Supplier selection criteria and the role of emotions: an exploratory study in an Upper-Austrian setting

The aim of this paper is, first, to provide a better understanding of the most important supplier selection criteria from a buyer's perspective in a Business-to-Business setting. Second, the contribution shall provide evidence, to which extent emotions play a role in supplier selection and purchasing decision. A qualitative empirical study was conducted, including 14 extensive face-to-face interviews with purchasing representatives from Business-to-Business companies in Austria. The findings show that (1) quality, (2) price, (3) delivery and (4) service are the most important supplier selection criteria. Furthermore, 22 different emotions have been revealed such as pride, rage or pleasure/joy, which occur during the whole buying process.

Introduction

Research on vendor selection has been undertaken since the 60th of last century and is still going on. The results of various studies and meta-analysis show that product quality, delivery compliance, and price might be crucial factors for industrial buyers; however, there are still inconsistencies among findings. One objective of this study is to contribute to a better understanding by empirically investigating the most important supplier selection criteria for industrial purchasers by means of exploratory techniques.

Professional purchasers are assumed to not only decide on rational factors (Sheth 1973; Bausback 2007) but also to rely on soft facts which cannot be determined by figures alone. Trust, personal interactions, gut feelings, guilt, pride, embarrassment and anxiety seem to play a role also in this “rational environment”. The assumption that professional purchasers are ‘purely’ cognitively driven decision makers might be questioned. Consequently, an objective of this paper is to investigate the role of emotions in the decision-making process of industrial buyers.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: First, existing literature on supplier selection criteria is reviewed, with a focus on industrial buyers. Second, literature about emotions occurring during supplier selection from a purchaser’s point of view will be analyzed. Little research has been conducted so far regarding ‘emotions in a business-to-business’ context, hence, this forms a gap to conduct further research in this direction (Bausback 2007; Küpers and Weibler 2005). Third, the chosen methodology for the empirical investigation will be discussed. The last section reveals the findings of the study, followed by a discussion and conclusions.

1 Literature review

This study’s main constructs, namely “supplier selection criteria” and “emotions in organizational buying” have been, as single concepts or in relation to others, discussed for many years. The
following section includes a brief review of existing literature.

1.1 Supplier selection criteria

Despite 40 years of research in this field, there is little consensus among researchers about what are the most important supplier selection criteria for industrial purchasers (Raut et al. 2010; Oke et al. 2009; Hsu et al. 2006). Kumar and Pani (2014) received 228 valid questionnaires across 188 firms in India after predefining the supplier selection through a three months Delphi study. The results show that product quality, delivery compliance and price are the crucial factors for industrial buyers. These findings are consistent with the findings of Ho et al. (2010) or Vanteddu et al. (2011), however, they are inconsistent with other research findings (Yeh and Chen 2012, Wu and Olson 2010; Raut et al. 2010).

Already in 1973, Sheth pointed out that professional purchasers do not solely decide on rational factors. He argues that purchasing behavior can be seen similar to consumers' behavior with respect to the decision process. This is consistent with the argumentation of Bausback (2007), who stated that the line between professional and private life is blurry.

Sarode et al. (2010) identified trust and commitment as crucial decision-making factors in addition to quality, delivery and technical expertise. Plutchik (2001) considers ‘trust’ to be derived from the basic emotion of admiration. A different view is presented by Rauyruen and Miller (2007). Their findings show that trust and commitment to the supplier do not significantly influence purchase intentions. Ulaga (2003) conducted in-depth interviews with ten purchasing managers in manufacturing companies in the USA and found out that ‘personal interactions’ have an influence on the final decision, not just product quality, delivery and direct product costs.

