Plagiarism Checker X - Report

Originality Assessment

4%

Overall Similarity

Date: Jan 10, 2026 (01:22 PM)
Matches: 272 / 6907 words
Sources: 7

Remarks: Low similarity detected, consider making necessary changes if needed.

Verify Report:
Scan this QR Code

Journal of Mathematics Instruction, Social Research and Opinion Vol. 5, No. 1, March 2026, pp. 27 – 44, https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 ISSN 2962-7842 27 Journal homepage: https://journal-gehu.com/index.php/misro Curriculum Quality and Personal Resources as Predictors of Subjective Employability among TESOL Students and Graduates in Cambodia Hornmann Banh1 1Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia Article Info ABSTRACT Article history: Received 2025-12-06 Revised 2025-12-30 Accepted 2026-01-01 This study examines how TESOL program quality and personal resources predict graduates' perceived employability in one program in the Cambodian private university. A cross-sectional survey of TESOL students and recent graduates (n = 263) measured five curriculum factors and four personal factors against five indicators of subjective employability. Correlation and regression analyses revealed that all curriculum and personal factors were positively associated with self-perceived employability. Practice-intensive curriculum features (teaching practicum, peer teaching) and personal resources (teaching self-efficacy, outcome expectations) showed particularly strong links with employability outcomes. In a combined model, personal factors – especially work adaptation, social capital, and outcome expectations – accounted for substantially more variance in employability perceptions than curriculum factors. Because the data are cross-sectional, self-reported, and drawn from a single institution, the findings indicate associations rather than causation and may not generalize to other TESOL programs or contexts. The findings suggest that while high-quality training contributes to graduates' career readiness, their adaptability, professional networks, and future-oriented outlook ultimately play a more decisive role in how employable they feel. The study recommends enhancing authentic teaching practice, career guidance, and networking opportunities in TESOL programs to improve graduate employability. Keywords: Curriculum quality Peer-teaching Practicum quality Social capital Subjective employability TESOL teacher education Work adaptation Corresponding Author: Hornmann Banh Faculty of Education, Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia Email: hornmannbanh@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Graduate

employability has emerged as an important indicator of higher education quality worldwide [1], [2]. As global labor markets become increasingly competitive and dynamic, universities are under pressure not only to equip students with disciplinary knowledge but also to develop their readiness for work [3]–[5]. In the context of teacher

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 28 education, employability is particularly critical as newly graduated teachers must immediately apply both theoretical and practical knowledge in real classrooms [6], [7]. This issue is especially important in developing countries like Cambodia, where higher education institutions face dual pressures to improve educational quality and align curricula with labor market demands [8], [9]. One important measure of graduate success is subjective employability, defined as an individual's perception of their ability to obtain and maintain employment [10], [11]. Unlike objective outcomes (e.g., actual employment status or income), subjective employability captures internal perceptions such as job-search confidence, career optimism, and perceived competitiveness [1], [12]. Studies show that subjective employability not only predicts job-seeking behavior but is also associated with graduates' psychological well-being [13], [14]. As such, understanding the antecedents of subjective employability is critical for enhancing the effectiveness of higher education programs in preparing work-ready graduates. Recent research highlights two broad categories of factors influencing employability: curriculum-related factors (reflecting human capital) and personal factors (reflecting psychological and social capital) [1], [15], [16]. On the curriculum side, human capital theory posits that education increases productivity by imparting skills and knowledge valued in the labor market [17], [18]. In Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) programs, key curriculum features that build students' human capital include English proficiency, teaching competence, faculty support, practicum quality, and peer-teaching experience [19]–[22]. Empirical studies have shown that hands-on training components—such as teaching practicum placements and peer-teaching opportunities—enhance both teaching readiness and self-perceived employability among graduates [23]–

[25]. On the personal side, Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) emphasizes the role of individuals' self-efficacy beliefs, outcome expectations, and personal agency in shaping career behaviors [26]–[28]. Students with high teaching self-efficacy and positive career outcome expectations tend to engage more proactively in job searches and report higher perceived employability [29]–[31]. Additionally, career adaptability—encompassing personal traits such as flexibility, resilience, and a willingness to learn—has been linked to smoother career transitions and greater career satisfaction [32]–[34]. Likewise, social capital, defined as the networks and relationships that provide access to information and opportunities, is widely recognized as a key facilitator of graduate employability [35]–[37]. However, the existing employability literature has two important limitations that constrain its relevance to teacher education in Cambodia. First, most empirical evidence on subjective employability and its determinants is drawn from Western or highly developed higher education systems, with comparatively limited evidence from Cambodia and similar developing contexts, where labor-market structures, institutional resources, and school recruitment practices differ substantially. Second, prior studies often examine curriculumrelated influences (human capital) and personal resources (psychological and social capital) in isolation, rather than testing their joint contribution within a single integrated model. As a result, there remains insufficient understanding of how specific TESOL

