

## THE HEDICOM FRAMEWORK: HIGHER EDUCATION TEACHERS' DIGITAL COMPETENCIES FOR THE FUTURE

*Dr. S. Mallikarjuna, Assistant Professor*

*Kotturswamy College of Teacher Education, BALLARI*

**Abstract:** There is little consensus about the nature of teachers' digital competencies in Higher Education. Moreover, existing digital competence frameworks have largely been developed for teachers in secondary education. In response to this, the current study focuses on developing and validating a framework of digital competencies for teachers in Higher Education. First, a review was conducted to determine the state of digital competence research regarding dimensions and definition of digital competence. In a next step, similarities and differences between existing digital competence frameworks were identified. Based on the outcomes of the review and the framework comparison, a framework was developed in an iterative process through expert meetings with policy makers, experts in the field of educational technology, and validated with practitioners. The new framework includes four dimensions of teachers' digital competencies: (1) Teaching practice, (2) Empowering students for a digital society, (3) Teachers' digital literacy, and (4) Teachers' professional development. The resulting Higher Education Digital Competence (HeDiCom) framework will provide guidance and clearer expectations of teachers' digital competency. Ultimately, improving teachers' digital competencies will contribute to improving the quality of digital competencies of the students.

**Keywords** Curriculum analysis · Digital competencies · Higher Education · Technology curriculum · ICT frameworks

### I. Introduction

With the rapid increase of technology available to support learning in recent decades, developing the digital competence of university graduates to prepare them for the future workforce has become a priority. However, for these digital competencies to be developed in Higher Education (HE) students, their learning environments and tasks must be designed to provide opportunities to build these competencies. Clearly, HE teachers must be able to organize learning environments in which students themselves develop digital competencies. This is particularly important in relation to online and blended learning. The Covid19 pandemic has forced teachers in Higher Education towards a rapid and massive shift to online teaching across the world (Schleicher, 2020). Teachers, most of whom had never fully taught online, were asked to redesign their teaching practice to support their students in an online environment (see Scherer et al., 2020). The question remains to what extent these teachers are prepared to teach online or in a blended setting. Teaching with digital technologies requires digital competencies but also different pedagogical approaches than for instance teaching face-to-face (Gurley, 2018). As a consequence, the focus on digital competence continues to grow in popularity in Higher Education (Zhao et al., 2021). Clearly, teachers are expected to adequately use digital technologies to strengthen their teaching practice and enhance their educational practice. The problem is that it is not always clear which digital competencies

HE teachers should possess to adequately integrate ICT into their educational practice, and they lack guidance on developing their digital competence (Basilotta-Gómez-Pablos et al., 2022; Bennett, 2014; Tondeur et al., 2018).

There are a number of digital competency frameworks created by government agencies and nonprofits (e.g., ISTE, DigcompEdu), but these have mainly focused on teachers in school contexts rather than Higher Education. To complicate this issue, there is little consensus about what features should be included in a HE competency framework (Tondeur et al., 2018). The current study intends to provide practitioners, the research community, as well as policy makers with a digital competence framework that can be used in Higher Education. This would provide important guidelines for teachers in Higher Education on implementing and integrating ICT in their teaching practices, promoting innovation, and sustaining professional growth. It also signals support that may be needed to develop digital competencies. In a first step we reviewed the evidence based on the digital competencies teachers in Higher Education should possess. Next, we identified similarities and differences between existing frameworks, to act as a lever for the development of necessary digital competencies to form an initial framework. In a final step, we validated the initial framework in order to refine the framework on the basis of experts' opinions and to explore the recognizability and usability of the framework for institutions of Higher Education. The result of this work has been a new framework for digital competence in Higher Education, which provides a straightforward tool for direct implementation in HE teaching.

## II. Background

The notion of digital competence is not new in educational research and training. However, competencies have changed and evolved over time relative to political, social, and educational contexts (Ilomäki et al., 2016). Digital competence has been understood in relation to digital literacy, digital capabilities, digital knowledge, etc. In the following section we The HeDiCom framework: Higher Education teachers' digital... 35 1 3 first address digital competence and how it has been defined, then consider existing frameworks and their relation to Higher Education.

