

The Effectiveness of the Financial Practices in Improving the Financial Literacy Skills of the Grade 3 Teachers in Caramoan South District, Division of Camarines Sur

Nesty A. Dy-Contang¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: Financial Practices Perceived Financial Literacy Questionnaire Kendall Concordance Caramoan South District	The study examined financial practices and perceived financial literacy in Caramoan South District, Division of Camarines Sur during School Year 2025–2026. A descriptive-evaluative-correlational design used a researcher-made questionnaire with 41 Grade 3 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 financial practices were classified as Very Much Employed, and those of perceived effectiveness for financial literacy as Very Much Effective. Significant agreement was reported for Budgeting and Financial Planning; Expense Management; Debt Management. Saving Behavior; Investment and Financial Security did not show significant reported agreement. For perceived effectiveness for financial literacy, significant agreement was reported for Resource Allocation Skills; Analytical Decision-Making. Economic Awareness; Risk Assessment Ability; Consumer Awareness 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

Financial literacy involves understanding financial choices and applying that understanding under actual income, expenditure, and family constraints. Teachers may report regular budgeting or saving while still needing support in evaluating credit terms, comparing alternatives, or responding to changing prices. The study examined both the financial practices of Grade 3 teachers and their perceptions of the effectiveness of those practices in developing financial literacy. These are related concerns, but practice frequency and demonstrated knowledge are not identical measures.

The five practice domains distinguish planning, saving, spending, investment and security, and debt management. The five perceived-literacy domains address economic awareness, allocation, risk assessment, consumer awareness, and analytical decisions. Together they provide a practical profile of how respondents describe their financial routines and judgment. The investigation concerns teachers' personal financial management; it does not assess the financial literacy of their Grade 3 learners or the quality of mathematics instruction.

Kaiser et al. (2022) synthesized experimental financial-education research and reported favorable average effects on knowledge and financial behavior. Their evidence makes financial learning a relevant professional-support concern. The study did not deliver or evaluate such a program, so those intervention effects cannot be attributed to the teachers' reported practices. The OECD (2022) measurement toolkit also provides a useful comparator because it distinguishes financial-literacy measurement from an undifferentiated self-assessment of effectiveness.

The study's local contribution is to identify reported practice patterns and the concordance of indicator rankings. Its effectiveness wording is retained as the research purpose and questionnaire interpretation. No pretest–posttest knowledge assessment, financial-record audit, or participant-level relationship model was reported. The empirical conclusions therefore concern reported extent and agreement, rather than a demonstrated increase in financial capability.

2. Purpose and research questions

The study addressed the extent of financial practices across Budgeting and Financial Planning; Saving Behavior; Expense Management; Investment and Financial Security; Debt Management; agreement on their indicator rankings; the extent of perceived effectiveness for financial literacy across Economic Awareness; Resource Allocation Skills; Risk Assessment Ability; Consumer Awareness; Analytical Decision-Making; 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 Caramoan South District, Division of Camarines Sur for School Year 2025–2026. The reported participant group comprised 41 Grade 3 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 10 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 budgeting list contains eight scored statements, while its reported test requires clarification of the item count and ranking groups. The saving probability entry contains stray text ("6.48 9(p>0.05)"); the unambiguous W, χ^2 , and inequality are retained separately, with the transcription issue recorded in the review notes.

4. Results

4.1 Budgeting and Financial Planning

Table 1. Budgeting and Financial Planning

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher adjusts financial plans and budgets according to changes in income, needs, and financial circumstances	5.00
The teacher prepares a monthly budget to allocate income for various financial needs and obligations	4.95
The teacher develops a financial plan to address future personal and family financial responsibilities	4.92
The teacher prioritizes essential expenses over non-essential purchases when managing financial resources	4.85
The teacher regularly reviews and monitors personal or household income and expenditures	4.83
The teacher follows a spending plan to ensure that expenses remain within available income	4.83
The teacher evaluates financial priorities before making major financial decisions or commitments	4.82
the teacher sets short-term and long-term financial goals and develops plans to achieve them	4.81

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

Table 1 presents budgeting and financial planning indicators. The displayed means range from 4.81 to 5.00. The reported classification is Very Much Employed. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

The ordering places adjustment to circumstances above the explicit setting of future goals. Revising a budget and establishing a direction for that budget serve different purposes. A high rating for flexibility therefore need not mean that goals were equally clearly articulated. The findings support reviewing how plans connect immediate obligations with longer-term intentions; they do not establish actual budget adherence or financial improvement.

