

# “Turquoise negotiations” – their features & case study

## AUTHORS

Andrzej Kozina  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9619-6201>

Agnieszka Pieczonka  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1663-2611>

## ARTICLE INFO

Andrzej Kozina and Agnieszka Pieczonka (2017). “Turquoise negotiations” – their features & case study. *Nowadays and Future Jobs*, 1(1), 14-22.  
doi:[10.21511/nfj.1.2017.02](https://doi.org/10.21511/nfj.1.2017.02)

## DOI

<http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/nfj.1.2017.02>

## RELEASED ON

Tuesday, 26 December 2017

## RECEIVED ON

Friday, 24 November 2017

## ACCEPTED ON

Friday, 22 December 2017

## LICENSE



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

## JOURNAL

"Nowadays and Future Jobs"

## ISSN PRINT

2544-2287

## PUBLISHER

LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”

## FOUNDER

Sp. z o.o. Kozmenko Science Publishing



NUMBER OF REFERENCES

19



NUMBER OF FIGURES

0



NUMBER OF TABLES

0

© The author(s) 2025. This publication is an open access article.

Andrzej Kozina (Poland), Agnieszka Pieczonka (Poland)

## “Turquoise negotiations” – their features & case study

### Abstract

The paper aims at characterizing specific type of negotiations, i.e., the ones conducted within a turquoise organization, which is a new, specific model of the functioning of modern institutions. Firstly, an organization of this type was described as both negotiations environment and party. Secondly, the features of turquoise negotiations were discussed in the frame of their different interpretations, i.e., as a process, a method of conflict resolution and reaching agreement, interdependence of the parties, and processes of decision making, communication, mutual exchange and value creation. Thirdly, a case study was presented concerning sales negotiation of turquoise nature within a company from IT sector. The summary comprises a synthesis of the features of turquoise negotiations and indicates the directions of further research.

**Keywords:** (business) negotiations, turquoise organization, negotiations within turquoise organizations (turquoise negotiations), features of turquoise negotiations.

**JEL Classification:** M191.

**Received on:** 24<sup>th</sup> of November, 2017.

**Accepted on:** 22<sup>nd</sup> of December, 2017.

### Introduction

The objective of this article is to characterize the negotiations conducted in a special type of institution called “turquoise organization”. Such an organization constitutes a new, specific model of the functioning of modern companies (Laloux, 2015, p. 17). The paper is of theoretical and methodical nature, as it attempts to create an original concept of the negotiations in question, in further considerations referred to as “turquoise negotiations”.

The article contains the description of turquoise organization as either specific negotiations environment or their participant (party), including both negotiations between internal stakeholders and external ones. Although the author of the model of turquoise organization does not distinguish negotiations as an important process occurring within the organization, the process itself seems to emerge in a certain sense in the context of other processes, determining their effective implementation.

The features of such negotiations have been distinguished using the general, most important interpretations of the negotiations, based on the comparative analysis of the classical literature of the subject and on the studies in which various definitions of the negotiations were synthesized, in particular Lewicki

et al. (2005, pp. 17-33), Kozina (2012, pp. 21-24). All these interpretations are presented in the literature review section. They are arranged in respect of their logical implications, giving first the formulations that define the essence of subsequent interpretations, citing next examples of general definitions, and referring finally each of the considered interpretations to the subject of discussion, i.e., negotiations in a turquoise organization.

The case study concerning turquoise negotiations is placed in the second part of the paper. They are conducted within one of the best-known Polish companies operating in IT sector. The case study is focused on sales negotiations with its clients, concerning both hardware and software. It may be observed that these negotiations reflects many features typical for turquoise organization, presented in the article, especially company’s orientation on establishing and maintaining partnership with its clients.

### 1. Literature review

**1.1. Turquoise organization as a negotiating party and environment.** On the one hand, the negotiations in every kind of organization, also turquoise, stem from the very essence of the operation of this organization as a special kind of social group, pursuing specific goals. Both the negotiations for which the organization is an environment and those for which it is a partner should be taken into account. In the company, negotiations can be conducted either between its internal stakeholders, e.g., employers and employees, owners and managers, etc., or by its representatives with external entities, e.g., suppliers, buyers, co-operators, etc. Negotiations are an effective tool for managing an organization, and in particular for intervening and resolving conflicts in all projects aimed at increasing the effectiveness of action.

