Digital Linguistic Rights and Educational Ethics: Evaluating Djezzy's English Learning Platform against Algeria's Academic and Corporate Standards

Droits linguistiques numériques et éthique éducative : Évaluation de la plateforme d'apprentissage de l'anglais de Djezzy au regard des normes académiques et professionnelles en Algérie

IkhlasGherzouli

[1]Mohamed LamineDebaghine Setif2 University, i.gherzouli@univ-setif2.dz

Received: 21/07/2025 *Accepted: 10/11/2025* *Published:15/12/2025*

Abstract:

This study examines Algeria's Djezzy, the sole affordable digital English platform. Analysed against corporate and national University Charters, it exposes an ethical monopoly. This singular option forces a compromised choice, scarifying data privacy and equity for access. Classroom observations reveal students have no viable alternatives, highlighting a market failure. The research urges ethical frameworks that balance critical educational access with the protection of fundamental rights.

Keywords:digital education ethics; English language learning; educational equity; Algeria; corporate ethics

Résumé:

Cette étude examine Djezzy, la seule platforme algérienne abordable pour l'apprentissage de l'anglais. Analysée à la une de l'éthique comparative et de la Charte universitaire nationale, elle révèle un monopole éthique. Cette option unique impose un choix compromettant, sacrifiant la confidentialité des données et l'éthique pour l'accès. Des observations en classe confirment l'absence d'alternatives viables pour les étudiants, soulignant une défaillance systémique du marché. La recherche appelle à des cadres éthiques équilibrés.

Mots-clés:éthique numérique éducatif; apprentissage de l'anglais; équité éducative; Algérie; éthique d'entreprise

***Correspondingauthor**: Ikhlas Gherzouli, **e-mail:**i.gherzouli@univ-setif2.dz.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The commercialization of digital English language learning has created unprecedented opportunities for educational access while simultaneously raising critical questions about ethical implementation in developing multilingual contexts. As learners increasingly rely on digital platforms to supplement formal language instruction, the tension between educational accessibility and ethical standards has become particularly acute in post-colonial nations where economic constraints limit access to international educational technologies.

In Algeria, this tension manifests through a stark choice facing university students seeking English language learning resources. International platforms such as Duolingo Plus ($6.99/month), Busuu Premium ($9.99/month), and Babbel ($13.95/month) offer high-quality, ethically-designed learning experiences but remain financially inaccessible to most students in a country where these costs represent significant portions of family incomes. Conversely, locally-developed alternatives like Djezzy's English learning platform, the country's sole such application, priced at 300 DA monthly, provide affordable access but raise serious questions about ethical implementation and compliance with both governmental and corporate ethics standards.

This accessibility crisis is particularly significant within Algeria's multilingual educational landscape, where English serves as a critical third language alongside Arabic and French. University students, constrained by limited financial resources and restricted access to international payment systems, increasingly turn to local companies for digital learning solutions. However, the ethical implications of this dependency on commercial platforms operated by telecommunications providers have received no scholarly attention, despite growing concerns about data privacy, educational commercialization, and access inequality.

Through my experience teaching *Information and Communication Technologies* (ICT) and *Ethics and Deontology*courses at an Algerian

university, I have observed firsthand how students navigate these constrained choices. Classroom discussions consistently reveal that while students recognize the superior quality of international language learning platforms, the subscription costs—often equivalent to or exceeding monthly family budgets for educational expenses—render them practically inaccessible. This forces students to discuss local alternatives like Djezzy's platform, even though none had direct experience with it. Their scepticism was evident, particularly regarding data privacy, an inherent distrust of local initiatives, commercial manipulation of educational content, and the restriction of access exclusively to Djezzy subscribers.

The significance of this issue extends beyond individual student experiences to fundamental questions about digital educational rights and corporate responsibility. Algeria's 2023 University Ethics Charter explicitly establishes principles for digital ethics in educational contexts, emphasizing data protection, equitable access, and non-discrimination. Simultaneously, Djezzy, as Algeria's second-largest telecommunications operator, has published comprehensive corporate ethics documentation outlining commitments to privacy protection, data security, and ethical business practices. Yet the implementation of their English learning platform appears to contradict both governmental ethics standards and the company's own stated ethical principles.

This contradiction reveals a critical gap in digital education ethics scholarship: while considerable attention has been paid to technological barriers and pedagogical effectiveness of digital language learning, little research has examined how commercial platforms navigate—or fail to navigate—ethical obligations when serving educationally and economically constrained populations. The intersection of telecommunications business models with educational service delivery creates unique ethical challenges that existing frameworks have not adequately addressed.

This study evaluates Djezzy's English learning platform against Algeria's University Ethics Charter—not because the platform specifically targets university students, but because it serves educational purposes within this population. This warrants its assessment against established

educational ethics standards to identify regulatory gaps and protection needs. When commercial platforms operate within educational ecosystems, they become subject to educational ethics principles, irrespective of their primary business models or intended audiences.

