Journal of Business Theory and Practice
ISSN 2372-9759 (Print) ISSN 2329-2644 (Online)
Vol. 14, No. 1, 2026
www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/jbtp

Original Paper

A Unified Theory of Value and Innovation: Integrating Technological Production and Cultural Construction

Manuel T. Fernandes[1]

[1] CAAM – Corporate Academy for Advanced Management (by Gestão Total), Av. Prof Egas Moniz, Parque do Alto E3, 2135-232 Samora Correia, Portugal

Received: December 5, 2025 Accepted: December 12, 2025 Online Published: December 25, 2025
doi:10.22158/jbtp.v14n1p1 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/jbtp.v14n1p1

Abstract

In this article, I address the fragmented and often siloed understanding of value, value creation, and innovation that pervades both academic literature and business practice. My primary objective is to synthesize a comprehensive theoretical framework that integrates the economic, technological, cultural, and behavioral dimensions of how value is created and perceived in products. My core contribution is a unified model that connects a "Holistic Value Construct" - which maps the domains of value from tangible to intangible - with dual, interconnected innovation paths: a "Technological Innovation Path" focused on production and a "Cultural Innovation Path" centered on the construction of meaning. This framework reveals that sustainable competitive advantage lies in mastering the interplay between these two fundamental forces. I conclude by highlighting the profound implications of this integrated perspective for business strategy, product development, and the direction of future academic research.

Keywords

Cultural innovation, technological innovation, strategic innovation, value, cultural value of products, value creation

1. Introduction: The Need for a Holistic Perspective

The concepts of "value" and "innovation" are pillars of modern economic and management discourse. Firms are exhorted to create value, and innovation is heralded as the primary engine for doing so. Yet, despite their centrality, these concepts are frequently defined and analyzed in isolation. Value is often confined to economic utility and exchange price, while innovation is typically viewed through the narrow lens of technological advancement. This siloed approach leads to an incomplete, and often misleading, understanding of why new products succeed or fail. As existing literature demonstrates, no common view or consensus has been reached on the concept of value, motivating the need for a more integrated approach (Fernandes, 2012).

In this article, I argue that a comprehensive understanding of value creation requires a unified framework that recognizes innovation not merely as a technological process, but as a dual force of *technological production* and *cultural construction*. Technological production refers to the process of transforming ideas into functional, tangible offerings, while cultural construction is the process of imbuing those offerings with intangible meaning, emotion, and social significance. It is the dynamic

interplay between these two forces that determines a product's holistic value and its ultimate market trajectory.

To build this unified framework, I will systematically deconstruct and then reintegrate these core concepts. The argument will unfold in four parts. First, I trace the historical and theoretical foundations of value, moving from classical economics to modern consumer behavior and cultural theory. Second, I introduce a *Holistic Value Construct Model* that visually maps the tangible and intangible domains where value is formed. Third, building on this foundation, I present a dual model of innovation, outlining the distinct archetypes and processes of both technological and cultural innovation. Finally, I synthesize these models to explore their strategic implications, particularly in navigating the central paradox between market commoditization and cultural singularization. By providing this integrated perspective, I aim to offer a more robust lens for both academic inquiry and strategic practice, beginning with a necessary exploration of the multifaceted nature of value itself.

2. Deconstructing the Concept of Value: From Economics to Culture

A firm's ability to innovate and compete hinges on a deep appreciation for how value is perceived by its customers and society at large. This understanding must extend beyond simple utility to encompass the complex cultural meanings that products acquire. The concept of value has been a subject of inquiry for centuries, evolving from a narrow economic definition to a much broader, socio-culturally embedded one.

The intellectual journey begins with the classical economic dichotomy between "value in use" and "value in exchange," a distinction first articulated by thinkers like Aristotle and later central to the work of Adam Smith (Fernandes, 2012). Smith famously illustrated this with his "paradox of value," questioning why water, essential for life (high use value), has little to no exchange value, while diamonds, with little practical use, command an immense price (high exchange value). This paradox highlights the fundamental tension between intrinsic utility and market-determined worth. This worldview found its ultimate corporate expression in Michael Porter's renowned "Value Chain". More than a mere model, the Value Chain is the corporate manifestation of an obsession with *exchange value* (Fernandes, 2012).