4.2 Saving Behavior

Table 2. Saving Behavior

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher deposits savings in a bank, cooperative, or other secure financial institution	4.96
The teacher consistently follows a savings plan or savings target	4.95
The teacher avoids unnecessary spending in order to increase savings	4.95
The teacher saves money for major future expenses such as education, housing, retirement, or family needs	4.95
The teacher allocates part of monthly earnings toward future financial goals	4.95
The teacher regularly monitors and evaluates personal savings to ensure progress toward financial goals	4.94
The teacher regularly sets aside a portion of income for personal savings	4.94
The teacher maintains an emergency fund for unexpected financial situations	4.94
the teacher saves money before spending on non-essential purchases	4.94

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

Table 2 presents saving behavior indicators. The displayed means range from 4.94 to 4.96. The reported classification is Very Much Employed. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

The narrow range of ratings suggests little descriptive separation among the reported saving routines. Use of secure institutions, savings targets, and emergency reserves all remained favorably classified. Such ratings do not reveal savings balances, regularity over time, or adequacy relative to household obligations. The nonsignificant concordance result should therefore be read as a ranking finding rather than evidence that saving was ineffective.

4.3 Expense Management

Table 3. Expense Management

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher prioritizes essential expenses before spending on non-essential items	4.96
The teacher plans purchase in advance to avoid unnecessary or excessive spending	4.96
The teacher practices cost-saving measures in daily spending to maximize available resources	4.96
The teacher keeps a record of personal or household expenses to monitor spending patterns	4.95
The teacher compares prices and alternatives before making purchases	4.95
The teacher allocates financial resources according to identified needs and priorities	4.95
The teacher avoids impulsive buying and unnecessary expenditures	4.94
The teacher regularly reviews expenditures to identify areas where spending can be reduced	4.94
the teacher ensures that monthly expenses remain within the available budget	4.93

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

Table 3 presents expense management indicators. The displayed means range from 4.93 to 4.96. The reported classification is Very Much Employed. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Essential spending, advance purchase planning, and cost-saving measures were comparatively prominent, while remaining within the monthly budget was relatively lower. Planning purchases and achieving a balanced month are related but different outcomes. The profile can guide discussion of implementation under income constraints. It does not identify overspending rates or show that particular teachers failed to meet their obligations.

4.4 Investment and Financial Security

Table 4. Investment and Financial Security

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher monitors and reviews savings and investments regularly to ensure continued financial stability and growth	4.98
The teacher sets aside a portion of income regularly for savings and investment purposes	4.97
The teacher invests in financial products or opportunities that support long-term financial growth	4.97
The teacher allocates financial resources toward achieving future financial goals and security	4.97
The teacher practices consistent saving habits to strengthen financial stability and preparedness	4.97

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher balances current financial obligations with long-term investment and savings goals	4.97
The teacher maintains an emergency fund to address unforeseen financial circumstances	4.96
The teacher evaluates investment options carefully before committing financial resources	4.96
the teacher seeks information and knowledge about investment opportunities to improve financial decisions	4.95

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

Table 4 presents investment and financial security indicators. The displayed means range from 4.95 to 4.98. The reported classification is Very Much Employed. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Monitoring and allocation were rated above seeking investment information. This pattern raises a useful developmental question about the information used to review financial choices. The study did not examine portfolios, investment returns, suitability, or exposure to loss. The high perceived extent must not be converted into product recommendations or a claim that respondents' assets were financially secure.

4.5 Debt Management

Table 5. Debt Management

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher allocates a portion of income specifically for debt repayment obligations	4.92
The teacher actively works to reduce existing debts in order to achieve greater financial stability and security	4.92
The teacher develops a repayment plan to settle financial obligations systematically	4.82
The teacher evaluates the terms, interest rates, and conditions of loans before borrowing	4.82
The teacher ensures that debt repayments remain within the capacity of available income	4.77
The teacher borrows money only for necessary and important financial needs	4.76
The teacher keeps records of outstanding loans and regularly monitors repayment schedules	4.75
The teacher avoids incurring multiple debts that may create financial difficulties	4.75
the teacher pays loan obligations and other debts on or before their due dates	4.75

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

Table 5 presents debt management indicators. The displayed means range from 4.75 to 4.92. The reported classification is Very Much Employed. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Allocating repayment funds and working to reduce debt were more prominent than several routine monitoring and payment statements. Intentional debt reduction is distinct from the regular execution of payments. The findings support attention to loan terms, records, and manageable obligations without estimating indebtedness or default. No loan balances, interest costs, or payment histories were independently examined.

