GRADIVA

Volume 64 | Issue 06 | June 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15630829

Global Ethical Practices in Financial Technology (Fintech): A Comparative Case Study of Paytm, Razorpay, Stripe, and Nubank

Dr. Oshma Rosette Pinto[1], Dr. Pradeep Kumar SV[2],
Dr. Dhanalakshmi K[3] & Dr. Kavitha B V[4]

1,2,3,4.Assistant Professor, School of Business Management, Christ University, Bangalore.
Email: [1]oshma.rosette@christuniversity.in, [2]pradeepkumar.sv@christuniversity.in,
[3]dhanalakshmi.k@christuniversity.in, [4]kavitha.bv@christuniversity.in

Abstract

The research paper proposes a relative exploration of the ethical and practicality of how guidelines, principles, and administration are planned to make decisions ethically at the levels of regional and corporate among the lending companies. Though the Fintech companies have disrupted the old financial services through inventions by bringing in modernised concepts of Artificial Intelligence, Big Data, and online payments, they face considerable difficulties in maintaining ethical issues like privacy in data, prejudices in algorithms, handling grievances, and access to digital financial services. The study discovers, through a comparative qualitative case study that focuses on the navigation of the issues related to ethics in the context of social and regulatory frameworks, emphasising the effect of governance on the practices of ethics. Under the defiance of the European Union's GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation), Stripe displays accountability in maintaining transparency in data by complying with the regulatory frameworks of ethics. In India's hastily developing regulatory framework, Paytm and Razorpay face difficulties in the localization of the data, developing trust in the public, and prejudices in AI algorithms. Nu Bank focuses on the Fintech model associated with Brazilian values based on social and equity, emphasising the prominence of culture and ethical judgement. The four firms, despite regional differences, display a collective ethical inadequacy, focusing on maintaining transparency in AI, handling grievances, and governance. The findings highlight the rising prominence of branding ethically and earning trust from stakeholders for enhancing resilience in the financial technology sector. Further, it focuses on building consistent but ethical guidelines in regions that provide financial technology firms to function responsibly in the presence of socio-legal circumstances that can be adopted. The research lays a basis for determining policy regulations for the future, approaches of corporate governance, and novelties focused on the welfare of consumers by implementing the theory of stakeholder and ethical AI environments. The conclusion of the paper is based on the suggestions from supervisors, companies, consumers, and collaborators who would develop an environment for ethical financial technology. The research in the future should focus on measurable reforms of ethics, how it can be an influencer for gaining trust from users, and should also examine the audits of AI-driven technologies to improve financial technology practices.

Keywords: *Fintech, Financial Inclusion, GDPR, Accountability, AI algorithms.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The development of financial technology companies has grown rapidly due to the utilization of digital technologies in financial services, which in turn has changed the conventional banking system around the world. The use of technologies like artificial

Volume 64 | Issue 06 | June 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15630829

intelligence, Blockchain, big data analytics, and cloud computing is utilized to provide financial services competently to the more deserving populations (Arner et al., 2022). But this innovativeness has also brought concerns about ethics related to the privacy of data, algorithmic prejudices, and impervious AI structures, an insufficient grievance addressal framework, and non-adherence with regional regulatory standards. (Zetzsche et al., 2017).

Though Financial Technology supports inclusivity and innovation, it also functions in regulatory ambiguities, where ethics is taken as secondary to flexibility and market dominance. (Narula & Barik, 2023). The paths left by digitalization by consumers have gathered with narrow transparency in using data or for the constant framework. Further, the usage of AI in the detection of fraud, credit scoring raises important concerns of fair use of algorithms, prejudices, and responsibility. As financial technology has expanded in different places, the ethical difficulties faced are more multifaceted, which include interconnecting with laws in local jurisdictions, anticipations of culture, and abilities at institutional capabilities. (Chernoff, & Jagtiani, 2024) A comparative ethical analysis is required to understand the variability of the regulatory and socio-political framework in which financial technology functions. This paper studies four Financial Technology companies: Paytm, Razorpay (Indian Companies), Stripe (USA), and Nubank (Brazil). These companies are chosen for the study based on their substantial market effect, demonstration of regulatory systems, and cultural framework. Paytm has undergone supervisory action in India for Governance that includes the localization of data and regulations. Stripe follows rigid laws in maintaining privacy, like the General Data Protection Regulation of the European Union. While Nubank follows financial technology and financial inclusion concepts in Latin America, within Brazil's developing data protection law, called Lei Geral de Proteção de Dados.

