

# Expectation vs. Reality: Food Service, Price, and Promotion of a Fast-Food Restaurant

Donato, Shane B., Andres, Jemima Faye V., Ang, Chin-chin A., Collado, Jan Cyrel Joy J., Infante, Rhiana Mashielle E. and Ibarra, John Michael C.

Hospitality and Tourism Management Department, Saint Mary's University

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.804110>

Received: 30 March 2024; Accepted: 11 April 2024; Published: 13 May 2024

## ABSTRACT

In the Philippines, deceptive advertising has been present in the market. The presence of ads from fast-food restaurants has also made consumers wonder if it is accurate in what they offer. With this evident deception in the market, consumers of a certain fast-food chain may face a similar problem in buying their food, whether they are getting what they are paying for. This study used a quantitative descriptive method that includes administering survey questionnaires in Likert form to diners of the fast-food chain who are aged 18-59 years old, excluding those who buy through the drive-thru and take-out. In the conducted study on February 2023, the findings reveal that among the 103 respondents, female emerging adults and young adults are mostly consumers of a fast-food chain in Bambang and dine occasionally. In terms of service, it shows that crew members who are not friendly have the highest frequency in the items. In price, the item that got the highest agreement was the additional fees when upgrading drinks, which the cashier did not disclose, and respondents consider it a deception. Regarding promotion, not receiving the same item as advertised got the highest agreement. Also, respondents did not experience other deceptions, resulting in them not doing any actions to address identified deception. The results have shown that there is no evident deception in terms of service, price, and promotions other than those identified as it receives a high frequency; nonetheless, it still falls under no perceived deception. It demonstrates that the mentioned fast-food restaurant fulfills its promised advertisements and continues improving its service and avoiding deception for customer retention.

**Keywords:** Marketing, deception, food, and beverage, buying behavior

## INTRODUCTION

The perception of people toward products plays a vital role in how a business will be influenced. The presence of advertising helps with the growth and survival of a business in the market. According to Gaber et al. (2018), advertising is the most crucial role a company needs to perform. This shows that effective advertising is critical to business success and fulfilling its objectives. As the world transforms more innovatively, advertising has also flown on its surge; it has grown in a wider spectrum and has built different approaches to target a specific audience.

Moreover, as advertisements (ads) have arisen throughout the years and have evolved drastically from print ads to digital, also known as e-marketing, this has changed the status quo in the market. The evolution of ads has influenced human behavior on how products are perceived. It affects the senses of humans so that even without tasting or physically holding it, they can already tell if it is good or not. Kádeková et al. (2019) point out that mental qualities must be recognized to impact individuals' decision-making. The principle of marketing tricks the receiver in a progressively complex manner for the consumer to be influenced and

purchase a product. From how a product has been packaged /to how the product has been used, introduced, and or consumed by a specific well-known personality, it plays an essential role in how people are pushed to purchase.

Incidents of increasing ways to advertise products have paved the way for consumers to be manipulated in their buying decisions. Google and Facebook have the greatest US digital advertisement revenue segment, with 28.6% and 23.8% correspondingly (Dautovic, 2022). Promoters such as social media influencers or artists may manipulate what they say about a certain product's quality, pushing their viewers to be influenced and consume what they advertise. All these activities aim to deceive consumers into making hefty profits, which could result in financial loss for the marketer and a decrease in its ability to compete (Gaber et al., 2018). The many cases broadcasted on this deception matter affected the consumer and the business itself. From crafting or conceptualizing ads to showcasing numerous promotions and discounts to services to pricing and sizing of the products, businesses have come a long way to advertise their businesses and attract consumers.

This type of advertising, evident in multiple product ads, is also known as deceptive advertising. Consumer Laws (2019) referred to deceptive advertising as confusing, misleading, or blatantly untrue statements when promoting a product. Deceptive advertising has been prevalent in the market in the Philippines in a variety of media, including social media and television. The presence of ads from fast-food restaurants has also made consumers wonder if it is accurate to what they put up. There are diverse types of false advertising, but consumers most commonly encounter deceptive pictures. This is using pictures that give a false impression of the product (Strauss, 2022). For example, the item advertised in a picture must be fairly depicted in fast food chains. According to a recent survey, the average turnaround time for fast food orders in 2018 was 193 seconds for Burger King, while McDonald's and Chick-fil-A had the longest turnaround times. (Wida, 2019). Fast food was created to make serving meals as seamless as possible, and it should meet customer needs to the best of its ability. But with the rising problems of these fast-food restaurants from their deceptive ads, upholding their objectives would be impossible.

Any marketing that falsely asserts the existence of a warranty or guarantee is prohibited by the Consumer Act of the Philippines (R.A. No. 7394, 1992), which means that it is against the law to distribute false, deceptive, or misleading advertisements to engage in commercial activity via print, radio, television, outdoor advertising, or on other media to including the purchase of goods or services of consumers.

Under this evident deception in the market, consumers of a certain fast-food chain in Bambang may face a similar problem in buying their needs, especially their food. The presence of the fast-food chain in the municipality may also have been deceptive advertising, which may attract consumers for its growth in consumers and profitability. Consequently, this study seeks to answer if there are existing practices of false advertisement in a fast-food chain in Bambang. The studies above show that numerous ways of advertising may have lapses that may manipulate consumers just for the sake of buying their products.

Thus, this study will reveal if the consumers of the existing fast-food restaurant in Bambang are getting the quality of products and price that they have paid for, their time and effort to wait in an extensive line to have the taste of the food they wanted to experience. Also, it will show how the consumers have responded to these deceptive acts, if any, that the fast-food chain has practiced and how it affected their perception of the business. Alqaysi and Zahari (2022) confirmed that deceptive marketing strategies like brand deception could change the perception and attitude of consumers negatively toward brands, therefore affecting consumer purchase intents. This will benefit other businesses as they discover that practicing deceptive advertising may affect their business because they cannot sustain business objectives as consumers will look for new fast food that they can be satisfied with. This malpractice of ads can ruin a brand name. Students, who are mainly the consumers of the said restaurants, may benefit from the study as they will recognize the presence of deception in the market, which may push them to recalibrate their minds and find better

restaurants that will suffice their needs. The School of Accountancy and Business (SAB) department can also gain from the study as they may use this as a guide when doing promotional projects where deception can be present, so it is important to be accurate when showcasing products for them to be equipped as future businessmen. Faculty from SAB can use the study as a reference when discussing deception in service, price, and product promotion. To future researchers, this is essential as they can make this study their basis for intervention and improve the variables presented for more reliable answers and findings.

Furthermore, this study is conducted on a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya, particularly the consumers who consumed and experienced their products for the researchers to determine its impact on their buying experience. In addition, this study is relevant to inform the upper management of the establishments of their unethical practices.