Table 6. Reported concordance for financial practices

Domain	W	χ^2	Reported p	Decision
Budgeting and Financial Planning	0.95	22.80	$p < 0.005$	Rejected
Saving Behavior	0.27	6.48	$p > 0.05$	Not rejected
Expense Management	0.82	19.68	$p < 0.025$	Rejected
Investment and Financial Security	0.60	14.40	$p > 0.05$	Not rejected
Debt Management	0.87	20.88	$p < 0.01$	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 6 reports significant agreement for Budgeting and Financial Planning; Expense Management; Debt Management. The exceptions were Saving Behavior; Investment and Financial Security. 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.

4.6 Economic Awareness

Table 7. Economic Awareness

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher evaluates how economic developments affect the achievement of personal financial goals	4.95
The teacher demonstrates awareness of how economic conditions affect personal and household finances	4.95
The teacher recognizes the impact of inflation on purchasing power and daily expenses	4.94
The teacher stays informed about economic issues and financial trends that influence financial decisions	4.94
The teacher applies knowledge of economic conditions when making financial decisions	4.94

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher recognizes the importance of financial preparedness during economic uncertainties	4.94
The teacher considers changes in prices of goods and services when planning expenditures	4.93
The teacher understands the relationship between income, spending, saving, and financial stability	4.93
the teacher identifies financial opportunities and challenges arising from economic changes	4.92

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

Table 7 presents economic awareness indicators. The displayed means range from 4.92 to 4.95. The reported classification is Very Much Effective. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

The indicators connect economic developments with personal goals, prices, preparedness, and household decisions. Their favorable ratings describe perceived responsiveness to economic conditions, not performance on an economic-knowledge test. The lower relative recognition of opportunities and challenges suggests a topic for contextual examples. Nonsignificant agreement does not imply that economic awareness was absent or unimportant.

4.7 Resource Allocation Skills

Table 8. Resource Allocation Skills

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher allocates financial resources according to identified needs and priorities	4.94
The teacher sets aside sufficient resources for essential household and personal needs	4.94
The teacher balances financial resources between present needs and future financial goals	4.94
The teacher prioritizes limited resources to meet the most important financial responsibilities	4.94
The teacher adjusts resource allocation strategies when financial circumstances change	4.94
The teacher distributes income effectively among expenses, savings, and financial obligations	4.93
The teacher allocates funds for emergency situations without compromising essential expenses	4.93
The teacher manages available financial resources efficiently to avoid unnecessary shortages	4.92
the teacher evaluates the effectiveness of resource allocation decisions in achieving financial goals	4.92

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

Table 8 presents resource allocation skills indicators. The displayed means range from 4.92 to 4.94. The reported classification is Very Much Effective. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

The profile distinguishes identifying priorities from reviewing whether allocations achieved intended goals. Favorable ratings for distributing limited resources can coexist with a comparatively lower evaluative routine. The significant reported concordance concerns the ordering of these statements. It does not demonstrate that allocations were optimal or that respondents with higher practice scores achieved better financial outcomes.

4.8 Risk Assessment Ability

Table 9. Risk Assessment Ability

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher gathers relevant information before making important financial decisions to minimize risks	4.96
The teacher assesses the affordability of financial obligations before incurring additional expenses or debts	4.95
The teacher prepares contingency plans to address unexpected financial challenges and emergencies	4.95
The teacher identifies potential financial risks before making financial decisions	4.94
The teacher considers possible financial losses when making investment or spending decisions	4.94
The teacher practices caution when engaging in unfamiliar financial products, investments, or financial transactions	4.94
The teacher makes financial decisions based on careful analysis of risks and available alternatives	4.94
The teacher evaluates the possible consequences of financial choices on personal and household finances	4.93
the teacher compares the benefits and risks of financial opportunities before committing resources	4.93

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

Table 9 presents risk assessment ability indicators. The displayed means range from 4.93 to 4.96. The reported classification is Very Much Effective. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Information gathering was comparatively prominent, while weighing benefits and risks and evaluating consequences were relatively lower within a favorable range. Obtaining information does not ensure that competing outcomes are assessed accurately. The table identifies a reason to examine decision processes, but it supplies neither risk-tolerance measurements nor observed responses to financial shocks. No loss-prevention effect can be estimated.

