

Round 1 Usability Testing Report

Quizwizz

Web Design Technology and Methodology 2025

Date of the testing: Nov 12, 2025

Author of this report: Alex Juráška

Goals

The goal of this specific testing was to try out the performance of the most core feature of the QuizWizz application, that being the completing the quizzes themselves. We specifically tested the ability to find a quiz based on a topic and subsequently complete it. Focus was placed the efficiency and ease of learning of the application, as well as user satisfaction. We also checked the frequency of user error or misunderstandings while performing the scenario. At the end we also checked whether the application is in any way memorable for the tester and asked which aspect they would improve or add.

Tester

Video(close-up): <https://youtu.be/lxe3EJcqS8>

Video: <https://youtu.be/87Ac1ySJYvE>

Matej is a first-year master's student in an education degree with a dual specialization in History and English language. He also has some experience tutoring other students. He has little in the way of a comprehensive IT background, however as a young person he has been in contact with general modern day internet technology, whether it be on mobile or desktop devices. From an education technology standpoint, the tester mentioned that he has had no contact with self-study applications, but from his university degree he has knowledge of ways to add interactive aspects into his lessons, to increase the attention and ease of study for his future pupils.

From the specification, Matej most closely matches the persona Gulnara – as he is a future teacher with some experience in tutoring, which lends him some perspective on what works and what doesn't while teaching. He also sees into the problem from the student perspective, as a current student himself.

Testing session

Scenario and tasks given to the tester:

1. Study for a history test: take an existing Slovak history quiz and, if any questions are answered incorrectly, create and complete a new quiz focusing only on the incorrectly answered questions.
2. Find a quiz about coffee, this quiz did not have to be completed.

Roles:

- Moderator: Klára Suchá (guided the session and interacted with the tester)
- Scenario author: Tomáš Magula (prepared the testing scenario)
- Note-taker: Štefan Beluško
- Report compilation: Štefan Beluško and Alex Juráška
- Technical support: Alex Juráška (ensured the prototype and testing environment ran correctly).
- Editing of footage: Egor Zvonov

Session summary and observations:

- Matej managed to find the wanted quiz “History of Slovakia” very quickly by scrolling down the introduction page, he then clicked on the quiz to open it
- In the page it opened he noticed that it said there were 4 questions and pressed “Start”
- He struggled to answer the first question, his first choice proved to be incorrect
 - As nothing was shown except for his chosen answer being colored red, he realized he had another try to answer the question, subsequently choosing correctly and being moved to the second question
- He also struggled with the second question, getting the answer wrong 3 times and correctly on the fourth
- The third question he got on the second try and the last one on first try
- After completing the test, he was shown his score, and as he was supposed to clicked on the correct button to retry the failed questions
- On the second attempt of the quiz, he got one answer wrong and two correctly, after which he retried again and got the last answer correct, completing 100% of the questions
- After this he clicked the “Home” button to go to the introduction screen, and scrolled down to manually find the quiz about coffee

Non-verbal cues: Tester showed some frustration on not answering the questions correctly, but other than that seem at ease with using the app

Evaluation

1. Learnability

- Positive: Matej grasped the basic actions of the application (select quiz, answer multiple-choice questions) immediately.
- Neutral: He did not use/seem to notice the search option while searching for a specific quiz, however that is not necessarily a bad thing, as he found his intended quiz anyway
- Negative: He felt that it would be better if some message popped up when he answered wrong, as had a moment of hesitation whether the app would go on to another question or if he had to answer again

2. Efficiency of use

- Positive: Searching for quizzes was mostly efficient, however his manual searching for them would be more time consuming had there been more options. The starting and completing of a quiz was efficient (minimal clicks needed).
- Negative: The process of having to repeatedly choose from the answers was a bit long for him, he felt it would be better if when the incorrect answer was chosen a popup would show telling him to try again

3. Memorability

- After a short exploration period of the application, the tester could do the assigned tasks without hesitation or assistance

4. Errors

- The tester did not identify any specific error with the current function of the application, more so recommended what could be done for better usability
- No application errors were observed, the prototype itself worked as intended

5. Satisfaction

- Matej generally expressed satisfaction with the application, but had some recommendations on how it could be better from a learning and attention standpoint
 - He thought the colour scheme would benefit from having more “playful” colors
 - He suggested that the quizzes on the introduction page could have some icons to make their subject easier to identify
 - Different formats of questions (Ability to add images, fill in the gap in text, choose the incorrect option, chains of question where a question continues the idea from a previous question)

Conclusions

Takeaways:

- The core functionality of the application (that being the tests themselves and the ability to retake them) works well
- For a general, less experienced user, more information could be added to make the quiz finding and taking process more intuitive, a main problem is the functionality of being able to try again instantly when picking an incorrect answer
- From a learning standpoint, more types of questions could be added for the application to be less monotonous

Recommended changes

1. Tell the user he can retry the question again if he failed it on first try, not just make the answer red
2. Change the colour scheme to something lighter and more playful
3. Add icons for every quiz signifying what's it's about (still keep the tags)
4. Add more options for the questions (Add images, fill in blanks in text)

Round 1 Usability Testing Report

Quizwizz

Web Design Technology and Methodology 2025

Date of the testing: Nov 12, 2025

Author of this report: Štefan Beluško

Goals

The goal of this round of usability testing was to verify how well the app supports a student who wants to learn quickly and focus on weak items. The tester was asked to:

- complete a chemistry quiz,
- if any questions were answered incorrectly, immediately start a focused review quiz composed only of the incorrect items,
- then use the search function to find an existing quiz about coffee.

