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The creation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) has deeply impacted tertiary education across the continent at all curricular and organizational levels. Objectives are now formulated in terms of learning outcomes, methodologies are becoming more student-centered, groupings and learning modalities are increasingly diversified, teacher and learner roles are being reconfigured, and assessment is more authentic, formative, and criterion-referenced (Pérez Cañado, 2010). Within didactic materials and resources, Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) are now acquiring a particularly sharp relief.

Indeed, in addition to being one the core generic competencies which most European universities have worked into all their Bologna-adapted degrees, the potential of technological or digital competence for enhancing the student-centered learning process has been underscored in the official EHEA literature. According to Benito & Cruz (2007: 104), ICT is not a new fad, but a crucial tool which, in combination with the EHEA, will foster pedagogical innovation and allow all the agents involved in the teaching-learning process to expedite knowledge-building and competency development. Much the same is claimed by Pennock-Speck (2008: 70):

ICT in the field of education is an exciting opportunity for teachers and students. With more and more teachers being expected to apply more student-centred teaching, even if they do not particularly want to (Bailey, 2008), practically all teachers will end up using ICT to teach or at least to communicate with or evaluate students to a greater or lesser extent.

The use of ICT for language learning or Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL), perhaps the most widespread and acknowledged term, has developed particularly rapidly in recent years, coming to involve an increasingly diverse range of options relating to the principled application of new technologies in language learning. During the last three decades, CALL has progressed and evolved at a remarkable rate. Books are regularly published on the subject and at least four international journals are now dedicated to the topic. There are annual conferences devoted to it in many parts of the world, and highly active online discussion lists (Levy & Stockwell, 2006: 1).

Beatty (2003: 7) defines CALL as “any process in which a learner uses a computer and, as a result, improves his or her language” and considers it an “amorphous or unstructured discipline, constantly evolving both in terms of pedagogy and technological advances in hardware and software” (2003: 8). Sure
enough, as Beatty (2003), Lee (2000), Levy (1997), Pérez Gutiérrez & Pérez Torres (2005), or Warschauer & Healey (1998) document, CALL has undergone three main phases, with each stage corresponding to a different level of technology and certain pedagogical theories.

Behaviorist CALL was conceived in the 1950s and implemented in the next two decades. As its name indicates, it was based on the behaviorist learning model underlying Audiolingualism and thus featured repetitive language drills, explicit grammar and vocabulary instruction, and activities focused on form. The latter were corrected by the computer, which fulfilled the role of mechanical tutor.

Communicative CALL emerged in the 1980s as a reaction to the behaviorist view of language teaching. It was based on cognitive theories which saw learning as a creative process of discovery and thus incorporated more interactive and varied programs. Computers were employed for conducting individual work and popular CALL software involved reconstruction, concordancing, and simulations.

Finally, integrative CALL has superseded the previous two types of CALL from the 1990s onwards. With its underlying socio-cognitive view and consequent emphasis on real language use in a meaningful, authentic context, it is based on skills integration, multimedia-networked computers, and the Internet, and employs varied and hybrid CALL programs, where the computer acts as tutor, stimulus, and tool. The evolution of CALL can be visually traced in the summary provided in Table 1 below.

| Table 1: CALL stages (after Pérez Gutiérrez & Pérez Torres, 2005: 562) |
|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Technology       | Pedagogical Approaches | Role of the computer |
| Behaviorist CALL (60s-70s) | Mainframe computers | Behaviorism | Tutor |
| Communicative CALL (80s) | Personal computers | Cognitivism | Tutor and Tool |
| Integrative CALL (90s-) | Multimedia World Wide Web | Sociocognitivism Constructivism | |

Table 1: CALL stages (after Pérez Gutiérrez & Pérez Torres, 2005: 562)
The introduction of multimodality and the Internet in this last phase is precisely what has caused CALL as a general label to be called into question and competing terms to arise. Kern & Warschauer (2000: 1), for instance, speak of network-based language teaching (NBLT) to refer to a new side of CALL, “where human communication is the focus”. Gassó (2000) alludes to technology-enhanced language learning (TELL) as the latest acronym, coined to signal the incorporation of multimedia and the Internet. And Pennock-Speck (2013) mentions ICT as the preferred paradigm. CALL is associated in all these cases with pre-network language teaching and learning and the use of inflexible programs and mechanical activities with no room for creativity or peer interaction (Pennock-Speck, 2013).

