

Are Non-Experts Able to Comprehend Business Process Models - Study Insights Involving Novices and Experts

Michael Winter¹, Rüdiger Pryss², Thomas Probst³, Winfried Schlee⁴, Miles Tallon⁵, Ulrich Frick⁵, and Manfred Reichert¹

¹ Inst of Databases and Information Systems, Ulm University, Germany

² Inst of Clinical Epidemiology and Biometry, University of Würzburg, Germany

³ Dep for Psychotherapy and Biopsycho Health, Danube University Krems, Austria

⁴ Dep of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Regensburg University, Germany

⁵ Hochschule Döpfer, University of Applied Sciences, Germany

{michael.winter, manfred.reichert}@uni-ulm.de, ruediger.pryss@uni-wuerzburg.de,
thomas.probst@donau-uni.ac.at, winfried.schlee@googlemail.com,
{m.tallon, u.frick}@hs-doefer.de

Abstract. The comprehension of business process models is crucial for enterprises. Prior research has shown that children as well as adolescents perceive and interpret graphical representations in a different manner compared to grown-ups. To evaluate this, observations in the context of business process models are presented in this paper obtained from a study on *visual literacy in cultural education*. We demonstrate that adolescents without expertise in process model comprehension are able to correctly interpret business process models expressed in terms of BPMN 2.0. In a comprehensive study, $n = 205$ learners (i.e., pupils at the age of 15) needed to answer questions related to process models they were confronted with, reflecting different *levels of complexity*. In addition, process models were created with varying styles of element labels. Study results indicate that an *abstract* description (i.e., using only alphabetic letters) of process models is understood more easily compared to *concrete* or *pseudo* descriptions. As benchmark, results are compared with the ones of modeling experts ($n = 40$). Amongst others, study findings suggest using *abstract* descriptions in order to introduce novices to process modeling notations. With the obtained insights, we highlight that process models can be properly comprehended by novices.

Keywords: Business Process Model Comprehension, Visual Literacy, Cultural Education, Human-Centered Design

1 Introduction

Business process models constitute crucial artifacts for optimizing the operational efficiency of enterprises. The demand for process models of high quality, which properly capture the business processes of an enterprise, has increased during the last years [1]. To assist enterprises in meeting this demand, considerable

research has been spent on better understanding these factors that characterize process models of high quality [2,3]. However, as a prerequisite for an effective use of process models, the latter must be properly understood by individuals [4]. Concerning *process model comprehension*, an individual must parse information related to the *syntactics*, *semantics*, and *pragmatics* of a process modeling notation [5]. Prior research has shown that individuals apply different strategies for interpreting and comprehending process models [6]. In this context, it is known that children, adolescents, and grown-ups perceive their surroundings differently. As a consequence, they use varying strategies for interpreting and learning artifacts [7,8]. In certain cases, children and adolescents show an equivalent or even better performance in accomplishing cognitive tasks compared to grown-ups [9,10]. This raises the issue whether children and adolescents are also able to comprehend business process models, even though they have no previous knowledge in any process modeling notation. Following this, first, we believe that from corresponding insights we can draw conclusions fostering the comprehension of process models. Second, modeling guidelines (e.g., 7PMG [11]) towards creating better comprehensible process models might be derived. Third, BPM modeling tools can be augmented with features to foster the learning of process modeling notations and, thus, the comprehensibility of business process models.

This paper presents the results of a comprehensive study on *visual literacy in cultural education*. More specific, a representative sample ($n = 205$) of *pupils at the age of 15* from different kinds of German schools are confronted with a visual task related to process model comprehension. Particularly, the pupils have no previous knowledge on any process modeling notation. The objective of the study is to evaluate whether pupils (i.e., novices) comprehend process models correctly. Study results imply that pupils are able to comprehend process models. Further, as a benchmark, a similar study is conducted with participants having expertise in the domain of process modeling. Based on the study results, we give recommendations on how to foster process model comprehension.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 explains the study context and Section 3 the study settings. Study results, in turn, are presented, analyzed, and discussed in Section 4. Section 5 addresses related work. Finally, Section 6 summarizes the paper and gives an outlook.

2 Study Context

The presented results are obtained from a large-scale study in a project focusing on the *visual literacy in cultural education*.¹ The purpose of this project is to gain insights into how *visual literacy* can be fostered and empirically measured [12]. Thereby, visual literacy denotes a concept defining the capability to interpret, understand, and extract information presented in images [13]. Furthermore, studies have shown that the use of appropriate images foster learning processes as well as the development of learning strategies [14]. The project analyzes the

¹ https://www.dipf.de/en/research/current-projects/bkbb-visual-literacy-in-cultural-education?set_language=en

variation between motivation and perception of learners (e.g., pupils, students) about instructional quality with regard to visual literacy in cultural education. A particular emphasis is put on the effects of *cultural capital* (i.e., social assets like education) and *cultural-aesthetic practices* (e.g., religious beliefs) of learners. Cultural education will be assessed in the *European Framework of Visual Literacy (ENViL)* in a series of nationwide studies across various kinds of schools (e.g., secondary school, university) in Germany [15]. For this purpose, a mobile application was developed to assess visual literacy. In more detail, learners ① are asked to run through various *visual tasks* (e.g., Dalli-Click, Mental Rotation) and a set of questions [16]. Additional data are collected through eye tracking to reveal insights into learning processes and strategies (cf. Fig. 1).

