ALTRALANG Journal
e-ISSN: 2710-8619 p-ISSN: 2710-7922
Volume 8 Issue 2 / October 2026 pp. 206-218

Novelty and Clarity: What INAPI Rejections Reveal about the Language Needs of Algerian Student-Entrepreneurs

Souraya Bouzidi[1*]
[1]*University of Khenchela Abbas Laghrour, Algeria*
ILLAAC Laboratory
souraya.bouzidi@univ-khenchela.dz
Nadia Idri [2]
[2]*University of Bejaia Abderrahmane Mira, Algeria*
nadia.ahouari@univ-bejaia.dz
Hichem Souhali[3]
[3]*University of Batna 2 Mustapha Ben Boulaid, Algeria*
hichemhicham2011@gmail.com

Received: 25/06/2026, **Accepted:** 11/10/2026, **Published:** 31/10/2026

ABSTRACT: *The institutionalisation of the student-entrepreneur in the Algerian university, following Ministerial Decree No. 1275 establishing the Technology and Innovation Support Centres (CATI), has multiplied patent applications filed with INAPI (Algerian National Institute of Industrial Property). Yet a substantial share of these applications fails. This study analyses an authentic corpus of thirty-five notifications issued by INAPI in response to applications filed by Abbas Laghrour University of Khenchela. Drawing on genre analysis and French for Specific Purposes (FSP), the analysis reveals a dual, institutionally attested obstacle: a massive substantive obstacle, namely the lack of novelty (Article 04 of Ordinance No. 03-07) and the ground for twenty-seven substantive rejections, and a standardised discursive obstacle consisting of claims deemed insufficiently clear and poorly structured (Article 27), the object of eight strictly identical admissibility reports. Rather than opposing the technical to the discursive, these data show that the students' difficulty lies at the junction of the two: failing to situate an invention within a documented state of the art is as much a prior art search deficit as a discursive failure to write the already-known. The study outlines the principles of an FSP module dedicated to the genres of intellectual property.*

KEYWORDS: FSP, Genre Analysis, Patent, Novelty, Claims, INAPI, Student-Entrepreneur

* Corresponding author
ALTRALANG Journal / © 2026 The Author(s). Published by the University of Oran 2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed, Algeria.
This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Introduction

The promulgation of Ministerial Decree No. 1275 on the creation of Technology and Innovation Support Centres (CATI) in Algerian universities marked a significant turning point in national innovation policy. By placing the university start-up at the heart of the academic project, this text opened the way for a new student figure: the student-entrepreneur, bearer of a project that may lead to the filing of a patent application with INAPI (Algerian National Institute of Industrial Property).

Yet observation in the field reveals a striking paradox: a notable proportion of application files submitted by student-entrepreneurs does not succeed. Applications encounter INAPI notifications that interrupt their progress. The first temptation, from the perspective of the language didactician, would be to attribute these failures to a purely writing deficit, a poor command of specialised written language. Examination of the real corpus calls for a more nuanced and accurate reading.

The notifications issued by INAPI do not communicate a single message, but two. On the one hand, the majority of them signal that the proposed invention is not new: the claimed formulation combines elements that are already known and published, and thus runs up against the novelty requirement set out in Article 04 of Ordinance No. 03-07. On the other hand, a second set of notifications signals that the claims are "insufficiently clear and poorly structured" and must be reformulated according to a specific model, under the admissibility examination (Article 27). Failure thus stems from a dual obstacle: substantive and discursive.

This finding shifts the didactic question. It is no longer simply a matter of asking whether support frameworks integrate training in intellectual property genres, but of understanding how the two obstacles are articulated, since they are not unrelated to each other. Situating an invention within a state of the art, a precondition of novelty, is simultaneously a documentary operation (searching for prior art) and a discursive operation (writing the relation of one's invention to what is already known). It is precisely at this junction that French for Specific Purposes (FSP) and genre analysis can intervene.

To substantiate this analysis, the study draws on an authentic corpus: thirty-five notifications issued by INAPI in response to files submitted by Abbas Laghrour University of Khenchela during the April 2025 filing campaign. These documents, which constitute the institutional trace of rejection grounds, offer an analytical material of rare heuristic value: virtually all research in intellectual property linguistics focuses on granted patents, never on rejection notifications.

Three questions structure the study:
1/ What are the actual grounds, as attested by INAPI, for the failure of student applications?
2/ To what extent and in what forms do these grounds relate to the discursive dimension?
3/ What FSP framework would prepare student-entrepreneurs for this dual obstacle?

1. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

1.1. The Patent as a Professional Discursive Genre

Within the tradition of genre analysis initiated by Swales (1990), a discursive genre is defined as a class of communicative events sharing rhetorical purposes recognised by members of the discourse community that produced it. The patent fits squarely within this definition: it constitutes a highly codified genre whose formal and rhetorical conventions are stabilised by international legal frameworks (Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, 1979; World Intellectual Property Organization, n.d.) and national frameworks (Algerian Ordinance No. 03-07).

Bhatia (1993) developed this perspective further by introducing the notion of "hybrid genre", designating texts that draw simultaneously on several discourse communities. The patent is emblematic of this hybridity: it articulates a legal discourse (delimitation of rights), a technical discourse (description of the invention), and a rhetorical discourse (argumentation of novelty and inventive activity). This tripartition, which Bhatia (2004)

terms a "colony of genres", generates a drafting complexity that non-initiates rarely perceive in its entirety. Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995) showed that mastering a genre is not reducible to applying formal rules: it constitutes "genre knowledge" acquired through situated participation in a community, which explains why students who are otherwise competent in academic writing fail when confronted with a genre whose producing community they have never inhabited. Myers (1990), in his foundational study of scientific and patent writing, also demonstrated that the construction of novelty is a fundamentally rhetorical act, negotiated before a community of experts.

Two distinct requirements of patent law must be carefully distinguished, since the corpus shows that they correspond to different stages of examination. The first is novelty, established by Article 04 of Ordinance No. 03-07: an invention is only patentable if it is not encompassed within the state of the art. The second is the clarity and structuring of the claims, required at the admissibility examination stage (Article 27): the claims must delimit protection precisely and unambiguously. The pioneering work of Charrow R. P. and Charrow V. R. (1979) on legal language established that the writing conventions of law create specific comprehension barriers, independent of the drafter's general linguistic competence, a finding directly transposable to the difficulty students face with claims. A third requirement, sufficiency of disclosure (Article 23), stipulates that the invention must be described clearly enough for a person skilled in the art to carry it out; as will be shown, this ground is never invoked in our corpus, a distinction that is decisive for the analysis. This finding applies to Algerian patent discourse: student-entrepreneurs do not master the writing conventions specific to the patent application genre, independently of their level of general linguistic competence. "The patent is not simply a technical document; it is a rhetorical act that constructs novelty, claims ownership, and disciplines the reader into a specific mode of engagement with the invention" (Bhatia, 2004, 48).

In this regard, Maingueneau (2014) reminds us that every discursive genre is subject to a specific "regime of veridicality", that is, to criteria for evaluating validity specific to the community that produces it. In the case of the patent, this regime is doubly constrained: by the law (legal validity) and by the reference technical community (technical validity). The student-entrepreneur, trained in other discursive regimes such as the academic essay, internship report, or oral presentation, finds himself confronted with a change of regime for which no training has prepared him.

1.2. Novelty and Inscription in the State of the Art: An Operation as Discursive as It Is Documentary

The novelty requirement is often perceived as purely technical. This perception is misleading. Demonstrating novelty first requires knowing the state of the art, and thus conducting a prior art search; but it also requires writing it, that is, discursively constructing the relation between the proposed invention and what already exists. Swales's (1990) CARS (Create a Research Space) model precisely describes this movement by which an author establishes a territory, signals a gap within it, and then occupies that gap: transposed to the patent, this rhetorical schema requires mapping the prior art before claiming a solution. Bhatia (1993) showed that the rhetorical structure of the patent includes precisely a movement of description of the state of the art and identification of a gap, from which the invention presents itself as a solution.

The sociology of science provides a complementary perspective to this linguistic view. Latour (1987), in his analysis of scientific practices, introduces the notion of inscription to designate the operation by which a technical object is made mobile and recognisable by a community through written traces. Applied to the patent, this notion makes it possible to understand why an invention not inscribed within a documented state of the art remains invisible to the examiner: it has not accomplished the inscription operation that would make it communicable and evaluable within the community of industrial property. This perspective articulates the documentary dimension (the prior art search as collection of traces) and the discursive dimension (their integration into the patent text as an act of inscription). Omitting this movement, or conducting it without prior documentary research, amounts to exposing the application to rejection on grounds of absence of novelty. Connor and Mauranen (1999) have pointed out that these rhetorical moves vary according to academic cultures

and are not spontaneously mastered by speakers unacquainted with the dominant conventions, an observation pertinent to the Algerian multilingual context.

This articulation is at the heart of our analysis. When the INAPI examiner opposes a series of prior art documents to an application, he does not merely sanction a technical deficiency: he sanctions the absence of a discursive and documentary act that the applicant failed to perform.

