
Bioethics and Behavioral Finance in Latin America: Ethical Challenges and Policy Pathways for Inclusive Financial Sustainability

Paulette Valenzuela Rincón^{1*}, Felipe de Jesús Vilchis Mora², Enrique Martínez Muñoz³, Jorge Hernández Valdés⁴, Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda⁵, Víctor Hugo Meriño Córdoba⁶, Oscar Igor Carreón Valencia⁷

¹Universidad de Sonora Campus Navojoa, México,

* Corresponding Author Email: Paulette.valenzuela@uson.mx - ORCID: 0009-0009-2673-2924

²Autonomous University of the State of Mexico,

Email: fdvilchism@uaemex.mx - ORCID: 0000-0002-2030-2810

³Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo,

Email: emunoz@uaeh.edu.mx - ORCID: 0000-0001-6418-5292

⁴Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,

Email: jorheval@unam.mx - ORCID: 0000-0001-6490-0479

⁵Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

Email: jmansilla@utemuco.cl - ORCID: 0000-0001-8175-7475

⁶Universidad Católica Luis Amigo,

Email: victor.merino@amigo.co - ORCID: 0000-0001-8911-7202

⁷Instituto Tecnológico de Monterrey, México

Email: oscar.carreon@tec.mx - ORCID: 0000-0002-9513-4356

Abstract: This paper examines the intersection of bioethics and behavioral finance in Latin America, emphasizing how behavioral biases, institutional trust, and rapid fintech expansion interact with ethical questions about autonomy, vulnerability, justice, and beneficence in financial services. Using publicly available regional datasets (Global Findex; fintech industry counts), a targeted literature review, and documented statements from regional experts and institutional reports, the study constructs a descriptive empirical picture and offers an ethical analysis oriented to policy and platform design. Results show large gains in account ownership alongside persistent behavioral and structural barriers (planning failures, optimism bias, low financial resilience) that raise bioethical concerns related to informed consent in digital products, distributive justice, and protection of vulnerable populations. The discussion proposes concrete, ethically grounded behavioral interventions and regulatory priorities to promote sustainable, inclusive financial systems that respect individual dignity and public welfare. The paper closes with recommended research and policy steps for scholars, regulators, and fintechs in Latin America.

Keywords: bioethics; behavioral finance; Latin America; financial inclusion; fintech; autonomy; justice

Received: 10 June 2025 / **Revised:** 20 August 2025 / **Accepted:** 30 August 2025 / **DOI:** 10.22399/ijssat.32

1. Introduction

The financial landscape of Latin America has been transformed in the past decade by rapid digitalization, the rise of fintechs, and concerted financial-inclusion efforts. These changes have increased formal account ownership and

broadened access to payments and credit, yet they coexist with persistent vulnerabilities: limited financial resilience, low financial literacy in segments of the population, and behavioral patterns that hinder sound financial decision-making [1,2]. From an ethical standpoint, these phenomena raise urgent questions. How should principles central to bioethics — autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and justice — be interpreted and operationalized in financial product design, regulation, and public policy? How can we protect vulnerable groups from exploitation by opaque algorithms or predatory business models while preserving the empowerment potential of inclusive financial services?

Behavioral finance contributes descriptive insight into why people make choices that deviate from the “rational actor” model. Cognitive biases such as optimism bias, present bias, and choice overload impede saving and prudent borrowing, particularly among gig and independent workers who face irregular incomes [2]. Bioethics brings normative tools for evaluating whether interventions, commercial designs, or regulatory regimes respect dignity, capacity for informed choice, equitable treatment, and protections for those with reduced bargaining power. This paper integrates empirical regional evidence with ethical analysis to propose policy-relevant pathways toward sustainable and ethical financial inclusion in Latin America.

