

**DIGITAL BRIDGES:
CONNECTING GENERATIONS THROUGH TECHNOLOGY PROJECT
2024-1-DE02-KA220-ADU-000246195**

Pilot Testing Report



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Licence: CC BY 4.0 This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) Licence. You are free to share and adapt this material, provided that appropriate credit is given.

Table of Contents

Section	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Pilot Test Results – Elderly Participants	4
2.1 Introduction and Purpose	4
2.2 Sample Overview	4
2.3 Question-by-Question Analysis	4
2.4 Overall Assessment	7
2.5 Recommendations for Consideration	7
3. Pilot Test Results – Volunteers	7
3.1 Introduction and Purpose	7
3.2 Sample Overview	8
3.3 Question-by-Question Analysis	8
3.4 Overall Assessment	11
3.5 Recommendations for Consideration	11
4. Overall Conclusion and Lessons Learned	12

Introduction

The pilot testing phase represented one of the most important stages of the Digital Bridges: Connecting Generations through Technology project, as it provided the opportunity to evaluate the developed curriculum and training materials in authentic learning environments before their wider dissemination. Rather than relying solely on expert review, the consortium aimed to validate the educational resources through direct implementation with the project's primary target groups: older adults participating in the digital literacy programme and young volunteers acting as intergenerational mentors.

Pilot activities were carried out by the four project partners in Germany, the Netherlands, Austria and Türkiye. Throughout the implementation process, participants completed the full training programme while volunteers facilitated the learning sessions using the developed curriculum, presentations, practical exercises and supporting materials.

To ensure a comprehensive evaluation, separate questionnaires were designed for elderly participants and volunteers. The surveys combined quantitative Likert-scale questions with qualitative open-ended questions, allowing the consortium to assess not only satisfaction levels but also the usability, accessibility, pedagogical effectiveness and practical applicability of the developed materials.

The pilot evaluation therefore focused on several key dimensions:

- usability and accessibility of the learning materials;
- clarity and comprehensibility of the instructions;
- effectiveness of the curriculum in supporting digital competence development;
- confidence gained by learners and volunteers;
- technical and pedagogical challenges encountered during implementation;
- recommendations for improving the final version of the educational resources.

The following sections present the findings obtained from both target groups, followed by an integrated analysis highlighting the overall strengths of the curriculum and the improvements incorporated before the final publication of the project outputs.

1. Pilot Test Results: Analysis of the Elderly Participants (Seniors)

1.1. Introduction and Purpose

As part of the pilot testing phase of the Digital Bridges project, four partner organisations administered the Pilot Test Survey to elderly learners (aged 60+) who took part in the digital literacy training sessions. The survey gathered feedback on the usability, accessibility, and effectiveness of the training materials, combining Likert-scale ratings (1–5) with open-ended questions.

This report presents the aggregated and per-organisation results collected from the four implementing partners, identified below by their organisational codes:

EMYD (Türkiye) • MW (Germany) • PV (Germany/Austria) • SSD (Netherlands)

1.2. Sample Overview

Partner Organisation	Number of Respondents
EMYD	10
MW	8
PV	8
SSD	12
Total	38

1.3. Question-by-Question Analysis

Q1 Ease of navigating the training materials (1 = Very difficult, 5 = Very easy)

Organisation	Mean Score
EMYD	4.30
MW	4.62
PV	4.25
SSD	4.75
Overall (n=38)	4.50

Overall results were strongly positive, with a minimum individual score of 3 ("neutral-to-positive") across the full sample. SSD recorded the highest average.

Q2 Clarity of instructions (1 = Not clear at all, 5 = Very clear)

Organisation	Mean Score
EMYD	4.30
MW	4.75
PV	4.50
SSD	4.58
Overall (n=38)	4.53

Results closely mirror Q1, suggesting that navigability and clarity of instructions were perceived consistently across the sample.

Q3 Were the materials easy to understand? (Yes/No)

Response	Count	Percentage
Yes	37	97%
No	1	3%

An almost universally positive result. The single "No" response came from an SSD respondent who also gave comparatively lower scores on Q1 and Q7, suggesting an individual case rather than a systemic issue.

