Tilburg University

Aesthetics from a design perspective

Weggeman, M.C.D.P.; Lammers, I.; Akkermans, H.A.

Published in:
Journal of Organizational Change Management

Publication date:
2007

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Weggeman, M. C. D. P., Lammers, I., & Akkermans, H. A. (2007). Aesthetics from a design perspective. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 20(3), 346-358.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Aesthetics from a design perspective

Mathieu Weggeman

*Faculty of Technology Management, Eindhoven University of Technology,
Eindhoven, The Netherlands*

Irene Lammers

*Faculty of Economics and Business Administration,
Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, and*

Henk Akkermans

Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands

Abstract

Purpose – This paper aims to explore the relationship between aspects of aesthetics and the performance of organizations. It outlines a research agenda for studying the impact of aesthetic factors upon organizational design and change.

Design/methodology/approach – In the paper, a set of seven propositions is developed to address various aspects of organizational performance that are influenced by beauty in organizations. These propositions are based on a distinction between the concepts process aesthetics, product aesthetics and aesthetic sensibility.

Findings – The hypotheses suggest that organizational performance might be enhanced by the beauty of products and services, and indirectly by the aesthetics of organizational work processes, organizational structures, the personal well-being of employees and organizational designers with a high degree of aesthetic sensibility.

Research limitations/implications – The hypothesis in this paper should be tested by future researchers.

Practical implications – The paper might enhance the awareness of practitioners of the practical value of aesthetics

Originality/value – The paper adds to the new field of organizational aesthetics a performance-oriented approach based on a design perspective.

Keywords Organizational design, Organizational performance, Organizational change

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Although it seems obvious that aesthetic deliberations play a role in many different aspects of organizations, it is not so clear if and how aesthetics play a role in the process of organisational design. All professionals now and then take aesthetic considerations in their work into account. Schön (1983) pointed this out for architects, which is understandable as it is commonly assumed that the products of their work, architectural designs, should display beauty (Guillén, 1997). But perhaps, it appears less obvious at first sight that the products of managerial work can also display beauty, in the sense that they facilitate the origination of aesthetic experiences in work processes in the operational core.

Comparisons between management and managers and other areas where aesthetic considerations play an important role, have often been made. For instance, Weick (1998), Lewin (1998) and Berniker (1998) have stressed the relevance of jazz improvisation as a metaphor for organisation, and most jazz musicians certainly strive for beauty in their creative work. Also, it has repeatedly been stressed that managers as organisational designers should display creativity. Csikszentmihalyi (1996) has stressed the importance of a deep interest in various art forms such as music and poetry for the professional productivity of most of the highly successful creative individuals he interviewed. A well-known example of such an individual was Albert Einstein, and perhaps also the most outspoken one regarding the importance of beauty for his professional domain, physics. Einstein stated that "... the only physical theories that we are willing to except are the beautiful ones" and "physical laws should have mathematical beauty" (Formelo, 2002, p. xiii), although this view is not free of controversies in theoretical and applied physics. So, how about organisation science?

As indicated, the purpose of this paper is to open up an academic debate on the role of aesthetics of organisation, in both the process of organising and in the outcomes of this process: organisations. Are some organisations more beautiful than others and, if so, why? What roles do aesthetic considerations play in organisational design rules (Van Aken, 2004; Romme, 2003)? Do aesthetically pleasing organisational processes lead to more successful organisations? Our aim here is to present a research agenda, consisting of a logically ordered set of propositions suggesting relationships between aspects of aesthetics and performance in an organisational context.

This paper is structured as follows. First, we review what has been said about aesthetics in the broad context of organisation so far. Second, we present a number of logically ordered propositions regarding the role of aesthetics in organisation and its possible links with organisational performance. All of these propose clear causal relationships between these concepts. Relationships, that are of relevance to further research and discussion.

Aesthetics and the study of organisation

Nowadays, in our culture, the concept of beauty is closely associated with originality, genius, expressiveness, and the ability of a work of art to appeal beyond rationality to the taste or the senses of the spectator or listener. But, other views are still present too. Weggeman (2003) found that aesthetic appreciation tend to be expressed in any of the following four criteria. These are:

- (1) in balance, in harmony, at peace;
- (2) simple, complete, pure authentic;
- (3) exciting, adventurous, provoking, challenging; and
- (4) innovative, discontinuous, surprising, strange (Weggeman, 2003).

