REGISTER JOURNAL – Vol 17, No 1 (2024), pp. 225-249
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v17i1.225-249
p-ISSN: 1979-8903; e-ISSN: 2503-040X

CALL Design Processes in the Indonesian and Australian Universities: Practical Advice on Co-Design Capabilities in the Post-digital Futures

Dewi Wahyu Mustikasari,[1*] Lyla Anggerwina Kusuma[2]
Post-Graduate School, UIN Salatiga, Indonesia[1]
Language Centre, Macquarie University, Australia[2]

*) Corresponding Author
Email: dewi_wm@uinsalatiga.ac.id
DOI: 10.18326/rgt.v17i1.225-249

Submission Track:
Received: 31-03-2024
Final Revision: 10-06-2024
Available Online: 13-06-2024

Abstract
This paper discusses the authors' personal reflective notes in designing Computer Assisted-Language Learning (CALL) task design for English language teaching for the students in both Indonesian and Australian universities. The multiple case study was employed to see the different TPACK competence, and also social, economic, and geographical backgrounds of both universities. The authors brought together their teacher design practices at the classroom level and their roles in a team design aimed to analyse the design processes using two fields of study perspectives: Learning Design and CALL. Therefore, the classroom observation and reflection teaching journal were used as data to answer a specific case of CALL task design which focused on viewing the CALL

task and learning design of English language university teachers, a model drawn on the field of Learning Design, developed by Mustikasari et al. (2022). The cross-case analysis of both universities found out that the University Culture of Leadership Commitment and students' partner were suggested to escalate the English learning quality and value in post digital world.

Keywords: Design process, CALL task design, co-design, post-digital futures

INTRODUCTION

Learning Design, as a field of study, has been investigated over the past two decades. Prior to the work of Koper (2006), the terminology of Learning Design refered to teaching and learning processes in a unit of learning such as a course and a lesson. He argues that the important key concept of learning design relies on the learning activities and the support activities which are delivered by different teachers to different students in a unit of learning, as the context. Larcana Declaration was announced around the 2000s in the Netherlands, UK, and Australia, stating that the new field of Learning Design focuses on developing a descriptive framework and exploring this framework for great teaching and learning ideas to be shared and adopted (Dalziel, 2015). Much of the literature in Learning Design (e.g., Agostinho, 2011; Asensio- Pérez et al., 2017; Bennett et al., 2015; Bonk & Cunningham, 2012) have attempted to investigate the products of Learning Design. Agostinho (2011) reported a study on visual learning design representation to document and communicate learning ideas. Bonk and Cunningham (2012) have explored the collaborative educational learning tools to support learner-centred approaches. Bennett et al. (2015) have indicated technologies to support teachers' design decision-making. Asensio- Pérez et al. (2017) have reported learning design tools for teacher professional development. According to Mor et al. (2015), growing discussion of Learning Design which is still in its infancy, studies should be undertaken to strengthen the existence of the theory and frameworks and to acknowledge contemporary practices, methods, methodologies of Learning Design (e.g., identifying learning design processes, evaluating design work). The authors reported that much of the literature in

Learning Design tends to explore the products of design work, instead of the design processes.

Limited studies on teacher design practices in higher education contexts have explored design processes. Bennett et al. (2017) introduced a design process model for university teachers in multidiscipline in designing for learning. Bearman et al. (2017) specifically identified an assessment design process model which was formed by impetus for change, environmental influences, professional influences, and educator activities. Dickson-Deane (2020) demonstrated customised online pedagogical designs drawn from her role as learning designer. These several lines of studies undertaken in Australian universities have established that design processes can be visualised using different constructions to uncover the untold teacher design thinking and decision-making. However, these studies are only viewed by university teacher design practices in developed countries. A more recent study on design processes in developing countries e.g. Indonesia has been undertaken by Mustikasari et al. (2022). The Expanded Contextual Analysis Model was developed using the original model developed by Bennett et al. (2017). They reported that environmental factors such as technological affordances and affordability, internet connectivity and device ownership issues were overlooked in the original model; thus, it was expanded to anticipate these detrimental aspects. Identifying and planning the contextual analysis of the current model was also drawn from the Analysis Design Develop Implement and Evaluation (ADDIE) developed by Branch (2009). This model was developed based on a case study of lecturers who teach English learners in eight universities with various students' economic and social background and leadership perspectives. The current model was developed based on the design processes undertaken by these lecturers who experienced a major shift of teaching practices during Covid-19 from blended learning to fully online learning approaches. However, there is little attention to investigate language teacher design processes that record teacher design practices in western and non-western countries in one empirical study to explore leadership perspectives in anticipating environmental factors post-covid 19.

