

The Enduring Relevance of Manual Testing in Usability and Accessibility Evaluation: A Critical Examination of Human-Centered Quality Assurance

Alex Thomas Thomas

Saransh Inc

Email: alexthomaslive[at]gmail.com

Abstract: *Manual testing continues to play a vital role in evaluating usability and accessibility, even as automated tools become more advanced. Human testers can uncover real-world usability issues, user experience challenges, and accessibility barriers that automated tools frequently miss [3], [5], [18]. By interacting directly with digital products, manual testing provides a deeper understanding of how people with different abilities use a website or application, ensuring a more inclusive and user-friendly experience [7], [9], [10]. This human-centered approach allows for the detection of context-sensitive defects, offers immediate and actionable feedback, and supports compliance with accessibility standards like WCAG [1], [2], [6]. Combining manual methods with automation leads to more thorough quality assurance, but manual testing remains essential for delivering digital solutions that truly meet the needs of all users [4], [12], [16]*

Keywords: Manual Testing, Accessibility, Usability, Human-Centered Design, Quality Assurance, WCAG, Automation

1. Introduction

The rapid advancement of digital technologies has transformed the ways in which users interact with software, websites, and applications, making usability and accessibility central pillars of quality assurance [1], [8]. While automated testing tools provide efficiency and broad coverage for identifying technical issues, they are inherently limited in their ability to assess complex user experiences, contextual nuances, and the real-world challenges faced by individuals with diverse abilities [3], [5], [18]. Manual testing, conducted by human evaluators, offers a depth of analysis that automation cannot match, particularly in uncovering subtle accessibility barriers and usability problems that impact actual users [4], [7], [19].

A human-centered approach to quality assurance emphasizes the importance of involving real users and experts throughout the evaluation process, ensuring that digital products are not only compliant with standards such as the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) but are also genuinely usable and inclusive [1], [2], [6]. This approach aligns with the principles of human-centered design, which prioritizes the needs, preferences, and experiences of end-users in all stages of development [6], [9], [10]. As accessibility and inclusivity become increasingly recognized as both ethical imperatives and business priorities, critically examining the enduring relevance of manual testing is essential for advancing holistic, user-focused quality assurance strategies [4], [12], [15]. This paper explores the unique contributions of manual testing in usability and accessibility evaluation, highlighting its indispensable role in achieving truly human-centered digital experiences.

2. Problem Statement

Despite significant advances in automated testing tools for usability and accessibility evaluation, these technologies are inherently limited in their ability to capture the full spectrum of user experience and accessibility barriers [3], [5], [18].

Automated tools excel at detecting technical issues such as missing alt text, improper heading structure, and color contrast errors, yet they cannot assess contextual meaning, user intent, or the effectiveness of interactive elements from the perspective of real users [2], [16], [19]. Critical aspects such as logical content flow, meaningful alternative text, keyboard navigation, dynamic content interactions, and compatibility with assistive technologies require human judgment and manual verification to ensure true accessibility and usability [4], [7], [14].

Relying solely on automation risks overlooking nuanced problems that impact people with disabilities and may result in a false sense of compliance or inclusivity [5], [8], [17]. Furthermore, implementing a human-centered quality assurance process faces organizational challenges, including resistance to change, limited resources, and difficulties in integrating user-centered methods into established workflows [6], [10], [12]. Therefore, the enduring relevance of manual testing must be critically examined to address these gaps and to ensure that digital products are not only technically compliant but also genuinely usable and accessible for all users [1], [4], [9].

3. Proposed Solution

To address the limitations of automated testing and ensure comprehensive, human-centered quality assurance in usability and accessibility evaluation, a hybrid approach that systematically integrates manual testing with automation is proposed.

3.1 Combine Automated and Manual Testing Methods:

Automated tools should be used for initial scans to quickly identify common, technical accessibility issues such as missing alt text, improper heading structures, and color contrast errors [1], [5]. However, these tools must be complemented by manual testing to uncover complex,

context-dependent barriers and usability challenges that automation cannot detect [3], [17].

3.2. Conduct Structured Manual Accessibility and Usability Testin:

Manual testing should be performed by trained accessibility experts and, where possible, by users with disabilities [7], [9]. This process involves:

- Navigating websites and applications using only a keyboard to check for logical tab order, keyboard traps, visible focus indicators, and the presence of skip navigation links [8], [12].
- Testing with screen readers to ensure content is coherent and navigable when read aloud, and that all interactive elements are accessible [6], [10].
- Assessing the usability of dynamic content, forms, and menus to verify that real-world user needs are met and that no critical tasks are blocked for users with disabilities [4], [15].

3.3 Integrate Human-Centered Design (HCD) Principles:

Embed HCD methodologies throughout the quality assurance process by:

- Engaging stakeholders, including users with disabilities, in the evaluation and feedback process to ensure that solutions address actual user needs and experiences [6], [16].
- Iteratively refining digital products based on real user feedback, observations, and usability testing outcomes, rather than relying solely on technical compliance [9], [14].
- Facilitating strong communication and collaboration among development, design, and QA teams to foster a culture of empathy and continuous improvement [2], [18].

