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Abstract  A model of organizational cultures that for many years explained effectively the organizational behavior is that of the Italian authors Bellotto & Trentini (1989). This model is particularly suited to the Italian organizational and social reality and continues to implement its descriptive and explanatory capability. The four cultures derived from the model are characterized by well-defined variables for each culture, and which can be made operational. That also enables you to apply the method of quantitative research as well as the more usual method of qualitative analysis. The model also expresses specific figures of trainers in the classroom for every type of culture and, ultimately, these cultures were made in connection with the model of 'organizational pathologies' of Kets de Vries & Miller (1992). In this regard, the most frequent combination of cultures and the different weight which they assume within the same organization are able to provide important signals of the level of organizational wellbeing.
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'Organizational culture' means 'the coherent set of basic assumptions that a certain group invented, discovered and developed by learning to deal with the problems of external adaptation and internal integration. Assumptions worked pretty well, so can be considered valid and, therefore, likely to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems’ (Schein,1992).

It is therefore a fundamental concept that can explain a large part of behavior in organizations. To investigate the organizational culture, and most probably the different organizational cultures present in today's complex work environments, and extensive in-depth research is needed, especially using methods of qualitative research. Of course you can also use questionnaires for quantitative measurements, so that supplementary and other methodologies, in order to have a first and more rapid analysis of the organizational context which you want to analyze (Palumbo, 2010).

A very flexible model of organizational cultures lending itself to applications through qualitative and quantitative research methods has been developed for several years by Bellotto & Trentini (1989), with reference to the specific Italian situation, which is still the subject of depth analysis and research applications that implement the explanatory value (Palumbo, 2010; 2011).

1. Introduction
2. Four Organizational Cultures

Bellotto & Trentini (1989) consider organizational culture as: ‘The set of specific patterns of behavior characterized by ways of being and relating to others that characterize all members of an organization, despite the differences of personality, role, contingent situations’.

Based on this, the authors propose an interpretative Model of Organizational Cultures that fits four types based on two key elements:

- Insulation – Involvement
- Differences - Equality

The four Organizational Cultures are:

- Regulatory- Bureaucratic
- Technocratic - Paternal
- Permissive - Individualist
- Familistic - Maternal
2.1. Regulatory-Bureaucratic Culture

Regulatory: emphasis on procedures.
Bureaucratic: formal aspect and coldness of relationships.

High value to the recognition of differences and low levels of socialization.
Primary value is the status of the underlying of self-esteem and hetero-esteem.
Leadership focused on rules.
The authoritarian style of management career development for competition on education qualifications.
Factor of incentive effect: diligent appeal to the 'sense of duty'.
Reward system: stimulate compliance of 'formal rules'.
Relationship between roles and functions: strong differentiation and lack of integration.
Organizational environment: lack of emotion, emotional dimension private and subjective distinguished from the public, inability in expressing conflicts and competitions.
The psychological contract between the individual and the organization is of type 'compliance / approval'.

2.2. Technocratic-Paternal Culture

Technocratic: emphasis on technological development.
Paternal: emphasis on skills.

High value to the recognition of differences and high level of socialization.
Primary value is the expertise upon which the self-esteem and hetero-esteem.
Leadership targeted efficiency and the achievement of objectives.
Emphasis on goals achievement.
Management style flexible and suitable to various situations.
Career development for their expertise and achievements.
Correlation between the result and compensation.
Reward system: encouraging the development of skills.
Relationship between roles and functions: a highly differentiated and full integration.
Organizational environment: feeling of pride, important dimension of affective and subjective but controlled interdependent relations within which conflicts and competitions are managed and deemed normal.
The different people are valued in their different qualities. The psychological contract is of type 'results / reward': the working status between personal identity and work role tends to be seen as consistent by the organization members.

2.3. Permissive-Individualistic Culture

Permissive: emphasis on 'laissez faire'.
Individualistic: emphasis on the rights and interests of each one.

High value to the recognition of equality and low levels of socialization.
Primary value is the independence of the underlying self-esteem and hetero-esteem.
Leadership 'paradoxically' because it is explicitly forbidden to manifest.
Emphasis on guarantees covered.
Career development through automatic means.
Incentive system, an appeal to 'availability at work'.
Relation between the roles and functions on interpersonal relationships contexts.
Organizational environment, feelings of non-involvement, indifference and mistrust, dimension subjective and affective marked on 'mutual non-interference', competition and conflicts silenced 'for peace sake'.
The underlying contract is of the 'mutual non-interference': the relationship between personal identity and work role is solved with the introduction of the first.

2.4. Familistic-Maternal Culture

Familistic: emphasis on good relations.
Maternal: emphasis on the affective code.