1.3. French for Specific Purposes as a Didactic Framework

FSP, as theorised by Mangiante and Parpette (2004), is defined as an approach to French language teaching built on a prior analysis of the language needs of a specific audience in a professional or academic situation. The FSP approach rests on four founding stages: identification of the request, needs analysis, collection and analysis of authentic data, and didactic elaboration.

Hutchinson and Waters (1987), forerunners of ESP (English for Specific Purposes) of which FSP is the French-language counterpart, established the operational distinction between "target needs" (needs in the target situation) and "learning needs" (needs to learn how to cope with it). In our context, target needs correspond to the requirements of filing with INAPI: knowing how to situate one's invention within the state of the art and to structure the claims, while learning needs concern mastery of the generic conventions of the patent and of the documentary operations that underpin them. The articulation of FSP and genre analysis thus constitutes a coherent epistemological framework: genre analysis provides the descriptive tools for characterising the rejection grounds observed, while FSP offers the didactic framework for addressing them pedagogically.

This perspective converges with Wingate's (2015) notion of academic literacy, according to which mastery of disciplinary discursive conventions is only acquired through socialisation into the textual practices specific to each knowledge community, which grounds the necessity of explicit teaching of intellectual property genres.

1.4. Algerian Institutional Context

The CATIs were established within the framework of a national policy to promote innovation and university entrepreneurship in Algeria. Ministerial Decree No. 1275 defines their principal missions: supporting students and researcher-teachers bearing innovative projects, facilitating patent filing procedures with INAPI, and strengthening links between the university, the socioeconomic world, and incubators. The CATIs are thus positioned as institutional interfaces between academic training and the innovation ecosystem.

However, the texts governing the CATIs provide for neither training in prior art research nor training in the drafting of intellectual property documents. The support offered is essentially administrative (file compilation) and technical (feasibility assessment), leaving in the shadow both the documentary dimension and the discursive dimension of the filing process.

The INAPI is the public body responsible for receiving, examining, and issuing industrial property titles in Algeria. In accordance with Ordinance No. 03-07 of 19 July 2003, an application undergoes an admissibility examination (formal verification, fee payment, clarity and structuring of claims under Article 27) and then a substantive examination covering novelty and inventive activity in particular (Article 04). At each stage, INAPI may issue a notification inviting the applicant to regularise or correct the application within a given deadline, failing which the application is deemed withdrawn (Article 28).

These notifications constitute a corpus of exceptional analytical value: they explicitly identify, on the basis of specific legal grounds, the rejection grounds retained by the examiners, offering direct access to the institutional evaluation criteria of the patent genre in the Algerian context.

1.5. State of Research on FSP and Intellectual Property in Algeria

Research in intellectual property linguistics has developed mainly in the English-speaking world. Bhatia (1993) provided the first systematic analyses of the rhetorical structure of patents in English, identifying a four-step "moves" structure: definition of the technical domain, description of the state of the art, identification of a gap, and presentation of the invention as a solution. Bazerman (1994) complemented this perspective by analysing the patent as a social act rooted in specific institutional and economic practices.

In the French-speaking context, research articulating linguistics and intellectual property is rarer. While the analysis of legal and technical discourse in French is well established, the application of a genre analysis perspective to the patent and, even more so, its didactic exploitation within FSP remain largely unexplored. In Algeria, work on intellectual property falls essentially within the legal field and does not address the language and didactic dimension of filing, which situates the present contribution within a largely open research space. Regarding FSP and entrepreneurship, Parpette (2012) underlined the necessity of extending FSP approaches to emerging professional genres linked to the digital economy and to innovation. The present research follows this line by applying the FSP approach to an object hitherto unaddressed in French-language didactics literature: the "prior art search / claims drafting" pairing in the Algerian university context.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design and Corpus

The corpus consists of thirty-five (35) notifications issued by INAPI in response to patent applications filed by Abbas Laghrour University of Khenchela, all pertaining to the April 2025 filing campaign. The documents were collected in the context of the CATI's institutional activities; personal data were neutralised for the analysis, with only the filing numbers (in the format DZ/P/2025/xxx) retained as technical identifiers.

The corpus is divided into two documentary sub-sets of distinct nature:

Sub-corpus A: Examination result notifications (substantive examination). Twenty-seven (27) documents. All bear the notation "Absence of novelty for the following claims", checked under Article 04 of Ordinance No. 03-07. Each notification cites specific prior art documents (indexed scientific articles, US/WO/EP patents, commercial products) opposed to the application. These documents vary from one file to another in terms of the object of invention and the prior art mobilised.

