European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences 2022;
Vol.11, No1 pp. 12-36
ISSN 1805-3602

Factors Affecting Students, Faculties and Industry Partners Readiness in Virtual Internship: Input for Institutional Planning and Development in the Age of Pandemic

Jose Marie B. Dipay*, Daizylyn C. Palillo, Ryan S. Evangelista, Ramir M. Cruz, Josephine M. Dela Isla, Zenaida S. Bonaobra, Lester B. Sarmiento and Raymond L. Alfonso
Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Institute of Technology and College of Education
*Email: jmdipay@gmail.com

Received for publication: 23 October 2021.
Accepted for publication: 18 December 2021.

Abstract

This study is about how to stand on the brink of a technological revolution that will fundamentally alter the way we live, work, and relate to one another. In its scale, scope, and complexity, the transformation will be unlike anything humankind has experienced before. We do not yet know just how it will unfold, but one thing is clear: the response to it must be integrated and to be comprehensive, involving all stakeholders of the global polity, from the public and private sectors to academia and civil society.

The institute of Technology and College of Education come up with a research to assess the factors affecting students and faculty readiness in online internship. The output of this study will serve as an input for the Institutional planning and development of the Polytechnic University of the Philippines in order to address the gap that will hamper the services provided by the university to all its stakeholders.

Then study cannot be over emphasized because of the fact that the preparedness of online internship transmission have become an essential element in every aspect of human society in today's globalized world, its contribution in enhancement of the teaching – learning process to individuals, groups, society and to educational institutions have been overwhelming. It is believed that the tools available used in the teaching of online would greatly increase the learning activity of the students.

Keywords: online internship; educational institutions

Introduction

We stand on the brink of a technological revolution that will fundamentally alter the way we live, work, and relate to one another. In its scale, scope, and complexity, the transformation will be unlike anything humankind has experienced before. We do not yet know just how it will unfold, but one thing is clear: the response to it must be integrated and comprehensive, involving all stakeholders of the global polity, from the public and private sectors to academia and civil society (Schwab K., 2016).

The First Industrial Revolution used water and steam power to mechanize production. The Second used electric power to create mass production. The Third used electronics and information technology to automate production. Now a Fourth Industrial Revolution is building on the Third, the digital revolution that has been occurring since the middle of the last century. It is characterized by a fusion of technologies that is blurring the lines between the physical, digital, and biological spheres. There are three reasons why today's transformations represent not merely a prolongation of the

Third Industrial Revolution but rather the arrival of a Fourth and distinct one: velocity, scope, and systems impact. The speed of current breakthroughs has no historical precedent. When compared with previous industrial revolutions, the Fourth is evolving at an exponential rather than a linear pace. Moreover, it is disrupting almost every industry in every country. And the breadth and depth of these changes herald the transformation of entire systems of production, management, and governance (Schwab K., 2016).

According to the World Economic Forum, the dramatic spread of COVID-19 has disrupted lives, livelihoods, communities and businesses worldwide. All stakeholders, especially global business, must urgently come together to minimize its impact on public health and limit its potential for further disruption to lives and economies around the world.

But the sum of many individual actions will not add up to a sufficient response. Only coordinated action by business, combined with global, multi-stakeholder cooperation – at exceptional scale and speed – can potentially mitigate the risk and impact of this unprecedented crisis based under the World Economic Forum.

The institute of Technology and College of Education come up with a research to assess the factors affecting students and faculty readiness in online internship. The output of this study will serve as an input for the Institutional planning and development of the Polytechnic University of the Philippines in order to address the gap that will hamper the services provided by the university to all its stakeholders.

Another thing, as PUP gears to be a global university it is timely to adopt a global approach in infusing new methods of learning, doing of work and global approach in dealing problems specially in the age of pandemic.

Virtual internship provides various experiences and new learning to the PUP community.

Firstly, Global Connection, the importance of networking and building global connections is stressed in nearly every field. In fact, networking is vital to beginning any global career. The Virtual International Internship program is an excellent platform to expand the university network globally, all from the comfort of your home.

Secondly, Time Management & Discipline, remote working requires high levels of time management and self-discipline. Completing a virtual internship will allow you to hone these skills for future work experience, and apply the experience to your resume and discuss during your next interview.

Thirdly, Remote Work Skills, it's no secret that the recent massive move to remote working will continue for the foreseeable future. Many companies are establishing permanent remote work policies, meaning there is an increasing demand for professionals with previous remote work experience & skills in software/platforms, communication, problem solving, etc.

Forth, Cross-Cultural Competences, unlike a traditional online internship, our Virtual Internships allow you to choose a country to explore professional skills and gain cross-cultural competence.

Lastly, Accessibility, traveling for work or study (especially long term) can present a huge financial barrier for many individuals. A virtual international internship allows you to still gain the career & global skills from an international work environment, without the need for travel.

Statement of the Problem

The main problem of this research is to assess the Preparedness in Online Internship transmission of their students in Polytechnic University of the Philippines. Specifically is attempted to answer the following questions;

Statement of the Problem

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:
1.1. Students;
1.2. Faculty members;
1.3. Industries?
2. What is/are the gadget/s owned by the respondents in terms of:
2.1. Students;
2.2. Faculty members;
2.3. Industries?
3. What is the online tool mostly used by the students in terms of:
3.1. Academic/work related activities;
3.2. Non-academic/non-work activities?
4. What is the online tool mostly used by the faculty members in terms of:
4.1. Academic/work related activities;
4.2. Non-academic/non-work activities?
5. What is the online tool mostly used by the industries in terms of:
5.1. Academic/work related activities;
5.2. Non-academic/non-work activities?
6. What is the perspective level of preparedness of the respondents in handling online internship in terms of:
6.1. Students;
6.2. Faculty members;
6.3. Industries?

Significance of Study

The significance of this study cannot be over emphasized because of the fact that the preparedness of online internship transmission have become an essential element in every aspect of human society in today's globalized world, its contribution in enhancement of the teaching – learning process to individuals, groups, society and to educational institutions have been overwhelming. It is believed that the tools available used in the teaching of online would greatly increase the learning activity of the students .There is no doubt in the fact that this study will benefit the teachers, parents, students, policy makers i.e. the government, school administrators, professional bodies, textbook/module writers and researchers. As for the teachers, the study will create more awareness for them towards the use of tools available for teaching methods and materials in this computer age. The parents through this study will appreciate the usefulness of this online delivery mode of instruction.

It would also assist the students in showing positive attitudes towards their learning.