Several lines of research have indicated that collective roles of team designs during design processes improve the quality of learning experiences. An interconnected university system consists of collective actions among some actors such as university leaders, educational staff, IT support, partners, colleagues, and students to support student learning experiences in online learning before and during covid-19. Conversely, a dysfunctional university system leads to unbalanced workload on the side of university teachers to handle obstacles in teaching an online mode (Mustikasari & Heggart, 2022). Singh et al. (2021) reported that the institutional systems can be established based on several interconnected agencies among faculty, administrators, instructional designers, and students. Faculty team plays an important role to facilitate online education infrastructures. Administration and instructional design team manage quality assurance of accessible online learning for students and act as facilitators who provide institutional support technology tools, instructional approaches, and principles of course designs. Students are expected to show their self-regulated learning in virtual learning environment. Previous studies have not clearly addressed roles of team designs in CALL classrooms. For this reason, future studies should investigate roles of other actors to support teachers in this sector in higher education settings.

Literature has highlighted factors that are associated with co-design practices in post digital futures. Brown et al. (2023) has promoted an evolving model of co-design that recognises several aspects of co-design e.g., collegiate understanding, reflectivity, listening with attention, empathy, pluriversity, and trust to influence the development of designing learnings at the classroom level. This model was developed in a team design formed by nine women with a variety of roles, cultures, disciplines, and organisations in a leadership program. Contrasting to Brown et al. (2023), Dishon (2023) argues that design practice can be seen as a critical contingency which views the possibility of its spread and overuse of design patterns in the future; thus, it may result in its death. He suggests that design practices should be considered as a concept that tends to highlight liminality because design seasons happen within time and space. Design practices require teacher educators to imagine and

predict designing for learning for educational futures. Therefore, although collaboration and participation are pivotal keys in a team design, they are not sufficient to custom equitable design practices in post digital futures. Indeed, collaboration can be optimised if community, co-design, and participation are lively managed throughout design practices (Macgilchrist et al., 2024). These studies have shown the importance of effective co-designs are related to collective support of individual intentions during design processes.

Few literature (e.g., Sun, 2017, 2021; Sun and Goodyear, 2020) on LD and CALL have highlighted the complementary nature of these two fields of study. Sun's comprehensive review (2017) concluded that design for CALL is associated with the design for learning approach. The synergy between CALL and design for learning approach have expanded the understanding of CALL and strengthened the concept of design for CALL. Sun and Goodyear (2020) have explored the mechanisms of students' social co-configurative activities during fully online language learning. Students show two learning patterns to customize what has been designed for them. The mechanisms can be used to visualise the connection between educational designs and learning outcomes. Sun (2021) has explored patterns-based learning design to develop CALL task design. These studies have been undertaken to investigate Chinese language learners in a university in New Zealand.

For those highlighted reasons above, it is essential to explore teacher design practices in an empirical study aimed to investigate language teachers in CALL classrooms which intend to examine university system perspectives in western and non-western countries. It is hoped to fill gaps in the literature on LD and CALL for English language education that is underrepresented. This study was undertaken to explore CALL design processes of university English language teachers in developed and developing countries (e.g., Indonesia, and Australia) with the purpose of providing a better understanding of effective co-design capabilities in post-digital futures. It included investigating roles of team designs and university leadership directives to support or constrain teachers in designing for learning in CALL classrooms. The research questions were:

1. How did the English teachers undertake the CALL design processes?
2. What were the roles of the other actors in the university ecosystem in supporting or constraining teacher CALL design practices?

RESEARCH METHODS

The multiple case study was employed in this research to examine the practical guidance on CALL design process by comparing Indonesian and Australian cases. This research methodology was adopted to enable the comprehensive understanding about the teachers' implementation in undertaking the CALL design process in both universities as presented in research question one. In addition, this approach was intended to reveal the valuable insight of the potential roles performed by other actors in university environment to support the implementation of CALL in higher education level as proposed in the second research question.

This study used classroom observation and reflection teaching journal as data collection techniques. The classroom observation was conducted to observe the classroom dynamic whenever the teacher participants integrated the CALL in their teaching classrooms. The reflection teaching journal provided the detailed information about the obstacles, challenges and other teaching experiences experienced by the teacher. The teaching reflection was systematically incorporated to the adopted CALL Learning design as theoretical frameworks that was developed by Mustikasari et al. (2022).

FINDINGS: CROSS-CASE ANAYSIS

The Cases

The individual cases demonstrated that the teachers redesigned subjects that delivered in a blended learning construct for bachelor and master students. Although the cases were delivered in blended learning arrangement, the Indonesian case was developed based on the teacher's personal preferences; in other words, there is no legal institutional

arrangement. The blended learning arrangement in the Australian case was developed based on legal institutional construct.

