

Training to Teach Writing in FFL (French as a Foreign Language): Between Didactic Theories, Field Practices, and Digital Tools

Samir BENABDELKOU

Laboratory, SODIDLEM

University Center of Barika – Algeria

Samir.benabdelkoui@cu-barika.dz

Abstract

Teaching writing in French as a Foreign Language (FFL) represents a complex competency requiring linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural knowledge. In a context shaped by evolving pedagogical practices and emerging digital technologies, teacher training in this specific area reveals several shortcomings, particularly a disconnect between theory and practice, along with often superficial integration of digital tools.

To address these challenges, this research proposes an integrative approach combining three complementary dimensions: theoretical foundations (communicative and action-oriented approaches, writing processes), field practices (observation, experimentation, reflective analysis), and critical use of digital tools (Google Docs, Padlet). The methodology incorporates document analysis, participant observations, semi-structured interviews, and the design of innovative training modules.

The findings highlight the need to develop teachers' reflective stance, metacognitive skills, and informed mastery of educational technologies. Confronted with contemporary challenges like artificial intelligence, multilingualism, and hybrid learning models, this multidimensional approach emerges as key to developing training programs adapted to current realities in FFL instruction.

Keywords: *Writing pedagogy, Teacher training, Integrative approach, Educational technology, Reflective practice*

Former à enseigner l'écrit en FLE : entre théories didactiques, pratiques de terrain et outils numériques

Résumé

L'enseignement de l'écrit en français langue étrangère (FLE) constitue une compétence complexe qui mobilise à la fois des savoirs linguistiques, cognitifs et socioculturels. Dans un contexte marqué par l'évolution des pratiques pédagogiques et l'émergence des technologies numériques, la formation des enseignants à cet enseignement spécifique présente plusieurs lacunes, notamment un cloisonnement entre théorie et pratique, ainsi qu'une intégration souvent superficielle des outils numériques.

Pour répondre à ces défis, cette recherche propose une approche intégrative articulant trois dimensions complémentaires : les fondements théoriques (approches communicative et actionnelle, processus d'écriture), les pratiques de terrain (observation, expérimentation, analyse réflexive) et l'utilisation critique des outils numériques (Google Docs, Padlet). La méthodologie combine analyse documentaire, observations participantes, entretiens semi-directifs et conception de modules innovants.

Les résultats mettent en évidence la nécessité de développer chez les enseignants une posture réflexive, des compétences métacognitives et une maîtrise raisonnée des technologies éducatives. Face aux nouveaux enjeux comme l'intelligence artificielle, le multilinguisme et l'hybridation des apprentissages, cette approche multidimensionnelle apparaît comme la clé d'une formation adaptée aux réalités contemporaines de l'enseignement du FLE.

Mots-clés : *Didactique de l'écrit, Formation enseignante, Approche intégrative, Numérique éducatif, Pratique réflexive.*

Introduction

Writing in French as a foreign language represents a fundamental skill, the mastery of which directly influences the academic and professional success of learners. As Dolz and Schneuwly (1998) have shown, this skill goes far beyond the strictly linguistic framework by simultaneously mobilizing cognitive and sociocultural dimensions. In the current context marked by the rapid evolution of writing practices under the influence of digital technologies, the question of teacher training for this specific teaching is of particular importance.

Notre recherche part d'un constat préoccupant : les dispositifs de formation existants présentent plusieurs insuffisances majeures. On observe notamment un cloisonnement excessif entre théorie et pratique, une intégration superficielle des outils numériques, ainsi qu'une discontinuité entre formation initiale et continue. Comme le souligne Bucheton (2009, p.112), la formation des enseignants ne peut se limiter à une simple transmission de méthodes, mais doit viser la construction d'une compétence professionnelle contextualisée, fondée sur l'analyse des pratiques, la réflexivité et l'intégration raisonnée du numérique.

Our study is based on two central hypotheses. First, an integrative approach combining theoretical reflection, analysis of practices, and experimentation with digital tools would better prepare teachers for contemporary challenges. Second, the development of metacognitive skills among trainers would promote better adaptation to the diverse needs of learners. These hypotheses lead us to pursue three main objectives: to establish a critical inventory of existing training programs, to identify key skills for effective teaching, and to propose a conceptual framework for more appropriate training programs.