It could also give the policy makers a direction to appreciate the more the essence of tools and usage in education, thereby play its positive role in ensuring that these tools are translated into reality.

The school administrators would also find this study relevant by making sure that tools are made readily available.

It enables that all colleges, branches and campuses equip and update their members in the area of online mode of instruction. It will also assist the modules writers to know the areas of need, and then fill the gaps.

Finally, the researcher would be an additional stock of research at improving standard of education and as a reference point for further research in making and sustaining the use tools available in teaching and learning in Online Delivery Mode of Instruction.

Methodology

Design of the Study

The research employed the descriptive online survey research design for the investigation. This method is adopted because of the problem being experienced by the respondent and the researchers due to COVID 19. There is no interactive with the participants in the different stratified location.

Population of the Study

The population of the study consisted of Faculty Members, Student Trainees all PUP branches and campuses and Industry Partners; Faculty members handling OJT this summer, Student Trainees enrolled in OJT and Industry Partners who are PUP Partners and linkages from private, public government agency and industries.

Instrument of the Study

In order to collect data from the study, the researcher employed online questionnaires as the instrument. The online questionnaire is titled: Factors Affecting Students and Faculty Readiness in Virtual Internship: Input for Institutional Planning and Development in the Age of Pandemic

Results and Discussion

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of Students Respondents in Terms of Branches/Campuses they are affiliated

	Frequency	Percent (%)
PUP Calauan, Laguna Campus	14	1.6
PUP Main Campus	715	81.3
PUP Parañaque Campus	7	.8
PUP Pulilan, Bulacan Campus	12	1.4
PUP Quezon City Branch	25	2.8
PUP Sta.Maria, Bulacan Campus	1	.1
PUP Sto. Tomas, Batangas Branch	57	6.5
PUP Unisan, Quezon Branch	42	4.8
Total	880	100%

Table 1 describes the frequency distribution of students respondents in terms of branches/campuses they are affiliated

As shown in the table, the highest frequency distribution of students of branches/campuses they are affiliated is the PUP Main Campus having 715 with a percent of 81.3. Next is the PUP Sto. Tomas, Batangas Branch having a 57 with a percent of 6.5, next is the PUP Unisan, Quezon Branch having a 42 with a percent of 4.8, next is PUP Quezon City Branch having a 25 with a percent of 2.8, next is the PUP Calauan, Laguna Campus having a 14 with a percent of 1.6, next is PUP Pulilan, Bulacan Campus having a 12 with a percent of 1.4, next is the PUP Paranaque Campus having 7 with a percent of 0.8, and the least is the PUP Sta. Maria, Bulacan Campus with a percent of 0.1.

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of Student Respondents in Terms of colleges/institution they are affiliated

	Frequency	Percent (%)
College of Business Administration	47	5.3
College of Communication	2	.2
College of Computer and Information Sciences	19	2.2
College of Engineering	192	21.8
College of Political Science and Public Administration	1	.1
College of Science	3	.3
College of Tourism, Hospitality and Transportation Management	2	.2
Institute of Technology	607	69.0
Total	880	100%

Table 2 describes the frequency distribution of student respondents in terms of colleges/institution they are affiliated

As shown in the table, the highest frequency distribution of students of colleges/institution they are affiliated is the Institute of Technology having 607 with a percent of 69. next is the College of Engineering having a 192 with a percent of 21.8, next is the College of Business Administration having a 47 with a percent of 5.3, next is College of Computer and Information Services having a 19 with a percent of 2.2, next is the College of Science having 3 with a percent of 0.3, next is of Tourism, Hospitality and Transportation Management and College of Communication having 2 with a percent of 0.2, and the least is the College of Political Science and Public Administration with a percent of 0.1.

Table 3. Frequency Distribution of Students Respondents in Terms of Sex

		Frequency	Percent (%)
	Female	479	54.4
	Male	394	44.8
	Total	880	100%

Table 3 describes the frequency distribution of students respondents in terms of sex.

As shown in the table, most of the respondents are the female with a frequency of 479 with a percent of 54.4 and male with a frequency of 394 with a percent of 44.8.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of Student Respondents in Terms of Age

	Frequency	Percent (%)
18 - 23	639	72.6
21 - 23	188	21.4
above 23	46	5.2
Total	880	100%

Table 4 describes the frequency distribution of faculty respondents in terms of age. As shown in the table, most of the respondents are the ages 18 to 23, a frequency of 639 with a percent

of 72.6, next are the ages 21 to 23, a frequency of 188 with a percent of 21.4, and the least are the ages above 23, a frequency of 46 with a percent of 5.2.

Table 5. Frequency Distribution of Student Respondents in Terms of Programs they are enrolled

	Frequency	Percent (%)
Bachelor in Public Administration (BPA)	1	.1
Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering	112	12.7
Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering	2	.2
Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering	1	.1
Bachelor of Science in Electronics Engineering	1	.1
Bachelor of Science in Entrepreneurship	43	4.9
Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management	1	.1
Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering	57	6.5
Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering	2	.2
Bachelor of Science in Railway Engineering (formerly Bachelor of Science in Railway Engineering and Management)	21	2.4
Diploma in Civil Engineering Technology	56	6.4
Diploma in Computer Engineering Technology	75	8.5
Diploma in Electrical Engineering Technology	47	5.3
Diploma in Electronics Communications Engineering Technology	17	1.9
Diploma in Information Communication Technology	178	20.2
Diploma in Mechanical Engineering Technology	37	4.2
Diploma in Office Management Technology	222	25.2
Total	880	100%

Table 5 describes the frequency distribution of student respondents in terms of Programs they are enrolled in.

As shown in the table, the highest frequency distribution of students of of Programs they are enrolled is the Diploma in Office Management Technology having 222 with a percent of 25.2. next is the Diploma in Information Communication Technology having a 178 with a percent of 20.2, next is the Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering having a 112 with a percent of 12.7, next is Diploma in Computer Engineering Technology having a 75 with a percent of 8.5, next is the Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering having 57 with a percent of 6.5, next is Diploma in Civil Engineering Technology having 56 with a percent of 6.4, next is the Diploma in Electrical Engineering Technology having a 47 with percent of 5.3, next is Bachelor of Science in Entrepreneurship having a 43 with a percent of 4.9, next is Diploma in Mechanical Engineering Technology having a 37 with a percent of 4.2, next is Bachelor of Science in Railway Engineering (formerly Bachelor of Science in Railway Engineering and Management) having a 21 with a percent of 2.4, next is Diploma in Electronics Communications Engineering Technology having a 17 with a percent of 1.9, next are Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering and Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering having a 2 with a percent of 0.2, and the least are Bachelor in Public Administration (BPA), Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering, Bachelor of Science in Electronics Engineering and Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management having 1 with a percent of 0.2.