To the aforementioned study, we contribute a visual task that deals with the comprehension of process models. In particular, the focus lies primarily on *semantics* and *syntactics* of process models expressed in *BPMN 2.0* [17,18]. With this task, we want to investigate the following objectives with respect to process model comprehension:

Objectives for Process Model Comprehension

- Can process model semantics be interpreted by learners?
- Can process model syntactics be comprehended by learners?
- Does the interpretation and comprehension of process models change when taking cultural education into account?

The study results, in turn, can be used to discover directives on how to foster process model comprehension. Moreover, the introduction of modeling notations to novices might be improved and BPM tools could be enhanced with features fostering process model comprehension. As a benchmark, we conduct a similar study with participants experienced with business process modeling ②. In detail, instead of carrying out the entire visual literacy study as for pupils, including all visual tasks and questions, in the benchmark study, participants only need to answer questions on their process modeling experience. Furthermore, they only solve the process model comprehension task. Fig. 1 summarizes the described study context of visual literacy.

3 Study Setting

In general, there are many factors that have effects on the comprehension of process models [19]. Amongst others, the size of a process model (i.e., *level of complexity*) and the quality of element labels are such factors [20,21]. The latter is relevant for the semantic description of process models, which comprises the textual as well as informational content. In practice, the use of *concrete labels* (e.g., verb-object style) is common. However, *abstract labels* (i.e., alphabetic letters) may be used, if the semantic description of a process model is not relevant, e.g., when getting into touch with process modeling notations for the first time. In the study, we introduce an additional labeling style for elements using *pseudo*




Fig. 1: Visual Literacy in Cultural Education

labels, i.e., we generate appropriate pseudowords for all nouns, derived from the concrete labeling style. The different labeling styles (i.e., *concrete*, *abstract*, and *pseudo*) are denoted as *levels of semantics* in the following. Based on these two factors (i.e., *level of complexity* and *level of semantics*), the following three research questions (RQ 1 - RQ 3) are addressed with learners pupils in the study:

RQ 1: *How do pupils (i.e., novices) perform when reading and comprehending BPMN 2.0 process models of different levels of complexity?*

RQ 2: *How do pupils (i.e., novices) perform when reading and comprehending BPMN 2.0 process models of different levels of semantics?*

RQ 3: *How do pupils (i.e., novices) perform with respect to the reading and comprehension of BPMN 2.0 process models compared to process modeling experts?*

3.1 Study Planning

Participants. Study participants form two samples. The first sample comprises *pupils at the age of 15* from different kinds of German schools. The second sample, in turn, either refers to *students* or *research associates* (i.e., process modeling experts) at Ulm University. The latter are invited separately for participating in the benchmark study. As a prerequisite for participating in the study, benchmark participants need to have a sufficient expertise level in process modeling.

Objects. The objects include three process models expressed in terms of *BPMN 2.0*. As being frequently used in practice, BPMN 2.0 suits to the context of this research. The process models are divided into three *levels of complexity* (i.e., *easy*, *medium*, and *hard*). The *easy* process model only comprises a sequence of basic elements (i.e., activities, events). With rising *level of complexity*, new elements, previously not contained in the process model, as well as specific modeling constructs (e.g., loop) are added and the total number of elements is increased. Moreover, the process models represent different scenarios the participants have experienced repeatedly in their daily lives, i.e., taking the bus home, browsing Facebook while listening to music, and writing an exam.

For each *level of complexity*, the corresponding process models reflect three *levels of semantics* (i.e., *concrete*, *abstract*, and *pseudo*). For creating the latter, we use

the multilingual pseudoword generator *Wuggy* [22]. Figs. 2 a - c illustrate the labeling styles corresponding to the three *levels of semantics*.

For each process model, four statements on its semantics are presented to the participants, who then need to answer which of the four statements are correct. More precisely, two of the four statements are true, whereas the two others are false (i.e., *two-out-of-four* combination). Thereby, no information is given to the participants about the two-out-of-four combination. The statements are used to evaluate whether or not the participants interpret the process models correctly. For collecting answers, check boxes are placed beneath each statement, i.e., participants can easily select or deselect statements (cf. Sect. 3.3). Initially, all statements are deselected.