Those first early focus on objective properties and labor inputs—as seen in the labor theory of value advanced by Ricardo and Marx - gradually gave way to a more subjective, utility-based view in neoclassical economics and modern marketing. Thinkers like Mises argued that value is always the result of subjective judgments, while Burke contended that it is intrinsically related to the worth derived by the consumer (Fernandes, 2012). This shift moved the locus of value from the producer's effort to the consumer's perception and experience.

Before we can map how value is created, we need to understand its two fundamental forms. While classical economics often focused on the practical and measurable, modern value is a much richer concept that includes our emotions, experiences, and social connections.

This evolution necessitates a critical distinction between tangible and intangible value (Jensen, 2005).

- Tangible Value encompasses the classical economic concepts. It includes *economic/exchange value* (the price a product commands) and *use/utility value* (the functional benefit it provides). This is the practical, objective, and measurable worth of a product. It's the value that classical economics traditionally focused on. It combines two key ideas:

  Use Value: What a product *does*. Its utility and functionality. For example, a coffee machine's

use value is its ability to brew coffee.

Exchange Value: What a product *costs*. Its price in the marketplace.

- Intangible Value moves into the realm of human perception and culture. It includes *cultural value*, defined as the meaning and sign a product communicates, and *perception value*, which is the experience derived from its consumption. This is the subjective, emotional, and social worth of a product. It can't be easily measured with money and is rooted in human perception and culture. It combines two key ideas:

  Cultural Value: What a product *means*. The sign or symbol it communicates within a society. For example, an expensive watch can signify status.

  Perception Value: The *experience* a product provides. This includes the feeling of excitement when unboxing a new phone, the nostalgia of a favorite brand from childhood, or the sense of community from wearing a team's jersey.

To illustrate these four types of value, we may use the example of a pencil.

Any simple pencil has, as its main function, the purpose of "leaving a marc on a surface" (that is what we call writing). This function is of use or utility to any user; therefore, we might say that a pencil has "use value", or value as utility. As this can be measured, it is tangible.

To take benefit from that function, "leaving a marc on a surface", users are willing to make some form of sacrifice in order to acquire a pencil, usually expressed in monetary terms. Consequently, that pencil has "economic value" or value as exchange. This is measurable, therefore, tangible.

Some brand names, limited editions or artistic versions might add extra value to some pencils, at an emotional dimension. This esteem value exists within the collective cultural realm and is understood as "cultural value", or value as meaning and sign, which is intangible by nature.

An old or special pencil or some special add-on, given to us by someone close or acquired at a special moment, may hold tremendous emotional significance for an individual. This esteem value exists only at the individual level and it is understood as "perception value", or value as experience, also intangible by nature.

Because a product may hold no meaning or symbolic significance for part of the population—thus having no "cultural value", or because an individual's perception value is difficult to transfer to others due to its personal nature, the potential economic value of an object, in both cases, may be nonexistent to others, even if it holds strong cultural or perceptual value for someone.

This distinction is crucial for understanding the central conflict described by anthropologist Igor Kopytoff: the tension between market forces and cultural forces (Kopytoff, 1986). The market, driven by exchange, has a powerful tendency to *commoditize* products—to strip them of their unique context and render them comparable and interchangeable based on price. In direct opposition, culture seeks to *singularize* objects—to imbue them with unique histories, meanings, and associations that make them "priceless" and remove them from the realm of simple exchange. I argue that this constant struggle between the homogenizing drive of the market and the discriminating force of culture is at the heart of modern product value. To navigate this tension effectively, a model capable of containing these diverse and often conflicting dimensions is required.

3. The Holistic Value Construct: A Foundational Model

To operationalize a multifaceted understanding of value, a visual and holistic framework is indispensable. Such a model allows strategists and innovators to map the entire value creation journey, from an abstract concept to a tangible, culturally significant market offering. The Holistic Value Construct Model (Fernandes, 2012) provides this essential map and represents the first step toward resolving the value paradox I have identified.

The model is structured along two primary axes, creating four distinct but interconnected quadrants:

- Vertical Axis (Value Materialization): Ranging from Simple (e.g., distribution, consumption) to Complex (e.g., R&D, conceptualization), this axis represents the complexity of the process used to create value.
- Horizontal Axis (Value Form): Ranging from Tangible (e.g., utility, price) to Intangible (e.g., ideas, meaning), this axis defines the nature of the value itself.