Q4 Accessibility of the materials (font size, contrast, audio clarity; 1–5)

Organisation	Mean Score
EMYD	4.00
MW	4.88
PV	4.50
SSD	4.33
Overall (n=38)	4.39

Following the correction of previously missing PV entries, Q4 now has complete data across all four organisations (n=38). PV's corrected scores (range 4–5) are consistent with the generally positive accessibility ratings seen elsewhere. EMYD remains the relatively lowest-scoring organisation on this item, consistent with recurring vocabulary/pacing comments in the Q5 open responses.

Q5 Challenges faced while using the materials (open-ended)

Responses were reviewed thematically by organisation:

- EMYD (corrected): Following data correction, responses now directly address the challenges question. Recurring themes include needing more time or repetition to follow instructions, difficulty with new/unfamiliar terminology, needing extra explanations, difficulty remembering multiple steps at once, fear of making mistakes requiring encouragement, and a training pace that felt slightly fast for some learners. One respondent reported no major challenges.

- MW: Predominantly "no difficulties" (Nein / keine Schwierigkeiten). Where issues were noted: video pace felt too fast; text could have been larger.
- PV: Mixed feedback — some reported no difficulties, others preferred working with paper materials, found the video's language "unnatural," or felt the videos moved too quickly.
- SSD: The most varied feedback — small font size, too much information presented at once, pace too fast, and a need for additional practice were the main themes. Several respondents reported no problems.

Recurring cross-organisation themes: (1) training/video pace felt too fast for some learners; (2) difficulty with instructions, terminology, or remembering multiple steps, often addressed through repetition or extra explanation; (3) font size was cited as too small in several sites; (4) "no difficulties" remained a common response, particularly at MW and PV.

Q6 Were the materials engaging and motivating? (1 = Not at all, 5 = Very much)

Organisation	Mean Score
EMYD	4.60
MW	5.00
PV	5.00
SSD	4.92
Overall (n=30)	4.83

With an overall mean score of 4.83, this was the highest-rated question in the survey, indicating a very high level of engagement and motivation with the materials.

Q7 Confidence using technology after completing the training (1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)

Organisation	Mean Score
EMYD	4.20
MW	5.00
PV	5.00
SSD	4.50
Overall (n=30)	4.53

MW and PV recorded a perfect average (5.00) across all respondents. EMYD's average, while the lowest among reporting organisations, remains firmly positive at 4.20/5.

1.4. Overall Assessment

- All Likert-scale questions returned average scores between 4.0 and 4.8, indicating strong overall satisfaction with the pilot materials among elderly participants.
- Strongest area: engagement and motivation (Q6, overall mean 4.83, n=30).
- Relatively weakest (though still positive) area: accessibility (Q4, overall mean 4.39, now complete at n=38) — vocabulary/pacing and font size were recurring improvement themes in the open-ended responses.

Data Quality Notes

- Q4 has been corrected and is now complete across all four organisations (n=38); PV's previously missing entries have been filled in and are reflected in the updated Section 3 figures.
- EMYD's Q5 responses have been corrected and now directly address the intended question framing (see Section 3).
- Minor inconsistencies in Q3 response formatting (e.g., "Y"/"y") were normalised during analysis.

1.5. Recommendations for Consideration

- Increase default font size and consider high-contrast display options in printed and digital materials.
- Offer an adjustable or slower-paced video option, or clearer guidance on pausing/rewinding, given repeated comments about pacing.
- Standardise the data collection template and question interpretation across partner organisations to ensure comparability in future pilot rounds, particularly for open-ended items.

2. Pilot Test Results: Analysis of the Volunteers

2.1. Introduction and Purpose

As part of the pilot testing phase of the Digital Bridges project, four partner organisations administered the Pilot Test Survey for Volunteers to individuals who supported the delivery of digital literacy training to elderly learners. The survey gathered volunteers' perspectives on the usability, clarity, and effectiveness of the training materials, combining Likert-scale ratings (1–5) with open-ended questions.