However, these views have been countered by Levy & Hubbard (2005) and Levy & Stockwell (2006). They make a strong case for CALL as the global descriptor for the use of technology in language teaching and learning, built around three main reasons: it distinctively captures the application of technology to language as an object of learning; it reliably describes what we do; and it is an inclusive, established, and stable term which has been longer-lasting and more widespread than any other comparable acronym. Favoring the proliferation of other labels is counterproductive and simply serves to fragment the field, confuse, and distract. Thus, as Levy & Hubbard (2005: 148) maintain, “In the final analysis, the term CALL is simply useful. Avoiding the term simply fuels the idea that CALL is somehow locked into some kind of 1980s, pre-network time warp. The facts prove otherwise”.

Despite the controversy aroused by CALL as a general label, what remains incontrovertible is that technology is here to stay (Sharma, 2006: 59) and that its potential to enhance language learning is enormous: “it is obvious that we have entered a new information age in which the links between technology and TEFL have already been established” (Lee, 2000). O’Dell (2004: 6) terms it “the IT revolution” and expounds on how it “has had a particularly significant influence on how TEFL has changed over the last quarter of a century” (2004: 5). CALL has impacted what we teach (computer corpora and concordancing software have brought about striking advances in the grammar and lexis of spoken English); how we teach and how our students learn (by reading and listening to real language and using it productively in email or chat); and how we relate to each other (by availing teachers of opportunities to communicate with other practitioners worldwide).

CALL has also reconfigured teacher and learner roles: the former become facilitators, tutors, and advisors, while the latter need to be more autonomous, active, collaborative, and constructive in their own learning (Gassó, 2000). Thorne & Payne (2005: 380) go as far as to claim that the new generation of IT
users “… thinks, performs, learns and communicates in ways that quantitatively differ from cohorts born prior to the wide adoption of digital communication and information technologies”. It is what Prensky (2001) refers to as the digital immigrant/digital native divide. Digital natives think and process information in a substantially different way from their predecessors:

Digital Natives are used to receiving information really fast. They like to parallel process and multi-task. They prefer their graphics *before* their text rather than the opposite. They prefer random access (like hypertext). They function best when networked. They thrive on instant gratification and frequent rewards. They prefer games to “serious” work.

However, both Ware (2009) and O’Dowd (2007) approach these claims with heed for two main reasons: students’ acceptance of online activities will depend on whether they see them as relevant, and a gap may exist between their everyday online practices and the online literacies required to function effectively in virtual foreign language learning scenarios. In this sense, there is an increasingly consensual view in the specialized literature (Dudeney, 2011; O’Dowd, 2007; Ware, 2009) that students are not as technology-savvy as Prensky (2001) would have it. The digital immigrant/digital native divide is in fact being superseded by the digital visitor/digital resident dichotomy (Dudeney, 2011), which reflects the increasingly widespread view that students’ technological literacy is more limited or patchy than it might seem at first blush: they are tech-comfy (they have the computer literacy to use a digital tools for everyday social and entertainment purposes) but not tech-savvy (which involves being able to use key tools for educational and professional purposes) (Pegrum, 2009).

The impact of CALL has also been intensely felt in the variegated materials and technological options it has spawned for language teaching: “CALL has grown along both the horizontal and vertical axes: It has become a rich and diverse area of work with considerable depth” (Levy & Stockwell, 2006: 1). These options have, in turn, spurred on phenomenal amounts of research into their potential and effectiveness for language learning and teaching: “this volume of activity has led to the production of a sizable corpus of work. In fact, the breadth and diversity of CALL is frequently underestimated” (Levy & Stockwell 2006: xi). Following Lee (2000), Pérez Gutiérrez & Pérez Torres (2005), González-Lloret (2010), Moreno Fuentes (2010), or Palacios Maroto (2010), a classification is provided of the different types of CALL tools which have been identified for language teaching (Table 2).
Table 2: Summary of CALL tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multimedia software (programs with a fixed content with multimodal –text, images, audio, video– elements)</th>
<th>Reference software (e.g. dictionaries and encyclopedias)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drill and practice programs (e.g. multimedia CD-ROMs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Games and simulation programs (where students have to make a decision in order to obtain a reward or go on to the next level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word processors</td>
<td>Modifying, comprehending, or producing actions can be carried out with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>User software (programs ready to be installed and used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programming or authoring software (e.g. Hot Potatoes or JCLIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The World Wide Web</td>
<td>Source of authentic materials and content information through Internet searches (e.g. Treasure hunts, Webquests, Google Earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of specific language materials (grammar and vocabulary content pages, online dictionaries, meaningful contextualized language activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of communicative and collaborative tools: computer-mediated communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Numerous assets have been associated to the use of these CALL tools for foreign language learning:

