

The Self-Regulating Attributes and the Leadership Potentials of the Novice Teachers in Buhi South District, Division of Camarines Sur

Josephine Nacario Molina¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: Self-Regulating Attributes Leadership Potentials Questionnaire Kendall Concordance Buhi South District	The study examined self-regulating attributes and leadership potentials in Buhi South District, Division of Camarines Sur during School Year 2024–2025. A descriptive-evaluative-correlational design used a researcher-made questionnaire with 45 novice teachers. Weighted means and ranks described the indicators; Kendall's coefficient of concordance and corresponding chi-square tests assessed agreement at 0.05. The reported indicators of self-regulating attributes were classified as Very Much Evident, and those of leadership potentials as Very Much Evident. Significant agreement was reported for Self-Efficacy; Self-Control; Positive Framing; Goal Setting. Self Evaluation; Emotional Stability did not show significant reported agreement. For leadership potentials, significant agreement was reported for Social Skills; Adaptability; Integrity. Confidence; Tolerance of Stress did not show significant reported agreement. The findings identify local priorities for professional support and implementation review. They concern perceptions and rankings rather than independently verified improvement or causal effects. Incomplete measurement details and unresolved reporting issues constrain interpretation.

1. Introduction

Novice teachers must interpret feedback, manage classroom demands, establish professional relationships, and make decisions under uncertainty. Their development involves both the regulation of their own work and opportunities to contribute to others. The study examined self-regulating attributes and leadership potentials in this early-career context. It treated leadership potential as a set of reported behaviors, rather than as appointment to a formal leadership post or a verified record of organizational influence.

Self-efficacy, self-control, positive framing, self-evaluation, emotional stability, and goal setting formed the first set of domains. Confidence, social skills, adaptability, integrity, and tolerance of stress formed the second. These groupings distinguish perceived capability, emotional and behavioral regulation, relationships, and professional judgment. Several contents overlap, particularly adaptation, reflection, and emotional regulation; separate labels alone do not establish that the domains are psychometrically distinct. Panadero (2017) reviewed models of self-regulated learning that integrate cognitive, motivational, and emotional processes. That literature provides conceptual support for examining regulation as more than compliance or self-discipline. It does not validate the study's researcher-made teacher questionnaire. Wenner and Campbell (2017) reviewed teacher leadership and its theoretical and empirical foundations, making it pertinent to distinguish dispositions associated with leadership from evidence of enacted leadership in a school.

The study provides a local account of novice teachers' reported attributes and the ordering of their indicators. It does not estimate whether self-regulation predicts leadership potential, despite the correlational design designation. Rank concordance among school groups addresses consistency in relative emphasis. It cannot determine whether a particular teacher is ready for promotion or whether an attribute caused stronger leadership performance.

2. Purpose and research questions

The study addressed the extent of self-regulating attributes across Self-Efficacy; Self-Control; Positive Framing; Self-Evaluation; Emotional Stability; Goal Setting; agreement on their indicator rankings; the extent of leadership potentials across Confidence; Social Skills; Adaptability; Integrity; Tolerance of Stress; agreement on those rankings; and policy recommendations based on the findings. The reported null hypotheses concerned the absence of significant rank agreement. The title and substantive focus are retained while the interpretation is limited to the analyses actually reported.

Examining extent and agreement together separates the magnitude of a rating from the ordering of its components. Respondents may rate every statement favorably while differing in which they prioritize. Conversely, concordant rankings can coexist with less favorable ratings. The study therefore treats descriptive profiles and inferential comparisons as complementary evidence, without using one as a substitute for the other.

3. Methods

3.1 Design and participants

The study used descriptive-evaluative-correlational methods in Buhi South District, Division of Camarines Sur for School Year 2024–2025. The reported participant group comprised 45 novice teachers. The descriptive component assessed the listed practices and outcomes; the evaluative component concerned their rated extent. The reported inferential component assessed agreement on indicator rankings. No separate participant-level correlation or regression between the two sets of domain scores was presented.

Sampling procedures, the eligible population, recruitment, response rate, exact administration dates, and demographic distribution were not reported. References to respondent groups do not provide a documented allocation of the participant total. No subgroup counts are inferred. The findings concern the participating group and do not provide a probability-based estimate for a wider population. The study did not describe random assignment, an intervention comparison, repeated measurement, or an independently verified outcome dataset. Favorable reported attributes or perceived effectiveness cannot establish which practice produced a result. The design designation is preserved without adding an experimental or predictive analysis that was not reported.

