Thinking Fast and Slow in Purchasing

Tal Kotler – March 2023

Purchasing teams are responsible for making critical decisions related to buying goods and services for an organization. These decisions can have a significant impact on the success of the business, both in the short and long term. However, purchasing teams are at a disadvantage because they can fall prey to the cognitive biases associated with the way humans think, known as fast and slow thinking.

The Thinking Fast and Slow Error:

Daniel Kahneman, a Nobel Prize-winning economist, introduced the concept of "thinking fast and slow" in his book, "Thinking, Fast and Slow." According to Kahneman, the human brain operates in two modes of thinking: System 1 and System 2. System 1 thinking is fast, intuitive, and automatic, while System 2 thinking is slow, deliberate, and analytical.

Impact on Procurement Professionals:

Fast thinking, also known as System 1 thinking, is our automatic, intuitive, and often unconscious way of processing information. This type of thinking is useful when we need to make quick decisions, such as when we are driving a car or reacting to a sudden threat. However, when it comes to complex purchasing decisions, relying solely on fast thinking can lead to costly mistakes.

For example, a purchasing team might be tempted to choose a vendor because they have had a positive experience with them in the past, or because they have a good rapport with the sales representative. This type of decision-making is based on quick, intuitive judgments, rather than a thorough analysis of all the available options. While it may seem like an efficient way to make decisions, it can lead to overlooking important factors or missing out on better alternatives.

Slow thinking, also known as System 2 thinking, is a more deliberate, analytical, and conscious way of processing information. This type of thinking requires effort and is slower than fast thinking, but it allows us to make more informed decisions. However, when under pressure to decide quickly, purchasing teams may not have the time or resources to engage in slow thinking, and may rely solely on fast thinking.

Now let's discuss the various types of bias within fast and slow thinking.

Anchoring Bias:

Anchoring bias occurs when individuals rely too heavily on the first piece of information they receive when making a decision. Procurement professionals may be anchored to the first supplier they come across, without fully exploring other options that may be more cost-effective or provide better quality.

Confirmation Bias:

Confirmation bias occurs when individuals seek out information that confirms their existing beliefs, rather than considering all the available evidence. Procurement professionals may be biased towards suppliers they have worked with before, without fully considering other options that may be more suitable for the current project.

Availability Bias:

Availability bias occurs when individuals make decisions based on the information that is most readily available to them, rather than considering all the available evidence. Procurement professionals may be biased towards suppliers that have a strong online presence or those they have heard about from colleagues, without fully considering other options that may be more cost-effective or provide better quality.

Overconfidence Bias:

Overconfidence bias occurs when individuals have an overly positive view of their abilities and expertise, leading them to make decisions without fully considering all the available evidence. Procurement professionals may be overly confident in their ability to negotiate with suppliers, leading them to overlook potential red flags or other options that may be more suitable.

Confirmation Bias

This bias refers to the tendency to seek out information that confirms our existing beliefs and to ignore information that contradicts them. For example, a purchasing team may believe that a particular vendor is the best option and may only look for evidence that supports this belief, while ignoring evidence that suggests there may be better options available.

Let's explore some advantages to thinking fast and thinking slow:

Sales teams are often trained to use various persuasion techniques to influence their customers' decision-making processes. One of the ways they can gain an advantage over a customer's purchasing department is by leveraging the principles of fast and slow thinking.

Sales teams can use fast thinking to their advantage by appealing to their customers' emotions and intuition. They may use catchy slogans, appealing visuals, or compelling stories to quickly capture their customers' attention and create an emotional connection with them. This can help them to influence their customers' decisions in their favor, without allowing them to engage in deeper analytical thinking.

Sales teams can also use slow thinking to their advantage by providing their customers with detailed information and extensive research to support their claims. They may provide in-depth analysis of their products' benefits, comparisons with competitors, and detailed case studies to demonstrate their effectiveness. This can help to create a sense of trust and credibility with the customer, which can be particularly effective when dealing with customers' purchasing departments.

Moreover, sales teams may use cognitive biases to influence customers' decision-making processes. For example, they may use the scarcity heuristic by creating a sense of urgency around a limited-time offer or by highlighting how few products are left in stock. This can trigger customers fast thinking and create a sense of FOMO (fear of missing out), prompting them to make a quick purchase decision.

Sales teams may also use social proof by highlighting how many other customers have already purchased their products or how satisfied they are with the product's performance. This can trigger customers' slow thinking, prompting them to carefully consider the product's benefits and its impact on their organization.

Maximizing the negotiation process with fast and slow thinking:

Thinking fast and slow can be leveraged to maximize your leverage in a negotiation by understanding the cognitive biases that affect decision-making and using them to your advantage. Here are some ways you can use fast and slow thinking to improve your negotiation skills:

Use fast thinking to read the other party's emotions and reactions. During a negotiation, it's essential to pay attention to the other party's nonverbal cues, such as facial expressions, tone of voice, and body language. These cues can help you gauge the other party's emotional state and adjust your negotiation tactics accordingly.

Use slow thinking to prepare and plan for the negotiation. Before entering a negotiation, take the time to research the other party's interests, preferences, and goals. Develop a clear plan for what you want to achieve in the negotiation and identify potential areas of compromise or agreement.

Use fast thinking to adapt to changing circumstances. During a negotiation, unexpected events or new information can arise that can change the dynamics of the negotiation. Being able to quickly adapt to these changes and adjust your strategy can be a critical factor in achieving your desired outcome.

Use slow thinking to analyze the other party's arguments and proposals. During a negotiation, it's important to carefully evaluate the other party's proposals and arguments. Take the time to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of their position and use this analysis to formulate counterarguments or alternative proposals.

Use fast thinking to create a sense of urgency or excitement. During a negotiation, creating a sense of urgency or excitement can help to motivate the other party to agree to your proposal. For example, you might use a limited-time offer or emphasize the potential benefits of reaching an agreement quickly.

Use slow thinking to consider the long-term implications of the negotiation. When negotiating, it's important to consider not just the immediate outcome but also the long-term implications of the agreement. Take the time to carefully evaluate the potential risks and benefits of the agreement and ensure that it aligns with your broader strategic objectives.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the “thinking fast” and ”thinking slow” error can have a significant impact on procurement professionals, leading to cognitive biases and errors in judgment. Procurement professionals must be aware of the potential for these biases and take steps to mitigate their impact, such as seeking out diverse opinions, considering all available evidence, and taking the time to engage in System 2 thinking when making important decisions. By doing so, procurement professionals can make more informed decisions that benefit their organizations.