### Digital competence

Digital competence is a critical element in a teacher's successful integration of digital technologies in learning (Tondeur et al., 2018). It is of particular importance when considering how teachers move to designing online, blended or hybrid learning spaces. Throughout the years, different terms have been used to capture 'digital competence', namely it has overlapped with 'digital literacy' in terms of higher order capabilities, such as problem solving with digital technologies. However, competencies have typically combined digital skills with digital literacies. As such, in 2002 the OECD began work to identify key competencies in training and education and a way to understand these competencies across contexts. They defined competency as "the ability to meet demands or carry out a task successfully, and consists of both cognitive and non-cognitive dimensions" (OECD, 2002, p. 4). In the case of digital competence, cognitive aspects refer to digital literacies, while noncognitive dimensions are more closely related to digital knowledge, capacities and efficacy. As this definition evolves, the enduring aspect of competencies is the successful

use of technologies to meet demands—whether these be social, work or learning. In the current study, we follow the definition of ‘digital competence’ used by the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union. This definition provides a comprehensive view of the role of digital technologies and digital competence in education: Digital competence involves the confident, critical and responsible use of, and engagement with, digital technologies for learning, at work, and for participation in society. It includes information and data literacy, communication and collaboration, media literacy, digital content creation (including programming), safety (including digital well-being and competences related to cybersecurity), intellectual property related questions, problem solving and critical thinking. (European Union, 2018).

### **Digital competence and Higher Education**

Developing digital competencies of students to prepare them for the future workforce has become a priority in many universities around the world (Tondeur et al., 2018; Zhao et al., 2021). Higher Education institutions are “rich in technology resources and technologybased activities” (Selwyn, 2010, p. 2), but the risk of digital divisions among students in regard to what they use and how they use it is high. Moreover, it is expected that students will soon enter the workforce and there is a need for them to perform as knowledge workers, which requires a high level of digital competence (Ilomäki et al., 2016). For students to achieve a high level of digital competencies in their field, to become successful knowledge workers, HE teachers must also possess the digital competence to guide their development. Zhao et al. (2021) have shown that HE teachers and students have basic digital

competence; however, without clear standards of digital competence developing these competencies remain elusive. According to Zhao et al. (2021), the most frequently identified competencies were the use of digital technologies, knowledge of digital technologies, the Internet and technological related capacities, digital experiences and attitudes. The competencies mentioned above have been identified in research, but existing digital competency frameworks, such as DigcompEdu have been created for use at the compulsory

school level (see Redecker & Punie, 2017). In some cases, research has drawn on schoolfocused competency frameworks (Zhao et al., 2021), but the skills, attitudes and experiences of school learners and teachers, when compared to Higher Education, are quite different. Frameworks specifically designed for Higher Education are needed to address the complexity of digital technologies in the context and trajectory to the workplace. In this respect, Lin and Johnson (2021) have called for more research that is directly applicable to the specific teaching and learning context. A key aim of the current research has been to create a framework that can be used by HE teachers, to reflect on their own practice. Existing frameworks, while comprehensive and providing rich definitions of competencies, have also been at a level of detail that can be difficult for practical implementation to support the ongoing digital shift in education (see Howard et al., 2022), especially since the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. This Great Online Transition (Scherer et al., 2021; Tondeur et al., 2021) has transformed most HE from traditional to online and blended teaching and learning (see also Zarei & Mohammadi, 2022). Moreover, HE institutions that cultivate elites for our society, should be

committing to innovate and to effectively integrate educational technologies (Cordie & Lin, 2018). As a result, this HE context requires education institutions to reconsider the necessary digital competencies. This brings us to the purpose of the study

### **Context and purpose of the study**

As stated in the literature, a debate exists concerning the nature of teachers' digital competencies and how they can be best developed in Higher Education (cf. Falloon, 2020). The majority of digital competence frameworks were developed specifically for compulsory education. Only recently has the field turned its attention to competencies in Higher Education. But according to Zhao et al. (2021) "it is still not easy to get a full picture of digital competence of teachers and students in the context of Higher Education" (p. 6). The purpose of this study was to create a framework for digital competencies in Higher Education. Such a competence framework can serve as a common reference (Vuorikari et al., 2016) by depicting articulated digital competencies and hence support the development of expertise (McGee et al., 2017). In that way, a comprehensive framework is needed that can improve the transparency and simplify what is expected of teachers. Ultimately, improving the digital competencies of teachers will also enhance the quality of the educational activities and the digital competencies of the students.

