

**Investigating the Customers' Perceptions towards the Impact of Rumours on the  
Popularity of Quick Service Restaurant Chains in Egypt**

Mohamed S. Mohamed   Alaa A. El-Tantawy   Neveen M. Mansour  
Faculty of Tourism and Hotel Management, Helwan University, Egypt

**Abstract**

Quick Service Restaurants (QSRs) is always characterized by being intangible and highly affected by word of mouth. Sometimes word of mouth could result in either positive or negative rumours about the restaurants especially the brand ones. This study aims to measure both negative and positive impact of rumours on the popularity and image of quick service restaurant chains in Egypt. Three hundred questionnaire forms were distributed between customers of QSRs in Greater Cairo such as Burger King, Hardees, and KFC. The overall results indicated that the main cause of spreading rumours is the lack of accurate information from the chain's side. So, the best way for restaurant managers to avoid rumours is controlling their communication channels with their customers in an effective way, and addresses any negative rumor as quickly as they can.

**Keywords** Word of mouth - Rumours - Quick Service Restaurants (QSRs) – Greater Cairo

**Introduction**

Quick service restaurants (QSRs) are the most widespread in the world. Ninemeier (2005) defined QSR as an operation that provides a limited menu of fast-food and a limited service (generally self-service at counters or through vehicle drive-thru) at a low price; also called partial menu or fast-food restaurants. Moreover, Wade (2006) added that QSRs are designed to serve a basic meal quickly and affordably. Menus are usually limited and kitchens are intended to produce a high volume in short periods of time. The customer expects quick service, low price, and consistency.

Like many operations, fast-food restaurants are rife with rumours that may be true or may be false, which affects their popularity. Gordon (2014) mentioned that, to many people, rumours and gossip may seem like an innocent form of teenage life. After all, drama is takes place at this age. As a result, most adults see gossip and rumours as harmless and often encourage kids to just ignore it. But for those who are impacted, gossip can be downright painful at times and almost impossible to ignore – especially if social media is being used to perpetuate it. Noticing on the above, Fine and Ellis, (2010) mentioned that rumors as a complex form of disinformation characterized by many features. For example, rumors are misleading statements that lack clear criteria for evidence. Gossip and rumours can destroy a person's self-confidence and concern their self-esteem. It also can be expected to result in depression, desperate thoughts, eating disorders, worry and a host of other issues. What's more gossip and rumours can alienate friends, hurt reputations and even lead to ostracizing behavior and other forms of relational aggression.

DiFonzo and Bordia (2007) cleared that rumours are a piece of information or a story that has not meant to verify. What this means, is that the person telling the story doesn't know for certain if it is true or not. Most of the time, people who spread rumours don't worry to determine if there is any truth to what they are saying.

The restaurant industry is part of the most exposed to rumours. The false rumor that McDonald's uses worm meat in its burgers led to a drop in sales of up to 30% in some areas (Tybout and Sternthal, 1981). In situations like these, effective management and control of rumours is critical to the management of the crisis situation.

This study aims to measure both the negative and positive impact of rumours on the popularity and image of QSRs. To achieve this aim, this study has three objectives: to

undertake a review of literature on rumours' impact in the QSRs, to develop and distribute a questionnaire form among customers in QSRs in order to measure how rumours can affect them negatively or positively, and to set recommendations in order to clear how can QSRs take advantage of the positive and negative rumours.

### **Literature review**

#### **QSRs Concept**

The National Restaurant Association (NRA) defined the food service industry as "encompassing all meals and snacks prepared outside the home". This definition therefore includes all take – out meals and beverages (Khan, 1991).

Ball (1992) agreed with Samle (1980) that fast service restaurants are where customers should be served within five minutes or less of their entry even in the most crowded periods. While Melaniphy (2005) classified fast-food according to the product as it is produced and cooked quickly, with a service delivery varying between 2 to 15 minutes, a low price, easily consumed with fingers or disposable cutlery.

Brymer (1995) defined a quick-service restaurant as a "firm with a mission to provide quicker service and core technology geared towards this mission. However, Negl (2002) and Walker (2006) considered that quick-service restaurants offer a quick service.