---

© Andrzej Kozina, Agnieszka Pieczonka, 2017.

Andrzej Kozina, Professor of the Cracow University of Economics, Department of Public Administration, Section of Organizational Relationships Management, Cracow University of Economics, Poland.

Agnieszka Pieczonka, Master of Science, Director of Center for Training and Organization of Quality Systems, Tadeusz Kosciuszko Cracow University of Technology, Poland.

This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International](#) license, which permits re-use, distribution, and reproduction, provided the materials aren’t used for commercial purposes and the original work is properly cited.

On the other hand, the turquoise organization has a specific nature, so the negotiation process carried out between its internal interest groups and by its representatives with the entities of its surroundings has some specific characteristics that distinguish these negotiations from others that are typical of traditional organizations. An interpretation of the turquoise organization should therefore be presented, listing its most important characteristics, which determine the negotiations carried out within this organization, based on a study made by the originator of this idea.

Turquoise organization is a new, consistent organizational model and a new paradigm for teamwork. It is not a theoretical model or a utopian vision, but a very concrete way of managing organizations from a higher level of consciousness (Laloux, 2015, p. 17). Based on the studies of pioneering turquoise organizations encountered in practice, the author of this concept outlines three general types of structures found in such organizations, i.e., parallel teams with high degree of autonomy in defining tasks by employees, individual contracting networks, and fully autonomous nested teams (Laloux, 2015, p. 376).

The turquoise organization is resting on the three main pillars, which the author calls its breakthroughs (Laloux, 2015, p. 72). Each of these breakthroughs manifests itself in the form of many well-defined daily practices that diverge — sometimes gently, sometimes radically — from the traditionally accepted management methods (Laloux, 2015, pp. 312-313). Additionally, for each of these breakthroughs, the author gives examples of common elements of culture — norms, assumptions, aspirations — which seem consistent with the worldview of evolutionary turquoise.

1. Self-management — turquoise organizations have found the key to operate effectively, even at a largescale, with a system based on peer relationships, without the need for either hierarchy or consensus model. Self-management practices include counseling, conflict resolution mechanism, assessment based on the principles of partnership, and compensation process. Relevant elements of organizational culture are trust, information and decision-making, as well as responsibility and accountability (Laloux, 2015, pp. 72, 276, 312-313).

2. Evolutionary purpose — turquoise organizations are seen as having a life and a sense of direction of their own. Instead of trying to predict and control the future, members of the organization are invited to listen in and understand what the organization wants to become and what purpose it wants to serve. This is supported by the recruitment and practice of the “empty chair”. The cultural elements corre-

sponding to this breakthrough are collective goals, individual goals, future planning, and profit (Laloux, 2015, pp. 72, 278, 315).

3. Wholeness — turquoise organizations have developed a consistent set of practices that invite us to reclaim our inner wholeness and bring all of who we are to work. Practices related to the wholeness include the basic principles of safe space, office building or factory, the process of implementing a new employee, and the practice of meetings. Elements of culture adequate to wholeness are equal worth, safe and caring workplace, overcoming separation, learning, relationships and conflicts (Laloux, 2015, pp. 72, 277, 313-314).

Laloux broadly describes this model of organization, and in several places of his work makes a synthesis of reflections in the form of so-called practices concerning structure, human resources, major organizational processes and everyday life of turquoise organization (Laloux, 2015, pp. 172-173, 232-233, 269, 385-389). In the absence of space, these practices are not discussed here, although some of the issues related to them are mentioned below in the context of the characteristics of turquoise negotiations. Laloux (2015, p. 283) also identifies two conditions necessary to create a new organization with evolutionary turquoise principles, structure, practices and culture. First, the founder or leader of a high level should integrate the worldview and psychological development consistent with the turquoise level of development. Second, the owners of organizations must also understand and accept the evolutionary world of turquoise.

Additionally, it should be emphasized that the turquoise organization has a specific soul and purpose of existence; it lives its own life and has a sense of its own direction, which it spontaneously determines. All members of the organization are responsible for its existence; they do not restrict their activity to the functions assigned to them. Based on their own choices they undertake various tasks spontaneously and self-assign roles adapted to individual skills and abilities.