Table 6. Frequency Distribution of Student Respondents in Terms of year level they are enrolled

	Frequency	Percent (%)
Fifth year	39	4.4
Fourth Year	78	8.9
Third Year	269	30.6
Second Year	367	41.7
First Year	120	13.6
Total	880	100%

Table 6 describes the frequency distribution of student respondents in terms of year level they are enrolled

As shown in the table, the highest frequency distribution of students of year level they are enrolled is the Second Year followed by the Third Year, First Year, Fourth Year and the least is the Fifth Year.

Table 7. Frequency Distribution of Faculty Respondents in Terms of Branches/Campuses they are affiliated

	Frequency	Percent (%)
PUP Calauan, Laguna Campus	1	2.1
PUP Main Campus	31	66.0
PUP Parañaque Campus	5	10.6
PUP Pulilan, Bulacan Campus	2	4.3
PUP San Pedro, Laguna Campus	1	2.1
PUP Sta. Rosa, Laguna Campus	2	4.3
PUP Sto. Tomas, Batangas Branch	1	2.1
PUP Unisan, Quezon Branch	4	8.5
Total	**47**	**100%**

Table 7 describes the frequency distribution of student respondents in terms of Branches/Campuses they are affiliated.

As shown in the table, PUP Main Campus has a highest frequency of 31 with a percentage of 66. The least are PUP Sto. Tomas Batangas Branch, PUP San Pedro, Laguna Campus and PUP Calauan Laguna Campus that has 1 frequency with a percent of 2.1.

Table 8. Frequency Distribution of Faculty Respondents in Terms of colleges/institution they are affiliated

	Frequency	Percent (%)
College of Business Administration	11	23.4
College of Computer and Information Sciences	1	2.1
College of Engineering	7	14.9
College of Science	2	4.3
Institute of Technology	26	55.3
Total	47	100%

Table 8 describes the frequency distribution of faculty respondents in terms of Branches/Campuses they are affiliated

As shown in the table, PUP Main Campus has a highest frequency of 31 with a percentage of 66. The least are PUP Sto. Tomas Batangas Branch, PUP San Pedro, Laguna Campus and PUP Calauan Laguna Campus that has 1 frequency with a percent of 2.1.

Table 9. Frequency Distribution of Faculty Respondents in Terms of Employment Status

		Frequency	**Percent (%)**
	Part-Time	13	27.7
	Permanent	31	66.0
	Temporary	3	6.4
	Total	**47**	**100%**

Table 9 describes the frequency distribution of faculty respondents in terms of Employment Status. As shown in the table, Permanent is the highest frequency having a 31 with a percent of 66. Part-Time having a 13 with a percent of 27.7 and Temporary having a 3 with a percent of 6.4.

Table 10. Frequency Distribution of Faculty Respondents in Terms of Sex

		Frequency	Percent (%)
	Female	31	66.0
	Male	16	34.0
	Total	**47**	**100%**

Table 10 describes the frequency distribution of faculty respondents in terms of sex. As shown in the table, most of the respondents from faculty are the female having a 31 with a percent of 66, the least are the male having a 16 with a percent of 34.

Table 11 Frequency Distribution of Faculty Respondents in Terms of Age

	Frequency	Percent (%)
25 and below	4	8.5
26 - 30	4	8.5
31 - 35	6	12.8
36 - 40	4	8.5
41 - 45	4	8.5
46 - 50	4	8.5
51 - 55	11	23.4
56 - 60	4	8.5
above 60	6	12.8
Total	**47**	**100%**

Table 11 describes the frequency distribution of faculty respondents in terms of age. As shown in the table, most of the respondents from faculty are ages 51-55 having a 11 with a percent of 23.4, ages 31 to 35 and “above 60” are the same frequency of 4 with a percent of 12.8 and the rest of the ages category are 4 with a percent of 8.5.

Table 12. Frequency Distribution of Industry Respondents in Terms of Type of Business

	Frequency	Percent (%)
Advertising	27	9.5
Agriculture	6	2.1
Banks	14	4.9
Bars and Restaurants	1	.4
Book, Magazines and Newspapers	3	1.1
Building Materials and Equipmen	7	2.5
Business Services	21	7.4
Cable & Satellite TV Production	2	.7
Communications	10	3.5
Construction	4	1.4
Cruise Ships & Lines	2	.7
Education	1	.4
Electrical	1	.4
Electronics	8	2.8
Energy & Natural Resources	1	.4
Engineering	8	2.8
Entertainment	1	.4
Environment	3	1.1
Finance	13	4.6
Food & Beverage	8	2.8
Funeral Services	2	.7
Gas & Oil	1	.4
Government	24	8.4
Health	3	1.1
Industrial	3	1.1
Information Technology	11	3.9
Insurance	1	.4
Labor	3	1.1
Law	1	.4
Newspaper, Magazine & Book Publication	2	.7
Power Utilities	1	.4
Printing & Publishing	7	2.5
Real Estate	1	.4
Transportation	2	.7
Waste Management	2	.7
Others	4	1.4
Total	285	100%

Table 12 describes the frequency distribution of faculty respondents in terms of Type of Business. As shown in the table, most of the respondents from faculty having a business of Advertising, work in banks, business services, government, communication, information technology and finance.

Table 13. Frequency Distribution of Industry Respondents in Terms of Employment Status

	Frequency	Percent (%)
Casual	56	19.6
Contract	27	9.5
Job-Order	47	16.5
Permanent	40	14.0
Probation	39	13.7
Total	285	100%

Table 13 describes the frequency distribution of industry respondents in terms of Employment Status.

As shown in the table, most of the respondents from industry respondents are casual with percent of 19.6, follow by a job-order with a percent of 16.5, permanent with a percent of 14, probation with a percent of 13.7 and the least is the contract with a percent of 9.5.

Table 14. Frequency Distribution of Industry Respondents in Terms of Sex

		Frequency	Percent (%)
	Female	95	33.3
	Male	114	40.0
	Total	285	100%

Table 14 describes the frequency distribution of industry respondents in terms of sex.

As shown in the table, most of the respondents from industry respondents are male with a 114 frequency (40%) and the least are the female with a 95 frequency (33.33%).