Lane and Duper (1997) explained that in preference to a fast food restaurant tend to be located near highways, malls and down town areas which offer a standard menu with limited choices that attempt to satisfy a hungry audience. Moreover, Walker (2006) highlighted that QSRs have increased in popularity because of their location strategies. They are situated for convenience in every possible area. Their menus are limited, which makes it easier for customers to make quick decisions on what to purchase.

#### **Requirements of Customer in Terms of QSRs**

Wyckoff (2001) highlighted that quality is the degree of excellence in what is intended to add to this a controlled variation in order to achieve that excellence, where the end result is meeting customer requirements. While Schroeder (2004) stated that quality is meeting and exceed customer requirements now and in the future." This means that the product or service is fit for the consumer's use. Fitness for use has related to benefits received by the consumer and to customer satisfaction. Only the client, not the producer, can determine it.

Field (1999) reported that quality is the key driver of overall satisfaction, while price and service tied for second place. Seidman and Johnson (2002) argued that providing consistent quality service has become a challenge for the quick service industry. Schroeder (2004) indicated that quality can both improve revenues as well as to reduce costs. The cost of quality measures the lack of conformance to customer requirements. Quality costs can be conventional or appraisal. Failure costs may be due to internal or external failure.

Donnelly et al. (1998) argued that once the quality characteristics have defined. The next step is to determine the desired quality standards. These standards quantify the specific quality requirements for the organization's output. Quality standards are used as the reference point for comparing what is "ideal" to what actually "is". Reid and Bojanic (2006) considered that before you can evaluate the level of service provided by employees within your organization, you must establish the standards by which they will judge. Wade (2006) believes that the restaurant's criteria for food quality, beverage operations, cleanliness, and service consistency are specified according to the marketing plan which obviously indicating out the standards in the document provides management with a written document to reference.

### **Customer's Perception on QSRs**

Johnson and Clark (2005) illustrated that while the expectation-perception approach to understanding service quality is extremely useful in focusing on the outcome of customer satisfaction and helps identify on mismatches between operational and customer views of quality, which does have some downsides: Service could be perceived to be 'good' when it is 'bad'; Service could be perceived to be 'bad' when it is 'good'; Service that was 'good' last time may only be 'OK' this time and Satisfied customers may change.

King and Ronald (2006) are differentiated between quality and perception; they stated that quality in fact relates to our internal standard, we get what we expect, so set high expectations. Quality in perception is how our customers perceive our service.

### **Customer Satisfaction**

Cooper and Lawson (2004) agreed with Johnson and Clark (2005) in that satisfaction is the outcome of the consumer's evaluation of a service, which sometimes refer to as perceived service quality, and can be represented on a continue from delight to extreme dissatisfaction. Lillicrap et al. (2002) pinpointed the factors contributing to the meal experience which might affect the customer's enjoyment of a specific meal experience in a particular operation, and they could be: The welcome, the décor, and the ambience.; Efficiency, has the booking been taken properly, using the customer's name; Location of the table; Menu and beverage list (presentation and cleanliness); The order is being taken in recognition of the host; Availability of dishes / items; Speed and efficiency of service; Quality of food and drink; Courteousness of staff; Obtrusive / attentiveness of staff; Ability to attract the attention of staff; Other customer's behavior; Methods in which complaints are handled; Methods of presenting the bill / recovery payment and Departure attentiveness.

Schroeder (2004) told that customer satisfaction is a relative concept that varies from one consumer to another. Also, a client may be satisfied with today's products but not satisfied in the future. For example, while one consumer may consider a Ford automobile perfectly satisfactory, another may not. Seidman and Johnson (2002) argued that customer satisfaction is regarded as the highest mission of the chains. Johnson and Clark (2005) described that customer satisfaction is something that can be achieved to some level by influencing customers' perceptions and expectations of service delivery. This demands an in-depth understanding of this subject.

