

From Lived Meaning to Designed Meaning:- Transformations of Craft Existence in the Logic of Cultural and Tourism Innovation -

Dr. Maissoun Batouch

Affiliation university: University of Batna 1 – Hadj Lakhdar, Algeria

Specialization: Cultural Sociology

Email: maissounbatouch@gmail.com – maissoun.batouch@univ-batna.dz

Received: 12/01/2024 ; Accepted: 02/04/2024 ; Published: 27/06/2024

Abstract:

This study aims to analyze the transformations affecting the production of cultural meaning in Algerian handicraft industries, tracing the shift from craftsmanship as a lived practice deeply rooted in collective memory to craftsmanship as a designed experience within the spaces of cultural tourism and the creative economy. The study is guided by a central research question concerning how cultural meaning is reshaped under the influence of cultural innovation, market dynamics, and tourism representation.

The study adopts a critical sociological and anthropological approach, drawing on the concepts of habitus developed by Pierre Bourdieu, liquid modernity proposed by Zygmunt Bauman, as well as the literature on the cultural economy and cultural tourism. It concludes that craftsmanship is no longer merely a lived practice; rather, it has become part of a globalized system of symbolic production that is continuously reshaped at the

intersection of cultural revitalization and commodification.

Keywords: Craftsmanship; Lived Meaning; Designed Meaning; Cultural Tourism; Cultural Innovation; Habitus; Capitalist Liquidity.

1. Introduction:

The rapid transformations associated with globalization, the expansion of the symbolic economy, and the growth of the market economy have given rise to a new cultural reality in which culture has become an open field for the reconstruction and production of meaning according to dynamics that transcend local boundaries. These dynamics redefine the relationship between individuals, their heritage, and their social environment. In this context, handicraft industries are no longer viewed merely as functional activities or technical practices linked to everyday life; rather, they have evolved into a fundamental component of the cultural economy and

cultural tourism. As a result, they are increasingly subject to processes of design, innovation, and re-representation in ways that align with market logic and global consumer tastes.

However, understanding this transformation requires a return to the original structure of craftsmanship as a lived practice deeply rooted in collective memory. In its essence, handicraft production is not merely a form of material production; rather, it constitutes a mode of social existence that reflects the relationship between human beings and the world and expresses their everyday experience within a context of cultural and symbolic accumulation. From this perspective, craftsmanship can be interpreted through the concept of *habitus* developed by Pierre Bourdieu, as the product of repeated social practices that generate patterns of perception, action, and meaning, while embodying social memory within both the body and practice.¹

This understanding can also be expanded to reveal lived meaning in handicraft industries as one of the essential dimensions that connects human beings to action, work, and the implicit knowledge embedded in the body and memory. Craftsmanship is not merely an economic activity or a form of material production; rather, it is an existential experience that carries a meaning deeply rooted in everyday life and in the sense of time, place, and belonging. From this perspective,

craftsmanship can be understood within the framework of phenomenology as developed by Edmund Husserl and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, as well as within interpretive anthropology as presented by Clifford Geertz, as a system of meanings shaped by the human actor within their lived world. From a phenomenological perspective, the world is not experienced merely as an external object, but rather lived from within through embodied consciousness.

From this perspective, it can be argued that craftsmanship is a form of practical consciousness through which the artisan develops an understanding of the world through action rather than abstract thought. Every hand movement and every material that is shaped and transformed represents a form of lived knowledge that cannot be reduced to language or to the market.

Maurice Merleau-Ponty emphasizes in his book *Phenomenology of Perception* that the body is not merely an instrument of action, but rather it is “the general medium of our being in the world”², Perception and knowledge are therefore inseparable from lived bodily experience. From this perspective, craftsmanship can be understood as both a bodily and cognitive practice, through which the artisan’s relationship with the world they create is embodied, and through which meanings of belonging, memory, and inherited experience are formed.

At this level, we find that craftsmanship is not a commodity subject to exchange, but rather an existential act that reaffirms the relationship between human beings, time, nature, and society. It transmits memory from one generation to another, not through texts or institutions, but through the body itself. Skill is passed on through imitation, observation, and repetition — that is, through what Pierre Bourdieu refers to as **“embodied knowledge.”** However, from a phenomenological perspective, this practice is not merely a mechanical repetition; rather, it is a form of temporal consciousness that makes the past present in every manual action.

