# Research on Greek Consumer Satisfaction towards Private Label Products During Financial Crisis

***Vlachakis, S., Kargidis, T., Belidis, A.**
Alexander Technological Educational Institute of Thessaloniki, Marketing Dept., Greece

*Corresponding author E-mail: sotirisv@mkt.teithe.gr

**Abstract:** *Consumer reactions to national brands and private labels are constantly changing in favour of the latter by a number of factors such as consumers' value consciousness and the element of price-quality association. Therefore, the main purpose of this paper is to investigate consumer's attitude and satisfaction with respect to private label products (PLPs). Particularly, the objectives of this study are to a) identify Greek consumers' behavior before and during recession towards PLPs b) classify which factors have a greater impact on consumer satisfaction on PLPs c) determine consumers' preferences in terms of the private label supplier and d) link consumer personal characteristics with PLPs consumption. In order to address the multiple purposes of this study, a self-administered questionnaire survey of total 1025 questionnaires has been conducted in the East commercial zone of Thessaloniki, Greece between 1/10/2001 and 20/12/2012. Data are represented using SPSS data analysis software. Findings reveal a tendency to consume more PLPs during the recession whereas consumer satisfaction is influenced not only from inherent factors such as price and quality but also from the availability, packaging and promotional activities.*
**Keywords:** *Greece, Consumer satisfaction, Private label products, Recession*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Due to the increasing demand and consumption of private label products worldwide and specifically in the Greek market (Boutsouki et al., 2009; McNeill & Wyeth, 2011), this paper aims to research on Greek consumer satisfaction towards private label products (PLPs). In this regard, it is essential to define the key concepts this paper addresses. *Private labels products*, also known as store brands or own brands, are defined as the consumer products that are produced in a retailer's account and are sold using either the retailer's brand or another brand, which is then sold exclusively by the specific retailer or retail chain (Chaniotakis et al., 2009). *Consumer satisfaction* can be defined as a term which consists of three general components namely a) a response (emotional or cognitive) b) a particular focus (expectations, product, consumption, experience etc.) and c) at a particular time (after consumption, based on experience etc.). In other words, satisfaction is usually the result of disconfirmation or the fulfilment of expectations (Swan 1998; Giese & Cote, 2000). This paper is organized as follows: section one refers to the definitions of basic concepts used in this paper and section 2 highlights the most important literature review related to consumer satisfaction and behaviour towards PLPs. Section three discusses the research methodology used to extract the results and section four presents the most important findings. This study concludes in section five where future research is proposed.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Since they were first launched in the 1980s, PLPs had been perceived by consumers as products of lower quality and as "cheap" versions of the branded similar ones (Chaniotakis et al., 2009). From a consumer' perspective, PLPs offer greater "value for money" solution compared to brand products, have improved quality and variety similar to the branded alternatives and due to the current recession, which caused increased inflation and decreased consumer's bargaining power, the penetration rate of PLPs has increased (Azabagaoglu & Oraman, 2011). From a retailer's perspective, PLPs offer an attractive option for higher profit margins which in turn leads to higher retailer's income. Moreover, successful PLPs can create strong visual identity and corporate image which in turn leads to higher customer trust and loyalty towards the PLP retailer (Lupton et al., 2010). PLPs also incorporate lower merchandize risk in comparison to branded products which are costly to maintain and promote (Atlintas et al., 2010). As a matter of fact, the penetration rate of PLPs has gradually increased over the years namely 20% (percentage over the total sales in supermarkets and cash and carry markets) in 2011 compared to 18,8% during 2010 and 16,8% in 2009 (ICAP, 2011). The same research indicates that, at an international level, the highest penetration rate of PLPs into the total sales' portfolio has been observed in Switzerland (46,3%), in the United Kingdom (42,2%) and in Spain (38,2%) respectively. In the United Stated this rate has reached only the 18,3% over the total sales of FMCG (Fast Moving Consumer Goods). In Greece, the sales of private-label products has increased from a moderate 10% of the total sales volume in supermarkets during 2006 to an average value of 21,5% in 2011.