Table 15. Frequency Distribution of Industry Respondents in Terms of Age

	Frequency	Percent (%)
25 and b	62	21.8
26 - 30	40	14.0
31 - 35	23	8.1
36 - 40	20	7.0
41 - 45	22	7.7
46 - 50	8	2.8
51 - 55	8	2.8
56 - 60	6	2.1
above 60	20	7.0
Total	285	100%

Table 15 describes the frequency distribution of industry respondents in terms of age.

As shown in the table, most of the respondents from industry respondents are ages 25 and below with a frequency of 62 (21.8%), and the least are ages 46 to 50 and 51 to 55 with a frequency of 8 (2.8%).

Table 16. Distribution of Gadgets owned by the students

Units available	laptop		smartphone		Desktop		netbook		Computer table		PC stick	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Four to Five	3	.3	1	.1	0	0	53	6.0	0	0	0	0
None	413	46.9	732	83.2	824	93.6	19	2.2	811	92.2	846	96.1
One	414	47.0	133	15.1	47	5.3	650	73.9	56	6.4	23	2.6
Six and Above	0	0	2	.2	1	.1	22	2.5	3	.3	2	.2
Two to Three	43	4.9	5	.6	1	.1	129	14.7	3	.3	2	.2
Total	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%

Table 16 describes the distribution of gadgets owned by the students.

As shown in the table, the respondents in laptop owned by the students, 46.9 percent of the respondents are none and 47 percent are owned a one laptop. In smartphone, 83.2 percent are didn't have owned smartphone and 15.1 percent are owned one smartphone. In desktop, mostly of the students didn't owned a desktop computer/ The netbook has mostly owned gadget of the students. The computer table and pc stick mostly didn't own of the students.

Table 17. Distribution of Gadgets owned by Faculty

Units available	laptop		smartphone		Desktop		netbook		Computer table		PC stick	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Four to Five	1	2.1	3	6.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
None	5	10.6	1	2.1	30	63.8	39	83.0	39	83.0	40	85.1
One	34	72.3	27	57.4	15	31.9	8	17.0	8	17.0	7	14.9
Two to Three	7	14.9	16	34.0	2	4.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%

Table 17 describes the distribution of Gadgets owned by the faculty.

In laptop, most of the respondents are owned one with a frequency of 34. In smartphone, most of the respondents are owned one with a frequency of 27. In desktop, most of the respondents are owned none with a frequency of 30. In Netbook, most of the respondents are owned none with a frequency of 39. In computer table, most of the respondents are owned none with a frequency of 39. In PC stick, most of the respondents are owned none with a frequency of 40.

Table 18 Distribution of Gadgets owned by the Industry

Units available	laptop		smartphone		Desktop		netbook		Computer table		PC stick	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Four to Five	9	3.2	36	12.6	33	11.6	34	11.9	30	10.5	83	29.1
None	20	7.0	23	8.1	11	3.9	24	8.4	29	10.2	62	21.8
One	88	30.9	65	22.8	54	18.9	64	22.5	66	23.2	17	6.0
Six and Above	4	1.4	4	1.4	18	6.3	7	2.5	14	4.9	19	6.7
Two to Three	88	30.9	81	28.4	93	32.6	80	28.1	70	24.6	28	9.8
Total	285	100%	285	100%	285	100%	285	100%	285	100%	285	100%

Table 18 describes the distribution of Gadgets owned by the industry.

In laptop, most of the respondents are owned one and two to three with a frequency of 88. In smartphone, most of the respondents are owned two to three with a frequency of 81. In desktop, most of the respondents are owned two or three with a frequency of 93. In Netbook, most of the respondents are owned two or three with a frequency of 80. In computer table, most of the respondents are owned none with a frequency of 70. In PC stick, most of the respondents are owned four to five with a frequency of 83.

Table 19a. Distribution of Academic/Work related online tools used by the students (part 1)

	Email		Internet/research		Academic Platform		Watching Videos		Online Journals	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Everyday	222	25.2	253	28.7	275	31.3	161	18.3	61	6.9
Four to Six Days a Week	139	15.8	198	22.5	165	18.8	198	22.5	98	11.1
Never	22	2.5	41	4.7	96	10.9	42	4.8	264	30.0
Once to Thrice a Month	159	18.1	106	12.0	102	11.6	150	17.0	219	24.9
Once to Thrice a Week	331	37.6	275	31.3	235	26.7	322	36.6	231	26.3
Total	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%

Table 19a describes the distribution of academic/work related online tools used by the students.

As the table shown in email, most of the respondents are once to thrice in a week accessing the email with 331 (37.6%). Accessing an email everyday with 222 (25.2%), accessing once to

thrice a month with 159 (18.1), accessing four to six days a week with 139 (15.8) and the least is never access to the email with 22 (2.5%). In the internet/search, most of the respondents are once to thrice in a month accessing the email with 275 (31.3%). Accessing in internet/search everyday with 253 (28.7%), accessing four to six days a week with 198 (22.5%), accessing once to thrice a month with 106 (12%) and the least is never access to the internet/search with 41 (4.7%). In academic platform, 275 are everyday accessing the academic platform, 235 are once to thrice a week, 165 are four to six days a week, 102 are once to thrice a month and the least are never access to a academic platform. In watching videos, 322 are watching videos in once to thrice a week, 198 are four to six days a week, 161 are everyday watching videos, 150 are once to thrice a month and the least are never watch videos with 42. For online journals, 264 are never read about the online journals, 231 are once to thrice a week, 219 are once to thrice a month, 98 are four to six days a week, and the least are everyday reading a online journal with 61.

Table 19b. Distribution of Academic/Work related online tools used by the students (part 2)

	Real Time Communication		MOOCS		Complying Academic requirements		Web Portal / Online Software		Teamviewer		Research Tools (Turnutin, Grammarly, etc)	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Everyday	237	26.9	27	3.1	129	14.7	67	7.6	26	3.0	64	7.3
Four to Six Days a Week	151	17.2	54	6.1	197	22.4	116	13.2	65	7.4	82	9.3
Never	137	15.6	503	57.2	114	13.0	274	31.1	492	55.9	341	38.8
Once to Thrice a Month	133	15.1	141	16.0	167	19.0	197	22.4	151	17.2	196	22.3
Once to Thrice a Week	215	24.4	148	16.8	266	30.2	219	24.9	139	15.8	190	21.6
Total	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%

Table 19b distribution of academic/work related online tools used by the students.