### **Research design**

The aim of this study is the development and validation of a framework of digital competencies for teachers in Higher Education. This was done in three stages. The first stage comprised a literature review which was conducted in order to

provide an objective and comprehensive view of the existing literature and frameworks. The main goal of this review was to provide an overview of competencies relevant to teaching and learning with ICT in Higher Education. The second stage included the analysis of existing digital competence frameworks to establish main- and sub-dimensions of digital competencies, determining similarities and differences between the frameworks. The result of these two stages The HeDiCom framework: Higher Education teachers' digital... 37 1 3 was an initial draft framework for digital competencies in Higher Education. In the final stage, the initial framework was reviewed by experts and refined. The revised framework was then validated in a series of focus groups with practitioners. Below we present the procedure in more detail.

### **III. Review of the literature**

Between December 2020 and February 2021, a review of literature on digital competencies was conducted to locate, critically evaluate, and synthesize studies about the teachers' digital competencies. This study drew on a systematic review approach, which is defined as an interpretation of a selection of documents on a specific topic that optimally involves summarization, analysis, evaluation, and synthesis of the documents (Petticrew & Roberts, 2006). Four inclusion criteria were employed: (1) the language of the article is English, (2) the article was published between December 2010 and December 2020, (3) only articles and reviews are accepted, no other type of publication, (4) the article is peer-reviewed in the database Web of Science. The search terms used were: (ICT) AND (Higher Education) AND (Competence\*) AND (Lecturer OR Educator OR Teacher

OR Faculty OR Professor). Initially, 122 empirical articles were identified. Abstracts were examined to identify the educational level and if the topic was relevant for the review, which identified 36 relevant articles. The excluded articles had, for example, a focus on teachers' perception on their digital competence or on their level of digital competence, without discussing what competencies were included in the digital competence. Full-text readings of these articles further identified 21 articles that were specifically addressing digital competencies of teachers in Higher Education. These articles were then synthesized.

### **Comparison of existing frameworks**

The following frameworks were compared: Competence framework for Teaching and Learning with ICT (van Loon et al., 2018), DigCompEdu (Redecker & Punie, 2017), Digital Teaching Professional Framework (Education & Training Foundation, 2019), ISTE Standards for Lecturers (ISTE, 2017), JISC Teacher Profile (JISC, 2019) and UNESCO ICT competency framework for teachers (UNESCO, 2018). The main and sub-dimensions of the frameworks were identified, existing similarities were merged where necessary, and the remaining digital competencies were mapped. The result was an overview of identified dimensions. This resulted in an initial draft of the HeDiCom framework, which included four main themes: Teachers' digital literacy, Teachers' Professional Identity; Teaching and Learning with Technology; Empowering students. The overview further provided a list of possible main-and sub-dimensions, related to these themes. The initial framework was further refined through expert discussions (see section "Expert

meetings and validation of the framework").

### **Expert meetings and validation of the framework**

Experts participating in the study were identified as Dutch-speaking senior academics working in the area of digital technologies and teacher education, in Higher Education. Expert meetings comprised 11 experts across three groups, which met online twice over two months. In the first meeting, each group discussed design criteria for the framework, 38 J. Tondeur et al. 13 the initial draft of the framework with its themes, and dilemmas at hand. The main design criteria were: the framework should be specifically aimed at educational digital innovation in Dutch Higher Education Institutions; it should include competencies on empowering students for a digital society, with special attention to students' future profession; and the framework should be recognisable and useful for educational professionals in Higher Education and support them in improving their educational practice. The framework was then refined and again reviewed in an iterative manner in each subsequent session. In this process, main-and sub-dimensions were further defined. This resulted in a complete first version of the new framework for digital competencies. The resulting first version of the framework was then validated through online sessions with 34 educational professionals and teachers.