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 curriculum components (e.g., English proficiency, teaching competence, practicum quality, faculty support, and peer-teaching) interact with personal factors emphasized in SCCT (e.g., self-efficacy, outcome expectations, work adaptation, and social capital) to shape graduates' employability perceptions. This gap is particularly evident in Cambodian TESOL programs, where graduates must transition quickly into real classroom contexts and where employability may depend simultaneously on training quality and access to supportive networks. Addressing these limitations, the present study investigates how TESOL curriculum quality

and personal factors independently and jointly predict subjective employability outcomes among TESOL students and graduates in Cambodia. The present study, therefore, seeks to explain how both TESOL curriculum quality and personal factors relate to and predict students' and graduates' subjective employability in the Cambodian context. Drawing on SCCT and Tomlinson's graduate capital model, the study examines nine specific predictors – five curriculum-related factors (English proficiency, teaching competence, faculty support, practicum quality, and peer-teaching experience) and four personal factors (self-efficacy, outcome expectations, work adaptation, and social capital) – in relation to subjective employability outcomes. In this study, subjective employability is operationalized through five indicators: students' income expectations, career satisfaction, job-search confidence, perceived competitiveness, and career optimism [1], [10]. To guide the inquiry, the researcher addresses the following research questions: 1. To what extent does TESOL curriculum quality relate to students' and graduates' subjective employability outcomes? 2. To what extent do personal factors relate to students' and graduates' subjective employability outcomes? 3. To what extent do curriculum quality and personal factors jointly predict students' and graduates' subjective employability outcomes? 2. METHOD 2.1 Research Design This study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design to examine the relationships between curricular and personal resource factors and graduate employability perceptions. The approach is non-experimental and correlational, focusing on how multiple predictor variables relate to self-reported employability outcomes at a single point in time. Specifically, the independent variables included two sets of predictors: five curriculumrelated factors (English proficiency, teaching competence, faculty support, practicum quality, and peer-teaching experience) and four personal resource factors (teaching selfefficacy, career outcome expectations, work adaptability, and social capital). These nine variables were selected based on theoretical frameworks (human capital and career theory) and prior research linking program quality and personal attributes to employment readiness. The sole dependent variable was the subjective employability outcome, which, in this context, refers to graduates' perceptions of

their own employability. To capture this construct comprehensively, it was measured across several self-perception dimensions – for example, career confidence, career optimism, and job-search efficacy – reflecting how

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 30 confident, optimistic, and effective individuals feel about securing and succeeding in employment. 2.2 Participants Participants included both current students in the final year of the TESOL program and recent graduates within 1–5 years post-graduation at one private university in Cambodia. The researcher targeted these groups to capture perceptions near the point of entry into the job market. The inclusion of graduates allowed for reflection on how well the program prepared them, while final-year students provided insight into current selfperceptions before fully entering the workforce. To determine whether the number of participants surveyed was representative of the target population, a sample size calculation was conducted using 6 the formula for finite populations [38], [39]. This formula accounts for population size, confidence level, and margin of error, and is expressed as: n = $NZ2pq$ $e2(N - 1)$ + $Z2pq$ Where n is the required sample size, N is the total population size, Z is the standard score corresponding to the desired confidence level, p is the estimated population proportion, q = 1 - p, and e is the margin of error. The total population in this study consisted of 803 TESOL students and graduates who graduated between 2019 and 2025, according to archival data from the Department of Academic Affairs (DAA) of the university. A 95% confidence level was applied, yielding a Z value of 1.96. Given the population size of 803, a 95% confidence level (Z = 1.96), a conservative estimate of p = 0.5 (q = 0.5), and a 5% margin of error (e = 0.05), the calculation was as follows: n = 803 × (1.96)2 × 0.5 × 0.5 (0.052 × (803 − 1)) + (1.962 × 0.25) = 771.37 2.9654 ≈ 260 The results indicated that at least 260 respondents were required to ensure representativeness. In this study, a census invitation with voluntary response was used. The researcher invited all eligible TESOL practicum completers and alums from the target years (population N = 803) using institutional contact lists and online distribution channels, specifically via

Telegram private and group chats. Participation was voluntary, so the achieved sample reflects a self-selected, non-probability response rather than random sampling. In total, 266 responses were received (33.1%, 266 out of 803), and after screening for missing or invalid data, 263 valid responses were retained for analysis (32.8%, 263 out of 803). This number was considered statistically acceptable and sufficiently representative of the entire population. Figure 1 shows the basic profile of the respondents by gender, employment status, and field of work (n = 263). Most respondents were female (59.7%), followed by male (39.2%), with a small proportion of missing responses (1.1%). The majority were employed (91.6%), while only 8.4% reported being unemployed. Regarding the field of

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 31 work, slightly more respondents were in non-teaching positions (n = 138) than in teaching positions (n = 119), with very few missing cases (n = 6). Overall, the figure suggests that most participants had already entered the workforce and pursued diverse career paths beyond teaching. Figure 1. Gender, Employment Status, and Field of Work of the Respondents Figure 2 summarizes respondents' monthly income, age, and graduation year. Most respondents earned between USD 401–600, followed by USD 201–400, while relatively few reported incomes above USD 1,000 or no income. The age distribution is heavily concentrated in the 25–29 group, with smaller numbers in the 20–24 and 30–34 ranges, indicating a largely young cohort. In terms of graduation year, most respondents graduated recently, with the highest numbers from 2024 and 2025, while earlier cohorts (2019–2021) are less represented. Overall, the figure reflects a young, recently graduated group at early stages of their careers. Figure 2. Monthly Income Range, Age, and Graduation Year of the Respondents 2.3 Data Collection Tools Data were collected via a self-administered questionnaire on Google Forms comprising primarily Likert-scale items. The survey instrument was developed based on existing scales and literature, then reviewed by five content experts for validity. Construct 6 validity and reliability were also computed.