As the table shown in real time connection, 237 are everyday or daily used of real-time connection, 215 are once to thrice a week, 151 are four to six days a week, 137 are never used a real time connection, and 133 are once to thrice a month. In MOOCS, 503 are never used the MOOCS as online tool, 148 are using MOOCS once to thrice a week, 141 are once to thrice a month, 54 are four to six days a week and the least are everyday used of MOOCS with 27. In complying academic requirements, 266 are once to thrice a week, 197 are four to six days a week, 167 are once to thrice a month, 129 are everyday and the least are never used with 114. In web portal, 274 are never use the web portal, 219 are use once to thrice a week, 197 are use once to thrice a month, 116 are used four

to six months and the least are everyday used with 67. In Teamviewer, 492 are not using the teamviewer, 151 are use once to thrice a month. 139 are use once to thrice a week, 65 are use four to six a week and the least are everyday used of Teamviewer with 26. In research tools, 341 are never used any of the research tools, 196 are use once to thrice a month, 190 are use once to thrice a week, 82 are use four to six days a week, and the least are everyday with 64.

Table 19c. Distribution of online tools used by students in messaging (part 1)

	Instagram		Facebook		Twitter		WeChat		Line	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Everyday	123	14.0	752	85.5	148	16.8	1	.1	1	.1
Four to Six Days a Week	94	10.7	82	9.3	97	11.0	6	.7	4	.5
Never	328	37.3	2	.2	374	42.5	825	93.8	816	92.7
Once to Thrice a Month	168	19.1	8	.9	138	15.7	29	3.3	41	4.7
Once to Thrice a Week	160	18.2	29	3.3	116	13.2	12	1.4	11	1.3
Total	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%

For the first part, instagram, facebook and twitter are the common social media app that the respondents' response on the online tools used by students in messaging, it is reliable to the users to used.

Table 19d. Distribution of online tools used by students in messaging (part 2)

	Skype		WhatsApp		Telegram		SnapChat	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Everyday	3	.3	7	.8	41	4.7	16	1.8
Four to Six Days a Week	3	.3	6	.7	40	4.5	18	2.0
Never	788	89.5	803	91.3	653	74.2	719	81.7
Once to Thrice a Month	62	7.0	43	4.9	97	11.0	79	9.0
Once to Thrice a Week	17	1.9	14	1.6	42	4.8	41	4.7
Total	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%

For the second part, 788 are not used skype, 803 for whatsapp. 653 for telegram and 719 snapchat.

Table 19e. Distribution of internet service tools used by the students (part 1)

	email		Blogs		vlogs		news		Online / Mobile Games	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Everyday	241	27.4	14	1.6	73	8.3	198	22.5	223	25.3
Four to Six Days a Week	216	24.5	28	3.2	93	10.6	191	21.7	148	16.8
Never	22	2.5	579	65.8	439	49.9	167	19.0	204	23.2
Once to Thrice a Month	146	16.6	169	19.2	127	14.4	115	13.1	119	13.5
Once to Thrice a Week	248	28.2	83	9.4	141	16.0	202	23.0	179	20.3
Total	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%

The tables show the distribution of internet service tools used by the students. In first part in email, 248 are use once to thrice a week, 241 are everyday used in email, 216 use four to six days a week, 146 are use once to thrice a month and the least is never with a 22. In blogs, 579 are never used internet service tool by the students. In vlogs, 439 are most answer by never used vlogs. In news, 202 are use most once or thrice a week. In online, mobile games, 223 use most mobile games every day.

Table 19f. Distribution of online tools used by students in messaging (part 2)

	Dating app		Streaming (Video and Music)		Digital Artworks / Creative Media		Real Time Communication	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Everyday	4	.5	244	27.7	64	7.3	231	26.3
Four to Six Days a Week	4	.5	148	16.8	92	10.5	127	14.4
Never	766	87.0	245	27.8	409	46.5	200	22.7
Once to Thrice a Month	73	8.3	95	10.8	158	18.0	138	15.7
Once to Thrice a Week	26	3.0	141	16.0	150	17.0	177	20.1
Total	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%

The tables show the distribution of internet service tools used by the students. In second part where the never used dating app has a highest total of 766, streaming never used streaming has a highest total of 245, digital artworks / creative media has a highest total of 409, and real-time communication are everyday used has a highest total of 231.

Table 20a. Distribution of Academic/Work related online tools used by Faculty (part 1)

	email		Inter-net/research		Social Media		Watching Videos		Online Jour-nals	
	Fre-quen-cy	**Per-cent**	**Fre-quency**	**Per-cent**	**Fre-quency**	**Per-cent**	**Fre-quen-cy**	**Per-cent**	**Fre-quency**	**Per-cent**
Everyday	30	63.8	26	55.3	23	48.9	16	34.0	6	12.8
Four to Six Days a Week	5	10.6	10	21.3	10	21.3	16	34.0	13	27.7
Never	1	2.1	2	4.3	5	10.6	1	2.1	6	12.8
Once to Thrice a Month	4	8.5	9	19.1	2	4.3	4	8.5	15	31.9
Once to Thrice a Week	7	14.9	26	55.3	7	14.9	10	21.3	7	14.9
Total	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%

Table 20a shows distribution of academic/work related online tools used by faculty. In email, the respondents mostly used emails everyday for daily use as well as the Internet/Research, Social Media and Watching Videos. In online journals, most 15 respondents use once or thrice a month.

Table 20b. Distribution of Academic/Work related online tools used by Faculty (part 2)

	Real Time Communica-tion		**MOOCS**		**Complying Academic require-ments**		**Web Portal / Online Software**		**Remote Access Soft-ware**		**Research Tools (Tur-nutin, Grammarly, etc)**	
	Fre-quency	**Per-cent**	**Fre-quen-cy**	**Per-cent**	**Fre-quen-cy**	**Per-cent**	**Fre-quen-cy**	**Per-cent**	**Fre-quen-cy**	**Per-cent**	**Fre-quen-cy**	**Per-cent**
Everyday	25	53.2	5	10.6	11	23.4	14	29.8	3	6.4	5	10.6
Four to Six Days a Week	11	23.4	7	14.9	24	51.1	10	21.3	7	14.9	9	19.1
Never	2	4.3	15	31.9	1	2.1	7	14.9	16	34.0	14	29.8
Once to Thrice a Month	4	8.5	10	21.3	6	12.8	8	17.0	15	31.9	9	19.1
Once to Thrice a Week	5	10.6	10	21.3	5	10.6	8	17.0	6	12.8	10	21.3
Total	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%

Table 20b shows distribution of academic/work related online tools used by faculty. In second part by real time connection, 25 of the respondents most use real time connection everyday.