3.4 Prioritize High-Impact User Journeys:

Focus manual testing efforts on the most frequently used pages and critical user journeys, as recommended by accessibility standards, to maximize the impact of limited resources and ensure that essential functions are accessible to all users [1], [5].

3.5 Foster Organizational Change and Training:

Promote awareness and provide training on the importance of manual testing and human-centered QA practices. Encourage cross-functional teams to adopt HCD principles and support ongoing education in accessibility and usability best practices [6], [11], [13].

4. Application across Industries

Manual testing for usability and accessibility, guided by human-centered quality assurance, is highly adaptable and valuable across diverse industries. Its application ensures that digital products and services are not only compliant with accessibility standards but also genuinely usable by all individuals, including those with disabilities. Here is how this approach can be effectively implemented in key sectors:

4.1 Healthcare:

- Manual accessibility testing is critical in healthcare platforms where patients and providers rely on digital tools for appointments, medical records, and telehealth services. Testers, including those with disabilities, use assistive technologies to ensure that interfaces are navigable, information is clearly presented, and critical functions are accessible to everyone [5], [7].
- Usability evaluations help identify barriers that could impede patient access to important health information, supporting better health outcomes and regulatory compliance [10], [12].

4.2 Finance and Fintech:

- Financial applications and online banking services require rigorous manual testing to ensure that all users, regardless of ability, can securely access and manage their accounts. Manual testers validate that forms, transaction flows, and security features are accessible via keyboard navigation and screen readers [3], [9].
- This reduces the risk of excluding users from essential financial services and helps meet legal accessibility requirements [6], [14].

4.3 E-Commerce:

- E-commerce platforms benefit from manual testing by ensuring that product searches, shopping carts, and checkout processes are accessible to users with visual, motor, or cognitive impairments [4], [5].
- Manual testers check for logical navigation, clear labeling, and compatibility with assistive devices, which directly impacts customer satisfaction and conversion rates [8], [16].

4.4 Education:

- Educational websites and learning management systems must be accessible to students with diverse needs. Manual testing verifies that course materials, assessments, and interactive tools are usable with assistive technologies and keyboard-only navigation [6], [9].
- This fosters inclusive learning environments and supports compliance with educational accessibility laws [7], [13].

4.5 Government

- Government websites and digital services must be accessible to all citizens. Manual testing ensures that essential information, forms, and service portals are barrier-free, supporting equal access to public resources [5], [12].
- This is especially important for meeting legal mandates and serving diverse populations [10], [15].

4.6 Social Media and Communication Platforms:

- Manual usability and accessibility testing help social media platforms ensure that users with disabilities can interact, share content, and participate in online communities without hindrance [4], [8].

- Testing includes verifying alternative text for images, accessible messaging features, and logical content flow [9], [16].

4.7 Automotive and Manufacturing:

- In industries like automotive, manual testing is used to evaluate the usability of digital interfaces in vehicles and manufacturing systems, ensuring that controls and displays are accessible to all users [6], [14].

- Human-centered QA helps identify ergonomic and cognitive barriers, supporting safety and operational efficiency [5], [10].

4.8 Medical Devices:

- Medical device manufacturers apply manual usability testing to ensure that device interfaces are intuitive and accessible to both healthcare professionals and patients [10], [15].
- This is crucial for regulatory approval and user safety [12], [16].

Table 1: Comparison of Manual vs. Automated Testing in Usability and Accessibility Evaluation

Issue Type	Detected by Automated Testing	Detected by Manual Testing
Missing alternative text (alt tags)	✓	✓
Poor color contrast	✓	✓
Meaningful link text	✗	✓
Confusing navigation layout	✗	✓
Inconsistent UI elements	✗	✓
Keyboard navigability	partial	✓
Dynamic content updates (ARIA live)	partial	✓
Screen reader experience	✗	✓

5. Conclusion

Manual testing remains an indispensable component of usability and accessibility evaluation, even as automated tools continue to advance and proliferate [5], [10]. While automation offers efficiency and scalability in identifying many technical issues, it cannot fully replicate the nuanced understanding, contextual awareness, and empathy that human testers bring to the quality assurance process [3], [18]. Manual testing enables the identification of subtle barriers, real-world user challenges, and context-dependent usability issues that are often invisible to automated systems [7], [12].

A human-centered approach to quality assurance, grounded in manual testing, ensures that digital products are not only compliant with established standards but are also genuinely usable and inclusive for all individuals, including those with disabilities [6], [1]. This approach bridges the gap between technical compliance and true user experience, fostering digital environments that prioritize accessibility, inclusivity, and user satisfaction [2], [16].

As industries increasingly recognize the ethical, legal, and business imperatives of accessibility and usability, the enduring relevance of manual testing becomes even more apparent [5], [14]. By systematically integrating manual testing with automation and embedding human-centered design principles across development lifecycles, organizations can deliver digital solutions that meet the diverse needs of their users and set new benchmarks for quality and inclusivity [9], [4].