When the artisan creates a piece of pottery, a carpet, or a wooden object, they are not merely repeating a previous act; rather, they are reviving an experience lived by others before them and reproducing it in their own unique way. Here, memory becomes a sensory material that is reshaped through the body, making the body a mediator between heritage and reality.

This embodied relationship between human beings and craftsmanship gives lived meaning its human depth, as it brings together memory, skill, and the sense of time. In this context, craftsmanship is established as an existential act based on what can be called **“lived meaning,”** where skill intertwines with memory, time with experience, and human beings with material.

However, this cognitive and symbolic system has undergone a profound transformation with the rise of market logic, the expansion of cultural tourism, and the emergence of the creative economy. Craftsmanship has gradually moved from the realm of lived meaning to the realm of **“designed meaning.”**

Instead of being an extension of existential experience and collective memory, the craft has come to be reformulated within systems of design and cultural innovation. On the one hand, the latter works to renew popular symbols and reintegrate them into contemporary life, which allows collective memory to continue in a new form; on the other hand, subjecting the craft to market logic leads to stripping it of its symbolic dimension and transforming it into a commercial commodity.

In the Arab context, Abdullah Al-Ghadhami points out that contemporary culture is moving towards a spectacular nature that makes heritage symbols tools for display rather than being an extension of lived experience³. As for Mohammed Abed Al-Jabri, he believes that this transformation reflects a fragmentation of collective memory as a result of the secularization of heritage symbols and their removal from their original context.⁴ Where the aesthetic and the economic intersect, the handcrafted product

becomes an object of display, consumption, and symbolic reappropriation.

This transformation is considered part of what Zygmunt Bauman calls “**liquid modernity**,” where cultural symbols and social meanings become permanently fluid, subject to recycling and reshaping according to the logic of the market.

Within this framework, meaning is no longer associated with stability or roots, but rather with the ability to circulate and move within trans-cultural spaces.

The role of the designer emerges as that of an intermediary agent within the craft field, as the artisan is no longer the sole producer of meaning. Instead, meaning is formed within institutional, aesthetic, and marketing networks that include designers, brands, and exhibition spaces. From Tim Ingold’s perspective, craft does not merely represent the production of a material object; rather, it constitutes a practical engagement with matter and the lived world. However, its integration into the logic of contemporary design leads to a shift in focus from the act of making as an embodied process to the product as an object of display and visual representation 5 .

From this perspective, it can be argued that handicraft industries are currently experiencing a complex dialectical situation. On the one hand, they contribute to the revival of meaning through their integration into

cultural innovation projects; on the other hand, they are subjected to a transformation that makes them lighter and less symbolically profound. Thus, the question raised is not only about how to preserve heritage, but also about how to reproduce meaning without losing it in an age of speed and consumption.

Despite the diversity of studies that have addressed the relationship between globalization, cultural tourism, and local heritage, most of them have remained governed by the binary of preserving identity or losing it, without delving deeply into the analysis of the dynamics of meaning production within the craft practice itself.

Craft has also often been approached as a fixed heritage object or as something threatened with disappearance, without paying attention to its transformation into a space for redesign within the symbolic economy.

Hence, the research gap lies in the absence of sociological and anthropological approaches that explain the transition from “**lived meaning**” to “**designed meaning**” as a complex process of reshaping the position of the craft actor and the meanings of heritage within the context of capitalist fluidity.

Based on the above, this research paper seeks to answer the following questions: How is cultural meaning reproduced within handicraft industries in light of the intersection of globalization, tourism, and the logic of

cultural innovation? Does the transition of craft from “lived meaning” to “designed meaning” represent a form of heritage revival and the continuity of collective memory, or does it reflect a symbolic reshaping that leads to the commodification of culture and the stripping away of its original meanings? To what extent does cultural tourism contribute to reshaping the relationship between the artisan and their heritage, as well as with the globalized symbolic economy?

