





Please cite the Published Version

Dao, P , Bui, TLD , Nguyen, DTT  and Nguyen, MXNC  (2023) Synchronous online English language teaching for young learners: insights from public primary school teachers in an EFL context. Computer Assisted Language Learning. ISSN 0958-8221

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2023.2260429>

Publisher: Taylor and Francis

Version: Published Version


Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/636431/>

Usage rights:  [Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Additional Information: This is an open access article which first appeared in Computer Assisted Language Learning

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)



Synchronous online English language teaching for young learners: insights from public primary school teachers in an EFL context

Phung Dao, Trang Le Diem Bui, Dao Thi Thuy Nguyen & Mai Xuan Nhat Chi Nguyen

To cite this article: Phung Dao, Trang Le Diem Bui, Dao Thi Thuy Nguyen & Mai Xuan Nhat Chi Nguyen (25 Sep 2023): Synchronous online English language teaching for young learners: insights from public primary school teachers in an EFL context, Computer Assisted Language Learning, DOI: [10.1080/09588221.2023.2260429](https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2023.2260429)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2023.2260429>



© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 25 Sep 2023.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1901



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Synchronous online English language teaching for young learners: insights from public primary school teachers in an EFL context

Phung Dao^a , Trang Le Diem Bui^b , Dao Thi Thuy Nguyen^b 
and Mai Xuan Nhat Chi Nguyen^c 

^aFaculty of Education, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK; ^bAn Giang University-Vietnam National University HCMC, Long Xuyen, Vietnam; ^cDepartment of Languages, Information and Communications, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, UK

ABSTRACT

This study explored teachers' perceived benefits, issues and their responses to the issues when conducting synchronous online English language teaching (SOELT) for young learners via the lens of Bourdieu's (1986) capital framework. A mixed-methods design using in-depth interviews and a Likert-scale survey was adopted to investigate the perceptions of 124 Vietnamese EFL teachers in different public primary schools in Vietnam. Quantitative analyses revealed teachers' little access to economic capital as compared to social and cultural capital when conducting SOELT. Content-based analyses of interview data show that conducting SOELT for young learners increased teachers' access to social and cultural capital in the form of 1) enhanced online pedagogical skills, 2) greater awareness of the potential of technologies for online teaching and professional development, and 3) increased collaboration among colleagues and students' parents. However, the lack of economic capital created issues for implementing SOELT. Notably, teachers' perceptions appeared to be contradictory because they reported good access to social and cultural capital, but they stated multiple issues related to the access to these two types of capital. The interviews also revealed teachers' adoption of two strategies to resolve emergent SOELT issues: approach coping and avoidant coping strategies. Besides, the results show that teachers' degrees of access to capital were not associated with their background characteristics. The results overall indicate benefits and issues of SOELT that are both common to online education and specific to the characteristics of young learners.



ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 20 February 2023

Accepted 13 September 2023

KEYWORDS

Synchronous online ELT; young learners; teacher perceptions; public primary schools; capital

CONTACT Phung Dao  pd543@cam.ac.uk  Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

Introduction

Recent years have witnessed an increased prevalence of online English language teaching (ELT) across different regions, where many classes have been shifted both deliberately and voluntarily to online delivery (see Tao & Gao, 2022). In some EFL contexts, synchronous online English language teaching (SOELT), defined as a form of online ELT conducted *via* a technological platform with all participants (teachers and learners) present in real time but in different physical locations (Carlson, 2022; Mitchell & Mousa, 2019), has been introduced into public primary schools to young learners (YLS) (see Hajar & Manan, 2022; Wong & Moorhouse, 2021; Yulianti & Mukminin, 2021). However, little is known about how SOELT unfolds in primary schools in EFL contexts. Additionally, despite an increasing number of L2 studies on various issues related to YLS (see Butler, 2011; Oliver & Azkarai, 2017), research on SOELT for YLS, especially from the perspective of teachers—one of the key stakeholders or implementers of SOELT, is relatively scant. Also, in some under-resourced and disadvantaged contexts, it is unclear to what extent primary school teachers can access necessary resources (i.e. capital) to deliver SOELT effectively, given that online teaching requires more technological facilities and infrastructure than face-to-face delivery. To address these gaps and to expand our current understanding of SOELT for YLS (aged 6 to 11), this study explored teachers' perceived benefits, issues and their responses to issues when conducting SOELT *via* the lens of Bourdieu's (1986) capital—perceived as resources that enable individuals (e.g. EFL teachers) to position themselves and function well in a social world or a particular field/domain (i.e. SOELT). In the following sections, we present a literature review (e.g. benefits and issues of SOELT in general and in the context of Vietnam), and discuss the concept of capital as a theoretical lens for the current study. We then describe the study's participants, design, instructional context, and the methodology, followed by the findings and discussion sections as well as the study's limitations and conclusion.

Synchronous online teaching: Benefits and issues

Research has documented several potential benefits as second language (L2) teachers attempt SOELT. Synchronous online classes, for example, have been reported to benefit learners' emotional states by 1) reducing negative emotions common in offline classes (see Resnik & Dewaele, 2023), 2) promoting learning and teaching flexibility (Smedley, 2010), classroom interactivity (Leszczyński et al., 2018), 3) generating opportunities for translingual practices and pedagogy, as well as for collaborative teaching (Yi & Jang, 2020), 4) developing teachers' new sets of

pedagogical skills or competences (e.g. technological competence, online environment management competences, and online teacher interactional competences (Comas-Quinn et al., 2012), and 5) creating positive changes in pedagogy (Ashton, 2022). Notably, it appears that with sufficient preparation, synchronous online classes could achieve its full potential and effectiveness (Moorhouse & Beaumont, 2020).

Despite the potential benefits reviewed above, research has reported numerous issues teachers encounter when conducting SOELT. They include, for example, teachers' inadequacy or lack of training and little support from their institutions (Canals & Al-Rawashdeh, 2019; Le et al., 2022; Taghizadeh & Hasani Yourdshahi, 2020), unfamiliarity with using technologies for assessment (Wong & Moorhouse, 2021), and little to no experience and confidence in using diverse technologies (Jeong, 2017; Moser et al., 2021; Taghizadeh & Amirkhani, 2022; Xu et al., 2021). As a result, teachers experienced feelings of burnout (Lee, 2021; Vargas Rubilar & Oros, 2021), increased marginalization and emotional struggles in online classes (Song, 2022). Other issues concern teachers' ability to address learner-related issues such as learners' low engagement and boredom (Yan & Wang, 2022), and technology-related issues, such as limited and unstable internet connection (Le et al., 2022).

To address these pedagogical and learner-related issues, teachers were reported to have made efforts to improve their teaching efficacy through pedagogical adjustments. They, for example, experimented with new pedagogical techniques (Liu et al., 2022), planned a step-by-step transition (Yan & Wang, 2022), created more collaborative tasks to boost learners' engagement and social presence (Taghizadeh & Amirkhani, 2022), constantly adapted their teaching roles (Ehren et al., 2021), and carefully designed engaging real-time live sessions (Moorhouse & Beaumont, 2020; Yi & Jang, 2020). However, these pedagogical changes varied among teachers (Moser et al., 2021) and were influenced by various teacher-related factors, including their pedagogical beliefs and technological skills (Cheung, 2023; Gao & Cui, 2022; Moorhouse et al., 2021), their attitudes toward technological tools (Huang et al., 2021), their self-confidence in technology (Xu et al., 2021), their perceptions of their students, as well as their prior experience. Also, these issues seem to be more prevalent in EFL under-resourced contexts (Dao et al., 2023). It should be noted that the aforementioned benefits and issues of SOELT are mainly based on research on adult learners, thereby leaving it unknown in terms of how they are applicable to YLs.

Synchronous online English language teaching in Vietnam

SOELT has received little attention in Vietnam's formal education system, but it has become increasingly prevalent in some regions especially after

the pandemic (Pham & Ho, 2020). Like in other contexts, teaching English online in Vietnam has exhibited many issues. Teachers reported having little experience utilizing technology in synchronous online classroom and having little or no exposure to formal online learning as a result of its absence in general education (Utley & Roe, 2021). They also faced a range of issues concerning, for example, setting up interactions for their online teaching, unstable internet connection, limited knowledge of online teaching, minimal technical skills, and a lack of a clear school policy for online learning (see Dao et al., 2023; Le et al., 2022). Additionally, Vietnamese EFL teachers reported receiving limited technological and pedagogical support from their own institutions (Hanh, 2020). This early research provided insights into issues encountered by teachers within the context of Vietnamese online ELT. However, little is known about how primary school teachers perceive SOELT for YLs and how they respond to issues specific to this group of YLs in relation to their access to resources (i.e. capital) required for conducting SOELT. This therefore warrants research into this under-investigated aspect—teachers’ perceptions of SOELT for primary school learners. In the next section, we discuss the capital theory as a theoretical lens for examining teachers’ perceptions of SOELT in relation to resources or capital for conducting SOELT.