The paper focused on the following research questions

1. What ethical difficulties are shared among the financial technology around the world?
2. How do companies traverse the concerns of ethics centered on region and guidelines?

The study focuses on answering the research questions using a case study method, which is qualitative in nature. Further, the research focuses on highlighting the similar outlines and region-oriented approaches in ethical Financial Technology behaviour.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Foundations for Ethical FinTech Practices

The assessment of the ethics of the application of Fintech can be positioned in numerous environments theoretically. The theory of Stakeholder suggests that when companies make decisions, they should reflect the interests of the negatively impacted parties apart from the shareholders. (Freeman, 1984). It further spreads to consumers, officials, employees, and digitalised environments in the Fin tech setting (Krah et al., 2024). Apart from the theory of Stakeholder, ethically thinking shall focus on moral duties and obligations called deontological, and outcome-based called consequentialist. The method of deontology shall focus on the importance of consumers' right to privacy of data, and on the other hand, consequentialists shall defend the data mismanagement if it helps in the inclusion of finance.

The ethical AI application in the use of algorithms to finance has progressed a lightning speed. It enhances the clarity, responsibility, and equity in an AI-enabled environment. Further, the concept of having faith in digital environments that are safe, morally obligated,

Volume 64 | Issue 06 | June 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15630829

and equitable is a significant factor for the acceptance of using Fintech by customers (Shin, 2021). Trust is an important factor; without it, the competent novelties of Fintech will suffer in implementation or will have to undergo retaliation.

2.2 FinTech Governance and Ethical Risk

The governance approaches in Fintech sometimes cannot cope with advances in technology. The increase in innovation often delays the capability of the regulators to implement the guidelines of ethics (Zetzsche et al., 2023). The areas of apprehension are the extraction of data, cross-border standards, and the non-transparency of the AI algorithms. The absence of strong governance arrangements in startups of Fintech startups has led to lapses in ethical standards, like managing content and preventing fraud. (Gahlot, & Ghosh, 2023). For instance, Paytm has undergone an immense sharing of data and unproven investigation associations that involved the stakeholders from China. (Narula & Barik, 2023).. In general, the progressive fraud detection systems of Stripe have increased the apprehensions about algorithmic impenetrability and prejudice while using it as a barrier for dealing with the transactions of small-scale businesses without enough human intervention. (Levine, 2021).

2.3 Comparative Legal and Regulatory Frameworks

The execution and implementation of legal structure from Europe (GDPR), India's DPDP Act, and LGPD from Brazil shall differ from region to region as they all work towards protecting the privacy and usage of data of the consumers as well as the citizens. Further, the GDPR has established a world standard for maintaining the privacy of data, focusing on agreements, constraints, and rights of the user. (Voigt & Von dem Bussche, 2024). Though the DPDP Act also focuses on the agreements, but is criticised for providing wide exceptions for companies. The LGPD emphasises clarity and ethical process of data, while Nubank has been taken as the case for practical guidelines (Araújo et al., 2021). The different legal frameworks provide fluctuating ethical backgrounds for Fintech to determine how companies organise the privacy guidelines, use of AI, and handling grievances.

2.4 Identified Gaps in the Literature

Though earlier studies have investigated the FinTech disagreements and supervisory settings, there is a constraint in comparing ethical analysis among the FinTech regional companies. Most of the research that exists is either geographically separated or there is deficient in theoretical foundation in connecting the scope of technology, ethics, and regulatory bodies. There is also a lack of multidisciplinary knowledge that adds ethics of AI with the perceptions of the stakeholders and supervisory analysis (Chernoff, A., & Jagtiani, J., 2024; Arner et al., 2022). This paper focuses on filling the gap by conducting a comparative analysis of the ethics of Paytm, Razorpay, Stripe, and Nubank by utilising the theory of stakeholder and ethical AI settings, which focuses on how the regional setting impacts the strategies of ethics and problems faced by the Fintech firms.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Approach: Qualitative Comparative Case Study

