Delayed Gratification

Choosing the Long View

BY GAYATRI SREERAM, AIDAN KEEFE, EVELYN XING, AND SHAYNE KAVANAGH

Delayed gratification is the ability to resist an immediate smaller reward in favor of a larger, more valuable reward in the future. Anyone who has ever skipped the gym because the couch was more comfortable or spent money on something impulsive and regretted it the next day understands this tension intuitively.

Delayed gratification is not an abstract concept; it shows up in the smallest daily decisions. Research suggests that the way we consistently navigate it shapes outcomes over time. One study found that self-control was a stronger predictor of academic outcomes than IQ[1], which suggests that the ability to delay gratification is not just a personality trait but a measurable driver of long-term success. While pursuing immediate gratification can lead to regret, the ability to resist is indicative of discipline.

For finance professionals, delayed gratification translates to a lower discount rate. When individuals or institutions default to immediate rewards, they are implicitly applying a high internal discount rate—overvaluing what is available now and undervaluing what is available later. Psychologist Daniel Kahneman identified two modes of thinking that drive human decision making. System 1 is fast, automatic, and emotionally driven. It is the part of the brain that reaches for immediate reward without much deliberation. System 2 is slower, more logical, and deliberate. It is the part that weighs long-term consequences before acting. In everyday terms, System 1 is what makes you hit snooze; System 2 is what reminds you why you set the alarm. When it comes to financial decisions, System 1 pushes us toward near-term payoffs, while System 2 would select a lower discount rate and a better long-term outcome. The tension between the two is the tension between impulse and discipline.

This dynamic plays out directly in public finance. One of the most common and costly examples is funding recurring expenditures with non-recurring revenues. Solving a budget gap and hiring new firefighters, police officers, or parks staff with one-time funds feels like the right call in the moment. But the ongoing salary obligation doesn't disappear; it simply becomes next year's structural problem. Similarly, deferred maintenance is also a common example of immediate gratification in public finance. When budgets get tight, postponing repairs on roads, buildings, or equipment feels like the practical short-term solution. But the cost does not disappear. It accumulates, and what would have been a manageable repair becomes a far more expensive replacement down the line. The job of the finance professional in this context is to design budget processes that create the time and space for System 2 thinking to do its work, so the rational long-term choice becomes the default, not the exception.

How can we apply this to our own contexts? Via a simple framework rather than prescribing specific actions. The first step is to identify the issue. What is the immediate reward your organization keeps defaulting to? Perhaps you tend to, for example, defer a capital maintenance fund because budget is tight in a given year. Name the pattern first.

Then identify why the delayed reward matters. Articulate the long-term goal that immediate rewards are hindering. Research shows that people who can vividly picture future rewards wait longer for them to manifest. The key to making this system sustainable and effective is building in one structural constraint. The commitment device doesn't have to be complicated. It could be an automatic transfer, a policy rule, a reserve threshold, or a pre-committed budget line. For example, a government that routinely defers capital maintenance during tight budget years can enforce a policy requiring a minimum annual deposit into a dedicated maintenance reserve. The constraint doesn't have to be permanent; it just ensures the decision gets made in advance, before budget season pressure sets in. The point is that it removes the decision from the moment of temptation to act instantly.

These strategies are not one-size-fits-all; they need to be tailored to suit whatever situation you find yourself in. It can lead to a different system as well, but the aim is to give you the knowledge to make you start thinking about the issue in your own context. The goal is not perfect willpower—the goal is a system that makes the right choice the easy one.

Gayatri Sreeram, ***Aidan Keefe***, *and* ***Evelyn Xing*** *are public finance interns at GFOR.* ***Shayne Kavanagh*** *is GFOA's senior manager of research.*

[1] Angela L. Duckworth and Martin E.P. Seligman, "Self-Discipline Outdoes IQ in Predicting Academic Performance of Adolescents," Psychological Science, 2005.