the websites and mobile applications of public sector bodies? (1 - I have never heard of it, 5 - I know it very well)

Awareness	Frequency	Valid Percent
I have never heard of it	121	31.6
I have heard of it	110	28.7
I have some basic knowledge	83	21.7
I know it	56	14.6
I know it very well	13	3.4
Valid total	383	100.0

Note. Mean(SD)=2.3 (1.16), Missing N=52, Total N=435.

Only 3.4% (*N* = 13) of participants knew the European legislation very well, 14.6% (*N* = 56) knew about it, and 21.7% (*N* = 83) had some basic knowledge about it. On the other hand, 28.7% (*N* = 110) had heard about it, and 31.6% (*N* = 121) had never heard about it (Table 9).

Table 10

Question 4: Are you aware of any other national or international directive/legislation about web accessibility?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	37	9.7
No	213	55.8
I don't know/ I don't remember	132	34.6
Valid total	382	100.0

Note. Missing N=53, Total N=435.

9.7% of participants (*N* = 37) knew some other national or international legislation about digital accessibility (Table 10), such as article 13, GRPR, WAI, AG2AA-Conformance, Konwencja Organizacji Narodów Zjednoczonych o prawach osób niepełnosprawnych (ang. United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities), Krajowe Ramy Interoperacyjności (ang. National Interoperability Framework), Rozporządzenie o KRI (Dz.U. 2012 poz. 526) (ang. Regulation on the National Interoperability Framework), Ley General de Discapacidad (LGD) (ang. General Law on Disability), net neutrality, Norma EN 301 549:2018, Norma UNE139803:2012, Cookies, Projekt ustawy o dostępności cyfrowej stron inte (ang. Draft law on the availability of digital websites), Real Decreto 1112/2018, de 7 de septiembre, Rozporzadzenie RM z dnia 12.04.2012 r. w sprawie K (ang. Regulation of the Council of Ministers of April 12, 2012 on the National Interoperability Framework), UNE-EN 2018-2048, WCAG 2.0, Draft law on the digital accessibility, Great Britain, Italy, Ireland, USA, Zakon o dostopnosti javnih spletišč in aplikacij (ang. The law on accessibility of web and mobile applications), Ratification of the UN Convention, L.4074 / 2012, LAP / F.40.4 / 1/989, 2012.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 11

Question 5: Do you know WCAG 2.0/2.1 Web Content Accessibility Guidelines?

(1 - I have never heard , 5 - I know it very well)

Answer	WCAG 2.0 Frequency	WCAG 2.0 Percent	WCAG 2.1 Frequency	WCAG 2.1 Percent
I have never heard of it	179	48.1	197	53.0
I have heard of it	80	21.5	87	23.4
I have some basic knowledge	46	12.4	50	13.4
I know it	53	14.2	29	7.8
I know it very well	14	3.8	9	2.4
Valid total	372	100.0	372	100.0

Note. WCAG 2.0 Mean (SD)=2.04 (1.23),WCAG 2.1 Mean(SD)=1.83 (1.08), Missing N=63, Total N=435.

Almost half of participants (48.1%, *N* = 179) had never heard about WCAG 2.0, and 53.0% (*N* = 197) had never heard about WCAG 2.1. The rest of participants had heard about the guidelines or had at least some knowledge about them (Table 11).

Table 12

Question 6: How proficient do you feel you are in web accessibility?

(1 - Not proficient at all, 5 - Very proficient)

Profiecency	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not proficient at all	22	6.0
Not proficient	65	17.7
Somewhat proficient	172	46.9
Proficient	89	24.3
Very proficient	19	5.2
Valid total	367	100.0

Note. Mean (SD)=3.05 (0.93), Missing N=68, Total N=435.

More than a half of participants indicated some level of proficiency in web accessibility; 46.9% (*N* = 172) felt somewhat proficient at it, 24.3% (*N* = 89) felt proficient, and 5.2% (*N* = 19) felt very proficient. Only 17.7% of (*N* = 65) did not feel proficient, and 6.0% (*N* = 22) did not feel proficient at all (Table 12).

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 13

Question 7: Please indicate to whom is web accessibility aimed for:

Answer	False N (%)	True N (%)	Not sure N (%)
Deaf people and people with other hearing impairments	23 (6.9%)	267 (80.4%)	42 (12.7%)
Blind people and people with other visual impairments	13 (4.0%)	287 (86.4%)	32 (9.6%)
Physically disabled people	37 (11.1%)	247 (74.4%)	48 (14.5%)
People with other disabilities (cognitive, neurological, speech etc.)	41 (12.3%)	235 (70.8%)	56 (16.9%)
People with “temporary disabilities” (with a broken arm or lost glasses)	120 (36.1%)	166 (50.0%)	46 (13.9%)
People in bright sunlight or in an environment where they cannot listen to audio etc.	128 (38.6%)	144 (43.4%)	60 (18.1%)
People using mobile phones, smart watches, smart TVs, and other devices with screens, different input modes, etc.	130 (39.2%)	163 (49.1%)	39 (11.7%)
Older people with changing abilities due to ageing	40 (12.0%)	257 (77.4%)	35 (10.5%)
People using a slow Internet connection, or who have limited or expensive bandwidth	158 (47.6%)	118 (35.5%)	56 (16.9%)
People without internet access (Reverse statement)	200 (60.2%)	81 (24.4%)	51 (15.4%)
Everybody	116 (34.9%)	140 (42.2%)	76 (22.9%)

Note. Valid total N=332, Missing N=103, Total N=435.

Participants showed some basic knowledge about who digital accessibility is aimed for (Table 13).

Table 14

Question 8: Who do you think is responsible for assuring accessibility of organizations' websites and mobile applications? (1 – Not responsible at all, 5 Very responsible)

Answer	Mean (SD)	Total	I don’t know
Employers	4.08 (0.99)	302	13
Web designers	4.07 (1.02)	305	10
Web editors	3.81 (1.00)	302	13
Web content writers	3.64 (1.19)	301	14
Web developers	4.15 (0.92)	304	11
Programmers and IT professionals	4.01 (0.98)	305	10
PR/marketing	3.33 (1.05)	299	16
Managers	3.64 (1.18)	295	20
Social media managers	3.56 (1.08)	299	16
People with disabilities	2.11 (1.07)	285	30
Policy makers	3.61 (1.34)	286	29
VET teachers/trainers	3.21 (1.25)	286	29

Note. Missing N=120, Total N=435.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Participants confirmed the above mentioned professionals (Table 14) are responsible for assuring accessibility of organizations' websites and mobile applications. People with disabilities were indicated as the least responsible for that issue (*M* = 2.19, *SD* = 1.19). Frequencies for specific answers are depicted in the table below (Table 15).

Table 15

Question 8: Who do you think is responsible for assuring accessibility of organizations' websites and mobile applications?

Answer	Not responsible at all N (%)	Not responsible N (%)	Somewhat responsible N (%)	Responsible N (%)	Very responsible N (%)	I don't know N (%)
Employers	8 (2.5%)	14 (4.4%)	49 (15.6%)	107 (34%)	124 (39.4%)	13 (4.1%)
Web designers	7 (2.2%)	19 (6.0%)	48 (15.2%)	102 (32.4%)	129 (41%)	10 (3.2%)
Web editors	8 (2.5%)	21 (6.7%)	73 (23.2%)	117 (37.1%)	83 (26.3%)	13 (4.1%)
Web content writers	19 (6.0%)	35 (11.1%)	66 (21.0%)	95 (30.2%)	86 (27.3%)	14 (4.4%)
Web developers	4 (1.3%)	11 (3.5%)	50 (15.9%)	108 (34.3%)	131 (41.6%)	11 (3.5%)
Programmers and IT professionals	5 (1.6%)	16 (5.1%)	66 (21.0%)	103 (32.7%)	115 (36.5%)	10 (3.2%)
PR/marketing	16 (5.1%)	42 (13.3%)	109 (36.6%)	92 (29.2%)	40 (12.7%)	16 (5.1%)
Managers	20 (6.3%)	28 (8.9%)	72 (22.9%)	94 (29.8%)	81 (25.7%)	20 (6.3%)
Social media managers	16 (5.1%)	26 (8.3%)	96 (30.5%)	97 (30.8%)	64 (20.3%)	16 (5.1%)
People with disabilities	103 (32.7%)	88 (27.9%)	59 (18.7%)	30 (9.5%)	5 (1.6%)	30 (9.5%)
Policy makers	32 (10.2%)	26 (8.3%)	61 (19.4%)	69 (21.9%)	98 (31.1%)	29 (9.2%)
VET teachers/trainers	39 (12.4%)	37 (11.7%)	80 (25.4%)	86 (27.3%)	44 (14.0%)	29 (9.2%)

Note. Total N=315.