The research utilises a comparative case method, which is qualitative in nature, to examine the framework of ethics in operating Fintech companies among different regional and regulatory settings. This method is effective in investigating multifaceted real problems like making decisions within limited structures that allow for evaluation across cases. (Stake, 2025;

Volume 64 | Issue 06 | June 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15630829

Yin, 2017) It helps in bringing resilience to house different types of data and to understand the practices of ethics with particular settings in socio-political, legal, and technological backgrounds. (George & Bennett, 2005). Further, the comparative factor helps the descriptive influence the study by revealing outlines of union and separation in practicing ethics among the authorities (Ragin, 2014). This method is compatible for reviewing FinTech ethics, where worldwide development, invention in technology, and different standards that interconnect with complex concerns like privacy data, prejudices in AI, and financial involvement.

3.2 Case Selection

The study implements a purposive sampling approach following Patton's (2015) *maximum variation sampling* rationale to understand the variability among the geography and arguments of an ethicality. The companies (Paytm, Razorpay, Stripe, and Nubank are taken for the study based on the Market leadership, ethical controversies, and regulatory diversity.

a. **Market Leadership**: Every company around the world has an important place in the regional Fintech environment. Paytm and Razorpay rule the landscape of India's digital payment. (Reserve Bank of India, 2023). Stripe tops in Application programming interfaces in global payment (Forbes, 2023), and Nubank tops as the principal digital bank of Latin America (Statista, 2024).

b. **Ethical Controversies**: The four that were taken for the study have been the focus of ethical arguments. Paytm has faced investigations on the sharing of data practices with companies (Fu & Mishra, 2022). Razorpay has an impervious system of fraud detection (ET Tech, 2023). The Stripe has decision-making algorithm issues and AI clarity concerns. (TechCrunch, 2023), and Nubank over AI-driven credit evaluations, irrespective of its status for stimulating inclusion (Reuters, 2023).

c. **Regulatory Diversity**: The companies function under different legal environments like the DPDP, GDPR, and LGPD Acts. This discrepancy suggests a relative perception of how directive outlines the behaviour of ethics. (Arner et al., 2017; Greenleaf, 2021).

This approach of sampling enhances a wider range of concerns in ethics and delivers characteristic miniature applications of ethics in the FinTech companies around the world.

3.3 Data Sources

A varied range of secondary data is used to improve the rationality through triangulation (Denzin, 2012): They are reports, documents, and disclosures of CSR and ESG, which offer the knowledge of obligations of ethics and moral standards of the corporation. (Eccles & Krzus, 2018). Academic literature includes research articles that offer theoretical concepts of AI ethics, regulations of Fintech, and protection laws on data privacy (Gai et al., 2018; Zeng et al., 2021). The policy documents of GDPR, DPDP, and LGPD regulatory bodies are assessed to understand the regulatory standards of each firm (Greenleaf, 2021).

The analytical journalism and industry exposure are studied to classify disagreements, grievances of users, and public opinion (The Economist, 2022; TechCrunch, 2023). The professional thoughts from expert observations and white papers that are involved in governing organisations, think tanks, and AI researchers in ethics have been enhanced with experimental data and helped to understand the ambiguities. (Ananny & Crawford, 2018; Sullivan & Mackenzie, 2020). This approach of multidimensionality enhances a versatile knowledge of the application of ethics and diminishes the dependence on any one type of data.

Volume 64 | Issue 06 | June 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15630829

3.4 Analytical Framework

The study is designed in five conceptual frameworks, which are implemented from the literature on ethics and regulatory bodies of Fintech. (Martin et al., 2021; Cath et al., 2018; Wieringa, 2020):

1. **Privacy in Data**: Investigate the collection of data of the user, find out how it is stored and shared, and also examine the alignment of the ethical practices with regulatory policies like GDPR, DPDP, and LGPD (Greenleaf, 2021).
2. **Transparency in AI**: Evaluation of the translucency in the structure of AI with algorithms explanation, responsibility framework, and defense against prejudices (Wieringa, 2020; Mittelstadt et al., 2016).
3. **Finance exclusion**: Examines the approachability of financial products specifically for marginalised groups, and inspects whether algorithms unintentionally continue the elimination of groups (Brennen & Kreiss, 2016; Zetzsche et al., 2020).
4. **Regulatory adherence**: Examines the firm's compliance with particular laws and the governing bodies' role in determining ethical conduct (Arner et al., 2017; Zetzsche et al., 2017).
5. **Grievance mechanism for the customers**: Assesses the networks for determining the grievances of the user, clarity in communication, and technical justice in resolving conflict Bartlett et al., 2022).