Bagozzi (2006) argues that emotions in business-to-business buyer and seller interactions play a role and exist as positive (e.g. pride, attachment and empathy) or negative (guilt, shame, embarrassment and anxiety) ones. Andersen and Kumar (2006) and Sarode et al. (2010) also state trust as to be an important factor. Furthermore, they state that positive and negative emotions during interactions impact the trustworthiness of both parties. Wilson (1995) stated that trust is essential when a partner is selected. Kotler et al. (2011) and Dion et al. (1995) share this opinion that trustworthiness and trust are important components. Geyskens et al. (1998) sees the latter factor as the result of ‘feeling’ and ‘behaving’ of two parties during interactions. Andersen and Kumar (2006) pointed out that negative and positive emotions influence the final decision if a deal will be made. They argued that negative emotions increase transaction costs and can lead to the determination of relationships and the search for new partners. In line with these arguments, this challenges the assumption that professional purchasers are, and should be, ‘purely’ cognitive decision makers (Lynch and de Chernatony 2004).

Finally, the OBB literature pointed out as well that there is inconsistency according to which criteria purchasers select suppliers (Andersen et al. 1987; Johnston and Lewin 1996; Kotler et al. 2011). This supports the intention to conduct further research in this direction.

1.2 Emotions in organizational buying

A large body of literature on organizational buying behavior stresses the rationality of the industrial buyer during the buying and decision-making process (Kotler et al. 2011). In general, the entire buying process is perceived as more formal, systematic and rational, especially, when compared with consumer buying behavior (Homburg and Krohmer 2006). In particular, emotions in the field of B2C have gained broad attention (O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy 2003). Although organizational buying is perceived as mainly rational (Kotler et al. 2011), factors such as sympathy can play a role for industrial purchasers (Dion et al. 1995). Dion et al. (1995) found that “liking” the salesperson plays an important role in the interplay of industrial buyers and sellers. Rauyruen and Miller's (2007) findings confirm that B2B suppliers have to appear 'likeable' in the eyes of the
customer to enhance positive word-of-mouth recommendations and to build upon a pleasant relationship. Cater and Cater (2010) found that the ‘cognitive’ reason to establish, continue and leave a B2B relationship is product quality. However, they also found that emotions influence relationship and customer loyalty alike.

Other researchers raise the claim that emotional factors can play an equal or even more important role when decisions are made than rational ones (Lynch and de Chernatony 2007; Bennett et al. 2005; Lynch and de Chernatony 2004). Although buying decisions in organizations are supposed to be rational and more people are involved in the process to share the risk, people are ‘still’ individuals and human beings (O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy 2003). A person in their private life is emotional, impulsive, influenced by others and avoids making a decision. On the other hand, it is believed that the same person is rational, objective, unbiased and decisive in their professional life. The ‘dual personality’ approach has to be reconsidered (Bausback 2007). This is also coherent with the statement of Lynch and de Chernatony (2004, p. 405). “The focus on rationality has underpinned the long-held assumption that the organizational buyer ‘is not an emotional or impulsive one; he is making a rational decision’ […] the notion of organizational purchasers as purely rational buyers has, however, been increasingly questioned and challenged.”