Table 16

Question 9: To what extent do you think the web accessibility refers to? (1- Not at all, 5- To very great extent)

Answer	Mean (SD)	Valid total
Web technologies (e.g. HTML, CSS, JavaScript)	4.14 (0.98)	269
Assistive technologies (e.g. screen readers, color contrast analyzers)	4.16 (0.93)	275
Web (visual) design	4.17 (0.91)	282
Web accessibility testing	4.09 (0.99)	279
Usability testing	3.92 (0.99)	278
User experience	3.82 (0.96)	274
Web page text and content	3.77 (1.08)	281
Images and multimedia	4.09 (0.93)	279
Structure of the web page	4.10 (0.92)	281
Navigation of the web page	4.21 (0.90)	278
Web page code	3.68 (1.30)	259

Note. Missing N=141, Total N=435, Participants who answered with 'I don't know' are not included in the sum.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Participants agreed that web accessibility refers to above mentioned items (Table 16), with Navigation of the web page (*M* = 4.21, *SD* = 0.90) referring the most to it, and Web page code (*M* = 3.68, *SD* = 1.30) the least. Frequencies for specific answers are presented in the table below (Table 17).

Table 17

Question 9: To what extent do you think the web accessibility refers to?

Answer	Not at all N (%)	To small extent N (%)	To moderate extent N (%)	To great extent N (%)	To very great extent N (%)	I don't know N (%)
Web technologies (e.g. HTML, CSS, JavaScript)	8 (2.7%)	9 (3.1%)	37 (12.6%)	98 (33.3%)	117 (39.8%)	25 (8.5%)
Assistive technologies (e.g. screen readers, color contrast analyzers)	2 (0.7%)	13 (4.4%)	48 (16.3%)	88 (29.9%)	124 (42.2%)	19 (6.5%)
Web (visual) design	4 (1.4%)	9 (3.1%)	45 (15.3%)	102 (34.7%)	122 (41.5%)	12 (4.1%)
Web accessibility testing	6 (2.0%)	14 (4.8%)	46 (15.6%)	96 (32.7%)	117 (39.8%)	15 (5.1%)
Usability testing	7 (2.4%)	12 (4.1%)	68 (23.1%)	99 (33.7%)	92 (31.3%)	16 (5.4%)
User experience	6 (2.0%)	15 (5.1%)	73 (24.8%)	109 (37.1%)	71 (24.1%)	20 (6.8%)
Web page text and content	13 (4.4%)	21 (7.1%)	62 (21.1%)	107 (36.4%)	78 (26.5%)	13 (4.4%)
Images and multimedia	4 (1.4%)	14 (4.8%)	43 (14.6%)	109 (37.1%)	109 (37.1%)	15 (5.1%)
Structure of the web page	4 (1.4%)	14 (4.8%)	39 (13.3%)	118 (40.1%)	106 (36.1%)	13 (4.4%)
Navigation of the web page	5 (1.7%)	6 (2.0%)	42 (14.3%)	98 (33.3%)	127 (43.2%)	16 (5.4%)
Web page code	23 (7.8%)	27 (9.2%)	53 (18.0%)	62 (21.1%)	94 (32.0%)	35 (11.9%)

Note. Total N=294.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 18

Question 10: Please rate your knowledge in making the following parts of web pages accessible (1 - Never heard of it, 5 - Advanced)

Answer	Mean (SD)
Web technologies (e.g. HTML, CSS, JavaScript)	3.43 (1.11)
Web (visual) design	3.27 (1.08)
Web accessibility testing	3.10 (1.07)
Usability testing	3.18 (1.05)
User experience	3.42 (1.01)
Web page text and content	3.40 (1.04)
Images and multimedia	3.49 (1.04)
Structure of the web page	3.49 (1.07)
Navigation of the web page	3.53 (1.06)
Web page code	3.31 (1.16)

Note. Valid total N=280, Missing N=155, Total N= 435.

Participants indicated to possess some basic knowledge of all suggested digital accessibility related areas (Table 18). Frequencies for specific answers are presented in the table below (Table 19).

Table 19

Question 10: Please rate your knowledge in making the following parts of web pages accessible.

Answer	I have never heard of it N (%)	None N (%)	Basic N (%)	Intermediate N (%)	Advanced N (%)
Web technologies (e.g. HTML, CSS, JavaScript)	8 (2.9%)	57 (20.4%)	82 (28.8%)	76 (27.1%)	58 (20.7%)
Web (visual) design	9 (3.2%)	63 (22.5%)	97 (34.6%)	65 (23.2%)	46 (16.4%)
Web accessibility testing	10 (3.6%)	84 (30.0%)	87 (31.1%)	65 (23.2%)	34 (12.1%)
Usability testing	12 (4.3%)	64 (22.9%)	101 (36.1%)	69 (24.6%)	34 (12.1%)
User experience	7 (2.5%)	42 (15.0%)	103 (36.8%)	83 (29.6%)	45 (16.1%)
Web page text and content	8 (2.9%)	47 (16.8%)	94 (33.6%)	86 (30.7%)	45 (16.1%)
Images and multimedia	6 (2.1%)	46 (16.4%)	86 (30.7%)	89 (31.8%)	53 (18.9%)
Structure of the web page	6 (2.1%)	49 (17.5%)	83 (29.6%)	85 (30.4%)	57 (20.4%)
Navigation of the web page	7 (2.5%)	42 (15.0%)	85 (30.4%)	87 (31.1%)	59 (21.1%)
Web page code	11 (3.9%)	72 (25.7%)	67 (23.9%)	78 (27.9%)	52 (18.6%)

Note. Total N=280.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 20

Descriptive statistics - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites – Accessible web content*? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree)*

Accessible web content	N	Mean	SD
Sentences and paragraphs should be simple, clear and short.	247	4.09	.874
Glossary should be provided on every website for explaining difficult terms.	250	3.61	1.063
Every text should have additional images and videos for better clarity of the content.	248	3.58	1.070
The page titles should be long in order to properly describe what the content of the page is about. (Reverse statement)	244	2.76	1.126

Table 21

Descriptive statistics - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites – Accessible web content/Information technology (IT), accessible web programming/developing*? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree)*

Accessible web content/Information technology (IT), accessible web programming/developing	N	Mean	SD
Additional descriptions of short link texts, such as 'click here', 'read more' or 'link'' are not needed as they are clear enough.	232	2.90	1.267

Note. Participants who answered with 'I don't know' are not included in the sum.

Frequencies for specific answers are depicted in the table below (Table 22).

