



INNOVATION, TECHNOLOGIES,
EDUCATION & COMMUNICATION

INNOVATION, TECHNOLOGIES, EDUCATION & COMMUNICATION

N° 12

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AND INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES

Issue Coordinator Editor

Isam Mrah

SEPTEMBER 2026



COMMUNICATION, EDUCATION, DIGITAL USAGE
AND CREATIVITY LABORATORY

URL CNRS 19

ISSN : 2737-8195

Issue 12 of *Revue ITEC*, entitled “*Inclusive Education and Innovative Technologies*,” brings together a collection of scholarly contributions that explore emerging approaches, policies, practices, and innovative technologies that contribute to creating more inclusive, accessible, and learner-centred educational environments. At a time when educational systems are undergoing profound transformations, the intersection between inclusion and technological innovation has become increasingly significant.

Inclusive education extends beyond ensuring access to learning; it encompasses the creation of equitable educational environments that recognise learner diversity, reduce barriers to participation, and respond to different needs, abilities, and backgrounds. At the same time, the rapid development of digital and emerging technologies is creating new possibilities for enhancing teaching and learning, expanding access to educational resources, and responding to diverse learner needs.

The contributions in this issue address a range of topics, including inclusive education, special needs education, innovative pedagogies, teacher education and professional development, as well as the role of emerging technologies in expanding learning opportunities and addressing the diverse needs of learners. Collectively, the articles underscore the importance of combining pedagogical innovation with inclusive practices to promote equity, active participation, learner empowerment, and lifelong learning.

By bringing together perspectives from different disciplines and educational contexts, **Issue 12** seeks to contribute to current discussions on how innovation and technology can be harnessed to address contemporary educational challenges and foster more inclusive and learner-centred educational environments.

Editorial Board

Dr. Isam Mrah || FLSH, Mohammed I University, Oujda ||

Dr. Khalid Chaouch || FLSH, Sultan Moulay Slimane University, Beni Mellal ||

Dr. Hanane Darhour || FLAHS, University Ibn Zohr, Ait Melloul- Agadir ||

Dr. Abdellah Elboubekri || FLSH, Mohammed I University, Oujda ||

Dr. Naoual Derraz || FLSH, Mohammed I University, Oujda ||

Dr. Karim El Hiani || Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Tétouan ||

Dr. Mohammed Guamguami || ESEF, Mohammed I University, Oujda ||

Dr. Mohammed Zerioush || ENS, Moulay Ismail University, Mekness ||

Dr. Youssef EL Kaidi || FLSH, Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah, Fés ||

Dr. Nassira Houat || ENCG, Mohammed I University, Oujda ||

Dr. Mourad Benali || CRMEF, Oujda ||

Dr. Mohamed DIHI || CRMEF, Oujda ||

Dr. Aziz Askitou || FP, Mohammed I University, Nador ||

Dr. Abdelhafid Jabri || FSJES, Mohammed I University, Oujda ||

Unequal Access to AI Tools: Implications for Equity and Access among Moroccan ESP Teachers

Abdelilah EL Hachmi

*Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University, Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences, Fez, Morocco.
Email: abdelilah.elhachmi1@usmba.ac.ma*

Abstract

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is used by language teachers to prepare lessons, generate specialized vocabulary, design communicative tasks and provide writing feedback. This study examines whether differentiated access to ChatGPT may create professional inequities among Moroccan teachers of English for Specific purposes (ESP). The study combines an online questionnaire completed by 24 Moroccan ESP teachers with an illustrative same-prompt comparison of ChatGPT Free and Chat GPT Plus across four teaching tasks: business email writing, medical vocabulary explanation, corrective feedback and communicative task design. The questionnaire findings indicate that AI tools have become a regular part of the participants' professional practice as they reported that these tools help reduce the time required for lesson planning and task preparation. At the same time, concerns emerged about unequal access to paid AI services. In the comparative analysis, each ChatGPT plan was capable of assisting with common ESP teaching tasks. However, the Plus version produced more developed responses and classroom-ready materials. This paper argues that equity in AI-supported teaching depends on access and AI literacy and that institutional provision and sustained professional development are needed to prevent a new form of professional digital divide among teachers.