Each element was applied to qualitative pointers to agree on organised cross-case contrast and thematic coding.

3.5 Triangulation for Validity

To confirm internal rationality or validity, a triangulated method was used (Denzin, 2012; Flick, 2018):

a. **Source Triangulation**: The descriptions of ethics were cross-verified using studies from academics, documents, and reports from the media to support trustworthiness.

b. **Expert Authentication**: Analyses were tested against the opinions of the experts collected from documents related to governing bodies, industries, and think tanks of AI ethics (Ananny & Crawford, 2018; Sullivan & Mackenzie, 2020).

c. **Methodological Triangulation**: The assessment of the document was supplemented from the webinars, discussions, and white papers to evade the dependence on a single type of data (Silverman, 2016). This triangulated approach strengthens the study's vigour, decreasing the prospective for prejudice or generalisation. This operational outline supports a demanding, reasonable exploration of ethical principles followed in 4 FinTech companies functioning in diverse governing and cultural settings. The descriptive case study design, which is comparative, is reinforced by various data sources and theory-driven exploration. It permits for understanding into how FinTech establishes its invention, governance, and accountability towards ethics. This method operates to enlighten forthcoming policies, the formation of ethical governance, and planned decisions in digital finance around the world.

Volume 64 | Issue 06 | June 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15630829

4. CASE ANALYSIS

4.1 Paytm (India)

a. **Challenges faced from Regulatory bodies**: Paytm has undergone a rise in the examination for regulatory issues from the Reserve Bank of India, which includes the 2024 guidelines to stop new customer registration as a result of delays in adhering to KYC guidelines and functional flexibility (Fu & Mishra, 2022; RBI, 2024). These provided a wider ineffectiveness of the governance and approaches of regulatory standards.

b. **Apprehensions of data sharing:** Paytm has been condemned for sharing its data practices with a few companies (Zuboff, 2019). This raised concerns about the privacy of data and scrutiny in the environment of the FinTech firms.

c. **Steps to overcome**: In reply to these difficulties faced, Paytm has executed the encoding of the data from the local storage of data to India's Act called the Digital Personal Data Protection. But the translucency in the execution of the Act and the knowledge of errors faced are unknown.

4.2 Razorpay (India)

a. **Detection of Fraud and Ethical AI: Razorpay has capitalized on AI-enabled fraud recognition structures that observe the performance of transactions in real time. It projects to develop the safety for the user, but there is less transparency on the objectivity of the algorithm or rates of error that impact the small vendors (Eubanks, 2018). Numerous cases have** developed due to sudden deferrals of the merchant accounts as a result of impervious regulation of induction algorithms that are risky with restricted choices for the mechanism of grievance addressal (Klein et.al, 2020). This led to ethical apprehensions as a result of AI processing answerability.

b. **CSR and Ethical Initiatives:** Though Razorpay has commenced the financial literacy drives and taken part in real-life projects like COVID-19, the association of the CSR with data ethics and in the clarity of algorithm initiatives is not linked. (Martin et al., 2019).

4.3 Stripe (USA)

a. **Framework of Regulatory bodies:** Stripe is functioning under both the laws of United States and the regulating body GDPR. It has proven high principles in protecting the data, processing ethically utilizing the clear consent framework and keeping control on data. Stripe's guidelines are associated with **ethical concepts of deontology**, highlighting rights and duties of the user (Kant, 1988).

b. **Machine Learning Use:** Stripe utilizes machine learning in preventing fraud and risk. The potential prejudice in the prototypes remains an issue among varied geographies and demographics. The documentation of justice in audits and AI testing is inadequate (Binns, 2018; Mittelstadt et al., 2016).

c. **Clearness and Openness:** Stripe differentiates itself through reforms like **Stripe Atlas,** which provides help in direct assimilation, and its **clearness reports** on request of government data, encouraging answerability and digital reliance (Cath et al., 2018).