Table 22

Frequencies - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites - Accessible web content? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree)

Accessible web content	Strongly disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Neither agree/ disagree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly agree N (%)	I don't know N (%)	Total N
Sentences and paragraphs should be simple, clear and short.	3 (1.2%)	12 (4.6%)	30 (11.6%)	117 (45.2%)	85 (32.8%)	12 (4.6%)	259
Glossary should be provided on every website for explaining difficult terms.	7 (2.7%)	37 (14.3%)	55 (21.2%)	98 (37.8%)	53 (20.5%)	9 (3.5%)	259
Every text should have additional images and videos for better clarity of the content.	7 (2.7%)	37 (14.3%)	63 (24.3%)	88 (34.0%)	53 (20.5%)	11 (4.2%)	259
The page titles should be long in order to properly describe what the content of the page is about. (Reverse statement)	26 (10.0%)	94 (36.3%)	54 (20.8%)	52 (20.1%)	18 (6.9%)	15 (5.8%)	259

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 23

Frequencies - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites - Accessible web content/Information technology (IT)? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree)

Accessible web content/Information technology (IT)	Strongly disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Neither agree/ disagree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly agree N (%)	I don't know N (%)	Total N
Additional descriptions of short link texts, such as 'click here', 'read more' or 'link'' are not needed as they are clear enough.	36 (13.9%)	63 (24.3%)	48 (18.5%)	58 (22.4%)	27 (10.4%)	27 (10.4%)	259

Table 24

Descriptive statistics - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites - Accessible web content/design? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree*)*

Accessible web content/design	N	Mean	SD
Color is not used as the only way of conveying information or identifying content.	249	3.65	1.024
Default foreground and background colors and contrast of the web page should follow only modern design trends. (Reverse statement)	248	3.04	1.181
Images and videos are informative enough and don’t need additional description. (Reverse statement)	243	3.14	1.205
All images and videos should have text transcripts and/or captions for audio content.	243	3.87	.922
It is irrelevant to provide sounds such as 'door creaks' in the transcripts and captions. (Reverse statement)	221	3.08	1.103
Images of text should be resizable, replaced with actual text, or avoided where possible.	237	3.74	.924
Text should be resizable up to 200% without losing information, using a standard browser.	244	4.02	.796

Table 25

Descriptive statistics - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites - Accessible web design? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree*)*

Accessible web design	N	Mean	SD
All elements should have the same position on subpages.	234	3.79	.991
Attractive design is more important than accessible design. (Reverse statement)	240	2.58	1.129

Note. Participants who answered with 'I don't know' are not included in the sum.

Frequencies for specific answers are depicted in the table below (Table 26).

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 26

Frequencies - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites - Accessible web content/design*? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree)*

Accessible web content/design	Strongly Disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Neither agree nor Disagree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly agree N (%)	I don't know N (%)	Total N
Color is not used as the only way of conveying information or identifying content.	4 (1.5%)	35 (13.5%)	59 (22.8%)	96 (37.1%)	55 (21.2%)	10 (3.9%)	259
Default foreground and background colors and contrast of the web page should follow only modern design trends. (Reverse statement)	23 (8.9%)	66 (25.5%)	71 (27.4%)	55 (21.2%)	33 (12.7%)	11 (4.2%)	259
Images and videos are informative enough and don’t need additional description. (Reverse statement)	25 (9.7%)	55 (21.2%)	55 (21.2%)	77 (29.7%)	31 (12.0%)	16 (6.2%)	259
All images and videos should have text transcripts and/or captions for audio content.	2 (.8%)	16 (6.2%)	61 (23.6%)	97 (37.5%)	67 (25.9%)	16 (6.2%)	259
It is irrelevant to provide sounds such as 'door creaks' in the transcripts and captions. (Reverse statement)	15 (5.8%)	59 (22.8%)	63 (24.3%)	62 (23.9%)	22 (8.5%)	38 (14.7%)	259
Images of text should be resizable, replaced with actual text, or avoided where possible.	1 (.4%)	25 (9.7%)	58 (22.4%)	103 (39.8%)	50 (19.3%)	22 (8.5%)	259
Text should be resizable up to 200% without losing information, using a standard browser.	1 (.4%)	5 (1.9%)	53 (20.5%)	113 (43.6%)	72 (27.8%)	15 (5.8%)	259

Table 27

Frequencies - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites - Accessible web design*? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree)*

Accessible web design	Strongly Disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Neither agree nor Disagree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly agree N (%)	I don't know N (%)	Total N
All elements should have the same position on subpages.	5 (1.9%)	17 (6.6%)	63 (24.3%)	86 (33.2%)	63 (24.3%)	25 (9.7%)	259
Attractive design is more important than accessible design. (Reverse statement)	43 (16.6%)	80 (30.9%)	69 (26.6%)	32 (12.4%)	16 (6.29%)	19 (7.3%)	259

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 28

Descriptive statistics - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites - Information technology (IT), accessible web programming/developing*? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree)*

Information technology (IT), accessible web programming/developing	N	Mean	SD
The users can move through content with different assistive technologies in a way that makes sense.	246	4.19	.760
Users should be able to easily navigate, find content, and determine where they are. The navigation mechanism that are repeated on multiple pages should appear on the same position.	247	4.09	.843
There is more than one way to find relevant pages within a set of web pages.	228	3.70	.854
The users are informed about their current location within a set of Web pages, a Website, or a Web application.	231	3.80	.925
All functionality that is available by mouse should also be available by keyboard and the current location of keyboard focus indicator should be visible.	127	3.98	.886
Knowledge of web technologies is important to ensure web accessibility.	124	3.85	1.049
It is important to use valid HTML so user agents, including assistive technologies, can accurately interpret and parse content.	123	3.98	.910
A lot of accessibility can be built into the underlying code of websites and applications.	122	3.60	1.018
It is important to follow the web accessibility guidelines in all development phases.	243	4.09	.826
URLs have to be self-explanatory.	123	3.82	.924
Blinking banners should be avoided.	224	3.92	.992
Web page should be responsive (automatically adjusted to different devices such as tablets and mobile devices).	243	4.41	.701
Links to attachments should have information about type and size.	231	3.96	.906

Note. Participants who answered with 'I don't know' are not included in the sum.

Frequencies for specific answers are depicted in the table below (Table 29).

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 29

Frequencies - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites - Information technology (IT), accessible web programming/developing*? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree)*

Information technology (IT), accessible web programming/developing	Strongly disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Neither agree/ disagree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly agree N (%)	I don't know N (%)	Total N
The users can move through content with different assistive technologies in a way that makes sense.	1 (.4%)	5 (1.9%)	31 (12.0%)	119 (45.9%)	90 (34.7%)	13 (5.0%)	259
Users should be able to easily navigate, find content, and determine where they are. The navigation mechanism that are repeated on multiple pages should appear on the same position.	2 (.8%)	8 (3.1%)	41 (15.8%)	110 (42.5%)	86 (33.2%)	12 (4.6%)	259
There is more than one way to find relevant pages within a set of web pages	1 (.4%)	16 (6.2%)	73 (28.2%)	98 (37.8%)	40 (15.4%)	31 (12.0%)	259
The users are informed about their current location within a set of Web pages, a Website, or a Web application.	4 (1.5%)	14 (5.4%)	60 (23.2%)	99 (38.2%)	54 (20.8%)	28 (10.8%)	259
All functionality that is available by mouse should also be available by keyboard and the current location of keyboard focus indicator should be visible.	1 (.8%)	5 (3.9%)	30 (23.4%)	51 (39.8%)	40 (31.3%)	1 (.8%)	128
Knowledge of web technologies is important to ensure web accessibility.	2 (1.6%)	13 (10.2%)	27 (21.1%)	41 (32.0%)	41 (32.0%)	4 (3.1%)	128
It is important to use valid HTML so user agents, including assistive technologies, can accurately interpret and parse content.	1 (.8%)	6 (4.7%)	28 (21.9%)	48 (37.5%)	40 (31.3%)	5 (3.9%)	128
A lot of accessibility can be built into the underlying code of websites and applications.	3 (2.3%)	15 (11.7%)	34 (26.6%)	46 (35.9%)	24 (18.8%)	6 (4.7%)	128
It is important to follow the web accessibility guidelines at all development phases.	1 (.4%)	5 (1.9%)	52 (20.1%)	99 (38.2%)	86 (33.2%)	16 (6.2%)	259
URLs have to be self-explanatory.	1 (.8%)	8 (6.3%)	35 (27.3%)	47 (36.7%)	32 (25.0%)	5 (3.9%)	128
Blinking banners should be avoided.	4 (1.5%)	12 (4.6%)	60 (23.2%)	71 (27.4%)	77 (29.7%)	35 (13.5%)	259