The first author as the teacher taught compulsory subjects in a semester of the academic year of 2023/2024 in a public university located in Java Island:

1. A two-credit subjects namely Methods of Language Teaching (two classes), Evaluation of Language Teaching (two classes), Curriculum of Material Development (one class) and Listening for Academic Purposes (one class) were enrolled by Bachelor of English Education students. Each subject was delivered in 1,5 hours for fourteen sessions.
2. English Matriculation, a zero-credit advanced English course was enrolled by two classes of non-English Education department students majoring in Master of Islamic Education and Master of Primary Education. These subjects are compulsory subjects to be enrolled to obtain the intended degrees. Each subject was delivered in 2,5 hours for fourteen sessions.

Both bachelor and master students, who are Indonesian coming from various most regions in Java provinces, must attend 60 % of face-to-face sessions (comprised of lectures, group discussions, individual and group works) and 40% of online sessions (comprised of video conferencing lectures, group discussions, individual and group works in Google Classroom and WhatsApp group). The blended learning arrangement was not formally written in the institutional policy, and it was developed by the first author based on her own decision. The blended learning module was developed by the first author and her partners (the teachers who teach the same subjects) particularly for the content-area focus.

Meanwhile the second author investigated an English Academic Purposes course (EAP) that was delivered at one of universities in New South Wales, Australia. The investigated EAP class was conducted by the second author who also acted as an EAP teacher in the investigated University. The EAP class facilitated by the Australian institution is referred to as the U20 EAP class which is

delivered in a 5-week teaching period. The U20 EAP class is classified as a beginner-level EAP course in this institution. Additionally, the U20 EAP course requires both 100 hours of face-to-face English learning with the English language facilitators / English teachers in the classroom and 80% accomplishment on the university online learning management system (LMS) / U20 Moodle.

This EAP introductory-level course is delivered from Monday to Friday and divided into two learning sessions with two hours learning with one lesson for each session. The students attend different lessons that are intentionally designed by the university to improve their EAP foundation skill, such as academic writing skill, academic reading skill, and listening skill. The course also includes further language development skills which includes language workshop; grammar and vocabulary; discussion skill; academic writing practice and individual feedback & consultation; and academic presentation skill.

The U20 EAP course adopts blended learning as its pedagogical approach. This approach combines a variety of autonomous online activities with 100-hour of teacher-student interaction in the classroom during five-week learning. The students are expected to accomplish an online module that consists of different assignments, quizzes, tasks and extension practices on their personal time outside of the classrooms. The online Module is provided by the institution in the form of an interactive learning management system (LMS) In the form of Moodle to support the students' individual learning achievements. Students are expected to interact with the contents on University LMS both independently and interactively.

This study investigated two U20 EAP classes namely U20-01 and U20-02 classes. These classes were assessed on the first 10-week-block of 2024. The teaching reflection on these classes would be used to prepare the next upcoming class in the second 10-week-block in 2024 that commenced in mid-February 2024. The students who enrolled the U20 EAP class were generally a foreign English

language learner who had 'modest' English proficiency which equalled IELTS 5-5,5 score. They were future bachelor and master's international students from various nationalities who would like to continue their bachelor and postgraduate degree in the investigated universities.

Institutional and non-institutional supports

In general, the second author received more institutional supports compared to the first author. The institutional supports from both organisations are varied from teaching documents (e.g., syllabus and modules), technology (e.g., learning management system/ LMS, online office application, online internal email), instructional support, IT support, and teacher training. Both also used non-institutional tools (e.g., Google Classroom, WhatsApp) and partner support as the non-institutional supports in delivering the blended learning.

The first author received limited institutional supports (e.g., syllabus, semester lesson plans, University LMS, IT support) to redesign the courses. The redesigned subjects were developed using the previous subject documentations such as syllabus and semester lesson plans. These institutional documents mainly only show pedagogical approaches (e.g., teaching styles, assessments) and content-area focus (e.g., course description, learning objectives/ outcomes, topics of discussions, and references) of the course designs. These documents were normally used for face-to-face sessions; then, the author developed them to be used for blended learning, a mixture of face-to-face and online sessions. The IT Support was helpful to sort out technical issues with the university LMS and safeguard privacy and security of user personal data. However, she used the University LMS only to record administrative stuff such as teaching journal and student attendance list; not for delivering online learning.