This study seeks to achieve the following objectives:

- Clarifying how lived meaning is embodied within craft practice as a social and cultural act rooted in collective memory.
- Analyzing the impact of cultural innovation and cultural tourism on reshaping craft and transforming it into a symbolic product open to circulation.
- Revealing the nature of the transformation from “**lived meaning**” to “**designed meaning**” and its implications for the continuity of cultural meaning.
- Highlighting the dialectic between cultural revival and symbolic commodification in the context of globalization and capitalist fluidity.

2. Research Methodology:

To achieve this objective and answer this research problem, we will attempt to use the descriptive approach, which enables us to provide an accurate description for tracing the phenomenon. Since the research focuses on the transformation of cultural meaning from the lived to the designed, we have chosen the craft sector in Algeria as a model to approach the subject under study. Quantitative and qualitative data accompanying the processes of transformation of the cultural meaning of traditional crafts also served as a source for both quantitative and qualitative description. Therefore, we adopted the descriptive method, which is considered a way of studying scientific phenomena and problems with the aim of reaching logical explanations supported by evidence and arguments, allowing the researcher to establish specific frameworks that enable the analysis of the different aspects of the formulated research problem.

3. Fields of Study:

This study was conducted in a number of spaces related to handicraft industries within the context of cultural tourism and the broader field of Algerian cultural practices. Traditional craft workshops, craft markets, and tourism exhibitions were selected as the main spaces for the production and display of traditional crafts. The study focused on sites characterized by a clear interaction between local craft production and the requirements of tourist presentation, allowing for the observation of

the dynamics of transformation from “**lived meaning**” to “**designed meaning**.”

Therefore, the selected sample was a **purposive sample**, as it takes into account the functional diversity within the craft field. Its purpose is to trace and interpret the phenomenon rather than achieve statistical generalization. It included: traditional artisans with extensive experience in handmade production, young artisans involved in cultural innovation projects, designers working with craft heritage, and institutional actors in the tourism and traditional industries sectors.

The participants in this sample were selected according to the following criteria: direct involvement in craft practice or its redesign; variation in experience (**traditional/contemporary**); engagement with the tourism market or local production; and the ability to provide narratives about the transformation of practice and meaning.

4. Data Collection Tools:

This study relied in its procedures on: **participant observation** within production workshops and exhibition spaces; **document analysis** related to cultural and tourism policies; and **analysis of craft products as cultural texts**.

5. Data Analysis Method:

The data were analyzed using qualitative analysis, with a focus on identifying the semantic patterns related to:

- The construction of lived meaning
- Processes of symbolic redesign
- Representations of authenticity and innovation
- Transformations in the position of the craft actor within the cultural economy

The analysis was also supported by a semiological–sociological framework that allows craft products to be interpreted as systems of meaning rather than merely material objects.

6. Results:

The transformation taking place in Algerian handicraft industries represents a transformation in the very “**craft existence**” itself, that is, in the way the artisan exists and relates to meaning, production, and society.

With the emergence of the logic of cultural innovation and the symbolic market, the position of the artisan has been reorganized within the cultural and economic value chain, and new questions have emerged concerning the craft identity and its role in producing meaning. The artisan is no longer merely a bearer of memory, but has become a partial actor within an institutional economic system that determines the rhythm, form, and significance.

7. The repositioning of the artisan within the value chain:

The transformations that the handicraft sector in Algeria has undergone over recent decades reveal a qualitative shift in the artisan's position and function within the productive and cultural field. With the integration of traditional crafts into strategies of the creative economy and tourism development, craft is no longer an independent activity based on the direct relationship between the artisan and their product. Instead, it has become part of a more complex system in which economic, aesthetic, and marketing dimensions intersect. Reports from the Ministry of Tourism and Traditional Industries indicate that, since 2010, the sector has witnessed an increasing trend toward the valorization of tangible and intangible heritage and its transformation into an economic resource open to investment, within what has become known as **cultural and creative industries**.

The data provided by the National Office of Traditional Crafts (ONAT, 2022) confirms the registration of more than **350,000 male and female artisans**. A significant number of them operate within production networks, cooperatives, and small enterprises that maintain partnership relations with designers, marketing organizations, and export institutions. This reality reflects the emergence of a new logic of production, in which the

artisan is no longer the sole actor who monopolizes knowledge and aesthetic decision-making. Instead, the artisan has become part of a value chain involving multiple actors, from the designer and marketer to the institution and the final customer 6 .