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Information technology (IT), accessible web programming/developing	Strongly disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Neither agree/ disagree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly agree N (%)	I don't know N (%)	Total N
Web page should be responsive (automatically adjusted to different devices such as tablets and mobile devices).	-	-	30 (11.6%)	83 (32.0%)	130 (50.3%)	16 (6.2%)	259
Links to attachments should have information about type and size.	4 (1.5%)	7 (2.7%)	54 (20.8%)	95 (36.7%)	71 (27.4%)	28 (10.8%)	259

Table 30

Descriptive statistics - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites - Web accessibility testing*? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree)*

Web accessibility testing	N	Mean	SD
Web accessibility evaluation tools and software programs are reliable enough and do not need additional testing from people. (Reverse statement)	233	2.72	1.205
Testers should only check technical parameters of the design. Other aspects of the design shouldn't be tested to determine website's accessibility. (Reverse statement)	243	2.59	1.148

Table 31

Descriptive statistics - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites - Implementation*? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree)*

Implementation	N	Mean	SD
Only few, most common issues of accessible design should be considered during creation of a website. (Reverse statement)	243	2.65	1.152
All parts of the web page should be accessible to people who use different kinds of assistive technologies such as screen readers, screen magnification software etc. to be able to read it.	245	4.08	.785
It is important to have internal web accessibility policy in every company and to make all employees follow it.	247	3.81	.879

Note. Participants who answered with 'I don't know' are not included in the sum.

Frequencies for specific answers are depicted in the table below (Table 32).

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 32

Frequencies - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites - Web accessibility testing? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree)

Web accessibility testing	Strongly disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Neither agree/ disagree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly agree N (%)	I don't know N (%)	Total N
Web accessibility evaluation tools and software programs are reliable enough and do not need additional testing from people. (Reverse statement)	43 (16.6%)	63 (24.3%)	61 (23.6%)	48 (18.5%)	18 (6.9%)	26 (10.0%)	259
Testers should only check technical parameters of the design. Other aspects of the design shouldn't be tested to determine website's accessibility. (Reverse statement)	46 (17.8%)	80 (30.9%)	55 (21.2%)	51 (19.7%)	11 (4.2%)	16 (6.2%)	259

Table 33

Frequencies - Question 11: How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites - Implementation of web accessibility? (1 – Strongly disagree, 5 – Strongly agree)

Implementation of web accessibility	Strongly disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Neither agree/ disagree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly agree N (%)	I don't know N (%)	Total N
Only few, most common issues of accessible design should be considered during creation of a website. (Reverse statement)	39 (15.1%)	83 (32.0%)	61 (23.6%)	43 (16.6%)	17 (6.6%)	16 (6.2%)	259
All parts of the web page should be accessible to people who use different kinds of assistive technologies such as screen readers, screen magnification software etc. to be able to read it.	-	5 (1.9%)	51 (19.7%)	108 (41.7%)	81 (31.3%)	14 (5.4%)	259
It is important to have internal web accessibility policy in every company and to make all employees follow it.	-	13 (5.0%)	84 (32.4%)	87 (33.6%)	63 (24.3%)	12 (4.6%)	259

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 34

Question 12: Knowledge and skills in the field of web accessibility are important for:

Answer	Mean (SD)
Employers	3.75 (0.78)
Managers	3.73 (0.78)
Programmers/IT professionals	4.11 (0.76)
Web developers	4.19 (0.69)
Web designers	4.17 (0.72)
Marketing and PR professionals	3.60 (0.88)
Web editors and writers	3.86 (0.84)
Social media managers	3.80 (0.80)
Policy makers	3.71 (0.88)
VET teachers/trainers	3.64 (0.89)
People with disabilities	3.80 (1.08)

Note. Valid total N=251, Missing N=184, Total N=435.

Participants agreed that knowledge and skills in the field of web accessibility are important for all of the above mentioned stakeholders, for web developers (*M* = 4.19, *SD* = 0.69) and web designers (*M* = 4.17, *SD* = 0.72) the most, and for PR and marketing professionals the least (*M* = 3.60, *SD* = 0.88). Frequencies for specific answers are presented in the table below (Table 35).

Table 35

Question 12: Knowledge and skills in the field of web accessibility are important for:

Answer	Strongly disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Netiher agree nor disagree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly agree N (%)
Employers	6 (2.4%)	7 (2.8%)	57 (22.7%)	154 (61.4%)	27 (10.8%)
Managers	5 (2.0%)	11 (4.4%)	57 (22.7%)	152 (60.6%)	26 (10.4%)
Programmers/IT professionals	1 (0.4%)	8 (3.2%)	29 (11.6%)	137 (54.6%)	76 (30.3%)
Web developers	-	4 (1.6%)	29 (11.6%)	134 (53.4%)	84 (33.5%)
Web designers	1 (0.4%)	5 (2.0%)	26 (10.4%)	138 (55.0%)	81 (32.3%)
Marketing and PR professionals	8 (3.2%)	16 (6.4%)	71 (38.3%)	130 (51.8%)	26 (10.4%)
Web editors and writers	3 (1.2%)	16 (6.4%)	42 (16.7%)	142 (56.6%)	48 (19.1%)
Social media managers	2 (0.8%)	15 (6.0%)	52 (20.7%)	144 (57.4%)	38 (15.1%)
Policy makers	6 (2.4%)	15 (6.0%)	64 (25.5%)	128 (51.1%)	38 (15.1%)
VET teachers/trainers	8 (3.2%)	15 (6.9%)	69 (27.5%)	127 (50.6%)	32 (12.7%)
People with disabilities	17 (6.9%)	20 (8.0%)	75 (29.9%)	109 (43.4%)	30 (12.0%)

Note. Total N=251.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

3.2 Part II: Current practices

In the second part of the survey, participants were asked about their digital accessibility practices and about the digital accessibility practices of their organizations.

The results have shown that 23.9% (*N* = 59) of participants had their own website or managed the website of their company, 51.4% (*N* = 127) worked for the company that had a website, 28.3% (*N* = 70) developed or designed web pages for clients, and 19.4% (*N* = 48) wrote or edited web content for clients. 25.1% (*N* = 62) of participants had other professions or worked in other domains (e. g. accessibility evaluators, accessible tourism consultants, doing work on web applications, auditing accessibility of clients' websites, explaining people how to use the computer, programming B2B portals for clients and solutions, studying, having their own blog, using a website for school, collecting information).

Participants who had their own websites, managed the website for their company, or worked for the company that had a website, had to answer few additional questions referring to the websites they managed (Tables 36 – 38).

Table 36

Question 13a: Is your or your organization's website accessible?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	103	66.9
No	33	21.4
I don't know	18	11.7
Valid total	154	100.0

Note. Missing N=281, Total N=435.

The majority (66.9%, *N* = 103) of participants indicated that their or their organization's website was accessible. 21.4% (*N* = 33) confirmed their website was not accessible, and 11.7% (*N* = 18) of participants did not know whether their or their organization's website was accessible or not.

Table 37

Question 14a: Does your website/organization's website meet any Conformance Level according to the WCAG 2.0/2.1 standard? Which one?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Level A	16	10.4
Level AA	23	14.9
Level AAA	10	6.5
None	25	16.2
I don't know	80	51.9
Valid total	154	100.0

Note. Missing N=281, Total N=435.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Almost 32% of participants reported that their or their organization's website met Conformance Levels according to the WCAG 2.0/2.1 standard: (1) 10.4% (*N* = 16) Level A, 14.9% (*N* = 23) Level AA, and 6.5% (*N* = 10) Level AAA. 52.9% (*N* = 80) did not know whether their or their organization's website met any of the Conformance Levels, and 16.2% (*N* = 25) confirmed their or their organization's website did not meet any of the Conformance Levels.