The U20 EAP course taught by the second author, attained various ranges of support that are provided by institutional assistance. Primary support that are provided by the institution including an LMS application with a wide range of learning

modules; the IT supports (e.g., handle technical issues and provide a cybersecurity standard and secure user personal data); the instructional support from the English educators; and the online office application, Microsoft Outlook, as the Internal communication support that can be access by the teachers and language managers to improve the efficiency of coordination to prepare the U20 EAP course.

The university also provides support for the teacher by facilitating the teacher development program and offering Supervisor of Educational Program (SEP). The SEP is provided by the university at every level to coordinate the updated material, overcome the challenges faced by the teacher, to provide information and ongoing guidance to the teachers including monitoring the performance of the teachers. Secondly, the university also provides the Teacher Development Program / TDP which focuses on integrating the modern educational technologies and approaches in order to improve teachers' teaching skill. The Teacher Development program is regularly provided every semester.

Although both authors received the institutional support, they needed the non-institutional supports. The first author used several non-institutional tools such as Google Classroom and WhatsApp. The online sessions were developed using Google Classroom. This platform was chosen because it has several embedded features such as stream class to update class activities, GMeet, classwork, and grades. The institutional learning management system was not equipped with a video conferencing tool. Thus, designing for learning aimed for blended learning was not easily organised and managed. WhatsApp was also used to inform announcements. Both authors acknowledged their partner support to develop the content-area focus of the students such as providing teaching materials and designing learning activities and assessments.

Team designs

This section elaborates the team that supported the authors as the teachers in the investigated universities. It shows the role of team design during the CALL design processes.

The first point to highlight is the number of supporting team designs in both universities. Fewer actors in the university in the developing country had roles in supporting the unsupportive teacher, they are partners and students that are elaborated as following:

1. Partners / teachers who teach the same subjects
   The author developed the current semester lesson plans with her partners who taught the same subjects. The author and her partners typically discussed the pedagogical approaches and content-area focus. The team designs allowed for different teaching styles and assessments. The learning designs were discussed to accommodate a blended learning approach.
2. Students were also invited to design regarding their technology preferences and opinions on assessment designs. Students showed their technological knowledge by giving agreements and disagreements on the technological affordances.

Meanwhile, there were more actors engaged in the developed country's university. The various roles both education and non-education team members collaborated in supporting the supportive teacher and the roles were detailed in the following section:

1. Educators
   Educators are considered as the EAP teacher who has title language facilitators. They focused on delivering the EAP materials and assessing students' performance.
2. Senior educators and TESOL researchers
   The pedagogical team who oversaw U20 LMS learning material uploaded in Moodle is mainly developed by the senior educators, TESOL researchers and practitioners, and all English teachers who teach U20 EAP class. The roles of

senior educators and TESOL researchers are developing and tailoring course content, teaching material, assessment, rubric, syllabus, curriculum that meet the needs of the students and Australian university requirements.

3. Administrative staff
   All the administrative data prepared by the administration team and education manager, such as teaching material, students' attendance list, students' assessment result, were uploaded to Sharepoint in Outlook for access by all assigned teachers. The additional / supplementary teaching-related documents were also prepared by the Senior Educators / SEP, and education manager, to be handed in to the teachers via Sharepoint in Outlook / university mailing list system.
4. Education manager
   The education manager focused on arranging the staff and class management, curriculum evaluation, financial management, policy development and students' support. These multi-layered teams work collaboratively to responsively fulfil the administrative and pedagogical needs of the U20 EAP members, including teachers and students

CALL Design Processes using the Expanded Contextual Analysis model (Mustikasari et al., 2022):

1. Planning phase
   a. Analysis

   Both authors reported that the analysis stage with reflecting their previous teaching experiences regarding environmental factors (e.g., technological affordances, costs, internet connectivity, and device ownership issues) to influence their course designs. They analysed how to improve the limitations with the environmental factors that occurred in the past teaching experiences to fit with the running general ideas of the course designs.

   The first author with her partners analysed the environmental factors to influence the course framework of the past teaching experiences. They listed how the environmental

factors impacted the general ideas of the course designs. This action was visualised and demonstrated by undertaking two tasks. The author and her partners modified the course framework namely ideas for the CALL task design (i.e., learning and assessment designs). Then they identified and analysed technological affordances of some platforms such as Google Classroom, GMeet and WhatsApp and costs to deliver learning and assessment online. Post-covid 19, Internet connectivity and device ownership issues could be managed by giving less online sessions post. The face-to-face sessions were predominantly set-up. Although they discussed the potential platforms to support online learning, the first author and her partners did not make the same agreement to the technologies used. They made an agreement that the technology tools are based on their preferences, and students are involved in deciding the first meeting schedule. Privacy and security during online learning was managed by giving some information to students such as individual student work will be displayed for the whole class discussion after students provide agreements; individual works which are displayed in discussion sections do need to request permission to be used for the whole discussion.