### **IV. Results**

The final version of the Higher Education Digital Competence (HeDiCom) framework includes four dimensions, with two or three subdimensions (see Fig. 1). In the next section, we will discuss the four main

dimensions, its subdimensions and the associated competencies.

### Teachers' digital practice

The first dimension of the framework relates to digital competencies that are required as part of teachers' digital practice. The (re)design of digital learning requires specific



competencies of teachers (Basilotta-Gómez-Pablos et al., 2022; Bennett, 2014). The findings of the literature review emphasize that, in the context of stimulating educational change through the use of ICT, it is important for teachers to be aware of how and why they want to integrate digital technologies in a specific context, while ensuring alignment between learning objectives, learning activities, learning resources and assessment (see Heitink et al., 2016). As a consequence, integrating ICT into education requires teachers in HE to rethink their educational designs, implement new or refined designs, evaluate the results and then potentially re-design, beginning the process again. Therefore, the three sub-dimensions are: (1) Designing and implementing, (2) Facilitating and monitoring, and (3) Evaluating and modifying.

### Designing and implementing

The findings of the literature review point to the importance of the sub-dimension "Designing and implementing" (e.g., Ardiç

& Çiftçi, 2019; Cabero-Almenara et al., 2020; Romero Alonso et al., 2019). Some studies also highlight that ICT can act as a catalyst for innovation in practice, for example to create more flexible, personalized and self-regulated learning (Schneckenberg, 2010). As part of the Great Online Transition (GOT) (Scherer et al., 2020), teachers in HE have needed to transform their teaching practice into remote, online and blended learning formats (Scherer et al., 2021; Tondeur et al., 2021). To become a competent online teacher, there is a need for professional development and sufficient time to design and practice online and blended learning environments (see also Kebritchi et al., 2017). To do this, it is important that HE teachers create new digital educational resources, change and arrange existing sources (e.g., Cabero-Almenara et al., 2020). Some studies emphasize the potential of including students in the design process and implementation of these new designs (ISTE, 2017; Redecker & Punie, 2017) while also taking into account student well-being and social inclusion. This is an aspect that receives very little attention in the literature review on teachers' digital competencies, but it is mentioned in several frameworks (cf. DigCompEdu and JISC).

### Facilitating and monitoring

When using ICT to facilitate and monitor student learning, the second sub-dimension, HE teachers should make conscious use of the possibilities offered by ICT to improve or support students' learning. Teaching should be aligned with the needs of students, for instance to ensure more flexible and personalized learning and greater student self-regulation (Cabero-Almenara et al., 2020) and to facilitate collaborative learning (Ricardo-

Barreto et al., 2020). Teachers also need to be able to use digital technologies for student assessment. Different formative and summative assessment strategies using ICT can increase the effectiveness of assessment, for instance to give online feedback or peer review (Segovia Cifuentes & Díaz Gómez, 2016). The literature review reveals that the data generated by various systems can be used to analyze and optimize the learning process (cf. learning analytics). A review by Viberg et al. (2018) for instance shows that there is much potential for using and analyzing this data to improve the learning process, but that this rarely takes place in practice.

### Evaluating and modifying

As well as assessing students' learning processes, teachers in HE also need to be able to evaluate their (re)designed learning arrangements using ICT and modify their teaching practice accordingly (sub-dimension 3). To do so, teachers can use data from digital systems and digital learning resources (van Loon et al., 2018). At the same time, they should also be able to reflect on their own educational practice and design and implement improvements on how to integrate digital technologies into teaching and learning processes, and in particular the suitability of ICT for improving student learning. Based on the above, the following HE teachers' competencies for designing, implementing, and evaluating education were formulated.