The research is guided by three primary objectives: first, to analyse the features, access mechanisms, and implementation practices of Djezzy's English learning platform; second, to assess platform practices against ethical standards established in Algeria's 2023 University Ethics Charter and Djezzy's corporate ethics documentation; and third, to examine the broader implications for university students who must choose between financially accessible but ethically problematic local platforms and financially inaccessible but ethically sound international alternatives. This systematic ethical analysis represents the first comprehensive evaluation of a commercial digital English learning platform operating within a developing multilingual nation.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Digital Education Ethics in Developing Nations

Research consistently identifies significant ethical challenges in digital education platforms across developing nations, particularly regarding data privacy protections, educational equity outcomes, telecommunications influence, and ethical framework alignment (Bhatia, Arora, & Gupta, 2024; Assefa, Gebremeskel, Moges, &Azmera, 2024). This literature review examines existing research on ethical dilemmas in digital education platforms, focusing on data privacy protections, educational equity outcomes, telecommunications influence, and ethical framework alignment within developing multilingual contexts.

2.2 Data Privacy and Protection in Digital Learning Platforms

2.2.1 Privacy Vulnerabilities

Research consistently identifies significant data privacy concerns in digital learning platforms, particularly in nations where regulatory frameworks and enforcement mechanisms remain weak. Khlaif, Salha, Fareed, &Rashed (2021) documented increased privacy violations during

emergency remote teaching, revealing how shared internet access and inadequate security protocols expose vulnerable learners to data breaches and surveillance risks. Similarly, Czerniewicz and Feldman (2023) found that educators express considerable unease about datafication and surveillance, highlighting the tension between educational necessity and privacy protection.

Moreover, the literature reveals systematic concerns about corporate control over educational data, with telecommunications and EdTech companies often prioritizing commercial interests over user privacy. Taylor (2016) demonstrates how mobile network operators' reluctance to share data despite public good claims creates power imbalances that undermine user protections. Petreski (2024) extends this analysis, arguing that big data applications in education risk exploiting learners while generating profits for corporations, particularly when privacy-preserving techniques are inadequately implemented.

2.2.2 Regulatory Frameworks and Compliance Challenges

Recent studies emphasize the need for robust data protection regulations tailored to educational contexts. Atabey, Robinson, Čermáková, Siibak, and Kucirkova (2024) propose comprehensive ethical standards emphasizing user consent, transparency, and international compliance, particularly for vulnerable groups including children. However, Nikolova, Monova-Zheleva, and Zhelev (2022) identify persistent gaps between theoretical frameworks and practical implementation, especially regarding *General Data Protection Regulation* application in developing nation contexts where technical infrastructure and regulatory capacity remain limited.

2.3 Educational Equity and Digital Divides

2.3.1 Persistent Inequities in Digital Access

The literature constantly documents how digital English learning platforms can both alleviate and exacerbate educational inequities in developing nations. Assefa et al. (2024) identifies socioeconomic status, geographic location, and digital literacy as key drivers of inequality, while Bhatia et al. (2024) demonstrates how marginalized communities face

compounding barriers including device availability, connectivity costs, and culturally irrelevant content design.

Research reveals significant gender dimensions in digital learning access and participation. Khlaif et al. (2021) found that girls showed lower participation rates in synchronous online sessions during COVID-19, while Chikwe, Dagunduro, Ajuwon, and Ediae (2024) documents how sociological barriers compound gender-based exclusion in digital learning environments. These findings suggest that technological solutions alone cannot address deeply embedded social inequalities.

2.3.2 Infrastructure and Affordability Barriers

Multiple studies identify telecommunications infrastructure and pricing as critical determinants of educational equity. Olanrewaju, Adebayo, Omotosho, and Olajide (2021) documents how poor connectivity and high costs restrict access in rural areas, while Shahzad (2024) demonstrates that internet affordability and device access remain major barriers for deprived children even in urban contexts. These infrastructural constraints often interact with socioeconomic disadvantages to create systematic exclusion from digital learning opportunities.

2.4 Telecommunications Companies and Commercial Platform Ethics

2.4.1 Corporate Influence on Educational Access

The literature raises significant concerns about the influence of telecommunications companies on educational access, particularly through pricing models, infrastructure control, and data practices. Han and Kumwenda (2024) argue that inequalities in telecommunications infrastructure perpetuate Global North dominance in educational technology design, while Weiss, Yates, and Gulati (2017) advocate regulatory interventions to ensure affordable broadband as a matter of social justice.

Further, research highlights systematic tensions between commercial objectives and educational equity. Taylor (2016) documents how corporate data governance practices often conflict with the transparency required in educational contexts. The drive for user engagement on commercial platforms can also undermine pedagogical integrity, especially when

telecom providers enter the education sector without aligning with educational standards or stakeholder needs.