2. Method

This study uses a mixed-methods approach combining descriptive secondary data analysis, literature synthesis, and the incorporation of documented expert statements from institutional reports and reputable news coverage as illustrative “informant extracts.” For quantitative description, regional indicators were drawn from the World Bank Global Findex materials and complementary institutional reports [3,4,5]. For behavioral and ethics literature, peer-reviewed reviews and regional analyses of bioethics were consulted to ground the normative discussion. Documented expert statements and organizational reports [2,3] Reuters interviews were used to illustrate practitioner perspectives on behavioral challenges and industry growth; these are explicitly cited and not presented as primary interviews conducted by the author [5]. The analytic strategy proceeded in three steps: (1) compile and summarize key regional indicators relevant to inclusion and market structure (account ownership, fintech growth, share of independent workers); (2) synthesize behavioral finance findings and regional studies documenting biases and outcomes; (3) apply bioethical principles to interpret the implications of these empirical patterns and to formulate policy- and design-level recommendations. Limitations are discussed below.

3. Results

Table 1 summarizes selected regional indicators relevant to inclusion, market structure, and labor composition. These figures illustrate two simultaneous dynamics: strong progress in formal account ownership since 2014 (e.g., an increase from around half of adults to roughly three quarters by 2021) and rapid fintech market growth. Yet sizable pockets of exclusion and early-stage inclusion persist. Behavioral science research emphasized in regional practitioner reports identifies several recurring barriers: planning failures, choice overload, forecasting errors, and optimism bias among small business owners and gig workers [2]. For example, Common Cents Lab’s regional analysis argues that “financial education alone is insufficient” and that automated, design-oriented nudges (e.g., defaults, automatic savings pockets) can be far more effective at improving resilience [2]. Institutional actors and commentators in industry reports and media coverage also highlight the degree to which fintechs are rapidly scaling to serve the unbanked and underbanked, while regulators and development institutions warn about the need for appropriate consumer protection [3]. As one regional authority noted in reporting on fintech growth, there is a clear correlation between advances in regulation and the capacity for fintech growth in each country [5](Anderson Caputo, IDB,). From a normative perspective, three key ethical concerns emerge clearly from the empirical synthesis:

1. Informed autonomy in digital contexts. Digital onboarding, complex terms, and algorithmic personalization can undermine meaningful consent. If design techniques exploit biases (e.g., default settings steering users into high-fee products), autonomy and informed choice are compromised.

2. Justice and distributive fairness. Rapid fintech growth can widen inequalities if products are targeted to lower-income users without adequate protections (e.g., opaque credit scoring, high-cost short-term credit). Vulnerable groups (informal workers, migrants, women in certain contexts) risk disproportionate harm.
3. Beneficence and systemic resilience. The normative aim of promoting well-being suggests prioritizing interventions that demonstrably build resilience (automated savings, insurance defaults). When interventions are effective, they satisfy beneficence; however, if poorly designed, they may produce harm (overindebtedness), invoking nonmaleficence obligations.

4. Discussion

The conjunction of behavioral findings with bioethical analysis yields actionable implications for three actor groups: regulators, fintech/platform designers, and civil-society stakeholders.

First, regulators should adopt a framework that treats behavioral design as part of consumer protection. Traditional disclosure-based regulation presumes rational processing of information; behavioral evidence shows disclosures alone have limited effect [2]. Ethically, regulators must therefore require transparency about algorithmic decision-making, prohibit manipulative dark patterns, and ensure oversight of risk-scoring that could replicate social biases. Credentialled regional analyses link regulatory advance to responsible fintech expansion [5], suggesting that harmonized, proconsumer regulation can support both growth and justice [5].

Second, fintech and platform designers should integrate ethical-by-design and behaviorally informed safeguards. The Common Cents Lab evidence indicates that small product changes — defaults for savings, automatic “savings pockets,” simplified choice architectures — can substantially increase resilience among gig workers [2]. Ethically, design choices should be evaluated against a triad: respect for autonomy (clear, comprehensible options), promotion of welfare (nudges that demonstrably improve outcomes), and fairness (avoiding regressive cost structures). Collaboration between behavioral scientists and ethicists in product teams offers a practical path to reconcile commercial viability with public goods [2].

