Adaptability to Online Teaching: the GCBS experience

Author

Dr. P. Ramakrishnan[1], Assistant Professor, Gedu College of Business Studies.

Key words:

Adaptability, Pandemic, COVID-19, Online Teaching, Teachers.

Abstract

Teachers who are able to adapt quickly to changing circumstances in their working environment have a competitive advantage. The sudden closure of colleges during pandemic has left many teachers worldwide uncertain of their roles and responsibilities. Against this backdrop, this paper discusses Teachers' adaptability to Online Teaching during the turbulent times caused by the COVID-19 Pandemic. The study used quantitative data collected from GCBS faculty. The results confirmed the significant positive and moderate influence of adaptability on online teaching during the pandemic.

Introduction

The World Health Organization's Director-General (WHO, January 30, 2020) proclaimed the new coronavirus outbreak as "a public health emergency of worldwide significance."

The COVID-19 pandemic caused abrupt and significant changes notably to education, which underwent a broad, immediate, and dramatic digital transition (Lorenza & Carter, 2021). The abrupt digital transformation occurred in educational institutions, causing instability and upending the educational system (Azorn, 2020; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2020).

* I express my gratitude to Dr.Rajnish Ratna and Mr. Kalpak Chaudhuri of Gedu College of Business Studies (GCBS) for reviewing the paper .

[1] Assistant Professor, Gedu College of Business Studies, Royal University of Bhutan. Contact details are ramki.gcbs@rub.edu.bt
gcbsramki@gmail.com

Countries implemented safety measures in reaction to the outbreak, including social and physical segregation, travel restrictions, and stay-at-home directives (Cucinotta, D. & Vanelli, 2020). Restriction of large gatherings resulted in closure of educational institutions worldwide, necessitating rapid transition from face-to-face academic instructions to online delivery. The pandemic impacted an estimated 280 million learners across 22 countries, affecting over 80% of the global student population (Niranjan, P., 2020)

Similarly, Bhutan's educational institutions were shut down in March 2020. As a result, teachers encountered substantial difficulties in adjusting to online teaching-learning.

Teachers tried their best to be innovative despite their lack of knowledge and experience of and knowledge of online teaching-learning. They initiated a variety of activities such Quizzes, Kahoot, and Mentimeter. Spreadsheets, Google Jam Board, and Google Docs were also used to facilitate learning cooperation. In order to keep students interested teachers worldwide used social media sites including WhatsApp, Messenger, Telegram, Instagram, and YouTube (Anasi, 2018; Jogezai et al., 2021; Van Den Beemt, Thurlings, & Willems, 2020).

In this context, Wang, Tang, Shen, Wang, & Lo (2021), Yang et al. (2020) and Zhang, Chen, & Wang (2020) underscore that sustainable and high-quality learning can be delivered only when teachers are open to change and quick to adapt changes. Further, Macmillan & Tampoe (2000) asserts that an organization's capacity to swiftly grasp possibilities and dangers and turn them into a competitive advantage is referred to as adaptability.

Against this backdrop, this paper studies the adaptability of GCBS teachers to online teaching-learning during the pandemic. Specifically, this study will explore the impact of adaptability on online teaching and the co-relation between adaptability to online teaching and demographic variables of respondents.

The study applied descriptive research design with GCBS faculty as respondents. The study used convenient sampling technique.

Literature review

Nambiar (2020) and Orhan & Beyhan (2020) conclude that the level of the interaction between teachers and students is one of the key factors in determining the satisfaction level of online courses. Two months after the Covid-19 outbreak started, Giovannella (2020) studied the Italian education system to understand the perspectives of teachers on online teaching-learning. The study found that the teachers thought highly of using technology but they also expressed the need for professional development in digital skills. Klapproth (2020) also mentions the indispensability of digital skills to offer effective online teaching-learning. Thus, educational institutions should provide the teachers with the hardware and software that facilitate delivery of quality online-teaching learning.

It must also be understood that administration's perspective, regulatory frameworks, technological support, and computer proficiency of teachers and students are other factors that affect online learning (Srichanyachon, 2014).

