**Usability Report**

The usability of the app was tested using thinking-aloud experiments by giving three different potential users eight different tasks to solve in the app. The test subjects were a 22-year-old male mechatronics engineer, a 55-year-old housewife and a 27-year-old female student.   
Overall, the usability of the app can be rated as positive. Many of the work steps were clear and easy for the users to understand. Nevertheless, there were difficulties in using each of the eight tasks. The most noteworthy of these usability problems will now be discussed in more detail below:

Task 1 consisted of creating a request. It turned out that while it was clear that a request could be created by clicking on the "Post your request here" box, it was not clear among all test subjects that a new request could also be created by clicking on the "Plus" button. The purpose and use of the finished/unfinished subdivision also seemed unclear and rather confusing to the test subjects. Another screen subdivision (besides the Seeker and Provider division) would weaken usability immensely. Instead, one possibility would be to integrate the listing of finished/unfinished projects in the profile view. When entering keywords, two of the three test persons would like the input to be done via a checkbutton menu instead of an input field, so that more than one keyword can be entered and there is also a choice of keywords, as otherwise it is unclear which keywords are available at all. This problem also arose in other places in the app, whenever keywords have to be selected. Upon completion of Task 1, Seeker would now see a list of custom requests. However, it is unclear what list one would see as a provider - an overview of the requests for which the user has offered and agreed to help?

In Task 2, potential users were asked to search for a craftsman directly using the search function. For one user, it was unclear whether they should click on the magnifying glass icon or the plus icon to start a new search.   
The Thinking Aloud experiment showed that it would be better to create two separate input fields for location and keyword. In the current version it appears that by clicking on the crosshair icon only the current location could be selected. The fact that you are redirected to another page where you can specify the position either by using the crosshair icon or by entering text is not made clear. Two of the test persons also critically remarked that a rating function is essential in any case, but a mix of stars, comments and the writing of suitable keywords such as "very friendly" or "fair price" would be too much effort for a rating. They would prefer to give stars and write comments only.

Task 3 was to browse a profile. Feedback from a user was to change the presentation of the headbar by spatially separating the back arrow from the heading of the current page, otherwise it might seem that the back arrow would take you to the page described in the headbar.

Task 4 was to contact a craftsman. Feedback was received in experiment that the icon used for the voice messages was not necessarily indicative of this and should therefore be replaced with a unique icon. Secondly a text default such as "Type in your message here" in the input field would increase usability. At this step, where the user selects one request to send to a craftsman, it would be conceivable to introduce a button that reads "select this request" to submit the user's selection, in case one accidentally clicked on the wrong request.

In Task 5, users should familiarize themselves with the Notifications page. First, the notifications display was missing for the provider about a matching request being posted (related to their skills specified in their profile). The overall feedback from the respondents was that it would be good to have a subdivision for chats, comments and "notifications on suitable requests" in the notifications page.

In Task 6, in which the users were to use keywords to find corresponding requests, feedback was received that the presentation of the requests should be reconsidered, since the current presentation is not coherent as a whole. It would be conceivable to create two fields. In one field all requests of other users would be displayed, in the other field only the requests that match the skill information in the own profile. In addition, a filter button would be conceivable here, by which the matching requests could be filtered only according to individual keywords (e.g. only requests for "gardening" are displayed, although the user has also specified the skill "IT" in the profile).

For Task 7, which asked users to edit their own profile, feedback was given to possibly implement only one "Edit" button, rather than multiple for each section. This is because by clicking on the one "Edit" button, the entire profile could then be edited directly and would not have to be done in individual steps.

In Task 8, users were asked to look at the Exploring page. The users wondered whether only the keywords predefined in the app could be entered on the exploration page or whether any terms could be entered in the "Find some ideas" function.

Some of the usability issues raised could probably be solved through the normal "trial and error" process and "learning-by-doing," but some other problems now need to be discussed again within the team and solutions need to be found.