2.4.2 Network-Based Discrimination and Access Barriers

A notable gap in the literature concerns how telecommunications providers may entrench inequalities by creating preferential access based on network affiliation rather than educational merit or need. This concern is especially pertinent in developing nations, where telecom companies increasingly mediate educational delivery in the absence of robust public infrastructure. Without regulatory safeguards, such dynamics risk reinforcing educational exclusion under the guise of digital inclusion.

2.5 Ethical Frameworks and Cultural Alignment

2.5.1 Global North Frameworks in Local Contexts

The literature reveals significant challenges in applying ethical frameworks developed in Global North contexts to developing nation realities. Han and Kumwenda (2024) argue that existing frameworks often fail to account for local cultural norms, infrastructural constraints, and power dynamics, risking what they term ethical imperialism. Mthoko and Pade-Khene (2013) propose community-centred approaches that integrate local stakeholder knowledge and cultural values into ethical decision-making processes.

Recent research emphasizes the need for collaborative ethical frameworks that incorporate local stakeholder perspectives. Atabey et al. (2024) advocate for user-centric design principles that prioritize active engagement and cultural relevance, while Daiss and Parra (2024) stress the importance of ongoing ethical reflection among educators navigating technological constraints.

2.5.2 Emerging Technology Ethics

The literature increasingly addresses ethical challenges posed by emerging technologies including Artificial Intelligence (AI) and immersive learning environments. Chinta, Wang, Yin,, Hoang, Gonzalez, Quy, and Zhang (2024) identifies algorithmic bias and fairness as critical concerns in AI-driven educational tools, while Al-kfairy and Alfandi (2024) examine privacy and safety risks in *Metaverse* educational applications. These

studies highlight the need for adaptive ethical frameworks that can address rapidly evolving technological capabilities.

2.6 Socio-Technical Integration and Cultural Relevance

2.6.1 Standardization versus Local Relevance

A recurring theme in the literature concerns tensions between platform scalability and cultural responsiveness. Bhatia et al. (2024) documents how standardized digital platforms often undermine place-based learning needs and social relationships, while Han and Kumwenda (2024) argues for balanced approaches that maintain global standards while incorporating local cultural inputs.

Kuiler (2024) provides critical analysis of how digital platforms may perpetuate colonial patterns of educational exclusion through economic barriers and cultural homogenization. This perspective challenges assumptions about technological neutrality and highlights the need for decolonized approaches to digital education ethics that centre local knowledge systems and educational traditions.

2.7 Research Gaps and Theoretical Framework

Despite increasing interest in digital education ethics, critical gaps persist in the literature. There is limited empirical research on the practical implementation of privacy protections within commercially operated platforms in developing nations. The impact of telecommunications pricing strategies on educational access and equity also remains underexplored, constraining the formulation of effective policy responses. Furthermore, existing research offers little insight into how ethical frameworks can be co-developed with local communities to ensure cultural relevance and applicability.

This study addresses these gaps by examining the intersection of telecommunications business models and educational service delivery in Algeria. Informed by digital justice frameworks (Pangrazio et al., 2024) and post-colonial education scholarship (Kuiler, 2024), the analysis assesses how market forces shape ethical commitments, educational access, and equity. The study advances understanding of how commercial platforms

engage—or fail to engage—with their ethical responsibilities toward economically disadvantaged student populations.

3. Methodology

This study adopted a qualitative design combining two complementary approaches: *content analysis* of platform and policy documents to examine structural and ethical dimensions of Djezzy's English learning platform, and *participant observation* in a university classroom setting to capture student perceptions, trust issues, and adoption barriers. Together, these methods provided both a structural and a contextual perspective on the platform's role within Algeria's educational technology landscape.

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a systematic content analysis to examine Djezzy's English learning platform against established ethical frameworks (Krippendorff, 2018). The design integrated corporate ethics document analysis, platform feature assessment, and university classroom observations to evaluate gaps between stated principles and actual application practices (Krippendroff, 2018).

The methodology adapts digital platform analysis protocols (Chaudhry, Cukurova, &Luckin, 2022) for ethical assessment, combining systematic coding of platform features with interpretive analysis of ethical implications. This approach is suited to commercial educational platforms requiring both technical and ethical evaluation.

3.2 Data Sources

This study drew on three main categories of data sources (Table 1). Platform and corporate documentation includedDjezzy's English learning platform content, subscription pricing structures, access mechanisms, and corporate governance materials comprising the Ethics Charter (21 pages, August 2023) and Business Partner Code of Conduct (4 pages, August 2022). Regulatory framework analysis examined Algeria's 2023 University Ethics Charter (18 pages), particularly Section 1.7 on Digital Ethics requirements, alongside government standards for data protection and

educational equity. Contextual data was derived from university classroom observations documenting student discussions about platform accessibility, cost barriers reported during ICT instruction, and observed patterns in international versus local platform usage preferences.