To enable a comparability of the different process models, process modeling experts as well as novices, who do not participate in the study, are asked to rank and categorize the process models with respect to their *level of complexity* and *level of semantics*. Finally, a steady increase in the *level of complexity* is ensured by applying quality metrics for process models² [23].

Independent variables. The study comprises three independent variables, i.e., for each process model, the *level of complexity* (i.e., *easy*, *medium*, and *hard*), the *level of semantics* (i.e., *concrete*, *abstract*, and *pseudo*), and, only for the benchmark study, the *level of expertise* on process modeling of experts.

Dependent variables. Dependent variables are the *achieved score* regarding the statements and the *duration needed* for comprehending a process model.




Fig. 2: Levels of Semantics

3.2 Study Design and Procedure

Prior to the primary study, a pilot study with 17 students was performed to evaluate the used process models and statements as well as to eliminate misunderstandings and ambiguities. The pupils are told that the study contains process model comprehension tasks. In turn, the experts are informed that the study deals with process model comprehension. Both samples are asked to perform the task of the study as quickly as possible and as careful as possible.

As described in Sect. 2, there are two different procedures for pupils and experts

² Material download at: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=10DBzR1eS0Tv5hhNyf6A1ai-R39HVH6Ks>

during the execution of the study (cf. Fig. 3). Pupils ① need to work on a predefined sequence of visual tasks related to visual literacy and answer a number of questions providing personal information (e.g., age, gender) and cultural capital (cf. Sect. 2). Regarding the process model comprehension task, a corresponding description is displayed on the tablets that explains what needs to be done. In particular, the pupils are asked to read and comprehend the depicted process models, starting with the process model reflecting an *easy level of complexity*, followed by the process model with *medium level of complexity*, and the one with *hard level of complexity*. Thereby, each pupil is randomly assigned to a specific *level of semantics* (i.e., *concrete*, *abstract*, or *pseudo*) such that all elements in the three process models use the same element labeling style.

Regarding the experts ②, general study information is presented, followed by a demographic questionnaire (e.g., age, gender). A particular focus is put on questions related to the expert's present knowledge on process modeling and the number of process models he or she has analyzed and created during the last 12 months. After completing this mandatory step, experts are confronted with the same task on process model comprehension as the pupils. While the pupils have to solve and answer additional visual tasks and questions, for the experts the study ends after completing the respective comprehension task. Fig. 3 illustrates the two study designs for pupils and experts.




Fig. 3: Study Design for Pupils and Experts

3.3 Instrumentation

The study is performed using a Samsung Galaxy Tab A6. Therefore, we developed a mobile application, which serves as an instrument allowing for the planning and execution of studies in the context of visual literacy. It comprises a variety of customizable questions as well as visual tasks (e.g., Dalli-Click, Mental Rotation). Emerging study data is collected with the mobile application. Fig. 4 illustrates the user interface of the mobile application, showing the screen when performing the visual task related to process model comprehension. Finally, IBM SPSS Statistics 23 is used for all statistical analyses.




Fig. 4: User Interface of the Mobile Application

4 Data Analysis and Interpretation

A total of 268 participants are recruited for both studies, forming two samples. The first one consists of 228 learners (i.e., pupils, students) from different types of German schools. As solely pupils are considered, data sets produced by other learners are removed (i.e., 23 in total), leaving $n = 205$ data sets left for statistical analyses. The second sample, in turn, consists of students and research associates from Ulm University, stemming from various departments (e.g., Computer Science, Economics). As a prerequisite for their selection, they must have a sufficient expertise level in business process modeling. Accordingly, this sample is classified as *process modeling experts* and used as a benchmark for evaluating the results obtained from the study with pupils. Finally, the stated research questions (cf. Sect. 3.1) are investigated for $n = 205$ pupils (i.e., novices) around the age of 15 and $n = 40$ modeling experts respectively. Table 1 summarizes the sample descriptions, displaying general information (with *standard deviation (SD)*) on the total *number of participants*, their *average age*, and *gender balance*. Concerning process modeling experience, the average number of process models *analyzed* and *created* during the last 12 months is shown as well as the average *number of activities* in these process models. Regarding the novices, no such data is available (NA) as they have no experience in process modeling and process model comprehension respectively. Finally, for each *level of semantics* (i.e., *concrete*, *abstract*, and *pseudo*), its distribution is presented in Table 1.