### **Customer service and customer satisfaction**

Bateson (1995) mentioned that customer satisfaction is depends on the production of services as well as their consumption. Field (1999) pointed out that a common five – step processes for developing a customer satisfaction program are: Identify the attributes of your product or service that is most important to customers; Measure customer – satisfaction levels of these important attributes; Link satisfactions levels to key customer behavior (use levels, Retention); Identify and implement concrete actions that will improve customer satisfaction and correspondingly, customer behavior and Track results.

Reid and Bojanic (2006) showed that improving customer service should be a key priority of all managers working in the hospitality and tourism industry. Walker (2006) said that we not only need to keep customers happy during their stay, but also to keep them returning-with their friends. It costs several times more to attract new customers than to keep existing ones.

Satisfaction is largely a function of past experience and current expectations (Oliver, 1997; Penny and Judy, 2008). The interaction between the actors (staff) and the audience

(customers) is built on their mutually understood definition of the situation, service providers do not simply act and tourists do not only watch. Rather, through their interaction, hosts and customers perform together through negotiation, narrative completion, and Embodiment (Chronis, 2005). Customer satisfaction is a keen judge of business success in terms of market share, return on investment, and cost reduction (Spreng et al., 1996).

Schroeder (2004) told that customer satisfaction is a relative concept that varies from one customer to another. Also, a customer may be satisfied with today's products but not satisfied in the future. It isn't enough to just satisfy your customer. Being satisfied is no longer satisfying. Companies always lose some satisfied customers. These customers switch to competitors who can satisfy them more. Resort requirements to deliver more satisfaction than its competitors (Philip, 2003). Resorts need to observe and increase the level of customer satisfaction. The higher the customer satisfaction is the higher the retention. Here are four facts:

Attracting new customer can cost 5 to 10 times more than the costs involved in satisfying and retaining current customers.

The average company loses between 10 and 30 percent of its customers each year.

A 5 percent reduction in the customer satisfaction rate can increase profits by 25 to 85 percent, depending on the industry.

The customer profit rate lean to increase over the life of the retained customer (Philip, 2003).

Carden and Dellifraire (2004) reported that customer satisfaction is a function of consumer expectations with regard to the purchase of a product or service, and the perception of the degree to which those expectations are met after the purchase. The same author defined that customer satisfaction as a post purchase attitude formed through a mental comparison of the quality that a customer expected to receive from an exchange and the level of quality to the customer perceives actually receiving from the exchange.

### **Materials and Methodology**

It was essential to illuminate the research approach as an effective strategy to increase the cogency of social research (Cresswell, 2007). The research adopted the quantitative approach to investigate the customers' perceptions towards the impact of rumours on the popularity of quick service restaurant chains in Egypt. The researcher had distributed 300 forms, a total number of 202 valid forms were returned. This signified 67.3% as a reply percentage. Open ended questions as well as the five-level Likert scale ranging from 1 " was Strongly agree" to 5 "was strongly disagree" were used to design the questionnaires form.

The questionnaire is divided into three main parts: The first part focused on the customer's preferences to deal with fast-food operations. The second part asked the customers about the most significant elements on the popularity of QSRs in Egypt. While the third part was included the personal data such as (age, gender, and the marital status). Finally, asking guest recommendations or suggestions.

Pilot study was conducted on September, 2017. The survey was completed through social media (face book, e-mails), and field visits. The aim of the pilot study is to make sure that the survey was well designed and easily understood by potential respondents, to examine the reliability and validity of the research tools. Questionnaire was reviewed by some academic scholars to establish their appropriateness. Some suggestions were found and then were implemented.

**Results and discussions**

The responses obtained from the direct interview are shown as follows:

**Study Instrument reliability**

For all scales, Cranach alpha correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the internal consistency of the scale, Reliability coefficient of 0.70 or higher is considered "acceptable" in most social science situations. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability was computed and the tests showed that the reliability coefficients for all the instruments were above 0.971, which indicates that the instrument is reliable for being used. Cronbach's alpha for all five survey instruments is shown in the following table 1:

Table 1: Reliability Statistics

Scale for	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of items	No. of interviews
All the scale items	.971	21	202

**Question NO. (1):- Customers' preferences to deal with fast food restaurants**

The aim of this question is to illustrate customers' preferences to deal with fast food restaurants. Table (2) shows this issue and illustrated that out of 202 respondents who dealing with quick service restaurants; 60.4 % of respondents deal with fast food restaurants always, 9.9 % are usually preferred to deal with fast food restaurants usually. 29.7% of customers deal with fast food restaurants sometimes. With Mean 1.6931 and Std. Deviation 90044.