These axes define four archetypal domains where value is created and resides:

- Complex-Intangible Quadrant (R&D/Creation-Conceptualization): This is the genesis of all value. It is the realm of pure ideas, scientific discoveries, and abstract concepts where value is potential and intangible.
- Complex-Tangible Quadrant (Technology/Production): This quadrant represents the pathway of technological production. Here, intangible concepts are transformed into functional products through scientific knowledge, engineering, and manufacturing.
- Simple-Intangible Quadrant (Culture/Construction): This quadrant represents the pathway of cultural construction. Here, products are imbued with meaning, emotion, and symbolism through branding, storytelling, and social adoption, shaping attitudes and behaviors.
- Simple-Tangible Quadrant (Distribution/Utilization): This is the commercial and economic sphere where the value creation journey culminates. Here, exchange value is realized and use value is experienced by the end-user.

The model's application is clearly illustrated through two distinct examples. A coffee machine primarily follows the technological path: an idea conceived in the *Complex-Intangible* quadrant is engineered in the *Complex-Tangible* quadrant to produce a functional appliance that is ultimately sold and used in the *Simple-Tangible* quadrant. Conversely, Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* primarily follows the cultural path: a creative concept (*Complex-Intangible*) was transcribed into a written play and performed—a process of cultural construction that created immense emotional and symbolic meaning (*Simple-Intangible*). While it has tangible forms like books and tickets that are exchanged (*Simple-Tangible*), its most profound value is intangible and cultural.

While this model maps the static *domains* of value, it is the dynamic force of innovation that dictates the pathways between them—a dual force of technological production and cultural construction that we will now deconstruct.

4. The Dual Nature of Innovation: A Proposed Construct Model

A monolithic view of innovation as solely R&D-driven is insufficient for today's competitive landscape. I argue that successful firms must master two distinct yet interconnected innovation pathways that correspond directly to the production and construction processes identified in the Holistic Value Construct. The Technological Innovation Path is the engine that drives an idea from the *Complex-Intangible* quadrant through the *Complex-Tangible* production process, while the Cultural Innovation Path is the force that shapes its meaning in the *Simple-Intangible* quadrant.

4.1 The Technological Innovation Path

Technological innovation concerns the application of knowledge to create tangible outcomes. The Technological Innovation Construct Model (Fernandes, 2014) maps this domain using two axes: the Creation Process (from Procedural to Loose) and the Value Curve outcome (from a Modified curve to a New one). This framework yields four archetypes:

- Planned/Structured: This R&D-based innovation follows well-defined procedures to achieve predictable results or improvements. A prime example is the development of hybrid cars. Also, the first drones, products made by 3D printing technology, communication satellites, first computer and programming languages are clear examples of this type of technological innovation. This archetype often underpins Upgrading Innovation strategies focused on incremental differentiation.
- Targeted/Objective-Driven: This innovation responds to specific market needs with a focus on design and user experience. Cirque du Soleil exemplifies this by re-imagining the circus for a sophisticated audience. But, design furniture, restricted personal and collective equipment, jewelry and other artistic artifacts, conceived to satisfy aesthetic and functional needs of specific market niches, are examples of this type of technological innovation. It is frequently associated with Value-Added Innovation strategies that layer intangible value onto a product.
- Adopted/Adapted: Based on imitation and applying existing knowledge in new ways, this approach often leads to minor changes, such as through cost-reduction processes. Newly modified household appliances, sports equipment, utilitarian furniture, all improved to facilitate use or follow use trends are day to day examples of this innovation. This archetype is the engine for Turnaround Innovation strategies that leverage commoditization.
- Serendipitous/Stochastic: Resulting from accidental discoveries within a loose, experimental process, this innovation can create entirely new markets. Famous examples include Velcro, penicillin, Post-It Notes and the microwave oven. This archetype is a common origin for Breakthrough Innovation strategies that establish entirely new value curves.

4.2 The Cultural Innovation Path

Cultural innovation involves creating or changing collective behaviors and meanings. Fernandes (2014), drawing on Schwartz's (1996) value system, proposes four archetypes of cultural innovation, named with neologisms to emphasize their unique drivers. The Cultural Innovation Construct Process Model maps this domain using axes of Cultural Collective Values (Conservation to Open to change) and Cultural Individual Values (Self-enhancement to Self-transcendence).

- Neowel: The first archetype, Neowel, describes cultural shifts fundamentally driven by the adoption of new technologies. These technologies create new habits and social norms, as exemplified by the behaviors created by smartphones and social media.