Volume 64 | Issue 06 | June 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15630829

4.4 Nubank (Brazil)

a. **Accessibility to finance:** Nubank has grown in appreciation for providing finance to the marginalised in Brazil by offering credit to users, which the traditional banks failed to do (Rudolph et al., 2020). This is associated with the theory of stakeholders, which emphasizes the importance of social effects on populations and diversity (Freeman, 1984).

b. **Credit Scoring with AI enabled:** Though Nubank utilizes AI for the credit evaluation, it raises ethical concerns and translucency. Though Nubank is entitled to utilize the data sensibly, it fails to reveal the process of auditing and prejudices the easing methods (O'Neil, 2016).

c. **Framework of Regulatory:** The company is roughly complying with **Brazil's regulatory body** (Lei Geral de Proteção de Dados), by executing a robust agreement outline and conventions of privacy, but there is an absence of independent authentication of governance. (Zetzsche et al., 2020).

5. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

5.1 Ethical Practices Comparison Matrix

Features	Paytm (India)	Razorpay (India)	Stripe (USA)	Nubank (Brazil)
Regulatory Control	Recurrent Reserve Bank of India mediations and volatile arrangement with DPDP	Amenable, however, on embarking was identified for discrepancy	Robust loyalty towards the GDPR and the laws of the United States.	Associated with Brazil's LGPD, execution is still in development.
AI Ethics & Clarity	Impervious in credit scoring, and the prototypes are deceitful.	Limited translucent with vague AI auditable.	Highly translucent; inadequate public equality assessments	There is an absence of prejudice in credit scoring, and it also fails to protect. There is a deficit of public assessment.
Protection of Data Privacy	Allegations of exploitation of user data	Apprehensions over merchant data management	Robust encoding and user agreement outlines	Data protection is refining, but not vigorously verified
Financial Inclusion	Less focus on fairness	Restricted availability in the regions of marginalised	Not an important element for the business	Robust objective to assist marginalised users
Grievance Addressal	WeAK framework and restricted clarity	There is no organised grievance management	Rationalized structure with customization	Approachable, customer-centric framework
Culture of ethics and CSR	Insignificant internal ethics releases	Although the CSR is present, it is not connected with ethics	Stimulates ethical digital frameworks.	Robust ethical outlining is incorporated into the goals of the business.

5.2 Cross-Case Themes and Comprehensions

5.2.1 Impact of Regional Regulatory

The regional regulatory outlines the ethical behaviour of the FinTech firms. The Stripe focuses on the legal structure based on the GDPR policy, nurturing the rights of the user with translucency of the algorithm (Zetzsche et al., 2020). Nubank is associated with LGPSD policy,

Volume 64 | Issue 06 | June 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15630829

but there is a gap in implementation (Reuters, 2023). The Paytm and Razorpay firms face shifting regulatory prospects, which have led to unpredictable ethical guidelines (Fu & Mishra, 2022).

5.2.2 Expectations of the Culture with Ethical Standards

The factors of the culture impact the outline of ethics. The Nubank's wide-ranging philosophy focuses on the social impact on fairness (Cath et al., 2018). The Stripe represents the translucency of the standards in Western culture. The Paytm and Razorpay functions in a provisional setting, with prospects in the ethical behaviour of the user rising, but the established faith is in the process of developing (Sullivan & Mackenzie, 2020; The Economist, 2022).

5.2.3 Transparency and Trust-Building

The approaches for building trust vary extensively. The Stripe records its approaches through a tool like Stripe Atlas, whereas Nubank' trust is built through Financial initiatives. The data practices followed by Razorpay and Paytm have destroyed the trust of the public. (Zuboff, 2019; ET Tech, 2023; TechCrunch, 2023).

5.2.4 Collective Gaps in Ethics

In spite of the differences in geography and culture, there is a common unseen area found in ethical behaviour.

a. **Ethics in AI**. Firms depend more on decisions produced through algorithms, but there is no proper explanation or audits made by a third party, which creates a danger of misperception and blockage. (Mittelstadt et al., 2016; Eubanks, 2018).

b. **Redressal of grievances**: The Nubank focuses on approachable arrangements; Stripe is operational but detached. The Paytm and Razorpay failed in deciding grievances commendably (Sullivan & Mackenzie, 2020).

c. **Autonomy of Data:** The Cross-border data raises dangers in India and Brazil. Paytm faced investigations on local data and scrutiny (Zuboff, 2019).

d. **Internal responsibility**: Informant defences and ethical boards internally were not present, leading to weak self-directives (Gillespie, 2018).

