KRIEZACADEMY
ISSNN:3031-8025

BEYOND FINANCIAL AWARENESS: A COMMUNITY EDUCATION FRAMEWORK FOR FRAUD RECOGNITION AND HELP-SEEKING

Fitriana[1], Endang Ruchiyat[2]

[1]Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP, Bandung, Indonesia

[2]STIE Ekuitas, Bandung, Indonesia

Correspondence: fitriana@usbypkp.ac.id

Abstract

Background: Financial awareness does not necessarily enable people to evaluate pressure tactics or obtain appropriate assistance. **Aims:** To propose a community learning framework connecting fraud recognition, independent verification, and help-seeking. **Review Method:** A purposive conceptual analysis uses three official resources on financial literacy, consumer protection, and reusable education. No fraud cases, participant data, or intervention results are presented. **Results and Conclusion:** The framework uses balanced fictional scenarios, explained decisions, and rehearsal of verified assistance routes. Assessment considers false alarms as well as correct recognition and separates consumer learning from institutional protection responsibilities. **Contribution:** The article offers a safe teaching design, observable measures, and research propositions. It makes no claim about losses prevented or the recovery of funds.

Keywords: financial literacy; fraud recognition; consumer protection; community education; help-seeking.

1 INTRODUCTION

A person may remember a warning about financial fraud yet find it difficult to respond when an unexpected message creates urgency. Awareness and protective action are different educational outcomes. Community education can address the second by rehearsing how to pause, evaluate the request, and find independently verified assistance.

The OECD Recommendation on Financial Literacy provides a policy reference for education, while the updated G20/OECD principles situate education within a wider consumer protection system (OECD, 2020, 2022). This article develops an instructional framework consistent with that distinction. It does not offer personal financial advice or present education as a substitute for provider controls and effective complaint handling.

2 CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATION

Protective judgement is defined here as the ability to explain why a financial request needs checking, select an independent verification route, and describe an appropriate next step. This is distinct from remembering a slogan or recognising a familiar example. A learner can be cautious without being able to find reliable assistance, while excessive suspicion can disrupt legitimate activities. The educational objective must therefore include discrimination and help-seeking.

OECD (2020) provides a financial literacy policy reference, while OECD (2022) situates consumers within a wider protection system. The framework does not infer that a trained person can prevent every scam or that education transfers responsibility from institutions. Its analytical contribution is to make a limited set of decisions observable without collecting real account details. UNESCO (2019) informs the use of adaptable materials, with local assistance information checked separately before delivery.

Table 1. Proposed operational definitions

Construct	Meaning in this article	Observable example
Recognition	Identifying a reason to question a fictional request.	Explanation refers to the requested action and context.
Independent verification	Checking through a route not supplied by the suspicious request.	Learner identifies a verified institutional source.
Help-seeking	Describing the concern and locating suitable assistance.	A fictional incident summary and appropriate route.
Calibrated confidence	Confidence interpreted alongside decision quality.	Self-assessment compared with scenario performance.

The definitions in Table 1 specify the analytical objects for this framework. They are proposed working definitions rather than established measurement scales. A future study should examine whether participants and assessors interpret them consistently before combining them into a score.

3 REVIEW APPROACH

Three official resources were selected purposively to cover financial learning, institutional protection, and adaptable teaching materials (OECD, 2020, 2022; UNESCO, 2019). Their publication details and available official descriptions were checked. The conceptual analysis asked which learner actions could be observed safely in a community setting and which responsibilities remain outside the learner's control.

The corpus is deliberately small and does not represent all research on fraud prevention or financial capability. No intervention, prevalence survey, victim interview, or institutional performance assessment was undertaken. The scenarios and measures below are proposed teaching and research instruments; they are not validated scales or findings.

Table 2. Documentary corpus and analytical role

Source	Type	Role in the synthesis	Inference limit
OECD 2020	Financial literacy recommendation	Policy reference for education and capability.	Not validation of the proposed curriculum.
OECD 2022	Consumer protection principles	Context for institutional responsibilities and digital services.	Not a guarantee of assistance or recovery.
UNESCO 2019	Open educational resource recommendation	Basis for adaptable learning materials.	Local reporting routes still require fresh verification.

The analysis proceeds from construct definition to a proposed sequence, followed by consideration of failure conditions and measurement choices. Source statements supply context; the sequence, tables, examples, and propositions are analytical proposals developed in this manuscript. No search-completeness count, independent coding agreement, or causal estimate is reported. References should be checked against the full original documents during author review.

4 INTEGRATED CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A training exercise should include both suspicious and ordinary fictional messages. Otherwise, participants may learn to reject every request and appear successful without developing discrimination. Scenario design can vary claimed authority, urgency, requested action, and availability of an independent verification route.

Participants explain their judgement in plain language. An answer that identifies pressure and an unusual request is more informative than a memorised label. Facilitators should explain why an unfamiliar message is not automatically fraudulent and why professional-looking material does not establish legitimacy. The purpose is reasoned checking rather than blanket trust or fear.