Those who prefer to use categories (1) and (2) are usually not very enthusiastic about categories (3) and (4), and vice versa. Whitehead (1929) explains his preference for what in this scheme would be category (3), by saying that no single beauty can ever install itself in a harmony that has already been achieved. Even perfection cannot save beauty from endless repetition. Standing still is also moving backwards and sinking into anaesthesia. That is why beauty, in its very essence, is linked with renewal

and adventure, with the mental and in that way with discourse. A civilisation without adventure is in decline, Whitehead states. Would this also apply to an organisation as a micro-civilisation?

If aesthetics as a topic of philosophical enquiry goes back several centuries, it is only in the past few decades that more and more aspects of our reality are becoming aesthetically mantled, and that our social reality becomes more and more an aesthetic construction (Welsch, 1996). Welsch points at a number of aestheticisation processes happening around us. We live in styled houses, drive our beautiful cars through our minitiously planned city, go to shops with a carefully designed “total shop experience” wander through parks and forests with nice lingering lanes and let our noses made perfect by our plastic surgeon. In other words, we are transforming our urban, industrial and natural environment *in toto* into a hyperaesthetic scenario.

Aestheticisation can also be seen in the rise of specific industries that are geared to meet our aesthetic interest: our need to have fun, make ourselves and our surroundings beautiful and to have as much meaningful experiences or adrenaline-experiences as we can. Lastly, aesthetic deliberations clearly form the basis of many different activities of organizations, for example for advertising campaigns, product designs and the physical arrangement of workspaces and offices. Corporate buildings are carefully designed to reflect the corporate image, see for instance the very impressive buildings of some financial institutes.

Aesthetics is more and more part of a deliberate marketing strategy. Products and organisations are styled, and made fashionable (Dickinson and Svensen, 2000; Schmitt and Simonson, 1997). As aesthetic fashions are particularly short-lived, the need for replacement arises as soon as they are aesthetically “out”. Whether it is clothes, cigarettes, cars, furniture, perfume: you are not buying the product itself, but the image, the aesthetic value the company has created around it. The aesthetic is no longer the “software” around a material “hardware” but more and more the essence, the core of a product. This can also be seen in the service industries, where the face-to-face or voice-to-voice interactions with customers are also carefully aesthetically styled by organizations. A dress code or corporate clothing, detailed instructions on how to make contact and when to smile, and thorough training of the staff on how to look good or to sound right, are phenomena that illustrate the rise of aesthetics in many different elements of organization.

While philosophy has been dealing with aesthetics for centuries and the past decades have shown a strong growth of attention to aesthetics in our daily lives, within organisation studies aesthetics as a line of inquiry is a very recent activity indeed, dating only from a few years back. Pioneering work on the notion of organizational aesthetic has been done by Strati (1990, 1992, 1996, 1999) and Gagliardi (1990, 1996). Both sought to address the importance of studying organizational aesthetics as a means of developing a greater insight into how meanings are structured and promoted within an organization, seen as a cultural environment. Strati presents a case for the importance of studying previously overlooked examples of organizational facility, such as the significance of office decors or the location and style of office chairs, as a means of understanding the structuring of social relations within the workplace. For Strati, an organizational artefact is simultaneously material and non-material, belongs to both an individual and everybody else, denotes status, plays a part in organizational rituals, symbols competition within organizations, etc. Strati calls the

aesthetic knowledge that results from this kind of analysis “weak thought” that has the potential to enrich organizational theory based on strong paradigms and the search for universalism and domination.

In his contribution to the *Handbook of Organization Studies* called “Exploring the aesthetic side of organizational life” Gagliardi (1996) deliberately seeks to be “mould breaking, future oriented and agenda setting”. He argues that our experience of the real is in the basis a sensory experience, called the aesthetic experience. Aesthetic experience, due to its unconscious nature, cannot be (completely) expressed by words. A way to solve this problem, for Gagliardi, is the study of organizational artefacts. An artefact can be defined as a product of human action, which exists independently of its creator, that is aimed at solving a problem or satisfying a need and that it is endowed with its own corporeality or physicality. By following Latour (1992) observation that “material things are the missing masses that knock insistently at the doors of sociology” Gagliardi makes it likely that the study of artefacts is a way to bypass the dominant cognitive and intentional ways of accessing systems of meaning. An example of this is the direct relationship between things and the development of the self:

If, for example, we seek confirmation of our identity as thinkers through the working out of ideas, it is only the written page in front of us; it is only the materialized idea, which reassures us about our capacity to pursue such aims. Only the sight, the feel, the smell of printing ink form the newly published book unequivocally tells us that we are capable of exercising those particular forms of control of external reality with which our identity as writers is bound up (Gagliardi, 1996, p. 569).