Table 1 Competencies for the dimension teachers' digital practice

Designing and implementing	The teacher is able to... <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Design digital learning that is consistent with conception of teaching, the discipline and the institutional vision of education</li> <li>2. Design digital learning that responds to students' individual needs and supports student ownership</li> <li>3. Support, combine and coordinate learning process in a variety of contexts (e.g. face-to-face, online and in the workplace)</li> <li>4. Take the well-being of students and inclusion into account in digital learning design; and</li> <li>5. Select, modify, organize and create digital resources and learning materials</li> </ol>
Facilitating and monitoring	The teacher is able to... <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use ICT to monitor and support the students' learning process using formative and summative assessment</li> <li>2. Use ICT to collect, analyse and report on student data to understand and improve their learning process; and</li> <li>3. Use ICT to provide timely and personalized supervision and support</li> </ol>
Evaluating and modifying	The teacher is able to... <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evaluate and optimize digital learning designs</li> <li>2. Reflect on the benefits of implementing digital learning and redesign accordingly; and</li> <li>3. Reflect their digital teaching practice and adapt this to individual, institutional and societal needs</li> </ol>

### Teachers' digital literacy

Research evidence from the review has shown that teachers' digital literacy is related to the quality of their educational practice using technology (see e.g., Tondeur et al., 2017) and can be considered as a prerequisite for students' digital literacy (Falloon, 2020). Therefore, HE teachers' and students' digital literacy are presented in parallel in the model depicted in Fig. 1. Digital literacy is also mentioned in various frameworks, such as the Digital Teaching Professional Framework (Education & Training Foundation, 2019), the JISC Teacher profile (Higher Education) (JISC, 2019), the ISTE Standards for Educators (ISTE, 2017) and the UNESCO ICT Competence Framework for Teachers (UNESCO, 2018). Based on the comparison of these frameworks and the review of

Table 2 Competencies for the dimension empowering students for a digital society

Students' digital literacy for living, learning and working	The teacher is able to... <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop and implement learning activities for students' digital literacy</li> <li>2. Guide students in making appropriate use of the Internet and social media</li> <li>3. Support students to effectively manage and protect personal data; and</li> <li>4. Guide students in the use of ICT to regulate and monitor their own learning process</li> </ol>
Students' digital literacy for future professions	The teacher is able to... <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure that students are familiar with new digital developments in their profession/discipline</li> <li>2. Encourage students to actively contribute to new digital innovations within the profession/discipline; and</li> <li>3. Develop the digital communication skills of students to ensure continued employability</li> </ol>

### V. Discussion and conclusion

The main goal of the current study was to create a framework of digital competencies

for Higher Education that is simplified and practice focused. Based on the findings of the systematic review, the comparison of relevant existing digital competence frameworks, and the focus groups with experts and practitioners, we developed the HeDiCom Framework (see Fig. 1). This new framework includes a comprehensive set of digital competencies grouped in four dimensions: (1) Teachers' digital practice, (2) Empowering students for a digital society, (3) Teachers' digital literacy for teachers, and (4) Teachers' professional learning. Below we discuss the main principles of the HeDiCom Framework, together with the implications for research, practice and policy. The systematic review and expert discussions confirmed these are necessary for students to develop digital competencies (see e.g., Zhao et al., 2021).

### **A full picture of HE teachers' digital competencies?**

As ICT continues to drive changes in society, Higher Education institutions need to define an organizational vision in view of the planned change. In this respect, the empirical evidence stresses the importance of developing teachers' digital competencies (see e.g., Basilotta-Gómez-Pablos et al., 2022; Bennett, 2014). As stated before, a debate exists concerning the nature of teachers' digital competencies and how they can be best developed in Higher Education (Falloon, 2020; Tømte et al., 2015). With only four dimensions, the new HeDiCom framework is neither too complex nor too simple to provide a clear overview (see Fig. 1). Other frameworks provide a longer list of (sub-)dimensions to distinguish between types of digital competencies (e.g., DigCompEdu). According to Kimmons and Hall (2018), a good framework reduces complexity, and should be easily

