

## **Evaluating Research Survey Websites in Kinesiology: A Case Study Using An Accessibility Rating Form**

YI SHENG WU, JAFRĀ D. THOMAS, REGINA F. HOCKERT, JASMINE C. WONG, & SAMANTHA M. ROSS

Lab of Dr. Jafrā D. Thomas; Department of Kinesiology and Public Health; California Polytechnic State University—San Luis Obispo; San Luis Obispo, CA

---

*Category: Undergraduate*

*Advisor / Mentor: Thomas, Jafra (jthoma84@calpoly.edu)*

### **ABSTRACT**

Advancing equity in the research and educational practice of kinesiology requires intentional efforts to ensure access divides do not widen nor persist (Ross et al., in press, *JOPERD*). **PURPOSE:** Given knowledge of suitability assessment of materials (SAM) principles supports the equitable design of lay print and online material, we evaluated the extent they would also support developing a research survey website consistent with accessibility guidelines for digital technology. **METHODS:** The study website was adapted from the Canvas learning management system. A cross-sectional formative assessment was performed. Using their knowledge of SAM principles (eg, clear layout, text  $\leq$  8<sup>th</sup> grade reading level), the second and third author (JDT, RFH) constructed the website webpages (eg, site welcome page, online questionnaire; Jun.-Jul. 2022). The first author (YSW), using guidelines from two reputable sources (ie, a Canvas tutorial and W3C website), developed a 14-item accessibility rating form to critically appraise the website's 10 webpages (ie, 1 = *Not Accessible*, 2 = *Somewhat Accessible*, 3 = *Accessible*; Wallace et al., 2010, *JPAH*). Authors 1-4 then performed a formative assessment of the adapted Canvas websites' accessibility independently (Jul.-Aug. 2022). Form reliability was assessed using the intraclass correlation coefficient and its interpretive cut-points for average absolute-rater agreement (Cicchetti, 1994, *Psych Assess*; Landers, 2015, *Winnower*). **RESULTS:** Average rater agreement was excellent per webpage ( $M = .91$ ,  $LL = .82$ ,  $UL = .94$ ). Mean webpage score ranged between 2.55 ( $\pm 0.78$ ) to 2.77 ( $\pm 0.58$ ). Informational pages (eg, welcome page) had greater accessibility than interactive pages (eg, forms). Five discrepant items were systematic, resulting in redundant rater differences (eg, keyboard navigation was hard to notice). All discrepancies were resolved with 100% consensus. **CONCLUSION:** The findings of the present study suggest knowledge of SAM principles ensures developers can design lay friendly and accessible research survey websites. They further suggest rating forms inclusive of digital accessibility guidelines should be used as a supplement to further meet accessibility and equity goals. We will share our form, then discuss our results using the universal design for learning framework.