While the second author observed her previous U20-01 and U20-02 classrooms in the first and second term to set up the teaching design for the upcoming U20-08 and U20-09 EAP Class in Australian University. The author identified the EAP learning goal including its content and selecting the appropriate blended teaching strategy for the upcoming classes in this action stage.

From previous teaching performance analysis, the author found out that generally, the author had well-comprehension about the learning objective of writing skill and writing practice lessons. However, her performance in utilising the smart whiteboard had to be evaluated to improve the learning engagement and boost students' participation in using smart whiteboard to present their ideas or works. Other IT issues experienced by the author were the writing feedback that has to

be uploaded on the U20 Moodle and the ability to monitor students' working progress on U20 Moodle. The author also experienced the insufficient students' IT literacy that was related to locating the teaching sources, teaching instruction. This issue that occurred in the first and second weeks had to be addressed to accelerate the learning and teaching efficiency in the U20 EAP course.

b. Design

The pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) and technological knowledge (TK) approach offered in the current model were also experienced by the authors. Adjusting the PCK and TK approach was illustrated by deciding pedagogy strategies to deliver content-area focus, and choosing the suitable technology tools that would be effectively used to match with the pedagogy strategy and content-area focus of the CALL task design. They documented more specific information of the CALL task design (i.e., course description, learning objectives and outcomes, lesson topics and activities, assessment descriptions, content resources, and timetables) using the existing semester lesson plans.

In addition, the teacher from Australian cases overcame the IT issue found in the design phase by adjusting students' IT mastery and TPACK. The teacher planned to independently improve her IT mastery by exploring the Moodle navigation before the teaching process. To improve Students' IT mastery, the teacher planned to do modelling action to locate the source of writing material on the U20 Moodle. Another plan is providing engaged learning activities to promote students' technological mastery and to encourage student active learning in blended learning mode.

c. Develop

During this stage, the Indonesian author and her partners had different approaches to undertake the tasks. They shared course resources such as e-books and slides from previous iterations of the subjects and created new slides and compiled reading materials in the Microsoft word format. The author uploaded

them in the Google Classroom related to the weekly online contents and learning activities, but her partners uploaded them in the WhatsApp group.

The author from Australian case developed six main activities to solve her and students' IT problem Those six main activities are (1) IT navigation modelling, (2) Independent material retrieval, (3) Collaborative text analysis, (4) Interactive presentation, (5) Writing practice and Homework assignment on Moodle, (6) One-on-one Consultation session.

2. Implementation phase
   a. Implement

   The first author discussed and communicated the redesigned courses, and more specifically the CALL task design with students in the first week of the semester. She highlighted the weekly learning and assessment designs. Students were invited to provide opinions, agreements, and disagreements regarding the non-institutional technologies (e.g., Google Classroom, GMeet, and WhatsApp) being used to deliver the blended language course design. Students' perceptions toward the tools were also used to observe their technological knowledge, personal expenses to access the tools and device ownership issues to follow the instructions during face-to-face and online learning.

   The redesigned courses were delivered as planned. The author reported that most learning designs could be carried out in a timely manner. She developed and posted the course contents in the Google Classroom weekly. Although the learning designs were for a face-to-face session, she uploaded the course contents in the Google Classroom so that students could have the record of the learning activities, sources, and discussion history. It was supposed to anticipate the condition when the students did not make some notes during the teaching and learning processes. At this stage, students were able to follow the instructions in both modes and demonstrated their weekly intended learning outcomes.

Secondly, the Australian university EAP teacher implemented the redesigned TPACK plan conducted and found out that even though she spent longer time in modelling the IT navigation, her students' performance in completing the independent material retrieval was beyond teacher's expectation. It is because the teacher witnessed the students' engagement in carrying out the tasks.

The implementation report for the second teaching phase was also run as expected because during the Collaborative Text Analysis and Interactive Presentation activities, both teacher and students did not find any IT issue. In addition, students' writing product was also achieving the EAP writing standards. It was because they had enough time to do online mind mapping with the smartboard and U-20 Moodle as their LMS. Therefore, during a one-on-one consultation session, the teacher found out that almost all students mastered the U20 Moodle navigation because of the high accuracy and flawless students' IT skills in locating, resourcing, uploading and downloading teaching material and learning production U20 Moodle which was beneficial for the EAP learning process

b. Analyse

A design-while-teaching approach was undertaken during the CALL design processes by the first author because several design issues occurred. Some learning designs were not able to be delivered in a timely manner because the topics were too complicated and too many aspects to be discussed in one session. Students could not demonstrate the intended learning objectives on that day. Students needed more sessions to understand the assessment-based project. Another design issue was the internet connectivity. The solution toward these obstacles is discussed in the redevelop-reimplement stage.

