

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: HISTORICAL ASPECT

Osondu M.G., PhD student, gr. AI-9-073
Scientific supervisor – PhD. **O.V. Prokhorenko**
National Technical University «Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute»

Organizational development (OD) comes off as studies in connection with human relations which has been investigated by psychologists in the 1930's, though realizing that workers behaviors and motivation are been affected by organizational process and structure.

Organizational development evolution over the past 50 years from the adoption of behavioral science and methods of solving problems in an organization, the change in Organizational development has enabled today was kicked off in the 1940's and was enacted in innovating the work Kurt Lewin has carried out as social scientists which also enhance the work Carl Roger and Abraham Maslow as psychologists.

Around the time of World War II, Kurt Lewin carried out and experiment with alliance to utter the process on the method of planning, performance and measurement [1]. The experiment succeeded in being the research theory. Kurt Lewin's theory served as an important component of research of organizational development.

Organizational development has been widely ascribed to Robert Blake, Jane Mouton and Herbert Shepherd. Nevertheless, Scientists Richard Beckhard also asserts variance. No matter who perpetrated the first definition, it was brought upon in 1957 and it is normally agreed to have advanced.

From the earliest starting point, OD created and applied its speculations of individuals and change to hierarchical life and working. Huge numbers of the intercessions initially spearheaded and rehearsed by OD experts depend on the field's strong responsibility to the human side of the venture. Despite the fact that being censured as „too narrow“ some of the time, a large number of its mediations have now become standard, molding the way we as a whole consider how associations work. This included „change management“, which developed as a subfield of OD [2,3]. It additionally included association job configuration, characterizing how undertakings, authority and frameworks will be sorted out and incorporated across hierarchical units and inside individual employments.

It is in reality difficult to envision how associations will be the equivalent, particularly in the West, on the off chance that we remove the fundamental impact of those early OD scholars and specialists. Much has changed since OD's beginnings during the 1950s. There are the heartless

quest for effectiveness, as business reengineering during the 1980s, legitimization during the 1990s, and forceful redistributing during the 2000s – all these originated from the consolidated effect of changes in innovation, globalization, serious weights, capricious socio-political and monetary elements, which along with different groups have all adjusted the universe of work and the manners in which we sort out work gatherings. Nonetheless, regardless of the evolving difficulties, the accompanying concerns stay consistent for pioneers and OD experts.

Thus, OD moved from a behavioral approach to a process approach, as it came to be seen as a process of making certain changes in organizations, mostly to increase efficiency or avoid adverse influences from external factors. And although the concept of "change management" is largely based on behavioral factors, it is the process approach allowed to identify certain stages of the life cycle of the organization, as well as, in turn, to form the concept of "organizational maturity"[4].

The latter concept is widely used by number of the authors and allows describing a set of characteristics that indicate a particular stage of the life cycle in the development of the organization. Such characteristics include the degree of hierarchy of the organizational structure, the level of innovation of technologies used in the organization, the level of centralization of decision-making and social responsibility. Thus, OD can be considered from the standpoint of a systems approach, and the relationship between these elements as certain characteristics of organizational development.

References

1. Burnes B. Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: a re-appraisal //Journal of Management studies. – 2004. – T. 41. – №. 6. – C. 977-1002.
2. Robertson P. J., Roberts D. R., Porras J. I. A meta-analytic review of the impact of planned organizational change interventions //Academy of Management Proceedings. – Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510 : Academy of Management, 1992. – T. 1992. – №. 1. – C. 201-205.
3. Beer M., Huse E. F. A systems approach to organization development //The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. – 1972. – T. 8. – №. 1. – C. 79-101.
4. Alden J., Curtis B. The Business Process Maturity Model (BPMM) //An Overview for OMG Members. – 2006.