



**De La Salle University – Dasmariñas**

**AN ANALYSIS ON THE PREFERENCES OF SELECTED FILIPINA  
HOMEMAKERS FROM BARANGAY SALAWAG, DASMARIÑAS CITY,  
CAVITE BETWEEN COMPARATIVE AND NON-COMPARATIVE  
LAUNDRY DETERGENT TV ADS**

**An Undergraduate Thesis Presented to  
The Faculty of Communication Arts Department  
College of Liberal Arts and Communication  
De La Salle University-Dasmariñas**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements in  
COMM102 Communication Research**

**by**

**Denise Gabrielle A. Almera**

**Hapynez C. Benitez**

**Karla Jane G. de Leon**

**COM41**

**April 2014**



## ABSTRACT

One of the many branches of communication is advertising message, or more correctly called as marketing communications. One of the ways how advertising message is executed is through comparative advertising. The Philippines has strict laws against comparative advertising, and that is why advertisers in the country are only allowed to have indirect, or Brand X, comparisons. On the other hand, non-comparative advertising does not employ any Brand X comparisons. It simply promotes the brand's benefits and features.

Last February 2013, in a Social Weather Stations Consumer Coping Behavior Survey data, it was found out that in the Luzon area the number one must-have for Filipinos is detergent soap/powder. And two of the top brands which were patronized by households are Tide and Surf. The target market of these brands is housewives. Interestingly, these two brands use different advertising execution styles: Tide utilizes indirect comparison, while Surf uses the non-comparative style.

This study aimed to find out which between the two advertising executions were preferred better by selected homemakers from Barangay Salawag, Dasmariñas City, Cavite and their reasons for their preferences. This study was done to examine as well which elements in the advertisement affected the preferences of the homemakers. The relationship between the choices and rationalizations of the homemakers with their demographics and psychographics were also determined in this study.

The respondents for this study were homemakers from Mabuhay Homes 2000, Dasma 4, and Dasma 3 subdivisions in Barangay Salawag, Dasmariñas City, Cavite. The researchers conducted a focus group discussion for each subdivision with ten participants from Mabuhay Homes 2000, twelve participants from Dasma 4, and ten participants from Dasma 3.

The researchers found out that most of the housewives who participated in the three focus group discussions preferred the non-comparative advertising execution style for laundry detergent commercials. They liked this advertising execution because it realistically presents the truth, it is simple, it is convincing even without comparison, and it presents only the advertised brand's benefits. Majority said that the indirect comparison style defames the Brand X. The minority who liked this execution reasoned that it only emphasizes the superiority of the brand, and for them this execution is more convincing. The television advertisement elements which the



housewives put emphasis on are the endorser, visuals and message execution, and tagline message. They also looked for the quality of the advertised brands and their economical benefits. The participants' demographics, lifestyles, values, and beliefs reflected on their preferences. They were also not able to separate their own experiences from their opinions on the advertisements shown to them by the researchers.

The researchers recommend that future researchers on this topic should study the market first and get the perspectives of the brand managers and advertising agencies of the brands they will utilize. Further exploration on the behavioral stage in the Hierarchy of Effects is also advisable, as this already tackles consumer purchase behavior. The researchers also recommend that makers of laundry detergent ads should study their market extensively so they can produce more effective commercials targeted to housewives.

**Keywords:** LAUNDRY DETERGENT COMMERCIALS, INDIRECT COMPARISON ADVERTISING, NON-COMPARATIVE ADVERTISING, HOUSEWIVES





**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Tables and Figures**

Fig. 1 Facets Model of Effects.....	21
Fig. 2 Head and Heart Strategy.....	32
Fig. 3 Social Judgment Theory Model.....	40
Fig. 4 Hierarchy of Effects Model.....	43
Fig. 5 Conceptual Framework.....	48
Fig. 6 Operational Framework.....	51
Timetable.....	71
Budget.....	72
Table 1 Demographics and Psychographics of FGD 1 Participants.....	74
Table 2 Demographics and Psychographics of FGD 2 Participants .....	76
Table 3 Demographics and Psychographics of FGD 3 Participants .....	78
Table 4 Number of Housewives Who Preferred the Tide and Surf Commercials.....	86
Table 5 Comments of Housewives on Tide’s Advertising Strategy.....	87
Table 6 Comments of Housewives on Surf’s Advertising Strategy .....	91
Table 7 Comments of Housewives on Tide’s Brand Endorser.....	95
Table 8 Comments of Housewives on Surf’s Brand Endorser.....	97
Table 9 Comments of Housewives on Tide’s Visuals and Effects.....	98
Table 10 Comments of Housewives on Surf’s Visuals and Effects.....	100
Table 11 Comments of Housewives on Tide’s Jingle.....	102
Table 12 Comments of Housewives on Surf’s Jingle.....	103



Table 13 Tagline Message of Tide Ads According to the Housewives .....106

Table 14 Tagline Message of Surf Ads According to the Housewives.....108

**I. The Problem and Its Background**

Introduction..... 1  
Statement of the Problem.....4  
Significance of the Study.....5  
Scope and Delimitation.....7  
Definition of Terms.....8

**II. Review of Related Literature**

Conceptual Literature.....12  
Research Literature.....33  
Synthesis.....37

**III. Framework of the Study**

Theoretical Framework.....40  
Conceptual Framework.....48  
Operational Framework.....51

**IV. Methodology**

Research Design and Methods.....53  
Research Instrument.....55  
Participants of the Study.....57  
Data Gathering Procedure.....68



Data Analysis.....	69
Timetable.....	71
Budget.....	72

**V. Results and Discussion**

Specific Problem Statement No. 1.....	73
Specific Problem Statement No. 2.....	86
Specific Problem Statement No. 3.....	94

**VI .Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation**

Summary.....	110
Conclusion.....	114
Practical Recommendation.....	118
Methodological Recommendation.....	119
Conceptual Recommendation.....	120
Theoretical Recommendation.....	120