- They provide learner-centered environments with increased opportunities for student participation and interaction (Freiermuth, 2002; O’Dowd, 2007; O’Rourke, 2005; Tudini, 2003), thereby helping to establish an important sense of community (Fleming et al., 2002; Rovai, 2002; White, 2006).
- They furnish sufficient and comprehensible input (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Gass, 1998, 2003; VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993;) which is elaborated and not merely simplified (Oh, 2001; Parker & Chaudron, 1987; Yano, Long & Ross, 1994).
- They produce pushed output which allows for the comparison of patterns and the adjustment of interlanguage structures (Swain, 1985, 1995; Swain & Lapkin, 1995).
- They provide immediate feedback (Lalande, 1982; Kubota, 2001).
- They result in increased student autonomy, motivation, and achievement, strengthening linguistic skills, positively affecting learner attitudes, and promoting self-confidence (Lee, 2000; Moreno Fuentes, 2010; Pérez Gutiérrez & Pérez Torres, 2005).

However, the use of technology can also be fraught with frustration; as O’Dell (2004: 6) puts it, “Revolution does not come without a cost: two steps forward, one step back”. According to this author, Lee (2000), Pérez Gutiérrez & Pérez Torres (2005), and Moreno Fuentes (2010), the following barriers or objections to the use of CALL in the language classrooms must be borne in mind:
• Hardware, software maintenance, and staff development are expensive.
• Computer hardware and software may not always be available.
• Using CALL in the classroom can be potentially time-consuming and may present technological hiccups.
• It requires additional knowledge which some teachers might be resilient to acquire. In this sense, the acceptance of technologies by tecnophobe teachers is a particularly tall order.
• Methodological readjustments need to be effected in the curriculum to make learning more autonomous and student-centered.
• Keeping up to speed with the constant and rapid changes involved in the use of CALL necessitates flexibility and adaptability on the part of both the teacher and the students: “engaging in CALL is a continuing challenge that requires time and commitment” (Lee, 2000). In this sense, O’Dell (2004) speaks of the Information Overload Syndrome.

Thus, the success with which CALL is incorporated into the language classroom is eminently reliant on the teacher, which substantiates the view that computers “will not replace teachers, but will supplement their efforts” (Lee, 2000). Technology is no “‘silver bullet’ which will bring about change and innovation by itself” (O’Dowd, 2007: 33); it is the teacher who needs to set up the program, assign the material, and ultimately hone the course to create an optimal language learning environment through the use of CALL options (Pérez Gutiérrez & Pérez Torres, 2005; Sharma, 2006). In Gassó’s (2000: 54) words, “The effectiveness of CALL does not reside in the medium itself but rather on how it is put to use”.

In this sense, Pennock-Speck (2013) sets forth three conditions for the use of ICT. The first of them (Ceffort) is that it should not be too time-consuming for teachers to design and put into practice activities and methodologies dependent on new technologies, nor should they involve an inordinate workload for the students. Either of these outcomes would inevitably lead to frustration and the rejection of ICT. Secondly, it should not be too expensive (CEcon), as this would mean resilience on the part of universities to subsidize its use. In this sense, it is important to invest not only in hardware and software, but especially in what Pegrum (2009: 53) terms “wetware”; that is, the human competence essential to make the most of technology. Thirdly, and perhaps the most important condition, is that ICT should be used only if it brings something new or innovative to teaching practice or gives the students more opportunities to acquire the knowledge and competencies they need (CInnov). Contravening any of these conditions, the author claims, will mean the ICT activity will either be superfluous, redundant, or counterproductive—or all of the above. However, if they are
met and the use of ICT is adequate, it is highly likely that computer-based language-learning tools will become both pervasive and invisible (Beatty, 2003), leading to what Bax (2003) terms the normalization of CALL, where “technology is invisible [...] hardly even recognized as technology”.