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 A. Content Validity Five field experts in TESOL, higher education, and educational psychology, reviewed the 58-item instrument against construct definitions and objectives using a 3-point Item Objective Congruence (IOC) scale (+1/0/–1). IOC means were computed across raters with the pre-specified rule, as can be seen in Table 1 (retain ≥ .75; revise .50–.74; discard < .50). Overall, 54/58 items (93.1%) met the retain threshold; 4/58 items (6.9%; TC1, TC2, TC5, WA3) were revised; none were discarded. Qualitative notes led to wording clarifications (e.g., context cues for TC items; refinements of EP5 and FE items; emphasis on classroom management in PQ; authenticity and confidence in PE; phrasing consistency in SE/OE; clearer demographic ranges and “current vs. expected” income). Table 1. Expert Content Validity Decisions for the 58-Item instrument Decision category n items % of total Retain (IOC ≥ .75) 54 93.1 Revise (.50–.74) 4 6.9 Discard (< .50) 0 0.0 Note. Revised items: TC1, TC2, TC5, WA3. Five experts rated each item (+1/0/–1); IOC = mean across experts. B. Construct Validity Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used and computed on IBM SPSS version 27 to assess the construct validity of the survey scales, and the results confirm that the items grouped into factors as theoretically expected. According to Table 2, curriculum quality yielded five distinct factors (EP, TC, FE, PQ, PE) explaining ~63% variance (KMO = .897; Bartlett’s $\chi^2(300) = 3132.33$, $p < .001$) with strong primary loadings and minimal cross-loadings. Personal Factors produced four factors (SE, OE, WA, SC) explaining ~56% variance (KMO = .886; Bartlett’s $\chi^2(190) = 1924.64$, $p < .001$); items loading < .40 were removed during refinement. Employability Outcomes was unidimensional (five items; ~56% variance; KMO = .797; Bartlett’s $\chi^2(10) = 393.34$, $p < .001$) with loadings > .60. Table 2. Exploratory Factor Analysis Summary by Scale Group Scale group Factors extracted KMO Bartlett’s χ^2 (df) p Variance explained (%) Curriculum Quality (EP, TC, FE, PQ, PE) 5 .897 3132.33 (300) < .001 63.06 Personal Factors (SE, OE, WA, SC) 4 .886 1924.64 (190) < .001 56.23 Employability Outcomes 1 .797 393.34 (10) < .001 56.02 Note. Extraction = principal axis; rotation = oblimin. Items retained showed primary loadings ≥ .50 with minimal cross-loadings; items < .40 were removed during refinement (Personal Factors).

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 33 Table 3. Construct-Level Coverage After Validation Construct Items retained English Proficiency (EP) 5 Teaching Competence (TC) 5 (3 revised) Faculty Expertise (FE) 5 Practicum Quality (PQ) 5 Peer-Teaching (PE) 5 Self-Efficacy (SE) 5 Outcome Expectations (OE) 5 Work Adaptation (WA) 5 (1 revised) Social Capital (SC) 5 Employability Outcomes (EO) 5 C. Reliability Table 4 indicates that all scales demonstrated acceptable to excellent internal consistency (α ≥ .70). Curriculum subscales ranged from α = .739 to .882; personal factors α = .737 to .822; employability outcomes α = .796, supporting score reliability for subsequent analyses. Table 4. Internal Consistency (Cronbach's α) by construct Construct k α n Curriculum Quality English Proficiency (EP) 5 .739 263 Teaching Competence (TC) 5 .882 262 Faculty Expertise (FE) 5 .868 260 Practicum Quality (PQ) 5 .838 259 Peer-Teaching (PE) 5 .863 262 Personal Factors Self-Efficacy (SE) 5 .768 263 Outcome Expectations (OE) 5 .791 263 Work Adaptation (WA) 5 .737 261 Social Capital (SC) 5 .822 262 Employability Outcomes Employability Outcomes (EO) 5 .796 262 Note. All α ≥ .70 indicate acceptable to excellent reliability. 2.4 3 Data Collection Procedure Data collection was conducted over three months, from July to September 2025, using an online survey. Participants were recruited from the official name list provided by the Department of Academic Affairs (DAA), which included all TESOL students and graduates who had completed their practicum between 2019 and 2025. The online

 questionnaire required approximately 15–20 minutes to complete and was designed for voluntary participation. From the total population (N = 803), the researcher obtained 263 valid responses after rigorous data cleaning. The cleaning process involved removing cases with excessive missing data or straight-line responses (where participants selected the same response throughout). Specifically, five cases were excluded for exceeding the acceptable threshold of 15% missing responses in a 58-item instrument [40], [41]: one respondent skipped 25 items,