1.3 Emotions and supplier selection

There is a plethora of evidence that emotions might play a role in organizational buying and it could be necessary to rethink the assumption of a purely rational industrial purchaser (Bausback 2007). Surprisingly, Antoine Bechara (2004) argued that emotions in decision-making have received little attention in research so far. Furthermore, the scholar points out the fact that people do not make decisions primarily by evaluating consequences and probabilities. In some situations decision are made mainly based on gut feelings or emotions (Bechara 2004). Giunipero et al. (1999) presented similar results and confirmed the ‘gut feeling approach’ to decision-making. Gutnik et al. (2006) claimed that under risk and uncertainty both cognition and emotion are crucial in decision-making. Seo and Barrett (2007) found evidence through empirical investigations that emotions can have a positive impact, when a decision has to be made. The scholars argued that identifying, understanding and regulating emotions leads to better decision-making performance. According to Loewenstein (2000) emotions have been studied in the field of psychology. Although, economists do not deny the importance of emotions there is still a lack of attention and incorporation in economic behavior models. Following Selnes and Genhaug (2000), affective states are the drivers of behavioral intentions to be loyal. Satisfaction, as the cognitive evaluation, seems to have a more modest influence. Ultimately, a lack of reliability leads to negative emotions, such as dislike and decreases loyalty. On the other hand liking seems to be created through benevolence. Selnes and Genhaug (2000) declared reliability as a ‘hygiene’ factor and benevolence as a ‘motivator’ factor. Supplier reliability is the basis, which is expected (e.g. delivery on time) and does not create a positive affect but a negative one. Furthermore, benevolence impacts positive affect and (e.g. flexibility and willingness to help when problems arise) lead to liking, gratitude and some kind of friendship. Research has started to recognize the importance of emotions in B2B interactions. Trust is often seen as a cognitive or rational factor, however, this is not enough as trust has also emotional aspects (Andersen and Kumar 2006, p. 523): “A lack of personal “chemistry” or negative emotions may also prolong trust building or terminate relationships.” Emotions, negative or positive, influence the behavior of people who interact with each other. Moreover, constantly these interactions shape the perception of trustworthiness of each other.

Witkowski and Thiodeau (1999) investigated managers in 20 small-to-medium-sized businesses and came to the conclusion that positive emotions are important in establishing and keeping international B2B relationships. Based on the literature there is a dominant view that industrial buyers are mostly rational (Kotler et al. 2011) and that emotions play a greater role in the consumer buying behavior (O’Shaughnessy and
O’Shaughnessy 2003). Cater and Cater (2010) pointed out that product quality is the main reason to purchase and enter into a relationship with the supplier; however, the scholars emphasized that emotions should not be neglected and impact the customer loyalty. Moreover, Haehnel (2011) and Bausback (2007) stressed that emotions are present in the organizational buying behavior and have received little attention so far. O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2003) stated that emotions such as pride or anger can occur when expectations are not met. Furthermore, Bagozzi (2006) highlighted that emotions exist in B2B relationships and Zehetner et al. (2012) found empirical evidence that emotions occur from a purchaser’s point of view. Selnes and Gonhaug (2000) stated that positive and negative emotions of the supplier exist and Andersen and Kumar (2006) said that negative emotions prolong the development of trust, create higher transaction costs and impact the final buying decision. Additionally, Bechara (2004) and Giunipero et al. (1999) claimed that besides emotions gut feelings also impact decisions. Gutnik et al. (2006) stressed the importance of cognition and emotion when decisions are made.

Therefore, there is evidence that emotions might be important in supplier selection and organizational buying behavior (Haehnel 2011; Bausback 2007) and it is unclear to which extent industrial buyers base their decision on cognition alone (O’Shaughnessy 2003).

2 Methodology

The methodology of this paper follows an interpretative approach, accepting the fact that the social world is too complex to theorize it or define it by laws. Interpretivism argues that it is necessary for the researcher “to understand differences between humans in our role as social actors” (Saunders et al. 2009, p. 116). The research objective is to gain a better understanding of supplier selection criteria and the role of emotions from the professional purchasers’ point of view. The data collection includes qualitative interviews with industrial purchasers in the form of semi-structured interviews in order to allow the researchers to follow up on unexpected answers. The interview guideline questions can be found in appendix 2. The study design is cross-sectional, hence all data is gathered within a relatively short period of time, i.e. all fieldwork took place in April, 2014. The sampling strategy was purposive/judgmental, based on a list provided by the chamber of commerce in Upper Austria. Several companies were called by the author’s judgment based on the criteria in Table 1. Table 1: Sample selection criteria