To address these complex challenges, we have developed a rigorous qualitative methodology combining four complementary approaches. Documentary analysis of existing training programs will provide a detailed overview. Participant observations of training sessions, guided by a standardized analysis grid, will provide access to actual practices. A series of semi-structured interviews with various stakeholders (trainers, trainee teachers, experienced practitioners) will provide rich data on representations and needs. Finally, from an action research perspective, we will design and evaluate innovative training modules incorporating the principles of the integrative approach.

This multidimensional methodology has the advantage of combining different data sources and points of view, making it possible to grasp the complexity of the issue while maintaining a strong anchoring in the realities of the field. The complementarity of these approaches should make it possible not only to produce solid scientific knowledge, but also to formulate concrete operational recommendations for improving training practices. The articulation between theoretical reflection, field practice and reasoned integration of digital technology thus appears to be the key to more effective teacher training, better adapted to the contemporary challenges of teaching writing in FFL.

1. Teaching writing in FFL, a skill to be built

1.1. Theoretical approaches to teaching writing

The teaching of writing in French as a foreign language has undergone a profound transformation in recent decades, reflecting the evolution of pedagogical trends in language teaching. Initially focused on a normative and structuralist perspective, the pedagogy of writing emphasized the reproduction of textual models and the systematic correction of linguistic er-

rors. This traditional approach centered on form rather than meaning, considered writing essentially as a finished object to be produced according to predetermined standards.

As S. Plane and B. Schneuwly (2000, p. 78) rightly point out, this restrictive conception has gradually given way to more global approaches: «The teaching/learning of writing cannot be limited to training in textual production; it is a question of introducing learners into a culture of writing, by mobilizing linguistic, discursive and socio-cognitive knowledge». This paradigm shift has taken place in two major stages.

First, the advent of the communicative approach in the 1970s and 1980s redefined the aims of teaching writing. It was no longer seen as a simple linguistic coding activity, but as an authentic act of communication, involving constant adaptation to the context of enunciation and the characteristics of the recipient. Textual coherence, pragmatic relevance and the sociocultural dimension became essential parameters in the evaluation of written productions.

This development paved the way for the action-oriented approach, enshrined in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). From this perspective, writing is seen as a genuine instrument of social action. Learners are no longer mere text producers, but social actors required to perform meaningful tasks: writing professional emails, publishing posts on social networks, completing administrative forms, etc. These activities, anchored in real or realistic situations, mobilize an integrated set of language, intercultural, and pragmatic skills.

Alongside these developments, didactics research has highlighted the process dimension of writing. The seminal work of Hayes and Flower (1980) showed that the act of writing is not reduced to a finished product, but constitutes a complex pro-

cess involving several interdependent phases: planning, textualisation, revision and rewriting. This conception has had major repercussions on teaching practices, leading to particular attention being paid to the learner's journey rather than just the final result. Teachers are now required to support each stage of the process, developing metacognitive strategies and a capacity for self-assessment in learners.

Finally, recent research in psycholinguistics and cognitive neuroscience has highlighted the complexity of the cognitive mechanisms involved in writing in a foreign language. This activity simultaneously mobilizes working memory, conceptual planning, attentional control, and the management of linguistic resources in the L2, making it one of the most demanding skills to acquire. For the teacher, this requires the ability to identify the specific difficulties of each learner and to offer differentiated remediation measures.

These various developments reflect the growing complexity of the field of writing teaching in FFL, which now incorporates linguistic, cognitive, social, and cultural dimensions. They imply a profound transformation of teaching practices and, consequently, of teacher training methods.

1.2. Specificities of FFL teacher training

Effectively training teachers to teach writing in FFL represents a complex challenge that requires a comprehensive approach to professional skills. As C. Puren (2006, p. 48) rightly points out, this training cannot be limited to the transmission of linguistic knowledge: «The competence to teach a language does not reside solely in mastery of the linguistic system, but in the ability to design, implement and evaluate learning devices adapted to contexts, audiences and objectives». This broader conception of teaching competence implies developing genuine didactic and pedagogical expertise among those trained.