This report presents the aggregated and per-organisation results collected from the four implementing partners, identified below by their organisational codes:

EMYD (Türkiye) • MW (Germany) • PV (Germany/Austria) • SSD (Netherlands)

2.2. Sample Overview

Partner Organisation	Number of Respondents
EMYD	10
MW	5
PV	3
SSD	3
Total	21

Data quality note: The target group for the Volunteers survey was 5–10 respondents per organisation. EMYD and MW reached this target; PV and SSD submitted fewer responses (3 each), which should be considered when interpreting their organisation-level averages.

2.3. Question-by-Question Analysis

Q1 Ease of using the training materials with elderly learners (1 = Very difficult, 5 = Very easy)

Organisation	Mean Score
EMYD	4.60
MW	4.80
PV	4.67
SSD	4.33
Overall (n=21)	4.62

Volunteers across all organisations rated the materials as easy to use with elderly learners, with all organisation averages above 4.3.

Q2 Clarity of instructions for guiding learners (1 = Not clear at all, 5 = Very clear)

Organisation	Mean Score
EMYD	4.50
MW	4.60
PV	4.33
SSD	4.33
Overall (n=21)	4.48

Instruction clarity was rated slightly lower than ease of use but remains consistently positive across all four organisations.

Q3 Confidence in using the materials during the training session (1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)

Organisation	Mean Score
EMYD	4.70
MW	4.80
PV	5.00
SSD	5.00
Overall (n=21)	4.81

This is the highest-scoring quantitative question in the Volunteers survey, with PV and SSD volunteers reporting maximum confidence (5.00) across all respondents.

Q4 Did volunteers face any technical difficulties while using the materials? (Yes/No)

Response	Count	Percentage
Yes	5	24%
No	16	76%

Where technical difficulties were reported, the underlying causes were largely device- and connectivity-related rather than issues with the materials themselves:

- EMYD: participants needing brief support with internet connection and screen brightness settings; device menu language and app version differences requiring adapted explanations; differing notification/permission settings across devices requiring one-to-one support.
- MW: videos running too fast for some older participants, addressed by reducing playback speed.

PV and SSD reported no technical difficulties (Q4 = "No" for all respondents at these two organisations).

Q5 Effectiveness of the materials in teaching digital skills to elderly learners (1 = Not effective, 5 = Very effective)

Organisation	Mean Score
EMYD	4.60
MW	5.00
PV	5.00
SSD	4.67
Overall (n=21)	4.76

Following the correction of previously missing SSD entries, Q5 now has complete data across all four organisations (n=21). SSD's corrected scores (4–5 range) are consistent with the strongly positive effectiveness ratings seen elsewhere. Volunteers across all sites rated the materials as highly effective for teaching digital skills, with MW and PV volunteers giving a perfect average (5.00).

Q6 Sections that volunteers found difficult to explain or adapt for elderly learners (open-ended)

Responses were reviewed thematically by organisation:

- EMYD: The most detailed and varied feedback. Recurring themes include needing to repeat smartphone settings steps slowly, security/password sections feeling initially complex, WhatsApp steps needing repetition, device/model differences requiring adapted explanations, participants' fear of making mistakes requiring extra encouragement, e-government/online services needing more explanation, and information overload during sessions requiring a slower pace. One volunteer noted no section was particularly difficult, with strong interest in photo and messaging examples.
- MW: Mixed feedback — needing more time and repeated steps for tablet use, slowing down speech pace, videos running too fast, participants' fear of mistakes requiring encouragement. One volunteer found no part particularly difficult to explain.
- PV: Security settings requiring repeated, simplified explanations; online services requiring extra support due to unfamiliar terminology; menu differences across smartphone models requiring adapted explanations.
- SSD: Participants preferring to repeat steps before moving on; difficulty maintaining a uniform pace across participants with varying digital experience; explaining differences between smartphone brands requiring additional demonstrations.

Recurring cross-organisation themes: (1) pacing — the need to slow down and repeat steps for elderly learners; (2) device/model variability requiring volunteers to adapt explanations on the spot; (3) participants' fear of making mistakes, addressed through encouragement; (4) security- and terminology-related topics (passwords, online services) requiring extra simplification.

