

**Organizational Diagnosis as a tool for planning and development.  
Exploratory study on its uses in public and private organizations.**

*Ticlaud Tudor Cristian*

*Babes-Bolyai University, Faculty of Political, Administrative and Communication Sciences,  
Cluj-Napoca, Romania*

*Bogdan Andrei Moldovan, Babes-Bolyai University, Faculty of Political, Administrative and Communication  
Sciences, Cluj-Napoca, Romania*

*Cristina Hintea, Babes-Bolyai University, Faculty of Political, Administrative and Communication Sciences,  
Cluj-Napoca, Romania*

**Abstract:** Organizations, public and private alike, are functioning in a more complex environment - the dynamics of the modern organizational world is characterized by uncertainty and disruptive change. Whether these pressures are coming from the external environment – COVID19 pandemic, macro-economic evolutions, major international political changes (Ukraine war) – or internal one – changes of leadership, internal political influences, resource access and allocation – it is clear that traditional approaches in accomplishing their mission and goals fall short.

In this context, organizations are going through a "continuous transformation" process – it can take many shapes, be it radical or revolutionary transformation or an incremental approach, but "standing still" is the most risky option. This process is complex it implies that organizations try to adopt (and adapt) different tools, mechanisms, managerial and leadership approaches, even changes of cultural paradigm in order to "remain relevant"

In this context, organizational diagnosis plays a critical role in organizational change initiatives in terms of both choosing appropriate interventions and contributing to readiness-to-change within an organization (McFillen, O'Neill, Balzer, Varney, 2012).

Our study explores multiple cases of organizational diagnosis usage by both public (local authorities) and private (corporation) organizations in a context of major organizational change. The purpose is to highlight the specifics of the process – steps, areas evaluated – the challenges these particular organizations faced in the last 3 years. While this does not constitute grounds for generalizations, it offers a very interesting insight regarding the usage of such tools by organizations and the capacity to integrate the "knowledge" provided through a diagnosis into the transformation process.

We attempt to explain findings in light of modern approaches in governance (adaptive governance - Dietz, Ostrom and Stern, 2003; turbulent governance - Ansell, Trondal and ?g?rd, 2017).

Relevance for practitioners lies in identifying similar context and using the data to appropriately use (or integrate) this tool in a change process.