Current institutional frameworks, such as the Council of Europe's Framework of Competences for Language Teachers and the CIEP Framework, effectively emphasize this professional dimension. They particularly emphasize the need to master a set of key skills:

- The ability to design teaching sequences adapted to different text genres.
- The ability to lead varied and motivating writing activities.
- Mastery of formative and summative assessment techniques.
- The flexibility required to adapt teaching to diverse contexts.

These skills must be acquired and perfected throughout a career, combining initial and continuing education. However, it is clear that the teaching of writing often remains the neglected subject of training curricula. Recent studies show that:

- In initial training, writing is frequently relegated to the background, in favor of oral skills, which are perceived as more urgent to develop.
- Continuing education programs tend to favor a technical approach, focusing on digital tools without always incorporating them into in-depth didactic thinking.

This problematic situation is compounded by a significant gap between institutional prescriptions and realities on the ground. The action-oriented approach, although theoretically sound, faces several obstacles in its implementation:

- Time constraints often incompatible with the lengthy processes required for writing.
- Assessment systems sometimes unsuited to new process-based approaches.

- Divergent cultural representations of what constitutes "good" written production.
- Resistance linked to deep-rooted pedagogical traditions.

These tensions reveal the need to fundamentally rethink training systems to better equip teachers to face the complex challenges of teaching writing in a FFL context. Truly effective training should help overcome these contradictions by developing teachers' ability to analyze and adapt to the diversity of teaching situations encountered.

1.3. Didactic and pedagogical issues linked to writing

The teaching of writing in French as a foreign language faces several persistent difficulties, well documented by didactics research. The first major challenge concerns the assessment of written productions, which raises complex questions. This fundamental tension is expressed in several concrete dilemmas: should we prioritize linguistic correctness or the richness of ideas? How should we weigh the quality of the final text and the efforts made during the writing process? These questions reveal the limitations of traditional assessment grids and call for more flexible approaches, combining summative and formative assessment, and adapted to the specificities of each learning context.

The issue of learner motivation represents a second major pitfall. For many students, especially those who struggle with writing in their mother tongue, writing in FFL can become a source of apprehension and discouragement. This phenomenon can be explained by several factors: the significant cognitive load required by writing in their second language, the feeling of vulnerability in the face of correction, and sometimes the perceived lack of relevance of the proposed tasks. To counter these difficulties, it appears essential to design authentic and motivating writing situations, connected to the learners' real

interests and needs. Activities such as collaborative writing, publishing texts, or corresponding with native speakers can thus contribute to strengthening student engagement.

Managing group heterogeneity is a third major challenge. In FFL classes, especially in university settings or language centers, teachers must deal with extremely diverse learner profiles: differences in language levels, learning objectives (academic, professional, or personal), cognitive styles, and attitudes toward writing. This diversity requires the ability to differentiate teaching approaches, for example by offering flexible instructions, personalized learning paths, or optional activities. Such pedagogical flexibility, however, requires solid didactic expertise and a good understanding of learning processes.

A final, often underestimated issue concerns the influence of learners' mother tongue. L1 can play an ambivalent role in the acquisition of writing in FFL: sometimes facilitating (through the transfer of similar writing strategies or rhetorical structures), sometimes hindering (through interference at the lexical, syntactic, or discursive level). Knowledge of the linguistic and cultural specificities of learners' L1 would allow teachers to anticipate certain difficulties and adapt their teaching approach. However, as several researchers regret, teacher training still gives too little space to contrastive linguistics and the consideration of multilingual repertoires in the teaching of writing.

These various challenges—assessment, motivation, differentiation, and the influence of L1—illustrate the complexity of teaching writing in FFL and the need to train teachers in these multiple dimensions. They also demonstrate that solutions cannot be straightforward, but must be adapted to specific teaching contexts and learners' particular profiles.

2. Practical training: between professional gestures and appropriation of procedures

Initial teacher training in teaching writing in French as a foreign language (FFL) cannot be achieved solely through the transmission of theoretical knowledge, which is nevertheless essential. Thus, M. Tardif, (2006, p. 5) stipulates that «the observation of classroom practices and the analysis of real-life or simulated situations allows future teachers to test their representations and to construct a professional judgment based on experience». By virtue of his statement, it is important to note the essential nature of professional training in a situation, combining theoretical knowledge and experience.