Another line of research is the study on the aesthetics of service labour (Witz *et al.*, 2003; Adkins, 2000; Hancock and Tyler, 2000; Sturdy *et al.*, 2001). These studies focus on the ways in which employers seek to influence the embodied “dispositions” of service workers. The notion of aesthetics is used as a way to refocus the perspective to the sensible, physical elements of organizational life. Thus, these studies do not focus on the way the smiles and manners, or the “right” emotions of service workers are produced, but they focus on the managerial strategies that are executed to install those standards of behaviour like the dress code, how to wear your hair, make-up or how to shave.

These different approaches have in common, that they all stem from the first conception of aesthetics, which brings the sensory and perceptive faculties of organizations to the fore. A Hegelian conception of aesthetics, that focuses on the beauty of organizations is mostly lacking. An exception is the work of Ramirez (1991, 1996), who focuses on the description of the beauty of social organization, grounding his analysis on the approach of Kant (2002)[1]. Unfortunately, Ramirez stops where our interest begins, namely at the question whether it is possible to determine the factors that enable an organization to act beautifully. He argues:

... this in effect amounted to determining the “necessary and sufficient factors” that enabled something to be considered as beautiful. Since, no one has ever been able to come up with such a recipe for anything, be it a painting, a statue or whatever, it [is] ludicrous to attempt to do so in the domain of social organization (Ramirez, 1991, p. 12).

We consider an attempt to establish what it is that makes an organization act beautiful not ludicrous, but a possible and worthwhile undertaking. We argue that there is more

to say about the appreciation of the beautiful than it being a mere subjective experience. Within the art world, the value of a work of art is the outcome of the dynamics of its institutional context, the art-world (Vickery, 2003). Likewise, the aesthetic value of an organization can be socially constructed, leading to ideas that enhance both the beauty and the performance of organizations.

Our perspective in the remainder of this contribution is applying a design science perspective (Van Aken, 2004; Romme, 2003) geared to the development of a research agenda on the aesthetics of organisation. We are interested in the ways in which aesthetic considerations can be instrumental in designing better organizational processes, better being defined in terms of organisational performance. With aesthetics, we want to “make a difference” here (Romme, 2003). For many scientists and engineers, it is obvious that beautifully designed technological processes or artefacts yield better performance. Our quest is for a similar role of aesthetics in organisational design, for we consider organisations to be artefacts as well, “things” that can be designed and made. Here, our literature search has yield very few results. We have the intention to define a research agenda for this topic that will be developed in the next section.

Aesthetics of organisation, a research agenda

If we want to study the impact of aesthetics on organisation, it is necessary to start from an overview and an initial structure of the field. We will structure the field from a design science perspective, leading to an initial conceptual model that is depicted in Figure 1. Derived from this model, we will develop several propositions. Each of them will be discussed below.

We will start by discussing some key assumptions that lay underneath our research agenda. We argue that an analytical distinction can be made in, what we have called, process aesthetics and result aesthetics. Result aesthetics refer to the experiences of beauty someone goes through while he or she as an observer or bystander is exposed to an outside artefact. That is the case when listening to a symphony, tasting a course or seeing a limousine moves us. This is the kind of aesthetics that we are most familiar with. With process aesthetics we refer to the experiences of beauty someone goes through while he or she is actually participating in the origination process of the artefact. This kind of experience occurs while playing the violin in an orchestra, making a car or preparing dishes in a restaurant. In our terminology Csikszentmihalyi’s (1996) notion of flow corresponds with a situation in which someone experiences the highest level of process aesthetics. We want to extend that notion by introducing the term collective flow meaning a situation in which many workers experience high level process aesthetics while working together on the same artefact, at the same time in the same process.