- Beutel: This cultural change is driven by the adoption of new aesthetics. It emerges from creative fields and introduces new styles that become culturally significant, such as the societal impact of new fashion like the miniskirt or new music genres like jazz.
- Moral: This innovation is driven by the adoption of new codes, rules, and laws that shape collective behavior. Public health campaigns against "drink n' drive" or mandates for vaccination have successfully created new, widely accepted social norms.
- Gnosil: This cultural change is driven by the adoption of new knowledge, often related to science or health, which inspires new lifestyles. The popularization of activities like jogging with an iPod or adopting a raw food diet based on health information are examples.

Understanding these dual paths of innovation is critical, but true strategic mastery comes from synthesizing them to navigate the fundamental tensions in the modern marketplace.

5. Synthesis and Strategic Implications: Navigating the Value Paradox

The true power of this unified framework emerges when these models are synthesized. I contend that the ability to consciously manage the interplay between technological production and cultural construction is a primary source of sustainable competitive advantage. This synthesis reveals and helps resolve the central paradox of modern product development: the conflict between technological innovation, which often leads to commoditization and value homogenization, and cultural innovation, which leads to singularization and "pricelessness" (Kopytoff, 1986; Renfrew, 1986).

This paradox is the primary analytical lens through which all innovation strategy must be viewed. The four strategies outlined below represent four distinct approaches to managing the Kopytoff paradox, using the innovation archetypes as their engines (Martins & Fernandes, 2015).

- Breakthrough Innovation: This strategy aims to create an entirely new value curve, originating from technological novelty but achieving lasting success by becoming a cultural icon. The first personal computer, for instance, was a technological breakthrough that ultimately created a new culture of work and communication. This path deliberately seeks to establish a new form of singularity.
- Turnaround Innovation: This strategy deliberately embraces commoditization as a competitive tool. It involves simplifying a product, often using new technology to radically reduce costs, thereby making it accessible to a mass market. The Tata Nano car, designed to be the world's most affordable automobile, is a quintessential example of leveraging homogenization for strategic advantage.
- Value-Added Innovation: This strategy champions singularization as a direct assault on commoditization. It involves layering intangible value—such as esteem, brand prestige, and cultural significance—onto an otherwise functional product to transform it into a premium offering. Renova's black toilet paper, which turned a basic commodity into a luxury design statement, perfectly illustrates this path.
- Upgrading Innovation: This strategy involves making incremental technological improvements to key attributes to differentiate from competitors within a commodity market. It seeks to achieve temporary singularity in a market constantly being pulled toward homogeneity. Zara's fast-fashion model, which uses process technology to rapidly upgrade its clothing lines, is a prime example.

This framework also holds specific implications for Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). Lacking the resources for large-scale, R&D-driven breakthrough innovation, SMEs can compete effectively by leveraging this dual model. They can achieve success by focusing on niche solutions, specializing in specific cultural or technological components, and excelling at sourcing external knowledge. Rather than competing with large corporations on their terms, SMEs can carve out defensible market positions by mastering value-added, turnaround, or highly focused upgrading strategies. This integrated framework, therefore, not only explains current market dynamics but also provides a powerful lens for shaping future strategy.

The first imperative is to dismantle the legacy "value chain" mindset. This linear, inside-out model is an operational liability in an ecosystem where value is co-created. Leaders must instead architect and manage a dynamic "value network," a system defined by "multidirectional dynamic value exchanges." This perspective recognizes that customers and partners are not endpoints but active nodes in value creation. In this network, intangible assets like knowledge and access are currencies in their own right, exchanged for a fair return, creating a more resilient and adaptive value system than any linear chain could ever achieve.

6. A Case Study in Technological and Cultural Innovation

While countless products have undergone significant changes in value and meaning over time, few artifacts illustrate this process as clearly and universally as blue jeans. This paper presents the history of blue jeans as an exceptional case study for examining the evolution of product value. The central argument is that the garment's enduring global relevance stems from a profound historical shift, moving from an initial foundation of "use value," defined by its physical utility, to a complex superstructure of "cultural value," defined by its rich symbolic meaning. This evolution was not accidental but was driven by a dual process of innovation. The following analysis will demonstrate how the initial "technological innovation" that created the garment was followed by a series of "cultural innovations" that transformed it from a simple piece of workwear into a powerful global emblem.