**1.2. Turquoise negotiations as a process.** Negotiation is a process, not a unitary skill (Fowler, 2001, p. 10). It is a complex, time-stretched operation involving a series of sub-processes and phases, and within them, a series of sequential and detailed steps carried out in a sequential, parallel and/or cyclic mode. This is the most general and widespread way of interpreting the negotiations, but at the same time also the most ambiguous one (Dupont, Faure, 2002). Negotiations comprise all events and interactions taking place between the parties before the final outcome is reached (Thompson, 2001, pp. 9-10).

The general negotiation process (meta-process) includes three sub-processes (partial processes): planning – providing conditions for negotiations; conducting – reaching agreement through decision-making, conflict resolution, exchange, etc., as well as summing up – formulation and conclusion of the agreement and assessment of the negotiations.

Laloux does not speak directly about process management, although structures used in the turquoise organization, especially self-organizing teams, coordination and meetings (mainly ad hoc in case of emerging needs), as well as fluid and partial roles instead of fixed responsibilities, make the organization perceived as a living being with its own evolutionary purpose (Laloux, 2015, pp. 172, 269, 385, 386, 388). Thus, it can be stated that all processes, including negotiations, are implemented spontaneously, impulsively – one might even say, in all those areas of activity where problems requiring their use arise. In every organization, also turquoise, the negotiation process is ancillary to basic processes. At the same time, it should be emphasized that because of their specificity, the negotiations in general, and turquoise in particular, are not subject to easy structuring. It is difficult to program them and formalize in the form of procedures. Models are created, but usually such that simplify reality.

**1.3. Turquoise negotiations as a method of conflict management.** Negotiations are a method (form, measure, etc.) to direct (resolve, settle) conflicts between parties pursuing their own goals to achieve the best results. Negotiations are a subset of social relations involving conflict resolution (Rubin, Brown, 1975, p. 3) and a sequence of reciprocal moves by which parties strive to achieve a mutually advantageous solution to a partial conflict of interest (Necki, 2000, p. 17). Conflict is simply a condition or reason for negotiations (Kennedy, 1998, p. 75); it is the perceived divergence of interests, or the belief that current aspirations of the parties cannot be realized simultaneously (Pruitt, Rubin, 1986, p. 4).

In the turquoise organization, various conflicts exist between its stakeholders as a result of numerous interactions that occur between them. They have divergent aims and different views on particular issues within the scope of the negotiations. Contradictions also apply to values, principles, expectations, ideas, etc., which form the emotional context of the negotiations, requiring identification because of the significant impact on substantive issues. Interpersonal conflicts are resolved through a conflict resolution process called “direct communication and reaching agreement” (Laloux, 2015, p. 139). A formal multi-stage practice is used in this respect. Culture limits conflicts to interested parties and mediators, without the participation of third parties. This

process is so important for collaboration where there is no hierarchy that many self-governing organizations train every new employee in conflict resolution. The process applies to all sorts of disputes and animosities. This may be the issue of dissenting opinions on technical decisions in the context of the given situation, interpersonal conflict, value infringement. This may also be related to the quality of work (Laloux, 2015, pp. 173, 232, 387). Regardless of the topic, the process starts when one person asks the other for an agreement.

1. In the first phase, the interested parties sit together and try to resolve the problem privately. The initiator must express a clear request (not a judgment or demand), and the other person must react explicitly (“yes”, “no” or counter-proposal) to the initiator’s request.
2. If they are unable to find a solution, they choose a colleague they trust and ask him to act as their mediator. The colleague can support conflicting parties in finding an agreement, but he cannot impose it.
3. If the mediation fails, a panel of colleagues is called to deal with the problem. The role of the panel is to listen and help to work out an agreement. And again, one cannot force a decision, although the moral strength of the group is usually sufficient to explain the conflict and bring the matter to an end.
4. In the end, the founder/president of the company may be invited to the panel to raise its moral standing (Laloux, 2015, p. 140).