The practical anchoring of the training is based on three fundamental pillars. First, guided observation of teaching practices allows theoretical knowledge to be compared with the complexity of the field, to analyze professional gestures in their real context and to develop a critical view of different teaching postures. Second, active experimentation is based on professional scenarios, such as micro-teaching, simulations of problem situations or the analysis of concrete cases, in order to test teaching methods. Finally, the co-construction of knowledge involves individual and collective reflective feedback, exchanges between peers to develop shared solutions and collaborative work on concrete projects. This experiential approach aims to develop key skills in future teachers: the adaptation of interventions to the needs of learners, a reflective posture to evolve their practices and essential pedagogical flexibility in the face of the diversity of teaching contexts.

The training is anchored around three practical dimensions: guided observation (to analyze real-life practices), active experimentation (through role-playing), and the co-construction of knowledge (through collective reflection). This approach develops skills in adaptation, reflexivity, and pedagogical flexibil-

ity among preservice teachers. The challenge is significant: the goal is to train professionals capable not of mechanically applying pedagogical recipes, but rather of constructing responses adapted to the complex situations they will encounter in their daily practice. This training, through and for practice must, however, remain closely linked to theoretical contributions, in a fruitful dialectical dynamic where each dimension nourishes and challenges the other.

2.1. Observation and support of field practices

Access to the teaching profession in FFL begins with immersion in the reality of classrooms, a decisive step in developing practical skills. The systematic observation of authentic teaching situations serves as an essential lever for this training, allowing future teachers to test their theoretical knowledge against the realities of the field: confrontation of didactic models with their concrete application, understanding of the variability of contexts, and awareness of the gaps between institutional prescriptions and real practice. The analysis of sessions (live or via recordings) nourishes a professional culture by sharpening the eye on didactic choices (instructions, activities), teacher-learner interactions during writing, or even feedback strategies. To strengthen this approach, structured support is crucial: observation grids targeting specific skills (time management, differentiation), reflective logbooks, collective debriefings, or dialogues between observers and observed teachers. Framed in this way, this practice forges a “professional perspective” – the ability to decipher teaching situations in order to draw lessons from them – and lays the foundations for a reflective posture essential to the continuous evolution of practices throughout a career.

Professionalization in FFL stems from immersion in classrooms, where critical observation of real-life practices plays a central role. By confronting theories and realities (variety of contexts, institutional gaps), by analyzing teaching gestures and interactions, trainees develop expertise. Observation grids, reflective journals, and peer debates optimize this approach, building a lasting "professional perspective" and reflective stance.

2.2. Experimentation in training: workshops, micro-teaching and self-confrontation

The training of FFL teachers in the teaching of writing is structured around an action-based pedagogy, favoring concrete experimentation as a driving force for learning. This approach is divided into three complementary phases. First, didactic design workshops allow future teachers, through collaborative work, to master the development of complete teaching sequences, from the creation of writing activities adapted to different levels to the integration of the action-based approach in realistic scenarios, without forgetting the design of effective feedback systems. Next comes the micro-teaching phase, where trainees, in a secure environment, test facilitation techniques, experiment with various postures (guide, mediator, expert) and refine their time and interaction management, while benefiting from immediate formative feedback.

Systematic reflective analysis (individual and group debriefings, identification of strengths and areas for improvement, and theoretical perspective) helps transform experience into lasting skills. This alternation between design, practice, and reflection offers triple added value: contextualized appropriation of know-how, development of a critical reflective stance, and preparation for the complexity of the field. Thus, pre-service teachers gradually build their professional identity while ac-

quiring the essential tools to teach writing in FFL with agility and creativity.

The training in teaching writing in FFL relies on an active pedagogy combining three phases: collaborative design (sequences, activities, feedback), micro-teaching (experimentation of postures and techniques), and reflective analysis (debriefings, avenues for improvement). This cycle allows skills to be anchored in practice while cultivating reflexivity, which is essential for dealing with the complexity of classrooms.