one skipped 11, one skipped 10, and two skipped 9. These were deemed invalid and removed. For the retained responses, the majority of participants answered all items, with only minimal missingness (one or two skipped items). To preserve sample size while maintaining data integrity, scale-mean substitution was applied for participants who skipped fewer than five items. This approach is widely endorsed in survey research for its ability to maintain reliability without distorting variance or correlations [42], [43]. Prior to substitution, missingness was verified to be random and minimal. Consequently, the final dataset comprised 263 complete and valid cases, representing approximately one-third of the target population. This systematic datacleaning procedure ensured that the final sample was both representative and statistically robust for the intended analyses. 2.5 Data Analysis Survey responses were exported from Google Forms into Microsoft Excel and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 27. The initial dataset comprised 268 cases, which were screened for completeness, missing values, and response accuracy following standard procedures [43], [44]. After excluding five cases with excessive missing data, 263 valid responses remained for analysis. Minor missing values were treated using scale-mean substitution after verifying randomness and minimal impact. To aid interpretation, Likert-scale responses (1–5) in Table 5 were classified into equal intervals of 0.80 units, following established guidelines [45]–[48]: 1.00–1.80 = Very Low, 1.81–2.60 = Low, 2.61–3.40 = Neutral, 3.41–4.20 = High, and 4.21–5.00 = Very High. This approach provides a consistent and neutral interpretation across all constructs. Table 5. Interpretation of Five-Point Likert Scale Label Numerical Range Anchor Text Neutral Meaning Very Low 1.00 – 1.80 Strongly Disagree Very low endorsement Low 1.81 – 2.60 Disagree Low endorsement Neutral 2.61 – 3.40 Neutral Neither endorse nor reject High 3.41 – 4.20 Agree High endorsement Very High 4.21 – 5.00 Strongly Agree Very high endorsement

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 3.1. Results A. Descriptive Statistics Curriculum Factors Among the five

curriculum components in Table 6, peer-teaching recorded the highest mean (M = 4.23, SD = 0.65), placing it in the very high band (4.21–5.00). Faculty expertise and support (M = 4.19, SD = 0.68) and practicum quality (M = 4.13, SD = 0.70) sit at the upper end of High, with faculty support just below the very high threshold. English proficiency (M = 3.84, SD = 0.68) and teaching Competence (M = 3.76, SD = 0.77) are solidly high but comparatively lower than the faculty expertise and support. Variability is greatest for teaching competence (largest SD = 0.77), suggesting more heterogeneous preparedness across pedagogical skills, and lowest for peer-teaching (smallest SD = 0.65), indicating consistently positive experiences. Overall, respondents rated all curriculum components positively. Table 6. Summary of Curriculum Quality Components (n = 263) Component M SD Interpretation 1. English Proficiency 3.84 0.68 High 2. Teaching Competence 3.76 0.77 High 3. Faculty Expertise & Support 4.19 0.68 High to Very High 4. Practicum Quality 4.13 0.70 High 5. Peer-Teaching 4.23 0.65 Very High Personal Factors Table 7. Summary of Personal Factors (n = 263) Component M SD Interpretation 1. Self-Efficacy 4.13 0.70 High 2. Outcome Expectations 4.13 0.68 High 3. Work Adaptation 4.11 0.75 High 4. Social Capital 3.96 0.74 High Among the four personal factors in Table 7, self-efficacy and outcome expectations recorded the highest mean scores (M = 4.13, SD = 0.70 1 and M = 4.13, SD = 0.68, respectively), both positioned in the high range (3.41–4.20). These 2 results indicate that respondents felt confident in their teaching capabilities and held positive expectations regarding future career outcomes. Work adaptation followed closely (M = 4.11, SD = 0.75), also within the high band. This suggests that most graduates perceived themselves as flexible and able to adjust effectively to new job demands and working environments. Social capital had the lowest mean among the four personal factors (M = 3.96, SD = 0.74), yet it remained in the high category. The slightly larger variability for social capital (largest SD = 0.74) implies differing levels of access to professional networks—some graduates enjoyed strong career connections, while others reported more limited ties. Overall, respondents rated all personal factors positively.

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 36 Subjective Employability Outcomes Respondents' perceptions of their subjective employability outcomes were generally positive. The composite Subjective Employability Outcomes score was averaged (M = 3.88, SD = 0.58), indicating a high level of employability. This indicates that most participants felt they were employable and on track in their careers. B. Correlation Analysis Pearson correlation analyses were used to examine the relationships between each independent construct and the composite score for the subjective employability outcome. Curriculum Factors and Employability Outcomes All curriculum factors were positively related to each employability outcome, with effects ranging from small to medium. Practice-intensive components showed the strongest links: Peer-Teaching correlated most with job-search confidence (r = .362, p < .001) and perceived career success (r = .302, p < .001), while Practicum Quality correlated robustly with job-search confidence (r = .303, p < .001) and both career satisfaction and optimism (rs = .276 and .261, ps < .001). Teaching Competence related consistently to success (r = .317, p < .001) and optimism (r = .250, p < .001). English Proficiency showed its largest association with perceived career success (r = .308, p < .001). After Bonferroni adjustment (αadj = .002), most effects remained significant, except several smaller links (e.g., EP with income and satisfaction). Table 8. Correlations Between Curriculum Factors and Employability Outcomes Variable Income expectations Career satisfaction Job-search confidence Perceived career success Career optimism 1. English Proficiency .152* .162** .217** .308** .187** 2. Teaching Competence .165** .175** .246** .317** .250** 3. Faculty Expertise & Support .192** .253** .223** .195** .173** 4. Practicum Quality .183** .276** .303** .261** .261** 5. Peer-Teaching Experience .193** .229** .362** .302** .296** * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed) ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) Personal Factors and Employability Outcomes According to Table 9, all personal factors were positively related to each employability outcome, with effect sizes ranging from small to medium-large. Work Adaptation showed the most consistent

and strongest links—especially with perceived career success (r = .513, p < .001), career satisfaction (r = .487, p < .001), career optimism (r = .453, p < .001), and job-search confidence (r = .482, p < .001). Outcome Expectations was also robust, led by job-search confidence (r = .498, p < .001) and sizable relations with satisfaction (r = .428, p < .001), success (r = .457, p < .001), and optimism (r = .451, p < .001). Social capital was most salient for income expectations (r = .340, p < .001) and