With respect to the study's objectives we classify in table 1 the most important factors that influence consumer satisfaction. In this regard, based on existing literature, we identify and describe factors that a have impact on consumer attitude therefore affecting satisfaction related to PLPs.

**Table 1. Factors affecting consumer satisfaction towards PLPs.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Price | Baltas (1997), Baltas & Argouslidis, (2007), Veloutsou et al., (2004), McNeil & Wyeth (2011), Chaniotakis et al., (2009) |
| Perceived quality | Baltas & Argouslidis, (2007), Veloutsou et al., (2004), Chaniotakis et al., (2009), Jin & Suh (2005) |
| Packaging | Baltas (1997), Veloutsou et al., (2004), Chaniotakis et al., (2009) |
| Variety | Baltas & Argouslidis, (2007), Sinha & Batra, (1999), DelVecchio (2001) |
| Smart buy (value for money) | Veloutsou et al., (2004), Jin & Suh (2005), Ailawadi et al., (2009) Boutsouki et al., (2008) |
| Availability | Baltas (1997), DelVecchio (2001), Baltas & Argouslidis, (2007) |
| Marketing activities (promotion) | Baltas & Argouslidis, (2007), Sinha & Batra, (1999), DelVecchio (2001) |
| Trust in retailer's chain | Veloutsou et al., (2004), Castaldo et al., (2008) |

Among the intrinsic factors that affect consumer's satisfaction towards PLPs, most authors argue that private label satisfaction is a) positively related to price consciousness (i.e. desire to pay low prices), b) positively related to value consciousness (i.e. desire to maximize the ration of quality received to the price paid) and c) negatively related to price-quality perceptions (i.e. when price is a strong indicator of quality) (Burton et al., 1998). Moreover, the greater variability in quality across the private label products increases the risk that a given private label brand will not perform in a satisfactory way. This further implies that quality and price are competitive factors for PLPs differentiation and if not satisfactory consumers are more likely to purchase alternative branded ones (Lupton et al., 2010). In addition, ease to use and distinctive packaging is also a factor that influences behaviour towards purchase and also satisfaction in a manner of after-product experience. It is supported (Venetsou et al., 2004) that the more closely resemblance in package PLPs use to their branded alternatives, the more likely they are to succeed. According to ICAP (2011), PLPs increased penetration rate has created the need for a greater variety which in turn has created stronger consumer loyalty. Variety is not restricted only to product extension but also in flavours, sizes and even variety in value.

There is no doubt that the increased PLPs awareness and competition intensification has lower prices and increased quality in favour of PLPs consumption. Therefore, PLPs "value for money" relationship remains the strongest driver for PLPs consumption and is considered a competitive advantage over branded alternatives (Altintas et al., 2010). Moreover, availability of PLPs at a specific retailer creates strong consumer perception about the image and reputation of the retailer (DelVecchio, 2001). This in turn creates trust, commitment and stronger customer base. Trust is considered the building block for commitment and satisfaction since it can be interpreted as the expectations held by the consumer that a specific retailer is dependable and can be relied upon to deliver on the promises (Castaldo et al., 2008). Moreover, consumers who have positive attitude towards purchasing PLPs, beyond seeking low prices per product, they are after favourable deals through sales promotions and thus, these consumers can be described as being "deal prone". For example, the use of a coupon (e.g. 30% off the regular price) would likely attract a deal-prone consumer and cause "transaction utility". The latter can be defined as the satisfaction arising from a purchase transaction based on the consumer paying a lower price than his or her internal reference prize (Burton et al., 1998).

While most literature focuses on making explicit arguments around factors that affect consumer satisfaction, yet to our knowledge, none has link factor's influence on consumer satisfaction with the current recession. Therefore the purpose of this paper is not only to demonstrate which factors have the greatest impact on consumer satisfaction but also to link the current recession with the overall consumer attitude. We chose to particularly investigate on coffee and house paper since they are the only categories that lie on the top of consumer preferences as far as PLPs consumption is concerned (Assael, 1993; ICAP, 2011)

## 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

For the purpose of this paper, a self-administered questionnaire survey of total 1025 questionnaires has been conducted in the East commercial zone of Thessaloniki, Greece between 1/10/2001 and 20/12/2012 for academic purposes. For this reason, convenience sampling was used and respondents were interviewed before and after goods purchase in order ensure a variety of opinions (Wilson, 2006). We used SPSS software for the data analysis.