Figure 1.
Conceptual model of the
impact of aesthetics on
organization

Furthermore, in our conceptual model the term aesthetic quality is used several times. By that we mean the capacity of an artefact (a man-made design, product or process) to generate, evoke experiences of beauty, either by observers (result aesthetics) or makers (process aesthetics). In addition, we presuppose that such artefact is beautiful if an individual or a group is moved or touched by it that is goes through an aesthetic experience. To conclude, aesthetic sensibility is defined here as the subjective predisposition to experience beauty. This predisposition expresses itself, consciously or unconsciously in the skill to assess and appreciate the aesthetic quality of artefacts. This skill is largely influenced by the upbringing, training and education of the individual as well as by the values and believes of the local culture.

Our conceptual model is based on the logic of an input-output model of organisation. In this, we follow the common logic in designing organisations, which we are seeking to apply on the aesthetics of organisation. Organisational designs lead to organisational processes, those processes deliver certain products and services and those can be more or less successful in the external environment. Equally straightforward, it would seem to assume that the quality of this organisational design is influenced by certain characteristics of the management of these organisations, and that these characteristics are partly formed by education and training. Following this logic, we can see that the final link in this causal chain implies that the aesthetic quality of products and services influences business performance (*P1*). Tracing one step back, *P2* is that the higher the aesthetic quality of organisational processes, the higher the aesthetic quality of products and services. In other words: process aesthetics influences result aesthetics. *P3* takes a side step and investigates the question to what extent people are happier when they experience aesthetically pleasing processes and the reverse, if happier people make organisational processes more aesthetically pleasing. Our *P4* investigates the relationship between the well being of organisation members and the aesthetic quality of products and services, an issue that is surprisingly well researched within the domain of services management. Our *P5* looks at the question to what extent organisational designs with high-aesthetic quality also lead to organisational processes with high-aesthetic quality. *P6* traces even further back. It looks at managers as organisational designers, a concept frequently stressed in the systems thinking and organisational learning literature (Forrester, 1965; Keough and Doman, 1992; Senge, 1990). Do managers with a highly developed aesthetic sensibility design organisational structures of high aesthetic quality? And *P7* ends at the beginning, which is the educational question: if more attention were given to aesthetics in management curricula, would this heighten aesthetic sensibilities of managers in their roles as organisational designers? We will now discuss each proposition in turn.

P1: product or service beauty and business performance

Our first proposition is that organisations that generate more beautiful products or services will be more successful in their environment. We would suggest measuring successful performance according to the EFQM Excellence Model, which distinguishes in people results, customer results and society results (corporate image and citizenship). Successful performance than becomes having more then average satisfied customers, employees and other stake-and shareholders (EFQM, 2004).

This seems fairly mundane, in comparison with the elevated ideas brought forward elsewhere in this paper. However, we have to be frank about this: although we believe

explicit attention for the aesthetic dimension is relevant in organisation studies, we do not want to suggest a *l'art pour l'art* attitude in organisations. We recognise that, in terms of Witz *et al.* (2003), we are, “in effect, ‘adding on’ a concern with aesthetics to a fundamentally rationalist and structuralist paradigm of organization” (p. 43). As we emphasise the role and significance of aesthetics, we primarily do so, as Witz *et al.*, call it, for instrumental reasons. In doing so, we are not that far away from business authors such as Peters and Waterman (1982), who have looked for “excellence” as an underlying explanatory factor for company success. In the eyes of Sandelands and Buckner (2003, p. 119), “excellence is a kind of beauty, a kind of aesthetic. The excellent organisation engages its members in transcendent values, which rise above worldly concerns”.

The left hand side of proposition *P1* is less straightforward. When are products and services more beautiful? Here, we come to proposition *P2*.

P2: process beauty and the beauty of products and services

We are not suggesting that, aesthetic organisational processes will automatically result in beautiful products. Rather, we suggest something as shown in Table I. If the process is considered “ugly” it is unlikely that the product will be “beautiful”. Equally unlikely, at least in the eyes of the creators, is the situation where a beautiful process would lead to an ugly product.

We acknowledge that this proposition is much more complicated than this two-by-two matrix suggests. To start off with, one might critique our emphasis on processes as the defining characteristic of organisation. Here, we remain on relatively safe ground, as we can refer to Weick (1969), who states:

... assume that there are processes which create, maintain and dissolve social collectivities, that these processes constitute the work of organising, and that the ways in which these processes are continuously executed *are* the organization (Weick, 1996, p. 1).