As food prices are skyrocketing, it is also important to know if consumers are getting what they have paid for. The study is relevant as this will show people, especially consumers, that there might be a presence of deception in the market. It is blindsided because it provides their needs but does not sufficiently meet them.

## METHODOLOGY

To answer the problems of the study, the Quantitative Descriptive method will be used as its method includes administering survey questionnaires to the corresponding respondents, and this was used to know the respondents' experiences regarding Service, Price, and Promotion.

The research locale was a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya, because it is the province's commercial center and vegetable hub, and most people who visit fast-food restaurants are students. The respondents of the study were the diners of a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya, who were willing to participate and at the age of 18 years old or above, excluding those who were 60 years old and above and availing of the drive-thru and take-out. In addition, only those diners who have seen ads for the fast-food restaurant in any form were chosen.

To gather pertinent data, an adopted survey questionnaire from Ghazi, KM (2016) validated and approved by a group of arbitrators after a series of tests and revisions was slightly modified to suit the current study. The modified survey questionnaire was duly reviewed, validated, and approved by the school's research coordinator, research professor, and panel of evaluators to check and assure its face validity, especially its content.

Data gathered were tabulated, rated, and analyzed using Qualitative Interpretation where in the first part of the problem of the study, frequency, and percentage were utilized in profiling the respondents and their frequency of visits and availing of goods to a fast-food restaurant. Second, the frequency and percentage were also used for rating respondents in identifying deception sources of food advertising in terms of service, price, and promotion. Lastly, other deceptions experienced by the respondents and recommendations provided concerning the identified deception sources were lifted, summarized, and arranged thematically according to service, price, and promotion to properly analyze the commonality of their actions and recommendations.

The study was submitted for ethics review to Saint Mary's University Research Ethics Board (SMU-REB), Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya, for approval and monitoring.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter contains the researchers' findings and discussions on the data acquired following the order of

the specific questions sought in Chapter 1.

Table 2: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Profile	Category	Frequency	Percent
<b>Age</b>	18-25 (Emerging Adult)	41	39.80
	26-39 (Young Adult)	42	40.80
	40-57 (Middle-Aged Adult)	20	19.40
<b>Sex</b>	Male	51	49.50
	Female	52	50.50
<b>Number of visits</b>	Weekly	11	10.70
	Monthly	10	9.70
	Occasionally	82	79.60
<b>Total</b>		<b>103</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 2 presents the respondents’ frequency and percentage distribution regarding demographic profile regarding age, sex, and visit frequency. Among 103 respondents, 42, or 40.80%, are Young Adults, ranging from 26-39 years old; 52, or 50.50%, are female and occasionally visit/avail goods in the identified fast-food chain.

In the table above, young and emerging adults were generally the respondents. In contrast, middle-aged adults have the least number of respondents. It is apparent that 18-25 years old are mostly students while 26-39 years old are young professionals since it is more convenient and evident for the locale of the study as schools like Nueva Vizcaya State University Bambang, Saint Catherine School, and Bambang National Highschool is nearby and as the restaurant is surrounded by work offices many office workers can dine and have its convenience and accessibility. According to the study of Gafford (2023), Fast Food Statistics, people ages 20-39 eat mostly in fast-food restaurants. On the other hand, those 40-59 years old choose to eat at home and make their food as it is healthier and can save money because fast food is not affordable. In addition, the study by Segmanta (2020), The Appetite of 2020: Gen Z & Millennials on Fast Food shows that convenience is the main reason why fast food is attractive to Gen Z-ers (11-26 years old) and Millennials (27 – 42 years old).

Almost the same number of respondents from both sexes participated in the study. Still, female respondents have a higher frequency, with a difference of one percent than male consumers. This shows the importance of a balanced number of both sexes as respondents because research has shown that gender bias has important implications for the scientific content. In the study of The Institute of Theoretical and Computational Chemistry of the Universitat de Barcelona (2019) entitled Gender balance in research, why is it so important? mentioned that including sex in research studies increases the quality of research output and improves the acceptability in the field of study.

The table reveals that most respondents occasionally dine/avail goods in McDo Bambang. This implies that diners go and eat at a fast-food restaurant when they have meaningful events they want to celebrate or need to satisfy their cravings. People visit restaurants to celebrate a memorable occasion; it exudes an experience different from celebrating at home. Also, they can enjoy different foods unusual to cook at home (Two-way discussion: Foods and Restaurant, IELTS Online, 2019). Another reason consumers occasionally dine in a fast-food chain, as stated in the study of Bjarnadottir (2019), is that most of the available goods at a Fast-Food Restaurant are highly processed and unhealthy. According to research, the fast-food chain is known for its taste and convenience. Still, it is most likely abundant in sugar, fat, and calories and low in nutritional

value, meaning that fast food may negatively affect multiple body areas (Pietrangelo, 2022).

Table 3: Perceptions of the Sources of Deception in Terms of Service

Item	Did Not Experience	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Answer
1. Incomplete and wrong orders are not free to be exchanged.	59 57.3%	8 7.8%	12 11.8%	7 6.8%	11 10.7%	6 5.8%	
2. The waiting time for exchanging orders is not provided.	54 52.4%	5 4.9%	16 15.5%	17 16.5%	9 8.9%	2 1.9%	
3. Complaints are disregarded when food orders are not followed accurately.	41 39.8%	17 16.5%	23 22.3%	11 10.7%	7 6.8%	4 3.9%	
4. There are unfriendly crews in contrast to what is expected/promised by the establishment.	32 31.1%	16 15.5%	14 13.6%	19 18.4%	19 18.4%	3 2.9%	
5. There are inattentive service crews contradictory to what is advertised.	37 35.9%	8 7.8%	18 17.5%	18 17.5%	17 16.5%	4 3.9%	1 1%
6. Services are slow, very slow, and inefficient contradictory to the ads.	24 23.3%	13 12.6%	33 32%	17 16.5%	14 13.6%	2 1.9%	
7. Refund is not an option when incorrect/incomplete orders occur.	55 53.4%	9 8.7%	11 10.7%	18 17.5%	8 7.8%	2 1.9%	
<b>Total</b>		<b>103</b>					

The frequency and percentage of deception in terms of service experienced by the customers of a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya, are shown in the table above. Most of the cited deception in service has been evaluated as respondents did not experience any deception from items mentioned above in the table, with a frequency ranging from 23.3% to 57.3%. In terms of respondents who agree and disagree to the given deception, item number 6 gathered the largest frequency of disagreement in terms of the deception with a frequency ranging from 12.6% to 32%, despite the large percentage, few respondents still agreed that deception exist garnering a frequency ranging from 1.9% to 13.6%, followed by item number 5 where a frequency ranging from 7.8% to 17.5% disagree to the said deception while in contrary was a frequency ranging from 3.9% to 16.5% agreed to the given deception, next in line is item number 3 that a gathered a disagreement in deception with a frequency ranging from 16.5% to 22.3%, however a few respondents agree that they experienced the said deception with a frequency ranging from 3.9% to 6.8%, followed by item number 4 with a frequency ranging from 13.6% to 15.5% of disagreement where in contrary to this is a frequency ranging from 2.9% to 18.4% of agreement from respondents who experienced deception on the said item, with a small gap is item number 2 where respondents disagree to any deception with frequency ranging from 4.9% to 15.5% but few consumers said that they had experienced deception in the given item

with a frequency of 1.9% to 8.9%, in line is item number 1 which gathered a disagreement with a frequency ranging from 7.8% to 11.8% in the said deception but contrary to this is an opposing respond that agreed to the said deception which garnered a frequency ranging from 5.8% to 10.7%, for the smallest percentage of disagreement to the given deception is item number 7 garnering a frequency ranging from 8.7% to 10.7%, despite the disagreement, a frequency ranging from 1.9% to 7.8% was garnered as respondents said that they experienced deception in the given item.