3.2 Instrument and operational definitions

The main instrument was a researcher-made questionnaire covering 11 domains. The reconstructed findings below preserve the listed indicator statements, mean values, and interpretation labels. Numerical rankings, overall means, and group-specific values have not been invented where they were not reported. The categories describe the study's operational measure rather than a standardized diagnostic or performance scale.

The complete response anchors, interpretation intervals, instrument-validation process, pilot sample, and reliability coefficients were not supplied. A favorable verbal classification is retained without reconstructing a five-point response scale from the observed means. The number of statements in a summary does not by itself establish the number administered. Any incomplete or repeated entries remain visible rather than being repaired through assumption.

3.3 Procedures and ethical reporting

Questionnaire distribution, administration mode, retrieval, missing-response handling, individual consent, confidentiality safeguards, ethics approval, and data-retention procedures were not specified. These steps are not presumed to have occurred. The study is reported through aggregate findings without adding personal information. Missing documentation is identified separately for author review before further inferential interpretation.

No new fieldwork or reconstruction of individual responses was undertaken. The reporting process preserves aggregate values and distinguishes them from proposed actions. Consequently, the manuscript cannot add standard errors, confidence intervals, missing-data estimates, or participant characteristics that were not provided. The limitations of the available evidence are part of the interpretation of the study, not evidence that an unreported procedure was performed incorrectly.

3.4 Statistical analysis

Weighted means, frequency counts, percentages, ranks, Kendall's coefficient of concordance, W, and corresponding chi-square tests were identified as analytical tools. Significance was set at 0.05. The test tables retain reported W values, chi-square values, probability inequalities, and decisions. Probability inequalities are not exact p values. No unreported probability or corrected calculation has been substituted.

Kendall concordance concerns similarity in the ordering of statements across ranking groups. It does not estimate an association between a practice score and an outcome score, and it does not establish a causal effect. A nonsignificant result means that the reported procedure did not establish significant agreement; it is not proof of no agreement, equivalent groups, or low skill. These distinctions are maintained throughout the results.

The full ranking matrices, degrees of freedom, treatment of ties, and unrounded calculations were not supplied. Three groups are mentioned in some research questions or result summaries, but group composition and counts are insufficiently documented. The inferential results are reproduced as reported and should be verified against the complete statistical output before further inferential interpretation.

The social-skills summary provides no numerical value for the final active-listening statement; it is retained as Not reported. Several W–chi-square pairs, including Self-Efficacy and Self Evaluation, require calculation review. No missing score or corrected statistic has been substituted.

4. Results

4.1 Self-Efficacy

Table 1. Self-Efficacy

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher reflects constructively on teaching outcomes to adjust future practices	4.91
The teacher remains motivated and resilient when facing low engagement or initial teaching failures	4.90
The teacher sets high expectations for learner performance and believes they can help learners meet those standards	4.88
The teacher demonstrates confidence in facilitating learner development despite limited experience	4.87
The teacher actively seeks out professional development opportunities to enhance instructional skills	4.84
The teacher maintains composure and problem-solves during classroom disruptions or unexpected challenges	4.80
the teacher adapts teaching methods to accommodate diverse learner needs and responses	4.80

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 1 presents self-efficacy indicators. The displayed means range from 4.80 to 4.91. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Constructive reflection was more prominent than adaptation to diverse learner needs. The ordering suggests that confidence-related behavior and responsive practice were not rated identically. The table should not be used to diagnose a lack of confidence in particular teachers. It describes aggregate perceptions, and no observation or learner-outcome measure establishes whether reported capability translated into successful instruction.