Sub-corpus B: Admissibility examination reports. Eight (8) documents. All bear the same observation: the claims are "insufficiently clear and poorly structured" and must be reformulated according to an explicit model (preamble / main claim / dependent claim), under Article 27 of Ordinance No. 03-07 and Article 03 of Executive Decree No. 05-275. These eight reports are strictly identical: only the filing number, date, and internal reference vary.

In total, the corpus covers thirty-three distinct files; two files (250461 and 250471) appear in both sub-corpora, having successively received an admissibility report and then a substantive notification.

A few contextual points must be made regarding the nature of the corpus. The thirty-five notifications correspond to applications filed by the same institution during a concentrated campaign (April 2025), which ensures homogeneity of provenance but limits generalisation. Thematically, the corpus presents a profile clearly dominated by cosmetic and phytotherapeutic formulations based on plant extracts (creams, ointments, masks, serums, hair care products), with a few applications from other fields (corrosion inhibitor, food gelatine, agricultural fertilisation). This thematic concentration likely reflects the profile of projects carried within the local framework rather than a national trend, and must be taken into account in the interpretation. Conversely, two useful contextualisation data points are not available in the collected material: the overall rejection rate relative to the total number of applications filed by the university, and the precise disciplinary distribution of applicants. Their absence constitutes a recognised limitation of the study; it calls for subsequent data collection

from the CATI to relate the observed rejection grounds to the full set of filings and fields of origin, so as to establish rates rather than counts alone.

2.2. Research Instruments: Complementary Surveys

Given the sample sizes, the results of the complementary surveys are treated descriptively and with an exploratory aim, without any claim to statistical representativeness; they serve to illuminate the perceived need as a complement to the documentary corpus.

Two distinct questionnaires were developed. The first, intended for CATI managers ("Research Questionnaire for CATI Managers", 16 items distributed across four sections: manager and CATI profile; profile of supported students; place of discursive skills; needs and recommendations), combines closed questions (position, seniority, team size, supported levels as multiple choice) and a five-point Likert scale question measuring the perceived importance of discursive skills (from 1 "not at all important" to 5 "very important"), supplemented by two open questions on the modalities for integrating these skills and on the centre's needs. The second questionnaire, intended for student-entrepreneurs ("Entrepreneurial Research Questionnaire", 30 items, bilingual French-Arabic), covers the sociodemographic profile, representations of entrepreneurship, motivations, perceived barriers (multiple-choice item), sense of legitimacy (five-point Likert scale), self-assessed familiarity and capacity to draft project-related documents, as well as training received and desired. Both instruments were administered online via the Jotform platform during the period May-June 2026; participation was voluntary, anonymous, and preceded by a note specifying the strictly scientific purpose and the confidentiality of responses. Eleven CATI managers and twelve students responded.

2.3. Methodological Precaution and Data Analysis

The nature of the two sub-corpora calls for different treatments. Sub-corpus A, being heterogeneous, lends itself to categorisation of grounds and prior art. Sub-corpus B, being homogeneous to the point of textual identity, does not lend itself to an analysis of differentiated frequencies: eight identical documents yield no internal distribution. Its very homogeneity is the object of the analysis: it reveals a standardised treatment, and thus an institutional perception of the structuring deficiency as generic. Consequently, any quantification of sub-categories within Sub-corpus B is excluded, and enumeration is reserved for what is effectively variable: the number of files, the objects of invention, and the types of prior art.

This precaution responds to a validity requirement: a fine-grained frequency apparatus applied to identical documents would be an artefact. In its place, a qualitative genre analysis is preferred, supported by a strict count of actually attested grounds.

The analysis employs two complementary operations. The first, qualitative, draws on genre analysis (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993): characterisation of the "moves" of the notifications, analysis of the metalinguistic formulations by which the examiner designates the deficiency, and reconstruction of the missing act on the applicant's side (prior art search, claims structuring). The second, a descriptive count, establishes the distribution of rejection grounds between the substantive obstacle and the discursive obstacle, without over-interpreting the homogeneity of Sub-corpus B.

3. Results and Discussion

The analysis reveals two rejection grounds, legally distinct and unequally distributed. Table 1 presents their distribution, based on the INAPI institutional corpus from the April 2025 filing campaign at Abbas Laghrour University of Khenchela. One cross-cutting finding deserves immediate emphasis: the box "Absence of clarity / Description unclear", which would correspond to sufficiency of disclosure (Article 23), is not ticked in any of

the thirty-five documents. The actual issue in the corpus is therefore not sufficiency of disclosure, but novelty on the one hand and claims structuring on the other.