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 presents the *mean (M)* as well as the *standard deviation (SD)* for all values obtained by novices (i.e., pupils) and experts. For each *level of complexity* (i.e., *easy*, *medium*, and *hard*) and each *level of semantics* (i.e., *concrete*, *abstract*, and *pseudo*), the *achieved score* in correctly selecting the right statements as well as the *duration needed (in s)* to solve the task are shown in Table 2. Note that

Variable	Novices	Experts
General Information		
Number	205	40
Age (SD)	15.20 (.95)	27.30 (6.33)
Gender (f / m)	98 / 107	9 / 31
Experience in Process Modeling		
Analyzed (SD)	NA	24.43 (21.39)
Created (SD)		19.48 (20.33)
Activities (SD)		15.70 (7.69)
Level of Semantics		
Concrete	75	14
Abstract	58	14
Pseudo	72	12

Table 1: Sample Descriptions for Novices and Experts

only the identification of a correct statement result in a point (i.e., two points are the maximum for each *level of complexity*).

Figs. 5 - 10 depict descriptive *data (means)* of novices (i.e., pupils) and experts with corresponding *standard error*³. When juxtaposing the results shown in Figs. 5 and 6, they present the achieved *score* in identifying the correct statements. Instead of an expected steady decrease of the *score* with rising *level of complexity*, the *score* for the *medium* process model is erratic for both samples.

		Indep. & Dep. Var.	Version			
			Concrete M (SD)	Abstract M (SD)	Pseudo M (SD)	
Novices	Easy	Score	1.04 (.68)	1.62 (.64)	1.13 (.60)	
		Duration	2282.60 (821.78)	1742.00 (651.41)	3474.19 (1877.23)	
	Medium	Score	.88 (.66)	.53 (.60)	.63 (.70)	
		Duration	2410.03 (1019.28)	2238.98 (1308.19)	2475 (1618.57)	
	Hard	Score	1.04 (.73)	1.19 (.58)	.82 (.61)	
		Duration	2582.92 (1729.61)	2516.57 (2123.66)	2331.37 (2154.54)	
Experts	Easy	Score	1.43 (.51)	1.93 (.27)	1.17 (.58)	
		Duration	2360.86 (668.82)	2061.57 (642.45)	3656.42 (1110.17)	
	Medium	Score	1.43 (.65)	1.64 (.63)	1.58 (.52)	
		Duration	2177.71 (803.76)	2255.14 (599.44)	3379.42 (954.74)	
	Hard	Score	1.36 (.48)	1.64 (.48)	1.17 (.72)	
		Duration	4016.57 (1495.65)	4079.07 (1475.68)	6755.25 (2384.94)	

Table 2: Descriptive Results for Novices and Experts

Regarding the *duration* needed by pupils for corresponding process models (cf. Fig. 7), a clear difference between the different *levels of semantics* can be

³ Standard error is used to estimate the standard deviation of a sampling distribution




Fig. 5: Score Achieved by Novices




Fig. 6: Score Achieved by Experts

observed in the easy process model. However, the *duration* to solve a task reaches the same value with increasing *level of complexity*. For experts (cf. Fig. 8), tasks with process models reflecting an *abstract* and *concrete* level of semantics are solved faster than the *pseudo* ones.

As depicted in Fig. 9, experts show a better performance in comprehending process models compared to the novices (i.e., pupils). According to Fig. 10, interestingly process models showing an *abstract* level of semantics are understood easier than models with a *concrete* or *pseudo* level of semantics, thus *abstract* labels having a positive effect on process model comprehension. However, these observations are merely based on descriptive statistics. For a more rigid investigation, dependent variables are tested for statistical significance.




Fig. 7: Duration Needed by Novices




Fig. 8: Duration Needed by Experts




Fig. 9: Score for both Samples




Fig. 10: Duration for both Samples

4.2 Inferential Statistics

The *analysis of variance (ANOVA)* for repeated measurements is performed for each dependent variable (i.e., *score* and *duration*). Thereby, *main effects*⁴ (*ME*) and *interaction effects*⁵ (*IE*) are considered. The main effects for *level of complexity (ME 1)*, *level of semantics (ME 2)*, and *level of expertise (ME 3)* are investigated (cf. Sect 3.2). Furthermore, the following interaction effects are analyzed: *complexity*semantics (IE 1)*, *complexity*expertise (IE 2)*, *semantics*expertise (IE 3)*, and *complexity*semantics*expertise (IE 4)*. All statistical tests are performed two-tailed with the significance value being set to $p < .05$. Table 3 presents the results calculated for *both samples* as well as for *novices (n)* (i.e., *pupils*) and *experts (e)* being considered separately.