Table 3. Proposed sequence and responsibilities

Stage	Task	Responsible role	Expected evidence
Interpret	Describe what the message asks and why it matters.	Learner	A plain-language account of the request.
Question	Identify pressure, uncertainty, or an unusual action.	Learner explains; facilitator probes	A reasoned judgement rather than a memorised label.
Verify	Choose an independently established information route.	Learner uses a dated training reference	A relevant route not taken from the request.
Seek help	Prepare a concise account and locate appropriate assistance.	Learner; private support for real disclosures	A fictional summary without sensitive account data.

Table 3 links each stage to a responsibility and an observable record. The sequence is intended to expose a missing connection, rather than imply that completing a form guarantees an outcome. Movement between stages may be iterative. Where an essential condition is absent, the appropriate decision is to repair that condition or narrow the scope before expansion.

5 OPERATING MECHANISMS

The second stage asks participants to choose how they would check a request without following a contact route supplied by that request. In the classroom, learners can work with a printed list of verified institutional channels prepared by the organiser. No actual transfer, login, installation, or disclosure of credentials is required.

The organiser must date and verify local reporting information before delivery because channels and procedures can change. The article intentionally does not supply unverified telephone numbers or promise recovery of funds. A learner's performance can be assessed by whether the chosen route is independent and relevant, rather than whether the learner remembers a particular number.

Table 4. Mechanisms proposed for examination

Mechanism	Analytical function	Required condition
Balanced scenarios	Distinguishes reasoned suspicion from rejecting every message.	Ordinary and suspicious requests are both represented.
Route independence	Reduces reliance on contact information supplied by the request.	Training references are independently verified and dated.
Rehearsed explanation	Supports concise communication when assistance is needed.	Exercises use fictional facts and respect privacy.

A fictional message claims that a payment problem requires urgent action through a link. Participants are not asked to open it. Instead, they identify the requested action, explain what is uncertain, and select a verification route from a facilitator-prepared reference sheet. A second fictional message is a routine service notice that requests no credentials or transfer. Including both prevents automatic rejection from being mistaken for accurate recognition.

The facilitator asks how the learner would describe a concern to an official service. The exercise uses invented details and a printed interface; it does not initiate a transaction, request a real password, or contact a bank. If a participant discloses a real incident, it is handled privately through an appropriate support process outside group assessment. This example is a proposed exercise and has not been tested.

6 PROPOSITIONS FOR EMPIRICAL TESTING

The propositions below describe relationships that a future study could examine. Their numbering supports discussion and does not indicate a hierarchy of importance. They are not hypotheses tested by this manuscript, and no effect size or statistical significance is implied.

P1. Scenario-based explanation and verification rehearsal are more likely to support protective judgement than warning-message exposure alone.

P2. Help-seeking instruction is more useful when the receiving institution offers an accessible and responsive process.

Table 5. Additional propositions and possible tests

ID	Proposed relationship	Possible observation
P3	Assessments using only suspicious scenarios will overstate recognition capability.	Include legitimate requests and report false alarms.
P4	Help-seeking capability will decay when assistance information is outdated or inaccessible.	Repeat a route-finding exercise after a delay.
P5	Confidence gains will overstate learning where verification choices remain unchanged.	Compare confidence with scenario explanations and route selection.

A useful test would specify a plausible competing explanation and seek evidence that could weaken the proposed relationship. Comparison conditions, timing, and assistance received should be described before interpreting an observed difference. A finding inconsistent with a proposition would require revision of the framework, not reinterpretation of every outcome as support.

The appropriate unit of analysis may be a task episode, a decision, or a programme cycle. Future researchers should choose that unit explicitly and keep it consistent across measurement and interpretation. Repeated observations from the same person or organisation should not automatically be treated as independent evidence.

7 IMPLEMENTATION PATHWAY

The pathway in Table 6 is a proposed pilot design rather than a record of completed implementation. It identifies who would perform each task and what evidence should be available before proceeding. Local organisers should adapt the sequence to their authority, resources, participant needs, and responsibilities.

Table 6. Staged implementation proposal

Stage	Proposed task	Responsible role	Evidence before proceeding
Prepare	Create balanced fictional scenarios without active transaction links.	Education lead	Safe materials and a clear learning objective.
Verify	Check local official assistance routes before each delivery.	Responsible organiser	Dated reference and accessible alternatives.
Explain	Model a reasoned decision and an independent verification choice.	Facilitator	Learners can explain rather than recite a warning.
Rehearse	Practise describing a fictional concern and locating assistance.	Learner	No real credentials, transactions, or public loss disclosures.
Review	Assess new scenarios and examine misunderstandings.	Assessor	Recognition, false alarms, route choices, and support needs.

A pilot should begin with a bounded scope that can be reviewed without unnecessary cost or disruption. The coordinator should record deviations from the plan, including inaccessible activities, unavailable resources, and support that exceeded expectations. These records help explain why an apparently suitable design may work differently across settings.