### 3.1 Questionnaire design

In order to pilot test the questionnaire we used a random sample of 50 consumers. During this test, we examined the validity of our questionnaire and then the final questionnaire was finalized and distributed. A closed question approach was used and interviewees were asked to tick their chosen answer. Likert scales were used in order to measure the level of satisfaction by product category (1 represents lowest and 5 the highest value). The questionnaire consists of 13 (thirteen) main questions, each concerned with a different variable:

Supermarket preference (**4.1**) 2. Interest in retailer's brand (**4.2, 4.3**) 3. Past consumer behaviour towards PLPs (before financial crisis) (**4.4**) 4. Change in income (**4.5**) 5. Degree of influence crisis has on buying behaviour. (**4.6**) 6. Tendency in buying behaviour (**4.7**) 7. Percentage of PLPs in total purchase (**4.8**) 8. Factors impact on PLPs satisfaction (**4.9**) 9. Purchase frequency about house paper/coffee PLPs (**5.0**) 10. Factors impact on house paper/coffee PLPs satisfaction (**5.1**) 11. Future purchase frequency about house paper/coffee PLPs (**5.2**) 12. Profile of the average PLP consumer (**5.3**) 13. Prior and current consumption of PLPs (**5.4**)

## 4. Analysis and Discussion of Findings

**4.1** Our first question refers to which supermarket the consumer is used to buy from. This question will show whether consumers match their store buying behaviour or if they change store when they decide to buy specific PLPs. This question could receive multiple entries because consumers may buy goods from different supermarkets but at a different intensity or rate of preference. The supermarkets chosen to participate in the survey were "Masoutis". Carrefour", "Lidl", "Atlantis", "Beropoulos", "Vassilopoulos", "Galaxias", "Arvanitidis" and "other". These supermarkets are best characterized as stores that service primarily all kind of users from lower-income to high-income shoppers. In this respect, first responses show that the majority of consumers choose supermarkets "Masoutis", "Carrefour" and "Lidl" to shop their goods at a 61%, 54% and 40% percentage respectively. Only 4% use to buy from supermarket "Atlantis", while "Vassilopoulos" and "Arvanitidis" receive 15% and 19% respectively.

**4.2, 4.3** Interesting is that the majority of consumers visit "Lidl" and "Masoutis" to buy house paper PLPs at a 44% and 38% rate respectively. Third is Carrefour with 33%. House paper PLPs usually include kitchen and bathroom papers and exclude papers for any industrial use. These proportions show that consumers tend to choose their main preference supermarket as a store for PLPs. Therefore we can safely propose that it is important for a supermarket to be an "all in one" store because consumers are more likely to buy paper PLPs. This notion does not change drastically when consumers are seeking to buy coffee PLPs. "Masoutis" is still the leader in coffee PLPs with 49% while "Carrefour" is second with 43%. In this PLP category, supermarket "Lidl" receives only a modest 10%. "Vassilopoulos" receives 16% while an 18% use to buy coffee PLPs from an "other" supermarket.

**4.4** This question shows past consumer behaviour towards PLPs, specifically before three years when the phenomenon of economic recession has not been as obvious as it is nowadays. In a five (5) point scale from "never" to "always" the majority of consumers (88%) used to buy frequently ($4^{th}$ scale) PLPs. This shows that even before financial crisis consumers' reaction to PLPs was positive. This further implies that consumers with favourable attitudes towards private label brands are particularly price conscious and tend to focus on paying low prices, essentially disregarding other factors in brand evaluation such as quality of brand image.