Another critique might be that the notion of beauty is inappropriately assigned to something as mundane as selling a ticket or fixing a car, or any other organisational process. Here, a reply would be that, in the arts, those that can only appreciate beauty in a very selected number of categories are often labelled as having a low level of aesthetic sensibility indicating that they only can achieve satisfaction from certain types of music, certain painters, certain forms of dance. Sandelands and Buckner (1989) rightfully assert “artistry is possible even in the most prosaic doings and makings of modern life” (p. 117). As we know, those mundane processes like arranging flowers or serving tea in Japan can achieve the status of high art.

P3: personal well-being and process beauty

One of the most notable proponents of well being as a relevant aspect of organisational life is Csikszentmihalyi (1975), who has introduced the notion of flow:

Table I.
Possible relations
between process and
product beauty (in the
eyes of creators)

Product	Beautiful	Ugly
<i>Process</i>		
Beautiful	Likely	Unlikely
Ugly	Unlikely	Plausible

“Flow” denotes the holistic sensation present when we act with total involvement. It is the kind of feeling after which one nostalgically says: “that was fun” or “that was enjoyable”. It is the state in which action follows upon action according to an internal logic, which seems to need no conscious intervention on our part. We experience it as a unified flowing from one moment to the next. (p. 43).

We agree with Sandelands and Buckner (1989) who point at the similarity between aesthetic experiences and flow, by also noting, “flow arises in activities that are art like” (p. 121). The more aesthetically aroused people are, the more they operate in flow the more they are indeed intrinsically motivated. And, hence, the better they will do their work and the more beautiful this work will become, at least in their eyes. This feeling of flow can go so far that:

... one relates oneself to work with an attitude allowing one to recognize that the work justifies itself and that the employee can recognize and take pleasure in this fact. Thus, the employee will call a product beautiful, not because he or she is paid to produce it, but because the thing itself, is pleasant... (White, 1996, p. 204).

This, White argues, is in line with Kant’s definition of beauty as having an element of “disinterestedness”. So, aesthetic work processes give rise to aesthetic experiences, which can lead to better work performance.

P4: personal well-being and the beauty of products and services

It is not always possible to correlate the work process of an employee directly to the products of services that an organisation produces, and this is especially the case in big organisations. For the production of products, it is possible to argue that the happiness of personnel is of influence on the beauty of products that are produced, but that might be a bit far fetched.

However, the picture changes when we take a look at services organizations. One of the key characteristics of service processes is its simultaneous production and consumption of them. Service organisations, via its front-line staff, have to “get it right first time”. In these “service encounters” (Czepiel and Solomon, 1985), or “moments of truth” (Carlzon, 1987), aesthetic aspects of a service (especially the “software” of the service) can mean the difference between a satisfied (and returning) customer and a dissatisfied customer. As Schlesinger and Heskett (1991) have shown, there are no satisfied customers without satisfied service employees who have a good service attitude. The commercial utility of the aesthetic gaze and manners of service personnel is well recognized by high-street retailers, banks, hospitality outlets and airline companies (Hancock and Tyler, 2000; Witz *et al.*, 2003; Adkins, 2000). In these branches, personnel with aesthetic qualities (e.g. people who look “good” sound “right” and have the “right” manners) are recruited and selected, and their aesthetic qualities and sensibilities are trained (Nickson *et al.*, 2001). For them, the difference between the beauty of the producer, the beauty to produce and the beauty of the produced is no more.

P5: organisational design beauty and organisational process beauty

What can be said about the relation between the beauty of an organisational design and the beauty of the organisational processes this design gives rise to? Well, for instance, that Ramirez (1996) states that “it is not possible to set out to design

a beautiful organization, and, by carrying out the ‘right’ procedures, to succeed.” (p. 239) And yet, despite this earlier research, why not go for the initially impossible? Let us take the field of architecture. Here, the idea that people that work and live in beautiful surroundings will themselves live and work at an aesthetically elevated level, is an old but lively one. Guillén (1997) for instance shows how the European modernist architects of the 1890-1930 were strongly inspired by such ideas.

Ramírez (1996) suggests that there must be relations of this kind, even if they cannot be “designed-in” before hand, when he notices that:

... the very language we use to depict organizational phenomena is full of references to “form”: we *reform* institutions, *transform* work practices, enhance or measure *performance*, *formalize* procedures, analyse *informal* behaviour, *formulate* strategies... (p. 234).