2.3. Co-construction of pedagogical knowledge

The evolution of concepts in language teaching has profoundly redefined approaches to teacher training, as M. Gremmo (2011, p. 78) points out: «Training cannot be reduced to a transfer of knowledge, but must be built on a collaborative dynamic where exchange and critical reflection reinvent practices». This interactive paradigm is particularly relevant for the teaching of writing in FFL, the complexity of which requires a collective approach. Based on co-construction, this philosophy values the experiential and tacit knowledge of teachers, while favoring horizontal exchanges rather than a vertical transmission model.

Concretely, it takes the form of mechanisms such as communities of practice, pedagogical co-design workshops, and collective analysis of professional situations. These spaces allow for the confrontation of representations, the pooling of resources, and the development of solutions adapted to the challenges of the field, thus fostering a shared professional culture. Educational research attests to this: such collective intelligence generates contextualized innovations, transcends the limits of prescriptive approaches, and consolidates professional identity.

More than a method, this collaborative approach involves a metamorphosis of the profession—a transition from a position of performer to that of reflective practitioner, anchored in a learning community. Ultimately, it is through this synergy that FFL writing training becomes more effective, providing teachers with the tools to respond nimbly to the complexity of classrooms.

The collaborative model, the linchpin of modern FFL training (Gremmo, 2011), replaces vertical transmission with the co-construction of knowledge. Shared workshops, practice analyses, and peer exchanges foster innovation and reflexivity, transforming the teacher into an actor in a learning community—key to mastering the complex teaching of writing.

3. Digital technology as a lever for transformation in the teaching of writing

The integration of digital technology into the teaching/learning of French as a foreign language is no longer a simple technological trend, but a structural transformation of teaching practices. As F. Mangenot (2013, p. 112) points out: «Digital tools offer a multitude of possibilities for transforming teaching practices: they allow for the diversification of materials, the encouragement of collaboration, and the adaptation of teaching to the specific needs of learners.»

The teaching of writing, in particular, is profoundly affected by these developments: it is no longer just a matter of teaching how to write, but also where, for whom, with what tools and according to what digital methods. In this perspective, training teachers in the didactic, critical and creative use of digital tools is becoming a major challenge to ensure relevant training adapted to the current realities of teaching FFL.

3.1. Digital Tools for Training

The evolution of digital technologies has considerably enriched FFL teacher training programs, particularly in the area of writing instruction. These tools offer innovative pedagogical possibilities that are profoundly transforming training practices.

Collaborative platforms such as *Moodle*, *Google Docs*, and *Padlet* have revolutionized the approach to writing by enabling unprecedented interactions between instructors and learners. *Google Docs*, for example, facilitates real-time collaborative writing while offering precise commenting and change tracking features. This tool encourages a process-based approach to writing, where each stage of text production can be accompanied and commented on. Teachers-in-training thus learn to guide the writing process while developing their own ability to provide constructive feedback.

Padlet, meanwhile, introduces a visual and creative dimension to writing instruction. This platform allows for immediate and aesthetically pleasing publication of writing, thus fostering personal expression and learner motivation. Student teachers are discovering how to use these tools to diversify writing situations and adapt their teaching methods to different learner profiles.

These digital technologies offer several major advantages for teacher training. First, they allow for individualized progress monitoring, as each piece of writing can be annotated, corrected, and improved in a targeted manner. Second, they facilitate collaborative work, essential for developing shared professional skills. Finally, they offer opportunities for metacognitive reflection, as student teachers can retrospectively analyze the progress of their own writing or that of their peers.

Using these tools in training also prepares future teachers for the realities of contemporary FFL classrooms, where digital technology plays an increasingly important role. They learn to integrate these technologies effectively into their future teaching practices, while developing a critical eye for their uses. This dual skill - technical and reflective - now constitutes a key element of teaching professionalism in the field of teaching writing in foreign languages.

3.2. Developing a critical approach to digital technology in writing instruction

The proliferation of digital tools in FFL teaching requires in-depth teacher training that goes beyond mere technical mastery. As N. Ferry (2016, p. 23) aptly points out, «the use of digital technology in the classroom must go beyond the simple digitization of traditional tools. It is about encouraging critical reflection on technological uses, in order to avoid the excesses of automation and to foster ethical, creative, and collaborative digital education». This critical perspective is essential to ensure the relevant pedagogical integration of technology in writing instruction.