Table 1. Data sources and documentation

Category	Source	Content	Pages/Duration
Platform Documentation	Djezzy English Learning Platform	Website content, features, pricing structures, access mechanisms	Live website / Featureanalysis
CorporateEthics	DjezzyEthics Charter	Corporate governance, ethical principles, compliance frameworks	21 pages (August 2023)
CorporateEthics	Business Partner Code of Conduct	Partnership standards, ethical guidelines	4 pages (August 2022)
Regultory Framework	Algeria'sUniversityEthics Charter	Digital ethicsrequirements, educational standards	18 pages (2023)
Regulatory Framework	Government Standards	Data protection policies, educational equity principles	Section 1.7
Observational Data	UniversityClassroom Observations	Student accessibility discussions, cost barrier reports, platform usage patterns	Academicyear 2024 - 2025

3.3 Content Analysis

This study employed qualitative content analysis, drawing on frameworks by Krippendorff (2018) and Chaudhry et al. (2022), to evaluate Djezzy's English learning platform against ethical standards. The corpus included all publicly available platform-related documents—terms of service, subscription policies, data privacy statements, corporate ethics charters—as well as the 2023 University Ethics Charter.

An iterative coding matrix was developed to categorize features and policies into four thematic domains: ***accessibility***, ***data privacy***, ***commercialization***, and ***corporate ethics compliance***. Each domain was further broken down into sub-themes with specific coding criteria (see Table 2). Documents were manually coded through repeated close reading, supported by memoing, whereby analytical notes were produced to link textual evidence to categories. This process ensured interpretive transparency and traceability.

The coding framework emphasised ethical alignment and educational equity, enabling systematic comparison between documented commitments and actual platform practices. By structuring the analysis in this way, the study ensured that ethical principles were not only identified but also evaluated against operational realities.

Table 2. Coding matrix for content analysis

Category	Sub-themes/Codes	Description	Data Sources
Platform Features	Subscriptionaccess, user registration	Accessibility and cost implications of platform	Platform documents, subscriptionpolicies
Ethics Charters	Data privacy, user consent	Privacy policies and data protection measures	Platform policies, University Ethics Charter
CorporatePolicies	Commercialization, advertising,	Corporate business	Corporateethics documentation

	ethicscompliance	ethics and marketing practices	
Educational Impact	Access equity, linguisticrights	Inclusivenes s and fairness in educational use	Participant observation notes, policyanalysis

Note. The framework categorizes features of the Djezzy English learning platform and related policy documents across four domains: accessibility, data privacy, commercialization, and corporate ethics. Sub-themes indicate specific aspects analysed, and data sources identify the documents from which evidence was drawn.

3.4 Participant Observation

To complement the document analysis, the study employed participant observation duringan *ICT* module taught by the author to approximately 400 third-year English language students at an Algerian university in the second semester of the 2024–2025 academic year. Attendance was optional.

Over the course of six instructional units, the instructor presented students with a range of global language learning applications, outlining their respective advantages and limitations. This activity was integrated into the course to generate reflective discussion and to assess how learners perceive and evaluate educational technologies in practice—an inquiry directly aligned with the study's broader focus on ethical access and trust in digital learning environments.

The classroom discussions revealed consistent skepticism toward Algerian-developed applications, with students citing doubts about their reliability and educational value. Regardingthe Djezzy platform specifically, none of the students reported prior experience with the application, and the majority were unaware of its existence until the classroom discussion. Awareness of the application was primarily limited to

promotional SMS campaigns sent exclusively to Djezzy subscribers. This access model,combined with subscription fees, significantly constrained opportunities for students to trial or adopt the platform.

As a result, no direct user data could be collected. Instead, insights were derived from thematic analysis of classroom discussions, informal feedback, and instructor field notes. Following an ethnographic orientation, these observations provided valuable evidence on cultural perceptions and technological trust, thereby directly addressing the study's central question of how structural and cultural factors shape access to and adoption of digital language learning in Algeria.

3.5 Data Collection Procedures

Platform data andcorporate documents were systematically collected through direct website analysis during the year 2025. Screenshots and documentation were captured to ensure accuracy and enable verification. Corporate ethics documents were accessed through official company websites and verified for authenticity and currency.

Government ethics documentation was obtained from official Ministry portal and cross-referenced for accuracy. University classroom observations were conducted as part of routine *ICT* instruction, with anonymized student feedback and instructor fieldnotes recorded for contextual understanding.

3.6 Limitations

This study is limited in scope to publicly documented features and policies of the Djezzy English learning platform. Internal company decision-making processes and user analytics data were not accessible; consequently, the analysis concentrates on ethical framework compliance rather than direct user experiences or learning outcomes. While publicly available documentation provides a reliable foundation for evaluating transparency and accountability, it may not capture all internal practices affecting ethical implementation.

Classroom observations provided valuable insights into perceptions of educational technology, but a key limitation is that students had not directly engaged with the platform. Their awareness stemmed primarily

from the operator's SMS advertising campaigns and classroom discussions. Finally, the researcher's dual role as university instructor and analyst, while offering valuable contextual insights, may introduce a degree of observer bias in the interpretation of classroom discussions and field notes.