Table 2: Do you deal with quick service restaurants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Always	122	60.4	60.4	60.4
	Usually	20	9.9	9.9	70.3
	Some-times	60	29.7	29.7	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

**Question NO. (2):- Customers' restaurants preferences**

The aim of this question is to illustrate customers' restaurants preferences. Table (3) shows this issue and illustrated that out of 202 respondents who dealing with fast food restaurants; 26.7% of respondents deal with fast food restaurants the most preferred , 17.8 % are more preferred to deal with local fast food restaurants usually. 55.4 % of customers less preferred the local fast food restaurants.

Table 3: Local restaurants (eg, Mo'men, Cook Door)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	more preferred	54	26.7	26.7	26.7
	Average	36	17.8	17.8	44.6
	Less preferred	112	55.4	55.4	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Table ( 4 ) shows this issue an illustrated that out of 202 respondents who dealing with fast food restaurants; 72.3 % of respondents deal with fast food restaurants the most preferred , 11.9 % are more preferred to deal with local fast food restaurants usually. 15.8 % of customers less preferred the local fast food restaurants.

Table 4: International restaurants (eg KFC, Burgerking, McDonald's, ....)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
More preferred		146	72.3	72.3	72.3
Average		24	11.9	11.9	84.2
Less preferred		32	15.8	15.8	100.0
Total		202	100.0	100.0	

Table 5: The restaurant's fame

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Normal	30	14.9	14.9	14.9
	Like	60	29.7	29.7	44.6
	like so much	112	55.4	55.4	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Results illustrated that 40.6% (like so much) of customers indicated that international chain restaurants had the most attractive locations., 29.7% (normal) of customers unaccepted independent restaurants' locations.

Table 6: Location of the restaurant

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Normal	60	29.7	29.7	29.7
	Like	60	29.7	29.7	59.4
	like so much	82	40.6	40.6	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Results indicated that price was the most effective factor in independent restaurants; 75.2% (like so much) of the respondent proposed that the price in independent restaurant was reasonable. 19.8% (like) of the respondent proposed that the price in independent restaurant was reasonable. 5% (normal) of the respondent proposed that the price in independent restaurant was reasonable

Table 7: price

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Normal	10	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Like	40	19.8	19.8	24.8
	like so much	152	75.2	75.2	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Results illustrated that, 80.2% (like so much) of the customers indicated that international chain restaurants had the maximum food quality level that matching with Field (1999) who reported that quality is the key driver of overall satisfaction, while price and service tied for second place. Results illustrated that, 14.9% (like valid) of the customers indicated that international chain restaurants had the maximum food quality level. Results illustrated that, 5% (normal) of the customers indicated that international chain restaurants had the maximum food quality level.

Table 8: Quality of food

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Normal	10	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Like	30	14.9	14.9	19.8
	like so much	162	80.2	80.2	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Results highlighted that, service quality was the most effective factor in international chain restaurants by 64.4% (Highest level & high level) of customers, 20.8% (like valid) of customers agreed with service quality in independent restaurants. In the other side, 14.9% (normal level) of the respondents were unsatisfied with the level of service quality offered in independent restaurants.

Table 9: Quality of service

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Normal	30	14.9	14.9	14.9
	Like	42	20.8	20.8	35.6

	like so much	130	64.4	64.4	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Results highlighted that, Stability of product quality was the most effective factor in international chain restaurants by 65.3% (Highest level & high level) of customers, 34.7% (like) of customers agreed with Stability of product quality in independent restaurants.