This is precisely what the present monograph seeks to contribute to: fostering the successful incorporation of digital competence in Bologna-adapted language degrees. To this end, it pools the insights of a set of international practitioners and investigators who report on classroom- and research-based experiences which have integrated ICT for specific and generic competence development within the Higher Education (HE) language context. It begins by framing the topic against the broader backdrop of the competencies which the foreign language teacher must acquire and develop with the new European HE arena. This is analyzed by Daniel Madrid-Fernández, who probes different competency-based approaches within the European context. The basic competencies within the Spanish education system are brought to the fore, along with the pedagogical implications of recent legislative developments. In addition to this, the chapter offers an array of cross-curricular competencies to be developed by teachers in general, and language teaching professionals in particular, as well as a series of guidelines for a competency-based assessment of language curricula.

A specific teacher training experience in the use of Web 2.0 tools is then reported on by Anna Franca Plastina. Her chapter describes an experimental study carried out at the University of Calabria (Italy) with the aim of preparing future EFL teachers for the lifelong process of competency development in e-Europe. Both quantitative and qualitative findings in the pre- and post-training phases of the experiment underpin the hypothesis that it is possible to narrow the current European ICT-skills gap in local educational settings by offering transformational guidance enabling teachers to adopt a European approach to their praxis.

Web 2.0 tools –concretely, the educational social network site NING– are also explored in Anna María Brígido-Corachán & María Goretti Zaragoza-Ninet’s chapter. In their case study, they analyze the impact of this site on an upper-level ESL module at the University of Valencia (Spain), offering detailed information about the didactic advantages provided by this multimodal online tool, which integrates digital literacies with the creative practice of writing, reading and listening activities in the English language. Their results show that the use of this educational platform greatly improved their students’ digital, communicative, and collaborative skills.

If these authors’ research has evinced that digital competence can act as a catalyst for the development of other linguistic and generic competencies of crucial relevance in HE language degrees, so do the next set of contributions. The
use of ICT to develop the multiple literacies involved in digital competence, linguistic skills, cooperative learning, critical thinking, or literary aspects is explored in the contributions by Maruenda-Bataller & Clavel-Arroitia; Talaván, Bárcecna, & Villarroel; Rodríguez-Arancón & Jordano-de la Torre; and Borham-Puyal & Olmos-Migueláñez. In their chapter, Sergio Maruenda-Bataller & Begoña Clavel-Arroitia describe their experience in the use of blended-learning methodology at the University of Valencia (Spain), and they point out the advantages and drawbacks of the implementation of ICT in the English class. They provide data concluding that its implementation has acted as a powerful catalyst for higher achievement. Likewise, Noa Talaván, Elena Bárcecná, & Álvaro Villarroel highlight the benefits of competence transfer between different groups of English students (Tourism and English Philology) undertaking computer supported collaborative language learning (namely, doubling and sub-titling a tourism video) at the National Distance Education University (Spain). Pilar Rodríguez-Arancón & María Jordano-de la Torre report on a pedagogical innovation experience at the same university which addresses the need to undertake appropriate development of comprehension and production skills in English by making students work, through telecollaboration, with English-speaking individuals from other countries. Literary Studies is, on the other hand, the main focus of analysis in the chapter by Miriam Borham-Puyal & Susana Olmos-Migueláñez, who describe the design of original resources and instruments built into the virtual platform Moodle, aimed at the development and assessment of reading efficiency and competence in critical analysis.

Finally, assessment of such competencies comes to the fore in the aforementioned chapters by Madrid-Fernández and Maruenda-Bataller & Clavel-Arroitia, but it is more specifically targeted in that by Kent Löfgren, which addresses university teachers’ evaluations of their students’ competencies. He also delves into the historical roots behind student-centered education and competency development fostered in the EHEA, thus offering the necessary contextualization so as to make personal choices in the shift from older methodologies to the new winds of change coming from Bologna.

Thus, the contributions included in the present volume seem to make a compelling case for the incorporation of ICT into the new language learning scenario provided by the implementation of the European Credit Transfer System. In the light of these findings, the use of technology should not be seen, as Kessler & Ware (2013: 104) put it, “as a separate competency, but rather as a vehicle for accomplishing other tasks”. Whether we like it or not, ICT is here to stay, and its role is becoming increasingly significant in our HE system: “If our university and state universities in general are to remain at the forefront in teaching and research in the future, we have to make sure that we implement ICT as effective-
ly as possible in the new degree and postgraduate degree structures” (Pennock-Speck, 2009: 183-184). The experiences and studies comprised in this volume will hopefully help us make strides in this direction and open a window into the many possibilities which ICT has to offer in Higher Education.
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