4.2 Self-Control

Table 2. Self-Control

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher demonstrates restraint when facing distractions or emotionally provocative situations	4.90
The teacher uses positive language and non-reactive strategies to manage classroom tension	4.81
The teacher refrains from impulsive decisions during classroom conflict, opting for reflective action	4.81
The teacher maintains emotional composure during moments of learner defiance or behavioral disruption	4.81
The teacher resists expressing frustration when instructional goals are not immediately met	4.81
The teacher remains patient and fair when handling repeated mistakes or misunderstandings among learners	4.80
The teacher adheres to scheduled routines and policies even when under pressure or fatigue	4.80
the teacher avoids personalizing feedback or criticism from learners, parents, or colleagues	4.79

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 2 presents self-control indicators. The displayed means range from 4.79 to 4.90. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Restraint in provocative situations was rated above avoiding personalization of criticism. Managing visible behavior and interpreting feedback are distinct aspects of regulation. Mentoring could explore both through professional dialogue, but the ratings provide no record of interpersonal incidents or psychological diagnosis. They do not establish that teachers with comparatively lower ratings reacted inappropriately.

4.3 Positive Framing

Table 3. Positive Framing

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher models optimism and resilience, especially during moments of uncertainty or instructional setbacks	4.93
The teacher maintains a solution-focused attitude when instructional challenges arise	4.92
The teacher uses affirming language that nurtures hope, motivation, and a sense of possibility among learners	4.90
The teacher encourages peer support and celebrates collaborative learning efforts within the classroom	4.89
The teacher interprets challenging behavior as signals for unmet needs or learning opportunities, rather than defiance	4.88
The teacher celebrates small achievements to build learner confidence and maintain momentum	4.87
The teacher promotes a culture of effort, praising persistence and progress over perfection	4.87
The teacher rephrases negative feedback into constructive suggestions that promote learner improvement	4.85
the teacher acknowledges learner mistakes as part of the growth process and responds with encouragement	4.84

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 3 presents positive framing indicators. The displayed means range from 4.84 to 4.93. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Modeling optimism was comparatively prominent, whereas encouraging learners through mistakes was lower within the favorable classification. This differentiates an educator's stance toward uncertainty from a particular feedback practice. The practical implication is to connect constructive interpretation with how errors are discussed. The study did not assess whether positive framing altered achievement, motivation, or classroom climate.

4.4 Self-Evaluation

Table 4. Self-Evaluation

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher documents reflective insights to inform future lesson planning and classroom management	4.89
The teacher reflects on daily instructional practices to identify strengths and areas for improvement	4.89
The teacher seeks input from mentors and colleagues to refine instructional approaches	4.89
The teacher monitors progress toward professional goals and makes proactive adjustments	4.88
The teacher adjusts teaching methods based on observed learner engagement and understanding	4.88
The teacher analyzes learner feedback and classroom outcomes to guide professional growth	4.87
the teacher evaluates the effectiveness of assessment strategies and modifies them accordingly	4.87

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 4 presents self-evaluation indicators. The displayed means range from 4.87 to 4.89. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Documentation of reflection and review of assessment strategies received closely grouped ratings. The small descriptive spread makes it especially important to avoid interpreting rank positions as large substantive differences. Nonsignificant concordance does not show that self-evaluation was weak. It indicates that the reported ranking test did not establish agreement, despite broadly favorable ratings.

4.5 Emotional Stability

Table 5. Emotional Stability

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher recovers quickly from stressful situations and resumes professional duties with clarity	4.96
The teacher demonstrates patience when working with learners exhibiting complex behavioral or emotional needs	4.96
The teacher avoids projecting personal frustrations or mood shifts onto classroom dynamics	4.95
The teacher seeks healthy coping mechanisms to manage emotional stress (e.g., reflective journaling, peer support)	4.95
The teacher displays empathy and emotional balance when resolving conflicts among learners	4.95
The teacher regulates emotional reactions when faced with criticism or unexpected challenges	4.95
The teacher maintains consistent emotional tone across instructional periods	4.95
the teacher remains calm and composed during moments of classroom tension or disruption	4.91

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 5 presents emotional stability indicators. The displayed means range from 4.91 to 4.96. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Recovery after stress was rated above calmness during disruption. These describe different points in a stressful episode: restoration afterward and regulation while it unfolds. Their distinction is useful for discussing support needs, but it is not a clinical measure of stability. The study did not record stress exposure or assess individual recovery trajectories.