6.1 The Genesis of Utility

This section analyzes the foundational stage of the blue jean's life cycle, a period in which its value was defined almost exclusively by its utility. This origin story is strategically important as it reveals how specific technological solutions were developed to address a tangible, real-world problem. The user dissatisfaction experienced by laborers in the American West acted as the direct catalyst for the innovations that would give birth to a garment prized not for its style, but for its sheer resilience. This initial focus on functionality established the material basis upon which all subsequent cultural meanings would be built.

To understand the genesis of blue jeans, one must consider the occupational context of the American West during the second half of the 19th century. Workers engaged in physically demanding labor, such as farming and gold mining, faced a persistent problem: their standard trousers could not withstand the strain of their daily work. Garments would frequently rip at points of high stress, drastically reducing their lifespan and utility. This constant failure of equipment represented a significant drain on both time and resources, leading to widespread economic dissatisfaction among these workers. The low use value of existing pants created a clear and urgent market demand for a more durable solution, setting the stage for innovation.

The solution to this problem of durability emerged not from a single invention, but from the clever combination and application of existing materials and technologies. Two key innovations were pivotal:

- Riveting: Jacob Davis, a tailor in Reno, Nevada, conceived of applying metal rivets—a technology he commonly used to strengthen horse blankets—to the stress points of work pants, such as pocket corners and the base of the button fly. This act represents what can be characterized as an "adoption and adaptation of existing technology" from an entirely different industry.
- Fabric Selection: Levi Strauss, a dry goods merchant in California, originally intended to sell rolls of canvas for tents and wagon covers, but he quickly realized the material could be repurposed for making pants (Solomon, 1986). He later transitioned to an even more rugged cotton fabric from France known as "serge de Nimes," which eventually became known as "denim." This shift constitutes a "process of adoption of existing materials" to better serve the product's primary function of durability.

The riveted pants created by Davis were an immediate local success. Recognizing the commercial potential, but lacking the funds to secure a patent, Davis offered a partnership to Levi Strauss, his fabric supplier. This collaboration led to the official birth of the modern blue jean. In 1873, a patent was awarded to both men, and production began at a plant in San Francisco. In 1890, the company first used the lot number "501" to designate its iconic denim waist overalls. The garment's common names also have historical roots; "denim" is a corruption of "de Nimes," its fabric's place of origin, while "jeans" derives from "genes," the French term for the heavy cotton pants worn by sailors from Genoa (Solomon, op. cit.).

Thus, the blue jean began its life as a purely utilitarian garment, defined by its resistance and durability and created for a specific working-class segment. For decades, it remained largely confined to this niche, poised for a radical transformation that would elevate it far beyond its humble origins.

6.2 The Great Transformation

The second major phase in the evolution of blue jeans was catalyzed by profound external socio-economic forces. The Great Depression of the 1930s created a new social and economic context that disrupted established norms and fostered new behaviors, transforming the garment from a piece of niche workwear into a powerful national icon. During this period, the blue jean began to accumulate cultural value, functioning as a symbolic bridge that blurred the lines between class and gender and came to represent emerging American ideals of equalitarianism and freedom.

The economic calamities of the Depression era spurred a re-evaluation of the American way of life, creating an environment ripe for symbolic change. In this context, blue jeans began their migration from the countryside and factories into the mainstream. The garment's rugged, unpretentious nature resonated with a national mood that valued authenticity and resilience. It served as a bridge between the working class and the middle class, and between male and female consumers, challenging existing paradigms of dress. Beyond production and consumption factors, this transformation was spurred by two key categories of events: regulatory changes that reorganized consumption in a more equitable fashion, and aesthetic shifts that used style to make sense of the era's calamities and reinterpret the American way of life (Comstock, 2011).

Scholars offer two complementary theoretical approaches to explain the diversification and popularization of jeans during this era:

- Consumption-Side Factors: As argued by Rabine and Kiser (2006), significant changes in the lifestyles of middle-class Americans created a new demand for casual clothing. The rise of leisure time, women's entry into the paid workforce, and a greater emphasis on women's sports all contributed to a cultural environment where formal attire was no longer practical or desirable for all occasions.
- Production-Side Factors: Fine and Leopold (1993) contend that shifts in the garment industry itself were a primary driver. Advances in mass-production technologies and new mass-distribution capabilities intensified competition. This pressure pushed manufacturers to market standardized garments like dungarees in innovative ways to expand beyond their traditional markets and capture new consumer segments.