However, these boundaries also reflect the structural realities of Algeria's digital education context, where limited access and transparency are themselves central to understanding the ethical and practical constraints shaping platform adoption. To mitigate potential observer bias, classroom insights were triangulated with document analysis, and only recurring themes raised by multiple students were retained as evidence.

4. Findings

4.1 Platform Access and Pricing Structure Analysis

4.1.1 Subscription Model Implementation

Djezzy's English learning platform operates through a tiered subscription framework offering daily (25 DA), weekly (90 DA), and monthly (300 DA) access options. This pricing structure presents a considerable economic advantage over international alternatives, with Duolingo Plus, Busuu Premium, and Babbel commanding monthly fees of 1,050 DA, 1,500 DA, and 2,100 DA respectively—representing cost differentials of 3.5 to 7 times Djezzy's standard rate.

However, the platform implements discriminatory access protocols that systematically privilege Djezzy telecommunications subscribers. Non-subscribers encounter procedural barriers including SMS-exclusive subscription mechanisms and restricted portal functionality, establishing a bifurcated access system that contravenes fundamental educational equity principles enshrined in Algeria's University Ethics Charter.

4.1.2 Economic Accessibility Paradox

While the platform's pricing ostensibly addresses affordability barriers documented in contemporary literature (Shahzad, 2024; Olanrewaju et al., 2021), it subscription requirements nonetheless generate exclusionary mechanisms. The daily payment option, though nominally accessible at 25 DA, accumulates to 750 DA monthly under consistent

usage—a 150% premium over the advertised rates that potentially exploits financial literacy limitations among economically vulnerable users.

The SMS-dependent payment infrastructure necessitates sustained telecommunications credit, creating compounded financial obligations for students who must maintain separate communication expenses specifically for educational access. This configuration transforms essential educational services into recurring commercial transactions, exemplifying the subordination of educational objectives to commercial imperatives identified by Taylor (2016).

4.2 Data Privacy and Protection Violations

4.2.1 Personal Information Collection Practices

Platform access mandates phone number registration across all subscription methods, generating comprehensive user databases integrated with telecommunications accounts. SMS-mediated interactions produce granular behavioural analytics encompassing learning frequency, content preferences, and engagement patterns—data assets with commercial applications extending beyond educational purposes.

Authentication protocols requiring SMS-transmitted verification codes raise substantive concerns regarding data security during transmission and storage phases. The platform's absence of visible privacy policies or data protection frameworks constitutes fundamental transparency violations, contradicting established governmental and corporate ethics standards while confirming privacy vulnerability concerns documented by Khlaif et al. (2021) and Czerniewicz and Feldman (2023).

4.2.2 Corporate Ethics Charter Contraventions

Analysis reveals systematic contradictions between Djezzy's documented Ethics Charter commitments and platform implementation practices. Section 4.4's mandate to protect business partner privacy expectations conflicts with comprehensive SMS tracking conducted without explicit consent mechanisms. Section 4.5's prohibition against accessing customer information without valid business justification is violated through educational analytics exploitation for telecommunications marketing purposes. The Charter's requirement for appropriate data security

systems contrasts sharply with the platform's demonstrable absence of visible security protocols or user data protection measures, exemplifying implementation gaps documented by Nikolova et al. (2022).

4.3 Educational Commercialization Ethics

4.3.1 Commercial-Educational Objective Conflicts

The platform's integration with telecommunications services generates inherent tensions between educational goals and commercial imperatives. User engagement data derived from educational activities is systematically exploited to enhance broader marketing strategies, transforming learning analytics into commercial intelligence that serves telecommunications profitability rather than educational advancement. This data commodification exemplifies the systematic commercial-educational tensions documented by Taylor (2016).

Subscription models explicitly prioritize customer acquisition and telecommunications revenue optimization over educational outcome enhancement. Pricing strategies maximize commercial returns rather than learning effectiveness, demonstrating how market imperatives systematically undermine educational missions and subordinate pedagogical integrity to business objectives.

4.3.2 Content Design and Educational Integrity

Platform content prioritizes brief, mobile-optimized interactions (5-10 minutes daily) designed to serve telecommunications engagement patterns rather than evidence-based language learning methodologies. The absence of pedagogical expertise indicators or educational accreditation reveals fundamental instructional design deficiencies. This superficial approach confirms the platform's function as telecommunications service enhancement rather than a legitimate educational intervention, reflecting standardization concerns documented by Bhatia et al. (2024).

