

Review of: "Digital Mapping of Resilience and Academic Skills in the Perspective of Society 5.0 for Higher Education Level Students"

Fabrizio Consorti¹

¹ Sapienza University of Rome

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article reports on a mixed method study of validation of an instrument of measure of digital resilience in Indonesia. The topic is of interest and the idea of doing a mixed method study is suitable for a comprehensive evaluation of the construct of digital resilience in HE students.

I have four suggestions to improve the article:

1. the article is too long and the revision of literature on resilience, society 5.0 and digital resilience is confusing for the reader. The Introduction of a scientific article should provide a concise overview of the issue at hand, highlight the knowledge gap that the study fills, and make a case for the reader's attention. I suggest that you should choose one model of resilience and digital resilience as a foundation of your study (possibly the one that underlies the tool you adopted) and only give a brief definition of Society 5.0
2. the research questions are clearly stated, but I'm not sure that your study answers them. What you did actually is the validation of a tool in a sample of Indonesian students, and the definition of a proposal of normative values.
3. the instrument: you wrote "As previously explained, the construction of measuring instruments in this study was adopted from the theory of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development for Digital Resiliency and the theory of Cassidy & Eachus (2002) for Academic Resiliency." What do you mean with "adopted"? Did you use a revalidate an existing instrument? Did you use the theory to develop it from the scratch? Was it in English or in Indonesian?

Moreover, you wrote "The instrument used in this study is a psychological resilience scale adapted from The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC)". What do you mean with "adapted"? Did you change/translate the original instrument? Or did you mean that after the validation you eliminated some items?
4. Results: you do not provide the results of the qualitative inquiry (interviews and questionnaires: "The first stage is to formulate the measurement construct with an open-ended questionnaire qualitatively"). Did qualitative results support the elements of construct that you hypothesized?

You also mention "Moreover, evidence-based constructs, namely through Explanatory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), to obtain a fit model of the digital resiliency research instrument and academic skills of the Society 5.0 perspective students. " but I could not find the results of these analyses.

