

## Tester 2: Adam

Video: <https://youtu.be/phd0BsQ3Shk>

### Background

The tester is a recent university graduate (aged 26–29), now in entry-level work, with a casual attitude toward studying—he avoided it during school but used apps for quick cramming. Tech-savvy, proficient with mobile devices, but no IT background. His profile matches Ján persona: he can still remember struggling with school as a student with short attention span seeking minimal-effort, mobile-friendly study tools to pass exams.

### Scenario and Tasks

The tester was given a scenario matching Ján: Back in school preparing for a Business 101 exam, create a practice quiz for self-testing. Tasks included creating a new quiz ("Biznis 101"), adding a multiple-choice question with multiple correct answers, adding a fill-in-the-blank question with gaps, saving, and testing it.

### Observations

- **Efficiency:** Completed in 8–10 minutes, praising the straightforward flow. Minor scroll issue after "Okay" (had to manually scroll up).
- **Ease of Learning:** Found "+" immediately and entered details effortlessly; liked the icon selection. Fill-in-the-blank was initially confusing (needed verbal explanation from moderator), but once understood, filled gaps and marked correct answers without issues. Multiple-choice was intuitive—added options, marked multiples. All buttons felt self-explanatory.
- **User Satisfaction:** Highly positive; appreciated simplicity and clear UI. Viewed summary easily and understood results.
- **Frequency of Errors/Misunderstandings:** 0-1 errors; 1 misunderstanding (initial fill-in-the-gap mechanics, resolved).
- **Memorability:** immeasurable

### Post-Testing Interview

- Marking multiple correct answers was clear right away.
- Fill-in-the-blank was intuitive after explanation; adding to gaps felt natural.
- Change: Fix auto-scroll after "Okay" to stay at top.
- Overall: Very intuitive, no major stuck points.
- Change/Add: Nothing major—keep the simplicity.
- Notes: First impression: User-friendly, clear design; annoying scroll but overall simple and effective, did not use the explanation(did not request fill in text)

## Common Conclusions and Feedback Processing

Both testers completed tasks with high satisfaction, indicating improved intuitiveness. Efficiency was good (under 14 minutes), with ease of learning strong after minor hurdles. Errors were low (total 3 across testers), mostly UI-related (e.g., back navigation, scrolling).

Suggestions:

- Add bilingual labels (English/Slovak) for question types.
- Enable back navigation after "Finish" for edits.
- Auto-scroll to top after confirmations.
- Automatic explanations for answers (show for correct/incorrect).
- More engaging visuals/themes for students.
- Moderator observation: reload next page, waits until snackbar hides