5.3 Synthesis and Implications for Ethical Practices in FinTech

The findings provide a regulatory inference.

a. **Flexibility to Regulatory Frameworks:** The companies of FinTech have to follow the best practices with the local regulatory bodies to uphold ethical legality (Zetzsche et al., 2017).

b. **Entrenchment of culture:** Associating the ethical approaches with culture, like how Nubank emphasizes social values that improve the user trustworthiness and belief (Bartlett et al., 2022).

c. **Clarity and Equality in AI:** The explanation and clarity in the AI framework should be the introductory ideologies. The present self-directive is inadequate (Martin et al., 2019; Mittelstadt et al., 2016).

d. **Financial inclusivity:** The arrangements of ethics must include criteria to provide a sincere access for underserved users (McKinsey, 2022).

Volume 64 | Issue 06 | June 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15630829

e. **Vigorous Redressal Framework:** The ethics in FinTech must include a practical and clear user grievance framework to nurture faith and responsibility (Sullivan & Mackenzie, 2020).

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 Theoretical Implications

The comparative results emphasize and lengthen the basic ethical theories in the FinTech field. **Stakeholder theory** (Freeman, 1984) is sturdily sustained, as firm status and performance progressively pivot on how morally they maintain the regulatory bodies, customers, buyers, consumers, patrons, and stakeholders. **Deontological ethics**, ingrained in philosophies of responsibility and privileges (Kant, 1785), is perceptible in Stripe, which observes with GDPR policy that highlights user consensus, clarity, and data diminution (Greenleaf, 2021). In the meantime, **consequentialist ethics**, that emphasis on consequences over processes (Mill, 1863), are more relevant in India and Brazil which is a developing market where companies like Paytm and Nubank focus on exponential which is based on the cost expensed on difficult ethical execution (Fu, Mishra, 2022; Reuters, 2023).

Furthermore, the combination of algorithmic arrangements demands a reassessment of conventional prototypes of ethics that have been raised. The theories on AI ethics and digital trust are under stress as businesses tussle with imperviousness, prejudice, and responsibility. For instance, the absence of audits of AI and inadequate explanation specify that present prototypes of ethics must familiarize themselves with mechanized and transnational FinTech environments (O'Neil, 2016; Mittelstadt et al., 2016).

6.2 Practical Implications

This study provides legitimate perceptions for supervisors, controllers, firms, consumers, and buyers.

a. **The supervisors, controllers should transform from** conformity guidelines to utilitarianism of ethical governance, particularly focusing on the explanation of AI and the framework of Grievance redressal. Regulatory bodies such as DPDP and LGPD must progress towards the flexibility and transparency of GDPR, without changing the cultural settings. (Zetzsche et al., 2020).

b. **The Fintech companies must see ethics not as a** problem but as a **planned benefit.** The Stripe and Nubank determine that clarity and principled labelling can distinguish the firm's competitiveness (Binns, 2018). Practical incorporation of apparent AI, comprehensive models of finance, and vigorous framework of end users' belief which is important (Martin et al., 2021).

c. The consumers, buyers, and end users must be invested with **digital knowledge** and a vibrant complaint mechanism. As algorithmic choices have become collective in credit scoring and recognition of fraudulent activities, users need devices to comprehend and defy impervious consequences (Eubanks, 2018).

6.3 Ethical Implications

In spite the regulatory development, there are numerous ethical implications:

a. **Verifiability and clarity in AI** are self-disciplined. There are no firms taken for study that reveal audits from third parties, generating possibilities for addressing prejudices. (Eubanks, 2018; Ananny & Crawford, 2018).

