Examiner Report	
Qualification Name	Higher Education Qualification
Qualification Level	Diploma
Date/ Series	April 2024
Module	User Experience
Question no.	**comments**
A1	a) In better answers, candidates provided specific examples of relevant metaphors, however, they did not secure full marks as there was insufficient explanation of how those metaphors were relevant. Many candidates misunderstood the term "metaphor" and did not address the question, therefore losing potential marks. b) (i) Most candidates struggled with addressing this question by discussing the reasons why metaphors are often used in interfaces. Instead, candidates made statements that metaphors are used but without discussion of the "why". Many answers repeated the same information multiple times, which did not assist in achieving any additional marks. (ii) Responses from candidates were mixed, with the better answers addressing the online payment scenario, as well as discussing and justifying their answers, thereby obtaining higher marks. However, there was a considerable proportion of candidates who did not address the online payment scenario and only discussed the use of metaphors in a generic way, losing the opportunity to score better marks. c) Some candidates provided good answers to this question, demonstrating the required underlying knowledge, and therefore scoring marks at the higher end. However, there was a small proportion of candidates who misunderstood the question and described different types of interfaces, as opposed to what to consider when selecting an interface and features to include.
Question no.	**comments**

Question no.	comments
A2	a) Most responses indicated a reasonable level of understanding but there was some distraction with candidates going into significant depth around the definition of evaluation, which was not the focus of the question. Answers could have been improved by candidates by providing more detail in relation to their examples, specifically how the examples would illustrate bias, as opposed to just providing an example at a high level. b) (i) Candidates largely scored fair marks on this question, losing out on the opportunity to achieve full marks due to not addressing the question sufficiently. Several candidates walked through heuristic principles that they could recall, without specifically addressing the heuristic evaluation process overall. (ii) Most candidates answered this question correctly, with a minority incorrectly identifying whether users would be involved in heuristic evaluation or not, indicating a lack of knowledge. However, even the correct answers did not proceed to provide enough justification, resulting in lost marks. c) Responses to this question ranged from the better answers which achieved close to full marks by providing both an example and explanation that addressed the principle of Similarity. The remaining responses achieved fewer marks due to a lack of sufficient explanation in relation to the example provided, or by repeating the same high-level explanations multiple times, demonstrating lack of depth in the underlying knowledge.
Question no.	**comments**
A3	a) The majority of candidates correctly identified 3 examples of aspects they would consider when designing the website interface. Additional marks could have been achieved by discussing the examples provided rather than making brief statements. Remaining candidates named incorrect examples, making it difficult for them to achieve good marks. b) Candidates demonstrated a mixed performance on this question. There were some good answers that addressed the question directly and achieved higher marks, for example, discussing how to obtain insights, establishing who the users would be, and how they would arrive at the new digital offering. However, there were also a high proportion of candidates that did not understand or address the question, instead discussing prototypes or other aspects that were not relevant which demonstrated that

	they did not grasp some of the basic concepts of user needs and user research.
	c) Some candidates correctly identified and explained a relevant type of prototype, and therefore achieved good marks. Further explanations in answers would have achieved full marks. A few candidates did not correctly identify a relevant prototype, which led to lost marks and evidenced a lack of understanding on prototyping.
Question no.	**comments**
B4	a) This question was poorly answered with responses ranging from the definition of augmented reality (AR), features of AR, aspects such as testing and implementation, and reference to one or two investigation techniques with no consideration of the wider picture of how the problem space as a whole would be understood. Even where candidates referred to a more wide-ranging approach to understanding the problem space, answers were too brief with little explanation provided to enable high marks to be achieved.
	b) All candidates correctly identified that users should be involved. One candidate demonstrated good breadth of justification, resulting in almost full marks. All other candidates, whilst correctly identifying user involvement, did not give enough justification for their responses, and therefore could not obtain better marks overall.
	c) Answers to this question generally demonstrated lack of meaningful knowledge and understanding of human-centred design, leading to little discussion of what it means and why it is important. Some answers responded to only one part of the question, such as explaining briefly why it is important, but not discussing what it means. Most answers were very brief, with the remaining responses repeating the same information multiple times, which provided no opportunity to obtain additional marks.
Question no.	**comments**
B5	a) The better answers to this question provided some discussion that addressed what a persona represents, why it is used, and gave a meaningful example. However, a significant number of answers did not demonstrate depth of knowledge and understanding of the concept of a persona to achieve good marks, or did not provide an example, missing out on the possibility of additional marks.
	b) This was generally a poorly answered question with candidates fundamentally misunderstanding the concept of a scenario, which meant that they could not achieve many marks. Where examples of scenarios were provided, they were brief and lacked depth.

Question no.	comments
	c) This question was not answered well. Candidates struggled with the principle of providing users with a sense of control, and as a result did not explain how this could be considered when designing a website. Some answers provided very brief references to heuristic principles or Fitt's law, whilst others simply listed functionality or features in a repetitive way with no explanation.
B6	a) This question received low to mid-range marks. Some candidates misunderstood the question and provided a comparison of low and high-fidelity prototypes. Other candidates gave insufficient justification for the choice they had made. b) (i) There was a mixed range of responses, with some candidates providing valid examples of errors but without sufficient description therefore losing the opportunity to score better marks. Weaker answers did not address the specific scenario and instead described generic "page not found" or "time out" errors, for which marks could not be awarded. (ii) Responses to this question varied. Some candidates scored average to good marks with relevant examples of error recovery measures, with higher marks for meaningful descriptions of the examples. However, many candidates struggled as they appeared to misunderstand the question and referred to generic measures such as back-up servers which meant that they could not achieve marks. c) (i) A small minority of candidates were able to score average to good marks by providing relevant explanations of the Wizard of Oz technique. The vast majority of candidates either did not answer this question, or could not provide valid explanations, which meant they achieved little to no marks. (ii) The marks achieved for this question were a mirror of part (i). The minority of candidates who understood and explained the technique, were able to discuss how it might be used in the question scenario. However, most candidates did not answer the question, or provided responses that did not address the topic as they did not have the underlying knowledge of the Wizard of Oz technique to discuss how it might be applied.