**4.5** To complement the previous question, this one examines whether consumers' monthly income has changed during the last three years. This question shows if a tendency to buy and consume PLPs is due to a decrease in salary. Since it is difficult to indicate precisely the right amount of increase or decrease in an individual's salary we chose to show this difference in single entry percentage pick. Therefore, in a nine (9) point scale the majority of consumers (78%) responded a decrease between 21% and 40%. Only 11% responded an increase in their salary by 1-20%. This implies that the current financial crisis had a great impact on the majority of consumers. Therefore, consumers are more prone to purchase PLPs since they can not afford high price national products.

**4.6** This question refers to the degree of influence financial crisis has on buying behaviour. In a 5-point scale, most respondents indicated that financial crisis has a very high degree of influence on their buying behaviour. If we take into consideration responses from **4.5** then we can safely conclude that this high degree of influence derives from a high decrease in consumers' salary. Specifically, half of the respondents (50%) indicated a very high degree of influence whereas 33% indicated a high degree of influence. This implies that the majority feels the current crisis had a great impact on their buying behaviour.

**4.7** This question reveals consumers' tendency in buying behaviour towards PLPs. Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 analyze the results.

**Table 2**

**I buy more PLPs during financial crisis**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Strongly disagree | 53 | 5,2 | 5,2 | 5,2 |
| | Disagree | 89 | 8,7 | 8,7 | 13,9 |
| | Neither agree/nor disagree | 160 | 15,6 | 15,6 | 29,5 |
| | Agree | 392 | 38,2 | 38,2 | 67,7 |
| | Strongly agree | 331 | 32,3 | 32,3 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 1025 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

**Table 3**

**My preference to PLPs is due to my income decrease**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Strongly disagree | 78 | 7,6 | 7,6 | 7,6 |
| | Disagree | 88 | 8,6 | 8,6 | 16,2 |
| | Neither agree/nor disagree | 147 | 14,3 | 14,3 | 30,5 |
| | Agree | 426 | 41,6 | 41,6 | 72,1 |
| | Strongly agree | 286 | 27,9 | 27,9 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 1025 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

**Table 4**

**I do more restricted and programmed product buy**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Strongly disagree | 24 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 2,3 |
| | Disagree | 43 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 6,5 |
| | Neither agree/nor disagree | 123 | 12,0 | 12,0 | 18,5 |
| | Agree | 429 | 41,9 | 41,9 | 60,4 |
| | Strongly agree | 406 | 39,6 | 39,6 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 1025 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

**Table 5**

**My preference to PLPs is due to their improvement**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Strongly disagree | 119 | 11,6 | 11,6 | 11,6 |
| | Disagree | 192 | 18,7 | 18,7 | 30,3 |
| | Neither agree/nor disagree | 337 | 32,9 | 32,9 | 63,2 |
| | Agree | 297 | 29,0 | 29,0 | 92,2 |
| | Strongly agree | 80 | 7,8 | 7,8 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 1025 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

The analysis of the findings reveals that the majority of consumers tend to buy more PLPs due to the current recession. Moreover, in consistent with findings in **4.5** most users agree on the fact that their income decrease led them to prefer or to try PLPs whereas the majority of them strongly agree that they do more organized and restricted purchase of goods. However, interesting is to notice that the majority feels that their preference to PLPs is not because of their vast improvement in quality, image, package or other factors. This further implies that the current recession may be the main reason why consumers tend to purchase PLPs and this is due to decrease in their salary which it used to justify national brands purchase and now it is insufficient for similar purchases.

**4.8** This question aims to answer what percentage of total goods belongs to PLPs. According to results, consumers respond that almost half of the total goods purchase belongs to PLPs. Specifically 21% use to buy 21-30% PLPs of their total goods while 19% between 41-50%. Responses match with **4.7** findings since both show that the current environment leads to a higher percentage of PLPs in the average supermarket visit.

