

Examiner Report	
Qualification Name	Higher Education Qualification
Qualification Level	Diploma
Date/ Series	April 2026
Module	Systems Analysis & Design
Question no.	comments
A1	A1 - Use Case Analysis This was a popular question. Quite well-answered by some candidates. A1(a) – Identifying Actors Candidates often confused actors with use cases or system components. For example, they identify "Repair Job" or "Inventory System" as actors rather than external entities interacting with the system. Some candidates also failed to explain the actor's role in the business context, simply listing names without describing how the customer, supplier or proprietor interacts with the proposed system. A1(b) – Identifying Use Cases A common weakness is that candidates describe business functions too broadly, such as "Manage System" or "Repair Computers", rather than identifying specific use cases. Some also forgot to identify the primary actor for each use case or provide only a title without explaining the sequence of activities involved. Some simply repeat information from the case study without translating it into proper use case descriptions.
Question no.	comments
A2	A2 – Systems Development Life Cycle (SDLC) A popular question generally well-answered but with some candidates providing textbook definitions of SDLC stages without applying them to the CompuFix scenario. Another common mistake was failing to distinguish between the activities carried out during each phase and the deliverables produced. For example, candidates often confuse requirements specifications with design documents or describe testing activities under implementation. Answers that remain generic and do not refer specifically to repair jobs, inventory control or invoicing typically lost marks.

Question no.	comments
A3	A3 – Requirements Gathering Techniques Interviews Candidates often describe interviews in general terms but fail to explain how interviewing Bob would help uncover requirements for the repair business. Many also provide advantages and disadvantages that are too vague, such as "easy to use" or "takes time", without linking them to the CompuFix context. Questionnaires A common mistake was assuming questionnaires are always appropriate, despite CompuFix currently having only one employee. Strong answers recognised that questionnaires become more useful if additional staff are employed. Candidates also tended to overlook the limitations of questionnaires, particularly the lack of detailed follow-up and clarification. Observations Many candidates describe observation simply as "watching the user" without explaining what processes the analyst would observe or why observation may reveal requirements that interviews miss. Another common error is failing to recognise that observations capture only a snapshot of activities and may not reveal infrequent processes. Document Analysis Candidates frequently forgot to identify the actual documents that would be analysed, such as invoices, repair logs and purchase orders. Some also assumed that existing documents are always accurate and complete, overlooking the possibility of incomplete, inconsistent or disorganised records.
Question no.	comments
B4	B4 – Normalisation and ER Modelling B4(a) – Normalisation This is often one of the most difficult questions for candidates. Many can produce the final tables but cannot explain the steps from UNF to 1NF, 2NF and 3NF. Others remove attributes incorrectly because they do not understand partial and transitive dependencies. A particularly common mistake was failing to identify the many-to-many relationship between orders and parts or forgetting to create an associative relation to resolve it. B4(b) – Entity Relationship Diagram Some candidates drew entities correctly but lost marks on relationships and cardinalities. Common errors included assigning incorrect multiplicities, omitting associative entities, or failing to transfer the relations produced during normalisation into an ERD.

	Some candidates also mixed ERD notations with UML notation, producing diagrams that were difficult to interpret.
Question no.	comments
<i>B5</i>	B5 – UML Relationships and Sequence Diagrams B5(a) – Association, Aggregation/Composition and Inheritance Some candidates confused association, aggregation and composition, particularly the difference between a weak "has-a" relationship and a strong "part-of" relationship where components cannot exist independently. In the inheritance question, candidates often identified subclasses correctly but failed to explain that common attributes and behaviours are inherited from a superclass. B5(b) – Sequence Diagrams Some candidates remembered the appearance of sequence diagrams but omitted essential elements such as lifelines, messages or loops. Another error was drawing a data flow diagram or activity diagram instead of a sequence diagram. Some candidates also struggled to show the correct order of interactions between the proprietor, supplier and order objects.
Question no.	comments
<i>B6</i>	B6 – Relationships Between UML Models and State Machines B6(a) – Relationship Between UML Diagrams Candidates often treat class diagrams, sequence diagrams and state charts as independent modelling techniques rather than complementary views of the same system. Many can define each diagram separately but cannot explain how class operations generate interactions in sequence diagrams or how events and transitions lead to state changes. B6(b) – State Machines and State Charts Candidates frequently confuse states with events, labelling states as "Create Order" or "Amend Order" rather than using nouns representing the condition of an object. Another common mistake is omitting initial and final states, forgetting guard conditions, or drawing transitions that allow impossible behaviour. The restriction that an order can only be amended once was often overlooked entirely.