This transformation has resulted in a redistribution of symbolic power within the craft field. While traditional craft granted the artisan a position as an independent producer of meaning, the contemporary creative economy has reformulated this position, so that decisions related to form, quality, and function have become subject to the logic of the market and the requirements of presentation. The designer determines the aesthetic direction, the institution regulates production and marketing standards, while the artisan gradually becomes an executor within a broader production system.

In this context, the study by **Ben Youssef Ben Aissa (2019)** on traditional crafts in Algeria between authenticity and innovation indicates that the artisan no longer occupies the central position in the production of cultural meaning. Rather, the artisan has become part of an economic and symbolic structure that defines the limits of possible creativity and redirects meaning according to market requirements.

However, this transformation cannot be interpreted as an absolute loss of

independence, as it has provided artisans with new opportunities for economic integration, expanded marketing opportunities, and access to national and international markets. This has contributed to improving incomes and ensuring the continuity of some crafts that were at risk of disappearing 7 .

However, this integration into the logic of the value chain has resulted in a kind of decline in the artisan's symbolic autonomy. Craft, which was once an expression of lived experience deeply rooted in collective memory, has come to be practiced within a space governed by commercial considerations and the standards of consumer taste.

In this sense, the artisan is no longer merely a producer of an object, but has become a producer within a system that itself produces meaning. This reflects a shift in the center of power from craft practice to the institutional structure that frames it. Therefore, the repositioning of the artisan within the value chain does not only express an economic transformation; it reveals a deeper transformation in the nature of the relationship between the craft actor and the meaning they produce. The production of symbolic value thus becomes the result of a continuous negotiation between heritage and the market, and between memory and the requirements of the globalized cultural economy.

The loss or reshaping of the craft identity: Field realities in regions such as

Tamanrasset, Ghardaïa, and Kabylie show that the artisan today is experiencing a state of **“dual identity”**: on the one hand, they see themselves as the heir of a traditional expertise representing collective memory; on the other hand, they are required to adapt to the logic of design and marketing.

A report by the **National Center for Research in Social and Cultural Anthropology (CRASC)** on “The Dynamics of Transformation in Traditional Crafts” indicates that a large number of young artisans perceive craft as an entrepreneurial path rather than merely as heritage, and they use social media networks to market their products.

In this sense, a **“new craft identity”** is emerging, capable of combining authenticity and innovation, yet gradually losing the traditional symbolic reference framework. In contrast, traditional artisans in regions such as **Biskra and Tizi Ouzou** express a loss of meaning in their work, as they believe that modern design **“borrows the form while losing the spirit.”** This duality between **“loss”** and **“reshaping”** reflects a transitional phase experienced by the artisan actor in Algeria, where professional identity is being redefined in light of new economic and cultural transformations.

In other words, the artisan no longer produces their own identity through craft as in the past; rather, their identity is produced through their position within the system of

cultural production. This is consistent with **Bourdieu's** analysis of **“transformations within symbolic fields,”** where the actor's identity changes according to their position within the network of values and power relations.

Who produces craft meaning: the artisan or the designer?

The central question in today's transformation of craft is: **Who produces meaning?** Is it the artisan who shapes the product through their inherited expertise? Or is it the designer and the institution that reframe it within a new visual vision?

The Algerian context reveals an interaction between both sides. The artisan has not completely lost their ability to produce meaning, but they are no longer its exclusive owner.

A study by **Bouakaz Nadia (CRASC, 2021)** indicates that cooperation projects between artisans and designers in **Tlemcen** and **Algiers** have produced new products that combine traditional symbols with contemporary design. However, these products have, in turn, been subject to external marketing criteria that have redefined the aesthetic and symbolic message of the product.

Here, meaning becomes a **“result of negotiation”** between the artisan, the designer, and the institution, rather than the outcome of a single lived experience.

This can be described as **“composite meaning”** or **“programmed meaning,”** where authenticity coexists with commercial presentation, and memory is reformulated within ready-made frameworks for cultural circulation 8 .