4.6 Goal Setting

Table 6. Goal Setting

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher aligns personal goals with school-wide or curricular priorities	4.92
The teacher defines specific and measurable goals related to instructional effectiveness or learner outcomes	4.91
The teacher develops action plans that outline steps, timelines, and resources needed to achieve goals	4.91
The teacher adapts goals based on evolving classroom needs, learner performance, or feedback	4.91
The teacher communicates goals with mentors or peers to seek accountability and collaboration	4.91
The teacher monitors progress regularly and reflect on goal-related outcomes	4.90
The teacher celebrates goal milestones to sustain motivation and reinforce progress	4.90
The teacher demonstrates persistence in pursuing long-term goals despite setbacks or competing demands	4.89
the teacher uses goal-setting to inform instructional adjustments and professional development choices	4.89

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 6 presents goal setting indicators. The displayed means range from 4.89 to 4.92. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Alignment with school priorities was rated above using goals to guide instructional adjustment and development. Institutional alignment may be visible before goals become a continuing decision tool. The profile supports considering how goals are reviewed in practice. It does not demonstrate that formally aligned goals were achieved or that any particular goal-setting approach improved teaching.

Table 7. Reported concordance for self-regulating attributes

Domain	W	χ^2	Reported p	Decision
Self-Efficacy	0.97	17.64	p<0.01	Rejected
Self-Control	0.76	15.96	p<0.05	Rejected
Positive Framing	0.94	22.56	p<0.005	Rejected
Self Evaluation	0.54	9.75	p>0.05	Not rejected
Emotional Stability	0.47	9.87	p>0.05	Not rejected
Goal Setting	0.72	17.28	p<0.05	Rejected

Note. All statistics and probability inequalities are retained as reported. Not rejected expresses a stated exception to rejection; it does not establish equivalence.

Table 7 reports significant agreement for Self-Efficacy; Self-Control; Positive Framing; Goal Setting. The exceptions were Self Evaluation; Emotional Stability. The test concerns indicator ordering. It does not determine which domain was most effective, establish the magnitude of improvement, or demonstrate an association between the two sets of constructs.

Comparisons of chi-square magnitudes require attention to the number of indicators and degrees of freedom; they are not a common scale of educational or organizational value. The practical interpretation is therefore to examine the content of the ratings alongside the reported agreement. Any unresolved calculation or transcription issue limits confidence in the inferential classification until the underlying output is checked.

4.7 Confidence

Table 8. Confidence

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher adapts lesson plans responsively based on learner feedback and performance	4.93
The teacher maintains composure and decisiveness when managing classroom behavior	4.91
The teacher articulates clear learning goals and communicates expectations confidently to learners	4.91
The teacher engages in professional dialogue and shares best practices with peers	4.91
The teacher seeks out leadership roles or mentoring opportunities within the school	4.91
The teacher reflects critically on their teaching practices and sets goals for improvement	4.90
the teacher demonstrates initiative in designing and implementing innovative instructional strategies	4.83

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 8 presents confidence indicators. The displayed means range from 4.83 to 4.93. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Responsive lesson planning was more prominent than initiative in innovative strategies. Adaptation and initiating a new approach are not interchangeable evidence of confidence. Nonsignificant agreement should not be interpreted as low confidence, because every reported indicator remained favorably rated. Opportunities for supported experimentation may be considered, but no intervention effect was tested.

4.8 Social Skills

Table 9. Social Skills

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher communicates clearly and respectfully with learners, fostering mutual understanding and trust	4.87
The teacher builds positive relationships with parents and guardians through regular, meaningful communication	4.85
The teacher models respectful behavior and social responsibility in daily interactions	4.85
The teacher adapts communication style to suit different learners and contexts	4.85
The teacher facilitates inclusive classroom discussions that value diverse perspectives	4.84
The teacher manages interpersonal conflicts calmly and professionally, promoting resolution and respect	4.84
The teacher collaborates constructively with colleagues to plan, reflect, and solve instructional challenges	4.81
the teacher listens actively to learner concerns and responds with empathy and support	Not reported

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred. Not reported marks a missing mean, not a zero.

Table 9 presents social skills indicators. The displayed means range from 4.81 to 4.87. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

The scored statements favor clear communication and professional relationships. The final listening statement lacks a reported numerical mean, so its position cannot be evaluated quantitatively. Listening is conceptually important, but a score cannot be inferred from neighboring entries. The table supports examining relationships and conflict processes while preserving that measurement gap.