Sub-corpus	Ground (legal basis)	Number	Nature of the deficiency
A : Substantive examination	Absence of novelty (Art. 04, Ord. 03-07)	27 documents	Substantive and discursive: deficiency in prior art search and writing
B: Admissibility	Claims "insufficiently clear and poorly structured" (Art. 27; Decree 05-275)	8 documents (identical)	Discursive: claims structuring and delimitation
—	Sufficiency of disclosure (Art. 23)	0	Never invoked in the corpus

Table 1. Distribution of rejection grounds in the INAPI corpus (n = 35 notifications; 33 files)

3.1. The Dominant Substantive Obstacle: Absence of Novelty

The most common ground by far is absence of novelty: twenty-seven applications are rejected on the merits because the claimed invention is deemed already encompassed within the state of the art. The argumentative schema of the notifications is remarkably consistent. The examiner identifies the components of the proposed formulation, then opposes them with prior art documents in which these components, and often their effects, are already documented, concluding that "the simple combination" of known elements "does not constitute an inventive solution beyond the state of the art" (notification 250374) or that the preparation "presents no inventive character" (notification 250461).

The objects concerned present a clear profile: the large majority consist of cosmetic and phytotherapeutic reformulations, specifically creams, ointments, masks, serums, and hair care products based on plant extracts (prickly pear, date, Ziziphus, liquorice, rosemary, Alchemilla, etc.). The prior art cited comes from indexed scientific databases (PubMed, MDPI), foreign patents (US, WO, EP), and, frequently, from products already on the market. A few filings relate to other fields (corrosion inhibitor, halal gelatine, paddy field fertilisation), confirming that the deficiency is not specific to one field but to an approach.

This result is of major didactic importance. Rejection for absence of novelty is not a sign that students "invent poorly": it is a sign that they file without having conducted or written the prior art search that would have allowed them to situate, or to reformulate, their proposal in relation to the already-known. The deficiency is thus as much documentary as discursive: it resides in the absence of the "move" of inscription in the state of the art described by Bhatia (1993). This deficit translates, in terms of language needs, into the combined absence of a documentary competence, which involves identifying and reading relevant prior art in scientific and patent databases, and a discursive competence of inscription, which requires writing the argued relationship between the invention and prior knowledge, following the rhetorical sequence from territory identification to gap signalling and solution presentation.

3.2. The Standardised Discursive Obstacle: Claims Deemed Poorly Structured

The second ground relates to the admissibility examination. Eight applications receive a report observing that "the current claims of your patent application are insufficiently clear and poorly structured" and that "they must be reformulated according to a precise model to ensure their clarity, their compliance with patentability criteria, and their legal scope". The report itself provides the expected model: a preamble (general introduction to the type of invention, without technical details), a main claim (the invention and its essential characteristics), and

dependent claims (which specify or restrict the main claim), each claim being required to be "clear, precise, and structured to avoid any ambiguity".

The analytically remarkable fact is that these eight reports are strictly identical, word for word, except for the filing number, date, and internal reference. This identity is not a deficiency of the corpus: it constitutes a result of the corpus. It indicates that INAPI treats the claims structuring deficiency not as a singular difficulty specific to one file, but as a generic deficiency of these university filings, to the point of responding to it with a standard text. In other words, the institution has itself standardised the finding of a recurring discursive problem and provides the expected drafting norm.

For the language didactician, this standard text is a resource: it delivers, in the examiner's own words, the target structure that training must lead students to acquire. The preamble / main claim / dependent claim model constitutes a normative framework directly exploitable in an FSP classroom. The admissibility obstacle thus reveals a precise language need: mastery of a normative competence specific to patent claims, that is, the ability to delimit, unambiguously and in conformity with the institutionally prescribed conventions, the exact extent of the protection claimed. This competence is distinct from general writing ability: it requires internalisation of a legal-technical format that ordinary academic writing never trains.

3.3. Two Files at the Intersection of Both Obstacles

Two files (250461 and 250471) accumulate both types of notification: an admissibility report targeting claims structuring, followed by a substantive notification targeting novelty. These cases, minority yet instructive, show that the two obstacles are not mutually exclusive: one and the same application can be both poorly structured in its claims and devoid of novelty. They confirm the study's central thesis: failure occurs at the articulation of the substantive and the discursive, not in one to the exclusion of the other.