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 37 remained substantial for success (r = .436, p < .001) and optimism (r = .448, p < .001). Self-Efficacy was positive but comparatively smaller across outcomes (rs ≈ .25–.35, all p < .001). After Bonferroni adjustment for 20 tests (α adj = .0025), all effects remained significant. Table 9. Correlations Between Personal Factors and Employability Outcomes Variable Income expectations Career satisfaction Job-search confidence Perceived career success Career optimism 1. Self-Efficacy .252** .325** .328** .326** .346** 2. Outcome Expectations .251** .428** .498** .457** .451** 3. Work Adaptation .304** .487** .482** .513** .453** 4. Social Capital .340** .330** .376** .436** .448** * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed) ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) C. Regression Analysis Hierarchical multiple regression was conducted to examine the extent to which TESOL curriculum quality and personal factors predict subjective employability outcomes. In Step 1, curriculum quality components explained 19.3% of the variance in employability outcomes ($R^2 = 0.193$, p < .001), indicating a statistically significant but modest effect. When personal factors were added in Step 2, the explained variance increased substantially to 46.6% ($R^2 = 0.466$), with a significant change in explained variance ($\Delta R^2 = 0.273$, p < .001). This demonstrates that personal factors provide considerable additional explanatory power beyond curriculum quality alone. Table 10. Hierarchical Regression Model in Predicting Employability Outcomes Model Predictors Included R^2 ΔR^2 F p Step 1 Curriculum Quality Components 0.193 — 12.01 < .001 Step 2 Curriculum + Personal Factors 0.466 0.273 31.56 < .001 Table 11. Final Regression Model: Standardized

Coefficients Predictor β t p English Proficiency .028 0.51 .612 Teaching Competence −.108 −1.75 .081 Faculty Expertise & Support .030 0.55 .586 Practicum Quality .023 0.36 .718 Peer Teaching .013 0.20 .840 Self-Efficacy .012 0.18 .854 Outcome Expectations .226 3.35 < .001 Work Adaptation .345 5.40 < .001 Social Capital .261 4.45 < .001

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 38 In the final model, work adaptation (β = .345, 1 p < .001) emerged as the strongest predictor of subjective employability outcomes, followed by social capital (β = .261, p < .001) and outcome expectations (β = .226, p < .001). In contrast, neither curriculum quality components nor self-efficacy showed significant unique effects after controlling for personal factors. Overall, the findings indicate that, when both sets of factors are considered, graduates' adaptability, professional networks, and future-oriented expectations are the primary drivers of subjective employability. 3.2. Discussion The results suggest that Cambodian TESOL students and graduates generally perceive both their program experiences and their employability positively. All curriculum components were rated "high" to "very high," with peer-teaching (M = 4.23) and practicum quality (M = 4.13) among the strongest curriculum components, indicating a curriculum that is perceived as practice-rich and supportive of professional readiness. From a Human Capital perspective, this is consistent with the view that higher education builds market-relevant capabilities by developing skills and knowledge valued in the labor market [17], [18]. In employability research, this "capability building" is often framed as 4 one of the foundations of graduate readiness, especially in professional disciplines such as teacher education [6], [7]. At the correlational level, all five curriculum factors were positively related to employability indicators, but the largest effects were concentrated in practice-based experiences, particularly for job-search confidence (e.g., peer-teaching r = .362; practicum r = .303). This pattern aligns with arguments for work-integrated learning (WIL) that authentic practice strengthens employability and that placement quality can matter more than mere participation [23]. It also aligns with teacher education literature, which emphasizes that well-designed field experiences help novices

connect theory to practice and develop a more confident professional identity [7]. In short, the curriculum findings support the claim that “doing the work” (guided practice, feedback, repeated teaching opportunities) is especially salient for employability perceptions—more so than classroombased learning alone. However, the personal-resource findings were stronger and more consistent across outcomes. All personal factors correlated positively with each employability outcome, and work adaptation showed the most robust links (up to r = .513 with perceived career success), while outcome expectations and social capital were also substantial across several indicators. These results are highly compatible with Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT), which proposes that career development is shaped by individuals’ self-beliefs and expectations about the consequences of career actions [26]–[28]. Similarly, the prominence of work adaptation resonates with career adaptability research that links adaptive resources to smoother transitions and stronger indicators of career success [29], [32]–[34]. The social capital effects also mirror classic employability and career success scholarship, emphasizing that networks provide access to job information, opportunities, and support [35]–[37].