4.9 Adaptability

Table 10. Adaptability

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher embraced change by integrating new teaching strategies, tools, and feedback into their practice	4.92
The teacher demonstrated cognitive flexibility by modifying lesson plans and approaches based on learner performance and classroom dynamics	4.91
The teacher regulated emotions effectively, maintaining composure and empathy during stressful or uncertain situations	4.91
The teacher initiated problem-solving strategies to address instructional challenges and learner concerns proactively	4.91
The teacher collaborated effectively in dynamic teams, adapting to different roles and contributing constructively to shared goals	4.90
The teacher responded confidently to technological changes, integrating digital tools and platforms to enhance teaching and learning	4.90
The teacher exhibited learning agility by acquiring new pedagogical skills and applying them in unfamiliar or evolving contexts	4.90
The teacher showed resilience by recovering from setbacks and sustaining motivation and focus on learner outcomes	4.89
the teacher practiced situational awareness, adjusting behavior and instructional methods in response to contextual cues	4.88

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 10 presents adaptability indicators. The displayed means range from 4.88 to 4.92. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items. Openness to change and contextual adjustment were both favorably rated, with a small descriptive spread. Adopting new tools is not the same as judging when a change fits the situation. The findings identify both as components of reported potential. They do not show which adaptations were implemented successfully or whether adaptability predicted leadership responsibilities.

4.10 Integrity

Table 11. Integrity

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher advocated for ethical practices, speaking up against injustice, bias, or misconduct within the school environment	4.95
The teacher accepted constructive feedback, using it to reflect on practice and improve without defensiveness or blame-shifting	4.91
The teacher upheld ethical standards by consistently demonstrating honesty, fairness, and transparency in interactions with learners, colleagues, and stakeholders	4.90
The teacher honored commitments and responsibilities, fulfilling duties reliably and maintaining accountability for instructional and administrative tasks	4.90
The teacher maintained confidentiality, safeguarding sensitive learner information and respecting professional boundaries	4.90
The teacher demonstrated consistency in decision-making, applying rules and expectations fairly across all learners and situations	4.90
the teacher modeled respectful behavior, treating all learners equitably and fostering a classroom culture grounded in dignity and inclusion	4.88

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 11 presents integrity indicators. The displayed means range from 4.88 to 4.95. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Advocating ethical practice was rated above modeling equitable and respectful behavior. Publicly supporting a principle and applying it consistently are distinct professional actions. The ordering supports discussing ethical judgment alongside daily conduct. The study did not investigate misconduct, verify equal treatment, or certify ethical compliance; favorable self-report should not substitute for such evidence.

4.11 Tolerance of Stress

Table 12. Tolerance of Stress

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher demonstrated resilience, recovering quickly from setbacks and maintaining focus on learner outcomes	4.83
The teacher maintained professional relationships, interacting respectfully with learners, colleagues, and parents despite stressful circumstances	4.83
The teacher adapted to shifting priorities, reorganizing tasks and adjusting plans without losing momentum or clarity	4.83
The teacher sought support when needed, recognizing personal limits and accessing resources or peer assistance to manage stress effectively	4.81
The teacher modeled healthy coping strategies, encouraging learners to approach challenges with optimism, problem-solving, and emotional awareness	4.81
The teacher remained calm and composed during high-pressure situations, avoiding reactive or impulsive behavior	4.81
The teacher continued to perform instructional duties effectively, even when faced with time constraints, workload demands, or unexpected disruptions	4.80
the teacher managed emotional responses constructively, using self-regulation strategies to maintain a positive classroom climate	4.74

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 12 presents tolerance of stress indicators. The displayed means range from 4.74 to 4.83. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Recovery from setbacks was more prominent than management of emotional responses. This again distinguishes resilience after difficulty from regulation during it. The nonsignificant concordance result concerns relative rankings rather than a demonstrated deficit in stress tolerance. Professional support can be considered without presuming distress, clinical need, or reduced teaching capability.

Table 13. Reported concordance for leadership potentials

Domain	W	χ^2	Reported p	Decision
Confidence	0.66	11.88	p>0.05	Not rejected
Social Skills	0.89	18.69	p<0.01	Rejected
Adaptability	0.80	19.20	p<0.025	Rejected
Integrity	0.74	13.32	p<0.05	Rejected
Tolerance of Stress	0.67	14.07	p>0.05	Not rejected

Note. All statistics and probability inequalities are retained as reported. Not rejected expresses a stated exception to rejection; it does not establish equivalence.