Table 10: Stability of product quality

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Like	70	34.7	34.7	34.7
	like so much	132	65.3	65.3	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Results highlighted that, Variety of varieties on the menu was the most effective factor in international chain restaurants by 49.5% (Highest level & high level) of customers, 29.7% (like) of customers agreed with Variety of varieties on the menu in independent restaurants. In the other side, 20.8% (Like so much) of the respondents were unsatisfied with the level of Variety of varieties on the menu offered in independent restaurants.

Table 11: Variety of varieties on the menu

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Normal	100	49.5	49.5	49.5
	Like	60	29.7	29.7	79.2
	Like so much	42	20.8	20.8	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Results highlighted that, General atmosphere on the menu was the most effective factor in international chain restaurants by 44.6% (Normal) of customers, 35.6% (like) of customers agreed with General atmosphere in independent restaurants. In the other side, 19.8% (Don't Like) of the respondents were unsatisfied with the level of General atmosphere offered in independent restaurants.

Table 12: General atmosphere (cleanliness - decor - music - lighting – temperature

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't like	40	19.8	19.8	19.8
	Normal	90	44.6	44.6	64.4
	Like	72	35.6	35.6	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Results indicated that, 54.5% (Don't like) of the customers claimed that international chain restaurants had the most attractive promotional activities, 30.7% (Normal) of them ensured the same result for local restaurant chains and independent restaurants respectively. On the other hand, 14.9 % (Low level & lowest level) of the respondents were disagreed with the above results for independent restaurants, local chain restaurants and international chain restaurants, respectively.

Table 13: Promotional activities (offers, discounts, etc.)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not like at all	30	14.9	14.9	14.9
	Don't like	110	54.5	54.5	69.3
	Normal	62	30.7	30.7	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Results indicated that, 80.2% (Great effect) of the customers claimed that international chain restaurants had the most attractive promotional activities, 14.9% (Good effect) of them ensured the same result for local restaurant chains and independent restaurants respectively. On the other hand, 5 % (Moderate effect) of the respondents were disagreed

with the above results for independent restaurants, local chain restaurants and international chain restaurants.

Table 14: The gossip (talk to friends and others about the restaurant)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Moderate effect	10	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Good effect	30	14.9	14.9	19.8
	Great effect	162	80.2	80.2	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Results indicated that, 90.1% (Great effect) of the customers claimed that international chain restaurants had the most attractive promotional activities, 9.9% (Good effect) of them ensured the same result for local restaurant chains and independent restaurants respectively.

Table 15: Rumours (whether written or audible etc ...)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good effect	20	9.9	9.9	9.9
	Great effect	182	90.1	90.1	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Results indicated that, 10.9% (Good effect) Positive Advertising that international chain restaurants had the most attractive promotional activities, 89.1% (Moderate effect) of them ensured the same result for local restaurant chains and independent restaurants respectively. On the other hand, 54.5 % (Little effect) of the respondents were disagreed with the above results for independent restaurants, local chain restaurants and international chain restaurants.

Table 16: Positive Advertising (Good Reputation)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Little effect	110	54.5	54.5	54.5
	Moderate effect	70	34.7	34.7	89.1
	Good effect	22	10.9	10.9	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Results indicated that, 70.3% (Great effect) Negative publicity that international chain restaurants had the most attractive promotional activities, 29.7% (Good effect) of them ensured the same result for local restaurant chains and independent restaurants respectively.

Table 17: Negative publicity (bad reputation)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	good effect	60	29.7	29.7	29.7
	great effect	142	70.3	70.3	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

Results indicated that, 10.9% (acceptable) assessment of the quick service chain experience in Egypt, 89.1% (success) assessment of the quick service chain experience in Egypt.

Table 18: assessment of the quick service chain experience in Egypt

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Success	180	89.1	89.1	89.1
	acceptable	22	10.9	10.9	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	



Results indicated that, 100% were experienced any problems during their experience with quick service chains, 79.2 % were experienced any problems during your experience with quick service chains.

Table 19: Have you experienced any problems during your experience with quick service chains?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	160	79.2	79.2	79.2
	No	42	20.8	20.8	100.0
	Total	202	100.0	100.0	

The results found that 59.4% of the investigated customers in terms of gender were men. 59.4% were under 25 years of age. 67.3% were unmarried (single).