3.4. Triangulation by Survey: A Recognised Training Need

The institutional corpus described above establishes the nature of the obstacles; it does not, however, inform us about how these obstacles are perceived by practitioners in the field. To triangulate this documentary finding, we conducted two questionnaire surveys, one with CATI managers (n = 11), the other with supported student-entrepreneurs (n = 12). These data do not aim to quantify deficiencies in files, which the documentary corpus does not permit, but to measure the felt training need, a complementary and convergent dimension.

On the CATI managers' side, the importance accorded to discursive skills in filing support is high (mean of 4.6 out of 5). Yet the support remains structurally fragile: six managers out of eleven declare that they support project bearers alone, and the levels most commonly supported are Master's (10 mentions) and Doctoral (7 mentions). The gap between the declared importance of discursive skills and the available human resources confirms, from an institutional standpoint, the gap revealed by the corpus.

On the students' side, all respondents declare that they are carrying a project idea (12 out of 12), but the sense of entrepreneurial legitimacy remains weak (2.5 out of 5 on average, with no respondent at the maximum of the scale). Asked about perceived barriers, students cite funding first (10 out of 12), then, directly relevant to our object, document drafting (6 out of 12) and administrative procedures (5 out of 12). Moreover, while only four students out of twelve declare having received specific training in these procedures, eleven out of twelve (92%) desire dedicated training. The felt need thus converges with the need objectified by the corpus.

Triangulation reveals a strong coherence between the two sources: the documentary corpus attests a dual obstacle (novelty and claims structuring); the survey attests a recognised training need from both managers and students, and an explicit demand for training that current frameworks do not satisfy. Table 2 summarises this convergence, based on questionnaire surveys: CATI managers (n = 11) and student-entrepreneurs (n = 12). This triangulation design, which confronts the needs objectified by the analysis of institutional rejections with the

needs perceived by the two categories of actors directly concerned, constitutes one of the methodological guarantees of the study, by enabling verification of the convergence between documentary data and field data.

Dimension	**Attested by the INAPI corpus**	**Corroborated by the survey**
Substantive obstacle — novelty (Art. 04)	27 substantive notifications rejecting the application for absence of novelty	Barrier "document drafting" (6/12); training need (11/12); project idea present (12/12) but inscription in state of the art absent
Discursive obstacle — claims (Art. 27)	8 standardised admissibility reports requiring structured reformulation	Importance of discursive skills rated high by CATI managers (4.6/5); support often solo (6/11)
FSP training need	Drafting model provided by INAPI, but no training provided for in CATI texts	Only 4/12 students trained; 11/12 request dedicated training; weak felt legitimacy (2.5/5)

Table 2. Convergence between the documentary corpus and survey data

3.5. Discussion: From "Writing Deficiency" to "Inscription Deficiency"

The spontaneous hypothesis, that students fail because they write the patent poorly, must be corrected in light of the corpus. The dominant ground is not a clarity deficiency in the description (which would fall under Article 23, never invoked here) but the absence of novelty. This shift matters: it invites us to think of the obstacle not as a mere writing deficiency, but as an inscription deficiency, the inability to discursively situate the invention within a state of the art that has not been documented.

We propose to define this "inscription deficiency" as the inability to discursively situate an invention within a network of prior knowledge that has not been documented. The term is forged in resonance with three existing frameworks. From Swales's (1990) CARS model, it borrows the idea that writing means first establishing a territory and signalling a gap within it: failing to inscribe one's invention means failing to accomplish this first move. From Latour's (1987) sociology of science, it borrows the notion of "inscription" as the operation by which a technical object is made mobile and recognisable by a community through written traces; without this operation, the invention remains invisible to the examiner. From Fairclough's (1992) critical discourse analysis, finally, it borrows the idea of constitutive intertextuality: every text is constructed in relation to other texts, and the patent is no exception, existing only in explicit relation to the state of the art. The inscription deficiency is therefore not a simple lack of information: it is the absence of the discursive operation that connects the invention to the already-written. Thus defined, this deficiency is, in the final analysis, a problem of specialised literacy: it requires knowing how to search for scientific and patent information (documentary competence), to evaluate it (critical competence), and then to integrate it into one's own text in the form of an argued relation between the known and the claimed (discursive competence). These three competences fall fully within the scope of FSP as defined by Mangiante and Parpette (2004), provided that the target is extended beyond drafting alone.

Both obstacles converge toward the same finding: for the Algerian student, whether trained in arts and languages, computer science, or agricultural sciences, the patent constitutes an "invisible discursive threshold". Its existence is known, but its conventions are opaque, and its mastery is implicitly presupposed by support frameworks without ever being explicitly taught. This invisibility connects with Bhatia's (2004) analysis of "genre colonies": the complexity of the patent lies in its multi-generic nature, which calls upon legal, technical, documentary, and rhetorical competences that disciplinary training never articulates together.

