The paper surveyed consensuses and contradictions on scope and definition of UX and pointed out future works to be done to reach an accurate definition. Of course, respondents do share ideas in common, like UX shall be dynamic, context-dependent, and varies among every individual user, at least among different social groups, yet obstacles remain obviously on the path to the final definition. First, opinions are varied in many aspects, especially when coming to picking preferred given definitions and giving reasons for their choices. In the first step, Academics will consider user’s degree of gratification, meaning of the product and resulting emotion, whilst many practitioners focus on to what extent the product meet customers’ needs and what value can it deliver to them. The second one is probably more pragmatic, as it focuses directly on how to attract potential costumers thus make profit. In the second step, comments form an even more colorful spectrum of contents, reflecting diverse thoughts on UX definition. Second, a reluctance on reaching a standard definition grows with level of expertise. This may have some connection with the phenomena that ‘country of residence’ leads to different preferences on statement agreements and the definition choice, another possible reason given by survey conductors is that an explicit definition is probably more necessary for communication among UX starters rather than experts. UX is still a newborn field of study grounded on UCD and several topics need to be clarified. Since ISO definition is already close to what people agree on, perhaps we can stick to that for some time and wait for future UX-related successes in industry to tell us how to progress.