Volume 64 | Issue 06 | June 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15630829

b. **Trans border data** and **local data** issues remain unsettled. Paytm's data management has elevated warning about the investigation and national self-governance. (Zuboff, 2019; Fu & Mishra, 2022).

c. **Obscure financial elimination**- Here, the users are algorithmically deprived of clarification, which signifies understated but important ethical difficulties. (O'Neil, 2016).

d. **Framework of internal ethics-** The Informant guidelines are inconsistent and unclear among the firms (Gillespie, 2018), replicating a wider concern of managing the internal ethics.

7. CONCLUSION

The analysis of Paytm, Razorpay, Stripe, and Nubank features the practices of ethics in Fintech that are designed by the connection of regulatory bodies, culture, and the corporation's importance. The companies that are functioning in legal settings, such as Stripe, provide robust ethical protection and practical regulations. The firms that are vibrant or have underdeveloped regulatory backgrounds, like Paytm and Razorpay, will display responsive or unpredictable ethical practices. The Nubank positions for associating its task with societal presence areas in Brazil, displaying how cultural arrangement can determine both ethical impact and consumer trust. Despite regional variances, the collective ethical breaks are present in all four firms, especially in the Translucency of AI, clarity in the Algorithm, and framework in grievance addressal. These breaks propose that with advancing technology, the strategy of ethics and administration must be rooted in the fundamentals of FinTech. When the industry grows, the trust of the stakeholders, ethical authenticity, transparency, and social responsibility are developing as correspondingly important to accomplishment as novelty and adaptability. To proceed, it is essential for worldwide synchronisation, but also the adoption of ethical settings locally that can monitor FinTech in harmonizing development with accountability. This study offers the essential comprehension, restricted its possibility by the various cases and dependence on widely accessible data. Forthcoming research must examine the impact of ethics on the behaviour of the consumer, internal control framework, and evaluate real-world influences of AI-driven policymaking in varied markets.

References

1) Araújo, E., Vilela, J., Silva, C., & Alves, C. (2021, June). Are my business process models compliant with LGPD? The LGPD4BP method to evaluate and model LGPD-aware business processes. In *Proceedings of the XVII Brazilian Symposium on Information Systems* (pp. 1-9).

2) Ananny, M., & Crawford, K. (2018). Seeing without knowing: Limitations of the transparency ideal and its application to algorithmic accountability. *New media & society*, *20*(3), 973-989.

3) Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2017). FinTech and RegTech: impact on regulators and banks. *J Bank Regul*, *20*(1), 4-24.

4) Bartlett, R., Morse, A., Stanton, R., & Wallace, N. (2022). Consumer-lending discrimination in the FinTech era. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *143*(1), 30-56.

5) Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. In *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency* (pp. 149-159). PMLR.

Volume 64 | Issue 06 | June 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15630829

6) Brennen, J. S., & Kreiss, D. (2016). Digitalization. *The international Encyclopedia of communication theory and philosophy*, 1-11.

7) Cath, C., Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the 'good society': the US, EU, and UK approach. *Science and engineering ethics*, *24*, 505-528.

8) Chernoff, A., & Jagtiani, J. (2024). The role of bank–FinTech partnerships in creating a more inclusive banking system. *Journal of Digital Banking*, *8*(4), 330-354.

9) Denzin, N. K. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of mixed methods research*, *6*(2), 80-88.

10) Eccles, R. G., & Krzus, M. P. (2018). Constructing Bank of America's 2017 Mock Integrated Report: Experiment No. 3. *Available at SSRN 3226953*.

11) ET Tech. (2023). Razorpay faces scrutiny over its fraud detection algorithm after multiple customer complaints. The Economic Times. Retrieved from https://economictimes.indiatimes.com

12) Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.

13) Flick, U. (2018). Designing qualitative research.

14) Forbes. (2023). Stripe: Leading the future of online payment processing. Forbes Magazine. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com

15) Freeman, R. E. (2010). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Cambridge University Press.

16) Freeman, R.E. (1984) Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Pitman, Boston.

17) Fu, J., & Mishra, M. (2022). Fintech in the time of COVID-19: Technological adoption during crises. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, *50*, 100945.

18) Gahlot, C. S., & Ghosh, S. (2023). Emerging opportunities and challenges in the Fintech industry–A comparative study of India with other jurisdictions. *Technology, Management and Business: Evolving Perspectives*, 21-31.

19) Gai, K., Qiu, M., & Sun, X. (2018). A survey on FinTech. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, *103*, 262-273.

