

# BCS Higher Education Qualification

## Diploma

April 2025

### EXAMINERS' REPORT

#### User Experience

#### Questions Report:

<b>A1</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Candidates provided varying levels of responses. The better answers addressed the question directly by providing an example and using this to demonstrate the Gestalt principle of proximity. Some candidates lost marks because the principle was not understood sufficiently well and therefore examples provided were vague.</li><li>b. This question was answered reasonably well by a small minority of candidates who provided distinct examples of considerations relating to cross-cultural UI interfaces. Most candidates did not appear to have sufficient understanding of design and ethical issues to provide meaningful examples and as a result achieved low marks.</li><li>c. A minority of candidates answered this question well and scored good marks as they focussed on justifying the use of both personas and scenarios. Most candidates misunderstood the question and provided definitions of these techniques rather than justifications. Even where justifications were provided, they were extremely brief or repetitive, resulting in candidates not achieving a higher level of marks.</li></ul>
<b>A2</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. A small number of candidates gave good examples of how AI might improve UX, although there could have been more focus on the improvements from an end user point of view rather than the benefits to an organisation. Most candidates lost out on the opportunity to score better marks as they did not offer meaningful real-world examples, focussed on the benefits of AI at a generic level, or gave duplicate examples. There was overall a lack of knowledge relating to the trends in interactive systems.</li><li>b. Many candidates appeared not to have sufficient knowledge of the fundamentals of evaluation, which meant that they struggled to justify why and when it is used. For example, candidates focussed instead on techniques used during design, such as interviews. A minority of candidates did provide some brief outline of why and when evaluation is used but could not justify its use overall.</li><li>c. This question was generally not answered well as candidates did not appear to understand the differences between heuristic evaluation and user testing in sufficient depth to provide meaningful responses. Many</li></ul>

	answers were generic and high-level or provided short definitions without addressing the key differences.
<b>A3</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Most candidates confirmed whether they would use a low-fidelity or high-fidelity prototype but then did not justify their answers in sufficient detail or repeated the same justifications in multiple ways which meant that higher marks could not be obtained. Candidates appeared to lack familiarity with the two types of prototypes, which hampered their ability to provide justifications.</li> <li>b. Higher-scoring candidates addressed the question by setting out how they would assess different interfaces, although they missed out on additional marks by only focussing on a narrow range of assessment factors. Some candidates scored few marks because they described the assessment process in generic terms (such as conducting user research or prototyping) but not set out how they would assess different interfaces to determine which one was appropriate.</li> <li>c. This question was answered to a reasonable level with most candidates setting out the constituent elements of the PACT framework. Candidates could have scored additional marks by providing more specific and detailed descriptions of the PACT framework elements.</li> </ul>
<b>B4</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Some candidates scored reasonably well in defining Fitt's law and setting out how it is used. However, overall, definitions were not as detailed as they could have been and covered a narrow range of information as to how Fitt's law is used in practice, which meant that candidates lost out on the opportunity to obtain additional marks.</li> <li>b. Candidates who scored highly were able to provide a range of distinct reasons as to why Web standards are important. Other candidates provided reasons that were vague or repeated the same information multiple times, resulting in lost marks.</li> <li>c. Candidates generally struggled with defining SUS, how it is measured and its benefits, indicating a lack of knowledge relating to usability principles which impacted the ability to address the question and obtain good marks.</li> <li>d. Almost all candidates who answered this question struggled to demonstrate a fundamental understanding of the term "ecological validity" and hence could not specify its relevance during system evaluation.</li> </ul>
<b>B5</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. This question demonstrated that candidates did not have a clear understanding of the difference between formative and summative evaluation and did not proceed to justify which one was most appropriate in the scenario. One candidate misunderstood the question and provided only high-level definitions of the two types of evaluation, without determining and justifying which one should be used.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. A minority of candidates addressed the question well by focussing on where the evaluation would take place and proceeded to justify their choices. However, candidates largely misunderstood the question, outlining how they would carry out an evaluation as opposed to where.</li> <li>c. This question was not approached well by candidates as the responses revolved around narrow aspects of functionality rather than a broader range of evaluation aspects relating to the app.</li> </ul>
<b>B6</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Candidates did not avail of the opportunity to score well on this question. Responses were not specific in relation to typical considerations relevant to interface design in a cross-cultural setting. One candidate misunderstood the question and outlined the benefits of AI usage, which resulted in low marks being achieved.</li> <li>b. In relation to this question, responses demonstrated a lack of understanding of the UX walkthrough process, how it operates in practice, and when it is best used. Several candidates did not provide meaningful justifications for their decision as to whether a UX walkthrough should be used for the entire website, and some candidates did not answer the question at all.</li> <li>c. Overall, candidates provided poor responses to this question, demonstrating a lack of familiarity with walkthroughs and heuristic evaluation, making it difficult for them to appraise the differences.</li> </ul>