It has become a major issue among teachers. The growth of COVID-19 could be stopped by switching from in-person to online learning. Liguori, Winkler, Zane, Muldoon, & Winkel (2021) mentions that the negative impact of the pandemic on education was mellowed by using creative solutions. For instance, to present online content, professors frequently mixed a variety of delivery techniques (D. Hampton et al., 2017).

However, teachers were obliged to work hard to convert face-to-face instructions to online learning due to the issue of atypical learning patterns (Fussell & Truong, 2021; Jnr & Noel, 2021).

Unfortunately, in some places outside Bhutan, most schools were inactive when online teaching-learning platforms replaced face-to-face teaching-learning for over two years, (König, Jäger-Biela, & Glutsch, 2020).
Thus, literature points that adaptability to embrace change is indispensable.

Data analysis

Table 1

Demographic Details

Sl.#	Details	Description	Frequency	Percentage
1	Gender	**Male**	**38**	**70.4**
		Female	16	29.6
2	Age	Upto 25	4	7.4
		26-35	19	35.2
		36-45	**21**	**38.9**
		46-55	8	14.8
		Above 55	2	3.7
3	Nationality	**Bhutanese**	**43**	**79.6**
		Expatriate	11	20.4
4	Position	Assistant Lecturer	4	7.4
		Associate Lecturer	11	20.4
		Lecturer	**33**	**61.1**
		Assistant Professor	4	7.4
		Associate Professor	2	3.7
6	Years of Teaching	Upto 5	11	20.4
		6-10	10	18.5
		11-15	**17**	**31.5**
		16-20	7	13.0
		Above 20	9	16.7
7	Educational Qualification	Degree	4	7.4
		Master	**43**	**79.6**
		Ph.D.	7	13.0
8	Area of Specialization	Accounting	8	14.8
		Finance	**12**	**22.2**
		HRM	5	9.3
		Marketing	5	9.3
		Economics	4	7.4
		Mathematics	2	3.7
		ICT	2	3.7
		English	4	7.4
		Others	12	22.2
9	Number sections handled	1-2 sections	5	9.3
		3 sections	**28**	**51.9**
		4 sections	21	38.9
10	Platform used	**Zoom**	**51**	**94.4**
		WhatsApp	2	3.7
		WeChat	0	0
		Google classroom	0	0
		Others	1	1.9

70.4% (38) of the respondents are male and the remaining 29.6% (16 respondents) are female.

By age, the maximum number of the respondents (39.9% = 21), fall in the age group of 36 to 45 followed by 19 respondents (35.2%) in the age group of 26-35 and 8 respondents (14.8%) in the age group of 46-55. The least number of respondents (2 respondents=3.7%) are those in the age bracket of 55 years and above.

79.6% (43 respondents) are Bhutanese and the remaining 20.4% (11 respondents) are expatriate.

The highest number of respondents (61.1% =33 faculty) are lecturers followed by associate lecturers (20.4%=11 faculty) and assistant lecturers (7.4%=4 faculty). On the other hand, the least respondents are in Associate Professor position.

Majority of the respondents (31.5% =17 faculty) are those with have 11 to 15 years of teaching experience followed by 20.4% (11 faculty) (with upto 5 years of teaching experience. On the other hand, the lowest number of respondents are faculty with 16 to 20 years of teaching experience.

Majority of the respondents (79.6%=43 faculty) have master's degree followed by 13% (7 faculty) with Ph.D. and the 13% of the respondents are with Bachelor's degree.

22.2% of the respondents are those with specialization in finance. This category represents the highest number of respondents followed by from accounting (14.8%), marketing (9.3%), HRM (9.3%). The minimum number of respondents are from ICT (7.4%) and mathematics (7.4%). .

51.9% (28 faculty) of the respondents handled 3 sections during the pandemic while 38.9% (21 faculty) handled as many as 4 sections. On the contrary, 9.3% of the respondents handled the least sections which is upto 2 sections.

Analysis of platform used by the GCBS teachers for teaching during the pandemic shows that majority (94.4% =51 faculty) of the respondents used zoom followed by 3.7% (2 faculty) who used WhatsApp. The remaining 1.9% used other platforms for online teaching during the pandemic.