Table 38

Question 15a: How often do you check the accessibility of your or company's website?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Daily	23	14.9
Weekly	18	11.7
Monthly	21	13.6
Once a year	24	15.6
Never	38	24.7
I don't know	30	19.5
Valid total	154	100.0

Note. Missing N=281, Total N=435.

14.9% (N = 23) of participants checked the accessibility of their or their company's website daily, 11.7% (N = 18) checked it weekly, 13.6% (N = 21), and 15.6% (N = 24) once a year. 24.7% (N = 38) of participants never checked the accessibility of their or their company's website, and 19.5% (N = 30) did not know how often they checked their or their company's website.

Participants who worked for the company that had a website had to answer few additional questions referring to the accessibility of their website and internal policies regarding digital accessibility (Table 39 – 44).

Table 39

Question 13b: Does your company/organization have an internal policy about web accessibility?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	22	17.3
No, but we are going to implement it in the near future	25	19.7
No	42	33.1
I don't know	38	29.9
Valid total	127	100.0

Note. Missing N=308, Total N=435.

Only 17.3% (*N* = 22) of participants indicated that their organization had an internal policy about digital accessibility, however 19.7% (*N* = 25) of participants responded that their goal is to implement it in the near future. 29.9% (*N* = 38) of participants did not know if their organization had an internal policy about digital accessibility, and 33.1% (*N* = 127) confirmed that their organization did not have an internal policy about digital accessibility.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 40

Question 14b: Does your company/organization have employees that are responsible for web accessibility?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	43	33.9
No	50	39.4
I don't know	34	26.8
Valid total	127	100.0

Note. Missing N=308, Total N=435.

Almost 40% (*N* = 43) indicated that the companies they worked for had employees that were responsible for web accessibility in the company (e. g. accessibility auditor, web designer, worker with gdpr, IT specialist, data administrator, IT engineer, worker in corporative communication, web developer, web planner, PR, junior programmer, accessibility reviewer, server administrator, professor, system administrator, web accessibility technician and designer, UX/UI, programmer, multimedia manager).

Table 41

Question 15b: Do any of the employees in your organization hold a web accessibility certification?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	2	1.6
No	57	45.2
I don't know	67	53.2
Valid total	126	100.0

Note. Missing N=309, Total N=435.

Only 1.6% (*N* = 2) of participants indicated that some of the employees in their company held a web accessibility certification, such as CCID, CTIC, and WCAG 2.0. However, 45.2% (*N* = 57) confirmed that none of the employees in their organization held a digital accessibility certification, and 53.2% (*N* = 67) did not know whether anyone held such certification.

Table 42

Question 15bb: Is anyone in your organization enrolled or is planning to enroll into a web accessibility course?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes, he/she is attending the course	4	3.2
Yes, he/she is planning to enroll in the course	8	6.3
No	31	24.6
I don' tknow	83	65.9
Valid total	126	100.0

Note. Missing N=309, Total N=435.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Only 9.5% of participants confirmed that their employees were either attending (3.2%, *N* = 4), or were planning to enroll (6.3%, *N* = 8) into a digital accessibility course, however, they were not aware of the names of the programmes. 24.6% of participants confirmed none of their employees being enrolled or planning to enroll into a digital accessibility course, and 65.9% (*N* = 83) did not know whether anyone in their organization was or was planning to enroll in such a course.

Table 43

Question 16b: Does your company/organization plan to hire a web accessibility expert in the (near) future?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	9	7.1
No	34	27.0
I don't know	83	65.9
Valid total	126	100.0

Note. Missing N=309, Total N=435.

Only 7.1% (*N* = 9) of participants responded that their organization planned to hire a web accessibility expert in the future. 27.0% (*N* = 34) confirmed their organization did not plan to hire a web accessibility expert, and 65.9% (*N* = 83) did not know about the plans of their organizations on hiring a web accessibility expert in the future.

Table 44

Question 17b: Does your company/organization want to hire candidates with skills in web accessibility?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	11	8.7
No	27	21.4
I don't know	88	69.8
Valid total	126	100.0

Note. Missing N=309, Total N=435.

Participants (8.7%, *N* = 11) who indicated that the company they worked for was interested in hiring candidates with skills in web accessibility, named skills such as: knowledge of web accessibility standard WCAG 2.0/2.1, communication strategy and understanding of web accessibility, knowing accessibility of web pages and mobile applications, revision and correction of accessible web content, web designing, web developing.

Participants who either developed or designed web pages for clients, or wrote or edited web content for clients, had to answer one additional question about using web accessibility knowledge at their work (Table 45).

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 45

Question 13c: Do you use your web accessibility knowledge when creating websites/web design/web content?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	64	68.8
No	29	31.2
Valid total	93	100.0

Note. Missing N=342, Total N=435.

86.8% (*N* = 64) of participants who either developed/designed web pages for clients, or wrote/edited web content for clients, used their digital accessibility knowledge at their work. 31.2% (*N* = 29) indicated that they did not use their digital accessibility knowledge when creating, designing websites or web content.

3.3 Part III: Learning and training

In the third part of the survey, the participants were asked about their possible learning and training preferences related to gaining web accessibility knowledge.

Table 46

Question 18: Do you think it is important for your work to gain some additional knowledge in web accessibility? (1 - Not important at all, 5 - Very important)

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not important at all	5	2.0
Not important	17	6.9
Somewhat important	60	24.4
Important	104	42.3
Very important	60	24.4
Valid total	246	100.0

Note. Mean (SD)=3.80 (0.96), Missing N=189, Total N=435.

Participants found it important (*M* = 3.8, *SD* = .96) to gain some additional knowledge in web accessibility. Only 9% of participants thought this kind of additional knowledge is not important.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table 47

Question 19: What kind of knowledge would you like to gain? (1 - not interested at all, 5 - very interested)

Answer	Mean (SD)
Writing and preparing web accessible content	3.39 (1.12)
Accessible web page navigation	3.52 (1.05)
Accessible web development	3.43 (1.10)
Accessible web (visual) design	3.38 (1.14)
Managing web accessibility	3.43 (1.07)
Digital accessibility implementation	3.49 (1.06)
Basic knowledge of web accessibility and the needs of disabled people regarding web accessibility	3.57 (1.02)
Web accessibility/usability testing	3.41 (1.08)
Web accessibility legislations	2.84 (1.11)
Web accessibility standard (WCAG 2.0/2.1)	3.29 (1.13)
WCAG conformance levels (A, AA, AAA)	3.26 (1.16)

Note. Valid total N=246, Missing N=189, Total N=435.

Participants were on average interested in all the suggested domains and topics related to the field of digital accessibility. There was not big difference in the means of preferences towards any of the topics, however, the most interest had been shown towards Basic knowledge of web accessibility and the needs of disabled people regarding web accessibility (*M* = 3. 57, *SD* = 1.02), and the least interest towards Web accessibility legislations (*M* = 2.84, *SD* = 1.11). Frequencies for specific answers are presented in the table below (Table 48).

Table 48

Question 19: What kind of knowledge would you like to gain?