Most of respondents are never use MOOCS as online tool for faculty. In complying Academic requirements, 24 most use four to six days a week. In web portal / online software, the highest is 14 for everyday use. In Remote Access Software, 16 respondents are never used the software for online tools. In research tools, 14 are never used Research Tools as a online tools by a faculty.

Table 21a. Distribution of Non-Academic/Non-Work related online tools used by Faculty (part 1)

	Instagram		Facebook		Tumblr		YouTube	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Everyday	37	78.7	26	55.3	2	4.3	17	36.2
Four to Six Days a Week	7	14.9	10	21.3	0	0	19	40.4
Never	0	0	2	4.3	43	91.5	2	4.3
Once to Thrice a Month	1	2.1	9	19.1	2	4.3	5	10.6
Once to Thrice a Week	2	4.3	26	55.3	0	0	4	8.5
Total	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%

Table 21a shows the distribution of non-academic/non-work related online tools used by faculty.

As the table shown in Instagram, 37 responses to everyday used, 7 responses to four to six days a week, 2 responses to once to thrice a week, 1 response to once to thrice a month, and no response to never. In Facebook, 26 respond to everyday use and once to thrice a week, 10 respond to four to six days a week, 9 respond to once to thrice a month, and 2 respond to never. In Tumblr, 43 responses are never used, 2 answers to everyday and once to thrice a month, and no responses to four to six days a week. In Youtube, 19 responses to four to six days a week, 17 responses to everyday used, 5 responses to once to thrice a month, 4 responses to once to thrice a week, and 2 responses to never used.

Table 21b. Distribution of Non-Academic/Non-Work related online tools used by Faculty (part 2)

	LinkedIn		Pinterest		TikTok	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Everyday	3	6.4	3	6.4	2	4.3
Four to Six Days a Week	25	53.2	2	4.3	1	2.1
Never	13	27.7	27	57.4	39	83.0
Once to Thrice a Month	6	12.8	11	23.4	4	8.5
Once to Thrice a Week	3	6.4	4	8.5	1	2.1
Total	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%

Table 21b shows the distribution of non-academic/non-work related online tools used by faculty.

In the second part in LinkedIn, 26 responses to four to six days a week, 13 responses to never used, 6 responses to once to thrice a month, and 3 responses to everyday and once to thrice a week. In Pinterest, 27 responses never used, 11 responses to once to thrice a month, 4 responses to once to thrice a week, 3 responses to everyday used, and 2 responses to four to six days a week. In tiktok, 39 responses never used, 4 responses once to thrice a month, 2 responses to everyday used, and 1 response to four to six a week, and once to thrice a week.

Table 22a. Distribution of online tools used by faculty in messaging (part 1)

	Instagram		Facebook		Twitter		WeChat		Line	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Everyday	5	10.6	43	91.5	6	12.8	4	8.5	4	8.5
Four to Six Days a Week	3	6.4	4	8.5	4	8.5	1	2.1	1	2.1
Never	25	53.2	0	0	31	66.0	37	78.7	37	78.7
Once to Thrice a Month	8	17.0	0	0	3	6.4	2	4.3	3	6.4
Once to Thrice a Week	6	12.8	0	0	3	6.4	3	6.4	2	4.3
Total	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%

Table 22a shows the distribution of online tools used by faculty in messaging.

As the table shown in Instagram, 25 responses to never used, 8 responses to one to thrice a month, 6 responses once to thrice a week, 5 responses everyday used, and 3 responses four to six days a week. In Facebook, 43 responses everyday used, 4 responses to four to six days a week, and no responses to never, once to thrice a week and once to thrice a month. In twitter, 31 responses never use, 6 responses everyday used, 4 responses four to six days a week, and 3 responses to once to thrice a month. In WeChat, 37 responses to never, 4 responses to everyday, 3 responses once to thrice a week, 2 responses to once to thrice a month, and 1 response to four to six days a week. In Live, 37 responses never used, 4 responses everyday used, 3 responses once to thrice a month, 2 responses once to thrice a week, and 1 responses four to six days a week.

Table 22b. Distribution of online tools used by faculty in messaging (part 2)

	Skype		WhatsApp		Telegram		SnapChat	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Everyday	3	6.4	3	6.4	3	6.4	2	4.3
Four to Six Days a Week	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0	0	0
Never	35	74.5	33	70.2	39	83.0	37	78.7

	Skype		WhatsApp		Telegram		SnapChat	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Once to Thrice a Month	6	12.8	5	10.6	3	6.4	5	10.6
Once to Thrice a Week	2	4.3	5	10.6	2	4.3	3	6.4
Total	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%

Table 22b shows the distribution of online tools used by faculty in messaging.

In second part in Skype, 35 responses to never used, 6 responses to one to thrice a month, 6 responses once to thrice a month, 3 responses everyday used, 2 responses once to thrice a week, and 1 response four to six days a week. In Whatsapp, 33 responses never used, 5 responses once to thrice a week and once to thrice a month, 3 responses everyday and 1 response four to six days a week. In Telegram, 39 responses never used, 3 responses everyday used and once to thrice a month, and no response four to six days a week. In SnapChat, 37 responses never used, 5 responses once to thrice a month, 3 responses once to thrice a week, 2 responses everyday used and no response the four to six days a week.

Table 23a. Distribution of internet service tools used by faculty (part 1)

	email		blogs		vlogs		news		Online / Mobile Games	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Everyday	31	66.0	4	8.5	3	6.4	20	42.6	5	10.6
Four to Six Days a Week	9	19.1	2	4.3	6	12.8	11	23.4	6	12.8
Never	0	0	28	59.6	27	57.4	5	10.6	23	48.9
Once to Thrice a Month	3	6.4	4	8.5	6	12.8	3	6.4	8	17.0
Once to Thrice a Week	4	8.5	9	19.1	5	10.6	8	17.0	5	10.6
Total	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%

Table 23a shows the distribution of internet service tools used by faculty.

As the table shown in email, 31 responses everyday used, 9 responses four to six days a week, 4 responses once to thrice a week, 3 responses once to thrice a month, and 0 response never. In blogs, 28 responses never used, 9 responses once to thrice a week, 4 responses everyday used and once to thrice a month, and 2 responses four to six days a week. iIn vlogs, 27 responses never used, 6 responses four to six months and once to thrice a month, 5 responses once to thrice a week, and 3 responses everyday used. In news, 20 responses everyday used, 11 responses four to six days, 8 res-

ponses once to thrice a week, 5 responses never used, and 3 responses once to thrice a month. In Online / Mobile Games, 23 responses never used,

Table 23b. Distribution of online tools used by faculty in messaging (part 2)

	Dating app		Streaming (Video and Music)		Digital Artworks / Creative Media		Real Time Communication	
	Frequency	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Everyday	2	4.3	10	21.3	4	8.5	26	55.3
Four to Six Days a Week	0	0	11	23.4	5	10.6	9	19.1
Never	42	89.4	12	25.5	20	42.6	1	2.1
Once to Thrice a Month	2	4.3	8	17.0	8	17.0	8	17.0
Once to Thrice a Week	1	2.1	6	12.8	10	21.3	3	6.4
Total	47	100%	**47**	**100%**	**47**	**100%**	**47**	**100%**

Table 23b shows the distribution of internet service tools used by faculty.