**1.4. Turquoise negotiations as a means of reaching agreement.** This aspect of the interpretation of the negotiations concerns their intended outcome, which should be beneficial to both parties. The factor underlying all negotiations is the pursuit of mutual benefit, i.e., working out an agreement that will bring more advantages to the parties when accepted than when rejected. This happens both when the parties negotiate a new contract and when they try to settle a longstanding dispute (Samuelson, Marx, 1998, p. 686). Negotiations are a way to reduce differences or strengthen an agreement, while maintaining mutually acceptable differences, a way to cooperate in the development of mutually acceptable changes and consciously implemented transformations arising from mutual desire (Bellenger, 1999, p. 7). It is the process of communicating with the parties when they expect that the agreement can provide greater benefits than working without agreement on their own or against each other (Dąbrowski, 1991, p. 11). Negotiations are an effort made by two or more parties in a certain conflict situation to find a joint action that seems better to everyone than other alternative actions (Lax, Sebenius, 1986, p. 11).



The parties to the turquoise negotiations share common goals of a fundamental character, expressed in a concerted effort to obtain the success and development of the organization. Their co-operation is therefore desirable necessary to achieve the required level of organizational effectiveness. This in turn demands the conclusion of appropriate contracts (open to the public, as well as classified) to specify the terms and conditions of cooperation. The conflict resolution process discussed above is used to reach agreement. Moreover, the need for coordination between the teams, where the form follows the function, is also important. When a problem or opportunity arises, an inter-team meeting is organized. When a more permanent form of coordination is needed, a staff post may be selected from among the team members in the reverse delegation process. In none of these cases an approval is needed in advance. Meetings and roles in self-managing structures emerge spontaneously. Leadership is scattered and there are no leadership roles to be prepared for employees. Turquoise organizations devote considerable time and energy to training all employees to understand the basic principles that shape productive co-operation (Laloux, 2015, pp. 100, 151, 185).

**1.5. Turquoise negotiations as a mutual dependence of partners.** This relationship, which expresses the close association between the two previous aspects, implies the co-existence of two dimensions, i.e., cooperation (co-action) and competition (contention), by combining contradictory and convergent goals of the parties. Both express the desire of the parties to achieve a favorable result, conditioned by the need to resolve the conflict between them. Neither party can accomplish their goals independently and at the same time each one can help the other in achieving its goals. If partners could see other alternative and more effective ways of achieving their goals, they would not engage in negotiations. Negotiations are deliberate (intentional) interactions of two or more social entities seeking to define or transform the conditions of interdependence (Walton, McKersie, 1965, p. 3). It is a reversible process of communication in order to reach agreement when two parties are bound by certain interests, some of which are common, while others are opposing (Fisher et al., 2000, pp. 27-28).

Interactions between stakeholders of the turquoise organization are generally positive, but at the same time they are numerous, multi-faceted, symmetrical and asymmetrical, stronger and weaker, positive and negative, incidental and permanent, and so on. They are therefore difficult to identify, and even more to shape. With respect to internal dependencies, in the organizations discussed, hierarchical relationships

are replaced by obligations to co-workers. By resigning from judgment, these relationships gain a new quality. Listening to others, we have no longer the need to limit ourselves to gathering information to better convince, instruct, correct, or remove (Laloux, 2015, pp. 376, 65). As regards external dependencies, suppliers are selected based on alignment to the organization's purpose. Consumers are also partners; they are de facto elements of organization. The concept of competition is negligible, important insofar as it helps to achieve the purpose of the existence of the organization – “competitors” are bound to pursue this purpose (Laloux, 2015, pp. 269, 388).

**1.6. Turquoise negotiations as a decision-making process.** Among various interpretations of the concept in question, this function is the most important, as it is closest to the essence of the organization as a specific environment and at the same time a negotiator. The discussed process is interactive. In its preparatory phase, the parties carry out their activities independently, i.e., from the point of view of their goals. Then they mutually agree on two pairs of sets: alternatives to the solutions and criteria for their evaluation, as previously defined by each party separately. Finally, they jointly establish the criteria and set of alternatives, i.e., a common part of the initial options. Negotiation is a systematic analysis that addresses the problem (Raiffa, 1982, pp. 7-8). Negotiations are a process in which opposing positions are combined into a common decision (Zartman, 1994, p. 5).

Due to the high degree of integration of the elements of the turquoise organization and numerous interactions between them, many decision problems of varying gravity are solved in the negotiations. In the formulation of options, these variants are considered which will allow the realization, to the greatest extent possible, of both common and individual goals of the stakeholders. Common values shared by them are fundamental in formulating evaluation criteria for solution options.