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 39 Hierarchical regression clarifies the relative contributions of curriculum and personal resources. Curriculum quality explained a modest but significant share of variance in subjective employability (R^2 = .193), but the explained variance increased substantially once personal factors were added (R^2 = .466; ΔR^2 = .273). In the final model, work adaptation (β = .345), social capital (β = .261), and outcome expectations (β = .226) remained significant, whereas the curriculum factors (and self-efficacy) did not show unique effects when all predictors were modeled together. This pattern is consistent with the broader argument that employability is not only a function of human capital, but also of psychological and social resources—an integrated view reflected in graduate capital theory [1] and “capital + individual attributes + context” explanations of employability [4]. One plausible interpretation is that curriculum quality may partly operate through personal resource development (e.g., strong practicum and peer-

teaching experiences may build adaptability, career expectations, and networks). However, once these personal resources are accounted for, curriculum variables contribute less unique variance. This interpretation also aligns with employability frameworks that conceptualize employability as a psychosocial construct shaped by multiple interacting dimensions [15]. Finally, in a Cambodian context where graduate employability is influenced by both institutional preparation and broader labor-market conditions, these findings add local evidence 3 to the international employability discussion. They support the view that universities must do more than deliver content—they must create conditions that strengthen students' adaptive capacities and social ties, especially in developing higher education systems under pressure to align programs with labor market needs [8], [9]. Overall, the results support an integrated employability account: curriculum matters (particularly authentic teaching practice), but graduates' adaptability, networks, and futureoriented expectations appear to be the more decisive drivers of employability perceptions when considered together. 4. CONCLUSION This study concludes that Cambodian TESOL students and graduates generally view themselves as employable and perceive both their TESOL curriculum and personal resources as important contributors to that employability. Overall, curriculum experiences, especially authentic, practice-based learning such as practicum and peer-teaching, appear to strengthen graduates' confidence and sense of readiness for work. However, when curriculum and personal resources are considered together, personal resources play the more decisive role in shaping employability perceptions. In particular, graduates who feel more adaptable to workplace demands, who hold positive expectations about their career future, and who have stronger professional networks tend to 2 feel more confident about finding and sustaining employment. These findings support an integrated view of employability in which universities help build capability through the curriculum, but graduates' adaptability, career outlook, and social connections ultimately determine how strongly they perceive themselves to be employable.

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 4.1 Recommendation A. Policy Recommendations 4 Based on the findings, several policy-level actions could enhance graduate employability. Table 12 highlights actions to (i) improve the consistency and quality of practicum experiences by setting minimum standards for placements, mentor preparation, and feedback routines; (ii) institutionalize novice-teacher induction to support smoother school-to-work transition and reduce early-career difficulty; (iii) establish clearer recruitment and vacancy communication channels to make hiring processes more transparent and accessible; and (iv) promote network equity by expanding professional networking opportunities beyond informal connections. In addition, Table 12 emphasizes embedding employability support into quality assurance processes as an indicator of program effectiveness and providing targeted assistance for unemployed or low-network graduates to reduce inequality in career opportunities. Table 12. Policy Recommendations Policy area Recommendation Implementation Examples 1. School–university partnerships Minimum practicum standards. MoU; mentor training; checklist. 2. Novice teacher induction First-year induction/mentoring. Coaching; CPD; mentor assigned. 3. Employment pipeline Clear recruitment channels. Job board; campus hiring; criteria. 4. Network equity Broaden professional networks. Associations; CoPs; online groups. 5. Quality assurance Employability as QA indicator. Career services; employer input; alumni links. 6. Targeted support Support unemployed/low-network grads. CPD vouchers; job coaching; mentoring. B. Practical Recommendations for Institutions and Stakeholders Table 13. Practical Recommendations Stakeholder Actions Simple checks 1. TESOL programs/departments Improve practicum mentoring; run microteaching; teach job-search + demo lessons; build alums/job links. Mentoring log; micro-teaching completed; portfolios; alumni participation. 2. Partner schools/employers Mentor novices; set clear expectations; give regular feedback. Induction plan; feedback records, and progress reviews. 3. Students/graduates Build adaptability, grow networks, and prepare a hiring-ready portfolio. Portfolio/evidence file; networking record; updated CV + demo plan. Table 13 suggests what TESOL programs/departments can do to strengthen employability (e.g., improving

practicum mentoring and feedback, running continuous micro-teaching cycles, embedding job-search and demo-lesson preparation, and building alums/job link systems). It also outlines what partner schools/employers can do to support graduates' early-career success (e.g., structured mentoring, clear performance expectations, and regular standards-based feedback). For students and graduates, the table focuses on concrete behaviors that strengthen employability (e.g., building adaptability through varied teaching tasks and reflection, strategically growing networks, and preparing a portfolio

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 41 aligned with hiring needs). Importantly, table 13 includes simple "checks" or outputs— such as mentoring logs, completed micro-teaching rounds, portfolios, induction plans, and feedback records—so stakeholders can monitor whether the recommendations are being carried out, not only stated. C. Recommendations for Future Researchers To further advance understanding of TESOL graduate employability, future studies should consider: (1) conducting longitudinal research (tracking students from prepracticum through post-graduation) to examine how employability perceptions and actual outcomes evolve over time; (2) replicating this study across multiple institutions or countries to improve generalizability of the findings; (3) incorporating objective employment outcomes (e.g., actual employment status, time to first job, contract type, income level) to compare against subjective perceptions; (4) testing more complex models, such as whether personal factors mediate the relationship between curriculum experiences and employability (e.g., practicum quality → adaptability or social capital → employability), or whether these relationships differ by subgroups; and (5) using mixed methods (e.g., qualitative interviews with graduates, mentors, and employers) to explore the contextual reasons behind quantitative patterns, as well as refining the measurement of constructs like social capital and adaptability for greater validity. 4.2 Limitations This study has several limitations. First, it used a cross-sectional, self-report survey design, so the findings indicate associations rather than cause-and-effect relationships, and responses may reflect participants' perceptions at a single point in time.