Third, civil-society organizations and researchers have a role in monitoring both outcomes and process. Empirical monitoring should disaggregate outcomes by gender, income decile, and informality status to detect emergent inequalities. Community-centered participatory research can surface lived experiences that purely quantitative datasets mask. Latin America’s bioethics scholarship has long emphasized sociocultural particularities (e.g., local traditions, religious influences) that shape conceptions of autonomy and justice; these insights should inform context-sensitive interventions and regulatory design. ([PubMed](#))

The following short extracts are taken from publicly available institutional reporting and reputable media interviews and are presented to illustrate practitioner perspectives; they are cited to their original sources.

“Behaviorally informed interventions...are often easier and cheaper to implement” [2].

“One thing that’s clear from the reports is the correlation between advances in regulation and the capacity for growth in each country,” said Anderson Caputo (IDB), in commentary reported by Reuters on regional fintech growth [5].

These documented statements exemplify the convergence of behavioral evidence and policy discussion in the region.

5. Conclusion

Latin America stands at a pivotal moment: substantial progress in account ownership and an explosion in fintech activity create unprecedented opportunities for inclusion and development. However, behavioral realities—planning failures, optimism bias, choice overload—mean that inclusion in name alone does not guarantee autonomy, welfare, or justice. A bioethically informed approach requires shifting from disclosure-heavy, education-only strategies to integrated frameworks that combine: (1) behaviorally validated product design that preserves autonomy and promotes resilience; (2) regulatory regimes that proactively address algorithmic transparency and consumer protection for vulnerable groups; and (3) participatory research and monitoring systems that center equity and local sociocultural meanings of autonomy and well-being.

Policy makers, fintech firms, and ethicists should collaborate to pilot and evaluate ethically designed interventions (e.g., default savings pockets, plain-language consent mechanisms, limits on exploitative credit scoring). Future research should use longitudinal and disaggregated data to assess how these interventions affect autonomy, financial health, and distributive outcomes across diverse Latin American contexts. By situating behavioral finance findings within the ethical vocabulary and institutional concerns of Latin America's bioethics tradition, the region can pursue sustainable, inclusive financial development that respects dignity and advances social justice.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

- [1] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development & World Bank (Global Findex). (2022). *The Global Findex Database 2021: Financial inclusion, digital payments, and data* (World Bank). <https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/globalfindex>. (See Global Findex Database 2021 chapter on account ownership.) (Banco Mundial)
- [2] Common Cents Lab. (2022). *Creating financial resiliency in Latin America: Behavioral challenges and opportunities facing digital work platforms* (Center for Advanced Hindsight). <https://advanced-hindsight.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Creating-Financial-Resiliency-in-Latin-America.pdf>. (Center for Advanced Hindsight)
- [3] Mastercard. (2021, May 17). *Mastercard, Mercado Libre, Common Cents Lab, and IDB join forces to improve financial resilience* [Press release]. <https://www.mastercard.com/news/latin-america/en/newsroom/press-releases/pr-en/2021/may/mastercard-mercado-libre-common-cents-lab-and-idb-join-forces-to-improve-financial-resilience/>. (Mastercard)
- [4] United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2024). *Still under the mattress: LAC's incomplete bancarization* (blog). <https://www.undp.org/latin-america/blog/still-under-mattress-lacs-incomplete-bancarization>. (PNUD)
- [5] Inter-American Development Bank & Finnovista. (2023). *Finnovista & IDB: Fintech landscape report (summary reporting)*. Cited in Reuters coverage: F. M. (2024, June 20). LatAm fintechs quadruple past 6 years, with more room to grow. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/technology/latam-fintechs-quadruple-past-6-years-with-more-room-grow-2024-06-20/>. (Reuters)