Keywords: GenAI, equity, ESP teaching, digital divide, freemium AI tools, teacher professional development

1. Introduction

Background of the Study

AI tools have moved from a specialized technology to an everyday educational resource for the majority of Moroccan teachers. Teachers, nowadays, use AI tools to generate ideas, adapt materials, explain terminology and provide preliminary feedback on learner writing. Kohnke et al. (2023, p10) describe ChatGPT as a tool with notable possibilities for language teaching and learning and stress that ethical and effective use requires appropriate digital competencies. In the same context, Lo (2023) believes that Chat GPT may function as an instructional assistant and virtual tutor, although its performance varies by task and subject domain. Most AI services are offered through tiered plans. In other words, some capabilities are available without charge, but expanded features are available to paying subscribers. OpenAI's current pricing website describes the free plan as providing limited access, limited messages and uploads, whereas ChatGPT Plus provides enhanced access and increased limits for a monthly fee (OpenAI, 2026a, 2026b). In light of these circumstances, the real question is: when AI tools become part of teachers' professional routines, does unequal access to subscription plans create unequal working conditions between teachers?

In fact, this question is relevant to ESP teachers who often design materials for professional domains such as business, tourism and engineering. That is to say, they may need to produce specialized vocabulary support, simulate workplace communication, adjust tasks to learners' proficiency levels and provide general and specific feedback. AI can reduce preparation time, but teachers' ability to benefit from it may depend on the quality of their access and their ability to formulate effective prompts and evaluate outputs in a critical manner.

Problem Statement

Debates about AI in education focus on academic integrity and hallucinated information. These concerns are legitimate, but there is a less-examined issue, which is the professional divide between ESP teachers who can afford premium AI subscriptions and those who rely on limited free access. The main concern is whether differentiated access, when combined with unequal AI literacy and unequal institutional support, can lead to differences in preparation time, the depth of feedback and the adaptability of teaching resources. Digital divide research provides an appropriate starting point for examining this issue in particular. In the context of GenAI, this perspective suggests that free access alone does not necessarily guarantee equitable benefit. The most relevant question is whether teachers can access capable AI tools and translate that access into valuable pedagogical outcomes.

The Purpose, Significance, and Scope of the Study

This paper investigates unequal access to GenAI tools in ESP teaching and it has two complementary purposes. The first examines how Moroccan ESP teachers use AI tools, which subscription plans they access and how they perceive the relationship between paid access and professional advantage. The second compares recorded outputs generated through ChatGPT Free and ChatGPT Plus when the same prompts are used for four ESP tasks. It is worth mentioning that the study does not claim to determine the definitive quality of all ChatGPT Free and Plus outputs, nor does it attempt to isolate subscription status as the only cause of differences between responses because ChatGPT is a dynamic service. Models and available features may change and while dealing with AI tools, it must be taken for granted that prompt quality, user expertise and repeated interaction affect outcomes. For this reason, the value of the study lies in identifying an equity concern that merits systematic investigation and in generating practical recommendations for Moroccan institutions and policymakers.

1.4. The Research Questions and Hypotheses

The study addresses the following research questions:

RQ 1: To what extent are AI tools integrated into the professional practices of Moroccan ESP teachers?

RQ 2: What patterns of access to ChatGPT subscription plans and what barriers to paid AI access are reported by Moroccan ESP teachers?

RQ 3: How do the recorded Chat GPT Free and ChatGPT Plus outputs differ across four ESP related teaching tasks when the same prompts are used?

RQ 4: What are the implications of these findings for equity, inclusion and teacher professional development in AI-supported language instruction?

1.5. Research hypothesis and sub-hypotheses

In line with the research questions, the study is guided by the following hypothesis: Unequal access to AI tools may create a professional advantage for Moroccan ESP teachers who use

premium versions, since paid access can provide more detailed and instruction-ready pedagogical support. This general hypothesis is further examined through the following sub-hypotheses:

H1a: ChatGPT Plus generates more comprehensive output than the Free version for selected ESP teaching tasks.

H1b: Moroccan ESP teachers perceive access to paid AI tools as a professional advantage and a potential source of inequality among teachers.