Conceptualization and forms of capital

In his sociological framework, Bourdieu (1986, p.15) perceives capital as ‘accumulated labor (in its materialized form or its incorporated, embodied form) which, when appropriated on a private, i.e. exclusive, basis by agents or groups of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labor’. Specifically, Bourdieu’s (1984, 1986) idea of capital could be understood in terms of different forms of resources that individuals and groups possess, which can be used to gain advantage and exercise power within a given social context, and it enables an individual to adapt himself/herself to a social context while also serving as a critical explanation for the resultant societal structure. According to Bourdieu (1984) (see also Grenfell, 2007; Grenfell & James, 1998), the ability to possess capital in any form can enable a person to exercise or increase his social superior rank in a society or situation he is in. Conceptually, capital can manifest itself in three interconnected and interdependent forms: economic, cultural, and social (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 21). The first form, economic capital, concerns an individual’s capacity to supply commodities used for personal purposes, such as owning property and other financial resources (Bourdieu, 1986). The second form of capital is cultural capital, which consists of embodied assets (such as academic and professional knowledge and abilities), institutionalized assets

(such as educational degrees and credentials), and objectified assets (e.g. cultural goods). The final form, social capital, is depicted as 'collectively-owned' capital, indicating social links or interpersonal connections with other groups of people.

When these forms of capital are applied to the SOELT landscape, teachers with economic capital demonstrate their access to teaching resources and equipment such as computers, headphones, textbooks, and online teaching platforms. Teachers with cultural capital tend to possess creditable qualifications (such as degrees and certifications), job experience, and competence (including credentials, skills, and disciplinary knowledge). Finally, teachers with strong social capital have positive reciprocal interactions and connections with a variety of individuals (e.g. school officials, colleagues, students, students' parents, work-related or personal-related collaborators). In general, it could be argued that a teacher with access to diverse forms of capital is likely to deliver SOELT more effectively. More crucially, according to Bourdieu (1986), the triple capital forms can be reciprocal. This is demonstrated by the fact that teachers are more likely to use their social capital (for example, strong relationships with colleagues) to facilitate the accessibility of economic capital (for example, the use of teaching equipment), therefore seeking solutions to their deficiency of teaching equipment. Additionally, teachers can obtain access to cultural capital (e.g. attending a school-funded training course for personal development) if they have demonstrated a strong potential for economic capital.

Arguably, the theory of capital can be a useful framework for investigating issues concerning teachers' delivery of SOELT for various reasons. First, according to Grenfell and James (also see Grenfell, 2007, Naidoo, 2004), the concept of capital is highly relevant and useful for exploring educational issues (i.e. issues in SOELT) because it provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the various forms of resources and advantages teachers possess and how these resources influence their teaching practice and educational outcomes. Second, by considering teachers' experiences of SOELT-related issues *via* the lens of different forms of capital, we can gain insights into the complex interplay between social structures, resources, and educational outcomes. This could then shed light on the ways in which unequal distribution of capital among teachers can perpetuate educational disparities and reproduce social inequalities in the practice of SOELT. Third, the concept of capital offers more insights than conventional views of teacher qualities (e.g. subject knowledge, IT skills, understanding of teaching methodology, interpersonal skills, professional motivation, and self-efficacy) because it provides a broader sociological framework that considers the social, economic, and cultural factors that shape educational outcomes (Grenfell & James, 1998) while conventional

views of teacher qualities focus primarily on individual characteristics and skills. Moreover, by understanding the interplay between different forms of capital and the structural dynamics at play, we can develop a more comprehensive understanding of educational issues (i.e. SOELT-related issues) and work towards solutions that could address these issues and thus create more equitable educational outcomes.

The current study

To contribute to our current understanding of opportunities and barriers associated with SOELT for YLs (aged 6 to 11), this study investigated SOELT at public primary schools in an EFL context by 1) exploring teachers' perspectives (e.g. benefits, issues, and responses to emergent issues) of SOELT for YLs *via* the lens of Bourdieu's capital framework, and 2) examining whether primary school EFL teachers' access to capital depends on their background characteristics. As discussed above, the concept of capital within the context of SOELT was broadly operationalized as access to resources, such as having a network of colleagues and close connections with school leaders/managers and students' parents (i.e. social capital), possessing technological and pedagogical knowledge and skills of SOELT (i.e. cultural capital), and having sufficient facilities necessary for conducting SOELT (i.e. economic capital). With this conceptualization of capital, it is hypothesized that having access to a variety of capital forms is viewed as a condition for successful teaching (Research Question 1). Lacking the capital necessary for conducting SOELT will result in multiple issues during the process of implementing SOELT (Research Question 2), and the level of access to SOELT is associated with the background characteristics of SOELT teachers and learners (Research Question 3). To this end, the study addresses the following research questions.

RQ1. To what extent do primary school EFL teachers have access to economic, cultural, and social capital in conducting SOELT for young learners?

RQ2. What are teachers' perceived benefits, issues, and their responses to the issues in SOELT in relation to their access to capital?

RQ3. To what extent do primary school EFL teachers' access to different types of capital in SOELT vary according to their background characteristics?

Method

Participants

Participants were 124 Vietnamese EFL teachers (100 females, 24 males) recruited from different public primary schools in various provinces of

the South of Vietnam: urban (32), suburban (31), rural, and remote areas (61). Their ages ranged from 22 to 50 years old ($M=35.98$; $SD=8.01$). Their face-to-face teaching experience ranged from 6 months to 25 years ($M=12.69$, $SD=7.27$). Their synchronous online teaching experience ranged from 3 months to 3 years ($M=.79$; $SD=1.03$). They all held a degree in ELT: Master's ($n=4$), Bachelor ($n=87$) and Postgraduate Teaching Certificate from a three-year training program ($n=33$). Their self-rated proficiency levels on the CEFR scale varied: B1 ($n=15$), B2 ($n=106$), and C1 ($n=3$). They taught various grades at the primary school level: Grade 3 ($n=22$), Grade 4 ($n=11$), Grade 5 ($n=12$), and all three Grades ($n=79$). Sixty-nine participants (55.65%) reported not having received any training on SOELT as opposed to 55 teachers (44.35%) who reported attending some brief SOELT-related training. Notably, of the 55 teachers who attended the training, more than half of them (28 or 50.91%) perceived that the SOELT-related training did not prepare them well for teaching online.

The instructional context

SOELT was not compulsory at public primary schools in the context where this study was conducted, but it was implemented as a substitute method of traditional face-to-face teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic and some schools kept delivering SOELT during the time when this study was conducted. In this context, English was taught to students in grades 3 to 5 for two sessions each week (25–35 min per period). All teachers were required to follow the national curriculum for ELT issued by Ministry of Education and Training. However, schools were authorized to choose their core English textbooks. As for the assessment, all grades (3 to 5) follow a similar curriculum in which assessments included multiple informal short-tests, one formal mid-term and one formal final-term test. These tests targeted grammar, vocabulary, and reading skills.

Study's design and instruments

This exploratory study adopted a mixed-methods design using in-depth interviews (qualitative) and an online questionnaire (quantitative). While the interviews aimed to probe into teachers' perceptions of benefits, issues, and their responses to the issues in delivering synchronous online English lessons, the online questionnaire focused on teachers' self-reported access to capital when conducting SOELT.

For the interviews, we adopted a semi-structured individual format using three initial question prompts (i.e. *What do you think about the*

benefits of SOELT? What are the issues/challenges you have experienced when teaching English online to primary school EFL learners? How do you address these issues/challenges?) and follow-up questions based on the participants' answers. A total of eight interviews were conducted *via* Zoom or Google Meet with volunteer teachers who represented different grade levels, teaching experiences, geographical regions, and gender. Each interview lasted for 20–30 min and was audio-recorded. Participants were made aware of the purpose of the study, their rights as participants, and their anonymity in the data and in subsequent published reports.

For the online questionnaire, we investigated teachers' access to three types of capital (i.e. economic, cultural, and social) when conducting SOELT. The questionnaire consisted of four sections. The first section encompassed open-ended questions asking for the participants' background information (e.g. teaching experience, age, gender, English proficiency level, location of teaching, level of teaching, their students' characteristics, their educational backgrounds, and their perceptions of previous training in SOELT). The three main sections included 24 Likert-scale items equally divided into three parts examining teachers' access to economic, cultural, and social capital ([Appendix 1](#)). The items in the questionnaire were developed based on two sources: 1) existing conceptualisations and descriptions of the three types of capital in the literature, and 2) teachers' preliminary interviews that explored teachers' reported access to these types of capital. The preliminary interviews ($n=4$) were not included in this study. Questionnaire items were translated into the participants' first language (Vietnamese) and piloted with 30 teachers *via* Google Forms prior to the actual data collection. Revisions regarding the wording and organisation of items were conducted following the pilot participants' feedback to ensure the content validity.

To examine the psychometric validity of the questionnaire, exploratory factor analyses (EFAs) were conducted to investigate factor loadings on three dimensions (i.e. three capital types). The EFA results served to summarise the relationships among questionnaire items in the form of factor scores that were subsequently used in 1) ANOVA to determine the differences in teachers' levels of access to different types of capital and 2) in MANOVA to determine the relationship between teachers' access to capital and their background characteristics. The correlation matrix results showed that all question statements were significantly correlated with each other. No multicollinearity issues were observed, and no correlation coefficients were greater than .90.