It can be described from figure 10 that among the various devices used for online classes by the GCBS teachers, 98.1% representing 53 respondents used desktop computer or laptop for online classes and the remaining 1.9% used tablets.

Table 2

Adaptability

Sl.#	***Details***	***Description***	***Frequency (of Agreed responses)***	***Percentage***
1	*Handling emergencies or crisis situations*	*I react with appropriate and proper urgency in life-threatening, dangerous, or emergency situations*	*28*	*51.85*
		I quickly analyze options for dealing with danger or crises and their implications	*32*	*59.25*

		I make split-second decisions based on clear and focused thinking	*23*	*42.59*
		I maintain emotional control and objectivity while keeping focused on the situation at hand	*34*	*62.96*
		I step up to act and handle danger or emergencies as necessary and appropriate	*26*	*48.14*
2	*Handling work stress*	*I remain composed and cool when faced with difficult circumstances or a highly demanding workload or schedule*	*26*	*48.14*
		I am not overreacting to unexpected news or situations	*27*	*50*
		I manage frustration well by directing effort to constructive solutions rather than blaming others	*26*	*28.14*
		I demonstrate resilience and the highest levels of professionalism in stressful circumstances	*30*	*55.55*
		I act as a calming and settling influence to whom others look for guidance	*32*	*59.25*
3	*Solving problems creatively*	*I employ unique types of analyses and generating new, innovative ideas in complex areas*	*28*	*51.85*
		I turn problems upside-down and inside-out to find fresh, new approaches	*29*	*53.7*
		I integrate seemingly unrelated information and developing creative solutions	*25*	*46.29*
		I entertain wide-ranging possibilities others may miss, thinking outside the given parameters to see if there is a more effective approach	*30*	*55.55*
		I develop innovative methods of obtaining or using resources when insufficient resources are available to do the job	*35*	*64.81*
4	*Dealing with uncertain and unpredictable work situations*	*I take effective action, when necessary, without having to know the total picture or have all the facts at hand*	*31*	*57.4*

		I readily and easily change gears in response to unpredictable or unexpected events and circumstances	*30*	*55.55*
		I effectively adjust plans, goals, actions, or priorities to deal with changing situations	*39*	*72.22*
		I impose structure for self and others that provide as much focus as possible in dynamic situations not needing things to be black and white	*35*	*64.81*
		I refuse to be paralyzed by uncertainty or ambiguity	*29*	*53.7*
5	*Learning work tasks, technologies, and procedures*	*I demonstrate enthusiasm for learning new approaches and technologies for conducting work.*	*33*	*61.11*
		I do what is necessary to keep knowledge and skills current; quickly and proficiently learning new methods or how to perform previously unlearned tasks	*33*	*61.11*
		I adjust to new work processes and procedures	*32*	*59.25*
		I anticipate changes in the work demands and searching for and participating in assignments or training that will prepare me for these changes	*37*	*68.51*
		I act to improve work performance deficiencies.	*37*	*68.51*
6	*Demonstrating interpersonal adaptability*	*I am being flexible and open-minded when dealing with others*	*31*	*57.4*
		I listen to and consider others' viewpoints and opinions and altering own opinion when it is appropriate to do so	*36*	*66.66*
		I am being open and accepting of negative or developmental feedback regarding work	*32*	*59.25*
		I work well and develop effective relationships with highly diverse personalities	*30*	*55.55*
		I demonstrate keen insight of others' behavior and tailoring own behavior to persuade, influence, or work more	*30*	*55.55*

		effectively with them.		
7	*Demonstrating cultural adaptability*	*I act to learn about and understand the climate, orientation, needs, and values of other groups, organizations, or cultures*	*34*	*62.29*
		I integrate well into and am comfortable with different values, customs, and cultures	*33*	*61.11*
		I willingly adjust behavior or appearance as necessary to comply with or show respect for others' values and customs	*31*	*57.4*
		I understand the implications of one's actions and adjusting approach to maintain positive relationships with other groups, organizations, or cultures	*35*	*64.81*
8	*Demonstrating physically oriented adaptability*	*I adjust to challenging environmental states such as extreme heat, humidity, cold, or dirtiness*	*33*	*61.11*
		I frequently push self physically to complete strenuous or demanding tasks	*28*	*51.85*
		I adjust weight and muscular strength or becoming proficient in performing physical tasks as necessary for the job	*30*	*55.55*

1. Handling emergencies

Majority (62.96%) of the respondents agreed that they maintained emotional control objectivity during emergencies while 59.26% mentioned that they quickly analysed options for handling emergencies. On the other hand, the least number of respondents (42.59%) agreed that they made split-second decisions to handle emergencies.