Source: authors

The participants of the empirical fieldwork are presented in the appendix. In the interest of having more heterogeneous findings and richer results in terms of the topic of emotions, people who participated in the interviews were from different positions, however, all related to purchasing such as head of the purchase department (4), technical purchaser (2), purchaser (3), strategic purchaser (1), production manager (1) and plant manager (1). The list of interviewees including company, position and nationality can be found in appendix 1. The researchers focused on small and medium-sized enterprises as those represent 99.6% of all Austrian companies, employ 67% of the working population and create 63% of the entire Austrian turnover and therefore are important for the Austrian economy (note [1]). The definition of an SME is based on the European Commission’s definition (note [2]). In order to achieve a maximum variation sample to support the explorative character of this work, a wide range of companies with a different number of employees, different positions of the interviewees, genders and work experience was selected. 14 in-depth-interviews with purchasers were included in the study. Sequential analysis showed that after the 10th interview just few or almost no new insights were detected. Hence, and following Saunders et. al’s (2009) purposeful sampling strategy, the richness of data that could be achieved has been gathered and after 4 more interviews, the data gathering was completed. The interviews were recorded and transliterated word by word. Qualitative content analysis was done using MAXQDA software which supports defining categories, applying thematic coding and organizing the large amount of empirical
data in a structured way (Mayring 2000). The collected data for this paper was analyzed using both codes which derived from literature and thematic coding from the empirical data itself.

3 Findings and discussion

To address the research questions, the findings were structured in several categorical segments. Based on the literature review, those segments were: ‘Supplier Selection Criteria’, ‘Balance between hard and soft facts’, and ‘The Role of Emotions in the Buying Process’.

3.1 Supplier selection criteria

Regarding the most important supplier selection criteria a wide range of answers were given. 8 out of 12 interviewees (AS; CS; KK; SR; SK; PB; GK; GG) stated or used the expression of quality, price or payment terms as to be relevant ‘hard’ or ‘tangible’ facts, which influence the buying decision and which can be evaluated through a number. Other aspects (‘soft facts’) referred to items such as honesty, personal interactions, gut feeling or sympathy. The empirical results according to this sample indicate that quality, price, and delivery are the three most important factors. These findings are similar as reported by Sonmaz (2006) who conducted a literature review from 1985 to 2005 and analyzed 34 articles. In addition, Weber et al. (1991) who reviewed 74 articles from 1966 to 1991 showed the same results. The results also conform to findings by Ho et al. (2010) and Kumar and Pani (2014).

All interview partners have understood the criterion price as the monetary value referring to the verbal or written offer that can be compared with other offers. The interviewees interpreted the criterion delivery as the delivery time (JG; PG; SK; BL; PB; GG). Interviewee JG and BL added delivery conditions (e.g. ex works), the accuracy in terms of quantity and the flexibility of the supplier regarding changes. This definition is comparable with the findings of Ulaga (2003). One factor, which was named by all interviewees directly or indirectly through examples, is ‘meeting technical specifications’. In this context, 8 out of 12 interviewees (JG; KK; PG; BL; MS; PB; GG; GK) emphasized that generally suppliers have the tendency to overestimate themselves in terms of their capability. Therefore, sample deliveries and audits are important tools to assess their capability. Interviewee GK highlighted the danger of the ‘phenomenon’ of the perfect sample delivery. Meaning, that after the first delivery the quality level fluctuates on later follow up purchases. Respondent AS explained the difference between the criterion ‘meeting technical specifications’ and ‘quality’. The former criterion refers to the ability which product meets the specifications. He defined quality as how reliable the product is, meaning how often it can perform its required task. An example mentioned was with engines, in which case both engines have the same technical capabilities in terms of revolutions per minute or kW, however, one engine can break down after three months and the other runs three years without any problems. Additionally, Interviewee GG, GK and JG pointed out that continuously constant quality levels refer to the quality criterion. This is consistent with the findings of Cater and Cater (2010) who defined quality consisting of the sub-items ‘performance’, ‘reliability’ and ‘consistency’.