**4.9** In this question we seek to find which factor(s) have a great impact on PLPs satisfaction in general. In other words, which are the factors that play a significant role in choosing a PLP over a national brand? Results indicate that the highest level of satisfaction is due to lower prizes compared to national brands. This fact derives from a 70% strongly satisfied respondents about the *price* tag in most PLPs. This result implies that most respondents are “deal-prone consumers” since price is strongly related to one’s tendency to buy PLPs. *Quality* is open for discussion since a high percentage (30%) is neither satisfied/nor dissatisfied about the quality in most PLPs. If we say that total characteristics make up for the quality of a product then most 45% are seem satisfied for what they pay. However, there is a noticeable 15% that are not satisfied from the quality they get purchasing a PLP.
Moreover, half of the consumers argue that are satisfied about the *availability* of PLPs but there is still room for improvement since an accumulated 16% is strongly dissatisfied. *Variety* is also a factor that affects the level of satisfaction among consumers. Results show that the majority of consumers are satisfied about the variety of PLPs however, there is a noticeable 17% who are not. The level of satisfaction is also related to the level of *trust* a consumer shows in the S/M chain and on specific retailer. In this regard, the majority show satisfaction in a S/M chain, meaning that the image and overall operation of the S/M affect the level of satisfaction in purchasing PLPs.
*Ease to package* is a factor that should be made improvements since the majority (53%) is not satisfied with the package most PLPs use. In this regard, PLP retailers should focus on improving package characteristics such as the material, shape and overall practicality. Interesting to notice is the *marketing activities* involved during promotion and sales of PLPs. Most of the respondents are seeking additional benefits from a PLP so it is wise to employ marketing actions such as coupons and cent-off proneness. Specifically, 43% are satisfied about the marketing activities whereas as 22% is strongly satisfied. Consumers with PLP orientations may view themselves as sophisticated *smart buyers* who are not easily influenced by national brands and make rational choices among brand alternatives. Findings reveal that 51% and 24% is satisfied and strongly satisfied respectively.

**5.0** This is a combined question since we ask the frequency rate consumers buy coffee and house paper PLPs. Tables 6 and 7 shows respectively that most users buy either frequently or always house paper PLPs however, the majority prefer not buy PLP coffee. These results indicate that there is room for profits as far as coffee PLPs are concerned since consumers prefer national brand coffees to PLPs.

**Table 6**

**How often do you buy house paper PLPs**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Never | 56 | 5,5 | 5,5 | 5,5 |
| | Rarely | 70 | 6,8 | 6,8 | 12,3 |
| | Occasionally | 137 | 13,4 | 13,4 | 25,7 |
| | Frequently | 348 | 34,0 | 34,0 | 59,7 |
| | Always | 413 | 40,3 | 40,3 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 1024 | 99,9 | 100,0 | |
| Missing | System | 1 | ,1 | | |
| Total | | 1025 | 100,0 | | |

**Table 7**

**How often do you buy coffee PLPs**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Never | 673 | 65,7 | 65,8 | 65,8 |
| | Rarely | 88 | 8,6 | 8,6 | 74,4 |
| | Occasionally | 75 | 7,3 | 7,3 | 81,7 |
| | Frequently | 104 | 10,1 | 10,2 | 91,9 |
| | Always | 83 | 8,1 | 8,1 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 1023 | 99,8 | 100,0 | |
| Missing | System | 2 | ,2 | | |
| Total | | 1025 | 100,0 | | |

**5.1** This question refers to which factors have an impact on house paper/coffee PLPs satisfaction. Since these factors are the same with **4.9,** our discussion will focus on which factors affect most the level of satisfaction among consumers about these specific categories of PLPs. As far as house paper PLPs is concerned, most consumers show great satisfaction about the *price*. In other words, 73% show high satisfaction about house paper PLPs. *Quality* is also satisfactory since 67% find the characteristics of house paper PLPs more than adequate. *Availability* is also satisfactory (67%) but the majority (62%) argues that there must be an improvement in variety since it is not satisfactory enough. *Trust in S/M* and *easy to use package* are considered satisfactory by the majority with 68% and 61% respectively. Moreover, *marketing activities* are considered satisfactory with 62% but a noticeable 22% feels dissatisfied. In addition, the ratio *value for money* is considered satisfactory with 72% according to research results.
As far as coffee is concerned, half of the respondents are neither satisfied/nor dissatisfied (45%) about the *price* most coffee PLPs have. Particularly, 17% feel dissatisfied about price, implying that coffee PLPs have higher prizes than most consumers expect and are willing to pay. The *quality* is considered satisfactory (56%) but 22% feels dissatisfied. The *availability* of coffee PLPs is considered strongly satisfactory (72%) as well as the *variety* with 65%. However, there is a 20% that are dissatisfied about the variety which implies that more extension of coffee PLPs may be required. Satisfactory (68%) is the *trust* to S/M where consumers use to buy coffee PLPs however, a great amount of consumers (35%) are dissatisfied about the *package* of coffee PLPs. Dissatisfaction is also prevalent in *marketing activities* (27%) but the majority (69%) still feels satisfaction when they buy a coffee PLP considering the ratio *value for money*.