Second, the sample was drawn from a single university context and included mostly employed respondents, which may limit the generalizability of the results to other TESOL programs, public institutions, or graduates in different employment conditions. Third, because both predictors (curriculum and personal factors) and outcomes (subjective employability) were measured using the same questionnaire format, common-method bias and social desirability effects may have inflated some relationships. Finally, the study focused on subjective employability outcomes; therefore, the conclusions may not fully reflect objective labor-market outcomes such as time-to-employment, contract type, promotion, or verified income progression. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS The author would like to express deep appreciation to the Department of Academic Affairs for providing contact information for alums and current senior students, which make the online survey possible. Another sincere thanks to the survey respondents for their valuable input and time. REFERENCES [1] M. Tomlinson, “Forms of graduate capital and their relationship to graduate employability,” Education + Training, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 338–352, 2017, doi: 10.1108/ET-05-2016-0090.

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 42 [2] M. Yorke, Employability in Higher Education: What It Is – What It Is Not. Higher Education Academy, 2006. [Online]. Available: https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/employability-highereducation-what-it-what-it-not [3] D. Jackson, “Re-conceptualising graduate employability: the importance of pre-professional identity,” Higher Education Research & Development, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 925–939, 2016, doi: 10.1080/07294360.2016.1139551. [4] M. Clarke, “Rethinking graduate employability: the role of capital, individual attributes and context,” Studies in Higher Education, vol. 43, no. 11, pp. 1923–1937, 2018, doi: 10.1080/03075079.2017.1294152. [5] D. J. Finch, L. K. Hamilton, R. Baldwin, and M. Zehner, “An exploratory study of factors affecting undergraduate employability,” Education + Training, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 681–704, 2013, doi: 10.1108/ET-07-2012-0077. [6] S. Billett, “Curriculum and pedagogic bases for effectively integrating practice-based

experiences," Curriculum and Pedagogic Bases for Effectively Integrating Practice-Based Experiences. Australian Learning and Teaching Council, 2011. [Online]. Available: https://www.vu.edu.au/sites/default/files/CCLT/pdfs/billett-wil-report.pdf [7] K. Zeichner, "Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education," Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 61, no. 1–2, pp. 89–99, 2010, doi: 10.1177/0022487109347671. [8] S. Chea and W. Y. W. Lo, "International connectivity and employability in Cambodian higher education: a case study of developing employability skills in English language education," Educational Research and Evaluation, vol. 27, no. 3–4, pp. 335–356, 2022, doi: 10.1080/13803611.2022.2041875. [9] C. Sam and H. Dahles, "Stakeholder involvement in Cambodian higher education," Studies in Higher Education, vol. 42, no. 9, pp. 1764–1784, 2015, doi: 10.1080/03075079.2015.1124851. [10] A. Rothwell and J. Arnold, "Self-perceived employability: development and validation of a scale," Personnel Review, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 23–41, 2007, doi: 10.1108/00483480710716704. [11] E. Berntson and S. Marklund, "The relationship between perceived employability and subsequent health," Work & Stress, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 279–292, 2007, doi: 10.1080/02678370701659215. [12] A. Tymon, "The student perspective on employability," Studies in Higher Education, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 841–856, 2013, doi: 10.1080/03075079.2011.604408. [13] N. De Cuyper, B. I. Van der Heijden, and H. De Witte, "Associations between perceived employability, employee well-being, and its contribution to organizational success: a matter of psychological contracts?" International Journal of Human Resource Management, vol. 22, no. 7, pp. 1486–1503, 2011, doi: 10.1080/09585192.2011.561962. [14] W. Gunawan, P. A. Creed, and A. I. Glendon, "Development and initial validation of a perceived future employability scale for young adults," Journal of Career Assessment, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 610–627, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1069072718788645. [15] M. Fugate, A. J. Kinicki, and B. E. Ashforth, "Employability: a psycho-social construct, its dimensions, and applications," Journal of Vocational Behavior, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 14–38, 2004, doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2003.10.005. [16] D. Jackson and N. Wilton, "Perceived employability among

undergraduates and the importance of career self-management, work experience and individual characteristics," Higher Education Research & Development, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 747–762, 2017, doi: 10.1080/07294360.2016.1229270. [17] G. S. Becker, Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education, 3rd ed. Chicago, IL, USA: University of Chicago Press, 1993, doi: 10.7208/chicago/9780226041223.001.0001. [18] P. T. Knight and M. Yorke, Learning, Curriculum and Employability in Higher Education. London, UK: RoutledgeFalmer, 2004, doi: 10.4324/9780203465271. [19] S. Borg, "The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs," System, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 370–380, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.system.2011.07.009. [20] T. S. C. Farrell, "The practices of encouraging TESOL teachers to engage in reflective practice: an