Answer	Not interested at all N(%)	Not interested N(%)	Somewhat interested N(%)	Interested N(%)	Very interested N(%)
Writing and preparing web accessible content	20 (8.1%)	30 (12.2%)	63 (25.6%)	99 (40.2%)	34 (13.8%)
Accessible web page navigation	13 (5.3%)	28 (11.4%)	61 (24.8%)	106 (43.1%)	38 (15.4%)
Accessible web development	18 (7.3%)	31 (12.6%)	57 (23.2%)	107 (43.5%)	33 (13.4%)
Accessible web (visual) design	21 (8.5%)	31 (12.6%)	64 (26.0%)	94 (14.6%)	36 (14.6%)
Managing web accessibility	15 (6.1%)	32 (13.0%)	63 (25.6%)	103 (41.9%)	33 (13.4%)
Digital accessibility implementation	14 (5.7%)	30 (12.2%)	59 (24.0%)	107 (43.5%)	36 (14.6%)
Basic knowledge of web accessibility and the needs of disabled people regarding web accessibility	14 (5.7%)	18 (7.3%)	66 (26.8%)	110 (44.7%)	38 (15.4%)
Web accessibility/usability testing	19 (7.7%)	27 (11.0%)	64 (26.0%)	106 (43.1%)	30 (12.2%)

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Answer	Not interested at all N(%)	Not interested N(%)	Somewhat interested N(%)	Interested N(%)	Very interested N(%)
Web accessibility legislations	39 (15.9%)	45 (18.3%)	90 (36.6%)	60 (24.4%)	12 (4.9%)
Web accessibility standard (WCAG 2.0/2.1)	22 (8.9%)	34 (13.8%)	72 (29.3%)	87 (35.4%)	31 (12.6%)
WCAG conformance levels (A, AA, AAA)	25 (10.2%)	35 (14.2%)	69 (28.0%)	85 (34.6%)	32 (13.0%)

Note. Total N=246.

Table 49

Question 20: How do you prefer gaining new knowledge?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Studying by myself from free online sources	151	61.6
Joining the online course	130	53.1
Joining the standard course	82	33.5
Other (attending events, paid sources, I can teach about it, I don't want, meetings)	11	4.5
Valid total	245	100.0

Note. Missing N=190, Total N=435.

The majority of participants preferred either studying by themselves from free online sources (61.6%, *N* = 151), or joining the online course (53.1%, *N* = 130). However, 33.5% (*N* = 82) of participants indicated the preference of joining the standard course.

Table 50

Question 21: If there was available training on web accessibility near you, would you join it?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	108	44.3
No	32	13.1
Maybe	104	42.6
Valid total	244	100.0

Note. Missing N=191, Total N=435.

44.3% (*N* = 108) responded that they would join a web accessibility training in their proximity, 24.6% (*N* = 104) might join it, and only 13.1% (*N* = 32) would not join it.

Table 51

Question 22: If you were to join a web accessibility training/course, how long would you prefer it to be?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
A day or two	108	44.3

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
One week	36	14.8
Two weeks	28	11.5
A month or two	47	19.3
6 months	13	5.3
Other (1hour, 2-3days, a day, few hours, do not want to take part, I do not know, depend on the time of the day)	12	4.9
Valid total	244	100.0

Note. Missing N=191, Total N=435.

44.3% (*N* = 108) of participants preferred a digital accessibility training/course being a duration of a day or two. 14.8% (*N* = 36) preferred it to last for a week, and 11.5% (*N* = 28) preferred it to last for two weeks. 19.3% (*N* = 47) preferred a course to be a month or two long, and only 5.3% (*N* = 13) preferred it to last for 6 months.

Table 52

Question 23:Is it important to you that the web accessibility training/course that you would take was (internationally) certified?

Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	159	65.2
No	42	17.2
I don't know	43	17.6
Valid total	244	100.0

Note. Missing N=191, Total N=435.

The majority of participants (65,2%, *N* = 159) found it important that the digital accessibility course they took, would be internationally certified.

4 Discussion

The Digital Accessibility Survey for stakeholders was developed and conducted for the higher purpose of developing internationally Certified Digital Accessibility Training, which would empower stakeholders with necessary skills and knowledge related to the field of digital accessibility. The survey provided insight of digital accessibility awareness and proficiency, current practices, and learning and training preferences of stakeholders in four European countries: Poland, Slovenia, Spain, and Greece.

The research showed that participants were quite familiar with the concept of digital accessibility, and understood the importance of providing accessibility of the web. However, the majority of participants were not aware of *EU directive 2016/2102 on the accessibility of the websites and mobile applications of public sector bodies a*s well as with any other national or international legislation related to digital accessibility.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Approximately half of participants had never heard of WCAG 2.0 and 2.1. Nevertheless, participants acknowledged themselves as somewhat proficient in digital accessibility, claimed to have some basic knowledge related to the field and whom digital accessibility is aimed for. Parts of the survey that aimed at testing participants' knowledge in digital accessibility confirmed the above mentioned self-evaluations of their digital accessibility related knowledge.

The survey indicated that the digital accessibility field is growing, and some organizations have already been actively working on implementation of digital accessibility, creating digitally accessible websites, hiring or planning to hire employees with digital accessibility skills, or digital accessibility experts. However, it seems that the percentage of these kinds of organizations is still relatively low (see Tables 36 - 44) and the field of digital accessibility is still in its infancy. The previously conducted analysis of digital accessibility skills

(see IO1 – A1 Desktop research: The analysis of digital accessibility skills, trainings, job roles, best practices) related to creating web content, web development/programming, web design, evaluation and implementation of digital accessibility (e.g. Conti, 2016; WAI, 2018; WAI-ARIA, 2018, WCAG, 2018; W3C, 2018) has already highlighted the skills key stakeholders should have in order to make websites accessible. However, the analysis of the current state of the digital accessibility field (e.g. Bennet, 2014; Central Washington University, 2018; Glassdoor, 2018; Media Access Australia, 2018; Mestna občina Ljubljana, 2018; Shell, 2018) indicated a flaw in translating the WCAG digital accessibility standard into practice in Europe, which can be also confirmed with the current Digital Accessibility Survey for stakeholders. The survey pointed towards lack of understanding the importance of implementing digital accessibility in organizations. Organizations do not seem to be very interested in hiring employees with digital accessibility skills, nor digital accessibility experts. The majority of employees are not taking digital accessibility courses nor acquiring certificates in digital accessibility.

However, people are willing to learn. The survey indicated the stakeholders' awareness about the importance of acquiring additional digital accessibility knowledge for their work, and consequently the interest of people in taking a digital accessibility course, especially if the training would be provided in their cities. Even more, interest had been shown in taking an online course which would not last for more than few days and would preferably be internationally certified. This interest was indicated for all digital accessibility areas (see Table 48).

5 Conclusion

The Survey for stakeholders provided great insight into the field of digital accessibility. The results of the survey, as well as the results of previously conducted Desktop research (see IO1 – A1 Desktop research: The analysis of digital accessibility skills, trainings, job roles, best practices), will serve as a ground point in developing Certified Digital Accessibility Training. The combination of both will enable the training to be rich in its content, as well as adjusted to the needs of stakeholders.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

6 References

Bennett, D. M. (2014). Teaching and Promoting Web Accessibility in Virtual Learning Environments. British Journal of Psychiatry, 205(01), 76–77.

Brophy, P. & Craven, J. (2007). Web Accessibility. *Library Trends, 55*, 950-972.

Central Washington University. (2018). Accessibility Studies. Retrieved from: http://www.cwu.edu/accessibility-studies/

Conti, G. (2016, May 17). The Writer's Guide to Making Accessible Web Content [Web log post]. Retrieved from https://zapier.com/blog/accessible-web-content/

DIRECTIVE (EU) 2016/2102 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 26 October 2016 on the accessibility of the websites and mobile applications of public sector bodies. (2016*). Official Journal of the European Union, 59*, 1. Retrieved from: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2016.327.01.0001.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2016:327:TOC

European Commission. (2017, December 2). Commission proposes to make products and services more accessible to the disabled persons [Press release]. Retrieved from: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-15-6147_en.htm

European Parliament. (2014, September 14). Disabled persons to have better access to products and services in the EU [Press Release]. Retrieved from http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/press-room/20170911IPR83596/disabled-persons-to-have-better-access-to-products-and-services-in-the-eu

Glassdoor. (2018). Retrived from: https://www.glassdoor.com/Job/director-of-digital-accessibility-jobs-SRCH_KO0,33.htm

Media Access Australia. (2018). Professional Certificate in Web Accessibility. Retrieved from: https://www.mediaaccess.org.au/digitalaccessibilityservices/services/education-and-training/pcwa/

Mestna občina Ljubljana. (2018). Ocena spletne dostopnosti ljubljana.si. Retrieved from: https://www.ljubljana.si/sl/moja-ljubljana/osebe-z-oviranostmi/dostopnost-za-vse/ocena-spletne-dostopnosti-nasega-spletnega-mesta/

Shell. (2018). Retrieved from: https://www.shell.si/

WCAG 2.1. (2018). Retrived from: https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/

W3C Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI), WAI-ARIA. (2018). Accessible Rich Internet Applications Suite. Retrieved from: https://www.w3.org/WAI/standards-guidelines/aria/

W3C Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI), WCAG. (2018). Web Content Accessibility Guidelines. Retrieved from: https://www.w3.org/WAI/standards-guidelines/wcag/

W3C Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI), UAAG. (2018). User Agent Accessibility Guidelines. Retrieved from: https://www.w3.org/WAI/standards-guidelines/uaag/

UNESCO Insitute for Statistics. (2012). International Standard Classification of Education ISCED 2011. Retrieved from: http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/international-standard-classification-of-education-isced2011-en.pdf

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Appendix
IO1 – A2 Digital accessibility survey for stakeholders

Survey short title: Digital Accessibility Survey

Question number: 49

Language: English

Active from: 09.01.2019

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Welcome to our web accessibility survey!

