Group 11:

The website looks good and well made at a first look, apart from some minor grammatical errors. Although, this is to be expected since English isn’t their mother tongue.

Dividing the test into two parts was neatly done. I like the idea, but as of now, there are some issues with this approach. Firstly, this was a bit messy being how I could write on both “parts” simultaneously. Ideally, the second part would only be accessible once the first part was completed. When I first pressed the button to transfer me to the test, it showed two boxes. The first contained some info, so I filled in the second box. This was however not part of the “first part”. It would be better if both parts were designed equally in a similar manner to minimize confusion. Both parts also require the user to input their emails twice, which gives me the feeling that the test is somewhat poorly optimized.

Some of the questions and answers had poor wording and incorrect grammar. Proofreading the questions an extra time would have caught such mistakes. It is also possible to choose multiple answers to questions where this shouldn’t be possible.

The motivation for the different “categories” and “Definition of Competence”, as they refer to them, are well made and contain references to back up their claims. Subcategories have also been motivated through reasoning in these categories. This is good because it allows the person taking the test to understand exactly what you’re testing, and why exactly you are asking the questions you’re asking. However, I would like the references to be presented better than simply posting all links in a list. I am also content with how they provided a description of the assessment as well as explained how the grading is to be performed.

Generally, the questions were well planned. However, there were instances where specific questions didn’t really make much sense considering the given demographic of leaders. For one I don’t see the connection between knowing whether the five largest companies in the US are platform businesses, and how that would affect my ability as a leader. Additionally, some questions were confusing and hard to understand.

Group 17:

The landing page video was very well made. Although, the tool contains some grammatical errors or other simple errors, a lot of which could be found if they would have looked through the text carefully. The same is true regarding some layout.

The motivations in this test for the different pillars (leadership and people, exponential technologies, etc) were very well made, and gave the reader insight into their so called “dimensions”. This also helped give an understanding as to why specific questions were asked.

I liked the instructional part of this test a lot. They defined who the test was for, the structure, instructions, and how to interpret the results in a nice, tangible way. This test differs from group 11 since this one had more questions where the respondent was to assess themselves on a scale, while group 11 only had questions where you had to choose the right alternative. These questions were not at all present in group 17. They instead structured their questions in a way so that the “worst” answer was to the left, and the “best” answer was furthest to the right.

Regarding the content of the questions, every question had a clear purpose. I never felt that a question was pointless. In fact, they were all cleverly thought out and combined worked well to assess different areas regarding each subject and showed good understanding of course concepts. Like group 11, users can choose multiple answers to questions when this isn’t be possible.

The results page was very well made, and graphically outlined your results compared to your own estimates of your abilities from the start of the test. I liked this especially because it allowed me to see if I in fact was as good at a particular subject as I believed. The results were also presented in a text format, which explained your results and how you’re expected to act given your answers. This was both a fun and informative way of presenting data which I liked a lot.

In summary, both groups had areas that were well made, and others that could have been improved on. For group 17, these are less severe and more related to layout, while group 11 has more problems related to their questions as well as layout.