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 43 appraisal of recent research contributions," Language Teaching Research, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 223–247, 2016, doi: 10.1177/1362168815617335. [21] J. C. Richards and T. S. C. Farrell, Professional Development for Language Teachers: Strategies for Teacher Learning. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005, doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511667237. [22] C. Dustmann and F. Fabbri, "Language proficiency and labour market performance of immigrants in the UK," Economic Journal, vol. 113, no. 489, pp. 695–717, 2003, doi: 10.1111/1468-0297.t01-1-00151. [23] C. Smith, S. Ferns, and L. Russell, "Placement quality has a greater impact on employability than placement structure or duration," International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 15–29, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1204750.pdf [24] McKinsey & Company, A Labor Market That Works: Connecting Talent with Opportunity in the Digital Age. McKinsey Global Institute, 2015. [Online]. Available: https://www.mckinsey.com/featuredinsights/employment-and-growth/connecting-talent-with-opportunity-in-the-digital-age [25] R. Leong and M. Kavanagh, "A work-integrated learning (WIL) framework to develop graduate skills and attributes in an Australian

university's accounting program," Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2013. [26] R. W. Lent, S. D. Brown, and G. Hackett, "Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance," Journal of Vocational Behavior, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 79– 122, 1994, doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1994.1027. [27] A. Bandura, Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control. 1 New York, NY, USA: W. H. Freeman, 1997. [28] S. D. Brown and R. W. Lent, Eds., Career Development and Counseling: Putting Theory and Research to Work. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons, 2005. [29] H. Zacher, "Career adaptability predicts subjective career success above and beyond personality, human capital, and career anchors," Journal of Vocational Behavior, vol. 84, no. 1, pp. 21–30, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2013.10.002. [30] A. Lo Presti and S. Pluviano, "Looking for a route in turbulent waters: employability as a compass for career success," Organizational Psychology Review, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 192–211, 2016, doi: 10.1177/2041386615589398. [31] M. M. Nauta, "Career interests, self-efficacy, and personality as antecedents of career exploration," Journal of Career Assessment, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 162–180, 2007, doi: 10.1177/1069072706298018. [32] M. L. Savickas and E. J. Porfeli, "Career Adapt-Abilities Scale: construction, reliability, and measurement equivalence across 13 countries," Journal of Vocational Behavior, vol. 80, no. 3, pp. 661–673, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.011. [33] A. Hirschi, "Career adaptability development in adolescence: multiple predictors and effect on sense of power and life satisfaction," Journal of Vocational Behavior, vol. 74, no. 2, pp. 145–155, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2009.01.002. [34] C. W. Rudolph, K. N. Lavigne, I. M. Katz, and H. Zacher, "Career adaptability: a meta-analysis of relationships with measures of adaptability, adapting responses, and adaptation results," Journal of Vocational Behavior, vol. 98, pp. 17–34, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2016.09.002. [35] N. Lin, "Building a network theory of social capital," Connections, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 28–51, 1999. [Online]. Available: https://faculty.washington.edu/matsueda/courses/590/Readings/Lin%20Network%20Theory%201999.p df [36] P. Brown, A. Hesketh, and S. Williams, "Skills development in an era of uncertainty," British Journal of Industrial Relations, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 251–273, 2019.

[37] S. E. Seibert, M. L. Kraimer, and R. C. Liden, “A social capital theory of career success,” Academy of Management Journal, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 219–237, 2001, doi: 10.2307/3069452. [38] W. G. Cochran, Sampling Techniques, 3rd ed. New York, NY, USA: Wiley, 1977. [39] R. V. Krejcie and D. W. Morgan, “Determining sample size for research activities,” Educational and Psychological Measurement, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 607–610, 1970, doi: 10.1177/001316447003000308. [40] P. D. Allison, Missing Data. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage, 2002, doi: 10.4135/9781412985079. [41] J. L. Schafer and J. W. Graham, “Missing data: our view of the state of the art,” Psychological Methods,

https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i1.905 44 vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 147–177, 2002, doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.7.2.147. [42] C. K. Enders, Applied Missing Data Analysis. New York, NY, USA: Guilford Press, 2010. [43] J. F. Hair, W. C. Black, B. J. Babin, and R. E. Anderson, Multivariate Data Analysis, 8th ed. Cengage, 2019. [44] B. G. Tabachnick and L. S. Fidell, Using Multivariate Statistics, 7th ed. Boston, MA, USA: Pearson, 2019. [45] H. N. Boone Jr. and D. A. Boone, “Analyzing Likert data,” Journal of Extension, vol. 50, no. 2, Art. no. 2TOT2, 2012. [Online]. Available: https://www.joe.org/joe/2012april/tt2.php [46] J. C. F. de Winter and D. Dodou, “Five-point Likert items: t test versus Mann–Whitney–Wilcoxon,” Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, vol. 15, no. 11, pp. 1–16, 2010. [Online]. Available: https://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=15&n=11 [47] A. Joshi, S. Kale, S. Chandel, and D. K. Pal, “Likert scale: what it is and how to use it?” International Journal of Applied and Basic Medical Research, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 31–33, 2015, doi: 10.4103/2229516X.149844. [48] W. M. Vagias, Likert-Type Scale Response Anchors. Clemson, SC, USA: Clemson University, 2006.

Sources

1	https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3701793/ INTERNET 2%
2	https://statisticsbyjim.com/hypothesis-testing/analyze-likert-scale-data/ INTERNET <1%
3	https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/computer-science/data-collection-procedure INTERNET <1%
4	https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sample_size_determination INTERNET <1%
5	https://chartexpo.com/blog/5-point-likert-scale-analysis-and-interpretation INTERNET <1%
6	https://www.clrn.org/what-is-a-good-sample-size-for-a-study/ INTERNET <1%
7	https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4601897/ INTERNET <1%

EXCLUDE CUSTOM MATCHES	OFF
EXCLUDE QUOTES	OFF
EXCLUDE BIBLIOGRAPHY	ON