In summary, for both samples, the statistical analyses show a high significance for all variables, except the value for *IE 4* regarding the *score* and *IE 1* regarding the *duration*. Thereby, the latter almost reaches statistical significance. Concerning the *score* achieved by novices, there are significant differences between the *level of complexity (ME_n 1)* and the *level of semantics (ME_n 2)*. Consequently, the interaction effect between these two variables reaches statistical significance (*IE_n 1*). Concerning the *duration*, there is no significant difference regarding the *level of complexity (ME_n 1)*. By contrast, a statistical significance related to the *level of semantics (ME_n 2)* is measurable. Consequently, the interaction effect shows a statistically significant result (*IE_n 1*). Regarding the experts' *score*, there is no significant difference regarding the *level of complexity (ME_e 1)*, but statistical significance is observable between the *level of semantics (ME_e 2)*. Furthermore, the interaction effect shows no significant difference (*IE_e 1*). Considering the *duration*, there are significant differences between the *level of complexity (ME_e 1)* as well as the *level of semantics (ME_e 2)* and, hence, likewise the interaction effect reflects a significant difference (*IE_e 1*).

⁴ ME is the effect of the variable averaging over all levels of the same variable.

⁵ IE measures the interaction of a variable with another variable(s).

		Dependent Variables	
Effect		Score	Duration
Both	ME 1	$F(1.90; 475.32) = 7.32; p < .01$	$F(1.62; 386.44) = 49.81; p < .01$
	ME 2	$F(2; 239) = 7.83; p < .01$	$F(2; 239) = 12.04; p < .01$
	ME 3	$F(1; 239) = 47.54; p < .01$	$F(1; 239) = 20.71; p < .01$
	IE 1	$F(3.98; 475.32) = 4.47; p < .01$	$F(3.23; 386.44) = 2.46; p = .06$
	IE 2	$F(1.90; 475.32) = 10.61; p < .01$	$F(1.62; 386.44) = 46.20; p < .01$
	IE 3	$F(1.90; 475.32) = 10.61; p < .01$	$F(1.66; 386.44) = 2.46; p < .01$
	IE 4	$F(3.98; 475.32) = 1.41; p = .23$	$F(3.23; 386.44) = 6.47; p < .01$
Novice	ME _n 1	$F(1.98; 399.79) = 47.98; p < .01$	$F(1.55; 57.46) = 79.97; p < .01$
	ME _n 2	$F(2; 202) = 6.02; p < .01$	$F(2; 37) = 14.36; p < .01$
	IE _n 1	$F(3.96; 399.79) = 10.30; p < .01$	$F(3.11; 57.46) = 3.41; p = .02$
Expert	ME _e 1	$F(1.96; 72.54) = 1.13; p = .33$	$F(1.55; 57.46) = 79.97; p < .01$
	ME _e 2	$F(2; 37) = 5.01; p = .01$	$F(2; 37) = 14.36; p < .01$
	IE _e 1	$F(3.92; 72.54) = 1.69; p = .16$	$F(3.11; 57.46) = 3.41; p = .02$

Table 3: Results from Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

4.3 Discussion

According to the study results, pupils do not outperform experts regarding process model comprehension (*RQ 3*). To be more precise, the modeling experts achieved better results than the pupils (i.e., novices). However, as indicated by descriptive statistics (cf. Sec. 4.2), pupils are able to comprehend process models correctly (*RQ 2 + RQ 3*). Concerning the *two-out-of-four* combination, pupils are able to identify at least one correct statement per average (*RQ 2*).

Regarding the *levels of semantics*, interestingly process models with an *abstract labeling* are comprehended better compared to models with *concrete* or *pseudo labeling* (*RQ 3*). This can be explained by the fact that pupils do not need to cope with parsing the relevant *semantic* and *pragmatic information* in the respective process models. Due to the *abstract labeling*, the cognitive load caused by the *semantics* as well as *pragmatics* can be neglected. This leads to more increased capacity in the working memory and enables us to solely focus on process model *syntactics* and behavior. Consequently, the probability for errors is inferior [23]. Concerning the *concrete level of semantics*, during process model comprehension, pupils seem to consider their own experiences with the respective process scenario. In particular, they try to match the given statements with their own process reflection of the scenario in their minds and, therefore, answer related statements based on syllogisms, though the answers might be false. As *pseudowords* reflect no lexical semantics, they appear to be an additional challenge for pupils. A clear difference with respect to the *duration* needed to comprehend a process model can be observed for the *easy* process models, the *comprehension duration* reaches the same value for all *levels of semantics* with increasing *level of complexity* (*RQ 2 + RQ 3*). Note that with a *pseudo labeling*, a decrease of the *duration* needed can be observed. However, the same effect cannot be observed for the *score* achieved. This can be explained by the fact that a learning

effect occurs between the *levels of complexity*, leading to a faster comprehension of respective process models [24].

Concerning the *medium* process model, a particular phenomenon is discernible (cf. Figs. 5 and 6). The pupils showed a significant decrease in the *score*, while the *score* increases for the *hard* process model. In turn, experts achieved a slightly better result regarding the *score* for the *medium* process model, but showed a decrease for the *hard* model. One might anticipate that the *scores* will decrease with rising *level of complexity*.