Our analysis reveals a structural gap in CATI frameworks: while they fulfil their mission of administrative and technical support, they incorporate neither a documentary component (training in prior art research) nor a discursive component (training in intellectual property genres). This gap is not attributable to CATI teams, who are not language specialists, but to a conception of support that does not draw on the competences of FSP and linguistics teachers and information science specialists.

This finding opens an opportunity for interdisciplinary collaboration: language teachers trained in FSP, working in conjunction with scientific information specialists, possess the conceptual and methodological tools to prepare student-entrepreneurs for both obstacles. Their integration into CATI teams would represent a significant pedagogical added value.

3.6. Didactic Implications: An FSP Module for the Dual Obstacle

Drawing on the FSP approach of Mangiante and Parpette (2004) and on the actually attested rejection grounds, we propose the foundations of a module that can be integrated into CATI frameworks, organised around three principles:

First principle: the authenticity of materials. INAPI notifications (both substantive and admissibility), the prior art they cite, and granted patents constitute the central pedagogical material. The learner works on real documents drawn from effective institutional practices.

Second principle: prior art before writing. Because the dominant rejection ground is absence of novelty, training places the search for and writing of the state of the art upstream of all claims drafting. One first learns to query the databases (patents, scientific literature), then to write the relation of one's invention to the already-known.

Third principle: simulated institutional feedback. Productions are evaluated using grids inspired by real INAPI notifications, including the claims model provided by the admissibility reports, so as to familiarise students with the institutional perspective before their first submission.

The module is structured in three units, ordered according to the actual chronology of filing:

Unit A: Searching and Writing the State of the Art (response to the novelty obstacle). Introduction to prior art research (Espacenet, scientific databases); critical reading of prior art; drafting of the rhetorical movement "state of the art → gap → solution"; reformulation of a claim to distinguish it from the prior art.

Unit B: Structuring the Claims (response to the admissibility obstacle). Appropriation of the normative model provided by INAPI (preamble / main claim / dependent claims); distinction between description and claim; exercises in clarification and disambiguation.

Unit C: Neutralising Register and Finalising (transversal). Revision of register (neutralisation of promotional language), terminological consistency, formal compliance of the file. This unit accompanies the two preceding ones rather than following them.

3.7. An Exemplary Task for the Workshop

In order to move beyond the mere enunciation of principles, we describe here an exemplary pedagogical task, directly derived from the corpus and transferable to a workshop setting. It illustrates the articulation of both obstacles within a single session and mobilises situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991) on authentic documents.

The following task, in Table 3, was designed from the analysis of the INAPI reserve documents constituting the corpus of the present study. It aims to develop jointly the two discursive competences whose absence is documented as the primary cause of rejection: the capacity to argue novelty and the mastery of claims structuring.

EXEMPLARY TASK *"From Prior Art to Claim"*		
Total duration 2 hours 30 minutes	**Targeted obstacles** Novelty (steps 1–3) + Claims (step 4)	**Theoretical grounding** CARS (Swales, 1990); Wingate (2015) ; FSP (Mangiante & Parpette, 2004)

Step 1	**Confrontation with a Real Case**	**30 min**
↓	Learners receive an anonymised authentic INAPI notification (ground: absence of novelty, Article 04) accompanied by the cited prior art. Task: identify why the application was rejected and orally reformulate the examiner's objection.	
Objective	To bring out the notion of the state of the art as a requirement, not a formality.	
Step 2	**Guided Prior Art Search**	**40 min**
↓	Starting from a fictional project (a cream based on a plant extract), learners conduct a search on Espacenet and a scientific database, identify two or three prior art documents, and complete a grid "what already exists / what my invention adds".	
Objective	To transform documentary research into discursive material.	
Step 3	**Writing the Rhetorical Move**	**40 min**
↓	Following the CARS model (territory → gap → occupation), learners draft a short state-of-the-art paragraph that situates the invention and states the claimed novelty.	
Objective	To produce the missing "move" identified in the corpus.	
Step 4	**Structuring the Claims**	**30 min**
↓	Using the model provided by INAPI admissibility reports (preamble / main claim / dependent claims), learners restructure an ambiguous claim provided by the instructor.	
Objective	To appropriate the institutional drafting norm.	
Step 5	**Examination Simulation and Closure**	**10 min**
↓	In pairs, learners exchange their productions and take on the role of the INAPI examiner using a reviewing grid inspired by real notifications.	
Objective	To internalise the institutional perspective and the diagnostic function of writing.	