Decision-making is fully decentralized, based on a counseling process or holacratic decision-making mechanisms (Laloux, 2015, p. 172). The process itself is very simple – as a rule everyone in the organization can make any decision. However, before doing so, he must seek advice from all interested parties and persons with expert knowledge of the subject matter (Laloux, 2015, p. 123). We often think that decisions can be made generally in two ways: either by hierarchical authority (someone issues orders, then many people may feel frustrated, but at least things go forward) or by consensus (everybody speaks their minds, but often things happen

slowly and sometimes they get stuck, because consent cannot be achieved).

The counseling process is a simple form of decision-making that transcends both consensus and unilateral action (Laloux, 2015, p. 127). Usually the decision maker is the person who has noticed the problem or the opportunity, or the person who will be most affected by the decision. In the counseling process, individual staff members can ask difficult questions and firmly express their own opinions on each of the consulted problems. Consensus has another drawback: it blurs responsibility. In many cases, no one feels responsible for the final decision. For this reason many decisions are not implemented, and if they are, it is done without conviction. In the counseling process, the responsibility for the decision is unambiguously left with one person: with the person who takes the decision fully convinced that it is the best one (Laloux, 2015, pp. 172, 387, 123-127).

**1.7. Turquoise negotiations as a process of communication.** Negotiating also requires mutual exchange of information “permeating” all the activities of the parties from the initial presentation of positions, through the formation of relationships, formulation and exchange of offers, inquiry, questioning and answering, listening, etc., to the final arrangements and drafting of the agreement. Negotiations depend on communication (Nierenberg, 1994, p. 8). This is a reversible process of communication, mentioned in the earlier definitions (Dąbrowski, 1991, p. 11) and (Fisher et al., 2000, pp. 27-28). In the negotiation planning process, it is necessary to obtain data describing all relevant dimensions and parameters of the negotiated situation, i.e., partners, scope and context of the negotiations (defined by the specific nature of the implemented activities, processes and projects) and the external environment. In the process of negotiation, typical forms of transmission are used, like offers, questions and answers, arguments and counter arguments. The negotiation evaluation process takes into account the data necessary to conclude the agreement (discussed in terms of particular issues) and evaluate the progress made (discussed in terms of effects, tools, relationships and process itself).

In the turquoise organization, all business information is open to all in real time. Data are made available to everyone in the public, creating competition and a healthy form of group pressure. People know that information will not be used against them (Laloux, 2015, pp. 153, 173, 269, 387). There are no unimportant people. Everyone expects to be granted at the same time access to every available piece of information. This is a “no secrets” approach and extends to all data, including those most sensitive. The information available includes not only the

financial data, but also the remuneration and performance of each team. Teams that are undergoing a difficult phase are confident that they will take responsibility for the quality of their situation and will start looking for a solution. Three reasons make this practice convincing for self-managing organizations.

1. In the absence of a hierarchy, self-managing teams need all the available information to make the best decisions.
2. Any information that is not public will cause suspicion and suspicion is toxic to the organization's trust.
3. Informal hierarchies emerge when some know more and others do not (Laloux, 2015, pp. 136-137).

**1.8. Turquoise negotiations as a process of mutual exchange.** Negotiations are also a process of bilateral exchange of material and non-material values under terms agreed by the parties, made through mutual agreements and concessions. This interpretation of the negotiations is closely related to the previous one, since the process of communication is a form of the exchange of information and data on other resources. Negotiations are the basic way to get from others what we want (Fisher et al., 2000, p. 27). This is the tool by which we seek to obtain what we want from someone who wants something from us, while the exchange itself is a way of making decisions through negotiations (Kennedy, 1998, p. 98). The basic mechanism for reaching an agreement is the exchange of compromises, concessions, and mutually imposed conditions, the fulfillment of which determines further conduct of the parties (Necki, 2000, pp. 17-18).

It is true that the author of the discussed concept of turquoise organization does not directly address the issue of exchange (internal and external), but based on other characteristics of this type of organization, the following theses can be formulated. The exchange between the parties to the turquoise negotiations deals with any issues they consider, and it comes down to allocating (reallocating) common resources. This exchange includes all types of the resources and by definition should be equivalent. The differences in the hierarchy of the goals of the parties foster this attitude, which means that one party will seek to gain the resources and values important for this party, giving in return those less important for them, but important for the other party. It concerns not only quantifiable resources, but also the intangible ones, i.e., ideas, schemes, concepts of solutions optimizing the effectiveness of cooperation.