Interviewee AS, KK, SR, PB, SK and JG emphasized that it does not make sense to accept lower prices in return for lower quality. This opinion is similar to the statement of Webster (1991), who claimed that price cannot make up for delivery problems or inadequate quality. Additionally, the interview partners pointed out that lower quality leads to higher follow up costs, which the company has to bear in form of production stops (JP; SR), quality problems lead to dissatisfied customers (KK; SK) and image problems (PB; AS). Respondents KK and BL highlighted that in case of company internal problems due to inappropriate quality they
experience pressure from colleagues. Interviewee GG declared the price criterion as a ‘hygiene’ factor that has to be within a certain range; however, quality is the most important factor. Contrary to all other statements Respondent PG insisted on the importance of price and declared it as the most important criterion.

Most of the participants defined the criterion ‘service’ differently. Interviewee AS and PB defined service referring to technical advice. Respondents CS, SR and MS described service as the willingness of the supplier to help in critical situations. Interview Partners CS, SR and GG added that it must be possible that the supplier is reachable e.g. telephonically. In addition, the vendor has to provide fast help and solutions for problems.

Table 2 shows the findings of our study contrasted with previous studies with respect to the order of price, quality, and delivery as main supplier selection criteria.

Table 2: Comparison between empirical results and previous findings
Source: authors

3.2 Balance between hard and soft facts

Besides quality, price, and delivery, most interviewees mentioned other factors that have an influence on the supplier selection. Those factors include reliability, honesty, trust, loyalty, sympathy and gut feeling, which are suspected to have an impact on the supplier selection decision. These factors can be described as “soft facts”. While hard facts may be expressed in economic indicators like cost, asset turnover, or lead times, soft facts include moods, feelings, tacit knowledge and resulting behavioral intentions (motivation/demotivation) and behavior (support/resistance) (note [3]). The findings of this study are in consonance with Sheth (1973) who pointed out that purchasers do not solely make decisions on rational factors.

9 out of 12 interviewees (CS; KK; SR; PG; BL; SK; PB; GK; GG) pointed out that they prefer to buy from suppliers they know and they have a sound relationship with. This is conformant with findings of Johnston and Lewin (1996) who said that especially when higher risk is involved, purchasers prefer well known suppliers. Furthermore, the nine interviewees mentioned that in a new task buying situation they firstly try to solve the buying task with existing suppliers and only if this is not possible, they look for other vendors. Interviewee CS, SK and KK explained that trust and reliability influence loyalty. Interviewee AS, CS and JG expressed that it cannot be denied that sympathy plays a role in the supplier selection. Interview Partners BL, PB and MS emphasized that sympathy alone should not be decisive, however, if offers are comparable, it plays a role. Interviewee JG stated that sympathy has an impact on the final decision as soon as personal contact is given. Moreover, he said that arrogance impacts sympathy negatively.

11 out of 12 interviewees said that gut feeling plays a role throughout the buying process. Interviewee JG and CS added that the right gut feeling or positive chemistry with the supplier is important for easier collaboration. Respondents KK and BL stated that in case of a negative gut feeling they are more careful in the buying process and that the gut feeling is always present when decisions are made. This is comparable with the findings of Bechara (2004) who stated that mood, gut feelings or emotions can impact buying decisions. Interviewee PG, MS and GK emphasized the hard facts such as price or quality play a role, however, gut feeling is part of the decision-making process and cannot be denied. Moreover, Respondent PG pointed out that, if the hard facts are comparable of several suppliers, he makes his decision based on gut feeling without being able to articulate his choice. Interview Partner PB admitted that regarding complex products purchases, under time pressure, the gut feeling influences some decisions to a great extent. This is similar to the findings of Giunipero et al. (1999) who argued that tacit knowledge including a gut feeling can be applied to make decisions. Finally, Respondent PG weighted hard and soft facts 90:10 when decisions are made; however, he admitted that if offers are comparable the soft facts play a higher role. Interview Partner GG said that in case of known products it is 90:10 and for unknown products it is 60:40. Interviewee BL weighed 80:20 and Respondent SK 70:30. Interviewee PB said that when
it comes to standard products it is 70:30 and with complex products it is 50:50. Interviewee CS stated that for him hard and soft facts are weighted equally 50:50. These results further support the statement of Sheth (1973) that decisions are not purely made based on rationality and cognition. The named soft factors are consistent with the literature and previous findings. This heterogeneous sample indicated a variety of other factors that influence the supplier selection, in particular, when relationships with suppliers exist. However, the impact of soft facts on the decision varies among the interviewees and shows a wide spectrum of different opinions and has to be interpreted with caution.