Some respondents answered they were ‘Not Sure’ about the given deceptions garnering a frequency ranging from 6.8% to 18.4%; also, one respondent preferred not to answer the deception given in item number 5, garnering a frequency of 1%. This has resulted from a sudden increase of Filipino consumers preferring convenient and quick fast-food chain service rather than home-made, time consumable food. According to the World Wildlife Fund of Nature – Philippines (2023), fast-food consumption has been a daily part and habit of Filipinos every day, making it the second spending place of food consumption; also, due to the increase in economic growth, Filipinos have been willing to spend on ready-to-eat meals and delivery foods and new trends restaurants. These sudden changes in the economy have affected Filipino buying decisions to where they don’t notice the deception being present as long as they are being served fast and convenient food or as long as they are in trend in the industry.

The results demonstrate that most respondents did not encounter or experience the service-related deception listed in the table above. However, there are still some of the respondents who strongly agree and experienced deception in service in item 4 regarding the unfriendly crews, which is in contrast to what is expected/promised by the establishment, according to Al-Heali (2020), a lack of clarity in terms of the assurance agreement that comes with after-sales services fails to meet the delivering of after-sales services as one negative attitude can damage the trust and patriotism a service crew must build with the consumer.

The results demonstrate that most respondents did not encounter or experience the service-related deception listed in the table above. However, there are still some of the respondents who strongly agree and experienced deception in service in item 4 regarding the unfriendly crews, which is in contrast to what is expected/promised by the establishment, according to Al-Heali (2020), a lack of clarity in terms of the assurance agreement that comes with after-sales services fails to meet the delivering of after-sales services as one negative attitude can damage the trust and patriotism a service crew must build with the consumer.

Table 4: Other Deception in Service Experienced by Customers

Other Deception in Service	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Some staff are pretending not to hear concerns from the customers</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.91</b>
Arrogant crew	2	1.94
There are physical contaminants in the food	1	0.97
<b>Insufficient seats</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.91</b>
Lack of cleanliness in the vicinity	1	0.97
A portion of food is smaller/ lesser than advertised	1	0.97
Giving insufficient change	1	0.97
Lack of crews to clean tables during peak hours	1	0.97
Do not open doors	1	0.97
<b>The food looks appetizing in the ads but does not look the same when I ordered</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.94</b>
Nothing	54	52.42

No answer/comment/ N/A	33	32.03
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The table above reveals the frequency and percentage of other deceptions in service as experienced by the customers in a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya. Out of the 103 respondents, the majority of respondents said that they have nothing to say about the cited deception in the above table with a frequency of 52.42%, followed by a frequency of 32.03% of respondents that preferred not to answer or give any comments about the given deceptions. In contrast, most other deceptions garnered a frequency of 0.97% from the respondents. Despite the many responses, some consumers said that they did experience deception from the service mentioned above.

One of the deceptions experienced by the consumers is ‘some staff is pretending not to hear concerns from the customers’ garnering a frequency of 2.91%, with the same frequency is the given deception that some consumers experienced insufficient seats during rush hours, next in deception is customers find the food appetizing in the ads but does not look the same when they ordered which garnered a frequency of 1.94%. In one statement by Abdulbaqi (2020), some businesses in the food industry use fictitious information about the product, such as its size, quantity, and other characteristics, to attract and affect consumers buying decisions.

The results above show that many deceptions in service at a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang Nueva Vizcaya have not yet been encountered by the respondents with the items/choices; on the given questions, ‘no answer’ is also noted. However, it is notable that some deception now exists in the said establishment as some respondents already experienced that staff is pretending not to hear their concerns, that there is a lack of seats at some specific time of their service, and that some of their products do not look the same as advertised, this strongly suggests that the bigger portion among the respondents have not yet encountered more deception with fast-food restaurants. Yet, some service-related deception persisted, which was consistent with the findings.

Table 5: Actions Done by Customers in Response to the Deception in Terms of Service.

Actions done	Frequency	Percentage
Stayed calm and talked professionally	1	0.97
<b>Talked to the manager</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.94</b>
Put the food in the trash	1	0.97
<b>Waited for other customers to finish eating</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.94</b>
<b>Dispose of used utensils properly</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.94</b>
Complain	1	0.97
I don't know	1	0.97
Approached the person/waiter involved	1	0.97
No choice	1	0.97
Nothing	47	45.63
No response from the respondents	44	42.72
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The table above reveals the actions done by respondents upon experiencing other deceptions in the service of a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya. The highest frequency of the respondents' answers was forty-seven (45.63%), which was respondents have left nothing to do or to say, followed by a 44 (42.72%), where respondents preferred not to respond. With a large number of gaps, some consumers

responded that they still did an action in response to deception in terms of service, where a frequency of 2 (1.94%) respondents talked to the managers about the deception they experienced from Table number 5, with the same frequency some said that they waited for other customers to finish eating in response to the deception said in the table above, also with the same frequency of 2 (1.94%) some respondents said that they rarely see crews disposing of used utensils properly.

Few respondents said they “didn’t know,” had “no choice,” and didn’t mind the situation. This response to a situation is one of the known Filipino cultures here in the Philippines; where according to DeGracia (2017) though Filipinos have been known as a mixed-influence country because of various colonization, Filipinos originally can be both said to be assertive nor aggressive or be identified as having both and be labeled as having a personality disorder, however, this characteristic has been inherited over three centuries of Spanish colonization, during which Filipinos have acquired an appreciation for silence and caution. To maintain security, they tend to be submissive to authority and hesitant when voicing their opinions.