For the economic capital construct, the analysis yielded a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) static value of .72, suggesting relatively compact patterns

of correlations and that factors identified in the analyses were distinct and reliable. The Bartlett's Test of Sphericity provided a significant result ($\chi^2(28) = 272.67$; $p < .001$), indicating the appropriateness of the EFA. Following the Kaiser criterion for communalities after extraction (i.e. Principal Axis Factoring) with eigenvalues being greater than 1, three factors were extracted, with the total variance explained by these factors accounting for 54.33%. These three factors concerned 1) access to school facilities, 2) access to self-finance, and 3) access to subscribed learning/teaching platforms/apps (see [Appendix 2](#) for factor loadings).

As for the cultural capital construct, the results showed a KMO static value of .77 and a significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($\chi^2(28) = 243.65$; $p < .001$). Based on the Kaiser criterion for communalities after extraction, with eigenvalues set to be greater than 1, three factors were extracted, with the total variance explained by these factors accounting for 48.84%. They concerned 1) access to training, knowledge, and skills in SOELT, 2) understanding of students and self-learning ability, and 3) access to parental support and online teaching experience (see [Appendix 2](#) for factor loadings). Finally, for social capital, the exploratory factor analysis yielded KMO value of .89 and a significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($\chi^2(28) = 479.91$; $p < .001$). Also based on the Kaiser criterion for communalities after extraction with eigenvalues being greater than 1, one factor was extracted: access to networks and support (i.e. social capital), with the total variance explained by this factor accounting for 50.22% (see [Appendix 2](#) for factor loadings).

Once all factors were extracted, reliability for all factors on which the items loaded highly was checked by examining internal consistency (i.e. Cronbach's alpha) (see [Appendix 2](#)). The results showed an acceptable level of internal consistency for the first and third factor of economic capital: access to school facilities ($\alpha = .72$) and access to subscribed teaching/learning platforms/apps ($\alpha = .77$), but low internal consistency for the second factor: access to self-finance for online teaching equipment ($\alpha = .58$). Given that Cronbach's alpha for the second factor was below the acceptable threshold, it was excluded from the analysis. Cronbach's alpha for social capital (i.e. access to networks of support) was $\alpha = .88$. As for cultural capital, Cronbach's alphas for three factors extracted in the EFAs reached acceptable level: Access to training, knowledge, and skills ($\alpha = .79$), understanding of students and self-learning ability ($\alpha = .73$), access to parental support and online teaching experience ($\alpha = .75$).

Coding and inter-coder reliability

To analyse the interview data, we adopted both inductive and deductive approaches. The coding process was divided into four stages. In the

first stage, following the inductive approach, the coders (the first three authors) read the whole data set independently to get a general sense of the interview data and then read it again, without basing on any pre-determined frameworks, to identify multiple major topics/ideas that were shared by the teachers to emerge. Once all emergent topics/ideas were identified, they were given labels. In the second stage, we followed a deductive approach in which we first consulted a broad L2 literature relevant to the topic of SOELT in order to refine and identify further emergent topics/ideas in the data. Additional topics/ideas identified in the second stage were also given labels. In the third stage, we grouped all topics/ideas (i.e. labels) identified in the first and second stages into themes (including major themes and their sub-themes) and revised the wording of major themes accordingly to represent their sub-themes. In the fourth stage (part of the process of inter-rater coding reliability), all three coders met and discussed differences and similarities in the identified major and sub-themes. During this discussion, we regrouped (e.g. merged, split, and rearranged) the coded themes and resolved differences until all coders reached a consensus on the final themes and sub-themes. To increase the quality of inter-rater coding reliability, the fourth author read (but did not code) the whole dataset, looked at the coding results agreed upon by the first three coders, and provided feedback on the clarity, organisation and meaning (i.e. whether the themes make sense) of the themes. The fourth author's feedback, albeit minor (e.g. wording and order of themes), was incorporated into the final coding results.

Analyses

To answer the first and third research questions, survey data were analysed quantitatively using inferential statistics. A repeated-measures ANOVA was performed to determine the differences in degrees of access to three types of capital among the teachers. A series of MANOVAs were conducted to examine the relationship between teachers' access to capital and their background characteristics (e.g. gender, school location, their self-rated economic status, and their students' economic situation). For the second research question, content-based analyses of the interview data were used to identify emergent themes following the inductive and deductive approaches described above. The identified themes that were commonly shared among teachers were presented according to the three foci of the research question: 1) teachers' perceived benefits of SOELT, 2) associated issues, and 3) teachers' responses to the issues.

Findings

Teachers' access to capital in conducting SOELT

To investigate primary school EFL teachers' level of access to capital (i.e. economic, cultural, and social) in conducting SOELT, the survey data was analyzed using descriptive statistics (Table 1), and then inferential statistics (i.e. ANOVA) were used to compare teachers' degrees of access to capital among the three types of capital (Table 2).

In Table 1, the results showed that the primary school EFL teachers had limited access to economic capital in conducting SOELT. Specifically, their access to facilities for online teaching and their students' access to online learning equipment was at a modest level (Economic capital Factor 1, $M=3.26$; $SD = .99$, on the seven-point Likert scale). This reality also applied to the financial support for subscriptions to learning and teaching platforms/apps (Economic capital Factor 3, $M=3.25$; $SD=1.07$). Meanwhile, they reported higher access to cultural and social capital, with all means being greater than 3.5 (on the seven-point Likert scale.) Repeated-measures ANOVA revealed that teachers' access to cultural and social capital was significantly greater than economic capital, $F(19.77, 3.78) = 26.938$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 1.4$). Table 2 summarizes the results for post-hoc analysis (i.e. pairwise comparisons)

Post hoc pair-wise analyses revealed that the greater access to cultural and social capital than economical capital was statistically significant in terms of the following aspects: access to training, knowledge, and skills in SOELT (Cultural capital Factor 1), understanding of students and self-learning ability (Cultural capital Factor 2), parental support as well as their SOELT experience (Cultural capital Factor 3), and access to networks of support (Social capital Factor 1).

Table 1. Teachers' access to capital in conducting SOELT.

Capital ($n=124$ teachers)	M	SD	95% CI
Access to economic capital			
School teaching/learning facilities (F1)	3.26	.99	[3.09; 3.44]
Subscribed learning/teaching platforms/apps (F3)	3.25	1.07	[3.06; 3.45]
Access to cultural capital			
Training, knowledge, and skills in SOELT (F1)	3.81	.69	[3.69; 3.94]
Understanding students and self-learning ability (F2)	4.06	.66	[3.94; 4.18]
Parental support and online teaching experience (F3)	3.52	.87	[3.37; 3.69]
Access to social capital			
Networks of support (F1)	3.62	.75	[3.48; 3.75]

Note. M: Mean; SD: Standard Deviation.

Table 2. Post-hoc analyses: Pairwise-comparison results.

<i>Capital Factor</i>		Mean difference	<i>p</i>	95% CI for difference	
<i>Economic Factor 1</i>	<i>Cultural Factor 1</i>	.553*	<.001	−0.784	−0.322
	<i>Cultural Factor 2</i>	.801*	<.001	−1.105	−0.497
	<i>Cultural Factor 3</i>	.261	1.00	−0.686	−0.165
	<i>Social Factor 1</i>	.358*	<.001	−0.583	−0.132
<i>Economic Factor 3</i>	<i>Cultural Factor 1</i>	.083	<.001	−0.162	.327
	<i>Cultural Factor 2</i>	.165	1.00	−0.416	.086
	<i>Cultural Factor 3</i>	.375*	<.001	.004	.746
	<i>Social Factor 1</i>	.278*	<.001	.052	.504
<i>Social Factor 1</i>	<i>Cultural Factor 1</i>	.196*	.008	−0.361	−0.030
	<i>Cultural Factor 2</i>	.444*	<.001	−0.664	−0.223
	<i>Cultural Factor 3</i>	.097	1.0	−0.290	.484

Note. *significant (Bonferroni correction applied for multiple comparisons).

Table 3. Teachers' perceived benefits of SOELT in relation to their access to capital ($n=8$).

<i>Benefits of SOELT</i>	<i>Capital type</i>
Increased collaboration and support from students' parents	Social
Increased connection and collaboration with colleagues	Social
Enhanced pedagogical skills	Cultural
Enhanced digital skills and self-efficacy	Cultural
Greater awareness of available digital tools for self-study skills development.	Cultural

Teachers' perceived benefits and issues of SOELT in relation to their access to capital

The analysis of interview data showed that all teachers reported benefits of SOELT in terms of increasing their access to social and cultural capital. These benefits mainly concerned five aspects as summarized in Table 3.

As presented in Table 3, all teachers acknowledged that SOELT strengthened the connection and collaboration with their colleagues and students' parents, which indicated their increased access to social capital (Excerpts 1 and 2).

Excerpt 1. SOELT enhances support and connection with parents

When I taught English online, parents of my students and I got closer thanks to our regular contact via Zalo and Facebook. I relied on parents to assist their kids in joining online classes and keep track of their progress. I helped parents use Google Meet on their smartphones so that they could manage their children's online classes. We communicated more frequently to keep each other updated on our kids' progress. (Ms. Hoa)

Excerpt 2. SOELT enhances collaboration with colleagues

Previously, I was okay designing a face-to-face lesson by myself, but when we started teaching online, my colleagues and I were more collaborative and willing

to share our online lesson plans and any teaching materials than we used to do. This was because it took a lots of more time to design online lessons than face-to-face lessons. So, it was better to do it together. Thus, we interacted more frequently, assisted one another more, and gained more knowledge from sharing. (Ms. Khanh)

Also shown in Table 3, all teachers reported an increase in their cultural capital in terms of pedagogical skills, digital skills, self-efficacy, and greater awareness of the potential of digital tools for self-study skills development (Excerpts 3, 4, and 5).

