

**BCS Higher Education Qualification**

**Diploma**

October 2021

**EXAMINERS' REPORT**

**User Experience**

<b>General comments</b>
Overall, most candidates demonstrated an appropriate grasp of the subject area and generally provided reasonable depth to their exposition in the answers.

<b>Question number: 1</b>
<b>Syllabus area:</b>
<b>Total marks allocated: 25</b>
<b>Examiners' Guidance Notes</b>
This was the second most popular question.  All but one candidate agreed that UXD is more than simply applying common sense, and that user-centric design is needed, which is encouraging. However, most failed to convincingly articulate adequate argument and generally failed to use the expected UX terminology.

<b>Question number: 2</b>
<b>Syllabus area:</b>
<b>Total marks allocated: 25</b>
<b>Examiners' Guidance Notes</b>
This was the least popular question, but candidates performed well. Generally, the question was reasonably well answered giving acceptable depth to the exposition. Though, the examples given for scenarios which might benefit from a Ubicomp solution lacked variety and only 2 candidates mentioned smart applications. Marks were also lost for failing to provide the number of examples required.

<b>Question number: 3</b>
<b>Syllabus area:</b>
<b>Total marks allocated: 25</b>
<b>Examiners' Guidance Notes</b>
<p>This question was attempted by all candidates. The majority of candidates could distinguish the two fact-finding methods, but answers were mostly descriptive and those who failed provided little depth. Marks were lost mainly on failing to identify when and where either are used. Considerations for planning/conducting were less distinguished, and many candidates repeated the same considerations for both, which shows lack of insight overall.</p>

<b>Question number: 4</b>
<b>Syllabus area:</b>
<b>Total marks allocated: 25</b>
<b>Examiners' Guidance Notes</b>
<p>Generally, candidates appear to have a basic grasp of the subject area here. Most seemed to struggle to reason about tangible interaction, and many failed to identify the sufficient considerations for effective interactive UI design.</p>

<b>Question number: 5</b>
<b>Syllabus area:</b>
<b>Total marks allocated: 25</b>
<b>Examiners' Guidance Notes</b>
<p>This appears to be the most challenging question for candidates.</p> <p>Marks were lost mainly for out-of-scope answers. While candidates demonstrated good awareness of user diversity, the answers lacked sufficient depth and many seemed to reiterate the same point in different ways. The consideration for the design implications needed when designing applications for young children focused on the GUI content for the interfaces more than the salient considerations needed. Interface metaphors appeared to be mostly confused.</p>

<b>Question number: 6</b>
<b>Syllabus area:</b>
<b>Total marks allocated: 25</b>
<b>Examiners' Guidance Notes</b>
<p>All candidates clearly understood the purpose and function of wireframes and answered this part of</p>

the question well. The Gestalt principles seemed to be more challenging. Candidates demonstrated little understanding or awareness of the principles, and many ignored this part entirely. The examples given clearly show confused understanding here. Narrow answers were also given for Q6.b.