The rising influence of Hollywood played a crucial role in cementing the new status of blue jeans. Actors who portrayed cowboys in popular Western films began wearing jeans in their public lives, popularizing the rugged, independent aesthetic as a form of casual dress. This association with the romanticized American West helped strip the garment of its purely labor-oriented connotations. A definitive milestone occurred in 1935 when Levi's for women were featured in *Vogue* magazine. This event signaled the garment's official entry into mainstream fashion and its formal adoption by women, confirming its transition from workwear to a versatile and stylish staple.

Having become a national symbol that crossed class and gender lines, the blue jean was now positioned for global adoption, where it would acquire new layers of meaning as a symbol for youth and counter-cultural movements.

6.3 The Symbolism of Rebellion and Global Liberation

The second half of the 20th century saw blue jeans complete their transformation from a national icon into a global symbol. As the garment spread across the world, its meaning shifted once again, becoming deeply intertwined with youth movements, rebellion against the establishment, and political ideologies. No longer just a signifier of American heritage, the blue jean evolved into a universal uniform for social and cultural change, demonstrating its remarkable capacity to absorb and project the aspirations of diverse groups.

In the post-war United States, blue jeans were adopted by successive youth movements as a key element of their identity. This adoption fundamentally altered the product's perceived value:

- In the 1950s, jeans became associated with the burgeoning youth culture and were seen as a symbol of "juvenile delinquency" (Gordon, 1991), representing a break from the conservative conformity of the era.
- In the 1960s, the garment was a core component of the hippie movement, worn to signify a rejection of materialism and a connection to more authentic, working-class roots.

This evolution corresponded with a shift in the product's key attributes. The original values of "durability and resistance" became secondary to newly prized qualities like "comfort, informality and versatility." The garment was no longer just a tool for work but a tool for self-expression.

The international popularization of blue jeans accelerated with the baby-boom generation and the global expansion of American producers. As jeans crossed national borders, they were imbued with potent political and cultural meanings, often standing as a symbol of Western freedom and democracy, despite many different interpretations in different countries, such as:

- Argentina: Jeans were among the first items of clothing used primarily by young people to signal generational, class, and gender distinctions, marking a departure from the traditions of their elders (Manzano, 2009).
- Portugal: During the nation's dictatorship, jeans were banned as a symbol of the American way of life. They only became widely available after the democratic revolution in 1975, cementing their association with liberty.
- South Korea: The government did not permit the import of blue jeans until the 1980s, highlighting their status as a culturally significant and potentially disruptive foreign object (DeLong et al., 1998).

The ability of a simple garment to accumulate such a complex and powerful array of cultural meanings necessitates a deeper theoretical framework to understand *how* this process of signification occurs.

6.4 Decoding the Denim: A Semiotic and Cultural Analysis

To fully comprehend the phenomenon of blue jeans, it is necessary to move beyond a purely historical account and analyze the garment through the lens of semiotics and cultural theory. This section serves as the theoretical core of the chapter, exploring how blue jeans function as a communication system. By examining the garment as a cultural object and a sign, we can deconstruct the mechanisms that allow it to carry so many layers of meaning and resolve the apparent paradox of its simultaneous appeal to both conformity and individuality.

The clothing we wear acts as a "visual metaphor for identity" (Davis, 1993), communicating information about ourselves within a shared cultural context. Users associate products such as jeans, based on their particular set of experiences and values that are shared within a cultural context, which certainly leads to certain expectations regarding the use of the product (Kaiser, 1997). This paradox of individuality and conformity that jeans can represent has led to a large number of meanings, associated with that ambiguity for the individual and society at large. At the individual level, favorite items of clothing might be perceived by users as meaningful, often contextualized by emotional or aesthetics properties or capabilities for them (Kaiser, Freeman and Chandler, 1993). Jeans, as a cultural object, are comprised of both form and content, components that are often separated during the communication process (Hillestad, 1994). According to Fiske (1990), communication relies on underlying "codes," which he defines as systems of meaning common to the members of a culture. Within this system, a "sign" is an object or component that represents something other than itself (Berger, 1992). Cultural objects like blue jeans can function as a sign in three distinct ways: as an icon, an index, or a symbol (DeLong et al., op. cit.). This capacity to function as a complex sign is what allows the garment to be interpreted in myriad ways by different groups and individuals.