Table 20: personal data

	Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percent
1	Gender	Man	120	59.4
		Woman	82	40.6
		Total	202	100.0
2	Age	less than 25	120	59.4
		25-40	70	34.7
		over than 40	12	5.9
		Total	202	100.0
3	Social status	Single	136	67.3
		Married	66	32.7
		Total	202	100.0

Prior to testing the hypotheses, it is important to establish the reliability of each of the items used in this study. Reliability judges the degree to which measures are free from error, hence, yielding consistent results (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). Means and standard deviation as well as T –test One-Sample Statistics (ANOVA) in table (21,22) used to measure the reliability:

Table 21 Scale Items of restaurants chains factors

Factor	Mean	Std. Deviation
Do you deal with fast food restaurants	1.6931	.90044
Local restaurants (eg, Mo 'men, Cook Door,.....)	2.2871	.86198
International restaurants (eg KFC, Burger king, McDonald's ...)	1.4356	.75199
The restaurant's fame	4.4059	.73543
Location of the restaurant	4.1089	.83339
Price	4.7030	.55619
Quality of food	4.7525	.53543
Quality of service	4.4950	.74144
Stability of product quality	4.6535	.47705
Variety of varieties on the menu	3.7129	.78969
General atmosphere (cleanliness - decor - music - lighting – temperature	3.1584	.72938
Promotional activities (offers, discounts, etc.)	2.1584	.65764
The gossip (talk to friends and others about the restaurant)	4.7525	.53543
Rumours (whether written or audible etc ...)	4.9010	.29942
Positive Advertising (Good Reputation)	2.5644	.68263
Negative publicity (bad reputation)	4.7030	.45809
What is your assessment of the quick service chain experience in Egypt?	1.1089	.31230
Have you experienced any problems during your experience with quick service chains?	1.2079	.40683
Gender	1.4059	.49229
Age	1.4653	.60782
Social status	1.3267	.47018
average total	4.0165	.59838

Table (22) T –test One-Sample Statistics of restaurants chains factors

Factor	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Do you deal with fast food restaurants	1.6931	.90044	.06335	26.724	.000	1.69307
Local restaurants (eg, Mo 'men, Cook Door ...)	2.2871	.86198	.06065	37.711	.000	2.28713
International restaurants (eg KFC, Burger king, McDonald's,)	1.4356	.75199	.05291	27.134	.000	1.43564
The restaurant's fame	4.4059	.73543	.05174	85.147	.000	4.40594
Location of the restaurant	4.1089	.83339	.05864	70.073	.000	4.10891
Price	4.7030	.55619	.03913	120.179	.000	4.70297
Quality of food	4.7525	.53543	.03767	126.152	.000	4.75248
Quality of service	4.4950	.74144	.05217	86.166	.000	4.49505
Stability of product quality	4.6535	.47705	.03356	138.640	.000	4.65347
Variety of varieties on the menu	3.7129	.78969	.05556	66.823	.000	3.71287
General atmosphere (cleanliness - decor - music - lighting - temperature	3.1584	.72938	.05132	61.545	.000	3.15842
Promotional activities (offers, discounts, etc.)	2.1584	.65764	.04627	46.647	.000	2.15842
The gossip (talk to friends and others about the	4.7525	.53543	.03767	126.152	.000	4.75248

**International Journal of Heritage, Tourism and Hospitality Vol. (12), No. (3/2)**  
**Special issue on papers of the 11<sup>th</sup> ICTH (2018) organized by Faculty of Tourism and Hotels, Fayoum University**

restaurant)						
Rumours (whether written or audible etc. ...)	4.9010	.29942	.02107	232.639	.000	4.90099
Positive Advertising (Good Reputation)	2.5644	.68263	.04803	53.391	.000	2.56436
Negative publicity (bad reputation)	4.7030	.45809	.03223	145.916	.000	4.70297
What is your assessment of the quick service chain experience in Egypt?	1.1089	.31230	.02197	50.466	.000	1.10891
Have you experienced any problems during your experience with quick service chains?	1.2079	.40683	.02862	42.199	.000	1.20792
Gender	1.4059	.49229	.03464	40.590	.000	1.40594
Age	1.4653	.60782	.04277	34.264	.000	1.46535
Social status	1.3267	.47018	.03308	40.104	.000	1.32673

### **Summary, Conclusion and recommendations**

Typically, rumours are spread from person to person and can change slightly each time they are informed. As a consequence, they can become overstated and altered over time. Rumours can involve just about anything and often execute the breadth.