References

- [1] W3C, "Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1," [Online]. Available: <https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/>.
- [2] S. L. Henry et al., "Accessibility Testing Techniques," ACM SIGACCESS, [Online]. Available: <https://www.sigaccess.org>.
- [3] J. Smith, "Manual vs. Automated Testing in Accessibility," UX Matters, 2022, [Online]. Available: <https://uxmatters.com>.
- [4] R. Patel, "Human-Centered QA in Web Applications," International Journal of Human-Computer Studies (IJHCS), 2020.
- [5] AccessibilityOz, "What Automated Testing Tools Miss," 2021, [Online]. Available: <https://www.accessibilityoz.com>.
- [6] ISO 9241-210, "Human-Centered Design for Interactive Systems," International Organization for Standardization, 2010.
- [7] WebAIM, "Screen Reader User Survey," 2023, [Online]. Available: <https://webaim.org/projects/screenreadersurvey/>.
- [8] J. Nielsen, Usability Engineering, San Francisco, CA, USA: Morgan Kaufmann, 1993.
- [9] Microsoft, "Inclusive Design Toolkit," 2021, [Online]. Available: <https://inclusive.microsoft.design>.
- [10] U.S. Food and Drug Administration, "Guidance on Human Factors Engineering," 2016, [Online]. Available: <https://www.fda.gov>.
- [11] T. Bi, X. Xia, D. Lo, J. Grundy, T. Zimmermann, and D. Ford, "Accessibility in Software Practice: A Practitioner's Perspective," arXiv, Mar. 16, 2021, [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.08778>.
- [12] M. Fan, X. Yang, T. T. Yu, V. Q. Liao, and J. Zhao, "Human-AI Collaboration for UX Evaluation: Effects of Explanation and Synchronization," arXiv, Dec. 23, 2021, [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.12387>.
- [13] R. Coppola, L. Ardito, and M. Torchiano, "Fragility of Layout-Based and Visual GUI Test Scripts: An Assessment Study on a Hybrid Mobile Application,"

- arXiv, Jul. 18, 2019, [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.08164>.
- [14] E. Alégroth, R. Feldt, and P. Kolström, "Maintenance of Automated Test Suites in Industry: An Empirical Study on Visual GUI Testing," arXiv, Feb. 3, 2016, [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.01226>.
- [15] N. Mosconi, "Manual Testing vs. Automated QA: Differences and When to Use," Devlane, Feb. 29, 2024, [Online]. Available: <https://www.devlane.com/blog/manual-testing-vs-automated-qa-differences-and-when-to-use>.
- [16] "Manual Testing vs. Automated Testing — Main Differences," CodiLime, [Online]. Available: <https://codilime.com/blog/manual-testing-vs-automated-testing/>.
- [17] "Manual Testing vs. Automation Testing: A Full Comparison," Katalon, [Online]. Available: <https://katalon.com/resources-center/blog/manual-testing-vs-automation-testing>.
- [18] S. Stemler, "Automated vs Manual Accessibility Testing," Accessible Metrics, [Online]. Available: <https://www.accessiblemetrics.com/blog/automated-vs-manual-accessibility-testing/>.
- [19] "Manual vs Automated Accessibility Testing," Aspiritech, Jun. 22, 2023, [Online]. Available: <https://aspiritech.org/featured/manual-vs-automated-testing/>.
- [20] "Manual Testing vs Automation Testing - Key Differences," Simplilearn, [Online]. Available: <https://www.simplilearn.com/manual-and-automation-testing-differences-article>.

Author Profile

With over 15 years of comprehensive experience in software development, quality engineering, agile delivery, and project leadership, I specialize in driving end-to-end quality and efficiency across enterprise technology landscapes. Currently serving as a QE Lead at Apple, I lead cross-functional testing and automation teams to ensure the delivery of reliable, customer-centric products across diverse platforms such as AppleCare for Enterprise, Secure Messaging, and Digital Legacy. My domain expertise spans cards and payments, capital markets, and customer service systems. I bring a strong foundation in SDLC/STLC, test automation, process improvement, and agile project management. Certified as a Project Management Professional (PMP) and Professional Scrum Master, I have a proven track record of successfully managing QA teams, enhancing test efficiency by up to 70%, and implementing automation frameworks that drastically reduce manual testing efforts. In previous roles with State Street Corporation and American Express, I led initiatives in Agile transformation, test strategy development, and system validation for high-impact financial and investment applications. I am passionate about bridging the gap between business and technology, mentoring teams, and exploring emerging technologies such as Generative AI to further enhance project delivery and innovation.

Specializations: Quality Engineering, Test Automation, Agile & Scrum Leadership, Project Management, Cards & Payments, Capital Markets, Customer Systems, Mainframe Testing, Generative AI in Project Management

Certifications:

- Project Management Professional (PMP) – PMI
- Professional Scrum Master I – Scrum.org
- Scrum Master & Product Owner – International Scrum Institute

Volume 14 Issue 5, May 2025

Fully Refereed | Open Access | Double Blind Peer Reviewed Journal

www.ijsr.net