**1.9. Turquoise negotiations as a value creating process.** The interdependence of parties and the

process of mutual exchange in negotiations allow the partners to achieve mutual benefits by creating additional values, which without negotiations would not be possible (the development of previous aspects). Negotiations are conducted for two reasons: to create something new, which neither party would be able to do by itself, or to solve the problem or dispute which divides the parties (Lewicki et al., 2005, p. 18). Value creation in the negotiation process is possible when one party has something to offer that is not very valuable for itself, but represents a great value for the other party, and vice versa. Due to differences in value assessment, there is an opportunity for a mutually advantageous agreement (Samuelson, Marks, 1998, p. 664). These differences may (as a source of added value) concern interests, opinions, consent to risk and time preferences (Lax, Sebenius, 1986, pp. 88-92).

Creating values in turquoise negotiations is expressed primarily by creating model (standard) solutions in the field of implemented activities. They are based on accepted and shared social norms and management philosophy aimed at shaping the partnership relations. This allows for the multiplication of relational capital (internal and external) and for maintaining the image of an organization that values relations with employees and their well-being. Thus the feeling of justice and partnership is strengthened. Turquoise organizations have clear values translated into direct basic principles of acceptable and unacceptable behaviors to maintain a safe environment. Practices are used that allow for continuous discussion of values and basic principles. There is a scattering of initiative, everyone is aware of what is going on. People do what they feel is appropriate in relation to their inner values and assumptions. The driving force behind the new organizational model is derived from the internal imperative to work differently, to work in the environment that people like, to work in line with their worldview (Laloux, 2015, pp. 232, 387-388, 338). Of course, putting value into action requires much more effort than writing it down. As part of the implementation program, all new employees are invited to attend a training session on company values and the underlying principles of the company. This helps to create a common reference point and a common language throughout the organization (Laloux, 2015, p. 187).

## 2. Practical insights – case study on turquoise negotiations

**2.1. Company profile.** Unique Computer Solutions SA (or in abbreviated form UCS, the name is fictional, but company data is authentically) is a computer company that was founded in 1992 with a minimum initial capital (its current market value is many times higher). Its majority shareholders (about

75% of the assets) are two private investors, who also perform the function of the President and Vice-President of the Management Board. The company is located in one of the big cities. It has branches in five smaller towns and several dozen company stores in Poland. It employs over 2,500 people and has about 12% market share.

Company's scope of business includes the manufacture and sale of computers, peripherals and accessories. It also provides software, both versatile and specialized, including a number of original packages, especially the ManagerPro 2000 management information system, implemented in dozens of institutions. It also offers hardware and software from other IT companies. The company has positive customer feedback, mainly due to the complexity and timeliness of deliveries and the high quality of products and services. It has implemented ISO 9000 quality standards. The company has held top positions in industry rankings several times and received numerous awards and distinctions, including emblem "Poland Now".

**2.2. Company's sales organization.** The sales department comprises cells and organizational positions corresponding to various types of customers, including industry (various sectors), financial sector (mainly banks and insurance companies), trade, transport and communications, telecommunications and media, health care, state and local administration, and science and education. All these areas are supported by eight industry specialists in the Sales Department, headed by the Area Sales Manager and supervised by the Business Manager. This sales organization is flexible, it ensures efficient execution of sales contracts thanks to fast response of the company to the specific needs of its customers, combined with the effective impact on customers and shaping their loyalty. Therefore, such sales organization reflects some features of turquoise one.

**2.3. The objectives of sales negotiations.** The general objectives of the negotiations reflect the desired level of profitability of the transaction from the point of view of the assumed sales revenue in the given year (for product range and customer groups). When formulating specific objectives, attention is paid to the clarification of initial conditions favourable for the recipients, with the possibility of manoeuvring in terms of particular issues, mainly in the product-price system (morphological analysis of variants), i.e., ensuring appropriate flexibility.

The following are the main reasons and details for the formulation of specific negotiation objectives: the company's initial offer for hardware and software configuration and pricing, customer needs



and expectations, and in particular the requirements (maximum and minimum) for each contract component, size and differentiation of the order, technical conditions of delivery, company's experience in the field (possibly as regards transactions with a given partner), mutual relations and level of trust, potential risk of the transaction, credibility and solvency of the counterparty, and current market situation, especially offers from other manufacturers.