The unique power of blue jeans lies in their ability to resolve a fundamental tension in modern identity. As Wilson (1991) eloquently states, jeans are "the symbolic vessel into which any and every aspiration about one's identity can be poured, the ultimate conveyer of that greatest fashion paradox: how to be just the same as, yet entirely different from, everyone else." This central paradox explains the garment's universal appeal. The jean's capacity to function as multiple types of signs is the very mechanism that allows it to resolve this paradox; it can serve as an *index* of a working-class background, a *symbol* of American freedom, and an *icon* of the cowboy aesthetic all at once. It allows an individual to signal conformity and belonging to a group while simultaneously providing a canvas for expressing individuality through fit, wear, and styling.

6.5 Cultural Innovation and Intangible Value

The entire trajectory of the blue jean after its initial invention can be understood as a process of "cultural innovation." This is defined as a change in the product's intangible value, reflecting a fundamental shift from "value as utility" to "value as meaning and sign." This process is driven by changes in consumer behavior, which are in turn caused or induced by the use of the product itself. The history of jeans demonstrates several types of cultural innovation, including the "beutel" process, occurred throughout its history, and the "moral" process, which arose in specific situations where a new behavior was adopted by large segments of the population under a shared behavioral code.

This theoretical analysis reveals that the value of blue jeans is not inherent in the object itself but is actively created and recreated through cultural use, a conclusion that provides a powerful lens for the final summary.

6.6 Summary

The history of the blue jean provides a compelling and uniquely accessible narrative of value creation and transformation. This paper has traced the garment's remarkable journey, beginning with its origins as a pragmatic solution to a functional problem. This initial phase, characterized by "technological innovation," established a product whose value was rooted entirely in its utility—its durability and resistance. However, as the jean moved from the sphere of work into the broader cultural landscape, it underwent a profound metamorphosis. Through a continuous process of "cultural innovation," it was imbued with a rich and often contradictory set of meanings, becoming a symbol of national identity, youthful rebellion, class consciousness, and political freedom. The blue jean stands as a perfect case to illustrate how changes in a product's use value and cultural value are driven by the deeply intertwined processes of technological and cultural innovation, demonstrating that the most enduring objects are often those that successfully bridge the gap between function and meaning.

7. Conclusion and Directions for Future Research

This paper has argued for a necessary and urgent evolution in our understanding of value. The traditional paradigms, focused on tangible outputs and economic exchange, are no longer adequate to guide strategy in a world where meaning and experience are the ultimate differentiators.

The core message is that the paradigm of value has shifted from a one-dimensional economic calculation to a holistic construct that powerfully integrates tangible utility with intangible meaning. Lasting success now depends on mastering the twin engines of innovation and managing the dynamic tension at the heart of the modern market: the market commoditizes, but culture singularizes.

For business leaders, the call to action is clear. Leaders who master this holistic blueprint will not just compete; they will create markets. They will move beyond selling products to architecting cultural phenomena, building enterprises that are not just profitable, but indispensable.

In this article, I have also moved beyond the fragmented definitions of value and innovation to propose a unified theoretical framework. By connecting a holistic model of value with the dual innovation paths of technological production and cultural construction, my synthesis reveals a more complete picture of how products succeed. This integrated perspective underscores a critical insight: value is not a static quality embedded in a product, but a dynamic property co-created through a complex interplay of a firm's productive capabilities, the cultural landscape, and the consumer's subjective experience.

The framework I have established provides a robust foundation for analysis and also sets a clear agenda for future inquiry. To advance this line of research, I propose the following:

- Empirical Validation: There is an explicit and pressing need for empirical research to test and validate the theoretical construct models presented: the Holistic Value Construct, and the Technological and Cultural Innovation models (Fernandes, 2012; Fernandes, 2014).
- Inter-Model Dynamics: Future research should investigate the specific correlations and causal links between the archetypes of technological and cultural innovation. For example, does "Serendipitous" technological innovation more frequently lead to "Neowel" cultural change? Understanding these dynamic pairings would provide invaluable predictive power.
- Analysis of Future Scenarios: The framework should be applied to analyze the potential cultural and value impacts of significant emerging technologies. Research is needed to explore how innovations like 3D printing, societal robotization, free energy, self-driving vehicles and artificial intelligence (AI) will disrupt existing value structures (Fernandes, 2014).
- Economic Impact of Behavioral Change: Further research within behavioral economics is warranted to move beyond qualitative descriptions and develop measurable models that quantify the economic impact of attitude and behavior changes driven by cultural innovation (Fernandes, 2014).