Thank you for agreeing to take part in the survey about web accessibility.

The survey is an important part of the Erasmus+ Digital Accessibility Project which aims to develop a Certified Digital Accessibility Training for various professions that work with web.

Your answers will greatly help us to improve the current state of web accessibility in Europe. Your survey responses will be strictly confidential and data from this research will be reported only in the aggregate. Your information will be coded and remain confidential.

If you have questions at any point about the survey or procedure, you may contact the project partner: info@inuk.si.

Thank you very much for your time and support.

Please start with the survey by clicking on the Continue button bellow.

Profession - Before you enter the survey please choose your field of occupation or study:

1. IT/Web development/programming
2. Design/web design
3. Management
4. PR/Marketing
5. VET teaching/training
6. Other:

Part1 - I. PART: WEB ACCESSIBILITY AWARENESS AND PROFICIENCY
In the first part of the questionnaire we are asking about your awareness and proficiency related to web accessibility. If not stated differently we are asking you to express your opinion by clicking a button.

Q1_2 - Web accessibility definition: Web accessibility means that websites, tools, and technologies are designed and developed so that people with disabilities can use them. More specifically, people can perceive, understand, navigate, interact with the Web and contribute to the Web. How well are you familiar with the concept of web accessibility? *Please indicate it on the 5-point scale.*

Not familiar at all (have never heard of it)	Not familiar	Somewhat familiar	Familiar	Very familiar
1	2	3	4	5

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Q2 - How important is to provide accessibility of web in your opinion? *Please indicate it on the 5-point scale.*

Not important at all	Not important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important
1	2	3	4	5

Q3 - Are you aware of the EU directive 2016/2102 on the accessibility of the websites and mobile applications of public sector bodies? *Please indicate it on the 5-point scale.*

I have never heard of it	I have heard of it	I have some basic knowledge	I know it	I know it very well
1	2	3	4	5

Q4 - Are you aware of any other national or international directive/legislation about web accessibility?

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know/I don't remember

IF (1) Q4 = [1]
Q4a - If YES, which one?

Please, insert your answer.

Q5 - Do you know WCAG 2.0/2.1 web accessibility standard? Please indicate it on the 5-point scale.

Answer	I have never heard of it	I have heard of it	I have some basic knowledge	I know it	I know it very well
WCAG 2.0	1	2	3	4	5
WCAG 2.1	1	2	3	4	5

Q6 - How proficient do you feel you are in web accessibility? *Please indicate it on the 5-point scale.*

Not proficient at all	Not proficient	Somewhat proficient	Proficient	Very proficient
1	2	3	4	5

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Q7 - Please indicate to whom is web accessibility aimed for (multiple answers possible): *Please indicate it as, false, true, not sure.*

Answer	False	Correct	Not sure
Deaf people and people with other hearing impairments	1	2	3
Blind people and people with other visual impairments	1	2	3
Physically disabled people	1	2	3
People with other disabilities (cognitive, neurological, speech etc.)	1	2	3
People with “temporary disabilities” (with a broken arm or lost glasses)	1	2	3
People in bright sunlight or in an environment where they cannot listen to audio etc.	1	2	3
People using mobile phones, smart watches, smart TVs, and other devices with small screens, different input modes, etc.	1	2	3
Older people with changing abilities due to ageing	1	2	3
People using a slow Internet connection, or who have limited or expensive bandwidth	1	2	3
People without internet access	1	2	3
Everybody	1	2	3

Q8 - Who do you think, is responsible for assuring web accessibility of websites and mobile applications in companies?

Answer	Not responsible at all	Not responsible	Somewhat responsible	Responsible	Very responsible	I don't know
Employers	1	2	3	4	5	9
Web designers	1	2	3	4	5	9
Web editors	1	2	3	4	5	9
Web content writers	1	2	3	4	5	9
Web developers	1	2	3	4	5	9
Programmers and IT professionals	1	2	3	4	5	9
Marketing and people's relations (PR) stuff	1	2	3	4	5	9
Managers	1	2	3	4	5	9
Social media managers	1	2	3	4	5	9
People with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5	9
Policy makers	1	2	3	4	5	9
Vocational educational teachers and trainers (VET)	1	2	3	4	5	9
Other:	1	2	3	4	5	9

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Q9 - To what extent do you think the web accessibility refers to:

Answer	Not at all	To small extent	To moderate extent	To great extent	To very great extent	I don't know
Web technologies (e.g. HTML, CSS, JavaScript)	1	2	3	4	5	9
Assistive technologies (e.g. screen readers, color contrast analyzers)	1	2	3	4	5	9
Web (visual) design	1	2	3	4	5	9
Web accessibility testing	1	2	3	4	5	9
Usability testing	1	2	3	4	5	9
User experience	1	2	3	4	5	9
Web page text and content	1	2	3	4	5	9
Images and multimedia	1	2	3	4	5	9
Structure of the web page	1	2	3	4	5	9
Navigation of the web page	1	2	3	4	5	9
Web page code	1	2	3	4	5	9
Other:	1	2	3	4	5	9

Q10 - Please rate your knowledge in making the following parts of web pages accessible.

Answer	I have never heard of it	None	Basic	Intermediate	Advanced
Web technologies (e.g. HTML, CSS, JavaScript)	1	2	3	4	5
Web (visual) design	1	2	3	4	5
Web accessibility testing	1	2	3	4	5
Usability testing	1	2	3	4	5
User experience	1	2	3	4	5
Web page text and content	1	2	3	4	5
Images and multimedia	1	2	3	4	5
Structure of the webpage	1	2	3	4	5
Nagivigation of the webpage	1	2	3	4	5
Web page code	1	2	3	4	5
Other:	1	2	3	4	5

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Q11 - How much do you agree with the following statements related to making accessible websites?