From a sociological perspective, this situation shows that the symbolic power of meaning has shifted from manual practice to institutional practice. Design is no longer merely an aesthetic form; rather, it has become a mechanism for controlling the production of meaning itself.

Thus, the artisan shifts from being an actor who produces symbols to becoming a participant in a symbolic production process managed outside their lived experience, whether through regulations or through market logic.

Field-Based Analysis: According to data from the Ministry of Tourism and Traditional Industries (**National Report, 2023**), Algeria is experiencing a diversity of dynamics in the transformation of crafts:

- In **tourist areas** (such as **Tlemcen** and **Algiers**), craft has become part of the cultural tourism system, where it is produced for display purposes and for foreign consumers.
- In **rural and southern regions**, crafts still preserve a lived and

social dimension, despite the introduction of some modern marketing techniques.

- In **major cities**, a category of “**craft designers**” has emerged, working to reformulate craft within the trends of fashion and contemporary art.

The report of the **National Council of Arts and Letters (CNAL, 2022)** indicates that the rate of design integration into handicraft industries exceeded **45%** in some sectors (particularly carpets and pottery), reflecting the depth of the transformation in the production of meaning⁹.

However, on the other hand, a field study conducted by the **National Institute for Research in Algerian Culture (INRC, 2021)** shows that traditional artisans face weak legal support and limited funding, which threatens the continuity of craft as a field of lived meaning¹⁰.

The field-based analysis therefore reveals that Algeria is experiencing a **dual reality**:

- A **positive cultural and economic transformation** that contributes to the revival and internationalization of craft.
- A **negative symbolic transformation** that threatens the loss of the traditional

craft identity in favor of a new institutional identity.

The erosion of the centrality of embodied expertise in the production of meaning: The findings show that the traditional artisan no longer monopolizes the production of symbolic meaning as in previous contexts, where physical skill and accumulated experience over time constituted the primary source of significance. Meaning has increasingly become reshaped through external interventions related to design, marketing, and globalized aesthetic standards, leading to a redistribution of the power to produce meaning among the artisan, the designer, and the institution.

The rise of designed meaning as an intermediary structure: The data confirm that “**designed meaning**” is no longer merely a formal modification of the craft product; rather, it has become an independent structure for producing meaning, redefining craft as a visual discourse directed toward tourism consumption. This is reflected in the dominance of aesthetic and marketing considerations at the expense of local symbolic references, as craft products are re-coded in ways that correspond to the tastes of the global consumer.

The transformation of craft into a field of symbolic mediation: The findings show that the entry of new actors, particularly designers and cultural institutions, has led to a

restructuring of the craft field. Production is no longer carried out through a direct relationship between the artisan and the material; rather, it occurs through a network of symbolic mediations that control the final form of the product. This transformation has resulted in what can be described as the **“dismantling of the direct relationship between action and meaning.”**

The redefinition of craft identity: The data reveal the emergence of new forms of craft identity characterized by a duality between belonging to traditional memory and engaging with the logic of the cultural market. The **“artisan–designer”** has emerged as a hybrid actor who combines manual production skills with design-thinking mechanisms. However, this hybrid identity also reflects a state of symbolic instability within the craft field.

The tension between cultural revival and symbolic commodification: The findings show that cultural innovation performs a dual function: on the one hand, it contributes to the revival of heritage symbols and their integration into the contemporary economy; on the other hand, it reproduces them within a commodifying logic that weakens their semantic density. Thus, craft appears as a space of continuous tension between the logic of memory and the logic of the market.

The redistribution of the power to produce meaning: The results, as a whole,

indicate a shift in the center of meaning production from the individual actor (the artisan) to a broader institutional–symbolic structure, where decisions related to form and significance have become subject to the logic of the tourism market and globalized aesthetic standards. This reflects a transformation in the nature of symbolic power within the craft field.

- Craft as lived meaning.
- The transition toward designed meaning.
- The role of cultural tourism in reshaping meaning.
- The duality between revival and commodification.
- Redefining the position of the artisan within the symbolic economy.