4.9 Consumer Awareness

Table 10. Consumer Awareness

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher practices responsible spending by selecting products and services that provide the best value for money	4.92
The teacher evaluates the value and usefulness of products before spending money on them	4.91
The teacher reads and understands product information, terms, and conditions before purchasing	4.91
The teacher recognizes consumer rights and responsibilities when purchasing goods and services	4.91
The teacher compares prices, quality, and features of products or services before making purchases	4.91
The teacher makes purchasing decisions based on needs rather than wants	4.90
The teacher exercises caution when responding to advertisements, promotions, and marketing strategies	4.90
The teacher seeks reliable information from credible sources before making important purchasing decisions	4.89
the teacher identifies and avoids deceptive, misleading, or fraudulent consumer practices	4.88

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

Table 10 presents consumer awareness indicators. The displayed means range from 4.88 to 4.92. The reported classification is Very Much Effective. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Value-oriented spending was rated above identifying deceptive practices. This distinction matters because obtaining a useful product and recognizing fraud involve different judgments. Consumer education can address both without assuming that respondents were victimized. The study did not administer fraud-recognition scenarios or verify purchasing records, so the results remain perceived effectiveness ratings rather than demonstrated consumer-protection competence.

4.10 Analytical Decision-Making

Table 11. Analytical Decision-Making

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher analyzes available financial information before making financial decisions	4.91
The teacher evaluates the short-term and long-term consequences of financial decisions	4.90
The teacher makes financial decisions that are aligned with personal financial goals and priorities	4.90
The teacher compares different financial alternatives before selecting the most appropriate option	4.89
The teacher uses facts and financial evidence rather than emotions when making financial decisions	4.88
The teacher identifies possible solutions to financial problems and selects the most beneficial option	4.88
The teacher considers the costs and benefits of financial choices before committing resources	4.88
The teacher assesses financial situations critically to determine appropriate courses of action	4.88
the teacher reviews past financial decisions to improve future financial decision-making	4.87

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

Table 11 presents analytical decision-making indicators. The displayed means range from 4.87 to 4.91. The reported classification is Very Much Effective. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Analysis before a decision was rated above reviewing previous decisions. Forward planning and learning from outcomes are complementary. The pattern supports considering reflection as part of financial education, while the favorable classification suggests it was not reported as absent. Significant concordance does not show that decisions improved over time; repeated assessments or documented decision outcomes would be needed.

Table 12. Reported concordance for perceived effectiveness for financial literacy

Domain	W	χ^2	Reported p	Decision
Economic Awareness	0.47	11.28	$p > 0.05$	Not rejected
Resource Allocation Skills	0.67	16.08	$p < 0.05$	Rejected
Risk Assessment Ability	0.59	14.16	$p > 0.05$	Not rejected
Consumer Awareness	0.33	7.92	$p > 0.05$	Not rejected
Analytical Decision-Making	0.68	16.32	$p < 0.05$	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 12 reports significant agreement for Resource Allocation Skills; Analytical Decision-Making. The exceptions were Economic Awareness; Risk Assessment Ability; Consumer Awareness. 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 financial practices and perceived effectiveness for financial literacy. 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.

The financial-education evidence of Kaiser et al. (2022) concerns evaluated learning interventions, whereas the study concerns reported routines and perceived effectiveness. The OECD (2022) toolkit is relevant to the next measurement step: separating knowledge, behavior, and related constructs. Together these comparisons support clearer assessment rather than treating near-ceiling ratings as demonstrated financial competence.

5.2 Agreement and the research questions

The reported agreement results address a narrower question than the title's practical purpose. For financial practices, significant agreement was reported for Budgeting and Financial Planning; Expense Management; Debt Management. For perceived effectiveness for financial literacy, it was reported for Resource Allocation Skills; Analytical Decision-Making. 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 financial-literacy workshops, consumer education, emergency-fund awareness, investment information, school-based financial wellness, and collaboration with local government, banks, cooperatives, and professional organizations. These proposals are developmental directions, not individualized financial recommendations or evaluated interventions.

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 financial practices and perceived effectiveness for financial literacy among 41 Grade 3 teachers in Caramoan South District, Division of Camarines Sur. Significant agreement was reported for Budgeting and Financial Planning; Expense Management; Debt Management in the first set and Resource Allocation Skills; Analytical Decision-Making in the second. The nonsignificant exceptions in the first set were Saving Behavior; Investment and Financial Security. The nonsignificant exceptions in the second set were Economic Awareness; Risk Assessment Ability; Consumer Awareness. 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] Kaiser, T., Lusardi, A., Menkhoff, L., & Urban, C. (2022). Financial education affects financial knowledge and downstream behaviors. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 145(2), 255–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2021.09.022>
- [2] OECD. (2022). OECD/INFE toolkit for measuring financial literacy and financial inclusion 2022. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/cbc4114f-en>