**2.4. The assumptions for sales negotiations.** Upon receipt of the response to its own initial offer or customer inquiry, the company pre-pares a proper offer, which is negotiated with a potential contractor. The scope of this offer includes issues (problems) typical of commercial contracts such as product range, price, terms of payment, delivery rules, warranty arrangements, etc. Attachments, such as acceptance and installation protocols, technical documentation, etc. are required to supplement these arrangements.

Due to the wide range of products offered by the computer market and difficult competition in this market, the company is usually forced to limit the level of its output requirements. This usually concerns the price and terms of payment, considered the most important issues in the negotiations, and consequently the key elements of the contract. This is not only due to the fact that these issues directly affect the profitability of the transaction, but also to due the fact that the delivery and acceptance conditions, as well as the conditions of services and guarantees proposed by UCS SA are quite beneficial to customers as compared to competitors. Each order is carefully examined, and during this analysis, the company develops several variants of solutions, where possible large price discounts depend on the scope and technological advancement of the configuration.

**2.5. Turquoise symptoms of sales negotiations.** The observations and analyses of many sales negotiations performed by salesmen representing UCS SA with its clients revealed that the following most important features typical for turquoise organizations are reflected by those processes.

1. The sales negotiation processes are rather informal, spontaneous, formalized to minimal extent, determined by desired level of effectiveness as well as designed and monitored directly by all salesmen.
2. Potential conflict with clients are immediately identified and resolved by those employees in cooperation with customers, potential interventions by managers are limited to crisis situations, which occur very seldom.

3. The agreements with clients are the prevailing focus within negotiations, supported by abovementioned flexibility of offers and wide range potential deals.

4. Persistent and continuous orientation on establishing and maintaining partnership of mutual relations, including both internal and external ones (which is described below, in last subsection of the paper).

5. Broad decision-making power delegated to the salesmen in negotiations, reinforced by flat, decentralized organizational structure, in particular in sales area.

6. Effective, open and direct communication inside and outside organization, based on reliable, complete, solid and relevant data.

7. Consistent seeking for mutual benefits while exchanging offer with clients while reaching potential deals.

8. Thriving on common values shared by all employees and cared in the frame of relationships with client, especially trust, credibility and loyalty.

The above-mentioned features of sales negotiations in UCS SA constitutes the key success factors of the company in the market and crucial dimension of its good reputation. In particular, within its business environment, it is known as an enterprise having unique competence of establishing and maintaining partnership relations with its clients.

**2.6. Partnership relations with clients.** It is easy to see that even the sales organization (tailor-made to the specific needs of particular groups of customers) and the analysis of the negotiating situation as well as the formulation of offers against the background of the detailed and specific objectives of the negotiations indicate a positive attitude towards the target audience and striving to establish and maintain partnership relations with the clients.

Generally, the company uses a co-operation strategy (integrative style), due to its weaker bid position as one of the potential suppliers (strong competition in the market). Moreover, when entering into negotiations with customers, sales executives do not just aim to accomplish the goals of a particular contract and achieve immediate benefits, but also seek to establish regular cooperation and create partnership relations with customers to achieve much greater value in the future. The effectiveness of this approach is confirmed by the constant cooperation of the company with several dozen large institutions, especially educational and research units, which have been provided with substantial amounts of hardware and software.



Real opportunities for implementation of the chosen strategy are mainly due to the large manoeuvring area of the company in the generation of variants in the negotiations. The specificity of the product, i.e. many different configurations of hardware and software components, and thus a wide and varied assortment offer gives UCS SA great flexibility in creating solutions in product-price dimensions. Additionally, the company provides professional advice and high-quality customer service. Very important is also the large scale of realized orders, creating additional opportunities for manoeuvre and reducing the costs of preparation, negotiation and execution of contracts. The company's important assets are also recognized brand and market position, high quality of offered products and favourable conditions of delivery and service.

In conclusion, it can be said that UCS SA can effectively establish and maintain partnership relations through negotiations, and especially to find proper balance between substantive issues and relations with partners. By applying the strategy of cooperation in commercial negotiations, the majority of the transactions concluded by the company are profitable in terms of both material and non-material values, thus resulting in the multiplication of relational capital. Moreover sales processes themselves and the negotiations with clients conducted by UCS SA are characterized by the most important features of turquoise organization.