Excerpt 3. SOELT enhances pedagogical skills

When teaching English online, I found more ways to help my students practice using English. I also spent more time honing my online teaching abilities. I think I was able to learn how to utilize more creative teaching methods, such as using Google Sheets to gather data from my students, LiveWorksheets to construct activities and tasks, Padlet to coordinate group projects, and Kahoot, Quizziz, and Quizlet to develop language games. (Mr. Hoang)

Excerpt 4. SOELT enhances teachers' digital skills and self-efficacy

Online teaching changed my perception of technology. I was more aware of its potential in language instruction. I felt more at ease and more able to use digital tools to teach effectively. The more I learn, the more I feel like I need to get better with digital skills. I felt like... these technology skills and knowledge really helped with my teaching. (Ms. Hoa)

Excerpt 5. SOELT promotes greater awareness of using technologies in self-learning

When teaching online, I learned that my students could use the digital tools for independent study. I guided them to use digital resources, including e-dictionaries, pronunciation applications, and quizzes from the app stores, for their independent study. (Ms. Que)

I was pleased to learn that many of my students developed their self-study skills by taking advantage of online resources. (Mr. Sang)

Notably, although the teachers reported an increase in their social and cultural capital (i.e. the benefits of SOELT on various aspects) as mentioned in Excerpts 1 to 5 and good access to cultural and social capital as shown in the survey (Table 1), the analysis of the interview data revealed numerous issues in SOELT that were related to their access to economic, social, and cultural capital. These issues were categorized into six groups: technology-related, schools' support, parent-related, colleague networking, and implementation issues (Table 4).

Table 4. Issues in SOELT in relation to teachers' access to capital.

<i>Issues and challenges in SOELT</i>	<i>Capital type</i>
Technology-related	
Unstable internet connection due to low network bandwidth	Economic
Negative impacts of free-of-charge teaching platforms on pedagogy	Economic
Schools' support and relationship with school leaders	
Lack of school's support in equipping teaching devices	Economic
Lack of school's support in terms of training in SOELT	Cultural
Feeling of not being heard by and less connected with school leaders	Social
Parent-related	
More pressure due to fear of being judged on language skills (i.e. pronunciation)	Cultural
Parents' inappropriate behaviors in their children's online classes	Cultural
Learner-related	
Learners' insufficient technological skills to participate in online classes	Cultural
Young learners' lack of self-regulation and positive mindset in online learning	Cultural
Learners' non-collaborative behaviors in online classes	Cultural
Students' decreased motivation or demotivation in online classes	Cultural
Implementation issues	
Reduced instructional time of online teaching session causes pedagogical issues	Cultural
Parents' names on the computer devices create classroom management issues	Cultural
Students use parents' names to tease and humiliate each other	Cultural

Table 4 showed that teachers' lack of economic capital resulted in three main issues of SOELT: 1) unstable Internet connection and low network bandwidth, 2) negative impact of free-of-charge teaching platforms that have limited functions used for pedagogy), and 3) insufficient school's support (i.e. lack of equipment and facilities for teaching such as computers, headsets, cameras) (Excerpt 6).

Excerpt 6. Issues in SOELT due to the lack of economic capital

Teaching online really cost me a lot as compared to offline teaching. I had to spend my own money on a laptop and then high-quality headphones. While the cost of those devices seemed modest for many of my colleagues in the city, it cost me a fortune in this rural area. Also, I could not afford a good Internet package with high bandwidth and thus ended up using the cheap one, which caused a lot of connection issues. (Ms. Hoa)

Like many teachers at my school, I used the free version of Zoom and other platforms for my online teaching without receiving any training or financial support for training on teaching online. To be honest, those free platforms had limited functions and thus I had limited options for creating engaging online activities. (Mr. Anh)

Excerpt 6 showed that teachers received little financial support (i.e. economic capital) regarding buying devices such as laptops and headphones, using full-functioned teaching platforms, and attending training for SOELT. Notably, while teachers at the urban schools could self-equip themselves with computers, teachers in rural schools found this a burden.

Additionally, SOELT resulted in negative impacts on teachers' social capital (i.e. a decreased connection with school leaders) (Excerpt 7).

Excerpt 7. Lack of social capital: Connection with school leaders

I knew that some of my English colleagues at other schools got the support from their school leaders thank to their diplomatic skills. But I just could not understand why my request for training on online teaching was not considered by the school leaders. They (school leaders) said they focused on other important subjects first such as Maths and Literature. English was not considered as important as other core subjects. I felt like my connection with them was not strong enough for my request to be considered seriously. (Ms. Khanh)

Notably, although Table 1 revealed teachers' high ratings of their access to cultural capital, the interview analysis revealed numerous issues in SOELT related to the teachers' lack of cultural capital (i.e. pedagogical knowledge and skills) as shown in Table 4 (see Excerpts 8 to 16).

Excerpt 8. Lack of cultural capital to deal with pressure created by the fear of being judged

I think my English was sufficient for the teaching, but parents attended online classes with their children and thus they could judge my English and even my Vietnamese. I was under pressure and felt burdened, which made it difficult for me to teach. It was unpleasant. I had no such feeling before [in face-to-face teaching], as kids could not judge my English. (Ms. Hoa)

Excerpt 9. Lack of cultural capital to address misbehaving students

Once a kid swore in an online class, I could not discipline him as his parent was present. Then, the parents of other kids were displeased because I did not do anything. They [the parents of other kids] thought such [misbehaving] kids should not be allowed to join the class because it affected their kids. I felt that other parents would think I was not a good teacher because I did not discipline the misbehaving kids. (Ms. Hoa)

Excerpt 10. Lack of cultural capital to address parents' inappropriate behaviors

In some online sessions, some parents disrupted my instruction by scolding their children when kids made mistakes, guiding them to answer my questions, or even explicitly reminding me that the session was about to finish. It was quite unpleasant. Some parents even reacted quite aggressively...like swearing because their child could not answer a question. I believe many [parents] even helped their kids on the tests as well. (Mr. Hoang)

Excerpt 11. Lack of cultural capital to address young learners' insufficient self-regulation and negative mindset

They were kids who had not developed their self-regulated learning skills yet when it came to online learning. Some did not attend classes regularly and many

did not do home assignments. This was partly because some parents or the kids themselves downplayed the importance of English as compared to Mathematics and Literature. This resulted in low online classroom attendance. (Mrs. Khanh)

Excerpt 12. Lack of cultural capital to address young learners' non-collaborative behaviors

Some of the kids did not cooperate during the class activities and turned off their microphone and camera. They kept silent even though they were called to answer the questions. (Mr. Sang).

Excerpt 13. Lack of cultural capital to address learners' demotivation

I felt that some kids were not motivated at all when learning online. They were okay when studying in face-to-face classes. But when they attended online classes, they changed and became demotivated. They were reluctant to participate in the class activities, made excuses for being late or absent, and even played computer games during classes. (Ms Que)

Excerpt 14. Lack of cultural capital to address young learners' insufficient technological knowledge and skills

Some kids even did not know how to turn on or off the mic and camera. They needed their parents or older siblings to help. Sometimes I just accepted and continued the lesson without being able to help those who had technological difficulties. (Mrs. Hoa)

Excerpt 15. Lack of cultural capital to address classroom management issues

I found it hard to identify the kids whose names did not appear on the screen but whose parents' names were used instead. Many borrowed their parents' or siblings' Google accounts to log into the class, so it was difficult for me to recognize them and track their progress. Many kids did not turn on the camera, so I could not know who was present and thus called them by the names of their parents. The only solution to this problem, for me, was to try to memorize the names of kids on the list and their parents' names. (Mr. Anh)

Excerpt 16. Lack of cultural capital to address learners using parents' names to tease each other

Because most of the kids in my class had to use their parents' cellphones to learn, the names of the parents were shown on the screen. Kids then used parents' names to tease or humiliate each other, which was very serious in the context of our culture [Vietnam]. I was really worried as fights and conflicts could occur due to this name issue. (Mrs. Hoa)

Excerpts 8 to 16 revealed that SOELT created various pedagogical issues for teachers, which indicated the negative impact of teachers' lack of cultural capital (i.e. pedagogical knowledge and skills) on their teaching effectiveness.

The results also show that the teachers tended to adopt two main strategies to respond to these issues: approach coping and avoidant coping strategies. The approach coping strategies refers to teachers attempting to 1) seek help from other sources e.g. colleagues, school leaders, and online and offline communities (i.e. social capital-related strategy), and/or 2) self-learn and innovate to address the emergent issues (i.e. cultural capital-related strategy). The avoidant strategies concerned teachers just acknowledging the difficulties or issues without attempts to resolve or stop attempting to resolve after failures. Excerpts 17 and 18 illustrate these strategies.