2. Literature review and Theoretical Framework

2.1. AI in education and language teaching

Indeed, artificial intelligence in the field of education predates the recent growth of conversational GenAI. According to Crompton & Burke (2023, p.3), earlier research examined intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive learning environments, assessment tools, profiling, prediction and personalized support. The release of conversational GenAI tools has accelerated this discussion because text generation has become accessible via ordinary natural-language prompts. In language education, ChatGPT can help teachers brainstorm activities, simplify texts, produce model responses, generate examples and develop feedback. Kohnke et al. (2023) examine the limitations of ChatGPT for language learning and emphasize the importance of developing digital skills. Kasneci et al. (2023) argue that large language models should be integrated through clear pedagogical strategies, critical thinking, fact-checking and continuous human oversight. These qualifications are very important in ESP contexts where producing correct text is only one part of the task. Teaching materials must be appropriate to a professional genre, relevant to a disciplinary domain, calibrated to learners' proficiency and usable within a realistic classroom procedure. For this reason, AI-supported ESP teaching materials should be evaluated based on their relevance to the teaching context, the quality of the explanation provided and their usefulness in actual classroom practice.

2.2. The Freemium model and differentiated access

The term freemium refers to a digital service model in which a basic version is offered free of charge while the premium version is reserved for paying users. Hamari et al. (2020, pp.2-3) examine this model in relation to perceived value, freemium business models and premium purchase intentions in online services. The commercial rationale is quite evident, which means that free access attracts users, while premium features motivate some users to upgrade. In education, this issue raises a different set of questions because when commercial AI tools become embedded in lesson planning, feedback and materials development, access becomes a professional issue, not a luxury. A teacher who pays for higher limits and expanded functionality may be able to handle longer documents and test alternative prompts.

This distinction may become the main concern of ESP teachers when institutions normalize AI-assisted work without ensuring equitable conditions for them. Teachers are expected to rely on AI in their teaching practices but they will find themselves obliged to pay for greater access. Such a situation may create different working conditions among teachers who are using the same technology in the same institution. Chat GPT illustrates this tiered approach when having a look at OpenAI's official pricing page. The latter lists multiple individual plans, including Free, Go, Plus and Pro, and distinguishes them by their limits and expanded features (OpenAI, 2026a). ChatGPT Plus is currently described as a paid plan with enhanced access, higher limits and faster responses (OpenAI, 2026b). The issue examined in this particular situation is not

simply whether teachers can access GenAI, but whether differences in the level of access will have consequences on their professional practice.

2.3. From the digital divide to the AI divide

The theoretical framework of this article draws on research on digital inequality. Warschauer and Matuchniak (2010, pp. 180-181) analyze equity in relation to access, use and outcomes; they shift attention beyond the simple availability of technology. This perspective is useful because access to a chatbot does not necessarily produce the same educational benefits for every teacher. Mohamed et al. (2024, p. 11) conceptualize the AI divide in light of three dimensions that are: access, skills and outcomes. Applied to this study, access refers to paid subscriptions and adequate devices. Skills concern teachers' AI literacy in terms of formulating effective prompts, identifying unreliable outputs, protecting sensitive information and adapting generated content to their teaching context. Outcomes refer to whether effective use of AI helps in achieving meaningful pedagogical benefits.

Miao and Holmes (2023, p. 29) emphasize human-centered policy, privacy protection, ethical validation and pedagogical design. This framework prevents a deterministic interpretation of paid access because a Plus subscription may provide practical advantages, but access alone does not ensure pedagogical quality. Free plan users may obtain useful results through careful prompting and professional judgment without having access to premium features.

3. Method

3.1. Research design

The study adopted a mixed-method design that integrates an online questionnaire with an illustrative comparative content analysis. The questionnaire captures teachers' reported practices and perceptions. On the other hand, the comparison examines how two ChatGPT subscription plans responded to identical ESP-related prompts. The components are complementary, meaning that the questionnaire identifies how teachers experience the issue and the comparative analysis provides concrete examples of the differences that may arise in ESP teaching tasks.

3.2. Participants

The questionnaire was completed by 24 Moroccan ESP teachers. The link was shared through WhatsApp and Facebook and remained available from 23 April to 4 May 2026. The final sample included 16 male participants and 8 female participants, all of whom teach in ESP-related contexts. It is worth mentioning that participation was voluntary. The introductory statement informed respondents that their identities would not be disclosed and that their responses would be treated anonymously.