2. Handling work stress

55.56% of the respondents felt that they exhibited the highest levels of professionalism and resilience under pressure while 59.26% of the respondents agreed that they had calming and settling influence on others. 48.15% of the respondents affirmed that they could maintain their composure and cool when under pressure.

3. Solving problems creatively

GCBS teachers use creative problem-solving techniques. For instance, majority of the respondents (64.81%) agreed that they came up with creative ways of using the limited resources, and 55.56% agreed that they considered broad possibilities that others might overlook, thinking outside the box to see if there's a better way to do things. At least 46.30% of the respondents concurred that they combined seemingly unrelated data and came up with innovative solutions.

4. Dealing with uncertain and unpredictable work situations

Majority of the respondents (72.22%) agreed that adapting plans, goals, activities, or priorities to deal with changing situations is important. On the other hand, 53.70% reported that one should not allow uncertainty or ambiguity to paralyze oneself.

5. Learning work tasks, technologies, and procedures

Most of the respondents (68.52%) stated that they acted to address performance issues at work, plan changes to respond to the demands of the job, and participate in training that will prepare the participants to cope effectively to change. However, very less percent of them (1.86%) reported that they were less enthusiastic for learning new approaches and technologies for conducting work.

6. Demonstrating interpersonal adaptability

Majority of the respondents (66.67%) agreed that they listen to and consider others' viewpoints and opinions and change accordingly to respond to change effectively. 55.56% of the respondents agreed that they work well and develop effective relationships with highly diverse personalities. But, just 1.86% them felt that they were being flexible and open-minded when dealing with others.

7. Demonstrating cultural adaptability

Majority of the respondents (64.81%) agreed that they understood the implications of one's actions and the need to adjust for maintaining positive relationships with other groups, organizations, or cultures. On the other hand 57.41% agreed that they willingly adjusted behaviour or appearance when necessary to comply with or show respect for others' values and customs.

8. Demonstrating physically oriented adaptability

51.85% of the respondents reported that they regularly pushed themselves physically to perform demanding or difficult tasks. On the other hand, 61.11% of the respondents thought they could adjust to challenging physical conditions such as excessive heat, humidity, cold, or dirtiness. While, only 1.86% of the respondents reported that they adjusted weight and muscular strength or becoming proficient in performing physical tasks as necessary for the job.

Table 3

Perspectives on online Teaching during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Sl.#	Details	Description	Frequency	Percentage
1	Perceived Usefulness	Online learning system makes my performance improved.	19	35.18
		Online learning system makes learning effective.	14	25.92
		Online learning system makes teaching easier.	14	25.92
		Online learning system is useful for teaching.	23	42.59
		Online learning system is convenient for me	17	31.48
2	Perceived Ease of Use	It is easy to operate an online learning system.	24	44.44
		The interaction with the online learning system is clear and understandable.	17	31.48
		The online learning system is flexible to interact with.	21	38.88
		It would be easy to be competent in the use of the online learning system.	27	50
		Online learning system is easy to use.	25	46.29
3	Behavioral Intention	I will use the online learning systemin my subject even after the pandemic of COVID-19.	27	50
		It is important to use the online learning system and I would recommend its use.	26	48.14
		I will modify the teaching activities of my subjects to take advantage of the capabilities of the online learning system.	31	57.40

		I will encourage my students in the online learning system.	33	61.11
		I would like to use the online learning system in the future if I had the chance.	30	55.55
4	System Use	I spend a long time interacting the online learning system.	27	50
		I get involved with the online learning system.	29	53.7
		I join the online learning system to interact with the subject I teach at least once a day.	23	42.59
		I frequently connect to participate in interactive activities (forums) I have proposed in the online learning system.	29	53.7
		I frequently connect to online learning systems to display the degree of participation and progress of students.	30	55.55

1. Perceived usefulness of online teaching

The online learning platform, according to 42.59% of the respondents, is helpful for instruction. However, 33.33% of them disagreed that it makes teaching simpler, and 38.89% disagreed that using an online learning system made learning more effective. Whereas, only 5.56% of the respondents felt that online learning system improved their performance.