4.4 Government Ethics Charter Compliance Assessment

4.4.1 University Ethics Charter Violations

Algeria's University Ethics Charter establishes explicit requirements for digital education platforms that Djezzy's implementation systematically contravenes. Section 1.7 mandates data access management to prevent

abuse while maintaining service quality, yet the platform demonstrates no visible data governance or abuse prevention mechanisms. Privacy protection requirements demand comprehensive personal data confidentiality and integrity safeguards through physical and logical security measures, while the platform conducts SMS-based data collection without adequate security protocols. The Charter's explicit requirement to combat manipulation and discrimination in digital technologies is directly violated through network-based discrimination that favoursDjezzy subscribers.

4.4.2 Educational Access Equity Failures

The Charter emphasizes equitable educational technology access regardless of economic status or telecommunications provider affiliation. The platform implementation violates these principles through preferential subscriber treatment and economic barriers that exclude financially constrained students despite ostensible affordability.

The platform's design assumes and reinforces telecommunications dependency, rendering educational access contingent upon commercial relationships rather than educational need. This model contradicts Charter principles requiring educational technology to enhance rather than restrict learning opportunities, reflecting access equity concerns documented by Assefa et al. (2024) and Han and Kumwenda (2024).

4.5 Corporate Governance and Accountability Deficiencies

4.5.1 Policy Implementation Gaps

Despite comprehensive corporate ethics documentation, Djezzy demonstrates systematic failure to implement stated principles within educational service delivery. The disparity between documented commitments and operational practices suggests inadequate internal governance mechanisms for educational service oversight. Platform implementation exhibits transparency deficits that contradict the company's stated integrity and honesty values, indicating either insufficient policy implementation frameworks or deliberate circumvention of ethical requirements for commercial advantage.

4.5.2 Stakeholder Obligation Neglect

Corporate documentation explicitly acknowledges obligations to respect customer privacy and ensure equitable service access, yet educational platform implementation systematically prioritizes telecommunications profits over stakeholder commitments. Platform design excludes educational stakeholder consultation and eliminates student representative involvement, directly contravening corporate governance principles mandating stakeholder engagement in public interest services. These omissions constitute deliberate disregard for participatory governance standards and confirm stakeholder exclusion patterns documented by Mthoko and Pade-Khene (2013).

4.6 Implications for University Students

4.6.1 Constrained Choice Architecture

University students confront a systematic constraint environment where ethically compliant international platforms remain financially inaccessible while affordable local alternatives violate fundamental digital rights. This generates a coercive choice framework where economic necessity compels acceptance of ethically problematic services.

Classroom observations reveal student awareness of these ethical contradictions alongside an expressed willingness to consider using the platform despite these misgivings due to the absence of alternatives. Students articulated frustration with having to ‘choose between learning English and protecting privacy’, indicating recognition of the impossible ethical choice they face, reflecting broader digital divide concerns documented by Bhatia et al. (2024) and Kuiler (2024).

4.6.2 Educational Inequality Institutionalization

The platform institutionalizes discrimination through telecommunications provider affiliation, establishing educational hierarchies based on commercial relationships rather than academic merit. The platform’s design creates systematic access barriers for students utilizing competing telecommunications services, effectively transforming consumer choices into educational penalties.This structure particularly disadvantages families with established non-Djezzy contracts. This commercial discrimination generates novel digital inequalities transcending

traditional socioeconomic barriers, establishing telecommunications loyalty as a prerequisite for educational opportunity.

5. Discussion

5.1 Ethical Framework Disjunctures in Commercial Educational Technology

The empirical evidence demonstrates fundamental disjunctures between articulated ethical principles and operational practices across governmental and corporate frameworks. While the platform addresses documented affordability constraints (Shahzad, 2024; Olanrewaju et al., 2021), its implementation systematically contravenes core tenets of data privacy, educational equity, and corporate responsibility. This paradox illustrates how ostensible technological solutions can generate novel forms of educational stratification under the guise ofdemocratization. Similar contradictions have been documented in other contexts, where EdTech platforms marketed as democratizing tools have deepened inequalities (Bhatia et al., 2024; Pangrazio et al., 2024).

The systematic nature of these contraventions indicates that prevailing ethical frameworks lack requisite enforcement architectures for commercial educational platforms, particularly within developing nation contexts. This corroborates Taylor's (2016) and Petreski's (2024) analyses regarding the systematic privileging of commercial imperatives over educational objectives in corporate EdTech ventures.

5.2 Neo-Colonial Digital Education Structures

The platform exemplifies what Kuiler (2024) conceptualizes as digital colonialism through economic coercion and commercial dependency mechanisms. Superficial affordability obscures profound dependency architectures that subordinate educational autonomy to telecommunications allegiance, replacing traditional colonial gatekeepers with commercial intermediaries. The transformation of telecommunications infrastructure into educational exclusion mechanisms reflects contemporary manifestations of commercial control documented by Han and Kumwenda (2024). This aligns with Taylor's (2016) critique of digital colonialism in

education and with Kuiler's (2024) findings on the persistence of colonial legacies in African higher education, suggesting that the Algerian case reflects wider structural patterns.

This commercialization of educational access constitutes a form of neo-colonialism where knowledge acquisition becomes contingent upon corporate fealty rather than educational entitlement, perpetuating asymmetrical power relations through digital mediation.