## Conclusion

To sum up, the presentation of the specific features of negotiations in a turquoise organization can be a useful tool for managing this type of organization, in particular for the identification, analysis and implementation of negotiating processes necessary to achieve its objectives. By synthesizing the above considerations, the following features of the turquoise negotiations can be mentioned:

- 1) the indefinite nature of the negotiation process and the impossibility and lack of its formalization;
- 2) ad hoc, spontaneous resolution of conflicts in places of their origin directly by involved parties, with the possible involvement of mediators;
- 3) immanent, natural – to some extent – pursuit of effective agreement in the event of any disputes;
- 4) spontaneity, directness and partnership of mutual relations, both internal and external;
- 5) situational decision-making by each participant acting as an expert and decision-maker in the advisory process;
- 6) unrestricted, multi-directional and open exchange of information combined with direct and multi-lateral communication;
- 7) the universality and equivalence of mutual exchange, both material and non-material;
- 8) the key role of fundamental values shared by all employees.

On the other hand, it should be emphasized that the presented concept is only a preliminary approach to the problem of turquoise negotiations. It will be further developed by the authors in order to clarify the features of these negotiations and their mutual dependencies for the purpose of their operationalization. It is also necessary to compare the methods of identifying and analyzing these negotiations in terms of both new tools and those adopted from other areas of management sciences. Further empirical studies are also planned to compare organizations with turquoise characteristics and practically verify the submitted proposal.

## Acknowledgements

The publication was financed from the resources allocated to the Faculty of Public Economy and Administration, Cracow University of Economics, under the grant for the maintenance of the research potential.

## References

1. Bellenger, L. (1999). *Negocjacje*. Kraków: Assimil Polska.
2. Dąbrowski, P. J. (1991). *Praktyczna teoria negocjacji*. Warszawa: Sorbog.
3. Dupont, C., Faure, G-O. (2002). The Negotiation Process. In V. A. Kremenyuk (Ed.), *International Negotiation. Analysis, Approaches, Issues. A Publication of the Process of International Negotiations (PIN) Project* (pp. 39-63). San Francisco-Oxford: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
4. Fisher, R., Ury, W., Patton, B. (2000). *Dochodząc do TAK. Negocjowanie bez poddawania się*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.
5. Fowler, A. (2001). *Jak skutecznie negocjować*. Warszawa: Petit.
6. Kennedy, G. (1998). *Negocjator*. Warszawa: Studio EMKA.
7. Kozina, A. (2012). *Planowanie negocjacji w przedsiębiorstwie*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie.
8. Laloux, F. (2015). *Pracować inaczej. Nowatorski model organizacji inspirowany kolejnym etapem rozwoju ludzkiej świadomości*. Warszawa: Studio EMKA.

9. Lax, D. A., Sebenius, J. K. (1986). *The Manager As Negotiator. Bargaining for Cooperation and Competitive Gain*. New York: The Free Press.
10. Lewicki, R. J., Saunders, D. M., Barry, B., Minton, J. W. (2005). *Zasady negocjacji. Kompendium wiedzy dla trenerów I menedżerów*. Poznań: Dom Wydawniczy Rebis.
11. Nęcki, Z. (2000). *Negocjacje w biznesie*. Kraków: Antykwa.
12. Nierenberg, G. I. (1994). *Sztuka negocjacji jako metoda osiągania celu*. Warszawa: Studio EMKA.
13. Pruitt, D. G., Rubin, J. Z. (1986). *Social Conflict. Escalation, Stalemate and Settlement*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
14. Raiffa, H. (1982). *The Art And Science Of Negotiation*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.
15. Rubin, J., Brown, B. (1975). *The Social Psychology of Bargaining and Negotiation*. New York: Academic Press.
16. Samuelson, W. F., Marks, S. G. (1998). *Ekonomia menedżerska*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.
17. Thompson, L. L. (2001). *The Mind and Heart of the Negotiator*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.
18. Walton, R. E., McKersie, R. B. (1965). *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations: An Analysis of a Social Interaction System*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
19. Zartman, W. I. (Ed.). (1994). *International Multilateral Negotiation. Approaches to the Management of Complexity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. Retrieved from <http://pure.iiasa.ac.at/3989/1/XB-94-006.pdf>