8. Discussion:

The findings of this study reveal that the transformation experienced by craft industries cannot be explained merely as a technical transition or a modernization of production methods; rather, it should be understood as a radical restructuring of the production of meaning within the craft field, in a context where the economic intersects with the symbolic, the local with the global, and the lived experience with design. Within this framework, the combination of the approaches of “Bourdieu, Bauman, and Ingold” makes it possible to deconstruct this transformation as a multi-level process involving the redistribution of symbolic power, the fluidization of cultural

structures, and the redefinition of the relationship between humans and materiality.

****The Restructuring of the Craft Field and the Redistribution of Symbolic Power (Bourdieu)****

From Pierre Bourdieu's perspective, the transformation occurring within craft industries can be understood as a restructuring of the cultural field itself, where symbolic power in the production of meaning is no longer exclusively concentrated in the craftsperson, but has become distributed among a network of actors including the designer, institutions, and the tourism market. The transition of craft from a "space of practice" to a "space of representation" reflects a transformation in the structure of symbolic capital, as value is no longer derived solely from embodied skill or traditional habitus, but rather from the ability to adapt to globalized aesthetic standards and visually reproduce heritage.

This transformation leads to a redefinition of the craftsperson's position within the field, shifting from an agent who produces meaning to an actor subjected to the logic of symbolic guidance. This reflects what Bourdieu refers to as the redistribution of "symbolic capital within social fields."

Thus, craft meaning becomes the outcome of an unequal negotiation between actors who possess varying degrees of cultural and symbolic power.

The Fluidity of Meaning and the Dissolution of Symbolic Stability (Bauman)

These findings are consistent with Zygmunt Bauman's thesis of "liquid modernity," according to which cultural symbols no longer possess their historical stability or their capacity to produce fixed meanings; instead, they have become subject to rapid recycling within the logic of the market and consumption. The transition of craft into the sphere of cultural tourism reflects this process of fluidization, as meaning is transformed from a structure deeply rooted in collective memory into a flexible form that can be circulated and consumed beyond its original context.

In this context, "heritage" is no longer considered a fixed given, but rather becomes a symbolic resource that is constantly reshaped according to the requirements of the tourism market. This situation leads to what can be described as the "fragility of meaning," where the intensity of the relationship between signifier and signified declines in favor of visual and commercial adaptability. Therefore, the fluidity described by Bauman does not only concern social structures, but also extends to the structures of meaning themselves.

Craft as a Formative Practice of World-Making (Ingold)

In contrast to this structural and critical perspective, Tim Ingold offers a different

interpretation of craft as a “process of becoming” rather than merely the production of objects.

However, the findings of the study indicate that this processual dimension is being redirected within the logic of contemporary design, where the act of “making” is separated from its sensory and lived context, and reinserted into a design system dominated by visual perception and conceptual abstraction.

Thus, what Ingold calls “direct engagement with material” becomes a mediated relationship governed by preconceived notions of the final form, leading to a weakening of the interactive relationship between the craftsperson and the material.

In this context, craft is no longer a “process of living with material,” but rather becomes the “execution of a design plan,” reflecting a shift from embodied knowledge to representationally framed knowledge.

In light of the intersection between the redistribution of power, the fluidization of meaning and the dissolution of its stability, as well as the redirection of the actor’s relationship with material toward representation rather than making, the transition from “lived meaning” to “designed meaning” is not merely a change in form, but rather an epistemological transformation in the very way meaning itself is produced.

Meaning is no longer extracted from embodied experience within the slow temporality of social life; instead, it is reproduced within institutional and tourism-oriented spaces governed by the logic of speed, display, and circulation.

Toward a Dialectical Understanding of Craft Transformation:

The discussion confirms that reducing craft transformation to the binary opposition of “authenticity/commodification” or “preservation/loss” does not allow for an understanding of the dynamics of meaning production in all their complexity. Rather, the findings indicate that craft has become a dialectical field for the reproduction of meaning, where mechanisms of cultural revival coexist with the logic of commercial representation.

9. General Conclusion:

The study reveals that the transformation experienced by Algerian craft industries is not merely a modernization of techniques or forms, but rather a transformation in the very nature of the meaning produced by craft. Craft, which previously represented an existential and lived experience deeply rooted in collective memory, has today become a field for redesign and cultural and economic reappropriation.

The dynamics of cultural innovation in Algeria have generated a new structure of craft existence, redefining the distribution of roles and meanings among the craftsman, the designer, institutions, and the market.