Table 13 reports significant agreement for Social Skills; Adaptability; Integrity. The exceptions were Confidence; Tolerance of Stress. The test concerns indicator ordering. It does not determine which domain was most effective, establish the magnitude of improvement, or demonstrate an association between the two sets of constructs.

Comparisons of chi-square magnitudes require attention to the number of indicators and degrees of freedom; they are not a common scale of educational or organizational value. The practical interpretation is therefore to examine the content of the ratings alongside the reported agreement. Any unresolved calculation or transcription issue limits confidence in the inferential classification until the underlying output is checked.

5. Discussion

5.1 Meaning of the descriptive profile

The study reported favorable ratings across self-regulating attributes and leadership potentials. The detailed tables nevertheless distinguish specific practices and behaviors rather than establishing a uniformly successful process. The most useful application is to examine what the relatively lower statements require in everyday practice. A high category rating does not establish that every participant had the same experience or that all implementation conditions were equally supportive.

The within-domain patterns are exploratory and descriptive. The displayed precision allows exact transcription but should not be confused with evidence that small mean differences are practically important. Without response distributions and variability estimates, it is not possible to determine whether a narrow range reflects genuinely similar experience, restricted response options, or a tendency to endorse favorable statements. The interpretation therefore remains tied to the content and type of measurement.

Panadero (2017) provides a reason to consider motivation, reflection, and emotion together, while Wenner and Campbell (2017) situate teacher leadership beyond an individual trait list. Applied cautiously, these perspectives support investigating how novice teachers regulate work and exercise influence in context. They do not establish a predictive link between the study's two sets of questionnaire domains.

5.2 Agreement and the research questions

The reported agreement results address a narrower question than the title's practical purpose. For self-regulating attributes, significant agreement was reported for Self-Efficacy; Self-Control; Positive Framing; Goal Setting. For leadership potentials, it was reported for Social Skills; Adaptability; Integrity. These findings describe the ordering of indicators under the reported procedure. They do not establish which practice explains individual differences in outcomes, nor do they demonstrate that changing one domain would improve another.

Nonsignificant domains should not automatically become deficit labels. They may reflect differences in relative emphasis even when ratings are uniformly high. Similarly, significant domains are not necessarily the strongest priorities for intervention. Priority setting should consider the importance of the behavior, actual implementation conditions, and the evidence needed to understand a problem. The test classification alone does not supply those judgments.

5.3 Implications for practice and policy

The study proposed mentoring, professional learning communities, reflective practice, goal-setting support, leadership development, and assistance with confidence and stress. These are proposed development directions. Nonsignificant rank concordance is not sufficient evidence that a trait is deficient or that a particular teacher requires remedial intervention.

A defensible next step is to review the findings with relevant stakeholders and compare the questionnaire statements with actual examples of practice. Such review can clarify what respondents understood, identify usable resources, and distinguish shared priorities from context-specific needs. This would extend the study rather than represent data already collected. Proposed actions should have explicit objectives and indicators before their effectiveness is evaluated.

Implementation should also include attention to access, workload, and the quality of support. Standardizing a form or activity does not by itself establish that participants can use it meaningfully. The findings provide a basis for discussing those conditions, but not for prescribing an identical response to every school or stakeholder group. The study did not compare alternative policy packages or estimate their costs and benefits.

6. Conclusion

The study reported favorable extent ratings for self-regulating attributes and leadership potentials among 45 novice teachers in Buhi South District, Division of Camarines Sur. Significant agreement was reported for Self-Efficacy; Self-Control; Positive Framing; Goal Setting in the first set and Social Skills; Adaptability; Integrity in the second. The nonsignificant exceptions in the first set were Self Evaluation; Emotional Stability. The nonsignificant exceptions in the second set were Confidence; Tolerance of Stress. These conclusions concern reported extent and rank concordance.

The findings support consideration of the proposed professional and implementation priorities. They do not establish causal effectiveness, individual mastery, or verified improvement. Completing the missing methodological details and resolving the identified reporting issues are necessary before stronger explanatory claims. The title and study purpose are retained without expanding the evidence beyond the reported design.

References

- [1] Panadero, E. (2017). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, Article 422. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422>
- [2] Wenner, J. A., & Campbell, T. (2017). The theoretical and empirical basis of teacher leadership: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(1), 134–171. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316653478>