Having a closer look at the process model with a *medium level of complexity*, one can see that the model comprises a parallel path (i.e., AND gateway) as well as a loop (i.e., XOR gateway). Moreover, the two correct statements associated with this model refer to the interpretation of the parallel path and the loop. According to the results, pupils seem to experience difficulties in the correct interpretation of the parallel path. The loop, in turn, is comprehended correctly by them. The same effect can be observed in the subsequent task related to the comprehension of the *hard* process model. The *hard* process model comprises a parallel path, a loop, and two decision points (i.e., XOR gateway). The statements in this model refer on the interpretation of the XOR gateways (i.e., loop and decision points). Pupils are able to interpret and comprehend the loop as well as the decision points correctly, which does not fully apply to the parallel path. This reconfirms observations we made in a prior study, which revealed that the first gateway appearing along the reading direction seems to be more challenging to comprehend compared to the subsequent ones [6]. A common approach for interpreting a gateway is to consider the process scenario in more detail. This way, the behavior of the remaining gateways can be derived.

Regarding the *scores* achieved by the experts and their *duration* needed, it has become evident that process models with an *abstract level of semantics* are comprehended easier compared to models with *concrete* and *pseudo* labels. Moreover, process models with an *abstract level of semantics* are comprehended fastest, whereas for the other two *levels of semantics*, the *duration* needed to comprehend respective process models is approximately the same. Experts achieved a considerably better *score* in identifying the correct statements compared to pupils. However, experts need more *time* for comprehending a process model. As a reason for this phenomenon, experts have spent more time in parsing information on the syntactics and semantics of a process model.

Our findings might have several implications. The conducted study provides information on how novices comprehend process models compared to experts. Interestingly, the use of an *abstract level of semantics* fosters learning of process modeling notations, e.g., reducing the complexity for parsing the semantic information of a process model and, hence, the focus can be set entirely on the syntactical interpretation of the modeling language. This insight might be useful for the analysis of process models which are syntactically not sound. In general, process models can be read and comprehended intuitively. On the other hand, particular modeling constructs (e.g., AND gateway) seem to be more challenging to comprehend compared to others (e.g., XOR gateway). This indicates to focus

on modeling constructs and their respective behavior, which are likely to be more difficult to comprehend. Moreover, based on our findings, modeling guidelines can be derived towards creating better comprehensible process models.

4.4 Threats to Validity

Although validity factors are carefully considered, there are threats to validity that need to be discussed. *First*, the use of two different procedures underlying the study for pupils and experts limit its validity. The procedure for pupils takes significantly more completion time (~ 40 minutes) compared to the one of experts (~ 10 minutes). Hence, this might have a negative impact on the outcome, due to particular state of minds (e.g., tiredness, boredom). *Second*, participants could discovered that two statements are always true. As a consequence, they know that always two statements need to be selected. *Third*, the respective *level of complexity* reflected by the process models constitutes another threat to validity. The process models might be considerably unbalanced between the *levels of complexity*. In detail, working memory capacity of participants may be exceeded. The same might be applied to the different *levels of semantics* as well as the single statements related to the process models. *Fourth*, as another risk, no professionals from industry are involved, but prospective ones (i.e., students). Although various investigations have shown that students are proper substitutes for professionals in empirical studies [25], results for professionals might differ. *Fifth*, the representativeness of the results is limited due to the relatively small sample of experts ($n = 40$), although this number is rather higher compared to similar studies. Accordingly, the different sample sizes between pupils ($n = 205$) and experts ($n = 40$) make it more probable to detect significant results for pupils than for experts. Note that we currently address these limitations in other studies to obtain more accurate results allowing for a further generalization.

5 Related Work

Research on process model comprehension can be classified into *subjective* and *objective comprehensibility*.

Regarding *subjective comprehensibility*, [26] gives insights into various characteristics (e.g., theoretical knowledge) of an individual that influence process model comprehension. In turn, [27] confirms that process scenarios from a familiar application domain represents a key factor for understanding conceptual models. Finally, [28] presents a study focusing on visual features of process models (i.e., flow consistency) and their impact on human perception of process models.

Regarding *objective comprehensibility*, [29] provides fifty guidelines for improving BPMN 2.0 process models with respect to their comprehensibility. A systematic literature review of the factors influencing the comprehension of process models is presented in [30]. Moreover, [31] presents an experiment investigates the effects of integrating business rules into a process model.

The empirical study in [32] shows that subjects who are confronted with complex

process models quickly encounter cognitive limitations, which impairs process model comprehension. Finally, [33] demonstrated that confronting individuals with a cognitive overload will have an adverse effect on model comprehension. Various works in literature exist investigating how different types of labels (e.g., *concrete* or *abstract*) are interpreted, understood, and processed by individuals. For example, [34] demonstrates that reading pseudowords results in a higher cognitive load of the working memory, having a negative impact on the performance in processing respective tasks. In turn, [35] showed that letters, words, and simple text, with or without context, are read at different speeds based on a set of individual differences (e.g., intelligence).