learned and remembered. In this respect, a too large number is less helpful to identify relevant use patterns (see also Scherer et al., 2020). This illustrates an apparent tension between the need for simplicity and the need to present a rich picture of digital competencies. The four main dimensions in the HeDiCom framework each represent a different set of digital competencies. However, in practice differentiation between these competencies is not always straightforward. To adequately integrate the HeDiCom framework into practice requires attention to not only the separate dimensions, but also the relationship between each of them (see also Spante et al., 2018). According to Spante et al. (2018), also the assessment of a specific digital competence requires the understanding of related constructs. They are linked together in ways that make it difficult to address them separately. Further, attempting to artificially separate competencies is not necessarily useful when thinking about developing teaching and learning. To illustrate, "teachers' digital literacy" (Dimension 4) in the HeDiCom framework can be associated with teachers' capability to "design, implement and evaluate education with ICT" (Dimension 1). Let us argue that a teacher has identified a need to develop their own level of digital literacy to better use video conferencing in their practice, to move to a more blended learning design. In this respect, Tondeur et al. (2017) stated that the distinction between digital literacy and educational technology use can be marred by the fact that technical ICT-use nevertheless involves some knowledge and skills construction. As stated before, Dimension 1—designing an ICT-rich learning environment—can also be considered as a prerequisite for empowering students for a digital society (Dimension 2). At the same time,



“teachers’ professional learning with ICT” (Dimension 3) is necessary for the development of their digital literacy (Dimension 4). Therefore, these different dimensions are presented in a specific way as depicted in Fig. 1.

## VI. Conclusion

The main goal of the current study was to create a framework for digital competencies in Higher Education. The resulting HeDiCom framework will enhance the transparency of what is expected of Higher Education teachers and hence support the development of their digital competencies. Ultimately, improving their digital competencies will also enhance the quality of the educational activities and the digital competencies of the students. In this study, we especially focused on the iterative construction of a comprehensive set of digital competencies and although future research is needed to further develop this framework, we hope that the HeDiCom framework can be helpful for the development of Higher Education teachers and students’ digital competencies for the future.

## References

1. Alayyar, G. M., Fisser, P., & Voogt, J. (2012). Developing technological pedagogical content knowledge in pre-service science teachers: Support from blended learning. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28, 1298–1316. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.773>
2. Almerich, G., Orellana, N., Suárez-Rodríguez, J., & Díaz-García, I. (2016). Teachers’ information and communication technology competences: A structural approach. *Computers & Education*, 100, 110–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.05.002>
3. J. Tondeur et al. 13 Ardiç, Ö., & Çiftçi, H. (2019). ICT competence and needs of Turkish EFL instructors: The role of gender, institution and experience. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 153–173. <https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.543791>
4. Barendsen, E., & Bruggink, M. (2019). Het volle potentieel van de computer leren benutten: Over informatica en computational thinking. <https://repository.uhn.nl/bitstream/handle/2066/213908/213908.pdf>
5. Basilotta-Gómez-Pablos, V., Matarranz, M., Casado-Aranda, L.-A., & Otto, A. (2022). Teachers’ digital competencies in higher education: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 19, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00312-8>
6. Bennett, E. (2014). Learning from the early adopters: Developing the digital practitioner. *Research in Learning Technology*, 22, 21453. <https://doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v22.21453>
7. Cabero-Almenara, J., Gutiérrez-Castillo, J. J., Palacios-Rodríguez, A., & Barroso-Osuna, J. (2020). Development of the teacher digital competence validation of DigCompEdu Check-In Questionnaire in the university context of Andalusia (Spain). *Sustainability*, 12, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12156094>
8. Carretero, S., Vuorikari, R., & Punie, Y. (2017). *DigComp 2.1: Digital Competence Framework for Citizens*. Luxembourg: European Commission.

- The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens with eight proficiency levels and examples of use. Publications Office of the European Union.  
<https://doi.org/10.2760/38842>
9. Castaño Muñoz, J., Pokropek, A., & WeikertGarcía, L. (2022). For to all those who have, will more be given? Evidence from the adoption of the SELFIE tool for the digital capacity of schools in Spain. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 53, 1937–1955.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13222>
  10. Cordie, L., & Lin, X. (2018). The e-revolution in higher education: E-learning and e-leaders. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 12, 76–78.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21602>
  11. Diaconu, M., Racovita, L. D., Carbonero Muñoz, D., & Faubert, S. J. (2020). Social work educators' perceived barriers to teaching with technology: The impact on preparing students to work with younger clients. *Social Work Education*, 39, 785–812.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2019.1683155>
  12. The teacher digital competency (TDC) framework. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68, 2449–2472.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09767-4>