Fast food establishments are those that serve foods for which there is little or no waiting. Many people in the industry are beginning to identify these as fast service restaurants in recognition of the fact that the service is fast not the food.

Fast food based on current concepts falls into three basic categories: utilization of time saving equipment; utilization of labour saving equipment and utilization of self - service devices or methods to reduce labour overhead. 202 response rates for the guest questionnaire and Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program was used when analyzing data. Most respondents deal with international fast food restaurants because they are most favored for them. Customers prefer the most famous restaurants, however rumored to be. The results indicated that many customers indicated that the chain restaurants have many reliable factors such as attractive location. Most customers see that the reasonable price in the restaurant is an important element to attract customers and can be a source of rumors, especially since most customers' link between price and quality of food. The results showed that 80.2% of the customers indicated that the chain restaurants have the highest level of food quality.

The results showed that the quality of service was the most effective factor in facing the rumors in chains restaurants by 64.4% of customers. Product quality stability was the most effective factor in the chain's restaurants with 65.3% of customers. , The presence of variety in menu varieties was the most effective factor in restaurant chains with 49.5% of customers. The overall atmosphere in the list was the most effective factor in the chain restaurants with 44.6% of customers. The results indicated that 54.5% of the customers claimed that the chain restaurants use the most promotional activities especially attractive in the face of rumors and attempts to deny that common. The results showed that 90.1% of customers claimed that international chain restaurants were the most attractive promotional activities. The results indicated that 54.5% of the positive announcements made by the chain restaurants were the most attractive promotions. The results indicated that 70.3% of customers are not affected by negative publicity on international restaurant chains because they have the most attractive promotional activities. The results indicated that 79.2% faced problems during their experience with fast service chains.

Through previous discussions and summaries, it is possible to recommend the following: Implement human developing strategies to develop the human element; Maintain a clear vision, mission, and operation strategies, specify the roles; Work with mystery shopper companies to evaluate the quality, service-cleaning level in the chain compared with the other chains and compared with the standard.; Nutritional value must be revealed to customers.; Frequency follows up marketing and research study; Continuing customer feedback and sensitivity analyses (guest comment, surveys, comment cards, recommendation box, guest complains, thanks letters); Creating a web site, hot line or other advertisement that makes the users meeting with your product or service memorable, Applying crises management policies.

### **References**

- Ball, S. D. (1992): "Fast Food Operations and their Management", Edward Arnold Publishers LTD, England, pp.19, 172,252.
- Bateson, J. E. (1995): "Managing Services Marketing", Text and Readings, 3rd Ed, the Dryden Press, Harcourt Brace College Publishers Fort Worth Philadelphia San Diego, New York, pp.558- 570.