Expansion should depend on a reasoned review of evidence and unresolved barriers. Completion of the pathway does not itself establish effectiveness. Stopping or revising a pilot can be appropriate when its objective cannot be reached under the available conditions.

8 EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT

A future protocol should predefine how ambiguous scenarios are handled and avoid scoring a disputed item as clearly correct. Facilitators should record what reference information was available. Actual victimisation or financial loss would require a separate research design and careful interpretation of reporting changes. A rise in reports after training might reflect improved help-seeking rather than increased fraud incidence.

Table 7. Proposed indicators and interpretation limits

Dimension	Operational question	Potential evidence	Interpretation limit
Recognition	Suspicious scenario identified with a relevant reason.	New fictional message set.	Memorised examples can inflate performance.
False alarms	Ordinary request incorrectly rejected or labelled fraudulent.	Balanced assessment set.	Maximum caution is not automatically good judgement.
Verification	Independent and relevant checking route selected.	Printed or accessible route-choice exercise.	A familiar number may be outdated.
Help-seeking	Concern described without unnecessary sensitive information.	Fictional incident summary.	Skill does not establish institutional responsiveness.
Retention	Decision quality on unfamiliar scenarios after a delay.	Follow-up with declared assistance conditions.	Selective follow-up can bias interpretation.

Any evaluation involving people or identifiable records needs an appropriate protocol, permissions, and a locally relevant ethics determination before collection. This article reports no such collection. A future report should describe missing observations, participation barriers, and the conditions of assessment, rather than presenting completed cases as if they represented everyone intended to benefit.

9 DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

The framework locates the educational contribution in a limited and testable set of decisions. Participants should explain a concern, choose an independent checking route, and know how to seek assistance. This is more specific than an awareness objective and more modest than a promise to prevent victimisation. It also allows teaching to address the adverse effect of indiscriminate distrust.

Assessment design is a substantive issue. A learner can score perfectly on a set containing only scams by rejecting everything. Balanced scenarios make that strategy visible, while explanations distinguish recognition from guessing. Changes in confidence should be considered alongside judgement: training that makes participants feel safer without improving their decisions may create a misleading impression of protection. A future comparison would need similar exposure time, task difficulty, and support across groups.

The institutional boundary is equally important. Consumers cannot be expected to compensate for unsafe service processes or ineffective complaints handling. A learning programme should establish where its responsibility ends and how a real concern can reach appropriate assistance. The article does not validate any reporting channel, provide personal investment advice, or estimate prevented losses. A local pilot must verify assistance information, respect privacy, and review possible embarrassment or distress arising from the exercises.

PROGRAMME IMPLICATIONS

For community organisers, the framework implies responsibility for maintaining safe materials and current assistance information. Exercises should not create an opportunity for participants to exchange real credentials or demonstrate transactions. The facilitator should explain that seeking help is compatible with competent judgement and that a person who has experienced fraud should not be blamed for failing a classroom rule. Feedback should address the decision shown in a fictional scenario while offering a private route for concerns that fall outside the lesson.

The documentary basis is limited to a small purposive corpus of official resources. It supports a normative and analytical design, not an exhaustive account of the research literature. Additional peer-reviewed studies, local evidence, and critical author review are needed to assess novelty and refine the proposed constructs. Cross-setting applicability remains an open question.

10 CONCLUSION

Financial education can make protective judgement observable through balanced scenarios, independent verification exercises, and rehearsal of help-seeking. The proposed framework recognises both learner capability and institutional responsibility. Its effectiveness, unintended effects, and suitability for local delivery remain to be evaluated before claims about fraud reduction are warranted.

PRIORITIES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The next research priority is to assess whether balanced fictional scenarios can be understood and scored consistently. A feasibility study should examine ambiguous items and the accessibility of route-finding tasks before making an effectiveness comparison. Later research could compare warning exposure with explanation and rehearsal while monitoring false alarms and confidence. Any study of actual fraud losses would require a separate protocol and consideration of changing reporting behaviour. Better classroom performance should therefore be reported as such, without converting it into an estimate of harm prevented.

DECLARATIONS

Data and ethics: This conceptual article reports no primary participant data. No ethics approval or exemption is claimed. Funding, competing interests, acknowledgements, and author contributions must be completed by the authors before submission.

AI assistance: ChatGPT assisted with conceptual development, drafting, language preparation, and formatting. No empirical data were generated. The listed authors must verify and revise the manuscript and accept responsibility before submission. AI is not an author.

REFERENCES

OECD. (2020). Recommendation of the Council on financial literacy (OECD/LEGAL/0461). https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0461

OECD. (2022). G20/OECD high-level principles on financial consumer protection 2022. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/48cc3df0-en

UNESCO. (2019). Recommendation on open educational resources (OER). https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/recommendation-open-educational-resources-oer