2. Perceived ease of use of online teaching

16.67% of respondents disagreed that the interaction with the online learning system is clear and straightforward, whereas 50% of the respondents agreed that it would be simple to become proficient in its use. On the contrary, 1.85% of the respondents strongly agreed that it is easy to operate an online learning system.

3. Behavioral intention to use online teaching in future

61.11% of the respondents agreed to urge their pupils to use the online learning system, and 48.15% agreed that using the system is necessary and that they would advise doing so. However, only 1.86% of the respondents strongly disagreed that they would like to use the online learning system in the future if they had the chance.

4. Sample description of the system use of online teaching

The majority of respondents, or 55.56%, concurred that they frequently connected to online learning systems to show the level of participation and progress of students and that the majority of respondents, or 42.59%, concurred that they joined the online learning system to interact with the subject they teach at least once a day.

Reliability Analysis

Reliability test was conducted on the two variables – adaptability and Online teaching. Adaptability consists of eight dimensions and online teaching has four dimensions. Reliability result is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Reliability results

S.N.	Variable	Dimensions	No of items	Cronbach's Alpha
1	**Adaptability**	Handling emergencies or crisis situations	5	.766
2		Handling work stress	5	.86
3		Solving problems creatively	5	.824
4		Dealing with uncertain and unpredictable work situations	5	.778
5		Learning work tasks, technologies, and procedures	5	.842
6		Demonstrating interpersonal adaptability	5	.813
7		Demonstrating cultural adaptability	4	.839
8		Demonstrating physically oriented adaptability	3	.78
9	**Online teaching**	Perceived Usefulness	5	.825
10		Perceived Ease of Use	5	.834
11		Behavioral Intention	5	.838
12		System Use		.87

Table 4 presents the value of Cronbach's alpha of all dimensions of the two variables. The values of Cronbach's alpha of all dimensions are more than the recommended value of .7 (Cronbach, 1951). Therefore, the instruments used for measuring dimensions and variables are highly reliable.

Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis was conducted to study the level of adaptability and online teaching among GCBS faculty and its difference with respect to demographic variables.

Table 5

Descriptive statistics of adaptability and online teaching

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Adaptability	54	2.77	4.75	3.7441	.43648
Online teaching	54	1.40	4.70	3.3287	.64278

The descriptive analysis showed that the faculty expressed higher level of adaptability to difficult situations as compared to teaching online.

Descriptive statistics of dimensions of adaptability

Descriptive statistics of different dimensions on the level of adaptability among GCBS faculty is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Descriptive statistics of dimensions of adaptability

Dimensions of Adaptability	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Learning work tasks, technologies, and procedures	54	3.00	5.00	4.092	.498
Demonstrating interpersonal adaptability	54	2.80	5.00	4.081	.539
Handling emergencies or crisis situations	54	1.80	5.00	3.840	.598
Handling work stress	54	1.40	5.00	3.718	.752
Demonstrating physically oriented adaptability	54	1.33	5.00	3.697	.804
Dealing with uncertain and unpredictable work situations	54	2.00	4.80	3.681	.533
Solving problems creatively	54	2.00	5.00	3.677	.656
Demonstrating cultural adaptability	54	1.80	4.00	3.163	.444

Descriptive data analysis showed that the mean of all the eight dimensions of adaptability is more than 3 on a scale of 5. The highest mean is reported for ‘Learning work tasks, technologies, and procedures’ followed by ‘Demonstrating interpersonal adaptability’ then ‘Handling emergencies or crisis situations’; while least mean is reported for ‘Demonstrating cultural adaptability’.