**5.2** This question addresses consumers' willingness to continue future purchase regarding house paper/coffee PLPs. Tables below show that the majority is willing to continue buy house paper PLPs at a very high degree but this notion is not the same with coffee PLPs, since most argue that they will continue to buy but at a low degree.

**Table 8**

**At what degree are you willing to continue buy house paper PLPs in the near future**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Very low degree | 1 | ,1 | ,1 | ,1 |
| | Low degree | 12 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,3 |
| | Medium degree | 97 | 9,5 | 10,0 | 11,4 |
| | High degree | 363 | 35,4 | 37,5 | 48,8 |
| | Very high degree | 496 | 48,4 | 51,2 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 969 | 94,5 | 100,0 | |
| Missing | System | 56 | 5,5 | | |
| Total | | 1025 | 100,0 | | |

**Table 9**

**At what degree are you willing to continue buy coffee PLPs in the near future**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Very low degree | 54 | 5,3 | 15,6 | 15,6 |
| | Low degree | 92 | 9,0 | 26,6 | 42,2 |
| | Medium degree | 65 | 6,3 | 18,8 | 61,0 |
| | High degree | 81 | 7,9 | 23,4 | 84,4 |
| | Very high degree | 54 | 5,3 | 15,6 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 346 | 33,8 | 100,0 | |
| Missing | System | 679 | 66,2 | | |
| Total | | 1025 | 100,0 | | |

**5.3** In order to address the aims of this research, we link consumer demographics with PLPs consumption, in order to get an average profile of the consumer who uses to buy a certain percentage of PLPs. Crosstab results from demographics show that the average person who shops PLPs is a woman, between 40 and 49 years old, usually a university or college graduate, with a monthly income of 801-1000euros that today when they buy from a S/M, usually they ratio of PLPs in total goods is 41-50%.

**5.4** This question shows a direct link between prior recession and current consumption of PLPs. The table below depicts those who used to occasionally buy PLPs, now they are used to buy 11-30% PLPs from total goods.

**Table 10**

**ow often you used to buy PLPs before financial crisis (before three years)? * Today, when you buy from a S/M, what is the percentage o PLPs Crosstabulation**

Count

| | | Today, when you buy from a S/M, what is the percentage of PLPs | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 0% | 1-10% | 11-20% | 21-30% | 31-40% | 41-50% | 51%+ | Total |
| How often you used to buy PLPs before financial crisis (before three years)? | Never | 12 | 59 | 27 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 14 | 162 |
| | Rarely | 1 | 39 | 73 | 74 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 264 |
| | Occasionally | 1 | 30 | 86 | 87 | 43 | 71 | 28 | 346 |
| | Frequently | | 5 | 13 | 22 | 22 | 40 | 26 | 128 |
| | Always | | 15 | 6 | 16 | 19 | 33 | 36 | 125 |
| Total | | 14 | 148 | 205 | 216 | 135 | 188 | 119 | 1025 |

## 5. STUDY LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In this paper our main research goals were to investigate on how the current environment of financial crisis has affected consumer behavior towards private label products generally and specifically towards coffee and house papers PLPs. Moreover, we examined which factors have a greater impact on consumer satisfaction and determined consumers' preferences in terms of the private label supplier. At the same time, an attempt is made to link demographics with PLPs consumption in order to conclude the average person who is willing to continue buy PLPs. Additionally, we compared prior and current behaviour to PLPs that is before and during the recession. Yet to our knowledge there is not a similar study that shows how the current crisis has affected consumer satisfaction and therefore behaviour towards PLPs. However, our results should not have a nation-wide application since a limitation that merits attention is the localized character of the research. In order to enhance the validity of our findings, actual store data could have given a much more comprehensive picture about the demand and supply of PLPs. Future research should focus on key issues uncovered in this study, particularly on the Greek private label sector, to consider the opinions of retailers about the marketing mission to deliver private label products, and make an assessment based on a retailer's perspective.