Results show that many respondents chose not to respond to the said deception or to not take any action in reaction to deceptions rather than moving to report the deception they had experienced despite all they had experienced. However, if we go back to Table 5, Perceptions of the Sources of Deception in terms of Service, item number 4 states, “There are unfriendly crews which are in contrast to what is expected/ promised by the establishment” and item number 5 that states “There are inattentive service crews contradictory to what is advertised,” these two items had the almost equal frequency of response in terms of the opposite point of view, but if we compare the two items, both of the questions revolve around the contrary from what is advertised. As Tables 6 and 7 have indicated, deceptions and actions directly or face-to-face, even though some respondents did something by actually talking to the manager, patiently waiting for other customers to finish their meal, or rarely see proper disposal of use utensils, a larger number of respondents have responded ‘Nothing or to not respond’ to the said deception.

According to Columbia University (2020), the Philippines spends more time on social media than any other country. Filipinos have used social media as their major platform of expression. They spend more time opening and exploring online than in the real world. In addition, Filipinos now prefer online feedback and comments that can give negative feedback to businesses. To avoid this kind of situation, a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang must focus on improving their service to lessen the ‘Agreed’ response that was given to item number 4, which states, “There are unfriendly crews which are in contrast to what is expected/ promised by the establishment” and item number 5 that states “There are inattentive service crew’s contradictory to what is advertised”.

Table 6: Perceptions of the Sources of Deception in Terms of Price.

Item	Did not Experience	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly Agree	No answer
1. Uses bogus discounts to motivate consumers to buy. (e.g., set meals are advertised as cheaper, but when individual meal prices are added, they are the same.)	57 55.3%	12 11.7%	16 15.5%	6 5.8%	9 8.7%	3 2.9%	
2. Additional prices are added which were not previously disclosed.	50 48.5%	11 10.7%	16 15.5%	11 10.7%	12 11.7%	3 2.9%	



3. Uses a high pricing strategy to signify the quality of products.	37 35.9%	12 11.7%	14 13.6%	25 24.3%	10 9.7%	5 4.9%	
4. Desired meals should have the same/higher value when replacing incorrect punched orders, else the remaining balance is not refundable.	48 46.6%	11 10.7%	16 15.6%	15 14.6%	11 10.7%	2 1.9%	
5. Additional fees for changing/upgrading drinks are not mentioned.	40 38.8%	13 12.6%	12 11.7%	17 16.5%	15 14.6%	6 5.8%	
6. Price variation of products that are mentioned in ads is unclear	38 36.9%	9 8.7%	14 13.6%	20 19.4%	16 15.5%	3 2.9%	3 2.9%
7. Products were advertised at a bargain price to motivate to buy/visit the store, but the product is unavailable.	36 35%	15 14.6%	14 13.6%	16 15.5%	17 16.5%	3 2.9%	2 1.9%
<b>Total</b>		<b>103</b>					

The table presents the frequency and percentage of deception in price experienced by customers in a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya. Item number 1 has the highest frequency of 57 (55.3%), which shows that respondents have not yet experienced any deception about using bogus discounts to motivate consumers to buy. Item 7 has the least frequency of 36 (35.0%) about products advertised at a bargain price to motivate customers to buy/visit the store.

The table also presents a few among the respondents who strongly disagree about the deception in the price stated above on a fast-food restaurant. Having the highest frequency of 15 (14.6%) is item 7 states that the products were advertised at a bargain price to motivate the consumers to buy/visit the store and go to the item, has the least frequency is item 6, with a frequency of 9 (8.7%) about the price variations of products in an advertisement are not clear.

The table also shows the frequency among the respondents who disagree with the mentioned deception in price. Items 1,2 and 4 equivalently have a frequency of 16 (15.6%) with the highest frequency regarding bogus discounts; having the different prices on products and the desired meals should have the same/higher value when replacing incorrect punched orders was not a deception. Next, the item with the least frequency of 12 (11.7%) is item 5 on additional fees for changing/upgrading drinks.

It also includes the sum of strongly disagree and disagree to determine the level of disagreement on the itemized deceptions. The highest frequency is the products are advertised at a bargain price to motivate to buy/visit the store. Still, the product is unavailable, item 7, with a frequency of 29. Moving forward to the item with the least frequency, item 6, with a total frequency of 23, refers to product price variation.

It also presents the totality of the sum of the frequency of did not experience and strongly disagreed and disagreed. The highest frequency, which means most of the respondents disagree with the mentioned deception, is item 1 on the use of the bogus discount, which has a frequency of 85, and the item with the

least frequency is item 6 for price variation of products with a frequency of only 61.

Some respondents are not sure about the deceptions that were itemized. Proceeding to who has the highest frequency of 25 (24.3%) in item 3, referring to “uses high pricing strategy to signify the quality of products,” most respondents are unsure about the fast-food restaurant’s pricing strategy. Furthermore, the item with the least frequency is item 1, with a frequency of 6 (5.8%) on the use of bogus discounts by the fast-food restaurant.

The findings are contrary to the respondents who strongly disagree and disagree with the stated deceptions. Regarding these, there was not a huge difference regarding the frequency per item. Moving forward, with the highest frequency of 17 (16.5%), item 7 on products was advertised at a bargain price to motivate to buy/visit the store. Still, the unavailable product is a deception for the respondents. Moving forward, the item with the least frequency is item 1, which has a frequency of 9 (8.7%), which is all about using bogus discounts on products.

Additionally, some respondents strongly agree regarding the deceptions presented. The table above shows that item 5 has a frequency of 6 (5.8%) about the deception on different product prices when upgrading or changing with exactly one difference. Proceeding to the item with the least frequency, item 4, with a frequency of 2 (1.9%) about the desired meals, should have the same/higher value when replacing incorrect punched orders, or the remaining balance is not refundable.

Furthermore, to determine the respondents’ agreement level on the mentioned deceptions are the sum of agree and strongly agree. The item that gains the highest frequency is item 5, with a frequency of 21 regarding the additional fees for changing/upgrading drinks. This means that some of the respondents consider this a deception. The following item with the least frequency is item 1, concerning bogus discounts; these findings will be contrary to the level of disagreement of the respondents stated above.

Based on the combined frequency of all the items, item number 1 has a high disagreement with a frequency of eighty-five (85) compared to the respondents who agreed, having a frequency of twelve (12), and following is item number 6 having the least frequency, referring to price variation of products, most of the respondents disagreed with a total frequency of sixty-one (61) comparing to a frequency of nineteen (19) of those who agreed. From the results, most respondents disagreed on the itemized deception. They had a huge difference in frequency compared to the respondents who agreed.

Five (5) respondents did not answer the questions, specifically item 6, which has a frequency of 3 (2.9%) regarding the price variations of products, and item 7, with a frequency of 2 (1.9%) referring to the products were advertised at a bargain price to motivate to buy/visit the store, but the product is unavailable.

Moreover, from the results presented, some respondents answered unsure about the deception itemized above. Having the highest frequency of 25 gained is item 3 about the high pricing strategy to signify the quality of products. The item with the least frequency of 6 is item 1 regarding the uses of bogus discounts. This also states that some consumers may experience deception but do not know the situation.