High value to the recognition of equality and high level of socialization.
Primary value is the experience of the underlying self-esteem and hetero-esteem.
Leadership focused unity, solidarity and affiliation.
Emphasis on membership.
Management style marked by the involvement.
Relations between roles and functions numerous and often confused.
Organizational environment: feelings of solidarity and unity, affective dimension, subjective and private confused and overlapping the work, competition and conflicts explode like fireworks, but are governed by loyalty to the system.
Dominated by a contract 'loyalty / protection': the relationship between personal identity and work role is experienced so confused and overlapped.

3. The Role of the Trainer in the Classroom in Different Organizational Cultures

Every Culture has a specific type of trainer in the classroom.
1 Instructor (Regulatory-Bureaucratic Culture).
He teaches without considering the emotions involved in making the training. He is primarily concerned with the "knowledge" and "know-how". Expert in content and approaches to be taken, he generally uses lessons-conversations-debates (possibly in a group) of structured type. This method of teaching is just suitable for training of technical and professional skills.
2 Trainer-Coordinator (Technocratic-Paternal Culture).
He coordinates and facilitates learning. Supervisor of the methodology, he does not pay special attention to what you say but how it is said. His approach is focused on group processes and the purpose is to make the communication
4. Organizational Pathologies and Organizational Cultures

Every Culture may be associated with certain Pathologies among those described by Kets de Vries and Miller (1992). These Pathologies are schematized as follows: (Palumbo, 2009):

- the Paranoid Organization, based on distrust towards the outside and the inside world (relationship with the Permissive-Individualistic Culture);
- the Compulsive-Perfectionist Organization, which program to its activities and results very formalized, with bureaucratic procedures which have a narrow minded (relationship with the Regulatory-Bureaucratic Culture);
- the Dramatic Organization, holding the attention and exhibits success with narcissistic preoccupation (relationship with the Familistic-Maternal Culture);
- the Depressive Organization, founded on the resignation, the routine, a limited operational and with decisive style oriented to postponement (possible in the Permissive-Individualistic Culture and Regulatory-Bureaucratic Culture, where there is an excess of procrastination);

The Organization Schizoid, which often lacks a stable orientation: the senior leadership does not allow an integrative function and internal tensions hinder effective interaction with the external environment (relationship with the Permissive-Individualistic Culture and Familistic-Maternal Culture).

5. Further Developments

The Bellotto & Trentini model shows more and more the cross-valence and the ability to an efficient interpretation of micro and macro phenomena of Italian social, political and economic reality.

The four organizational cultures indicate specific risks in terms of organizational wellbeing when each one of them tends to be overly present.

In the case of:
- Regulatory-Bureaucratic, paradoxical and paralyzing rigidity due to an excess of rules, regulations and procedures;
- Technocratic-Paternal, excessive consideration of technology as a main area of problem solving;
- Permissive-Individualistic, all-out defense of separate individual management within the organization, preservation of ‘mutual non-interference’;
- Familistic-Maternal, co-optation and loyalty which determinants and emotional dimension confused with job.

In addition, the overwhelming presence of a culture can lead to a strong reaction to the opposite one placed on the diagonal of the model:
- Regulatory and Bureaucratic - Maternal - Familistic on a diagonal,
- Technocratic - Paternal and Individualistic - Permissive on the other diagonal.

This is exemplified by statements that characterize these typical reactions to the excessive presence of the opposite Culture.

In the case of an excess of Familistic - Maternal Cultures, the reaction Regulatory - Bureaucratic are explicit, for example, with the sentence:
‘We need increasingly strict rules’; in the opposite case: ‘We will solve between friends’.

In the event of excessive Technocratic-Paternal Culture, the reaction Permissive-Individualistic is of the type: ‘So there’s always one who pays for all, that just is not me’; in the opposite case: ‘We need someone responsible to fix everything and avoid the proliferation of separate individual management within the organization’.

In the latter case, the risk you run is the rule of technocrats, ‘who knows’ versus ‘those who do not know’, in a way of skills ‘hyper-specialized’ (hyper-specialism) and progressive loss of the value of soft skills (Palumbo, 2013a; 2013b). Typical statements are: ‘I know the situation and guarantee how to solve-problems’.

It should also be remembered that cultures are interiorized and may explain behavioral automatisms apparently little functional but contradictory and even paradoxical.

Today, in Italy, the complex of socio-political-economic prospect seems rather a balance of all the cultural conditions that causes paralysis of the organizational action. To a historical prevalence ‘permissive-familistic’ is opposed the increased importance of ‘techno-regulatory’ model. All this is certainly not in the direction of an organizational wellbeing at different levels of relationship with the social.
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