P6: aesthetic sensibility and organisational design beauty

With aesthetic sensibility, we mean the personal ability – the mental skill – to experience beauty. Many of the descriptions of this “aesthetic attitude” and, even, of “the function of aesthetics” suggest similarities with what the organisation literature tends to describe as desirable characteristics of managerial behaviour. For instance, Sandelands and Buckner (2003) describe the aesthetic attitude as “a readiness to explore an object, to see what it might suggest... Art does not evoke or causes aesthetic experience, you need a willing and able beholder.” (p. 115)

Ackoff (1981), who wrote one of the leading texts on organisational design and the role management plays within that endeavour, dwelled on “the pursuit of beauty”. He quotes Singer (1948), who states that:

... the aesthetic function is to inspire: to create visions of the better and give us the courage to pursue it, whatever short run sacrifices are required. Inspiration and aspiration go hand in hand. Art therefore consists of the works of people capable of stimulating new aspirations, and inspiring commitment to their pursuit. We call this capability beauty. (Ackoff, 1981, p. 39-40).

Perhaps, most clearly this relation between management style and aesthetic sensibility has been laid out by Kuhn (1982) in his essay “Managing as an Art Form: The Aesthetics of management”. He, in turn, could build on the work of Selznick (1957, p. 152-3), “for whom leadership was art, was the art of institution building, the reworking of human and technological materials to fashion an organism that embodies new and enduring values.”

So, we can safely state that the relation between aesthetic sensibility of management and the aesthetic qualities of organisational design has been repeatedly acknowledged in the literature.

P7: education and aesthetic sensibility

In this proposition, we return to one of our original topics, which is to what extent management education should promote the development of aesthetic sensibility. Indeed, some evidence exist that companies themselves take the aesthetic production of new recruits, through training and enculturation, in their own hands (Nickson *et al.*, 2001). Should not management education come to the aid of companies and develop the aesthetic sensibilities of the new recruits and the managers of tomorrow? Whenever such suggestions occur, the European mind is easily drawn back to the original

concept of Bildung (Von Humboldt (1767-1835), Von Humboldt and Püllen, 1964). Bildung can also be seen as a revival of classic ideals. Indeed, Sandelands and Buckner (1989) quote Hamilton's (1942) history of Hellenistic Greece in this context, where an integration of aesthetic and practical values flourished that never before and perhaps never since then had been attained. "Scientific theories were written in verse, learning and leisure were considered synonymous" (p. 117).

Needless to say that we do not believe that increasing the aesthetic content of education and training programmes alone is sufficient to generate people with high-aesthetic sensibility. Local culture, genetic programming and personal level of consciousness are most likely at least as important on an individual basis.

On the other hand, ethically we can hardly refrain from aesthetic content in our educational programmes if we agree with Danto (2003) who states:

Beauty is an option for art and not a necessary condition. But it is not an option for life. It is a necessary condition for life as we would want to live it.

The above propositions collectively lay out a research agenda. Our own ambitions are, to study empirically some of the key propositions within this research agenda (e.g. the relationship between process aesthetics and result aesthetics, the influence of the result-aesthetics of the design on the process aesthetics in the operational core, and the influence of the aesthetics of work process on the result-aesthetics of the products and services) and to further develop key concepts within this research agenda.

Discussion

In organisation studies, we have long neglected the aesthetic context of organisational behaviour. Our purpose in this paper has been threefold. Firstly, to support the notion that organisational theories may have aesthetic as well as technical and ideological implications (Guillén, 1997). Secondly, if the aesthetics of organisation is at least for the time being accepted as worthy of further study, to propose a practical research agenda for the study of the various aspects in which beauty in organisation influences organisational performance, as well as the various factors that drive organisational beauty. And lastly, to contribute to the development of our conceptual repertoire, by distinguishing between process aesthetics, result aesthetics and the concept of aesthetic sensibility. We acknowledge, with Guillén, "people seem to yearn for beauty as intensely as they pursue instrumental methods and morally acceptable conditions" (Guillén, 1997, p. 710). Therefore, it is about time that we as organisational researchers can become of assistance in this quest. Wouldn't that be beautiful?

Note

1. Kant found (in his *Kritik der Urteilskraft*, 1. *Analytik des Schönen*, 1791) that beauty is something which can and should be universally appreciable through the human faculty of judgement. According to Kant, the experience of beauty has four characteristics: 1. It is disinterested (we can like an object without wanting to have it); 2. It is universal (objects have the capacity to be found beautiful by any observer); 3. It has purposive ness without purpose (the object displays some reason or function which cannot be completely grasped); 4. It is necessary (if we judge something to be beautiful, we feel as if everyone ought to agree with us).