The finding clearly explains that most respondents did not experience the deceptions itemized concerning price. It is also presented that there were few of the respondents who experienced a deception in price, which is the majority of the respondents who agree are the item regarding additional fees that are added when upgrading a certain product, the products that were advertised at a bargain price to motivate customers, and the price variation of products that are mentioned in an advertisement that are unclear. An article entitled “Don’t trick me: An event-related potentials Investigation of how to price deception decreases consumer purchase intention” (2019) explains that some deceptive sellers control the pricing

information by inflating the original price, a rather basic form of price deception that is difficult for potential customers to notice. To make the reduction appear greater, these vendors give an original price higher than the original price. It has repeatedly been demonstrated that a bigger discount, within a certain range, may lead to a more favorable evaluation of the product and subsequently enhance purchase intention. Due to an information gap, buyers can be deceived into purchasing goods from dishonest sellers. The claim reflects the respondents' experiences with dishonesty.

Table 7: Other Deception in Price Experienced by Customers

Other Deception in Price	Frequency	Percentage
No more deceptions	1	0.97
The upgrade of the product	1	0.97
Advertisements on the tarp show the prices of the product.	1	0.97
No Answer/No Comment	40	38.84
None	60	58.25
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100</b>

The table above discloses the frequency and percentage of other deceptions in price as experienced by customers in a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang Nueva Vizcaya. Of the 103 respondents, the highest frequency attained sixty (58.25%) who answered none. While the lowest frequency gained is one (0.97%), which are no more deceptions, the upgrade of product and advertisement in the tarpaulin show product prices.

According to an article published by Neuroscience Letters (2019), the impact of price deception on consumers' buying decision-making is difficult to determine when they are sufficiently informed about the price information. To study this matter, behavioral and event-related potential assessments were integrated. Behaviorally, compared to a tricky situation, the purchase rate and reduced reaction time were tracked in the factual condition, indicating that the respondents would do better under the right circumstances. Additionally, it has been repeatedly shown that a larger discount, within a certain range, could occur in an additional evaluation regarding the probability of purchasing the product. As a result, customers could be tricked into buying the products. The findings above imply that deception in price in a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang Nueva Vizcaya is not experienced yet by the respondents since the majority of the answers are none. However, there were still some deceptions in price conforming to the results above.

Table 8: Actions Done by Customers in Response to the Deception in Terms of Price

Actions Done	Frequency	Percentage
Just paid for the product	1	0.97
Do not know what action to do	1	0.97
No Answer/No Comment	49	47.57
None	52	50.49
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The table reveals the actions done by respondents upon experiencing other deceptions in the price of a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya. The highest frequency of the respondents' answers was fifty-two (50.49%), which was none. At the same time, the lowest frequency gained one (0.97%), which are just paid for the product and do not know what action to take.

Contradictory from the results above by the answer of the respondents, in an article from Food Quality and

Preference (2021), when evaluating goods, specifically more expensive products are assumed to have a higher intrinsic quality and should therefore lead to a superior consumer experience compared with cheaper products. The assumption of a positive association between a product’s price and intrinsic qualities is central to consumer behavior and should be factual. Moreover, from literature in connection to products, according to Al-heali (2020) on deception in price states that selling services of the same class to consumers at inflated prices to suggests the high quality of services while it may or may not increase prices to an unreasonable level by the company setting discounts to reach the normal price of the service. Imposing financial penalties on consumers if they want to return a commodity or stop a service. The consumer finds that commissions are added to the price at which they made a purchase when the consumer wants to pay by bank card or visa, which are deducted from their bank account without advance notice by the seller.

Moreover, regarding the data in Table 9 and Table 10, it can be seen that most of the respondents did “nothing” since they have “not experienced” any deceptions in price. But some respondents experienced deception in price but chose to eat still and buy the product of the mentioned fast-food restaurant. Also, some respondents did not know what action to take about the deception experienced.

These findings show that with all the deceptions answered by the respondents, most choose not to do any actions rather than make a move to report the deception they experienced.

Table 9: Perceptions of the Sources of Deception in Terms of Promotion

Item	Did Not Experience	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Answer
1. Provides misleading information in ads about their products.	28	5	16	15	27	12	
	27.20%	4.90%	15.50%	14.60%	26.20%	11.75%	
2. Products provided are available for a limited period to motivate consumers to purchase.	31	11	9	23	20	9	
	30.10%	10.70%	8.70%	22.30%	19.40%	8.70%	
3. Products and services are Assumed best than others.	33	4	13	17	26	7	3
	32%	3.90%	12.60%	16.50%	25.20%	6.80%	2.90%
4. Provides limited information on other product options to attract consumers to a specific product.	30	10	10	27	19	6	1
	29.10%	9.70%	9.70%	26.20%	18.40%	5.80%	1%
5. There are incomplete elements in the meal. (e.g., coke float has a missing chocolate drizzle instead of what is presented in the ads.)	34	9	15	16	26	3	
	33%	8.70%	14.60%	15.50%	25.20%	2.90%	
6. Consumers receive products that are not the same as in the advertisement. (e.g., burgers are bigger in the picture rather than the actual)	22	5	13	14	32	17	
	21.40%	4.90%	12.60%	13.60%	31.10%	16.50%	
Total		103					

The table illustrates the frequency and percentage of deception in promotion experienced by customers in a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya. It can be seen that most of the respondents did not

experience the cited sources of deception, with frequencies ranging from 27% to 33%.

Moreover, the table shows a few respondents strongly disagree about the itemized deception in promotion in the aforementioned fast-food restaurant. The highest frequency was item number 2, “products provided are available for a limited period to motivate consumers to purchase,” having a frequency of 11(10.7%). Furthermore, the lowest frequency obtained is 4(3.9%), item number 4, “products and services are assumed best than others.”

It likewise presents those who disagree with the deceptions in promotion which have been listed above. The frequency obtained the highest was item number 1, “provides misleading information in ads about their products,” with a frequency of 16(15.5%), while the lowest frequency that has been illustrated was item number 2, “products provided are available for a limited period to motivate consumers to purchase” having a frequency of 9(8.7%).

In terms of the level of disagreement of the respondents based on the deception mentioned above, Item number 5, “there are incomplete elements in the meal,” Ranks the highest frequency obtained, which was twenty-four (24). Moreover, the least frequency was item number 3, “products and services are assumed best than others,” garnering a frequency of seventeen (17).

Furthermore, regarding the frequency of the overall disagreement and those who did not experience the listed deception in promotion, the highest frequency was fifty-eight (58), item number 5, “there are incomplete elements in the meal.” On the other hand, item 6, “consumers receive products that are not the same as in the advertisement,” had the least frequency of forty (40).

