

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

Alessio Surian

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## ARTICLE REVIEW

### Abstract

It is not clear while the 3 population percentages are referred to different dimensions (i.e. resilience, stability, low strength)

### Introduction

-On the transition FROM the Industrial Revolution 4.0 to the era of Society 5.0

I would rather quote (in the Introduction as well as in the Literature Review) Mourtzis et al. 2022, [doi.org/10.3390/en15176276](https://doi.org/10.3390/en15176276)

-The authors adopt a normative approach exemplified by wording such as “the learning system must change to online learning”. There is no evidence neither that this “must” be the case, nor that the Society 5.0 shift implies leaving face-to-face schooling for 100% online learning (a blended format would seem a more appropriate scenario), nor that higher education schooling can be treated just as “learning” rather than “education” (see authors such as Biesta on this topic).

-Quoting Weller (2021) on “digital resilience” implies defining such resilience according to the four resilience’s aspects proposed by Walker et al. (2004: 1 latitude; 2 resistance; 3 precariousness; 4 panarchy. This is not made explicit in the text. A long list of other authors and definition of resilience aspects follows, not necessarily in line with each other and without a real discussion/comparison of such references. It would be useful for the reader to have the authors formulating a comparative and more scaffolded analysis here rather than just adding factors.

### Formulation of the problem

This section lacks an actual definition of the core problem. It brings together efforts made in different countries in this field as a suggestion that a similar effort should be carried out in Indonesia.

It would be better to define first what is meant by “digital resilience” The definition offered elsewhere states that it is: “a resource that is important to sustain human life in the digital era. Digital resilience refers to technology such as the Internet in the digital age and society”. This is too vague a definition and it lacks a focus on the key factors that should be monitored to understand a “resilient” attitude and behaviour.

## **Literature Review**

Placed after the above sections, the Literature Reviews repeats some of the content already stated in the introduction. It would be better to have a shorter and focused introduction and also a shorter but better focused Literature Review BEFORE the formulation of the problem in order for the reader to understand how the problem is formulated from epistemic and operational points of view.

## **Research Methodology**

This section should be merged with the following section (Resiliency Digital Instruments).

The Research Methodology text (as the text in the Academic Resiliency Instruments section) chooses Cassidy's Academic Resilience Scale (ARS-30) as key reference/tool while the Resiliency Digital Instruments section suggests to add the The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) as the study key research tool: there should be one consistent presentation of the research tools that explains how they are connected and brought as a whole into the study.

## **Qualitative Data Collection**

The information provided in this and the next two sessions on qualitative data (interviews, observation) is very limited and yet very vague. Too little information is provided about the population sample, the research approach, the actual interview and observation features and ways to collect and analyse data.

This part of the research does not seem to be taken into account in the sections that present data and results.

## **Results**

The article should be better structured in the initial part (Research methodology) when it comes to the formulation of the Main Research Question and its sub-questions so that when the results are listed, they can be properly placed in the framework of the Research Question(s) and discussed accordingly.

A section on limitations and further research would be useful.