Questions Report:

A1	
	Only a minority of candidates were able to correctly identify if the questions were appropriate but most candidates explained their rationale as to why they would lead to user responses that are not true or helpful. Candidates who scored poorly on part a) were, along with candidates who answered the previous section well, able to discuss and justify their choice of user testing environment for part b). All candidates scored well on part b of this question and correctly identified the work environment as the best choice.
A2	
	All candidates correctly identified that the error message was not appropriate. Responses varied in the level of detail provided for the justification. Some candidates did not mention the need for the error message to be noticeable and highly visible, however, in general candidates mentioned the need to provide clear instructions and provided clear and detailed examples for password format requirements. Candidates scored well part b), particularly the details of Fitt's law, but some answers lacked sufficient detail on how it could be applied to interaction design to score all the marks. The best answers provided an example such as the layout of digital displays for a touchscreen interface. Part c) was poorly answered by most candidates, with some responses identifying only one or two aspects and others discussing aspects that were not relevant. Candidates who covered three aspects and provided more detail on why they need to be considered in user interface design scored better marks.
A3	
	A minority of candidates correctly identified the main cognitive aspects that need to be considered when designing interactive products. The better candidate responses identified a good range of aspects and explained why they were relevant with some detail. Candidates would have scored higher if they had identified relevant cognitive aspects and their design implication. For part b) most candidates were able to describe the System Usability Scale in detail and explain how it is used to obtain feedback from users. Most candidates also mentioned Likert scale. Marks would have been higher for most candidates if they had mentioned the validity and reliability and other advantages of SUS. Almost all candidates scored well on part c) of the question, with all those who attempted it being able to identify three envisioning techniques and discuss their use in identifying requirements.
B4	
	The quality of answers for this question varied widely.

	For part a), the better candidates addressed the question specifically in terms of the advantages and disadvantages of low and high-fidelity prototypes. Candidates who did less well only listed features rather than pros and cons and so lost the opportunity to earn marks. Most candidates were repetitious in their answers and so could not achieve marks for the duplication of information. Even where candidates did list advantages and disadvantages, they could have picked up additional marks by providing a broader range of examples. For part b) many candidates struggled to go beyond identifying and defining elicitation techniques such as interviews and observation. Candidates generally did not go on to provide valid descriptions of how they would then use such techniques to understand the tasks, goals and relationship between the two in the context of the scenario provided in the question. Some candidates completely misunderstood the question recounting PACT or WCAG.
B5	
	This question was not answered to a good standard. Candidates were unable to provide valid examples of how the form would be evaluated against each usability heuristic, and in some cases no examples were provided at all, resulting in candidates achieving very few marks. Some candidates repeated or rephrased the heuristic principles in multiple ways, without addressing the question itself, thereby not scoring any marks.
B6	
	Few candidates opted to answer this question and those who did could not achieve high marks. Answers to part a) did not focus on a range of reasons as to why web standards are important, instead emphasising only accessibility, thereby losing out on marks for a broader set of reasons. In relation to part b), candidates struggled to understand this question, resulting in very low marks. Rather than addressing the safety aspect, responses revolved around protecting data privacy, and password error processes. Part c) answers also demonstrated that candidates did not understand the question. Responses addressed the meaning of "evaluation" as a standalone concept, rather than "bias" in the context of evaluation. Candidates were therefore unable to achieve good marks.