3.3. Instruments

3.3.1. Questionnaire

The questionnaire investigates how Moroccan ESP teachers use generative AI tools in their professional practice and how they perceive the distinction between free and paid versions. In addition to this, it aims to identify the frequency of AI use, the subscription plans accessed by teachers, the main reasons for not using premium tools, and teachers' views on the professional advantages associated with premium subscriptions. The questionnaire was created using

Google Forms and distributed online between 23 April and 4 May 2026. A purposive sampling approach was adopted to target teachers involved in ESP teaching. It consists of 16 items (see appendix) and it was circulated through WhatsApp and Facebook. Closed-ended items are used to collect demographic information and identify teachers' patterns of AI use. Multiple-choice items examine the tools and the subscription plans used by respondents in addition to the reasons that prevent them from accessing premium versions. Likert-scale items are included to measure teachers' levels of agreement with statements related to lesson planning efficiency, professional advantage and institutional responsibility. The questionnaire also includes an open-ended question, which gives the participants the chance to express additional views and concerns in their own words.

3.3.2. Comparative content analysis

The comparative component relies on four prompts representing common ESP-related teaching tasks: business email writing, medical vocabulary explanation, corrective feedback on a student email and the design of a communicative tourism task. Each prompt was submitted to ChatGPT Free and ChatGPT Plus and the first generated response was retained to maintain a consistent procedure. The comparison focuses on four analytical criteria: linguistic accuracy, depth, ESP relevance and pedagogical usefulness. The paired outputs were generated on 25 April 2026 and the exact prompts used in this study are the following:

- (1) "Write a professional business email (150-180 words) responding to a client who is complaining about a delayed delivery of goods."
- (2) "Explain the following medical terms in simple English for nursing students: diagnosis, prognosis, infection."
- (3) "Correct the following student email and explain the mistakes: 'Dear Mr. Abdelilah, I write this mail to inform you that the delivery was delay and the customer is not satisfy. Please find solution quickly.'"
- (4) "Design a communicative ESP task to teach hotel reservation language to tourism students: B1 level."

3.3. Data analysis

Questionnaire findings are analyzed descriptively through the percentages displayed in the Google Forms summaries. The analysis focuses on identifying patterns related to the frequency of AI use, access to paid subscriptions, perceived benefits of AI-assisted teaching, reasons for relying on free tools and opinions on the professional advantages associated with premium access. Responses to the open-ended question are reviewed qualitatively and some selected quotations are used to illustrate the participants' concerns. Regarding the comparative analysis, the outputs from ChatGPT Free and ChatGPT Plus were examined using a qualitative paired comparison. In this process, each response from the Free version was contrasted with the corresponding response from the Plus version, both generated from the same prompt. The purpose is to identify practical differences in the recorded outputs rather than claim that one subscription plan is better than the other in every context.

4. Results

4.1. Teachers' use of AI tools and perceived efficiency

The findings indicate that AI tools are common among Moroccan ESP teachers. Table 1 shows that 62% reported using AI tools in ESP teaching and 19% used them frequently. Only 10% selected rarely, but none of the respondents reported never using them. AI was a regular

component of their professional practice rather than an occasional resource. A combined total of 81% of respondents strongly agreed and agreed that AI tools had improved their efficiency in lesson planning and task preparation. These findings align with the practical uses discussed in the literature, especially in terms of the preparation of teaching materials and the generation of ideas for classroom activities.

Table 1

ESP Teachers' use of AI tools and Perceived Benefits for Teaching Practice

Items	Response option	%
Q7. How often do you use AI tools (such as ChatGPT, Gemini, or Copilot) in your ESP teaching practice?	Always	62
	Often	19
	Sometimes	9
	Rarely	10
	Never	0
Q12. Using AI tools has significantly improved my efficiency in lesson planning and task preparation.	Strongly agree	57
	Agree	24
	Neutral	14
	Disagree	5
	Strongly disagree	0

4.2. Access to ChatGPT Plans and Barriers to Paid Use

Moroccan ESP teachers who participated in the study reported using different ChatGPT plans, as summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

ChatGPT plans used by the Participants

ChatGPT plan	%
ChatGPT Free	46
ChatGPT GO	13
ChatGPT PLUS	33
Chat GPT PRO	0
Not using ChatGPT	8

This table illustrates that ChatGPT Free was the most widely used plan, selected by 46% of the participants. 33% used ChatGPT Plus while 13% relied on ChatGPT Go. A smaller proportion (8%) did not use ChatGPT and none of the respondents reported using ChatGPT Pro. Although the free Plan remained the dominant choice, this distribution shows that paid access was available to some participants.