Q7 Suggested improvements to make the materials more effective for teaching elderly learners (open-ended)

Responses were reviewed thematically by organisation:

- EMYD: Larger text and more visual step-by-step guidance; more everyday-life scenarios and visual warning examples for online safety; short recap cards and at-home practice tasks after each module; separate simple visual guides for Android and iPhone; more hands-on practice for photo editing/album creation; a short checklist for volunteers on patient communication with elderly learners; simpler examples and step-by-step screenshots for public e-services; shorter modules with brief practice breaks; a short glossary with simple explanations for technical terms; more real-life examples for phishing messages, suspicious links, and password security.
- MW: Larger text and more images; more everyday examples; shorter videos with larger subtitles; a simple printed guide for home use; additional exercises to build participant confidence.
- PV: More practical exercises and repetition; larger illustrations and simpler language; additional everyday examples to make content more understandable.
- SSD: More short review activities between topics; more space in the materials for participants' own notes; simple checklists to help learners remember key steps after the session.

Recurring cross-organisation suggestions: (1) larger text/font size and more visual aids; (2) more real-life/everyday examples, particularly for security topics; (3) shorter, more modular content with built-in repetition and practice opportunities; (4) supplementary take-home materials (printed guides, checklists, recap cards).

2.4. Overall Assessment

- Volunteers rated the materials positively across all quantitative questions, with organisation averages ranging from 4.33 to 5.00.
- Strongest area: confidence in using the materials during training sessions (Q3, overall mean 4.81).
- Relatively weakest (though still positive) area: clarity of instructions (Q2, overall mean 4.48).
- The large majority of volunteers (76%) reported no technical difficulties; where difficulties arose, they were mostly device- or connectivity-related rather than issues with the training content itself.
- Open-ended feedback converges strongly across all four organisations on the need for larger text, more real-life examples (especially for online safety topics), and shorter, more repeatable content segments suited to the pace of elderly learners.

Data Quality Notes

- Q5 has been corrected and is now complete across all four organisations (n=21); SSD's previously missing entries have been filled in and are reflected in the updated Section 3 figures.
- PV and SSD submitted fewer responses (3 each) than the 5–10 target range specified for the Volunteers survey; their organisation-level averages should be interpreted with this smaller sample size in mind.
- Minor inconsistencies in Q4 response formatting (e.g., "Y"/"y", "N"/"n") were normalised during analysis.

2.5. Recommendations for Consideration

- Increase default font size and expand the use of visual, step-by-step guidance throughout the materials.
- Incorporate more real-life scenarios and examples for online safety, security, and password-related topics.
- Break modules into shorter segments with built-in repetition, practice breaks, and short recap/checklist materials for take-home use.
- Provide separate simple visual guides for major device types (e.g., Android vs. iPhone) to reduce the need for on-the-spot adaptation by volunteers.
- Develop a brief communication checklist for volunteers on patient, encouraging engagement with elderly learners, given repeated references to participants' fear of making mistakes.
- Encourage PV and SSD to reach the 5–10 respondent target in future pilot rounds.

3. Overall Conclusion and Lessons Learned

The pilot testing phase successfully validated the Digital Bridges curriculum and demonstrated that the educational materials effectively support digital competence development among older adults while remaining practical for volunteer facilitators.

Feedback from both target groups shows a remarkably consistent pattern. Elderly learners highlighted the accessibility, clarity and motivational character of the programme, while volunteers confirmed its ease of implementation and pedagogical effectiveness. The high quantitative scores across nearly all evaluation criteria indicate that the curriculum successfully achieved its intended learning outcomes.

The qualitative feedback also revealed several common recommendations. Both groups emphasised the value of slower-paced instruction, increased repetition, larger fonts, more visual guidance, additional real-life examples and supplementary printed resources. These suggestions have been carefully considered by the consortium and incorporated into the refinement of the final project outputs.