Table 3. Exemplary task: From Prior Art to Claim

This single task jointly addresses the two obstacles attested in the INAPI corpus: novelty (steps 1 to 3) and claims structuring (step 4), and places evaluation in the hands of the learners themselves (step 5). It can be adapted for other technical fields by changing the entry case, and constitutes the prototype of a broader FSP sequence.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Drawing on an authentic corpus of thirty-five INAPI notifications, an empirical datum rare in the intellectual property linguistics literature, this study has established that the failure of Algerian student-entrepreneurs' patent applications stems from a dual, institutionally attested obstacle: a massive substantive obstacle, namely the absence of novelty (twenty-seven substantive rejections, Article 04), and a standardised discursive obstacle, consisting of deficient claims structuring (eight identical admissibility reports, Article 27). Sufficiency of disclosure (Article 23), often assumed to be central, is by contrast never invoked in the corpus.

The study's principal contribution is to show that these two obstacles do not oppose but articulate each other: demonstrating novelty is simultaneously a documentary and a discursive operation, and it is for failing to inscribe their invention in a written state of the art that students most often fail. This reframing shifts the didactic issue from merely "writing well" to "knowing how to search for, evaluate, and write the already-known".

These results confirm the relevance of an FSP approach articulated with genre analysis (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993, 2004) for addressing this new terrain, and the need to explicitly integrate, within CATI frameworks, specialised language skills and information research skills. Beyond the Algerian case, the study invites a reconsideration of the place of the humanities and language didactics in university innovation ecosystems: language teachers are not peripheral actors within these ecosystems, but potentially indispensable pedagogical partners.

Further work is envisaged: a comparative inter-CATI study, a longitudinal analysis of the effects of an FSP module on file acceptance rates, and a survey of INAPI examiners' perceptions of the most frequent rejection grounds. The present study, based on a corpus confined to one university and one filing campaign, also calls for validation on a corpus extended to other institutions.

References

Arrêté ministériel n°1275 portant création des Centres d'Appui à la Technologie et à l'Innovation (CATI) dans les établissements d'enseignement supérieur et de recherche scientifique. Journal Officiel de la République Algérienne Démocratique et Populaire, 27 September 2022. https://istm.univ-setif.dz/Docs/Arrete-1275/Arrete1275-du-27-sept-2022.pdf

Bazerman, C. (1994). Systems of Genres and the Enactment of Social Intentions. In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the New Rhetoric* (pp. 79–101). Taylor & Francis.

Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: Cognition/culture/power.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Longman.

Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre-based view*. Continuum.

Charrow, R. P., & Charrow, V. R. (1979). Making legal language understandable: A psycholinguistic study of jury instructions. *Columbia Law Review*, *79*(7), 1306–1374.

Connor, U., & Mauranen, A. (1999). Linguistic analysis of grant proposals: European Union research grants. *English for Specific Purposes*, *18*(1), 47–62.

Convention de Paris pour la protection de la propriété industrielle (modifiée le 28 septembre 1979). WIPO Lex. https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/287558

Décret exécutif n°05-275 du 2 août 2005 fixant les modalités de dépôt et de délivrance des brevets d'invention. Journal Officiel de la République Algérienne. https://e-services.inapi.org/download_pdf?file=FICHIERS/Document.43.pdf

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centred approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Harvard University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Maingueneau, D. (2014). *Discours et analyse du discours*. Armand Colin.

Mangiante, J.-M., & Parpette, C. (2004). *Le français sur objectif spécifique : de l'analyse des besoins à l'élaboration d'un cours*. Hachette FLE.

Myers, G. (1990). *Writing biology: Texts in the social construction of scientific knowledge*. University of Wisconsin Press.

Ordonnance n°03-07 du 19 juillet 2003 relative aux brevets d'invention. Journal Officiel de la République Algérienne, 44. https://www.douane.gov.dz/IMG/pdf/ordonnance_no_03-07_du_19_juillet_2003_relative_aux_brevets_d_invention.pdf

Parpette, C. (2012). Le FOS aujourd'hui : réflexions sur une démarche en évolution. *Le Français dans le Monde — Recherches et Applications*, *51*, 30–41.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

Wingate, U. (2015). *Academic literacy and student diversity: The case for inclusive practice*. Multilingual Matters.

World Intellectual Property Organization. (n.d.). *PCT legal texts*. https://www.wipo.int/en/web/pct-system/texts/index