Answer	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	I don't know
Sentences and paragraphs should be simple, clear and short.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Glossary should be provided on every website for explaining difficult terms.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Every text should have additional images and videos for better clarity of the content.	1	2	3	4	5	9
The page titles should be long in order to properly describe what the content of the page is about.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Color is not used as the only way of conveying information or identifying content.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Default foreground and background colors and contrast of the web page should follow only modern design trends.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Images and videos are informative enough and don’t need additional description.	1	2	3	4	5	9
All images and videos should have text transcripts and/or captions for audio content.	1	2	3	4	5	9
It is irrelevant to provide sounds such as 'door creaks' in the transcripts and captions.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Images of text should be resizable, replaced with actual text, or avoided where possible..	1	2	3	4	5	9
Text should be resizable up to 200% without losing information, using a standard browser.	1	2	3	4	5	9
The users should be able to pause, stop, or adjust the volume of audio that is played on a website.	1	2	3	4	5	9
The users can move through content with different assistive technologies in a way that makes sense.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Users should be able to easily navigate, find content, and determine where they are. The navigation mechanism that are repeated on multiple pages should appear on the same position.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Additional descriptions of short link texts, such as 'click here', 'read more' or 'link'' are not needed as they are clear enough.	1	2	3	4	5	9
There is more than one way to find relevant pages	1	2	3	4	5	9

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Answer	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	I don't know
within a set of web page.						
The users are informed about their current location within a set of Web pages, a Website, or a Web application	1	2	3	4	5	9
All functionality that is available by mouse should also be available by keyboard and the current location of keyboard focus indicator should be visible.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Knowledge of web technologies is important to ensure web accessibility.	1	2	3	4	5	9
It is important to use valid HTML so user agents, including assistive technologies, can accurately interpret and parse content.	1	2	3	4	5	9
A lot of accessibility can be built into the underlying code of websites and applications.	1	2	3	4	5	9
It is important to follow the web accessibility guidelines at all development phases.	1	2	3	4	5	9
URLs have to be self-explanatory	1	2	3	4	5	9
Blinking banners should be avoided.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Web page should be responsive (automatically adjusted to different devices such as tablets and mobile devices).	1	2	3	4	5	9
All elements should have the same position on subpages.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Links to attachments should have information about type and size.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Web accessibility evaluation tools and software programs are reliable enough and do not need additional testing from people.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Testers should only check technical parameters of the design. Other aspects of the design shouldn't be tested to determine website's accessibility.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Attractive design is more important than accessible design.	1	2	3	4	5	9
Only few, most common issues of accessible design should be considered during creation of a website.	1	2	3	4	5	9

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Answer	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	I don't know
All parts of the web page should be accessible to people who use different kinds of assistive technologies such as screen readers, screen magnification software etc. to be able to read it.	1	2	3	4	5	9
It is important to have internal web accessibility policy in every company and to make all employees follow it.	1	2	3	4	5	9

Q12 - Knowledge and skills in the field of web accessibility are important for *(Please indicate it on the 5-point scale.):*

Answer	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Employers	1	2	3	4	5
Managers	1	2	3	4	5
Programmers/ IT professionals	1	2	3	4	5
Web developers	1	2	3	4	5
Web designers	1	2	3	4	5
Marketing and PR professionals	1	2	3	4	5
Web editors and writers	1	2	3	4	5
Social media managers	1	2	3	4	5
Policy makers	1	2	3	4	5
VET teachers/trainers	1	2	3	4	5
People with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
Other:	1	2	3	4	5

Part2 - II. PART: CURRENT PRACTICES
In the second part we are asking about current practices of you and your organization.

Q13 - Which of the following applies to you *(multiple answers possible)*:

1. I have my own website/ I manage the website for my company
2. I work for the company that has a website
3. I develop/design websites for clients
4. I write/edit web content for clients
5. None of the above applies
6. Other:

IF (2) Q13 = [Q13a, Q13b]

Q13a - Is your or your organization's website accessible?

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

IF (3) Q13 = [Q13a, Q13b]

Q14a - Does your website/organization's website meet any Conformance Level according to the WCAG 2.0/2.1 standard? Which one?

1. Level A
2. Level AA
3. Level AAA
4. None
5. I don' t know

IF (4) Q13 = [Q13a, Q13b]

Q15a - How often do you check the accessibility of your or company's website?

1. Daily
2. Weekly
3. Monthly
4. Once a year
5. Never
6. I don't know

IF (5) Q13 = [Q13b]

Q13b - Does your company/organization have an internal policy about web accessibility?

1. Yes
2. No, but we are going to implement it in the near future
3. No
4. I don't know

IF (6) Q13 = [Q13b]

Q14b - Does your company/organization have employees that are responsible for web accessibility?

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don' t know

IF (7) Q14b = [1]

Q14b1 - IF yes, what are their job titles?

Please, insert your answer.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

IF (8) Q13 = [Q13b]
Q15b - Do any of the employees in your organization hold a web accessibility certification?

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don' t know

IF (9) Q15b = [1]
Q15b1 - Which certification?

Please, insert your answer.

IF (10) Q13 = [Q13b]
Q15bb - Is anyone enrolled or is planning to enroll into a web accessibility course?

1. Yes, he/she is enrolled in a course
2. Yes, he/she is planning to enroll in course
3. No
4. I don't know

IF (11) Q15bb = [1, 2]
Q15bb1 - Which course?

Please, insert your answer.

IF (12) Q13 = [Q13b]
Q16b - Does your company/organization plan to hire a web accessibility expert in the (near) future?

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

IF (13) Q13 = [Q13b]
Q17b - Does your company/organization want to hire candidates with skills in web accessibility?

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don' t know

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

IF (14) Q17b = [1]
Q17b1 - IF YES, with that kind of skills?

Please, insert your answer.

IF (15) Q13 = [Q13c, Q13d]
Q13c - Do you use your web accessibility knowledge when creating websites/web design/web content?

1. Yes
2. No

Part3 - III. PART: LEARNING AND TRAINING
In the third part we are asking about possible learning and training preferences related to gaining web accessibility knowledge.

Q18 - Do you think it is important for your work to gain some additional knowledge in web accessibility?

Not important at all	Not important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important
1	2	3	4	5

Q19 - What kind of knowledge would you like to gain? *Please indicate your answer on 5-point scale.*

Answer	Not interested at all	Not interested	Somewhat interested	Interested	Very interested
Writing and preparing web accessible content	1	2	3	4	5
Accessible web page navigation	1	2	3	4	5
Accessible web developement	1	2	3	4	5
Accessible web (visual) design	1	2	3	4	5
Managing web accessibility	1	2	3	4	5
Web accessibility implementation	1	2	3	4	5
Basic knowledge of web accessibility and the needs of disabled people regarding web accessibility	1	2	3	4	5
Web accessibility/usability testing	1	2	3	4	5
Web accessibility legislations	1	2	3	4	5
Web accessibility standards (WCAG 2.0/2.1)	1	2	3	4	5
WCAG conformance levels (A, AA, AAA)	1	2	3	4	5
Other:	1	2	3	4	5

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Q20 - How do you prefer gaining new knowledge? (More answers possible)

1. Studying by myself from free online sources
2. Joining the online course
3. Joining the standard course
4. Other:

Q21 - If there was available training on web accessibility near you, would you join it?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Maybe

Q22 - If you were to join a web accessibility training/course, how long would you prefer it to be?

1. A day or two
2. One week
3. Two weeks
4. A month or two
5. 6 months/half a year
6. One year
7. Other:

Q23 - Is it important to you that the web accessibility training/course that you would take was (internationally) certified?

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

Part4 - IV. DEMOGRAPHICS
In the fourth part we would like to ask you some personal questions.

Q24 - What is your gender?

1. Male
2. Female
3. I prefer not to say

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Q25 - Please choose your age:

1. Between 18 - 24 years old
2. Between 25 - 34 years old
3. Between 35 - 34 years old
4. Between 45 - 54 years old
5. 55 years old and more
6. I prefer not to say

Q26 - Where are you from?

1. Slovenia
2. Poland
3. Greece
4. Spain
5. Other:

Q27 - What is your level of education?

1. Secondary School (Upper Secondary School)
2. Post-secondary non-tertiary education
3. Short-cycle tertiary education (colleges of social work employees)
4. Bachelor's or equivalent (a first-cycle programme)
5. Master's or equivalent (a second-cycle or long-cycle programme)
6. Doctoral or equivalent (a third-cycle programme)
7. Other:

Q28 - What is your occupational status?

1. Student
2. Employed
3. Unemployed
4. Other:

IF (16) Q28 = [2]
Q28a - Are you working for a private or public organization? (*more answers possible*)

1. Public
2. Private

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

IF (17) Q28 = [2]
Q28b - What is the size of the organization you work for?

1. Micro (up to 10 employees)
2. Small (up to 50 employees)
3. Medium (from 50 - 250 employees)
4. Large (above 250 employees)

Q29 - Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

1. Yes
2. No

IF (18) Q29 = [1]
Q29a - IF YES, what kind of disability?

Please, insert your answer.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union