References

- Ackoff, R.L. (1981), *Creating the Corporate Future. Plan or be Planned for*, Wiley, Chichester.
- Adkins, L. (2000), "Mobile desire: aesthetics, sexuality and the lesbian at work", *Sexualities*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 201-18.
- Berniker, E. (1998), "Working the jazz metaphor: musings driving down I-5 past midnight", *Organization Science*, Vol. 9 No. 5, pp. 583-5.
- Carlzon, J. (1987), *Moments of Truth*, Ballenger, Cambridge.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996), *Creativity. Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention*, Harper Collins, New York, NY.
- Czepiel, J.A. and Solomon, M.R. (Eds) (1985), "The Service Encounter: Managing Employee/Customer Interaction in Service Businesses", Heath, Lexington, MA.
- Danto, A.C. (2003), *The Abuse of Beauty*, Carus Publishing Company, Peru, IL.
- Dickinson, P. and Svensen, N. (2000), *Beautiful Corporations: Corporate Style in Action*, Financial Times/Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- EFQM (2004), *EFQM Excellence Model*, European Foundation for Quality Management, Brussels, available at: www.efqm.org/model_awards/model/excellence_model.htm
- Formelo, G. (Ed.) (2002), *It must be Beautiful. Great Equations of Modern Science*, Granta Books, London.
- Forrester, J.W. (1965), "A new corporate design", *Industrial Management Review Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 5-17.
- Gagliardi, P. (Ed.) (1990), *Symbols and Artifacts: Views of the Corporate Landscape*, De Gruyter, New York, NY.
- Gagliardi, P. (1996), "Exploring the aesthetic side of organizational life", in Clegg, S., Hardy, C. and Nord, W. (Eds), *Handbook of Organizational Studies*, Sage, London, pp. 565-80.
- Guillén, M.F. (1997), "Scientific management's lost aesthetic: architecture, organization, and the taylorized beauty of the mechanical", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 42 No. 4, pp. 682-715.
- Hamilton, E. (1942), *The Greek Way*, Norton, New York, NY.
- Hancock, P. and Tyler, M. (2000), "The look of love, gender and the organization of aesthetics", in Hassard, J., Holliday, R. and Willmott, H. (Eds), *Body and Organization*, Sage, London.
- Kant, I. (2002), "Over schoonheid: ontledingsleer van het schone", *Inleiding van Jacques De Visscher en vertaling van Jean-Pierre Rondas en Jacques De Visscher*, Boom, Amsterdam, (in Dutch, original title: *Kritik der Urteils kraft, 1. Analytik des Schönen*, 1791).
- Keough, M. and Doman, A. (1992), "The CEO as organisation designer. An interview with Jay Forrester", *McKinsey Quarterly*, No. 2, pp. 3-32.
- Kuhn, J. (1982), "Managing as an art form: the aesthetics of management", *Proceedings of the General Education Seminar*, Vol. 11, Columbia University Press, New York, NY (quoted in Sandelands and Buckner, 1989).
- Latour, B. (1992), "Where are the missing masses? Sociology of a few mundane artefacts", in Bijker, W. and Law, J. (Eds), *Shaping Technology-building Society Studies in Sociotechnical Change*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 225-59.
- Lewin, A. (1998), "Jazz improvisation as a metaphor for organization theory. Introduction to the special issue", *Organization Science*, Vol. 9 No. 5, p. 539.