Level of online teaching among GCBS faculty

Descriptive statistics of different dimensions on the level of online teaching practices among GCBS faculty is presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Descriptive statistics of dimensions of online teaching

Dimensions of Online Teaching	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Behavioural Intention	54	2.00	4.80	3.577	.681
System Use	54	1.00	4.80	3.437	.750
Perceived Ease of Use	54	1.00	4.60	3.177	.795
Perceived Usefulness	54	1.00	5.00	3.122	.857

The analysis showed that the mean of all four dimensions of online teaching are more than 3 on a scale of 5. The highest mean is reported for 'behavioural intention' followed by 'system use' then 'perceived ease of use'. On the other hand, the lowest mean is reported for 'perceived usefulness'.

Comparative study of adaptability and online teaching with demographic variables

Table 8

Comparative results by sex

Gender		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Adaptability	Female	16	3.5911	.44912	.11228
	Male	38	3.8086	.42041	.06820
Online teaching	Female	16	3.3281	.57647	.14412
	Male	38	3.3289	.67610	.10968

Comparative analysis of male and female faculty on adaptability and online teaching showed that male faculty expressed higher adaptability to difficult situations. On the other hand, both male and female reported same degree of comfort in online teaching.

Table 9

Comparative analysis by age group

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Adaptability	Up to 25	4	3.8604	.67156	.33578	2.7918	4.9290
	26-35	19	3.6162	.36728	.08426	3.4392	3.7933
	36-45	21	3.7933	.48049	.10485	3.5745	4.0120
	46-55	8	3.7813	.30279	.10705	3.5281	4.0344
	Above 55	2	4.0625	.65407	.46250	-1.8141	9.9391
	Total	54	3.7441	.43648	.05940	3.6250	3.8633
Online teaching	Up to 25	4	3.2250	.57228	.28614	2.3144	4.1356
	26-35	19	3.3816	.51967	.11922	3.1311	3.6321
	36-45	21	3.2190	.77193	.16845	2.8677	3.5704
	46-55	8	3.5063	.50458	.17840	3.0844	3.9281
	Above 55	2	3.4750	1.30815	.92500	-8.2782	15.2282
	Total	54	3.3287	.64278	.08747	3.1533	3.5041

Analysis provided in Table 9 shows the highest level of adaptability among the faculty who are above 55 years followed by those in the category of up to 25 years. On the other hand, the lowest level of adaptability is reported by those in the age group 26 to 35 years.
With regards to online teaching, the highest mean is reported by faculty in the age group of 46-55 years followed by those above age of 55 years while least is reported by those in the age group of 36-55 years.

Table 10

Comparative analysis by nationality

Nationality		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Adaptability	Bhutanese	43	3.7434	.45270	.06904
	Expatriate	11	3.7470	.38599	.11638
Online teaching	Bhutanese	43	3.3407	.67421	.10282
	Expatriate	11	3.2818	.52691	.15887

Data provided in Table 10 for online teaching show that Bhutanese faculty are slightly higher than expatriates. On the other hand, the expatriates report slightly higher mean for adaptability.

Table 11

Comparative analysis by position

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Adaptability	Assistant Lecturer	4	3.8604	.67156	.33578	2.7918	4.9290
	Associate Lecturer	11	3.4833	.41105	.12393	3.2072	3.7595
	Lecturer	33	3.7924	.40579	.07064	3.6485	3.9363
	Assistant Professor	4	4.0771	.30652	.15326	3.5893	4.5648
	Associate Professor	2	3.4833	.21213	.15000	1.5774	5.3893
	Total	54	3.7441	.43648	.05940	3.6250	3.8633
Online teaching	Assistant Lecturer	4	3.2250	.57228	.28614	2.3144	4.1356
	Associate Lecturer	11	3.1409	.59111	.17823	2.7438	3.5380
	Lecturer	33	3.3879	.69508	.12100	3.1414	3.6343
	Assistant Professor	4	3.5250	.61847	.30923	2.5409	4.5091
	Associate Professor	2	3.2000	.28284	.20000	.6588	5.7412
	Total	54	3.3287	.64278	.08747	3.1533	3.5041

Comparative analysis by position (Table 11) shows that assistant professor level reported the highest degree of adaptability followed by assistant lecturer, and the associate lecturer. The highest mean for online teaching is reported by assistant professors followed by lecturers while associate lecturers' category reported the lowest mean.