Excerpt 17. Teachers' responses to children's misbehavior and parents' inappropriate intervention in the online class

To be honest, I found no way to prevent this problem from happening. It was difficult to resolve. (Ms. Hoa)

Actually, I could share and explain the difficulties with the parents. I also enlisted the help of the homeroom teachers who could discuss the issues with parents. (Mr. Sang)

Excerpt 17 indicated that the teachers responded to the parent-related issues differently, with some just accepting the situation (e.g. '*no way to prevent the problem*') while others tried to have a dialogue with the parents and homeroom teachers to resolve the difficulties.

For the teachers' responses to learner-related issues, some teachers tried different ways to address the issues while others stated that it was not an easy task and thus admitted not being successful in resolving learner-related issues (Excerpt 18).

Excerpt 18. Teachers' varied strategies in addressing learner-related issues

To help increase their [learners'] self-regulation and class attendance, I had to call them, via Zalo apps or phone, to join the class prior to the learning session. I also created a Zalo group for each class to keep students informed of the class schedule. Due to students' inability to operate the camera or microphone, they became non-collaborative in online classes, so I tried to familiarize them with the operation of turning on and off the microphones before the learning sessions. (Mr. Hoang)

To encourage frequently absent students to attend classes, I first sought help from the teachers and school leaders. Besides, I prepared handouts for their self-learning. (Mr. Anh).

When I realized that some kids really wanted to participate in the class but they had technological difficulties, e.g. in navigating or using the computer and the teaching platform, I tried to provide them with some brief training. I also encouraged them to ask for help from parents and older siblings to teach them the [technological] skills, at least in terms of how to navigate the teaching platform and turn on or turn off cameras and microphones. (Mrs. Khanh).

Although we tried to help students, we at times found that there were no effective ways to resolve the technological problems for the kids. We just tried, but it was not always successful. We then just accepted it and went with it (Mrs. Que)

Excerpt 18 revealed that teachers tried different ways to address learner-related issues. They included calling learners before class to remind them of the class schedule, asking the form teacher and the school head for support to increase attendance, preparing handouts for learners' self-learning at home, investigating issues for their non-collaboration, and providing technological training. However, Excerpt 18 also indicates that some teachers acknowledged difficulties in resolving these learner-related issues and thus just accepted the situation.

Relationship between teachers' access to capital in SOELT and their background characteristics

In this study, the teachers' backgrounds were operationalised as 1) gender, 2) the location of their school (e.g. urban, rural/remote, suburban), 3) the teachers' economic background (i.e. self-reported income), and 4) their students' economic backgrounds (i.e. self-reported family's finance). Between-groups MANOVAs were performed to explore whether teachers' access to capital is associated with these background characteristics. The results are summarised in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5. Access to capital according to gender and school location factors.

	Gender		School location		
	Female M(SD)	Male M(SD)	Urban M(SD)	Sub-urban M(SD)	Rural, remote M(SD)
Access to economic capital					
<i>School teaching/learning facilities (F1)</i>	3.20(1.0)	3.67(.93)	3.38(1.03)	3.17(1.03)	3.22(.96)
<i>Subscribed learning/teaching platforms/apps (F3)</i>	3.22(1.09)	3.50(1.04)	3.46(1.10)	3.15(.92)	3.16(1.1)
Access to cultural capital					
<i>Training, knowledge, and skills in SOELT (F1)</i>	3.83(.66)	3.83(.85)	4.12(.56)	3.74(.65)	3.71(.73)
<i>Understanding of students and self-learning (F2)</i>	4.06(.67)	4.16(.53)	4.21(.65)	3.77(.63)	4.14(.63)
<i>Parent support & online teaching experience (F3)</i>	3.57(.86)	3.35(.83)	3.53(1.01)	3.62(.76)	3.49(.85)
Access to social capital					
<i>Networks of support (F1)</i>	3.63(.73)	3.57(.92)	3.72(.81)	3.48(.68)	3.63(.74)

Note. M: Mean (based on the seven-point Likert scale, 1=strongly disagree and 7=strongly agree); SD: Standard Deviation; F1= Factor 1; F2=Factor 2; F3=Factor 3.

Table 6. Access to capital according to teachers' and students' economic background.

Capital	Teachers' economic background		Students' economic background	
	Poor M(SD)	Average M(SD)	Poor M(SD)	Average M(SD)
Access to economic capital				
<i>School teaching/learning facilities (F1)</i>	3.09(1.06)	3.30(.98)	3.03(.94)	3.38(1.00)
<i>Subscribed learning/teaching platforms/apps (F3)</i>	3.43(1.23)	3.21(1.04)	3.24(1.04)	3.26(1.10)
Access to cultural capital				
<i>Training, knowledge, and skills in SOELT (F1)</i>	3.69(.66)	3.84(.70)	3.65(.68)	3.90(.69)
<i>Understanding students and self-learning ability (F2)</i>	4.20(.62)	4.03(.66)	4.05(.71)	4.06(.63)
<i>Parental support and online teaching experience (F3)</i>	3.34(.90)	3.56(.85)	3.45(.76)	3.56(.91)
Access to social capital				
<i>Networks of support (F1)</i>	3.72(.70)	3.59(.76)	3.52(.65)	3.67(.80)

Note. M: Mean (based on the seven-point Likert scale, 1=strongly disagree and 7=strongly agree); SD: Standard Deviation; F1= Factor 1; F2=Factor 2; F3=Factor 3.

MANOVA (Wilks' Lambda) results yielded non-significant main effects with small effect size for all background-related factors: gender factor, $V = .83$, $F(14, 230) = 1.508$, $p = .109$, $\eta p^2 = .08$; school location, $V = .79$, $F(21, 322) = 1.248$, $p = .21$, $\eta p^2 = .07$; teachers' economic background, $V = .91$, $F(7, 116) = 1.77$, $p = .10$, $\eta p^2 = .09$; and students' economic background, $V = .93$, $F(7, 116) = 1.28$, $p = .27$, $\eta p^2 = .07$. Thus, the results showed that teachers' access to capital was not significantly linked to the teachers' background characteristics.

Discussion

Access to capital in SOELT for young learners

The goal of this study was to explore public primary school teachers' perceptions of SOELT for YLs in light of the capital framework. The quantitative analyses revealed that teachers' access to economic capital was limited and less than their access to social and cultural capital (Table 1). The qualitative analyses of interview data also revealed various issues in SOELT due to the lack of economic capital (Table 4 and Excerpt 6). These results are predictable given that the EFL context in which the teachers are located (e.g. a developing country) is under-resourced as compared to ESL contexts in developed countries.

Notably, primary school teachers in this context reported greater access to social and cultural capital (scores for social and cultural capital ranging from 3.34 to 4.20 on the seven-point Likert scale). These results suggest that teachers had a good network of resources (i.e. social capital) and sufficient knowledge, abilities, and qualifications (i.e. cultural knowledge). Thus, it seems, based on Bourdieu's (1986) conceptualization of the inter-connected characteristics of all types of capital, that teachers could

actively use social and cultural capital to compensate for the lack of economic capital. In other words, teachers could use or convert social and cultural capital into economic capital, which might address some issues related to economic capital. This capital-conversion possibility is reflected in one teacher's sharing: *'I was lucky because I had a good colleague* (i.e. social capital) who lend me his old but still working computer* (i.e. economic capital) to carry out my online teaching. He also helped me a lot when I had technological issues during the teaching* (social and cultural capital). I very much appreciated his help.'* However, although some teachers could use their access to social and cultural capital to address the lack of economic capital as, not all of them were able to do so. This points to the need for teachers to engage with relevant stakeholders (e.g. school leaders and local education authorities) regarding economic capital-related issues. It also seems necessary for stakeholders at the level of management (e.g. schools and local education authorities) to continue ensuring or providing further support regarding economic capital necessary for conducting SOELT for YLs.

Benefits and issues in SOELT for young learners

The results show that teachers perceived SOELT as beneficial for increasing their cultural capital, especially in terms of many aspects, such as enhancement of their digital skills, fine-tuning of online pedagogical skills, and greater awareness of digital tools for both online teaching practices and professional development (Table 3). These results corroborate previous research that reported similar benefits of online teaching for teachers, especially related to the enhancement of their technological and pedagogical competences (Dau, 2022; Cardullo et al., 2021).

One notable finding regarding the benefits reported by primary school EFL teachers in this study was that SOELT for YLs reinforced and enhanced collaboration and mutual support with colleagues and students' parents (i.e. an increase in their social capital). One explanation for the increased collaboration with colleagues could be that most of the teachers, except some with online teaching experience, realised their lack of SOELT experience, a huge amount of time dedicated to creating online lessons, and various other emergent issues in SOELT as similarly reported in previous research (see Dao et al., 2023; Harsch et al., 2021; Lee, 2021). Thus, they collaborated with colleagues more to address the lack of SOELT experience and resolve issues that arose from online teaching (Dao et al., 2023). As for the increased collaboration and support from students' parents, this result appears to be specific to young learners. That is, for synchronous online classes for YLs (aged 6 to 11 years old), parents often attend their children's classes to help them with the learning and dealing with technological issues due to their young age and inability to resolve

technological issues. These findings extend the previous research findings to emphasize the significance and the positive impact of not only parents' involvement but also teacher-parents' collaboration on their children's learning (e.g. young EFL learners) (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Sapungan & Sapungan, 2014; Stevens & Borup, 2015). The results overall suggest that SOELT for YLs in the current researched context created chances for reinforcing and enhancing teachers' relationship with parents.