Table 3

Reasons for not Using a Paid AI Subscription Plan

Reason	%
The subscription cost is too high	43
My institution does not provide access	32

I am satisfied with the free version	21
I prefer not to use AI tools in general	4

Table 3 shows that cost and institutional provision emerge as the most prominent barriers. 43% considered the subscription fee too expensive while 32% reported that their institutions do not provide access. 21% reported being satisfied with the free version. These results show that non-subscription should not be interpreted as resistance to AI because for many teachers, non-subscription appears to be shaped by financial limitations and the absence of institutional support.

Table 4

Perceptions of Professional Advantage and Inequality Associated with Paid AI Access

Items	Response Option	%
Q13. Access to ChatGPT Plus gives ESP teachers a professional advantage.	Strongly agree	50
	Agree	21
	Neutral	0
	Disagree	25
	Strongly disagree	4
Q15. Unequal access to paid AI tools may create a professional gap between teachers.	Strongly agree	70
	Agree	20
	Neutral	0
	Disagree	10
	Strongly disagree	0

The results in Table 4 show that participants associated paid AI access with professional benefits. 71% strongly agreed and agreed that access to ChatGPT Plus provides ESP teachers with a professional advantage in their work. A similar pattern emerges when respondents were asked whether unequal access to paid AI creates a professional gap between teachers. The results demonstrate that the majority of teachers (90%) strongly agreed and agreed that paid AI tools could create a professional gap between teachers. These findings confirm a widespread perception among the participants that disparities in access to premium AI tools may affect the resources, support and opportunities available to Moroccan ESP teachers.

4.3. Open-Ended Comments

The open-ended responses reinforce the tension between personal responsibility and institutional support. One of the participants asked: “Why is everyone expecting us to buy AI tools and invest in the teaching process from our own pocket? This is ridiculous.” Another respondent was more direct: “The ministry must provide teachers with a free subscription. Period.” A third respondent described a change in attitude after using AI features and he mentioned: “At the very beginning I was against AI in education, but when I started using its features I’ve changed my mind”. Access was raised again by another respondent who linked it directly to professional inequality and he said: “as far as I’m concerned teachers must have equal access to AI tools to avoid creating a professional gap between colleagues and it’s the ministry’s responsibility to provide access and training as well”. These comments should not be generalized beyond this small sample, but they reveal how Moroccan ESP teachers frame access to AI as an institutional concern.

4.4. The comparison between ChatGPT Free and ChatGPT Plus Outputs

The same-prompt comparison reveals significant differences across the four recorded task pairs. Table 5 summarizes these patterns, which indicate that the free version outputs are usable but concise and generic, while the Plus outputs are more developed and ready for classroom application.

Table 5

Summary of the Recorded Same-Prompt Comparison (ChatGPT Free and ChatGPT Plus)

Task	Observed pattern in ChatGPT Free	Observed pattern in ChatGPT Plus	Interpretation
Business email response	Short apology with a generic explanation and an imprecise delivery timeframe. Limited mitigation and no compensation strategy.	More developed business genre conventions: acknowledgment, explanation, updated delivery timeframe, goodwill gesture and closing offer of assistance.	The recorded Plus response demonstrates stronger genre control and greater workplace realism.
Medical vocabulary explanation	Accurate but brief, dictionary-like definitions of diagnosis, prognosis and infection.	Definitions are expanded through clinical context, process descriptions and learner-friendly elaboration.	The two outputs are useful, but the recorded Plus response requires less adaptation by the teacher.
Corrective feedback on student email	It corrects the main language errors but supplies only a minimal explanation.	It explains tense, lexical choice, passive construction, adjective form, article use and politeness strategy.	The recorded Plus response provides more metalinguistic and genre-sensitive feedback.
Tourism ESP communicative task	It suggests a basic role play between a receptionist and a customer.	It specifies roles, information-gap materials, procedure, target expressions, feedback focus and assessment criteria.	The recorded Plus response is more instruction-ready and easier to implement directly.

The business email task illustrates the distinction between a practical response and a workplace-oriented model. The recorded free plan answer apologizes for the delay and offers reassurance, but it remains generic. The Plus response uses a more developed rhetorical structure, including acknowledgment of the complaint, an explanation, a delivery update, a goodwill gesture as well as an invitation to seek further assistance. In an ESP lesson, the latter could support discussion of mitigation and customer relations. In the medical vocabulary task, the two responses explain the target terms accurately at a basic level. The Plus response adds relevant context, such as symptoms, tests, medical history, disease development and recovery. The difference is not correctness, but the degree of contextualization. The same pattern appears in the writing feedback task. The free output corrects the learner's sentences, whereas the Plus output adds metalinguistic explanations and highlights politeness strategies in formal correspondence. The communicative task prompt yields the clearest contrast in classroom design. The free response proposes a pair role play between a receptionist and a customer. The Plus response adds scenario cards, a reservation form, target expressions, feedback criteria and pronunciation. However, the free response could have been improved through follow-up prompting. The comparison highlights the importance of prompt design and user expertise when working with AI tools because the ability to formulate effective prompts remains a significant factor in determining the effectiveness of content that is generated through AI tools.