Contradictory to customers who did not experience, strongly disagreed, and disagreed with the itemized deception in promotion, some respondents agreed with the listed deception in the promotion. Item number 6, “consumers receive products that are not the same as in the advertisement,” Ranks the highest with a frequency of 32(31.1%). Whereas the lowest frequency obtained was 19(18.4%), item 4 “provides limited information on other product options to attract consumers to a specific product.”

Regarding those who agreed strongly, item 6, “consumers receive products that are not the same as in the advertisement,” got the highest frequency of 17(16.5%). On the other hand, the least frequency earned was 3(2.9%), item number 5, “there are incomplete elements in the meal.”

Regarding the sum of those respondents who agree and strongly agree with the items above. The highest frequency obtained was forty-nine (49), item number 6, “Consumers receive products that are not the same as in the advertisement.” Moreover, item number 4, “provides limited information on other product options to attract consumers to a specific product,” had the least frequency, twenty-five (25).

Among the results stated above, some respondents are unsure about the listed deception in the promotion. The highest frequency of 27(26.2%) is item number 4, which “provides limited information on other product options to attract consumers to a specific product.” Furthermore, the least frequency was 14(13.6%), item number 6, “Consumers receive products that are not the same as in the advertisement.” This reflects that consumers experience the said deception; however, they do not know what exact situation they have experienced. That’s why consumers must be informed about changes, as they have the right to be informed. According to Vikaspedia Domains (2019), consumers have the right to information about the items’ quality, quantity, potency, purity, standard, and price to avoid unfair business practices. Before deciding, the consumer should acquire all the facts about the good or service.

Four (4) respondents did not answer a specific question. 3(2.9%) from item number 3, “products and services are assumed best than others,” and 1(1%) from item number 4, “provides limited information on

other product options to attract consumers to a specific product.”

The results reflect that customer of a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya, mostly did not experience such deception in the promotion. This means that customers experience no perceived deception in terms of promotion. However, it was also observed that there is still deception in promotion, contradictory to the results stated above. This means that customers still experience deception in promoting the said fast-food restaurant, mostly in item 6, “Consumers receive products that are not the same as in the advertisement.” This supports the study of False Advertising Under Consumer Protection Laws (2022) that one of the common forms of false advertising is using misleading illustrations or photographs. In support of the study, as mentioned earlier, misleading illustrations or photographs and using colors and modification tools to make the product’s appearance more vibrant (Justia, 2018).

Moreover, the study by Hoerman (2022) also indicates that deceptive advertising is a form of promoting products under unrealistic and accurate to the product’s true form and appearance. Usually, companies use Photoshop to make the raw picture of their product into a more delicious look to deceive their target market and audience. This kind of marketing refers to overmarketing, and according to WordSense Dictionary, it is to market excessively. In this way, businesses cross the lines between promoting and advertising, where they sell what they have without considering the authenticity of their product.

Table 10: Other Deception in Promotion experienced by customers

<b>Other Deceptions</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Different in size</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.91</b>
<b>Not the same as advertised</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.80</b>
<b>Too much ice</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.91</b>
There are missing elements	1	0.97
Nothing	43	41.75
No Answers	46	44.66
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100</b>

The table above reveals the frequency and percentage of other deceptions in promotion as experienced by customers in a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya. The highest frequency obtained was 46(44.66%), which is “No Answers,” while only 1(0.97%) encountered missing elements on the products.

Deceptive advertising influences consumers’ perceptions and affects their decision whether they may purchase a product. The claim becomes misleading or untrue when false or deceptive claims are made in advertisements to draw customers to the goods or services (Iqbal & Siddiqui, 2019). Furthermore, according to what has been presented above, it can glean that 7(6.80%) of the respondents said that what they received was “not the same as advertised.” It supports the study of Ukaegbu (2020), which according to him, there is a “misrepresentation, omission, or practice that is likely to mislead the consumer,” it is deemed deceptive advertising or a misleading marketing strategy. Moreover, the ads drove consumers to avail themselves of a certain product. With that, they expected to receive food like they watched and saw in the restaurant ads. In relation, business companies use deceptive advertising to promote products with incorrect details in a way wherein products look or work excellently in the eyes of their target market. Some of these were in terms of “size,” “too much ice” on drinks as well as “there are missing elements” in the products, which supports the seven (6.80%) among the respondents who answered that what they have received was “not the same as advertised.” From the study by Nuesir (2018), false or misleading advertisements tend to give a negative experience to consumers as they are fraudulently convinced by the message of the advertisements of a fast-

food restaurant.

Moreover, in connection to the study of Mazow (2021), he mentioned that another way to mislead consumers about the products they offer is through misleading serving sizes, which give the appearance that there are larger in size products; however, a smaller size was being served. This study supports the above result wherein 3(2.91%) respondents said they had received different sizes compared to what kind of ads they had encountered. Additionally, missing ingredients were also mentioned by the said author as one of the sources of deception.

The findings above imply that deception in promotion in a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang Nueva Vizcaya is not perceived yet; there were still deceptions in some areas, as stated above.

Table 11: Actions Done by Customers in Response to the Deception in Terms of Promotion

Actions Done	Frequency	Percentage
Rarely buy the product	1	0.97
<b>Lessen the ice</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.94</b>
Don't know	1	0.97
Talk to crew	1	0.97
Still, buy the product	1	0.97
Still, eat the product	1	0.97
Nothing	39	37.87
No Answer	57	55.33
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100</b>

The table above presents actions done by respondents upon experiencing other deceptions in the promotion of a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya. The highest frequency based on the respondents' answers was fifty-seven (55.33), which was no answer. While the lowest frequency obtained is one (0.97), which rarely buys the product, doesn't know, makes no comment, talks to crew, still buys the product, and still eats the product.

From other deceptions experienced by other respondents, as stated in Table 10, some of the actions they have done were to "rarely buy the product." Moreover, some respondents also say they "still buy and eat the product" since they have no choice but to eat and buy to satisfy their cravings. Aside from that, one respondent said he "talked to the crew" to address his problem due to some missing elements in the burger. A few respondents said that they "didn't know" what to do since the service crew would not change their order. While on the case of too much ice, two respondents said it "lessened the ice" because they thought the ice from the drinks they received was too much compared to the amount of coke in the cup.

Furthermore, based on the data in Table 10 and Table 11, it can be seen that most respondents did "nothing" since they have "not experienced" any deceptions in the promotion. However, others experienced deception in promotion but still chose to eat and buy the product. Additionally, some respondents talked to the crew to address the deception experienced. Nevertheless, some respondents encounter deception but don't know what to do.

Findings indicate that with all the deceptions they have experienced, many of the respondents choose not to do any actions rather than make a move to report the deception they experienced. Though most of the respondents answered nothing or no answer, which means in the choices of deception, they did not respond.