From the implementation phase, the second author analysed that both teacher and students did not have any resistance in incorporating technology in the EAP classrooms. Secondly, the author also found out that the students' digital literacy skill was

amazing. It was because the students also did not hesitate to teach their friends whenever their friends had trouble in utilising smart whiteboards. This action also promoted collaborative learning in a digital learning environment.

c. Redevelop-Reimplement

Some solutions were arranged by the first author to sort out the design issues. Ensuring the intended learning objectives could be achieved by students; then, the course contents were rearranged and replanned to be delivered on the following week. Safeguarding students to understand the assessment-based project, instead of, provided another week to explain the project. The author decided to create a tutorial video by providing a deep explanation on the project such as step-by-step instructions to complete the project in order based on the provided rubric. Students could play the video multiple times if they still had problems understanding it. Internet connectivity was also experienced using the university Wi-Fi (i.e. some classrooms could not receive a strong internet connectivity), but it could be resolved using personal internet data packages and students did not complain about it because it was not too costly to access the Google Classroom and WhatsApp.

The redeveloped CALL task designs were reimplemented. There were no obstacles after it was redeveloped. It could be performed as replanned.

While in the second author case, the redevelop teaching strategy did not need to be conducted for this meeting. However, the reimplement teaching strategy will be reconducted in other teaching classrooms. The modelling action was a good sample to be reimplemented to give clear instructions and obvious steps in navigating and operating the U20 LMS Moodle.

3. Reflection phase

a. Evaluation

The first author found some interesting facts during the evaluation processes of the redeveloped CALL task designs. Students were able to follow the instructions using the

technologies from their mobile phones in face-to-face and online sessions during the implementation phase. Almost all students used mobile phones rather than laptops. It shows that they did not have problems with the costs to access the tools and device ownership issues. Students appreciated the tutorial video of the assessment-based project. It has helped them to complete the project. They reported that they liked the personal feedback received in the Classwork, a section in the Google Classroom. Students who learned the tutorial video and rubric obtained an excellent mark compared to those who did not use them. They also provided feedback for the first author teaching practices. The first author also received students' feedback from a report provided by the Head of English Education Department. The author also found students used artificial intelligence (AI) such as ChatGPT to complete some assignments. It was frustrating and difficult to be managed. More concise rules about AI and students' integrity should be communicated with students for the upcoming semester. Policy and security to use the non-institutional tools should have been discussed more exclusively by the Indonesia university leaders.

The second author for the Australian case found unexpected challenge that arose during the EAP classroom execution. The challenge was the use of AI during the writing practice activity that reduced the quality and the originality of the students' work. The finding was collected from the teacher's observation during the writing practice session. She found out that some of the students utilised ChatGPT, Grammarly and Google Translate to help them hone and improve their writing quality.

To overcome this AI challenge, the second author, as well as the EAP teacher, proposes the internal network to be sufficiently set up by the university to reduce the dependence on the AI application during the writing process for the future classes. This is beneficial to train students independence and writing endurance during the writing session. The students can also train their mind mapping skill and enrich their academic vocabularies

by patiently and independently selecting the appropriate academic vocabulary that suits their needs.

Another potential activity that can be conducted in the future teaching activity was inviting students to give feedback on the U20 platform and the ways or potential challenges that they might find during the learning process. This action is considered as a good move to improve the U20 LMS Moodle by accommodating students' point of view in navigating and using the app. This suggestion was based on the teacher's observation on students' difficulty and adjustment in optimally navigating the U20 LMS. It is also good for the university to get feedback from the students, especially the EAP students who also have IT background. The EAP students with IT background can potentially identify the technical issues that might occur in the U20 Moodle.

DISCUSSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Both authors have demonstrated their design practices. Although the two teachers' design practices represent different contexts, the design processes had similar phases that were drawn from the Expanded Contextual Analysis Model (Mustikasari, et al., 2022). Both design processes illustrated the parallel sequence of phases starting from planning, implementation and reflection. The original model was developed based on an investigation of design processes of English university teachers in a developing country. The model is also suitable to visualise the design processes of the English university teacher in developed country such as Australia.