20) George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case studies and theory development in the social sciences*. MIT Press.

21) Gillespie, T. (2018). *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. Yale University Press.

22) Greenleaf, G. (2021). Global data privacy laws 2021: Despite COVID delays, 145 laws show GDPR dominance

23) Hindustan Times (2024) Paytm is under investigation for data sharing with government agencies. Hindustan Times. Retrieved from https://www.hindustantimes.com

24) Kant, I. (1988). Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals. 1785. *English translation by Thomas Kingsmill Abbott*.

Volume 64 | Issue 06 | June 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15630829

25) Klein, J., Stuckenborg, L., & Leker, J. (2020). Hot or not–Which features make FinTechs attractive for investors?. *The Journal of Entrepreneurial Finance*, *22*(1), 1.

26) Krah, R., Tetteh, L. A., Boateng, A., & Amankwa, R. F. (2024). Financial technology adoption among small and medium enterprises in Ghana. *Cogent Business & Management*, *11*(1), 2321786.

27) Levine, M. R. (2021). *Finance, growth, and inequality*. International Monetary Fund.

28) Martin, K. D., Borah, A., & Palmatier, R. W. (2017). Data privacy: Effects on customer and firm performance. *Journal of Marketing*, *81*(1), 36-58.

29) Martin, K., Shilton, K., & Smith, J. E. (2022). Business and the ethical implications of technology: Introduction to the symposium. In *Business and the ethical implications of technology* (pp. 1-11). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

30) Martin, N., & Foohey, P. (2021). Reducing The Wealth Gap Through Fintech 'Advances' in Consumer Banking and Lending. *University of Illinois Law Review*, *2021*(2), 459.

31) McKinsey & Company. (2022). Inclusive finance in the digital age: Advancing financial inclusion through FinTech. McKinsey & Company.

32) Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society*, *3*(2), 2053951716679679.

33) Narula, N., Swartz, L., & Frizzo-Barker, J. (2023). CBDC: Expanding Financial Inclusion or Deepening the Divide? Exploring Design Choices that Could Make a Difference.

34) O'neil, C. (2017). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.

35) Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods (V. Knight, K. Bierarch, & DC Felts Eds.

36) Ragin, C. C. (2014). *The comparative method: Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies*. Univ of California Press.

37) Reuters. (2023). Nubank's AI-driven credit scoring under scrutiny despite success in financial inclusion. Reuters Technology News. Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com

38) Rudolph, C. W., Murphy, L. D., & Zacher, H. (2020). A systematic review and critique of research on "healthy leadership". *The Leadership Quarterly*, *31*(1), 101335.

39) Schuster, T., Govindarajan, V., Trimble, C. (2014). Reverse Innovation: Create Far from Home, Win Everywhere, Harvard Business Review Press, 2012.

40) Shin, D. (2021). The effects of Explainability and Causability on perception, trust, and acceptance: Implications for explainable AI. *International journal of human-computer studies*, *146*, 102551.

41) Silverman, R. M., & Patterson, K. (2021). *Qualitative research methods for community development*. Routledge.

42) Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies.

Volume 64 | Issue 06 | June 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15630829

43) Statista. (2024). Leading digital banks in Latin America by number of users. Retrieved from https://www.statista.com

44) Sullivan, R., & Mackenzie, C. (2020). Responsible investment and ESG reporting in FinTech. CFA Institute Research Foundation.

45) The Economist. (2022). AI and ethics in the financial sector: A fragile balance. The Economist. Retrieved from https://www.economist.com

46) Voigt, P., & von dem Bussche, A. (2024). Data Subjects' Rights. In *The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) A Practical Guide* (pp. 199-260). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

47) Wieringa, M. (2020, January). What to account for when accounting for algorithms: a systematic literature review on algorithmic accountability. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency* (pp. 1-18).

48) Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Sage Publications.

49) Zetzsche, D. A., Buckley, R. P., Barberis, J. N., & Arner, D. W. (2017). Regulating a revolution: from regulatory sandboxes to smart regulation. *Fordham J. Corp. & Fin. L.*, *23*, 31.

50) Zuboff, S. (2023). The age of surveillance capitalism. In *Social Theory re-wired* (pp. 203-213). Routledge.