In the second part in dating app, 42 responses never used, 2 responses everyday used and once to thrice a month, 1 response once to thrice a week, and 0 responses four to six days a week. In Streaming, 12 responses never used, 11 responses four to six days a week, 10 responses everyday used, 8 responses once to thrice a month, and 6 responses once to thrice a week. In Digital Artworks / Creative Media, 20 responses never used, 10 responses once to thrice a week, 8 responses once to thrice a month, 5 responses four to six days a week, and 4 responses everyday used. In real-time communication, 26 responses everyday used, 9 responses four to six days a week, 8 responses once to thrice a month, 3 responses once to thrice a week, and 1 response never used.

Table 24a. Distribution of Academic/Work related online tools used by the Industry (part 1)

	Email		Internet/research		Social Media		Watching Videos		Online Journals		Online software	
	Frequency	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Everyday	61	21.4	57	20.0	43	15.1	39	13.7	37	13.0	50	17.5
Four to Six Days a Week	82	28.8	73	25.6	82	28.8	79	27.7	73	25.6	77	27.0
Never	14	4.9	12	4.2	15	5.3	18	6.3	20	7.0	13	4.6
Once to Thrice a Month	20	7.0	18	6.3	21	7.4	21	7.4	27	9.5	24	8.4
Once to	32	11.2	49	17.2	48	16.8	52	18.2	52	18.2	45	15.8

	Email		Inter-net/research		Social Media		Watching Videos		Online Journals		Online software	
	Fre-quency	Per-cent	Fre-quen-cy	Per-cent	Fre-quen-cy	Per-cent	Fre-quen-cy	Per-cent	Fre-quen-cy	Per-cent	Fre-quency	Per-cent
Thrice a Week												
Total	285	100%	285	100%	285	100%	285	100%	285	100%	285	100%

Table 24a shows the academic/work related online tools used by the industry.

As the table shown in email, 82 responses everyday four to six a week, 61 responses everyday used, 32 responses once to thrice a week, 20 responses once to thrice a month, and 14 responses never used. In Internet/Research, 73 responses four to six days a week, 57 responses everyday used, 49 responses once to thrice a week, 18 responses once to thrice a week, and 12 responses never used. In Social Media, 82 responses four to six days a week, 48 responses once to thrice a week, 43 responses everyday used, 21 responses once to thrice a month, and 15 responses never used. In Watching Videos, 79 responses four to six days a week, 52 responses once to thrice a week, 39 responses everyday used, 21 responses once to thrice a month, and 18 responses never used. In Online Journals, 73 responses four to six days a week, 52 responses once to thrice a week, 37 responses everyday used, 27 responses once to thrice a month, and 20 responses never used. In Online Software, 77 responses four to six days a week, 50 responses everyday used, 45 responses once to thrice a week, 24 responses once to thrice a month and 13 responses never used.

Table 24b. Distribution of Academic/Work related online tools used by the Industry (part 2)

	Real Time Communica-tion		MOOCS		Complying Academic require-ments		Web Portal / Online Software		Teamviewer		Research Tools (Tur-nutin, Grammarly, etc)	
	Fre-quency	Per-cent	Fre-quen-cy	Per-cent	Fre-quen-cy	Per-cent	Fre-quen-cy	Per-cent	Fre-quen-cy	Per-cent	Fre-quen-cy	Per-cent
Everyday	45	15.8	36	12.6	43	15.1	46	16.1	44	15.4	76	26.7
Four to Six Days a Week	70	24.6	81	28.4	90	31.6	86	30.2	86	30.2	40	14.0
Never	16	5.6	20	7.0	14	4.9	10	3.5	13	4.6	88	30.9
Once to Thrice a Month	23	8.1	22	7.7	17	6.0	19	6.7	23	8.1	15	5.3
Once to Thrice a Week	55	19.3	50	17.5	45	15.8	48	16.8	43	15.1	19	6.7
Total	285	100%	285	100%	285	100%	285	100%	285	100%	47	16.5

Table 24b shows the academic/work related online tools used by the industry.

In the second part in real time connection, 70 responses four to six days a week, 55 responses once to twice a week, 45 responses everyday used, 23 responses once to thrice a month, and 16 responses are never used. IN MOOCS, 81 responses four to six days a week, 50 responses once to thrice, 22 responses once to thrice a month, and 20 responses never used. In Complying Academic Requirements, 90 responses four to six days a week, 45 responses once to thrice a week, 43 responses everyday used, 17 responses once to thrice a month, and 14 responses never used. In Web Portal / Online Software, 86 responses four to six a week, 48 responses once to thrice a week, 46 responses everyday used, 19 responses once to thrice a month and 10 responses never used.

Table 25a. Distribution of Non-Academic/Non-Work related online tools used by the students (part 1)

	Instagram		**Facebook**		**Tumblr**		**YouTube**	
	Frequency	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Everyday	195	22.2	42	4.8	603	68.5	6	.7
Four to Six Days a Week	135	15.3	28	3.2	170	19.3	10	1.1
Never	218	24.8	639	72.6	4	.5	774	88.0
Once to Thrice a Month	121	13.8	77	8.8	23	2.6	67	7.6
Once to Thrice a Week	204	23.2	87	9.9	73	8.3	16	1.8
Total	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%

Table 25a shows the distribution of non-academic/non-work-related online tools used by the students.

As shown in the table in Instagram, 218 responses never used, 204 responses once to thrice a week, 195 responses everyday used, and 135 responses four to six days a week. In Facebook, 639 responses never used, 87 responses once to thrice a week, 77 responses once to thrice a month, and 28 responses four to six days a week. In Tumblr, 603 responses everyday used, 170 responses four to six days a week, 73 responses once to thrice a week, 23 responses once to thrice a month, and 4 responses never used. In YouTube, 774 responses never used, 67 responses once to thrice a month, 16 responses once to thrice a week, 10 responses four to six days a week, and 6 responses everyday used.