Despite the benefits, the results revealed that teachers encountered various issues in SOELT which are related to the implementation of online teaching, technology, the learners' parents, young learners themselves, and the support system (Table 4). With regard to the technological issues, they included, for example, internet connection instability, limitations of free version of the teaching platform, learners' lack of basic technological skills, and little support from the schools. These results confirmed previous research that also documented similar issues in SOELT in various contexts (Le et al., 2022; Moser et al., 2021; Taghizadeh & Hasani Yourdshahi, 2020; Xu et al., 2021).

However, other issues in SOELT reported by the teachers appeared to be specifically related to the characteristics of YLs. For instance, due to their young age, some parents of these learners had to attend their children's learning sessions, which created both positive and negative impacts. While the positive impacts included, for example, parents supporting children's learning and dealing with issues emerging from the learners' end, the negative impacts concerned parents' inappropriate behaviors, additional pressure on teachers when parents acted as observers of their teaching, learners using parents' names to tease each other due to their use of their parents' accounts, and challenges in tracking online students' progress due to not knowing the students when their parents' names instead of their own names appeared on the screen. These results partially support previous research's argument that parental support and involvement result in positive impacts on children's learning (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014). The results of this study suggest that parental involvement especially during the synchronous online L2 classroom activities can impede learners' participation and thus negatively affect their subsequent L2 learning (Dao et al., 2023).

Other issues were related to characteristics of YLs included their lack of self-regulation and online collaborative learning skills, demotivation in online learning, and especially the reduction of teaching session duration (decreasing from 45 min to 20 or 30 min/session to address young learners' low attention and concentration, and time spent on computer screens). These issues significantly changed teachers' pedagogy and influenced their decision on what content to be prioritized in a brief session. These results overall indicate that SOELT for YLs create challenges (e.g. lack of self-regulation, and short

attention) that are very specific to young learners (see McKay, 2006). This thus requires young learner-tailored solutions rather than general solutions in order to address issues in SOELT for young learners. The suggestion for young learner-tailored solutions is in line with previous research that suggests characteristics of EFL YLs are reflected in their interaction patterns (Oliver & Azkarai, 2019), and features of their interaction are specific to young learners (see Ellis, 2003; Mackey & Gass, 2005). This thus requires specific interventions tailored to the characteristics of this group of young learners to enhance their learning (i.e. L2 development) (see Oliver & Azkarai, 2017).

Regarding the teachers' responses to the emerging issues in SOELT for YLs, it appears that their responses represented two typical types of strategies: approach and avoidant coping (MacIntyre et al., 2020). For the approach coping strategy, they demonstrated actively thinking and working out or trying out new ways to address the issues by using their cultural and social capital. This was reflected in their actions in, for example, dialoguing with parents or seeking help from head teachers to address parents' inappropriate behaviors or learners' difficulties in resolving technological issues (i.e. social capital-related strategy), training learners to improve their technological competence and creating additional materials for self-learning and development (i.e. cultural related strategy), and/or seeking further support at different levels (e.g. colleagues and school) (social capital-related strategy). These results indicate that the teachers in the current study, similar to those documented in MacIntyre et al. (2020) study, also adopted a wide range of approach-coping strategies to deal with issues. Notably, the approach-coping strategies adopted by the teachers in the current study encompassed a majority of the types of approach-coping strategies described in previous research (Carver, 1997; MacIntyre et al., 2020). These strategies include, for example, '*instrumental support*' strategy (i.e. seeking help from others), '*active coping*' strategy (i.e. taking action to improve the situation and focusing efforts on addressing issues), '*acceptance and planning*' strategies (i.e. acknowledging the issues and carefully considering the steps to take and devising ways to address issues), and '*positive framing*' (i.e. perceiving the situation as an opportunity for personal growth or finding something positive in challenging situations).

In terms of the avoidant coping strategy, some teachers of the current study employed this approach by behaviorally disengaging from the situation—*behavioral disengagement* strategy (i.e. acknowledging the situation or the problems but not seeking resolutions, giving up trying to deal with it, or abandoning their efforts quickly in tackling the emerging issues). These results are partially in line with the findings of MacIntyre et al. (2020) study which documented teachers' reported use of various avoidant-coping strategies, such as *denial*, *self-distraction*, *self-blaming* and *substance use* strategies. Despite the use of avoidant-coping strategies by some teachers,

the fact that they adopted different approach-coping strategies by drawing on their own cultural capital and social capital points to the teachers' adaptability and resilience. That is, teachers who are resilient and adaptable (i.e. flexible, open to change, and willing to learn and develop new skills) in new situations and challenges tend to be more capable of utilizing their existing cultural and social capital to effectively address SOELT-related issues compared to teachers who accept the issues and take little or no action. Thus, the results suggest a necessity to 1) raise teachers' awareness about the significance of teachers' adaptability in resolving SOELT issues and 2) encourage teachers' greater employment of approach-coping strategies, especially in contexts where resources are lacking.

Access to capital in SOELT and teachers' background characteristics

Finally, this study found that teachers' access to capital was not significantly associated with their background characteristics (e.g. their school location, their own and their students' economic backgrounds, and their gender). These results are not in line with previous research that suggests differences in teachers' access to resources, especially due to the school geographical location or its characteristics (Kanbur et al., 2014; Nguyen Tran, 2017). There are two possible explanations for the similarity observed in this study regarding teachers' access to capital and SOELT issues across teachers of different backgrounds. First, it is possible that because a majority of the teachers (except some who had previous online teaching experience) started SOELT relatively at the same time (i.e. the Covid-19 pandemic), they all seemed to experience similar issues when conducting SOELT for the first time. Second, teachers were all located in an EFL context in a developing country where resources are generally limited (NguyenTran, 2017; Kanbur et al., 2014). Thus, their differences in backgrounds do not seem to be significantly linked to their access to capital. Overall, these results indicate that regardless of their background characteristics, the public primary school teachers in this study seemed to share a similar degree or level of access to capital and thus experienced relatively similar SOELT-related issues as reported above.

Conclusion

This study explored how public primary school teachers in an EFL context perceive the benefits, issues as well as their access to capital when conducting SOELT. The results revealed multiple issues associated with SOELT for primary school learners (e.g. parent- and learner-related, technological, implementation-related and institutional support issues) and teachers' adoption of different coping strategies (i.e. approach and avoidant strategies) to address

these issues. Despite the issues, teachers reported various benefits of SOELT for YLs. The results also revealed similarities across teachers in their level of access to capital, with access to economic capital being the most limited.

Overall, the results overall suggest that SOELT can bring benefits to the teachers and that issues created by SOELT could be addressed *via* teacher's adoption of approach-coping strategies and an increased support from school level. The results also point to the significance of raising teachers' awareness about building up their adaptability and resilience in addressing SOELT-related issues. This awareness raising in combination with advocating for further support from management levels (e.g. schools or local education authorities) can become one of the possible solutions to address issues associated with SOELT, considering that teachers in the context of this study reported similar levels of access to capital regardless of their background characteristics.

Inevitably, the study exhibits limitations that could be addressed in future research. First, this study only focused on teachers' perceptions but not the practices of SOELT. Therefore, examining teachers' actual SOELT practices, as opposed to their reported practices, through classroom observations (to triangulate with interview and survey data), could provide further insights into the benefits and issues associated with SOELT. Second, the qualitative data were based only on eight participants (out of 124 survey participants), so increasing the number of participants for qualitative analysis is necessary to gain deeper insights into the investigated issue. Third, a critique is that perception research (i.e. the current study) has limited impacts on improving SOELT practices, so it is essential for future research to take a further step by devising interventions for improving SOELT practices or addressing SOELT-related issues with the goal to provide pedagogical implications for the classrooms. Fourth, no systematic relations between teachers' economic background and economic capital were observed in the current study, so it is not possible to offer critical commentary on education policies in Vietnam, which is therefore a potential gap for future research to address. Furthermore, due to various interpretations of Bourdieu's sociology-oriented concept of capital (see Dika & Singh, 2002; Lareau & Weininger, 2003; also see Grenfell, 2007; Grenfell & James, 1998), we have adopted a broad operationalization of this concept in this study, specifically relating it to the context of SOELT. Also, Bourdieu's concept of capital is often understood in relation to other core concepts such as habitus and field. However, this study took a partial view by discussing capital separately without looking closely at the social reproduction of various forms of capital among individuals through time/generations as well as emphasizing the interaction of the three core concepts (i.e. habitus, capital and field) that altogether generate practices or shape an individual's behaviour, choices and social outcomes within their specific social context. These issues together form potential limitations of this study and thus could be addressed in future research. Despite its limitations, the current study sheds light on the benefits of SOELT,

highlights issues that can arguably be addressed thoroughly at both the individual level (i.e. for teachers and learners) and the institutional level (i.e. schools or institutions), and showcases the usefulness of applying Bourdieu's ideas of capital to gain a more comprehensive understanding of educational issues, specifically those related to SOELT.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank all the participants who were involved in the study, especially the interviewees who participated in many rounds of follow-up interviews. We are also grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their insightful feedback, suggestions and detailed edits of the article. All errors remain our own.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Phung Dao  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8612-5589>

Trang Le Diem Bui  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8360-152X>

Dao Thi Thuy Nguyen  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5125-1529>

Mai Xuan Nhat Chi Nguyen  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1276-8589>

References

- Ashton, K. (2022). Language teacher agency in emergency online teaching. *System*, 105, 102–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102713>
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction. A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *The handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press.
- Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 36–57. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000122>
- Canals, L., & Al-Rawashdeh, A. (2019). Teacher training and teachers' attitudes towards educational technology in the deployment of online English language courses in Jordan. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 32, 639–664. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1531033>
- Cardullo, V., Wang, C-h., Burton, M., & Dong, J. (2021). K-12 teachers' remote teaching self-efficacy during the pandemic. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, 14, 32–45. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-10-2020-0055>
- Carlson, K. (2022). Upgrading classroom environments for tomorrow's learners. In T. F. Driscoll (Ed.), *Designing effective distance and blended learning environments in K-12* (pp. 61–72). IGI Global.