The pedagogical value of digital technology in FFL writing instruction is neither inherent nor automatic. While these tools undoubtedly offer transformative potential – enhancing learner engagement through gamified platforms like Kahoot! and enabling real-time collaboration via Google Docs – their misuse can inadvertently undermine the very learning outcomes they seek to promote. Research consistently demonstrates that without proper pedagogical framing, digital tools risk fostering what Selwyn (2020) terms "zombie pedagogies," where flashy interfaces mask shallow learning. Two particularly pernicious effects emerge: the **fetishization of technology** as an end in itself, and the **deskilling effect** of over-automation, where

grammar checkers and AI writing assistants short-circuit the cognitive struggle essential for writing development (Plane & Schneuwly, 2000).

This paradox necessitates a radical rethinking of teacher training programs. Beyond basic digital competency, FFL educators require **critical digital literacy** – the ability to interrogate technologies through multiple lenses:

- **Pedagogical soundness:** Can Padlet's virtual walls genuinely scaffold the writing process better than physical post-its, or does the medium distort the task?
- **Cognitive impact:** Does Grammarly's auto-correction enhance metalinguistic awareness, or create dependency?
- **Ethical dimensions:** How do algorithmically generated writing suggestions from tools like ChatGPT reinforce linguistic power structures?

Effective training must therefore cultivate teachers' capacity for **technology triage** – the systematic evaluation of tools against three criteria: alignment with writing theory (e.g., process vs. genre approaches), developmental appropriateness, and potential for fostering learner autonomy. For instance, while automated feedback systems may suit advanced learners refining nuance, beginners benefit more from tools like Etherpad that emphasize collaborative meaning-making.

Ultimately, the goal is to develop what Bucheton (2009) calls "**adaptive expertise**" – the ability to judiciously select, combine and sometimes reject technologies based on shifting classroom contexts. Only through such critical praxis can digital tools transcend their status as mere modernity signifiers and become genuine levers for writing development in FFL

3.3. Innovative Practices and Pedagogical Hybridization

The integration of digital technologies into the teaching of writing in French as a Foreign Language (FFL) has catalyzed a pedagogical revolution, fostering innovative practices that redefine traditional methodologies. By expanding the range of available materials, diversifying writing formats, and enabling dynamic learner interactions, these technological advancements have transformed writing instruction into a more engaging, collaborative, and socially embedded process. One of the most significant breakthroughs lies in **remote collaborative writing**, which allows learners to co-construct texts in real time, irrespective of geographical constraints. This practice not only enhances linguistic competence but also cultivates critical 21st-century skills, including collective meaning negotiation, peer feedback literacy, and adaptive writing strategies. Such interactions shift writing from a solitary exercise to a **dialogic and socially situated activity**, aligning with sociocultural theories of learning that emphasize knowledge co-construction (Vygotsky, 1978).

However, the effective implementation of these tools presents a **dual challenge** for FFL educators. Professionally, teachers must acquire new competencies to harness digital tools pedagogically, including designing scaffolded activities that leverage technology's affordances, facilitating collaborative writing dynamics, and mediating online interactions to ensure equitable participation. Didactically, they must strike a balance between innovation and pedagogical intentionality, ensuring technology serves clearly defined learning outcomes rather than driving instruction arbitrarily. Research underscores the risks of "**technology for technology's sake**" (Selwyn, 2020), advocating instead for a critical approach where digital tools amplify – rather than replace – proven writing pedagogies.

When thoughtfully integrated, digital technologies transcend mere modernization, enabling a **paradigm shift** in FFL writing

instruction. They promote learner autonomy through multi-modal writing tasks (e.g., blogs, podcasts, and hypertexts), foster intercultural exchanges via transnational collaborations, and provide data-driven feedback through learning analytics. Yet, their full potential hinges on **systematic teacher training** that emphasizes pedagogical design over technical proficiency alone. As argued by Mangenot (2013), the future of FFL writing lies in **hybrid models** that blend digital innovation with theoretical rigor, ensuring technology acts as a catalyst for deeper learning. Only then can it truly elevate writing proficiency in a globalized, digitally mediated world.