5. Discussion

The findings show that unequal access to premium AI tools may contribute to a professional digital divide among teachers but do not show that paid access improves teaching quality. They indicate that participants perceive professional differences between plans and that the recorded Plus outputs require less adaptation across several ESP-related tasks. The questionnaire findings are consistent with the perspective that AI tools have become part of teachers' ordinary work. Frequent use and perceived efficiency gains mean that access conditions matter. That is to say, when a tool is used occasionally, subscription limits may be a minor inconvenience, but when the same tool supports lesson planning, materials generation and feedback, at this stage, unequal access may influence workload and opportunities for pedagogical experimentation. In fact, the comparative analysis requires careful interpretation because the recorded Plus outputs are stronger in depth and classroom usability. Yet adept users of the free version can improve results through follow-up prompts and critical editing. The relationship between access and capability is central.

Miao and Cukurova (2024, p.20) argue that professional learning requires coherent training and support because it is a necessary condition for the meaningful use of AI in education. On the other hand, providing teachers with training has limited outcomes if most of them cannot access the tools they are expected to use. The open-ended comments collected from item 16 of the questionnaire make this institutional issue visible when several respondents resist the idea that ESP teachers should finance AI-supported teaching from their own salaries. Their concern is not simply frustration with subscription pricing, but it reflects a broader question about the distribution of responsibility when educational institutions encourage digital innovation (See 4.3). If AI integration is promoted as an expected part of ESP teachers' work, equitable access and professional development become an institutional obligation.

6. Implications, Recommendations and Conclusions

6.1. Implications for Institutions and Policymakers

The study has three implications that should be taken into consideration. First, institutions should treat GenAI access as an equity issue rather than a personal subscription decision. Second, access policies should be linked to professional development. Third, institutions should preserve teacher agency, which means that AI should support pedagogical judgment, not replace it. These implications are compatible with UNESCO's human-centered approach to GenAI and with the OECD's recommendation that education systems provide equitable digital infrastructure, resources and professional learning opportunities so that teachers and learners can benefit from GenAI (Miao & Holmes, 2023; OECD, 2026).

6.2. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Institutional access: universities and education authorities should assess whether AI subscriptions are needed for teachers whose work depends on GenAI tools.
2. AI literacy: professional development programs should move beyond introducing AI tools and basic prompt writing. In simple terms, they should help teachers evaluate AI-generated outputs critically, recognize their limitations, refine prompts iteratively, and determine when AI-generated content requires adaptation before classroom use.
3. Ongoing evaluation: because AI services change rapidly, access policies and training programs should be reviewed regularly rather than treated as one-time interventions.

6.3. Conclusion

AI tools have become integrated into the teaching and learning process worldwide, and it is believed that there is no turning back in this regard. Practitioners and policymakers are invited to benefit from such an outstanding invention, which has succeeded in transforming the way we engage with technology in this high-tech era. The study examines the emerging relationship between the so-called freemium AI models and equity in ESP teaching in Morocco. The questionnaire indicates that AI tools are popular among Moroccan ESP teachers, with numerous participants recognizing paid access as a significant professional advantage within the field. The comparative analysis confirms that ChatGPT Free and ChatGPT Plus can facilitate common ESP tasks, but ChatGPT Plus provides contextualized output ready for immediate use in educational settings. The findings should be read as evidence that access conditions deserve serious attention because the main issue is not whether AI is equitable or inequitable, the issue is how educational systems and institutions distribute access and preserve meaningful teacher judgment. AI does not create inequality, but unequal access to AI tools and unequal opportunities to use them well can deepen existing professional gaps between Moroccan ESP teachers.

7. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The findings need to be interpreted in light of the study's limited sample. They provide participants' experiences and perceptions, but they cannot represent all ESP teachers across Morocco. The comparative component is limited in scope as it includes four prompts and one retained output for each prompt, but ChatGPT plans, models and features change over time. Future research could test these findings with a large and more diverse sample and extend the comparison to a wider range of prompts and ESP tasks. It would be useful to investigate whether prompt literacy training reduces differences between free and paid users and whether institutional access policies improve workload management and classroom practices.