Ultimately, the relationship between human society and the technologies it creates is an evolving, co-dependent dance. By understanding the distinct rhythms of technological production and cultural construction, we can better appreciate, anticipate, and shape the innovations that define our world.

References

Berger, A. (1992). *Reading matter: Multidisciplinary perspectives on material culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Comstock, S. C. (2011). *The Making of an American Icon: The Transformation of Blue jeans during the Great Depression.* In D. Miller, & S. Woodward (Eds.), *Global Denim* (pp. 23-50). Oxford: Berg Publishers. https://doi.org/10.2752/9781472504401/GLOBDEN0004

Davis, F. (1993). Fashion, Culture and Identity. *Winterthur Portfolio*, *28*(1), 102-105. https://doi.org/10.1086/496608

DeLong, M., Koh, A., Nelson, N., & Ingvolstad, A. (1998). Jeans: A Comparison of Perceptions of Meaning in Korea and United States. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, *16*(3), 116-126. https://doi.org/10.1177/0887302X9801600302

Fernandes, M. T. (2012). A Holistic and Cultural view of Value. *Advances in Management & Applied Economics*, *2*(1), 55-107.

Fernandes, M. T. (2014). Innovation: Technological and Cultural Construct Model. *International Journal of Economics, Finance and Management*, *3*(7), 351-370.

Fine, B., & Leopold, E. (1993). *The World of Consumption*. London: Routledge.

Fiske, J. (1990). *Introduction to communication studies* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Gordon, B. (1991). American Denim: Blue Jeans and Their Multiple Layers of Meaning. In A. C. Patricia, & V. L. Susan (Eds.), *Dress and Popular Culture*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press.

Hillestad, R. (1994). Form in dress and adornment: The shape of content. In M. R. DeLong, & A. M. Fiore (Eds.), *Aesthetics of textiles and clothing: Advancing multidisciplinary perspectives* (#7, pp. 80-83). ITAA Publication.

Jensen, per A. (2005). *Value Concepts and Value based Collaboration in Building Projects* (pp. 3-10). Proceedings of the CIBW096 Architectural Management, Technical University of Denmark, Lyngby.

Kaiser, S. B. (1997). *The Social Psychology of Clothing: Symbolic appearances in context* (2nd ed., revised). New York: Fairchild.

Kaiser, S. B., Freeman, C. M., & Chandler, J. L. (1993). Favorite clothes and gendered subjectivities: Multiple readings. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, *15*, 27-50.

Kopytoff, I. (1986). The cultural biography of things: Commoditization as process. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *The Social Life of Things* (pp. 64-94). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511819582.004

Manzano, V. (2009). The Blue Jean Generation: Youth, Gender, and Sexuality in Buenos Aires, 1958-1975. *Journal of Social History*, *42*(3), 657-676. https://doi.org/10.1353/jsh/42.3.657

Martins, J. M., & Fernandes, M. T. (2015). Too small to innovate? Creating value with fewer resources. *Journal of Business Strategy*, *36*(2), 25-33. https://doi.org/10.1108/JBS-02-2014-0014

Rabine, L. W., & Kaiser, S. B. (2006). *Sewing machines and dream machines in Los Angeles and San Francisco: The case of the blue jean*. In C. Breward, & D. Gilbert (Eds.), *Fashion's World Cities*. Oxford/New York: Berg. https://doi.org/10.2752/9780857854117/FASHWRLDCIT0023

Renfrew, C. (1986). *Varna and the emergence of wealth in prehistoric Europe*. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *The Social Life of Things* (pp. 141-168). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511819582.007

Schwartz, S. (1996). *Value Priorities and Behavior: Applying a Theory of Integrated Value Systems* (Vol. 8). The Psychology of Values, The Ontario Symposium, Lawrence Erlbaum.

Solomon, M. R. (1986). Deep-Seated Materialism: The case of Levi's 501 Jeans. *Advances in Consumer Research*, *13*, 619-622.

Wilson, E. (1991). The evolution of blue jeans. *Utne Reader*, *44*(March/April), 122-124.