

Provisional End-User Personas

Context-Aware Diagnostic Notification Effectiveness in Problem Reporting

Kyle Owen | Project Design | October 2026

Purpose and Evidence Status

These personas translate the end-user survey constructs and pilot response into design tools. The first three personas are provisional because the formal survey has not yet been administered. The fourth persona is grounded in one pilot response and is not generalized beyond that response. Separate scenario documentation describes how each persona may encounter the prototype.

Persona 1: Jordan Ellis - The Cautious Wait-and-See User

Survey-derived provisional persona

Evidence Basis

Derived from survey items addressing waiting for a problem to stop, expecting independent recovery, uncertainty about seriousness, repeated occurrences, task interruption, restarting, and possibly not reporting.

Persona Element	Evidence-Based Description
Context	Uses a computer regularly for work or school but does not treat every slowdown as a support incident.
Primary goals	Continue working, avoid unnecessary tickets, recognize when waiting is no longer reasonable, and preserve useful evidence.
Current behavior	Waits for recovery, may restart first, and may report only after recurrence or after work can no longer continue.
Reporting barriers	Uncertainty about seriousness, expectation of recovery, interruption of active work, reporting effort, and uncertainty about how to submit a ticket.
Notification needs	Plain-language condition explanation, evidence of persistence or active-task impact, explanation of why reporting now may help, and an equally visible Continue Working option.
Design implications	The notification should appear only after validated persistence and task-impact rules, avoid diagnostic certainty, and preserve the user's ability to wait.

Persona 2: Avery Chen - The Control- and Privacy-Focused User

Survey-derived provisional persona

Evidence Basis

Derived from survey items concerning diagnostic-information collection, explicit permission, dismissal, suppression, mute duration, disabling, placement, frequency, and trust.

Persona Element	Evidence-Based Description
Context	Uses computer-based tools but wants to understand what the notification detects, what information may be attached, and whether any action has already occurred.
Primary goals	Retain authority over reporting, understand the

	information involved, prevent automatic submission, and reduce unnecessary interruption.
Current behavior	Reviews the notification cautiously and may dismiss or mute it. Trust increases when the interface clearly states that no ticket is created without permission.
Reporting barriers	Unclear data collection, repeated prompts, blocking placement, insufficient explanation, automatic action, and hidden controls.
Notification needs	Explicit permission, confirmation that no report has been submitted, data-minimization language, visible dismiss and mute controls, duplicate suppression, and edge placement.
Design implications	Permission compliance is mandatory. The interface should explain the scope of simulated data and avoid requesting passwords, client information, or unrelated diagnostics.

Persona 3: Lena Foster - The Low-Effort Prompt Responder

Survey-derived provisional persona

Evidence Basis

Derived from survey items concerning reminders, condition explanations, low-effort response, notification frequency, active-task impact, reporting convenience, and decision information.

Persona Element	Evidence-Based Description
Context	Is willing to report a meaningful condition when the notification provides enough context and the reporting action is brief.
Primary goals	Receive a timely reminder, understand practical impact, complete reporting with little effort, and avoid repeated or irrelevant prompts.
Current behavior	May otherwise forget, delay, call support directly, or abandon a lengthy workflow.
Reporting barriers	Too much effort, too many steps, vague explanations, prompts unrelated to active work, and repeated pop-ups.
Notification needs	A short condition explanation, direct Helpdesk Button path, minimal required fields, clear expectations, and suppression of repeated prompts.
Design implications	The workflow should minimize unnecessary steps while still requiring explicit action and should avoid excessive technical language.

Persona 4: Raymond Cole - The Pilot-Informed Selective Non-Reporter

Persona grounded in one pilot response

Evidence Basis

The completed pilot reported computer use five or more days per week, low technical comfort, no support ticket in the previous 12 months, waiting for the problem to stop, usually not reporting, expecting recovery, finding direct support convenient, restarting first, requesting simple but detailed information, and identifying too many pop-ups as a reason to disable notifications.

Persona Element	Evidence-Based Description
Context	Uses a computer frequently but has low technical comfort

	and little recent ticket-submission experience.
Primary goals	Allow recovery without unnecessary action, obtain simple but useful information, avoid a complicated ticket process, and retain permission.
Current behavior	Waits, may restart, may use a more convenient support channel, and often does not submit a ticket.
Reporting barriers	Low confidence in ticketing, preference for waiting or restarting, inconvenience of formal submission, and notification fatigue.
Notification needs	Simple but detailed problem information, explicit permission, a low-effort reporting path, temporary suppression, and strict frequency control.
Design implications	Frequent computer use should not be treated as evidence of high technical comfort. This persona remains pilot-informed because the evidence comes from one response.

Planned Validation and Revision

After formal survey collection, each persona will be reviewed against response distributions and open-ended themes. A persona will be retained, divided, merged, or removed only when the collected evidence supports the decision. The pilot-informed persona will not be treated as a separate user segment unless similar patterns appear across additional participants.