

Round 2 Usability Testing Report

Quizwizz

Web Design Technology and Methodology 2025

Date of the testing: December 10, 2025

App URL: <https://quiz.byboyserver.xyz/>

Goals

The goal of this specific testing round was to evaluate the performance of the quiz creation feature in the QuizWizz application, focusing on the process of creating new quizzes, adding different types of questions (multiple-choice and fill-in-the-blank), and handling explanations. We tested efficiency (time and steps required), ease of learning (how quickly users understood the interface), user satisfaction (overall experience and intuitiveness), frequency of user errors or misunderstandings, and memorability (whether the process felt memorable and repeatable for future use). At the end, we gathered suggestions for improvements or additions to enhance the feature.

Testing was conducted on-site, with users encouraged to think aloud. Scenarios were tailored to personas, emphasizing real-world motivations like preparing quick reviews for students or self-testing for exams. We ensured the prototype was stable, with pre-populated elements for quiz icons and tags.

Tester 1: Adriana

Video: <https://youtu.be/2ibhmbDsrJs>

Background

The tester is a high school economics teacher, aged 45–55, with over 20 years of experience in education. She has moderate tech skills—comfortable with desktops and basic apps but prefers simple, intuitive interfaces without complex features. She has used quiz tools like Kahoot occasionally for classroom activities. Her background aligns closely with the Gulnara persona: a dedicated educator focused on efficient lesson prep, sharing materials with students, and ensuring meaningful practice.

Scenario and Tasks

The tester was given a scenario matching Gulnara: As an economics teacher, prepare a short quiz for students to review material quickly, with explanations after each question for learning purposes. Tasks included creating a new quiz ("Ekonomía"), adding a multiple-choice question with multiple correct answers and an explanation, adding a fill-in-the-blank question with gaps and an explanation, saving the quiz, and testing it.

Observations

- **Efficiency:** The process took about 10–14 minutes, which she found reasonable but noted minor delays due to language barriers (English labels). She navigated creation smoothly overall, with only 2–3 extra steps for backtracking.
- **Ease of Learning:** She reacted confidently to instructions, quickly finding the "+" button to create a quiz and filling in details (name, author, icon) without issues. Tags were unfamiliar but added easily. For the fill-in-the-blank question, she initially didn't intuit the location (suggested adding English/Slovak labels). She navigated text gaps well but had a brief error in marking correct answers—realized it retrospectively when unable to proceed. Pressed "Finish" prematurely and couldn't return, causing frustration (1 error). Multiple-choice was straightforward; she marked correct answers and understood the optional explanation field.
- **User Satisfaction:** Overall positive; she appreciated the structure and clarity once oriented. Testing the quiz was seamless—she tried wrong answers, understood feedback, and reached the summary (though initially unsure if it was the results screen).
- **Frequency of Errors/Misunderstandings:** 2 errors (premature finish without back option; initial correct answer marking). 1 misunderstanding (tag purpose, but resolved quickly).
- **Memorability:** immeasurable

Post-Testing Interview

- Noticed the explanation field automatically but suggested auto-populating it for wrong answers.

- Adding options to text gaps was understandable and functional.
- Creation wasn't too lengthy, but English terms and potential misclicks (e.g., extra letters) were annoying; wanted automatic explanations.
- Hardest step: Determining correct answers in fill-in-the-blank.
- Overall: Intuitive, but not much fun.
- Change/Add: More fun, colorful environment for students (e.g., themes or gamification).
- Would Use: Yes, regularly for student homework—saves time compared to manual docs.
- Notes: Add Slovak support for broader accessibility, used/requested explanation