

Examiner Report	
Qualification Name	Higher Education Qualification
Qualification Level	Diploma
Date/ Series	April 2026
Module	User Experience
Question no.	comments
A1	This question was answered by one candidate. The System Usability Scale and the design principle of flexibility and efficiency was addressed well overall, but marks were lost in relation to human-centred UX design as only a narrow range of activities were outlined.
Question no.	comments
A2	Part a) - Candidates provided advantages and disadvantages of interviews with the higher-scoring candidates offering a clearer set of reasons and some evaluation / appraisal. A number of candidates lost the opportunity to score more marks as they provided overlapping advantages / disadvantages and answers lacked sufficient appraisal. Part b) - This question was answered reasonably well, with a few candidates achieving higher marks due to providing evaluations of a range of factors. A minority of candidates only focussed on one to two differences and repeated information, without providing sufficient evaluation. Part c) - Responses indicated that candidates were aware of some of the key ethical considerations for data collection. The candidates who scored more highly were able to state a range of ethical factors, whilst others only offered limited considerations.
Question no.	comments
A3	Part a) - A minority of responses evidenced sufficient knowledge of design implications to provide a meaningful range of ways in which to accommodate the limitations of human memory. Most candidates lost marks as they offered only a very restricted selection of considerations and repeated information. One candidate misunderstood the question and described the Waterfall model. Part b) - The majority of answers achieved average to good marks in explaining Fitt's Law and how it is used. Lack of precision in explaining the concept meant that some candidates lost an

	opportunity to score more highly. Part c) - This question was answered well overall with candidates outlining techniques and explaining their chosen method. One candidate, whilst outlining three techniques, did not go on to select which one they would use and why, hence losing the chance to score additional marks.
Question no.	comments
<i>B4</i>	Part a) - This question was answered reasonably well with candidates being able to justify why evaluation takes place. In order to achieve higher marks, there could have been a more comprehensive and fuller emphasis on when it takes place. Part b) - A number of candidates did not focus on logical steps to perform a heuristic evaluation, instead going into granular detail about how UI and other aspects could be tested rather than the overall evaluation process. Candidates that obtained higher marks addressed the steps in the evaluation process itself. Most responses demonstrated an understanding about who is involved in a heuristic evaluation, with only one response indicating lack of clarity.
Question no.	comments
<i>B5</i>	Part a) - Candidates did not address this question as well as they could have as there was insufficient discussion of the options. Some answers went straight into the chosen option and provided repetitive reasons for the selection. One candidate did not address the question itself and instead described the Waterfall model, thereby losing the opportunity to score marks. Part b) - 50% of candidates who answered this question demonstrated good discussion of three valid aspects of interface design in the context of the scenario provided, hence scoring good marks. The remaining responses offered fewer than three aspects and insufficient discussion. Part c) - A minority of responses provided breadth of explanation in relation to what is meant by human-centred design and why it is important. However, most candidates were unable to achieve high marks due to only explaining one or two aspects or explaining a subset such as user experience, and little explanation for why it is important.
Question no.	comments
<i>B6</i>	Part a) - In general, this question was not answered well. Candidates either misunderstood the question and put forward too few or no valid interface considerations or went into lower-level detail such as the positioning of icons. Part b) - The majority of answers scored fairly well by directly addressing the question with two examples although additional marks could have been achieved with clearer descriptions of how the

	examples provided would lead to an improved UX. A few responses scored low marks either due to not providing any examples or repeating information about a single example. Part c) - This question was answered well by one candidate, but the remaining answers indicated a lack of understanding of the concept of ecological validity, making it difficult for candidates to score marks. Part d) - Candidates struggled to answer this question or did not provide any response and therefore could not obtain good marks. The answers provided were, in many cases, unrelated to the question. For example, one response set out information regarding the CIA Triad. Another candidate only outlined aspects relating to the Hawthorne effect without offering a wider illustration of why the results of an evaluation might be biased.
--	---