3.3 The role of emotions in the buying process

The interviewees were asked to what extent they think that emotions play a role in the buying process. 9 out of 12 interviewees (AS; SR; SK; MS; PB; GG; GK; PG; KK) stated that they believe emotions to play a role.

Figure 2: Emotions stated by interview partners
Source: authors

The interview partners stated 22 different positive as well as negative emotions. All interviewees mentioned that during the buying process they have at least once experienced anger/annoyance. The second most named emotion is pride followed by rage and pleasure/joy in third place. 8 out of 12 interviewees have already experienced disappointment and frustration, followed by concern and nervousness. Half of the interviewees explained that they have experienced negative excitement, anxiety/fear, dissatisfaction or dislike during the buying process. Five interviewees have stated hate. Lower ranking emotions were satisfaction, insecurity/uncertainty, desperation, happiness, mistrust, hope, feelings of guilt, gratitude and enjoyment. The most often negative emotions stated were anger/annoyance in first place, followed by rage in second place and frustration and disappointment in third place. The three most named positive emotions were pride, pleasure/joy and satisfaction followed by happiness, gratitude, hope and enjoyment. Findings about the most frequently mentioned emotions are explained below.

In conclusion, the results of this heterogeneous sample provide evidence that emotions are triggered and present from a buyer’s perspective during the buying process. Particularly, negative emotions have been named more often than positive ones. Therefore, the author concludes that negative emotions have a greater impact on the buying decision and relationship development than positive ones. This is also consistent with the examples that have been given by the interview partners and is in consonance with the opinion of Andersen and Kumar (2006). Moreover, the two researchers claimed that negative emotions prolong the trust-building process. This sample revealed several different sources by which emotions are triggered. In addition, the sample indicated five external factors that impact the sources and occurrence of emotions, which are time pressure, procurement market structure, switching costs and the number of alternative offers.

4 Managerial implications

The findings of this work might be interesting for sales people and marketing managers alike. The data based on this particular sample indicates that quality is in first place regarding the importance, followed by price, delivery and service, when it comes to supplier selection. Therefore, sales people can base their arguments on quality, delivery and service in order to try to impact the price sensitivity of the purchaser in a favorable way. However, the supplier selection criteria are not static, but rather dynamic and are influenced by several factors that have been identified during this
The interview partners of this sample highlighted that for instance proper and honest technical advice and high technical expertise reduce the price sensitivity and increase the probability to be selected by the purchaser. In addition, there was evidence that showing goodwill by helping the purchaser in problematic situations results in gratitude, which might impact trust and loyalty positively. Therefore, supporting and caring about the other party and especially about the purchaser in difficult situations seems to be beneficial.

Moreover, there is evidence that purchasers prefer to solve new buying tasks with existing suppliers they can rely on, are honest and which they can trust. There is evidence that working on these factors and trying to strengthen those impacts future purchases intentions positively. Additionally, when comparable offers exist there was evidence that purchasers might buy based on sympathy to the supplier or the sales person.