Regarding the labeling of activities in process modeling, [36] presents different practices for labeling activities and examines their usability. Based on the insights obtained from this study, specific labeling styles are recommended for process modeling. In addition, the quality of activity labels is addressed in [20] and a technique for refactoring activity labels is presented. Finally, the visual design of element labels in a process model is addressed in [37], providing recommendations for the design of element labels in process models.

It is known that children as well as adolescents perceive and interpret their surroundings differently compared to grown-ups, e.g., [38] discusses issues when comparing children with grown-ups and, hence, why they have to be considered differently in research. Finally, [39] suggests to tackle research from a pupil's perspective in order to unravel new learning strategies. However, to the best of our knowledge, so far no approach has investigated the influence of a learner's visual literacy in cultural education on the comprehension of process models

6 Summary and Outlook

This paper investigated whether novices (i.e., pupils) are able to comprehend business process models, although they have no previous knowledge on process model notations. In total, $n = 205$ pupils had to solve a visual task related to process model comprehension. As a benchmark, we performed a similar study with $n = 40$ process modeling experts. Although experts outperformed pupils in the respective comprehension tasks, the results indicate that process models can be properly understood by pupils as well. Thereby, process models with an *abstract level of semantics* are easier to comprehend compared to process models with a *concrete* or *pseudo level of semantics*. Based on these findings, one may conclude that using an *abstract* labeling of elements fosters the learning of process modeling notations. Moreover, *abstract* labels assist in the analysis of syntactically unsound process models. Our study provides empirical evidence to focus on process modeling constructs that are likely to be difficult to comprehend (e.g., AND gateway). Our insights suggest that it might be beneficial to provide additional guidance in reading such constructs. Furthermore, modeling guidelines (e.g., 7PMG [11]) for the creation of better comprehensible process models can be provided based on the findings derived from the conducted study as well as existing modeling tools can be enhanced with supplementary features.

Although our results reveal interesting insights, further research is required. Therefore, we will conduct more process model comprehension studies with pupils from higher classes as well as teachers, students, and graduates (i.e., learners) to investigate the effects of cultural education (e.g., educational years) on process model comprehension. Furthermore, we will analyze data obtained from eye tracking and compare the applied strategies of learners to read and comprehend a process model with the one of experts. Finally, we will consider the influence of visual literacy and cultural education of learners with respect to business process models in more detail. This might reveal insights on how to foster the comprehension of process models.

References

1. Van der Aalst, W.M., La Rosa, M., Santoro, F.M.: Special Issue on BPM "Use Cases". In: Business & Information Systems Engineering. Volume 58. (2016)
2. Becker, J., et al.: Guidelines of Business Process Modeling. In: Business Process Management, Models, Techniques, and Empirical Studies. (2000) 30–49
3. Krogstie, J.: Quality in Business Process Modeling. Springer (2016)
4. Figl, K.: Comprehension of Procedural Visual Business Process Models. In: Business & Information Systems Engineering. Volume 59. (2017) 41–67
5. Lindland, O.I., Sindre, G., Solvberg, A.: Understanding Quality in Conceptual Modeling. In: IEEE Software. Volume 11. (1994) 42–49
6. Zimoch, M., et al.: Eye Tracking Experiments on Process Model Comprehension: Lessons Learned. In: Proc BPMDS'17. (2017) 153–168
7. Thomas, K.M., et al.: Evidence of Developmental Differences in Implicit Sequence Learning: An fMRI Study of Children and Adults. In: J of Cognitive Neuroscience. Volume 16. (2004) 1339–1351
8. Brehmer, Y., et al.: Comparing Memory Skill Maintenance Across the Life Span: Preservation in Adults, Increase in Children. In: Psychology & Aging. Volume 23. (2008) 227–238
9. Opfer, J.E., DeVries, J.M.: Representational Change and Magnitude Estimation: Why Young Children Can Make More Accurate Salary Comparisons Than Adults. In: Cognition. Volume 108. (2008) 843–849
10. Lucas, C.G., Bridgers, S., Griffiths, T.L., Gopnik, A.: When Children are Better (or at Least More Open-Minded) Learners Than Adults: Developmental Differences in Learning the Forms of Causal Relationships. In: Cog. Volume 131. (2014) 284–299
11. Mendling, J., Reijers, H.A., van der Aalst, W.M.: Seven Process Modeling Guidelines (7PMG). In: Inf & Software Techn. (2010) 127–136
12. Frick, U., Rakoczy, K., Tallon, M., Weiss, S.: Measuring the Unobservable - A Practical Approach. In: Ger-Dut Colloq on Res into Impacts of Arts Edu. (2017)
13. Stokes, S.: Visual Literacy in Teaching and Learning: A Literature Perspective. In: J for the Integration of Tech in Edu. Volume 1. (2002) 10–19
14. Tallon, M., et al.: Gaze Mapping und "Areas of Interests" von Novizen und Experten bei Lösungsstrategien zur Messung von Bildkompetenz. In: 6th A-Dok. (2017)
15. Wagner, E., Schönau, D.: Common European Framework of Reference for Visual Literacy - Prototype. Waxmann (2016)
16. Greenfield, P.M.: Technology and Informal Education: What is Taught, What is Learned. In: Science. Volume 323. (2009) 69–71

