

**BCS Higher Education Qualification**

**Diploma**

**April 2023**

**EXAMINERS' REPORT**

**User Experience**

**Questions Report:**

<b>A1</b>	<p>For section a), answers included reference to accommodating different user needs including accessibility as well as the user interface. The best answers offered more detail and a range of examples for how the interface could accommodate user needs and a sense of control. Navigation, control, login and simplicity and empathy with users were mentioned as means of considering the principle. Candidates should have provided and discussed examples of how a user could be made to feel in control when designing a new website.</p> <p>For section b), the best answers referenced interface design and provided examples with discussion. One candidate provided examples from their own experience with detailed discussion. The poorer answers were very brief and did not relate to interface design, instead focusing on access to laboratories. Responses should have included how the user would be protected from dangerous situations or potential errors.</p> <p>For section c), the good answers included two examples with detailed descriptions. Answers that did not achieve the higher marks made general references to the impact of AI on user experience and only briefly discussed the impacts.</p>
<b>A2</b>	<p>For part a) all candidates correctly identified all the four elements of PACT. The highest scoring answers provided a more detailed explanation of each of the factors with the lowest scoring missing marks for not providing a description. More examples would have resulted in higher marks.</p> <p>For part b) the strongest answers included breadth for people, activities and technologies with a good answer providing examples. Candidates lost out on the opportunity for more marks by providing only a brief discussion of context. The better candidates applied the PACT analysis to the specific scenario (controlling access to university laboratories) and provided examples of each component. The People aspect was better described overall than Activities, Contexts and Technologies. Candidates could have scored additional marks if they had provided more specific detail around these three areas.</p>
<b>A3</b>	<p>The strongest answer outlined the mathematical formula for Fitts' law and provided good detail in the explanation of how the law is applied to user experience. The weaker response lost marks by providing a very brief explanation of Fitts' law.</p>

	<p>For part b), candidates lost marks by not explaining why it is necessary to limit the data that is collected. Candidates mentioned the ethics of collecting data unnecessarily.</p> <p>For part c), candidates provided examples but some of the discussion was brief. The question asked for a discussion of benefits related to Augmented Reality in cars/ vehicles. Candidates missed out on marks as they addressed AR in contexts other than cars.</p>
<b>B4</b>	
	<p>For part a), candidates mentioned the need to design for a global audience and differences in culture. The higher scoring answers provided examples of things that might be offensive to some cultures mentioning colours and icons and provided more detailed discussion. A few candidates did not address the question and mostly repeated that it was necessary to take cultural differences into account without explaining why.</p> <p>Answers to part b) were brief and lost out on marks by not considering different evaluation methods and particular issues of evaluation in a mobile environment suggesting that candidates had not fully interpreted the question. Good answers focussed on evaluation methods and gave a supporting rationale. A number of candidates did not score well as they outlined an insufficient number of methods, or they discussed types of testing or prototypes.</p> <p>For part c) candidates provided varied responses but all justified the approach they would take by explaining why they had chosen high fidelity or low fidelity by discussing costs and time constraints. All responses were limited in length and discussion, the rationale lacked detail or was repetitious and so candidates did not maximise their scores</p>
<b>B5</b>	
	<p>As a whole, this question was not answered well.</p> <p>Part a) was better understood by candidates, and this is where they picked up most of their marks. Answers could have been improved with an outline of all the main steps for the card sorting process rather than a generalised discussion of open and closed card sorting.</p> <p>Part b) answers indicated a lack of understanding of the “think-aloud” method. They did not include adequate explanations of the method or why it is used. This resulted in candidates not being able to pick up many marks.</p> <p>Part c) answers were insufficiently detailed in relation to an advantage and disadvantage of using metaphors. They also lacked examples.</p>
<b>B6</b>	
	<p>For Parts i) and ii), answers did not adequately explain the meaning of Heuristic Evaluation and how it is conducted in practice. Instead, there was a focus on recalling Nielsen’s 10 Usability Heuristics. In relation to Part iii), examples of disadvantages were insufficient and lacked discussion/ evaluation which resulted in lower marks.</p>