Table 12: Sources of Deception

Item	N	Mean	SD	QD
Service	103	1.54	1.09	No Deception Perceived
Price	103	1.57	1.21	No Deception Perceived
Promotion	103	2.31	1.26	No Deception Perceived
<b>Overall</b>	103	1.56	1.16	<b>No Deception Perceived</b>
<i>*Legend: 1.00-2.99=No deception perceived; 3.00-3.99=Not sure; 4:00-5:00=Deception perceived</i>				

The table above illustrates that there is no deception perceived from the three sources. Moreover, the mean of the three falls from 1.00 – 2.99 under no deception perceived.

Furthermore, this result reflects that Filipinos, especially those in the food industry, particularly Fast-Food Restaurants, comply with the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) standard. This result also indicates that here in the Philippines, the law about the Consumer Act of the Philippines, otherwise known as RA No. 7394, states to promote consumer welfare and protect them from any misleading advertisements and fraudulent sales promotions is obeying by the aforementioned fast-food restaurant.

In conclusion, this result will serve as a recommendation to all future researchers to conduct a study similar and connected to this study, but an additional qualifier must be included.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the obtained conclusions and crafted recommendations forwarded based on the analyzed and interpreted data.

### Conclusions

Based on the indicated findings, subsequent conclusions were drawn.

1. The findings revealed that female emerging adults and young adults are mostly the consumers of a Fast-Food chain in Bambang and occasionally dine in the said restaurant.
2. With the sources of deception in terms of service, price, and promotion mentioned in the study, the following conclusions were drawn.
  - a. The item of service, “there are unfriendly crews which contrasts with what is expected/promised by the establishment,” got the highest frequency of agreement which shows that there are crews in a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang who are not friendly.
  - b. In the identified lists of deceptions in terms of price, the item “additional fees in changing/upgrading drinks are not mentioned” got the highest agreement which means that when it comes to additional fees in changing and upgrading drinks, it is not disclosed by the cashier and respondents consider it as deceiving.
  - c. The identified source of the deception in terms of promotion in the study was “consumers receive products that are not the same as in the advertisement” In this item, it shows that they do not receive products that are comparable to the ads that they have seen, which pushes them to buy in the first place.
3. The first open-ended question that asks what other deceptions they have experienced shows that there is



no other deception in a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang, as most answers were nothing. While the second part of the open-ended question tackles the actions, consumers did in the identified deception, which discloses that most consumers do not do any action to correct the deception they experienced if there is.

The researchers conclude from the results that there is no evident deception in terms of service, price, and promotions of a Fast-Food Restaurant in Bambang other than those identified as it receives a high frequency, nonetheless still falls under no perceived deception. It shows that the mentioned fast-food restaurant fulfills its promised advertisements and continues improving its service and avoiding deception for customer retention.

## Recommendations

Following the completion of the study, the following recommendations were formulated:

1. Owner-Manager should always maintain and check the quality of the products their crews serve to their customers.
2. Crews and other employees in a fast-food chain should convey a happy and willing-to-help attitude for customer satisfaction in terms of their service.
3. Large fast-food establishments should continue to improve their advertising for customer retention and minimize complaints about the inconsistency of food service, pricing, and promotions.
4. Customers should be knowledgeable and practice their rights as customers (right to be informed, right to complain, and right to consumer education).
5. The faculty of the School of Accountancy and Business can utilize the study in different courses related to marketing and promotions to further the student's knowledge of proper advertising.
6. Future researchers may ponder other small fast-food restaurants in the country that do not have standardized production as their locale to check whether there is existing deception if standardization does not exist. There should be a wide array of research locales for future researchers to conduct the study to compare the difference in advertising of fast-food chains in the country. Future researchers may consider the qualitative type of research through interviews to examine and determine real-time deceptions experienced by the customers. They may further study the limitations of this study.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdulbaqi, H. (2020) Impact of deceptive advertising on consumer buying decision on social media with mediating word of mouth: An empirical study from University of Tabuk, Saudi Arabia *Journal of Economics, Administrative and Legal Sciences*, 159 –182. <https://doi.org/10.26389/AJSRP.S120420>
2. Al-Healy, A. (2020) Al-Heali, A. N. (2020). The effect of marketing deception on consumer purchasing decisions: An analytical study of the opinions of a sample of Baghdad University students. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Alaa-Al-Heali/publication/344377301\\_The\\_Effect\\_of\\_Marketing\\_Deception\\_on\\_Consumer\\_Purchasing\\_Decisions\\_An\\_Analytical\\_Study\\_of\\_the\\_Opinions\\_of\\_a\\_Sample\\_of\\_Baghdad\\_University\\_Students/links/5f6ddf2792851\\_Effect-of-Marketing-Deception-on-Consumer-Purchasing-Decisions-An-Analytical-Study-of-the-Opinions-of-a-Sample-of-Baghdad-University-Students.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Alaa-Al-Heali/publication/344377301_The_Effect_of_Marketing_Deception_on_Consumer_Purchasing_Decisions_An_Analytical_Study_of_the_Opinions_of_a_Sample_of_Baghdad_University_Students/links/5f6ddf2792851_Effect-of-Marketing-Deception-on-Consumer-Purchasing-Decisions-An-Analytical-Study-of-the-Opinions-of-a-Sample-of-Baghdad-University-Students.pdf)
3. Alqaysi, S., & Zahari, A. (2020) The effect of deceptive brand image on consumer purchase intention: Empirical evidence from Iraqi market. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business (JAFEB)*, 9(6), <https://scholar.kyobobook.co.kr/article/detail/4010036893183?lang=en>
4. Bhandari, P. (2022). Quantitative research | Definition, uses & methods. *Scribbr*. Retrieved October 6, 2022, from <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/quantitative-research/>