We evaluated the following usability aspects: Learnability, Efficiency of use, Error prevention and recovery, Memorability, and Satisfaction.

Tester

Tester: Angelika

Video(close-up): <https://youtu.be/WFAFh9pV6Fk>

Video: <https://youtu.be/cA0utpL17k8>

Background: Angelika is a student and a regular user of memorisation/flashcard apps (Quizlet), which she uses for studying vocabulary and image-based learning. She has prior experience preparing for multiple-choice tests and using spaced-recall/flashcard workflows.

Persona fit: Angelika aligns well with our target student persona — she is moderately experienced with study apps, goal-oriented, and comfortable with basic UI conventions.

Testing session

Scenario and tasks given to the tester:

1. Study for a chemistry test: take an existing chemistry quiz and, if any questions are answered incorrectly, create and complete a new focused quiz made only from those incorrect answers.
2. Find and take a quiz about coffee using the search bar.

Roles:

- Moderator: Klára Suchá (guided the session and interacted with the tester)
- Scenario author: Tomáš Magula (prepared the testing scenario)
- Note-taker: Štefan Beluško
- Report compilation: Štefan Beluško and Alex Juráška
- Technical support: Alex Juráška (ensured the prototype and testing environment ran correctly).
- Editing of footage: Egor Zvonov

Session summary and observations:

- Angelika quickly located the chemistry quiz and started the quiz without help.
- The quiz contained only four questions, and she answered roughly half of them correctly; the questions and answer choices were displayed clearly.
- When she answered a question incorrectly she was uncertain what to do next: she clicked a button labelled "Quit" expecting to continue, but it returned her to the quiz start screen. She then restarted the quiz on her own, which added confusion and broke the task flow. After some exploration she understood the intended behavior: when she selects an incorrect answer, she must simply try again until she selects the correct one.
- After noticing the "Retry failed questions" option, she quickly created a new quiz from her incorrect answers and immediately started practicing those items.
- She successfully completed the "Retry failed questions" session on the second attempt and appreciated seeing 100% at the end of that focused practice.
- For the coffee quiz task she used the search bar, found a suitable quiz quickly.

Non-verbal cues: hesitation and brief pauses when feedback after an incorrect answer was ambiguous; slight frustration when the quiz session restarted unexpectedly.

Evaluation

We evaluate the session in terms of the five usability aspects (Learnability, Efficiency, Memorability, Errors, Satisfaction).

1. Learnability
 - Positive: Angelika grasped basic actions (search, select quiz, answer multiple-choice questions) immediately.
 - Negative: She initially misunderstood the behavior associated with the control shown after an incorrect answer. The label/affordance for continuing vs quitting was unclear and led to an incorrect action (pressing "Quit"). This required additional exploration to learn the correct sequence.
2. Efficiency of use
 - Positive: Searching for quizzes and beginning a quiz was efficient (minimal clicks).
 - Negative: The flow for recovering from incorrect answers added steps and inefficiency: the tester had to repeat the quiz or restart after pressing the wrong

control. The need to click multiple times until the correct answer was discovered felt slower than expected. There is opportunity to reduce clicks and simplify the review/retry path.

3. Memorability

- After the first more explorative attempt the tester was able to repeatedly perform tasks without hesitation, for example test completion, creating a test from failed questions as well as searching for quizzes

4. Errors (usability-related)

- The user didn't seem to encounter any parts of the application that did not work or were non-understandable to him
- No application errors were observed, application itself worked as intended

5. Satisfaction

- Angelika expressed satisfaction when she completed the focused review and saw a 100% result.
- She liked the homepage layout and the presentation of recent tests.
- She suggested enhancements (see below) that would increase her confidence and perceived usefulness.

Additional qualitative observations

- Expectations: Angelika expected clearer feedback after incorrect answers.
- Missing information: There was no clear, immediate feedback message when an answer was incorrect that explained the next available actions (try again, review wrong items, quit). This gap caused hesitation and extra clicks.

Conclusions

Takeaways:

- The core functionality is present and works for an experienced user, but a few affordances and feedback elements reduce learnability and efficiency for first-time users.
- The most critical usability problem is unclear feedback and action labeling after an incorrect answer (causing the tester to press a control that quit the quiz). This harms efficiency and increases error risk.

Recommended changes (specific, testable):

1. Clarify post-answer feedback and available actions
 - Keep the "Quit" label as it is, but add a clear feedback message after an incorrect answer (e.g., "Incorrect — try again") so the user understands they should select another option instead of quitting.
2. Reduce unnecessary restarts and clicks

- Require a confirmation dialog when the user presses “Quit,” including a clear message that the quiz will be ended. This prevents accidental restarts and makes the consequence of quitting explicit.
 - Keep “Quit” as a secondary action, but ensure the confirmation explains what will happen and offers a safe option to cancel.
3. Support common study affordances
- Add an optional flashcard view and the ability to attach images to cards (user asked for image-based learning).
4. Minor UX improvements
- Make the incorrect-answer feedback more visually noticeable (e.g., slight color change or clearer highlight).
 - Ensure the post-error action button stands out so the user immediately sees how to continue.

Next steps

- Implement clearer feedback for incorrect answers and add a visible progress indicator to reduce hesitation and improve user confidence.
- Add a confirmation dialog for quitting a quiz to prevent accidental restarts.
- Improve the visibility of the “Retry failed questions” option so users can more easily start focused practice.

Requirements coverage

- Tested goals: task flow for completing a quiz, recovery from incorrect answers, and search/discovery functionality — all successfully tested.
- Usability aspects (Learnability, Efficiency, Memorability, Errors, Satisfaction): evaluated in detail, with concrete improvement recommendations documented.