Conclusion

Teaching writing in French as a foreign language is now a complex and multidimensional field, requiring an integrative approach that combines three fundamental pillars: theoretical foundations, field practices, and the pedagogical integration of digital technology. As J. Jager (2019, p. 210) aptly observes, this articulation constitutes a real challenge: «Language teaching, and in particular writing, is a field where the articulation between theory and practice remains a constant challenge, especially since digital technology offers new perspectives without, however, erasing didactic fundamentals». This productive tension between these different dimensions appears to be at the heart of contemporary issues in teacher training.

Our analysis reveals that these three axes – theoretical, practical, and technological – enter into a complex dialectical relationship. On the one hand, they complement and enrich each other: theory illuminates practice, which in turn nourishes theoretical reflection, while digital technology offers new tools for

this interaction. On the other hand, as we have observed, tensions can emerge when these dimensions are not properly articulated. The action-oriented approach, for example, while theoretically sound, often runs up against the constraints of real-world educational contexts. Similarly, digital technologies, if not integrated wisely, risk becoming educational gadgets rather than genuine levers for learning.

Given this observation, we advocate for a three-dimensional training model that:

- Is firmly anchored in the contributions of research in language and text teaching
- Promotes reflective experimentation through concrete approaches such as micro-teaching or action research
- Integrates digital technology in a critical and creative manner as a tool for learning

This model is particularly relevant in the face of the emerging challenges described by N. Selwyn (2020, p. 45): «The rise of technology, coupled with artificial intelligence, is redefining the role of the teacher and transforming the very nature of teacher training. Pedagogy must evolve in response to these challenges to prepare learners and trainers for a constantly changing world». Three major challenges in particular emerge: the rational integration of generative AI into writing processes, the pedagogical management of the growing multilingualism of learners, and adaptation to new hybrid teaching-learning methods.

Ultimately, training in teaching writing in FFL can no longer be considered an accessory skill. On the contrary, it represents a central element for language education adapted to the needs of the 21st century - an education that must reconcile theoretical rigor, practical grounding, and technological innovation. Only under this condition will we be able to train teachers capable of effectively supporting learners in the develop-

ment of writing skills that are at once solid, creative, and truly operational in various social and professional contexts.

Bibliography

- Bucheton, D. (2009). *Professional gestures in the classroom: Ethics and practices for the times ahead*. ESF.
- Chiss, J.-L., & David, J. (2012). *French Language Didactics and Linguistics*. Armand Colin.
- Cuq, J.-P., & Gruca, I. (2017). *Course on Teaching French as a Foreign and Second Language*. Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.
- Dejean-Thircuir, C., & Mangenot, F. (Eds., 2020). *Collaborative Online Learning*. ENS Editions.
- Dolz, J., & Schneuwly, B. (1998). *Teaching oral and written skills: Approaches and methods*. De Boeck.
- Ferry, N. (2016). Digital technology in education: Challenges and issues. *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 195, 23-34.
- Gremmo, M. (2011). Training practices in language teaching: Towards a collaborative model. *International Journal of Languages and Cultures*, 25(2), 78-93.
- Guichon, N. (2019). *Integrating ICT in Language Teaching*. Didier.
- Jager, J. (2019). The role of digital technology in language teacher training: Between complementarity and questioning of practices. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 45(3), 210-228.
- Lebrun, M., & Lecoq, J. (2015). *Flipped Classrooms*. De Boeck.

- Mangenot, F. (2013). Digital technology and writing practices: Didactic and pedagogical perspectives. *Research in Education Journal*, 25(2), 112-128.
- Pegaz Paquet, A. (2021). "Blogs as Tools for Creative Writing in FFL". *Research in Language Education*, 36(1).
- Plane, S., & Schneuwly, B. (2000). *The didactics of writing: A cognitive approach*. De Boeck.
- Puren, C. (2006). The action-oriented approach: Towards a new didactic coherence. *Les Langues Modernes*, 2, 40-60.
- Selwyn, N. (2020). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Soubrié, T. (2016). "ICT and Writing in FFL: What Competencies for Teachers?". *Alsic*, 19(1).
- Tardif, M. (2006). The teaching profession and professionalization. *College Pedagogy*, 19(3), 5-12.