- Carver, C. (1997). You want to measure coping but your protocol's too long: Consider the brief COPE. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 4, 92–100. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327558ijbm0401_6
- Comas-Quinn, A., los Arcos, B. D., & Mardomingo, R. (2012). Virtual learning environments (VLEs) for distance language learning: Shifting tutor roles in a contested space for interaction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 25, 129–143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2011.636055>
- Cheung, A. (2023). Language teaching during a pandemic: A case study of zoom use by a secondary ESL teacher in Hong Kong. *RELC Journal*, 54(1), 55–70.
- Dao P, Tran T, Le T, Nguyen, T., Nguyen L., & Nguyen, M. (2023). *A landscape review of online English language teaching at public schools in Vietnam*. Research report. British Council.
- Dau, T. T. L. (2022). Remote Teaching amid the Covid-19 Pandemic in Vietnam: Primary School EFL Teachers' Practices and Perceptions. *AsiaCALL Online Journal*, 13, 1–21.
- Dika, S. L., & Singh, K. (2002). Applications of Social Capital in Educational Literature: A Critical Synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 72, 31–60. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543072001031>
- Ehren, M., Madrid, R., Romiti, S., Armstrong, P., Fisher, P., & McWhorter, D. (2021). Teaching in the COVID-19 era: Understanding the opportunities and barriers for teacher agency. *Perspectives in Education*, 39, 61–76.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Gao, Y., & Cui, Y. (2022). English as a foreign language teachers' pedagogical beliefs about teacher roles and their agentic actions amid and after COVID-19: A case study. *RELC Journal*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221074110>
- Goodall, J., & Montgomery, C. (2014). Parental involvement to parental engagement: A continuum. *Educational Review*, 66, 399–410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.781576>
- Grenfell, M. (2007). *Pierre Bourdieu*. Bloomsbury.
- Grenfell, M., & James, D. (1998). *Bourdieu and Education: Acts of practical theory*. Routledge Falmer.
- Hajar, A., & Manan, S. A. (2022). Emergency remote English language teaching and learning: Voices of primary school students and teachers in Kazakhstan. *Review of Education*, 10, 33–58. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3358>
- Hanh, H. (2020). Kiem soat chat luong day hoc truc tuyen o cac truong dai hoc [How to control online. teaching qualities at universities]. Dan Tri. <https://dantri.com.vn/giao-duc-khuyen-hoc/kiem-soat-the-nao-chat-luong-day-hoc-truc-tuyen-o-cac-truong-dai-hoc-20200408110113741.htm>.
- Harsch, C., Müller-Karabil, A., & Buchminskaia, E. (2021). Addressing the challenges of interaction in online language courses. *System*, 103, 102–673. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102673>
- Huang, F., Teo, T., & Guo, J. (2021). Understanding English teachers' non-volitional use of online teaching: A Chinese study. *System*, 101, 102–574. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102574>
- Jeong, K.-O. (2017). Preparing EFL student teachers with new technologies in the Korean context. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 30, 488–509. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1321554>
- Kanbur, R., Rhee, C., & Zhuang, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Inequality in Asia and the Pacific: Trends, drivers, and policy implications*. Routledge.
- Lareau, A., & Weininger, E. B. (2003). Cultural Capital in educational research: A critical assessment. *Theory and Society*, 32, 567–606. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:RYSO.0000004951.04408.b0>
- Le, A. V., Han, P., Khaing, M. M., Farrar, O., Reimers, F. M., Amaechi, U., Banerji, A., & Wang, M. (2022). An emerging dragon: Vietnamese education after resolution 29. In

- Education to Build Back Better: What Can We Learn from Education Reform for a Post-pandemic World* (pp. 99–123). Springer International Publishing.
- Le, V. T., Nguyen, N. H., Tran, T. L. N., Nguyen, L. T., Nguyen, T. A., & Nguyen, M. T. (2022). The interaction patterns of pandemic-initiated online teaching: How teachers adapted. *System*, 105, 102–755. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102755>
- Lee, S. M. (2021). Factors affecting the quality of online learning in a task-based college course. *Foreign Language Annals*, 55, 116–134. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12572>
- Leszczyński, P., Charuta, A., Łaziuk, B., Gałazkowski, R., Wejnarski, A., Roszak, M., & Kołodziejczak, B. (2018). Multimedia and interactivity in distance learning of resuscitation guidelines: A randomised controlled trial. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 26, 151–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2017.1337035>
- Liu, S., Yuan, R., & Wang, C. (2022). Let emotion ring: An autoethnographic self-study of an EFL instructor in Wuhan during COVID-19. *Language Teaching Research*.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Gregersen, T., & Mercer, S. (2020). Language teachers' coping strategies during the Covid-19 conversion to online teaching: Correlations with stress, wellbeing and negative emotions. *System*, 94, 102–352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102352>
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Erlbaum.
- McKay, P. (2006). *Assessing young language learners*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mitchell, S., & Mousa, W. (2019). A Framework for engaging language learners in the on-line constructivist classrooms. In M. Kruk (Ed.), *Assessing the effectiveness of virtual technologies in foreign and second language instruction* (pp. 238–259). IGI Global.
- Moorhouse, B. L., & Beaumont, A. M. (2020). Utilizing video conferencing software to teach young language learners in Hong Kong during the COVID-19 class suspensions. *TESOL Journal*, 11, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.545>
- Moorhouse, B. L., Li, Y., & Walsh, S. (2021). E-classroom interactional competencies: Mediating and assisting language learning during synchronous online lessons. *RELJ Journal*.
- Moser, K. M., Wei, T., & Brenner, D. (2021). Remote teaching during COVID-19: Implications from a national survey of language educators. *System*, 97, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102431>
- Naidoo, R. (2004). Fields and institutional strategy: Bourdieu on the relationship between higher education, inequality and society. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25, 457–471.
- Nguyen Tran, L. (2017). *Even it Up: How to tackle inequality in Vietnam*. Oxfam Briefing paper. https://www-cdn.oxfam.org/s3fs-public/file_attachments/bp-vietnam-inequality-120117-en.pdf
- Oliver, R., & Azkarai, A. (2017). Review of child second language acquisition (SLA): Examining theories and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 62–76. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190517000058>
- Oliver, R., & Azkarai, A. (2019). Patterns of interaction and young ESL learners: What is the impact of proficiency and task type? *Language Teaching for Young Learners*, 1, 82–102. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ltyl.00006.oli>
- Pham, H. H., & Ho, T. T. H. (2020). Toward a 'new normal' with e-learning in Vietnamese higher education during the post COVID-19 pandemic. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39, 1327–1331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1823945>
- Resnik, P., & Dewaele, J. M. (2023). Learner emotions, autonomy and trait emotional intelligence in 'in-person' versus emergency remote English foreign language teaching in Europe. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 14(3), 473–501. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0096>
- Sapungan, G. M., & Sapungan, R. M. (2014). Parental involvement in child's education: Importance, barriers and benefits. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education*, 3, 42–48.

- Song, J. (2022). The emotional landscape of online teaching: An autoethnographic exploration of vulnerability and emotional reflexivity. *System*, 106, 102–774. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102774>
- Smedley, J. (2010). Modelling the impact of knowledge management using technology. *Or Insight*, 23, 233–250. <https://doi.org/10.1057/ori.2010.11>
- Stevens, M., & Borup, J. (2015). Parental engagement in online learning environments: A review of the literature. *Advances in Research on Teaching*, 25, 95–111.
- Taghizadeh, M., & Hasani Yourdshahi, Z. (2020). Integrating technology into young learners' classes: Language teachers' perceptions. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33, 982–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1618876>
- Taghizadeh, M., & Amirkhani, S. (2022). Pre-service EFL teachers' conceptions and strategy use in managing online classes. *System*, 104, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102671>
- Tao, J., & Gao, X. A. (2022). Teaching and learning languages online: Challenges and responses. *System*, 107, 102–819. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102819>
- Utley, S., & Roe, J. (2021). Changing Technologies or Changing Identities? The Effects of Online Teaching on Educator Identity in Vietnam During COVID-19. *International Journal of TESOL Studies*, 4, 33–49.
- Vargas Rubilar, N., & Oros, L. B. (2021). Stress and burnout in teachers during times of pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 756007. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.756007>
- Wong, K. M., & Moorhouse, B. L. (2021). Digital competence and online language teaching: Hong Kong Language teacher practices in primary and secondary classrooms. *System*, 103, 102–653. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102653>
- Xu, Y., Jin, L., Deifell, E., & Angus, K. (2021). Chinese character instruction online: A technology acceptance perspective in emergency remote teaching. *System*, 100, 102–542. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102542>
- Yan, C., & Wang, L. (2022). Experienced EFL teachers switching to online teaching: A case study from China. *System*, 105, 102–717. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102717>
- Yi, Y., & Jang, J. (2020). Envisioning possibilities amid the COVID-19 pandemic: Implications from English language teaching in South Korea. *TESOL Journal*, 11, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.543>
- Yulianti, K., & Mukminin, A. (2021). Teaching and learning during COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative study on elementary school teachers in Indonesia. *The Qualitative Report*, 26, 3900–3910. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2021.5079>

Appendix 1

Table A1. Seven-point Likert-scale questionnaire: English and Vietnamese versions.