Table 12

Comparative analysis by experience

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Adaptability	Up to 5 years	11	3.6341	.50454	.15212	3.2951	3.9730
	6-10 years	10	3.6075	.43860	.13870	3.2937	3.9213
	11-15 years	16	3.8057	.42770	.10692	3.5778	4.0336
	16-20 years	8	3.8354	.48672	.17208	3.4285	4.2423
	Above 20 Years	9	3.8398	.33330	.11110	3.5836	4.0960
	Total	54	3.7441	.43648	.05940	3.6250	3.8633
Online teaching	Up to 5 years	11	3.3182	.46544	.14034	3.0055	3.6309
	6-10 years	10	3.2750	.81794	.25866	2.6899	3.8601
	11-15 years	16	3.2469	.75773	.18943	2.8431	3.6506
	16-20 years	8	3.4625	.59806	.21145	2.9625	3.9625
	Above 20 Years	9	3.4278	.52744	.17581	3.0224	3.8332
	Total	54	3.3287	.64278	.08747	3.1533	3.5041

Faculty above 55 years showed the highest levels of adaptability, followed by those under 25, and those ages 26 to 35 showed the lowest levels. In the case of online instruction, the highest mean is for the age range of 46 to 55, followed by adults above 55, and the lowest for the age range of 36 to 55.

Table 13

Comparative analysis by Qualification

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Adaptability	Degree	4	3.8604	.67156	.33578	2.7918	4.9290
	Master	43	3.7411	.43615	.06651	3.6069	3.8753
	PhD	7	3.6964	.33774	.12766	3.3841	4.0088
	Total	54	3.7441	.43648	.05940	3.6250	3.8633
Online teaching	Degree	4	3.2250	.57228	.28614	2.3144	4.1356
	Master	43	3.3756	.68238	.10406	3.1656	3.5856
	PhD	7	3.1000	.37749	.14268	2.7509	3.4491
	Total	54	3.3287	.64278	.08747	3.1533	3.5041

Comparative analysis by qualification shows that faculty with undergraduate degree reported the highest level of followed by those with masters. The lowest adaptability is reported by faculty with doctoral degree.
In the case of online teaching, the highest mean is reported by faculty with post graduate followed by those with undergraduate. On the other hand, faculty with Ph.D. reported the lowest mean.

Regression Analysis
Regression analysis was conducted to study the impact of adaptability on online teaching.

Table 14
Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.514[a]	0.264	0.25	0.55666
a. Predictors: (Constant), Adaptability				

The value of *r* is .514, and the *adjusted r square* is .25. It is reported that adaptability explains 25% of the variance (R^2=.264, F (1,52) = 18.669, p<.01). It is inferred that the remaining 75% is unexplained and attributed to other variables.

Table 15
ANOVA results

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5.785	1	5.785	18.669	.000[b]
	Residual	16.113	52	.310		
	Total	21.898	53			
a. Dependent Variable: Online teaching						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Adaptability						

It is inferred that adaptability is a significant predictor of online teaching.

Table 16
Coefficient results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.495	.660		.749	.457
	Adaptability	.757	.175	.514	4.321	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Online teaching						

Interpretation of coefficient results show that adaptability is has significant positive and moderate (β= .514, p<.01) impact on online teaching.

Conclusion

The analysis shows that the means of all eight dimensions of adaptability are above average with highest level reported for ‘Learning work tasks, technologies, and procedures followed by ‘demonstrating interpersonal adaptability’ and ‘handling emergencies or crisis situations. On the other hand, the lowest mean is reported for ‘demonstrating cultural adaptability. It is also concluded that the highest mean is reported for ‘behavioural intention’ followed by ‘system use’ and ‘perceived ease of use’ while the lowest mean is reported for ‘perceived usefulness’. These findings indicate higher level of adaptability to online teaching by GCBS faculty,

The study also shows higher degree of adaptability by male faculty as compared to female. On the other hand, both male and female faculty reported similar perspectives on online teaching.

The findings confirm that adaptation has a substantial impact on online instruction. Therefore, it can be concluded that enhancing faculty adaptability will produce better outcomes of online instructional practices.

