This final part of the volume moves from the realm of research studies to reviews of the current state of the field and proposals for its future direction. The authors of the four commentaries that follow explore the common theme of tracking language learner behavior in different ways and bring up some additional issues as well.

In the first contribution, Fenfang Hwu and Ching-yeh Tzeng address the “Challenges and Directions of Script-Based Tracking in Tutorial CALL.” They note that the central problem with tracking in tutorial CALL applications is often not the collection of data but rather interpreting it in a coherent and consistent way. As a solution to this problem, they propose the creation of a uniform tracking taxonomy implemented through a standard tracking interface (STI) and outline a process for CALL experts to develop the taxonomy and STI collaboratively.

Dorothy Chun also looks at the issue of learner behavior tracking in “Contributions of Tracking User Behavior to SLA Research.” She begins by observing that many studies in CALL fail to incorporate such data despite the clear value of doing so, noting that the sheer quantity and prohibitive amount of time necessary for analyzing and interpreting the data are common barriers. After echoing Fischer on acknowledging tracking as a form of ethnographic research, she explores the value of tracking in investigating SLA principles, examining four of the leading SLA theories/perspectives and concluding with a call for more advanced data mining and analysis tools.

In “Catalyzing Plurilingualism and University-level Academic Discourse Competence: The Language-Integrated Knowledge Education (LIKE) Approach,” Steven Thorne proposes a pedagogical initiative to enable students to participate in academic discourses more fully. In this case, learners track their own progress and achievements in the form of individual, ideally plurilingual online portfolios incorporating learning logs, reflective commentaries, and other items that they collect or create. Once implemented, the content of the LIKE portfolio would provide insight into both the process and products of students’ individual language learning and cultural experiences and into their developing proficiency in the genres of academic discourse. It would foster the integration of university foreign-language and literacy education and the study of their respective academic discipline areas. Thorne sees the plurilingual nature of the portfolios as an additional motivation for students to continue their foreign-language education.
beyond the required initial level and, thus, as a good tool to build their translingual and transcultural competencies.

This section and the volume conclude with Jozef Colpaert’s “Peripatetic Considerations on Research Challenges in CALL.” Setting his commentary in the narrative about a whimsical imaginary stroll with Bob Fischer around the cathedral of Amiens, he weaves together issues currently prominent in his thinking and pondered by many colleagues in CALL. After sketching each issue, he proposes core questions to Bob and invites him to discuss them further. Taking a broad look at the changing nature of academe, first, Colpaert laments the fact that the individualistic competitive side of meritocracy in academe has not stopped at the boundaries of the CALL field. Professors have become “are slowly turning into emotionally deprived civil servants who follow procedures, pursue quantitative targets and are being constantly evaluated.” The enormous pressure on young scholars, in particular, results in the adhering to a select few research methodologies and not—as one would expect in an innovative and fast-paced multidisciplinary field such as CALL—an emergence of new more ecological methodologies. As the walk comes to its end, Colpaert returns to the changing roles, opportunities, and challenges of all participants in language education: parents, students, teachers, publishers, developers, authors, editors, and researchers. He concludes the book on a very optimistic note: “We have the power to change the perception of CALL as a discipline and as a scholarly activity.”