

In my initial post, I argued that while Gu, Tang and Xue (2023) provide a compelling theoretical foundation for improving subjective evaluation accuracy through time-lapse measurement, the practical feasibility of their approach is limited in most real-world software engineering contexts. Their study demonstrates that the halo effect—where early aesthetic impressions distort usability judgements—diminishes significantly over time, indicating that delayed evaluations produce more stable and reliable UX assessments. I initially concluded that this longitudinal perspective could enhance evaluation quality but would realistically only supplement, rather than replace, established methods such as SUS or UEQ.

Peer responses prompted me to expand and refine this position. Several colleagues raised concerns about the transferability of controlled findings to diverse or time-constrained development environments, highlighting the influence of cultural, contextual and cognitive factors in subjective reporting (Belabbes et al., 2023). Ruben further emphasised that many organisations still struggle with even *basic* usability testing, citing Hertzum (2020), and that UX practices are often constrained by organisational culture and limited maturity (Law et al., 2014). This reinforced my earlier claim that multi-session evaluation is rarely feasible under typical project constraints, echoing the triple-constraint pressures discussed in the *Managing Customer Expectations* transcript (University of Essex Online, 2025).

Reflecting on Units 5–8, my understanding has evolved towards a more integrated risk- and governance-aware view. The CUE model (Van der Linden et al., 2019) emphasises that emotional reactions arise from interactions between system features, user characteristics and social context, underscoring the need for careful expectation management when introducing more demanding evaluation techniques. Privacy considerations from Unit 4 (e.g., NIST PRAM) further highlight the governance implications of richer emotional data.

I therefore now advocate a hybrid approach: applying time-lapse evaluation selectively to emotionally sensitive or high-impact journeys, while relying on classical subjective instruments for broader usability assessments. This balances accuracy, feasibility and ethical responsibility within real-world SDLC environments.

## References

- Belabbes, M.A. et al. (2023) 'Information overload: a concept analysis', *Journal of Documentation*, 79(1), pp. 144–159.
- Gu, Q., Tang, W. and Xue, C. (2023) 'The effect of time lapse on the halo effect in the subjective evaluation of digital interfaces', in Marcus, A. and Wang, W. (eds) *Design, User Experience, and Usability*. LNCS 14032. Cham: Springer, pp. 171–183.
- Hertzum, M. (2020) 'Usability testing in software development: a survey of common practice', *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 39(1), pp. 51–63.
- Law, E.L.-C. et al. (2014) 'Understanding, scoping and defining user experience: a survey approach', *Human–Computer Interaction*, 29(3), pp. 263–287.
- Van der Linden, J. et al. (2019) 'User Experience and Social Influence: A New Perspective for UX Theory', in Marcus, A. and Wang, W. (eds) *Design, User Experience, and Usability*. LNCS 11583. Cham: Springer, pp. 98–112.