Limitations and future scope

This study used GCBS as a case. Therefore, there are opportunities to conduct similar study engaging bigger sample size from different or more colleges, and incorporating more relevant variables for better understanding and generalization.

References

Anasi, S. N. (2018). Influence of gender on attitude towards the use of social media for continuing professional development among academic librarians in Nigeria. *Information and Learning Science*, 119(3/4), 226-240. https://doi.org/10.1108/ILS-11-2017-0114

Azorín, C. (2020). Beyond COVID-19 supernova. Is another education coming? *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 5 (3/4), pp. 381-390. https://doi.org/10.1108/JPCC-05-2020-0019.

Cucinotta, D. & Vanelli, M.(2020). WHO Declares COVID-19 a Pandemic. *Acta Biomed*, 91(1), pp. 157-160. https://doi.org/ 10.23750/abmv91i1.9397.

Culp-Roche, A., Hampton, D., Hensley, A., Wilson, J., Thaxton-Wiggins, A., Otts, J. A., Fruh, S., & Moser, D. K. (2020). Generational differences in faculty and student comfort with technology use. *SAGE Open Nursing*, *6*, 237796082094139. https://doi.org/10.1177/2377960820941394

Fussell, S. G., & Truong, D. (2021). Using virtual reality for dynamic learning: an extended technology acceptance model. *Virtual Reality*, *26*(1), 249–267. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10055-021-00554-x

Giovannella, C., Passarelli, M., & Persico, D. (2020). Measuring the effect of the Covid-19 pandemic on the Italian Learning Ecosystems at the steady state: a. . . *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343127257

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2020). Professional capital after the pandemic: revisiting and revising classic understandings of teachers' work. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, *5*(3/4), 327–336. https://doi.org/10.1108/jpcc-06-2020-0039

Kiilu, R., & Muema, E. (2012). "An E-Learning Approach to Secondary School Education": E-Readiness implications in Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *3*(16), 142–148. https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/ article/ download/3707/3756

König, J., Jäger-Biela, D., & Glutsch, N. (2020). Adapting to online teaching during COVID-19 school closure: teacher education and teacher competence effects among early career teachers in Germany. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *43*(4), 608–622. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1809650

Liguori, E. W., Winkler, C., Zane, L. J., Muldoon, J., & Winkel, D. (2021). COVID-19 and necessity-based online entrepreneurship education at US community colleges. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, *28*(6), 821–830. https://doi.org/10.1108/jsbed-09-2020-0340

Lorenza, L., & Carter, D. (2021). Emergency online teaching during COVID-19: A case study of Australian tertiary students in teacher education and creative arts. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, *2*, 100057. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100057

Macmillan, H., & Tampoe, M. (2000). *Strategic Management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nambiar, D. (2020). The impact of online learning during COVID-19: students' and teachers' perspective. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *8*(2). https://doi.org/10.25215/0802.094

Niranjan, P. S. (2020). Corona virus Pandemic impact on Global Education: A Blessing in disguise. *Sustainable Humanosphere*, *16*(2), 68–72. http://www.sustainablehumanosphere.com/index.php/JSH/article/view/407

Orhan, G., & Beyhan, Ö. (2020). Teachers' Perceptions and Teaching Experiences on Distance Education Through Synchronous Video Conferencing during COVID-19 Pandemic. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, *7*(1), 8–44. https://doaj.org/article/d26dac4485864989a6c82dc182c9608b

Sahu, P. K. (2020). Closure of Universities due to coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): Impact on education and mental health of students and academic staff. *Cureus*. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.7541

Srichanyachon, N. (2014). The Barriers And Needs Of Online Learners. *The Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *15*(3). https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.08799

Wang, F., Tang, H., Shen, W., Yan, W., & Lo, L. N. K. (2021). Factors influencing teachers' willingness to move in the Chinese school system. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *43*(1), 203–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1923457

WHO (2020). Director-General's Statement on IHR Emergency Committee on Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV). World Health Organization Website. Updated January 30, 2020. Available online: https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/whodirector- general-s-statement-on-ihr-emergency-committee-on-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov) (accessed on 6 February 2021).