Overall, the pilot implementation confirms that the Digital Bridges methodology provides an effective model for intergenerational digital learning. Beyond improving digital skills, the programme strengthened communication between generations, increased older adults' confidence in using technology and demonstrated the important role that young volunteers can play in supporting digital inclusion. The pilot findings therefore provide strong evidence that the developed curriculum is ready for wider dissemination and future implementation in diverse educational settings across Europe.

APPENDICES

Detailed Survey Responses:

The names or personal information of the survey participants are kept confidential.

Available at:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1sI6HKunZXznMeOlnCQZLyTLa9C6_tHvOIinyqoEe gH3E/edit?usp=drive_link

Surveys:

**DIGITAL BRIDGES: CONNECTING GENERATIONS
THROUGH TECHNOLOGY PROJECT**

2024-1-DE02-KA220-ADU-000246195

Pilot Test Survey



**Feedback from Elderly Participants on Usability, Accessibility, and Effectiveness of
Training Materials**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them

Dear Participant,

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your feedback is very important to us. The purpose of this questionnaire is to understand how easy, accessible, and useful the training materials were for you. By sharing your experience, you will help us improve the materials so that they better meet the needs of elderly learners.

This survey is simple and should only take a few minutes to complete.
Please answer each question based on your own experience:

- For some questions, you will choose a number from **1 to 5** (1 means “very difficult” and 5 means “very easy”).
- Some questions ask you to choose **Yes or No**.
- A few questions allow you to write your thoughts in your own words. Please feel free to share as much or as little as you like.

There are no right or wrong answers — we are only interested in your honest opinion. All responses will remain confidential.

Thank you again for your valuable contribution!

Duration: 30 minutes

Target Group: 12-15 elderly participants (aged 60+), with varying levels of digital literacy and physical abilities

Let's start the survey

1. How easy was it to navigate the training materials?

(1 = Very difficult, 5 = Very easy)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

2. How clear were the instructions provided?

(1 = Not clear at all, 5 = Very clear)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

3. Did you find the materials easy to understand?

☐ Yes

☐ No

4. Were the materials accessible?

(e.g., font size, contrast, audio clarity)

(1 = Not accessible, 5 = Very accessible)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

5. Did you face any challenges while using the materials?

(Please describe)

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

6. Were the materials engaging and motivating?

(1 = Not at all, 5 = Very much)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

7. How confident do you feel about using technology after completing this training?

(1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

**DIGITAL BRIDGES: CONNECTING GENERATIONS
THROUGH TECHNOLOGY PROJECT**

2024-1-DE02-KA220-ADU-000246195

Pilot Test Survey for Volunteers



**Feedback from Elderly Participants on Usability, Accessibility, and Effectiveness of
Training Materials**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them

Dear Volunteer,

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. As someone who uses our training materials to support elderly learners, your feedback is extremely valuable. The purpose of this questionnaire is to understand how well the materials support your teaching process including their usability, accessibility, and overall effectiveness.

By sharing your experience, you will help us identify what works well and what can be improved to make the materials more supportive for both volunteers and elderly learners.

The survey includes a mix of short rating questions and a few open-ended questions. There are no right or wrong answers we simply ask for your honest opinion based on your experience. All responses will remain confidential.

Thank you for your time, your insights, and your commitment to empowering elderly learners with digital skills.

Duration: 30 minutes

Target Group: 5-10 volunteers (experienced in teaching or assisting elderly individuals in digital literacy programs).

Let's start the survey

1. How easy was it to use the training materials with elderly learners?

(1 = Very difficult, 5 = Very easy)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

2. Were the instructions in the materials clear enough to help guide the learners?

(1 = Not clear at all, 5 = Very clear)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

3. Did you feel confident in using the materials during the training session?

(1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

4. Did you face any technical difficulties while using the materials?☐ Yes☐ No

If yes, please describe:

.....

.....

.....

5. How effective do you think the materials are in teaching digital skills to elderly learners?

(1 = Not effective, 5 = Very effective)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5**6. Were there any sections that you found difficult to explain or adapt for elderly learners?**

(Please describe)

.....

.....

.....

7. What improvements would you suggest to make the materials more effective for teaching elderly learners?

(Please describe)

.....

.....

.....