Lived meaning, based on experience and the sensory relationship with material and time, has given way to designed meaning, which is reshaped within the logic of image and symbolic positioning. This transformation has not eliminated the creative dimension of craft; rather, it has shifted the center of meaning production from individual experience to the institutional structure.

The study also shows that public laws and policies, such as Law 09-03 relating to the protection of intangible cultural heritage and Executive Decree 11-86 regulating traditional craft professions, have played a dual role.

On the one hand, they have contributed to protecting craft practices and ensuring their continuity; on the other hand, they have opened the way for their commodification within the framework of the creative economy.

This interaction between preservation and innovation has produced a complex situation experienced by the craftsman today, who seeks to balance loyalty to collective memory with integration into the market, and between the production of lived meaning and the creation of designed meaning.

At the sociological level, the findings reveal that the Algerian craftsman is experiencing a transformation in professional identity: from an independent cultural actor to a component of a broader symbolic and economic system. This transformation has redefined the craftsman's identity and generated new types of actors, such as the "craft designer" and the "cultural marketer," reflecting the reconstruction of the symbolic field of craft in Algeria.

Overall, it can be argued that Algerian craft industries today stand at a crossroads between authenticity and innovation, between memory and design, and between lived meaning and designed meaning.

The real challenge lies in finding an interactive model that ensures the sustainability of meaning without falling into its symbolic emptying.

10. Research References:

- Abdullah Al-Ghadhami, *Television Culture: The Fall of the Elite and the Rise of the Popular*, 2004, p. 112.
- Ben Youssef Ben Aissa. *Traditional Crafts in Algeria between Authenticity and Innovation*. University of Algiers 2, 2019, pp. 64–73.
- Bouakaz, Nadia. *Traditional Crafts as a Driver of the Creative Economy in Algeria*. National Center for Research

- in Social and Cultural Anthropology (CRASC), Oran, 2021.
- Bourdieu, Outline of a Theory of Practice, 1977, p 72.
 - Ingold, Tim. "Designing Environments for Life". In: Design and Anthropology, edited by Wendy Gunn, Ton Otto and Rachel Charlotte Smith, Bloomsbury Academic, 2013, pp. 129-142
 - Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. Phenomenology of Perception. Translated by Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962, p146

- Mohammed Abed Al-Jabri, The Arab Cultural Reason, 1990, p. 57.
- National Council for Arts and Letters (CNAL). Report on Design Practices in Algerian Cultural Industries. Algeria, 2022.
- National Institute for Research in Algerian Culture (INRC). Study on the State of Traditional Crafts and the Protection of Cultural Heritage. Algeria, 2020.
- National Office of Traditional Crafts (ONAT). Statistics of the Traditional Crafts Sector in Algeria. Algeria, 2022.

Footnotes:

¹ Bourdieu, Outline of a Theory of Practice, 1977, p 72.

² Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. Phenomenology of Perception. Translated by Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962, p146

³ Abdullah Al-Ghadhami, Television Culture: The Fall of the Elite and the Rise of the Popular, 2004, p. 112.

⁴ Mohammed Abed Al-Jabri, The Arab Cultural Reason, 1990, p. 57.

⁵ Ingold, Tim. "Designing Environments for Life". In: Design and Anthropology, edited by Wendy Gunn, Ton Otto and Rachel Charlotte Smith, Bloomsbury Academic, 2013, pp. 129-142

⁶ National Office of Traditional Crafts (ONAT). Statistics of the Traditional Crafts Sector in Algeria. Algeria, 2022.

⁷ Ben Youssef Ben Aissa, Traditional Crafts in Algeria between Authenticity and Innovation, University of Algiers 2, 2019, pp. 64–73.

⁸ Bouakaz, Nadia. Traditional Crafts as a Driving Force of the Creative Economy in Algeria. National Center for Research in Social and Cultural Anthropology (CRASC), Oran, 2021.

⁹ National Council of Arts and Letters (CNAL). Report on Design Practices in Algerian Cultural Industries. Algeria, 2022.

¹⁰ National Institute for Research in Algerian Culture (INRC). Study on the Reality of Traditional Crafts and the Protection of Cultural Heritage. Algeria, 2021.