## References


Ailawadi K. L., Beauchamp J. P., Donthu N., Gauri D. K. & Shankar, V., (2009), "Communication and promotion decisions in retailing: a review and directions for future research", Journal of Retailing, 85:1, pp. 42-55

Altintas M. H., Kiliç S., Senol G. & Isin F. B., (2010), "Strategic objectives and competitive advantages of private label products: Manufacturers' perspective", International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management, 38:10, pp. 773 - 788

Assael H., 1993, "Marketing Principles & Strategy", 2nd Ed., The Dryden Press

Azabagaoglu M. O. & Oraman Y., (2011), "Analysis of Customer Expectations after the Recession: Case of Food Sector", Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 24, pp. 229–236

Baltas G., (1997), "Determinants of store brand choice: a behavioural analysis", Journal of Product & Brand Management, 6:5, pp. 315-324

Baltas G. & Argouslidis, P.C., (2007), "Consumer characteristics and demand for store brands", International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management, 35:4, pp. 328-41

Boutsouki C., Zotos Y. & Masouti Z., (2008), "Consumer Behaviour towards Own Label: monitoring the Greek experience", Agriculture Economics Review, 9:1, pp. 81- 92

Burton S., Lichtenstein D. R., Netemeyer R. G. & Garretson J., (1998), "A Scale for Measuring Attitude toward Private Label Products and an Examination of its Psychological and Behavioral Correlates", Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 26:4, pp. 293-306

Castaldo S., Premmazi K. & Grosso M., (2008), "Store trust building, the emerging role of private label", Retrieved online from http://www.escpeap.net/conferences/marketing/2008_cp/Materiali/Paper/It/Castaldo_Premazzi_Grosso.pdf

Chaniotakis I. E., Lymperopoulos C. & Soureli M., (2009), "A Research Model for Consumers' Intention of Buying Private Label Frozen Vegetables", Journal of Food Products Marketing, 15:2, pp.152-163

DelVecchio D., (2001), "Consumer perceptions of private label quality: the role of product category characteristics and consumer use of heuristics". Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 8:5, pp. 239-249

Giese, J. L. & Cote, J. A., (2000), "Defining Customer Satisfaction". Academy of Marketing Science Review.

ICAP (2011), Κλαδική μελέτη για προϊόντα ιδιωτικής ετικέτας.

Jin B. & Y. Suh., (2005), "Integrating effect of consumer perception factors in predicting private brand purchase in a Korean discount store context", Journal of Consumer Marketing, 22:2, pp. 62–71

Lupton R. A., Rawlinson D. R. & Braunstein L. A., (2010), "Private label branding in China: what do US and Chinese students think?", Journal of Consumer Marketing, 27:2, pp.104–113

McNeill L. & Wyeth E., (2011), "The private label grocery choice: consumer drivers to purchase", The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research, 21:1, pp. 95-109

Sinha, I. & Batra, R. (1999), "The effect of consumer price consciousness on private label purchase", International Journal of Research in Marketing, Vol. 16, pp. 237-51

Swan J.E. (1988), "Consumer satisfaction related to disconfirmation of expectations and product performance", Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining behaviour, Vol.1, pp.40 - 47

Veloutsou C., Gioulistanis E. & Moutinho L. A., (2004), "Own labels choice criteria and perceived characteristics in Greece and Scotland: Factors influencing the willingness to buy", Journal of Product & Brand Management, 13:4, pp. 228–241

Wilson A., (2006), "Marketing research: An integrated approach", 2nd ed., Financial Times/Prentice Hall.