On the other hand, differences resulted from several dynamic interaction between the authors with the other actors in designing CALL task design. The second author, who is the supportive teacher, experienced less design problems compared to the first author as the unsupportive teacher. The design problems were associated with institutional technological affordances, costs, and role of team designs. The first author decided to use the non-institutional technologies to deliver online learning because they did not too

costly for both sides (teacher and students). Nevertheless, both authors experienced the same challenge to manage academic integrity, privacy, and security in online learning. Students were indicated that they used AI to support their learnings.

Anticipating the design problems and challenges, the authors offer the concept of effective co-design capabilities during CALL design processes aimed to expand the original model for a post-digital world. The effective co-design capabilities are relied on the following external factors to manage academic integrity, privacy, and security in online learning at the classroom level.

University Culture of Leadership Commitment

Future university directives should accommodate technological affordances to manage academic integrity, privacy, and security in online learning. Prior studies (e.g., Dickson-Diane, 2021; Dickson-Deane and Sutherland, 2022; Mustikasari and Heggart, 2023) have noted the importance of university leadership in supporting teacher design practices. Dickson-Deane (2021) argues that institutions should review affordability and accessibility of technology used to provide learning online opportunity. University culture should accommodate educational technology infrastructure for online learning in higher education (Dickson-Deane & Sutherland, 2022). Mustikasari and Heggart (2023) have reported a variety of leadership in Indonesian higher education. Different institutional supports (e.g., technology tools and non- technology tools) have resulted in dissimilar English university teacher design practices. Supportive teachers have experienced fewer design problems compared to unsupportive teachers. Teacher design practices should be provided with teacher training to anticipate academic integrity, privacy, and security in online learning because teachers lack clarity regarding included academic integrity, privacy, and security in developing CALL design patterns. Conceptualising academic integrity, privacy and security policy on online learning should be documented into legal documents to set up the procedures of delivering CALL task design, e.g. a clear understanding of informed consent regarding the data used on

online learning for monitoring, assessment and other purposes between teaching staff and students should be equally understood by both sides (Webb et al., 2021). Team designs should be very flexible to provide learning designs to anticipate unpredictable situations that may occur during learning online (Fawns et al., 2020) such as academic integrity, privacy, and security in online learning. Establishing teachers' capabilities to understand PCK to TPACK approach (Koehler et al., 2014) in designing CALL task design is a potential strategy to anticipate academic integrity, privacy, and security and a future research venue to be explored.

Nurturing Students as a Partner to Design Learnings

Students should be invited to develop CALL task design. The first author has reported that students were engaged to choose the technological affordances for online learning. There is a possibility for students may also participate to develop pedagogical patterns such as creating simple doable online learning activities by using technology tools that are familiar to students (Fawns et al., 2020). Students as partners should be frequently investigated by discussing their co-configuration activities during the design processes (Sun & Goodyear, 2020).

The potential lecturer-student partnership during the design processes brings the opportunities to investigate pedagogical patterns on how lecturers and teacher educators with students engage during the co-design. A possible research direction on how lecturers and teacher educators with students engage in designing for learning by integrating PCK to TPACK approach is also worth investigated. Other studies may explore appropriate teacher facilitation for the preparation of an internship program by creating a team design stimulated role play; in fact, an-in person stimulated work-integrated learning role play has improved students' perceptions of employability skill development (Hains-Wesson et al., 2023). A potential patterns of team design stimulated work-integrated learning role play can be developed in a qualitative study. Students' perception toward the proposed model and effectiveness of the model can be investigated in a qualitative study.

Having more chances to get involved in team designs is expected to boost students' confidence in designing for learning. Crafting students' learning design skills can be developed during the time by watching their lecturers in designing for learning in some subjects that they enrol and participating during the design processes. University teachers design their learning design based on their previous design experiences (Bennett et al., 2017; Mustikasari & Heggart, 2023). Students may use the team design experiences and acquire learning design knowledge building to support themselves when they undertake the internship program, teaching practices in the school partners. If students have good ability to design learning during the internship program, it will be valued by the school partners and academic institution. An internship program, a cooperative education, and work-integrated learning are used to measure success by calculating employability numbers which views students have the desired qualities of current and future employers to meet the expectations of the employees (Dickson-Deane et al., 2023).

CONCLUSION

This paper has presented the extended value of the original model of design processes of English university teachers. An effective co-design capabilities should be undertaken to develop CALL design patterns and task designs in the post-digital world. These efforts can be visualised if university leaders and students are stimulated to support them. Limitations of this study are a small qualitative study with experienced female senior teachers who work closely with technology and available internet access in the locations of the study.