Items	Economic capital
1.	<i>My school provides me with teaching resources (e.g. textbooks, materials, resource books) to teach online.</i> Trường tôi cung cấp cho tôi nguồn tài nguyên dạy trực tuyến (như sách, tài liệu, sách tham khảo).
2.	<i>My school provides me with technical equipment and facilities to teach online.</i> Trường tôi cung cấp cho tôi đủ thiết bị công nghệ and phương tiện để dạy trực tuyến.
3.	<i>My students have sufficient facilities (e.g. computer and headphones) to learn online.</i> Học sinh của tôi có đủ thiết bị (máy tính và tai nghe) để học trực tuyến.
4.	<i>I am financially able to afford necessary equipment to conduct my online teaching.</i> Tôi có đủ khả năng tài chính để chi trả mua thiết bị dạy trực tuyến.
5.	<i>I have stable internet connection when teaching online.</i> Tôi có kết nối mạng ổn định khi giảng dạy trực tuyến.
6.	<i>I pay to subscribe to the teaching platform in order to teach online.</i> Tôi tự chi trả để đăng ký nền tảng giảng dạy trực tuyến
7.	<i>I pay for materials that I use to teach online.</i> Tôi tự chi trả các tài liệu mà tôi sử dụng để dạy trực tuyến.
8.	<i>I pay for subscribed learning/teaching apps to increase my teaching effectiveness.</i> Tôi trả tiền cho các ứng dụng học tập/giảng dạy đã đăng ký để tăng cường hiệu quả giảng dạy của mình.
	Cultural capital
1.	<i>My previous training (i.e. at undergraduate and postgraduate levels) enables me to teach online well.</i> Đào tạo trước đây của tôi (ở cấp đại học và sau đại học cho phép tôi giảng dạy trực tuyến tốt.
2.	<i>I know how to teach online effectively.</i> Tôi biết cách dạy trực tuyến hiệu quả.
3.	<i>My pedagogical knowledge enables me to teach online well.</i> Kiến thức sư phạm của tôi giúp tôi giảng dạy trực tuyến tốt.
4.	<i>My English skill enables me to teach English online well.</i> Kỹ năng tiếng Anh của tôi cho phép tôi dạy tiếng Anh trực tuyến tốt.
5.	<i>My understanding of the students helps me teach online effectively.</i> Sự hiểu biết của tôi về học sinh giúp tôi giảng dạy trực tuyến hiệu quả.
6.	<i>I learn to teach online by myself.</i> Tôi tự học cách dạy học trực tuyến.
7.	<i>My students do not have support and guidance from their parents when learning online.</i> Học sinh của tôi không có sự hỗ trợ và hướng dẫn của ba mẹ khi học trực tuyến. (R)
8.	<i>My lack of online teaching experience hinders my online teaching's effectiveness.</i> Việc tôi thiếu kinh nghiệm giảng dạy trực tuyến cản trở hiệu quả giảng dạy trực tuyến của tôi. (R)
	Social capital
1.	<i>The attendance of my students' parents in my online classes increases my online teaching effectiveness.</i> Sự tham dự của phụ huynh học sinh trong các lớp học trực tuyến giúp tăng cường hiệu quả giảng dạy trực tuyến của tôi.
2.	<i>I have colleagues who can help me in terms of teaching pedagogies when teaching online.</i> Tôi có các đồng nghiệp có thể giúp tôi về phương pháp giảng dạy sư phạm khi giảng dạy trực tuyến.
3.	<i>I have a network of people (e.g. friends, colleagues, family members and others) to seek help for my online teaching whenever I need to.</i> Tôi có một mạng lưới người quen (ví dụ: bạn bè, đồng nghiệp, thành viên gia đình và những người khác) để tìm kiếm sự trợ giúp cho việc giảng dạy trực tuyến bất cứ khi nào tôi cần.
4.	<i>I can seek help from my school to resolve issues (e.g. technical, teaching resources and materials, and classroom management) when teaching online.</i> Tôi có thể tìm kiếm sự trợ giúp từ trường của mình để giải quyết các vấn đề (ví dụ: kỹ thuật, tài nguyên và tài liệu giảng dạy, và quản lý lớp học) khi giảng dạy trực tuyến.
5.	<i>I can have access to teaching materials necessary for my online teaching thanks to my networks of acquaintances (e.g. friends and others).</i> Tôi có thể có quyền truy cập vào các nguồn tài liệu giảng dạy cần thiết cho việc dạy trực tuyến của mình nhờ vào mạng lưới những người thân quen của tôi (ví dụ: bạn bè và những người khác).
6.	<i>I have friends and colleagues who help me with technical issues when teaching online.</i> Tôi có bạn bè và đồng nghiệp giúp đỡ về các vấn đề kỹ thuật khi giảng dạy trực tuyến.
7.	<i>I have a good relationship with my students' parents to support my online teaching.</i> Tôi có mối quan hệ tốt với phụ huynh học sinh để hỗ trợ việc giảng dạy trực tuyến của tôi.
8.	<i>I form a good relationship with my learners when teaching online.</i> Tôi hình thành mối quan hệ tốt với người học khi giảng dạy trực tuyến.

Appendix 2

Table A2. Questionnaire: Exploratory factor analysis and reliability results.

Items	Loadings
Economic capital	
Access to school teaching and learning facilities (Factor 1); $\alpha = .72$	
<i>My school provides me with teaching resources (e.g. textbooks, materials, resource books) to teach online.</i>	.931
<i>My school provides me with technical equipment and facilities to teach online.</i>	.542
<i>My students have sufficient facilities (e.g. computer and headphones) to learn online.</i>	.456
Access to self-finance for online teaching equipment (Factor 2); $\alpha = .58$	
<i>I am financially able to afford necessary equipment to conduct my online teaching.</i>	.667
<i>I have stable internet connection when teaching online.</i>	.596
Access to subscribed learning and teaching platform/apps (Factor 3); $\alpha = .77$	
<i>I pay to subscribe to the teaching platform in order to teach online.</i>	.847
<i>I pay for materials that I use to teach online.</i>	.689
<i>I pay for subscribed learning/teaching apps to increase my teaching effectiveness.</i>	.617
Total variance explained by these three factors:	54.33%

Note. α = Cronbach's alpha; Only items with factor loadings > 0.45 that indicate the minimum are shown.

Items	Loadings
Cultural capital	
Access to training, knowledge, and skills in SOELT (Factor 1); $\alpha = .79$	
<i>My previous training (i.e. at undergraduate and postgraduate levels) enables me to teach online well.</i>	.849
<i>I know how to teach online effectively.</i>	.667
<i>My pedagogical knowledge enables me to teach online well.</i>	.639
<i>My English skill enables me to teach English online well.</i>	.451
Understanding of students and self-learning ability (Factor 2); $\alpha = .73$	
<i>My understanding of the students helps me teach online effectively.</i>	.574
<i>I learn to teach online by myself.</i>	.584
Access to parental support and online teaching experience (Factor 3); $\alpha = .75$	
<i>My students do not have support and guidance from their parents when learning online. (R)</i>	.654
<i>My lack of online teaching experience hinders my online teaching's effectiveness. (R)</i>	.635
Total variance explained by these three factors:	48.84%

Note: α = Cronbach's alpha; Only items with factor loadings > 0.45 that indicate the minimum are shown.

Items	Loadings
Social capital	
Access to networks of support (Factor 1); $\alpha = .88$	
<i>The attendance of my students' parents in my online classes increases my online teaching effectiveness.</i>	.553
<i>I have colleagues who can help me in terms of teaching pedagogies when teaching online.</i>	.811
<i>I have a network of people (e.g. friends, colleagues, family members and others) to seek help for my online teaching whenever I need to.</i>	.825
<i>I can seek help from my school to resolve issues (e.g. technical, teaching resources and materials, and classroom management) when teaching online.</i>	.790
<i>I can have access to teaching materials necessary for my online teaching thanks to my networks of acquaintances (e.g. friends and others).</i>	.719
<i>I have friends and colleagues who help me with technical issues when teaching online.</i>	.706
<i>I have a good relationship with my students' parents to support my online teaching.</i>	.680
<i>I form a good relationship with my learners when teaching online.</i>	.521
Total variance explained by these three factors:	50.22%

Note. α = Cronbach's alpha; Only items with factor loadings > 0.45 that indicate the minimum are shown.