5.3 Digital Justice and Surveillance Capitalism Manifestations

The findings substantiate Pangrazio et al.'s (2024) digital justice framework by illuminating how data practices and commercial architectures systematically disadvantage marginalized learners. The platform embodies Heeks' (2021) concept of adverse digital incorporation, where students experience inclusion within digital systems while simultaneously enduring exploitation through privacy violations and commercial manipulation.

The systematic subordination of educational equity to telecommunications business objectives exemplifies surveillance capitalism's penetration into educational domains, as identified by Czerniewicz and Feldman (2023). Educational engagement becomes instrumentalised for commercial data extraction, fundamentally compromising learner agency and educational autonomy—the cornerstone principles of digital justice frameworks. Comparable dynamics are observed globally, where commercial EdTech ventures subordinate student rights to data extraction imperatives (Czerniewicz& Feldman, 2023; Pangrazio et al., 2024).

5.4 Regulatory Architecture Deficiencies

The Charter's comprehensive principles notwithstanding, systematic violations reveal critical implementation and enforcement lacunae in digital education governance. Contemporary regulatory frameworks appear structurally inadequate to address the complex convergence of telecommunications business models with educational service provision, necessitating specialized governance mechanisms for commercial educational platforms.

These findings confirm Atabey et al.'s (2024) contention regarding the insufficiency of traditional educational ethical frameworks when confronting evolving technological and commercial contexts. The evidence suggests an urgent need for adaptive regulatory architectures capable of addressing the unique challenges posed by telecommunications companies' educational market entry. These deficiencies mirror challenges noted in other postcolonial contexts, where regulatory frameworks have struggled to adapt to the hybridization of telecommunications and education (Kuiler, 2024; Bhatia et al., 2024).

5.5 Corporate Governance and Performative Ethics

The stark contradiction between documented ethical commitments and operational practices exposes fundamental corporate governance failures when commercial imperatives conflict with educational responsibilities. Ethics frameworks function as performative instruments rather than operational directives, revealing the inadequacy of voluntary compliance mechanisms in ensuring genuine adherence to stated principles.

The evidence indicates that telecommunications companies lack both specialized expertise and authentic commitment to ethical educational service delivery, treating ethical documentation as a marketing apparatus rather than a binding obligations. This necessitates mandatory external oversight mechanisms and specialized regulatory frameworks governing telecommunications entry into educational markets, transcending the voluntary compliance approaches that facilitate the systematic violations documented by Weiss et al. (2017).

5.6 Structural Violence and Educational Rights

The constrained choice architecture confronting university students constitutes a manifestation of structural violence, wherein economic necessity compels acceptance of ethically compromised services. This dynamic transforms privacy protection and equitable access into privileges accessible exclusively to economically advantaged students, fundamentally contradicting educational equity principles.

The systematic nature of these constraints demonstrates that individual agency cannot redress broader structural inequities in digital

education access. Rather, comprehensive policy interventions and robust regulatory frameworks are imperative to ensure that affordable educational technology does not necessitate the compromise of fundamental privacy rights and non-discrimination principles. The evidence calls for reconceptualising affordable EdTech within a rights-based framework that prioritizes learner dignity and educational justice over commercial expedience.

Similar dynamics have been reported in other Global South contexts, where commercial EdTech platforms reinforce dependency structures and exacerbate inequities (Taylor, 2016; Kuiler, 2024). Situating the Algerian case within this wider body of evidence underscores that such structural violence is not exceptional but systematic.

6. CONCLUSION

This study examinedDjezzy's English learning platform through the lens of educational ethics, combining content analysis of publicly available documents with classroom-based participant observation. The findings reveal profound contradictions between the platform's documented ethical commitments and its operational practices.

On one hand, the platform presents itself as an affordable gateway to English learning. On the other hand, subscription restrictions, privacy risks, and commercialisation practices systematically undermine educational equity. These dynamics reflect broader challenges in digital education governance, where voluntary compliance mechanisms and corporate self-regulation have proven insufficient.

The Algerian case highlights how telecommunications-driven educational platforms can reproduce patterns of exclusion and dependency that are widely recognised in critical EdTech scholarship. Rather than democratising education, such platforms risk entrenching inequities and subordinating learner rights to commercial imperatives.

The evidence underscores the urgent need for stronger regulatory frameworks, grounded in educational rights and digital justice, to ensure

that affordable EdTech platforms genuinely advance equity, privacy, and learner dignity.

Future research should account for the structural reality that direct user data from the platform remain scarce, as the Djezzy platform is currently the only Algerian application offering English learning and its subscription model restricts uptake. In this context, valuable directions include longitudinal monitoring of platform evolution, comparative studies with international EdTech initiatives, and policy-focused research examining how regulatory frameworks might better safeguard equity and privacy. Such inquiries would deepen understanding of whether the dynamics identified here reflect temporary market conditions or entrenched systemic patterns in Global South digital education.