This paper identified that not keeping promises, inappropriate behavior from the supplier or sales person, delivery delays, packaging problems and a lack of communication are the main sources, which primarily trigger negative emotions in a purchaser. The appearing emotions are anger/annoyance, rage, dislike or frustration, which have an impact on the buying decision and on the relationship. Therefore, the sales person should avoid triggering those sources. In case negative emotions occur, fast counter measures have to be taken. There is evidence that an apology, honest and accurate explanation why something happened or fast help/support can minimize the impact of the named negative emotions. In addition, sales people have to show the purchaser that he/she and his/her company is important to the sales person. Moreover, the sales person has to be honest, interested and supportive and care about the well-being of the purchaser and his/her company.

There was evidence that this behavior is highly appreciated by the buyer and has a positive impact on the relationship and on future buying decisions.

Finally, the marketing department can use this information and put more emphasis on trust and loyalty building activities or programs as it positively impacts follow up purchase intentions.

5 Limitations and further research directions

This work has several limitations and the author encourages the reader to interpret with caution and critically question the presented findings. Firstly, even though this work focused on small and medium-sized enterprises the findings cannot be generalized due to the heterogeneous sample and participants of this study and invites future research to approve, disprove, extend or limited these findings. As this study is explorative in its nature there is a need to research further into this direction. The author wants to stress that this paper should be seen as a possible start for further research endeavors and not as a representation of the absolute truth. Secondly, a limited time frame, limited financial resources and limited access to companies have characterized this research. Therefore, richer, consistent, more comprehensive or different findings might be achieved under different conditions and degree of resources.

Based on the empirical data and findings of this study additional evidence is provided that emotions occur and are present in the supplier selection process. In particular there is evidence that emotions impact current and future buying decisions. Moreover, the sample shows evidence that emotions are present in B2B relationships. Therefore, it might be valuable to undertake further research regarding emotions in order to develop new models regarding organizational buying behavior, including emotions. Furthermore, as this work revealed several sources that trigger emotions from a buyer’s point of view, further research could be done in this direction to discover a more comprehensive list of possible sources. Another research direction would be to measure the intensity of the occurring emotions during the buying process and try to measure the impact on the final decision. In addition, as certain ‘soft facts’ (e.g. sympathy, trust, honest etc.) have been mentioned, which impact the vendor choice, further research might be useful to identify more items and how they are linked to each other. In particular, the relationship theory provides a wide range of these
variables, however, research has not agreed on one comprehensive model yet.

Appendix 2

Interview guide (sample questions):
1. Buying Situations occurring in daily business
2. Buying process, with respect to different buying situations
3. Buying centre composition - who is involved in the buying process
4. Decisive power structure, who holds the power
5. Supplier selection criteria applied (Relevance, ranking, influence of buying situation)
6. Who decides on supplier selection criteria
7. Emotions playing a role in the decisive process (types of emotions, relevance ranking, influence of emotions on the buying process, displayed vs. perceived emotions)

Poznámky/Notes
[4] Interview partner insisted to stay anonymous.
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Résumé

Kritéria výberu dodávateľa a úloha emócií: prieskumná štúdia z prostredia územia Horného Rakúska

Cieľom tohto článku je po prvé poskytnúť lepšie pochopenie najdôležitejších kritérií pre výber dodávateľov z pohľadu kupujúceho v prostredí B2B. Po druhé, príspevok má poskytnúť dôkazy, do akej miery emócie hrajú úlohu pri výbere dodávateľa a nákupného rozhodovania. Bola vykonaná kvalitatívna empirická štúdia, vrátane 14 rozsiahlych osobných rozhovorov so zástupcami B2B spoločností v Rakúsku. Výsledky ukazujú, že (1) kvalita, (2) cena , (3) doručenie a (4) služby sú najdôležitejšími kritériami pre výber dodávateľov. Okrem toho bolo spozorovaných 22 rôznych emócií, z nich sú zjavené napríklad pýcha, zlosť alebo potešenie/radosť, ktoré sa vyskytujú v priebehu celého nákupného procesu.
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