-
- Nickson, D., Warhurst, C., Witz, A. and Cullen, A.M. (2001), "The importance of being aesthetic: work, employment and service organisation", in Sturdy, A., Grugulis, I. and Willmott, H. (Eds), *Customer Service, Empowerment and Entrapment*, Palgrave, New York, NY.
- Peters, Th.J. and Waterman, R.H. (1982), *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-run Companies*, Harper and Row, New York, NY.
- Ramirez, R. (1991), *The Beauty of Social Organization*, ACCEDO, Munich.
- Ramirez, R. (1996), "Wrapping form and organizational beauty", *Organization*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 233-42.
- Romme, A.G.L. (2003), "Making a difference: organization as design", *Organization Science*, Vol. 14 No. 5, pp. 558-73.
- Sandelands, L.E. and Buckner, G.C. (1989), "Of art and work: aesthetic experience and the psychology of work feelings", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 11, pp. 105-31.
- Schlesinger, L. and Heskett, J. (1991), "Breaking the cycle of failure in services", *Sloan Management Review*, Spring.
- Schmitt, B.H. and Simonson, A. (1997), *Marketing Aesthetics: The Strategic Management of Brands, Identity and Image*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Schön, D.A. (1983), *The Reflective Practitioner. How Professionals Think in Action*, Basic Books, New York, NY.
- Selznick, P. (1957), *Leadership in Administration*, Harper & Row, New York, NY, (quoted in Sandelands and Buckner 1989).
- Senge (1990), *The Fifth Discipline. The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*, Doubleday, New York, NY.
- Singer, E.A. Jr (1948), *In Search of a Way of Life*, Columbia University Press, New York, NY, (cited in Ackoff (1981), pp. 39-41).
- Strati, A. (1990), "Aesthetics and organisational skill", in Turner, B. (Ed.), *Organisational Symbolism*, de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Strati, A. (1992), "Aesthetic understanding of organizational life", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 568-81.
- Strati, A. (1996), "Organizations viewed through the lens of aesthetics", *Organization*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 209-18.
- Strati, A. (1999), *Organization and Aesthetics*, Sage, London.
- Sturdy, A., Grugulis, I. and Willmott, H. (Eds) (2001), *Customer Service, Empowerment and Entrapment*, Palgrave, New York, NY.
- Van Aken, J.E. (2004), "Management research based on the paradigm of the design sciences: the quest for tested and grounded technological rules", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 41 No. 2.
- Vickery, J. (2003), "Organizing art: constructing aesthetic value", *Tamara, the Journal for Critical Postmodern Organization*.
- Von Humboldt, W. and Püllen, K. (1964), *Bildung des Menschen in Schule und Universität*, Quelle und Neyer, Heidelberg.
- Weggeman, M. (2003), *Provocatief Adviseren; Organisaties Mooier Maken, Scriptum Management, Schiedam* (in Dutch).
- Weick, K.E. (1969), *The Social Psychology of Organizing*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Weick, K.E. (1998), "Improvisation as a mindset for organizational analysis", *Organization Science*, Vol. 9 No. 5, pp. 543-55.

- Welsch, W. (1996), "Aestheticisation processes: phenomena, distinctions and prospects", *Theory, Culture & Society*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 1-24.
- White, D.A. (1996), "It's working beautifully!" Philosophical reflections on aesthetics and organization theory", *Organization*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 195-208.
- Whitehead, A. (1929), *Process and Reality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Witz, A., Warhurst, Chr. and Nickson, D. (2003), "The labour of aesthetics and the aesthetics of organization", *Organization*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 33-54.

About the authors

Mathieu Weggeman is Professor of Organization Science and Innovation Management at the Department of Technology Management at Eindhoven University of Technology (EUT) in The Netherlands. His primary expertise lies in the field of organizational knowledge creation in the early stages of the innovation process. A second area of interest concerns the design of organizations in which professionals are motivated to high performance. As a project leader, he conducted several large-scale projects in R&D environments, geared to major structural and cultural change. He is a member of the Eindhoven Center of Innovation studies. He publishes in books and journals, like *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, and *R&D Management* on the field of participative strategy development, knowledge management, and the concept of knowledge. Mathieu Weggeman is a corresponding author and can be contacted at: m.c.d.p.weggeman@tm.tue.nl

Irene Lammers holds a MSc in Industrial Engineering & Management Science from the Eindhoven University of Technology, and a PhD in Economics from the Vrije Universiteit at Amsterdam. Her thesis is based on ethnographic research into the rise of the knowledge management hype within a large multinational firm. She has presented her work at several international conference. She is currently an Assistant Professor at the Vrije Universiteit, where she teaches course in strategic management and organizational design. Her research interests and current research projects concern organizational knowing, organizational aesthetics and organizational discourse. E-mail: ilammers@Feweb.Vu.nl

Henk Akkermans is Professor in aerospace supply network dynamics at the University of Tilburg. He received his PhD in Industrial Engineering from the Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands. He also leads Minase, a Dutch-based consulting firm that specializes in facilitating supply chain collaboration. Systems dynamics modelling and simulation is his preferred research method. E-mail: ha@ut.nl