5. Bjarnadottir, A. (2019). 10 fast-food restaurants that serve healthy foods. <https://www.healthline.com/nutrition/10-healthy-fast-food-restaurants>
6. Christoph P., Johanna B., Cosima L., Heike G., Nadja H., Ben C., Jens G. (2021). Price information influences the subjective experience of wine: A framed field experiment, food quality and preference, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2021.104223>.
7. Columbia University (2020) Freedom of expression. Retrieved March 31, 2023, from <https://globalfreedomofexpression.columbia.edu/publications/unshackling-expression-the-philippines-report/>
8. Dautovic, G. (2022, December 15.). The 45 most important advertising statistics of *Small Business Stats & Facts*. <https://www.smallbizgenius.net/by-the-numbers/advertising-statistics/>
9. DeGracia, R. (2017) Cultural influence on Filipino patients. *The American Journal of Nursing*, 1412-1414. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3424612>
10. Dial, L. (2021). Are fruit snacks like fruit? Children's and parents' evaluations of deceptive packaged foods. <https://infoalimentarios.files.wordpress.com/2021/05/ld-dissertation-etd-4.8.21.pdf>
11. False advertising under consumer protection laws. (2022). *Justia*. <https://www.justia.com/consumer/deceptive-practices-and-fraud/false-advertising>
12. Fu, H., Ma, H., Bian, J., Wang C., Zhou, J., Ma Q. (2019) Don't trick me: An event-related potentials investigation of how price deception decreases consumer purchase intention. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2019.134522>.
13. Furtwengler, D. (2020). Deceptive pricing. <https://www.retailcustomerexperience.com/blogs/deceptive-pricing/>
14. Gaber, H., Labib, A., & Salem, K. (2018). The effect of marketing deception on consumer buying decision on facebook. An empirical study on University Students in Libya. [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Hazem-Gaber/publication/326416012\\_THE\\_EFFECT\\_OF\\_MARKETING\\_DECEPTION\\_ON\\_CONSUMER\\_BUYIEFFECT-OF-MARKETING-DECEPTION-ON-CONSUMER-BUYING-DECISION-ON-FACEBOOK-AN-EMPIRICAL-STUDY-ON-UNIVERSITY-STUDENTS-IN-LIBYA.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Hazem-Gaber/publication/326416012_THE_EFFECT_OF_MARKETING_DECEPTION_ON_CONSUMER_BUYIEFFECT-OF-MARKETING-DECEPTION-ON-CONSUMER-BUYING-DECISION-ON-FACEBOOK-AN-EMPIRICAL-STUDY-ON-UNIVERSITY-STUDENTS-IN-LIBYA.pdf)
15. Gafford, D. (2023). Fast food statistics. The barbecue lab. *The Barbsegmantoiecue Lab*. <https://thebarbecuelab.com/fast-food/>
16. Hatton, T. (2019). Who's to blame for fast food on campus? You. [https://www.nytimes.com/2019/01/29/style/the-edit-fast-food-college.html?fbclid=IwAR1rjbyLLlfE8V23CO911o5PY0A94kzyrjlgmhg7wjSo4zyft\\_9FhcopUs](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/01/29/style/the-edit-fast-food-college.html?fbclid=IwAR1rjbyLLlfE8V23CO911o5PY0A94kzyrjlgmhg7wjSo4zyft_9FhcopUs)
17. Hoerman, T. (2022). Deceptive advertising: Definition, types, and examples |TorHoerman Law. <https://www.torhoermanlaw.com/false-or-misleading-marketing/#:~:text=Deceptive%20or%20false%20advertising%20is,product's%20actual%20appearace%20o>
18. Iqbal, S. & Siddiqui, A. (2019) The impact of deceptive advertising on customer loyalty: A case of telecommunication industry in Karachi, Pakistan. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3397133>
19. Justia (2018). *What consumers need to know about false advertising law* <https://www.justia.com/consumer/deceptive-practices-and-fraud/false-advertising/>
20. Kabir, J. (2016). Speed of service and fast food! Retrieved November 7, 2022, <http://www.linkedin.com/pulse/speed-service-fast-food-dr-jahangir-m-kabir>
21. Kádeková, Z., Košičiarová, I., Kubicová, L., Holotová, M., & Predanocyová, K. (2019). The impact of inappropriate food advertising on consumer behavior. *Potravinarstvo*, 13(1), 1034–1039. <https://doi.org/10.5219/1216>
22. Kendall, E. (2023, April 29). Fast food. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/fast-food>
23. Laws. (n.d). Deceptive advertising. *Consumer Laws*. <https://consumer.laws.com/deceptive-advertising/deceptive-advertising-definition>

- 24.Liberto, D. (2021). Shrinkflation: What it is, reasons for it, how to spot it. *Investopedia*. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/shrinkflation.asp>
- 25.Licit (2017, March 14). Consumer rights that everyone should aware of...!!! *Medium* [https://medium.com/@Licit\\_GoLegal/consumer-rights-that-everyone-should-aware-of-233d60c8d6b2#:~:text=Consumer%20Rights%3A%2D&text=The%20right%20to%20be%20informed,consu](https://medium.com/@Licit_GoLegal/consumer-rights-that-everyone-should-aware-of-233d60c8d6b2#:~:text=Consumer%20Rights%3A%2D&text=The%20right%20to%20be%20informed,consu)
- 26.Mazow, R. (2021, October 29). Spot false advertisements in food | Consumer protection. *Mazow / McCullough, PC*. <https://www.helpinginjured.com/blog/consumer-protection/how-to-spot-false-advertisements-in-the-food-industry/>
- 27.Nuseir, M. T. (2018). Impact of misleading/false advertisement to consumer behaviour. *International Journal of Economics and Business Research*, 453-465. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijebr.2018.095343>
- 28.Online, I. P. (2019). Two-way discussion: Foods & restaurant. *IELTS practice online* (Band 9). <https://ieltspracticeonline.com/two-way-discussion-foods-restaurant/>
- 29.Overmarketing – *Wordsense dictionary*. <https://www.wordsense.eu/overmarketing/>
- 30.Pietrangelo, A. (2022, October 25). 13 effects of fast food on the body. <https://www.healthline.com/health/fast-food-effects-on-body>
- 31.Republic Act No. 7394 | *GOVPH*. (1992, April 13). Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1992/04/13/republic-act-no-7394-s-1992/>
- 32.Segmanta (2021, January 11). The appetite of 2020: Gen Z & Millennials on fast food *Segmanta Blog*. <https://segmanta.com/blog/gen-z-millennials-on-fast-food/>
- 33.Strauss S. (2022, June 2). What is false advertising? *The Hourly Blog*. <https://www.hourly.io/post/what-is-false-advertising>
- 34.Team, M. (2016, April 26) Deceptive pricing – meaning & definition. *MBA Skool*. <https://www.mbaskool.com/business-concepts/marketing-and-strategy-terms/15995-deceptive-pricing.html>
- 35.The Institute of Theoretical and Computational Chemistry of the Universitat de Barcelona (2017, February 17). Gender balance in research, why is so important? *IQTC*. <https://www.iqtc.ub.edu/news/gender-balance-in-research-why-is-so-important/>
- 36.Ukaegbu, R. C. (2020). Deceptive Advertising and Consumer Reaction: A study of delta soap advertisement. *OALib*, 07(03), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1105865>
- 37.Wida, E. C. (2019, October 2). A recent study finds fast food service is getting slower. *com*. <https://www.today.com/food/recent-study-finds-fast-food-service-getting-slower-t163802>
- 38.Xing X., Song, M., Duan Y., & Mou, J. (2022) Effects of different service failure types and recovery strategies on the consumer response mechanism of chatbots. *Technology in Society* <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0160791X22001907>
- 39.Yohn, D., (2019, January 8). Marketing matters now more than ever. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/denisejohn/2019/01/08/marketing-matters-now-more-than-ever/?sh=324a2ecf117a>