7. Bibliography List:

Al-kfairy, M., &Alfandi, O. (2024).The ethical dilemma of educational metaverse.*Recent Advances in Evolutionary Education and Outreach*, *1*(1), 6–16. https://doi.org/10.17352/raeeo.000002

Assefa, Y., Gebremeskel, M. M., Moges, B. T., Tilwani, S. A., &Azmera, Y. A. (2025). Rethinking the digital divide and associated educational in(equity) in higher education in the context of developing countries: The social justice perspective. *International Journal of Information and Learning Technology, 42*(1), 15–32. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJILT-03-2024-0058

Atabey, A., Robinson, C., LindroosCermakova, A., Siibak, A., &Kucirkova, N. (2024). *Ethics in EdTech: Consolidating standards for responsible data handling and user-centric design*. University of Stavanger.https://doi.org/10.31265/USPS.283

Bhatia, K. V., Arora, P., & Gupta, S. (2024). Edtech platforms from below: a family ethnography of marginalized communities and their digital learning post-pandemic. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 1–15.https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2024.2328693

Chaudhry, M. A., Çukurova, M., &Luckin, R. (2022). A Transparency Index Framework for AI in Education. In I. A. R. Cohen, N. Mavrikis, & E. Millán (Eds.), *Artificial Intelligence in Education. AIED 2022. Lecture Notes in*

Computer Science (Vol. 13355, pp. 195–198). Springer.https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11647-6_33

Chikwe, C. F., Dagunduro, A. O., Ajuwon, O. A., &Ediae, A. A. (2024). Sociological barriers to equitable digital learning: A data-driven approach. *Comprehensive Research and Reviews in Multidisciplinary Studies*, *2*(1), 027–034. https://doi.org/10.57219/crrms.2024.2.1.0038

Chinta, S. V., Wang, Z., Yin, Z., Hoang, N., Gonzalez, M., Quy, T. L., & Zhang, W. (2024).Fairaied: Navigating fairness, bias, and ethics in educational AI applications. *arXiv.*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2407.18745

Czerniewicz, L., & Feldman, J. (2023). 'Technology is not created by the sky': datafication and educator unease. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *49*(3), 428–441. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2023.2206137

Daiss, B., & Gómez Parra, M. E. (2024).Explorando la fronteraética: la educación en línea en la era de los avances tecnológicos. *DIGILEC: RevistaInternacional de Lenguas y Culturas*, *11*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.17979/digilec.2024.11.10745

Han, S. P., &Kumwenda, B. (2024).Bridging the digital divide: Promoting equal access to online learning for health professions in an unequal world.*Medical Education*.https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.15455

Heeks, R. (2021). *From digital divide to digital justice in the global south: Conceptualising adverse digital incorporation* (Digital Development Working Paper no. 90).The University of Manchester.

Khlaif, Z. N., Salha, S., Fareed, S., &Rashed, H. (2021). The hidden shadow of coronavirus on education in developing countries.*Online Learning*, *25*(1).https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v25i1.2287

Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kuiler, E. W. (2024). Bridging digital and knowledge divides: Concepts, frameworks and ethical concerns. *Policy & Internet*, *16*(2), 222–241. https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.400

Mthoko, H., &Pade-Khene, C. (2013).Towards a theoretical framework on ethical practice in ict4d programmes.*Information Development, 29* (1), 36-53. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666912449456

Nikolova, E., Monova-Zheleva, M., &Zhelev, Y. (2022).Personal data processing in a digital educational environment.https://doi.org/10.53656/math2022-4-4-per

Olanrewaju, G. S., Adebayo, S. B., Omotosho, A. Y., &Olajide, C. F. (2021). Left behind? The effects of digital gaps on e-learning in rural secondary schools and remote communities across Nigeria during the COVID19 pandemic.*International Journal of Educational Research Open*, *2*, 100092.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100092

Pangrazio, L., Auld, G., Lynch, J., Sawatzki, C., Duffy, G., Hannigan, S., & O'Mara, J. (2024). Data justice in education: Toward a research agenda. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2024.2320196

Petreski, D. (2024). Big data in online education: Who produces value and who reaps the rewards? In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Networked Learning 13*.https://doi.org/10.54337/nlc.v13.8618

Shahzad, M. (2024). The Impact of Digital Divide on the Educational outcomes of deprived Children in Low-Cost Private Sector Schools in Lahore, Pakistan; Post COVID-19 Era. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *12*(4), 3240–3256.https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2024.v12i4.2500

Taylor, L. (2016). The ethics of big data as a public good: Which public? Whose good? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 374*(2083), 20160126. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2016.0126

Weiss, J. W., Yates, D. J., & Gulati, G. J. (2017). Affordable broadband: Bridging the global digital divide, a social justice approach. *Academy of Management Proceedings, 2016*(1), 17389. https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2016.17389abstract