REFERENCES

Agostinho, S. (2011). The use of a visual learning design representation to support the design process of teaching in higher education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *27*(6). https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.923

Asensio-Pérez, J. I., Dimitriadis, Y., Pozzi, F., Hernández-Leo, D., Prieto, L. P., Persico, D., & Villagrá-Sobrino, S. L. (2017). Towards teaching as design: Exploring the interplay between full-lifecycle learning design tooling and teacher professional development. *Computers & Education*, *114*, 92-116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2017.06.011

Bennett, S., Agostinho, S., & Lockyer, L. (2015). Technology tools to support learning design: Implications derived from an investigation of university teachers' design practices. *Computers & Education*, *81*, 211-220. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.10.016

Bennett, S., Agostinho, S., & Lockyer, L. (2017). The process of designing for learning: Understanding university teachers' design work. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *65*(1), 125-145. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9469-y

Branch, R. M. (2009). *Instructional design: The ADDIE approach* (Vol. 722). Springer Science & Business Media.

Brown, C., Huber, E., Bone, E., Gribble, L., Lys, I., Dickson-Deane, C., Yu, P., Markauskaite, L., & Campbell, C. (2023). Academic women co-designing education futures in a postdigital world. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 1-21.

Dalziel, J. (2015). Reflections on the art and science of learning design and the larnaca declaration. In *The art & science of learning design* (pp. 1-14). Brill.

Dickson-Deane, C. (2020). Designing with Forgiveness in Mind for the Process. *Handbook of Research in Educational Communications and Technology: Learning Design*, 661-673.

Dickson-Deane, C. (2021). Moving practical learning online. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *69*, 235-237.

Dickson-Deane, C. & Sutherland, J. (2022). Educational technology infrastructure to enable learning: The 2021-2022 Contextualising Horizon Report.

Dickson-Deane, C., Heggart, K., & Vanderburg, R. (2023). Designing Learning Design Pedagogy: Proactively Integrating Work-Integrated Learning to Meet Expectations. In *Design education across disciplines: Transformative learning experiences for the 21st century* (pp. 125-142). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Dishon, G. (2023). Designed to death? The tensions underpinning design in educational discourse. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 1-19.

Fawns, T., Jones, D., & Aitken, G. (2020). Challenging assumptions about "moving online" in response to COVID-19, and some practical advice. *MedEdPublish*, *9*.

Hains-Wesson, R., Ji, K., & Wu, E. (2023). Students' Perceptions of Employability Skill Development through a Theater and Reality of the Board Model. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, *24*(4), 537-552.

Koehler, M. J., Mishra, P., Kereluik, K., Shin, T. S., & Graham, C. R. (2014). The technological pedagogical content knowledge framework. *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology*, 101-111.

Koper, R. (2006). Current research in learning design. *Educational Technology & Society, 9* (1), 13–22.

Macgilchrist, F., Jarke, J., Allert, H., & Pargman, T. C. (2024). Design Beyond Design Thinking: Designing Postdigital Futures when Weaving Worlds with Others. *Postdigital Science and Education*, *6*(1), 1-12.

Mor, Y., Craft, B., & Maina, M. (2015). Introduction: Learning design: Definitions, current issues and grand challenges. *The art & science of learning design*, 9-26.

Mustikasari, D. W., Heggart, K., & Dickson-Deane, C. (2022) Indonesian English Teachers' Design Practices: How Technological Affordances and Costs Effect Learning Designs and Impact Student Learning. 45th Annual AECT Proceedings. Selected research and development papers. pp.232-241. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael-

Simonson/publication/376352704_2022_AECT_Proceedings_-_Volumes_1_and_2_complete_with_cover/links/65737b1a6610947889aee20e/2022-AECT-Proceedings-Volumes-1-and-2-complete-with-cover.pdf#page=246

Mustikasari, D. W., & Heggart, K. (2023). Blended and Online Distance Learning in Indonesian Higher Education: A Systems Perspective. In *Reimagining Systems Thinking in a Post-Pandemic World* (pp. 172-191). IGI Global.

Singh, J., Steele, K., & Singh, L. (2021). Combining the best of online and face-to-face learning: Hybrid and blended learning approach for COVID-19, post vaccine, & post-pandemic world. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, *50*(2), 140-171.

Sun, S. Y. (2017). Design for CALL–possible synergies between CALL and design for learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *30*(6), 575-599.

Sun, S. Y. (2021). Using patterns-based learning design for CALL tasks. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *34*(8), 1061-1084.

Sun, S. Y., & Goodyear, P. (2020). Social co-configuration in online language learning. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *36*(2), 13-26.

Webb, A., McQuaid, R. W., & Webster, C. W. R. (2021). Moving learning online and the COVID-19 pandemic: a university response. *World Journal of Science, Technology and Sustainable Development*, *18*(1), 1-19.