

Assessment Report

On this page

[Level 1 Digital Technologies 2019](#) ▾

Level 1 Digital Technologies 2019

Standards [91886](#) [91887](#)

Part A: Commentary

N/A

Part B: Report on standards

91886: Demonstrate understanding of human computer interaction

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described the role of the chosen interface
- correctly described and illustrated at least four heuristics from the chosen interface. This evidence may be found in other parts of the report.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- identified less than four heuristics from the chosen interface
- identified four heuristics with screenshots, but no descriptions were provided

- identified four heuristics from the chosen interface, but descriptions did not demonstrate a clear understanding
- identified four heuristics from the chosen interface, but examples were incorrect
- misunderstood one or more heuristics
- referred to interfaces other than those provided
- identified and described the same heuristic two or three times, therefore not correctly identify FOUR heuristics
- referred to website features (e.g. sign in page) rather than to a specific heuristic.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- evaluated more than four heuristics from the chosen interface
- used a scale or rating system to demonstrate how the chosen interface met or violated the heuristics and gave reasons for their decision
- may have included some of the excellence criteria, but shown weakness in other sections of the report
- provided examples with screenshots to support their evaluations of each identified heuristic
- gave more than one example of each heuristic being used
- demonstrated clear candidate voice throughout the report
- Candidates who evaluated less than four Heuristics for c, but had shown evidence of Excellence criteria in d and e, could be awarded a Merit.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- addressed all of the requirements of the Achieved and Merit grades
- compared and contrasted two different interfaces in terms of the heuristics: compared in terms of similarities and contrasted in terms of their differences, then discussed
- referred to their own work or another interface as well as one of the interfaces supplied
- used screenshots to support their understanding (must be legible)
- demonstrated clear candidate voice throughout the report.

Standard specific comments

LIVE

This standard provided clear opportunities for students to attain grades at achieved, merit and excellence, using the describe, explain and discuss model. The resource sheet enabled candidates to focus on identifying and evaluating the application the heuristics.

Most candidates described the role of their chosen interface and were able to identify and describe four heuristics.

Many candidates provided evaluations (i.e. how well their chosen interface had or had not met the usability criteria) of the interface against specific heuristics, rather than merely describing their examples in greater detail. Evaluation, however, continues to be poorly understood by some candidates. Some candidates simply repeated the answers to previous questions using different words or provided a score (e.g. 'I would give Visibility of System Status a 9/10'). This is not sufficient as it needed to be justified with examples.

Those candidates who compared their chosen interface to a second video that was provided generally did better in the comparison as they could use screenshots to illustrate their point.

A number of candidates confused the two error heuristics, error prevention and help users recognise, diagnose and recover from errors.

Teachers and candidates are advised to make themselves

91887: Demonstrate understanding of compression coding for a chosen media type

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated some understanding of how data can be represented using bits
- suggested appropriate file types and compression methods for the scenario but failed to show understanding of the comp
- used screenshots of colour palettes from Word (or similar) to support their explanation of how bits can be used to represent pixel colours in images
- could not to provide evidence to justify recommendations such as capture setting, file types and compression methods
- could not demonstrate a technical understanding of how each compression method works.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- confused compression types, for example stating that jpeg was lossless and png was lossy
- stated that RAW was a lossless compression method
- provided discussions that were too short, giving no evidence that they understood how compression works
- made incorrect decisions about appropriateness of compression types
- misunderstood what compression does, thinking it reduces file size by decreasing the file dimensions
- used hexadecimal codes to represent colours
- showed how a black and white image might be represented with explanation
- suggested a compression type for capturing sound / images / video without any justification.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- demonstrated some in-depth understanding but were not always able to communicate it clearly
- provided justifications for all decisions regarding capture and file types for output
- created and compressed their own images to demonstrate the effect of lossy compression
- wrote explanations that were not concise and sometimes contradicted themselves
- considered user perspectives and technical limitations when selecting output types for each scenario.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- demonstrated understanding of the technical complexity around compression coding
- were able to clearly communicate their justifications and reasoning for decisions
- referred to their chosen scenario in their explanations.
- used real-world examples when explaining when compression could be used

- were able to relate technical explanations to real world implications. for example: how jpg removes information from details that are unlikely to be detected by the human eye
- considered user perspectives and technical limitations when selecting output types for each scenario.

Standard specific comments

This standard allows candidates to take a deeper look at a technology they use every day. In general, they were able to explain what compression method or file type would be most appropriate for each situation, which is something they can take beyond the course.

Many candidates explained which compression method was most appropriate and when compression could be used but could not give a technical explanation of how compression method(s) worked or how they affect the media from a viewer's perspective, or even how files were represented using bits.

Teachers and candidates should be familiar with the 2020 Assessment Specifications.

[Digital Technologies subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2018 \(PDF, 87KB\)](#)