References

- Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, Article 22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8>
- Hamari, J., Hanner, N., & Koivisto, J. (2020). 'Why pay premium in freemium services?' A study on perceived value, continued use and purchase intentions in free-to-play games. *International Journal of Information Management*, 51, Article 102040. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.102040>
- Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Kuchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, Article 102274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>
- Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*, 54(2), 537-550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>
- Lo, C. K. (2023). What is the impact of ChatGPT on education? A rapid review of the literature. *Education Sciences*, 13(4), Article 410. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13040410>

- Miao, F., & Cukurova, M. (2024). *AI competency framework for teachers*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/ZJTE2084>
- Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693>
- Mohammed, A. L., Kutar, M., & Albakri, M. (2024). Conceptualising the artificial intelligence divide: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *UK Academy for Information Systems Conference Proceedings 2024*, Article 14.
- OECD. (2026). *OECD digital education outlook 2026: Exploring effective uses of generative AI in education*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/062a7394-en>
- OpenAI. (2026a). *ChatGPT plans: Free, Go, Plus, Pro, Business, and Enterprise*. Retrieved June 8, 2026, from <https://chatgpt.com/pricing/>
- OpenAI. (2026b). *What is ChatGPT Plus?* Retrieved June 8, 2026, from <https://help.openai.com/en/articles/6950777-what-is-chatgpt-plus>
- Warschauer, M., & Matuchniak, T. (2010). New technology and digital worlds: Analyzing evidence of equity in access, use, and outcomes. *Review of Research in Education*, 34(1), 179-225. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X09349791>

Appendix

Dear colleague,

You are invited to participate in this study, which examines how English for Specific Purposes (ESP) teachers use AI tools and how unequal access to free and paid versions of these tools may influence their professional practice. Your participation is voluntary and responses are anonymous and will be used for academic research purposes. By selecting “I agree to participate,” you confirm that you have read this information and provide your consent to participate in the study.

Section A. Consent

1. Do you agree to participate in this study?

-Yes, I agree to participate

-No, I do not agree to participate (end the questionnaire)

Section B. Professional and Demographic Information

2. Gender

-Male

-Female

3. Age group

-Under 25

-25-34

-35-44

-45-54

+55

4. Years of teaching experience

-Less than 5 years

-5-10 years

-11-15 years

- 16-20 years
- More than 20 years

5. Main teaching context

- University/higher education
- Vocational/professional training
- Teacher-training institution
- Other:

6. ESP domain(s) that you teach or have taught (select all that apply)

- Business English
- Tourism and hospitality
- Medical or nursing English
- Engineering or technical English
- Academic English
- Other:

Section C. AI Use and Access

7. How often do you use AI tools (such as ChatGPT, Gemini, or Copilot) in your ESP teaching practice?

- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

8. Which AI tools do you currently use for teaching-related purposes? (select all that apply)

- ChatGPT
- Gemini
- Microsoft Copilot
- Claude
- Other:
- I do not use AI tools

9. For which teaching-related tasks do you use AI tools? (select all that apply)

- Lesson planning
- Task and activity design
- Specialized vocabulary generation
- Text simplification or adaptation
- Writing feedback and correction
- Assessment design
- Professional communication models
- Other:
- I do not use AI tools

10. If you use ChatGPT, which plan do you currently use?

- ChatGPT Free
- ChatGPT Go
- ChatGPT Plus
- ChatGPT Pro
- I do not use ChatGPT

11. If you do not use a paid AI plan, what is the main reason?

- The subscription cost is too high
- My institution does not provide access
- I am satisfied with the free version
- I prefer not to use AI tools in general
- Other:

Section D. Perceptions of AI Access and Equity

For Items 12 to 15, select one response: Strongly agree / Agree / Neutral / Disagree / Strongly disagree.

12. Using AI tools has significantly improved my efficiency in lesson planning and task preparation.

13. Access to ChatGPT Plus gives ESP teachers a professional advantage.

14. Unequal access to paid AI tools may create a professional gap between teachers.

15. Educational institutions should provide teachers with access to suitable AI tools.

Section E. Additional Comment

16. Please share any additional comments about AI access, subscription costs, institutional support, or teacher training.

Open-ended response