- Brymer, R.A. (1995): "Hospitality Management an Introduction to the Industry", 7th Ed, U.S.A.: Kendall/ Hunt Publishing Company, pp. 417-419.
- Carden, R. and Dellifraire, J. (2004). "An Examination of Hospital Satisfaction with Blood Suppliers". *Transfusion* 44(11), pp.1648-1655.
- Chronis, A. (2005). "Constructing Heritage at the Gettysburg Story Cape". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32 (2), pp. 386–406.
- Cooper, C., and Lawson, R. (2004): "Hospitality, Tourism, and Lifestyle Concepts: Implications for Quality Management and Customer Satisfaction", THHP the Haworth Hospitality Press An Imprint of the Haworth Press, Inc. New York, pp, 2-7, 37, 38.
- Cresswell, J.W. (2007). "Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- DiFonzo, N. and Bordia, P., (2007). "Rumor psychology: Social and organizational approaches". , (pp. 205-227). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association, x, 292 pp.
- Donnelly, Jr.J., Gibson, J.I., and Ivancevich, J.M. (1998): "Fundamentals of Management", Irwin Mc Graw-Hill, New York, pp. 483- 493.
- Field (1999): "Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly", Volume 40, No 1, pp. 69, 72.
- Fine, G.A and Ellis, B. (2010). "Legend/Anti Legend: Humor as an integral part of the contemporary legend process," in *Rumour Mills: The Social Impact of rumour and legend*, Aldine Transaction, New Brunswick.
- Gordon, Sh. (2014). "Understanding the Impact of Rumours and Gossip" *About.com About Health Bullying Effects of Bullying*  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/11503-009>
- Johnston, R. and Clark, G. (2005): "Service Operations Management", 2nd edition, Prentice-Hall, Harlo.
- Khan, M.A. (1991): "Concepts of Food Service Operations and Management", 2nd Ed, John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York, pp. 13-15
- King, J and Ronald F. (2006), "Managing for Quality in the Hospitality Industry", Person Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458, pp, 2-13.
- Lane, H.E. and Duper, D. (1997): "Hospitality World an Introduction", Van Nostrand Reinhold, U S A, PP. 217-228, pp.39.
- Lillicrap, D., Cousins, J., and Smith, R. (2002). "Food and Beverage Service", 6th Ed, Hodder and Stoughton a Member of the Hodder Headline Group, pp. 6, 404.
- Melaniphy, J, C. (2005). "Restaurant and Fast Food Site Selection", 2nd Ed, John Wiley and Sons, New York, pp. 9, 16.
- Negl, J. (2002). "Marketing and Sales Strategies for Hotels and Travel Trade", S.CH and Company LTD. Ram Nagar, New Delhi -110 055, pp. 23, 95-98.
- Ninemeier, J. (2005). *Hospitality operations: Careers in the world's greatest industry*, First Edition, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, PP. 243-255.
- Oliver, R. L., (1997). "Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer", New York, McGraw Hill,.
- Penny M. Simpson and Judy A. Siguaw (2008). "Destination Word of Mouth the Role of Traveller Type, Residents, and Identity Salience". *Journal of Travel Research*, 47 (2), November 2008, pp.167-182.
- Philip, K. (2003). "Marketing insights from A to Z: 80 Concepts Every Manager Needs to know". New Jersey, John Wiley and Sons, Inc, pp.9, 19, 30.
- Reid, R. D, and Bojanic, D. C. (2006): "Hospitality Marketing Management", 4th ED, John Wiley and Sons, Inc, Canada, pp. 9-27, 553-562.

- Samle, P. T. (1980): "The UK Fast Food Market", An Operator View in Planning for Fast Foods, Report on Retail Planning Conference, December, C. F, pp.122.
- Schroeder, R.G. (2004): "Operations Management", Contemporary Concepts and Cases, 2nd Ed, John Wiley and Sons, New York, pp. 33-40, 128-167.
- Seidman, A., and Johnson, W. (2002): "Journal of Food Service Business Research™", Volume 5, no 3 2002, Haworth Hospitality Press ® New Trend in Lodging, Tourism and Food Service Managements, pp. 252 - 256.
- Spreng, R., Mackenzie, S., and Olashavsky, R. (1996). "A Reexamination of Determinants of Customer Satisfaction". Journal of Marketing (60), 15-32.
- Tybout, M., Bobby J. and Sternthal, B. (1981), "Using Information Processing Theory to Design Marketing Strategies," Journal of Marketing Research, 18, 73-79.
- Wade, D. (2006): "Successful Restaurant Management", From Vision to Execution Thomson Delmar Learning, Hospitality, Travel and Tourism, Donald Wade, United States, pp. 49, 81, 226 - 229.
- Walker, R. (2006), "Introduction in Hospitality", Person Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458, pp. 253-258.
- Wyckoff, D. (2001) "Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly", Volume 42, No 4, pp. 26 - 33.