FUNCTIONAL MANAGEMENT

Contemporary Issues



Dr. Manisha Verma



Copyright © Editor

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any from or by any means, without permission. Any person who does any unauthorised act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

Disclaimer: The views expressed in the articles are those of the contributors and not necessarily of the editor and publisher.

First Published, 2019 ISBN: 978-81-941162-7-1

Published by:

Bharti Publications

4819/24, 3rd Floor, Mathur Lane Ansari Road, Darya Ganj, New Delhi-110002

Phone: 011-23247537 Mobile: +91-989-989-7381

E-mail: bhartipublications@gmail.com

info@bharatipublications.com

Website: www.bhartipublications.com



Strategic Deception

Dr. Ishpreet Kaur Virdi

ABSTRACT

Deception is becoming a prominent issue day by day. This paper defines a newly emerged form of deception i.e.; Strategic deception, and provides ways to cope with it. Also, if harmed by this deception, there a list of suggested remedies also. This paper has been concluded by giving an example to help you understand the situation of strategic deception in a more practical manner.

Keywords: Deception, Strategic Deception, Remedies to Deception.

INTRODUCTION

Inadvertising literature, deception is defined as:

"If an advertisement (or advertising campaign) leaves the consumer with an impression(s) and/or belief(s) different from what would normally be expected if the consumer had reasonable knowledge, and that impression(s) and/or belief(s) is factually untrue or potentially misleading, then deception is said to exist (Gardner, 1975)".

This definition, comprised of two parts, effectively states that deception exists if the consumer believes something and if that something is untrue or misleading. A simpler definition arises out of the Federal Trade Commission discussion, taken from a psychological perspective, where deception is "viewed as an act that misleads the target party" (Aditya, 2001).

Digging deeper into treatments of deception, we encounter issues arising from the ethical arenas delineating the effects deceptions have on the target audience. For instance, sociologists engaged in debate over whether deception was ethically wrong if the target of the deception was not materially negatively affected by the deception (Goode E., 1996). To take these definitions a step further, it logically follows that deception exists when an entity communicates something that is untrue, and it is taken as true by the target audience

- Lim, H., & Dubinsky, A. J. (2005). The theory of planned behaviour in e-commerce: H., & Dubling a case for interdependencies between salient beliefs, Psychology & 10/22), 833-855. marketing, 10(22), 833-855.
- Nelson, P. (1974). Advertising as information. Journal of political economy, 4(82), 729-754.
- Penz, E., & Stottinger, B. (2008). Original brands and counterfeit brands-do they have anything in common. Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review, 2(7), 146-163.
- Rojsek, I. (2001). From red to green: Towards the environmental management in the country in transition. Journal of Business Ethics, 1(33), 37-50.
- Schlegelmilch, B. B. (1998). Marketing ethics: An international perspective. Congage learning EMEA.
- Simpson, P. M., Banerjee, D., & Simpson, C. L. (1994). softlifting: a model of motivating factors. Journal of business ethics, 13, 431-438.
- Steenkamp, J. B., Hofstede, F. T., & Wedel, M. (1999). A cross-national investigation into the individual and national cultural antecedents of consumer innovativeness. Journal of Marketing, 2(63), 55-69.
- Stokes, S. A. (2009). Deception in environmental advertising: Consumer's reaction to greenwashing. Thesis. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas state university.
- Sussman, S. W., & Siegal, W. S. (2003). Informational influence in organizations: An integrated approach to knowledge adoption. Information systems research, 14(1), 47-65.
- Wertenbroch, K., & Skiera, B. (2002). Measuring consumers' willingness to pay at the point of purchase. Journal of marketing research, 2(39), 228-241.