17. Aagesen, G., Krogstie, J.: Analysis and Design of Business Processes using BPMN. In: Handbook on Business Process Management 1. (2010) 213–235
18. OMG: Business Process Management & Notation 2.0 (2018) www.bpmn.org, last visited on 2018/02/27.
19. Mendling, J., Strembeck, M., Recker, J.: Factors of Process Model Comprehension-Findings from a Series of Experiments. In: Decis. Support Syst. (2012) 195–206
20. Leopold, H., Smirnov, S., Mendling, J.: On the Refactoring of Activity Labels in Business Process Models. In: Information Systems. Volume 37. (2012) 443–459
21. Latva-Koivisto, A.M.: Finding a Complexity Measure for Business Process Models. In: Research Report, Helsinki Uni of Tech, Systems Analysis Laboratory. (2001)
22. Keuleers, E., Brysbaert, M.: Wuggy: A Multilingual Pseudoword Generator. In: Behavior Research Methods. Volume 42. (2010) 627–633
23. Vanderfeesten, I., et al.: Quality Metrics for Business Process Models. In: BPM and Workflow Handbook. Volume 144. (2007) 179–190
24. Zimoch, M., et al.: Using Insights from Cognitive Neuroscience to Investigate the Effects of Event-Driven Process Chains on Process Model Comprehension. In: Proc 1st Int'l Conf on Cognitive Business Process Management. (2017) 446–459
25. Höst, M., Regnell, B., Wohlin, C.: Using Students as Subjects - A Comparative Study of Students and Professionals in Lead-Time Impact Assessment. In: Empirical Software Engineering. Volume 5. (2000) 201–214
26. Mendling, J., Recker, J., Reijers, H.A., Leopold, H.: An Empirical Review of the Connection Between Model Viewer Characteristics and the Comprehension of Conceptual Process Models. In: Information Systems Frontiers. (2018) 1–25
27. Khatri, V., et al.: Understanding Conceptual Schemas: Exploring the Role of Application and IS Domain Knowledge. In: Inf Sys Res. Volume 17. (2006) 81–99
28. Burattin, A., et al.: Detection and Quantification of Flow Consistency in Business Process Models. In: Soft & Sys Mod. (2017) 1–22
29. Corradini, F., et al.: A Guidelines Framework for Understandable BPMN Models. In: Data & Know Eng. Volume 113. (2018) 129–154
30. Dikici, A., et al.: Factors Influencing the Understandability of Process Models: A Systematic Literature Review. In: Inf & Soft Tech. Volume 93. (2018) 112 – 129
31. Wang, W., Indulska, M., Sadiq, S., B.: Effect of Linked Rules on Business Process Model Understanding. In: 15th Int'l Conf on BPM. (2017) 200–215
32. Figl, K., Laue, R.: Cognitive Complexity in Business Process Modeling. In: Advanced Information Systems Engineering. (2011) 452–466
33. Houy, C., Fettke, P., Loos, P.: On the Theoretical Foundations of Research into the Understandability of Business Process Models. In: 22nd ECIS. (2014)
34. Price, C.J., Wise, R.J.S., Frackowiak, R.S.J.: Demonstrating the Implicit Processing of Visually Presented Words and Pseudowords. In: Cer Cortex. (1996) 62–70
35. Biemiller, A.: Relationships Between Oral Reading Rates for Letters, Words, and Simple Text in the Development of Reading Achievement. In: Reading Research Quarterly. Volume 13. (1977) 223–253
36. Mendling, J., Reijers, H.A., Recker, J.: Activity Labeling in Process Modeling: Empirical Insights and Recommendations. In: Inf Sys. Volume 35. (2010) 467–482
37. Koschmider, A., Figl, K., Schoknecht, A.: A Comprehensive Overview of Visual Design of Process Model Element Labels. In: 13th BPM. (2015) 571–582
38. Punch, S.: Research with Children: The Same or Different from Research with Adults? In: Childhood. Volume 9. (2002) 321–341
39. Rudduck, J., Flutter, J.: Pupil Participation and Pupil Perspective: Carving a New Order of Experience. In: Cambridge J of Edu. Volume 30. (2000) 75–89