Table 25b. Distribution of Non-Academic/Non-Work related online tools used by Students (part 2)

	LinkedIn		**Pinterest**		**TikTok**	
	Frequency	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Everyday	399	45.3	8	.9	34	3.9
Four to Six Days a Week	201	22.8	10	1.1	57	6.5

	LinkedIn		Pinterest		TikTok	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Never	20	2.3	741	84.2	549	62.4
Once to Thrice a Month	57	6.5	91	10.3	146	16.6
Once to Thrice a Week	196	22.3	23	2.6	87	9.9
Total	880	100%	880	100%	880	100%

Table 25b shows the academic/work related online tools used by the industry.
In the second part in LinkedIn, 399 responses everyday used, 201 responses four to six days a week, 196 responses once to thrice a week, 57 responses once to thrice a month, and 20 responses never used. In Pinterest, 741 responses never used, 91 response once to thrice a month, 23 responses, 10 responses four to six days a week, and 8 responses everyday used. In Tiktok. 549 responses never used, 146 responses once to thrice a month, 87 responses once to thrice a week, 57 responses four to six days a week, and 34 responses everyday used.

Table 26a. Distribution of Non-Academic/Non-Work-related online tools used by Faculty (part 1)

	Instagram		Facebook		Tumblr		YouTube	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Everyday	37	78.7	26	55.3	2	4.3	17	36.2
Four to Six Days a Week	7	14.9	10	21.3	0	0	19	40.4
Never	0	0	2	4.3	43	91.5	2	4.3
Once to Thrice a Month	1	2.1	9	19.1	2	4.3	5	10.6
Once to Thrice a Week	2	4.3	26	55.3	0	0	4	8.5
Total	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%	47	100%

Table 26a shows the distribution of non-academic/non-work related online tools used by faculty.

As the table shown in Instagram, 37 responses to everyday used, 7 responses to four to six days a week, 2 responses to once to thrice a week, 1 response to once to thrice a month, and no response to never. In Facebook, 26 respond to everyday use and once to thrice a week, 10 respond to four to six days a week, 9 respond to once to thrice a month, and 2 respond to never. In Tumblr, 43 responses are never used, 2 answers to everyday and once to thrice a month, and no responses to four to six days a week. In Youtube, 19 responses to four to six days a week, 17 responses to everyday used, 5 responses to once to thrice a month, 4 responses to once to thrice a week, and 2 responses to never used.

Table 26b. Distribution of Non-Academic/Non-Work related online tools used by Faculty (part 2)

	LinkedIn		Pinterest		TikTok	
	Frequency	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Everyday	3	6.4	3	6.4	2	4.3
Four to Six Days a Week	25	53.2	2	4.3	1	2.1
Never	13	27.7	27	57.4	39	83.0
Once to Thrice a Month	6	12.8	11	23.4	4	8.5
Once to Thrice a Week	3	6.4	4	8.5	1	2.1
Total	47	100%	**47**	**100%**	**47**	**100%**

Table 26b shows the distribution of non-academic/non-work related online tools used by faculty.

In the second part in LinkedIn, 26 responses to four to six days a week, 13 responses to never used, 6 responses to once to thrice a month, and 3 responses to everyday and once to thrice a week. In Pinterest, 27 responses never used, 11 responses to once to thrice a month, 4 responses to once to thrice a week, 3 responses to everyday used, and 2 responses to four to six days a week. In tiktok, 39 responses never used, 4 responses once to thrice a month, 2 responses to everyday used, and 1 response to four to six a week, and once to thrice a week.

Table 27. Level of Preparedness of students respondents in the online Virtual Internship

	Frequency	Percent
highly prepared	94	10.7
not prepared	199	22.6
slightly prepared	580	65.9
Total	880	100%

Table 27 shows the level preparedness of student respondents in the online Virtual Internship

As shown in the table, 580 respondents' response to slightly prepared in the Online Virtual Internship, 199 respondents' response to not prepared and 94 respondents' response are highly prepared during the online virtual internship.

Table 28. Level of Preparedness of faculty respondents in the online Virtual Internship

	Frequency	Percent
highly prepared	18	38.3
not prepared	1	2.1
slightly prepared	28	59.6
Total	**47**	**100%**

Table 28 shows the level preparedness of faculty respondents in the online Virtual Internship

As shown in the table, 28 respondents' response to slightly prepared in the Online Virtual Internship, 18 respondents' response to highly prepared and 1 respondents' response are not prepared during the online virtual internship.

Table 29. Level of Preparedness of Industry respondents in the online Virtual Internship

	Frequency	Percent
highly prepared	48	16.8
not prepared	26	9.1
slightly prepared	135	47.4
Total	285	100%

Table 29 shows the level preparedness of industry respondents in the online Virtual Internship

As shown in the table, 135 respondents' response to slightly prepared in the Online Virtual Internship, 48 respondents' response to highly prepared and 26 respondents' response are not prepared during the online virtual internship.

References

Alonso, F., Couchet, J., Manrique, D. and F. J. Soriano (2015). Learning Objectives for E-Learning Instruction

Alonso, F., López, G., Manrique, D.and J. M. Viñes (2005). An Instructional Model for Web-Based E-Learning Education with a Blended Learning Process Approach. British Journal of Educational Technology 1, 217-235.

Arsovski, Zora, Stefanovic, Miladin, Arsovski, Slavko (2007). Effectiveness of E-Training http://www.uniteforsight.org/research-methodology/module6

http://wwwDRIVE%20D/SAMPLE%20THESIS/ASSESSMENT_OF_AVAILABILITY_AND_UTILIZATI.pdf.

https://blog.taaonline.net/2019/05/the-why-explaining-the-significance-of-your-research/.

https://www.weforum.org/platforms/covid-action

Ismael, J. (2002)The Design of an E-learning System. Beyond the Hype. Internet and Higher Education 4 329-336.

Muzio, J. A., Heins, T. and R. Mundell (2002). Experiences with Reusable E-Learning Objects. Internet and Higher Education 5, 21-34.

Schwab, K.(2016). The Fourth Industrial Revolution: what it means, how to respond. Retrieve from: https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/01/the-fourth-industrial-revolution-what-it-means-and-how-to-respond/.

Tallent-Runnels, M. K., Lan, W. Y., Fryer, W., Thomas, J. A., Cooper, S. and K. Wang (2005). The Relationship between Problems with Technology and Graduate Students' Evaluations of Online Teaching. Internet and Higher Education, 8, 167-174.