

# BUSINESS STRATEGIES ADOPTED BY THE ORGANIC TEA TRADERS IN COONOOR

Dr.M.Gopanasamy\*, Assistant professor, Department of Commerce,  
Chikkanna Govt Arts College, Tirupur-641 602, Tamilnadu, India.

Mr. Kumar.S<sup>1</sup>, Research scholar, Department of Commerce,  
Chikkanna Govt Arts College, Tirupur-641 602, Tamilnadu, India.

## 1.1 Introduction:

Water is the essential drink for all human beings and it is consumed as the most vital drink by and large. After water, stands the tea, which was universally accepted as the drink which gives relax for mind and body. The global market for tea, the countries like china, India, Kenya and Srilanka occupies the major place. The main reason for the major consumption is the health benefits attached to it. India not only the major producer but also a great consumer for tea, it has been in the front lashing the countries of China, Kenya, Vietnam and Indonesia. The major type of tea accounts to Black, Oolong, Green, white, loose teas and Tea bags. The global market for tea accounts to 15.4 billion In the financial year 2011-12, the production of tea accounts to 1,095 million kilograms, and the exports stood up to 214 million kilograms. In the financial years of 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15,2015-16, the production accounted to 1,135, 1,209, 1,233 million kilograms and the exports of these years accounts to 216,226,199,233 million kilograms respectively(tea board of India). In the year 2016-17, 2017-18 the output was accounting to 1,250.5, 1,325.1 million kilograms. Out of the total production black tea accounts for 80.46%, Regular tea - 15.66%, Green Tea - 3.45%, Herbal Tea - 0.20%, Masala tea - 0.15% and Lemon tea - 0.08%.

## 1.2 NEED FOR THE STUDY:

In the recent years, the consumption of organic tea has been improved drastically. The reason behind is the physical performance of the tea, it gives quick fat burning experience, kills bacteria and removes toxins, improvises the dental health and lowers risk of infection, reduces the risk of becoming obese and make the look smarter. It also brings great support for the diabetic patients to reduce sugar level, reduces cholesterol for blood pressure patients and the antioxidants present in the tea reduces cancer, and the bio active compounds present improvises the health vitally. All these benefits have been a great push for consuming organic green tea. This study is intended to know the traders perspective on organic green tea.

## 1.3 OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

To analyse the marketing activities carried by the traders on sale of organic tea.

## 1.4 STUDY AREA AND SAMPLING DESIGN

For the purpose of study, Coonoor area was selected because Coonoor areas have large traders who were involved in the production and selling of organic tea. The questionnaire was distributed to 70 traders at random who have registered in the Coonoor tea board of which 2 traders have not properly filled the questionnaire and hence it was rejected and the 68 questionnaires were taken in to account and the analysis was carried out.

## 1.5 STATISTICAL TOOL USED

**Frequency analysis, Factor analysis, ANOVA.**

## 1.6 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE TRADERS

**Table 1: Gender of the Respondents**

S.No	Gender of the Respondents	Frequency	Percent
1	Male	46	67.6
2	Female	22	32.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100</b>

From the Table 1 it revealed that majority 67.6% of the respondents were male and 32.4% of the respondents were female.

**Table 2: Age group of the Respondents**

S.No	Age group of the respondents	Frequency	Percent
1	Less than 30 years	4	5.9
2	Between 31 – 40 years	27	39.7
3	Between 41 – 50 years	24	35.3
4	Above 50 years	13	19.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100</b>

From the Table 2 it can be inferred that 39.7 percent of the respondents were in the age group of 31 – 40 years. 35.3 percent of the respondents were in the age group of 41 - 50 years, 19.1 percent of the respondents were in the age group of above 50 years and 5.9 percent of the respondents are belonged to the age group of less than 30 years.

**Table 3: State the tenure of Experience**

S.No	State the tenure of experience	Frequency	Percent
1	Less than 5 years	8	11.8
2	6 – 10 years	12	17.6
3	11 – 15 years	24	35.3
4	More than 15 years	24	35.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100</b>

From the Table 3 it can be inferred that 70.6% of the respondents have 11 – 15 and more than 15 years of experience, sharing 35.3% respectively, 17.6% of the respondents have 6 - 10 years of experience and 11.8% of the respondents have less than 5 years of experience.

**Table 4: Level of Education**

S.No	Level of education	Frequency	Percent
1	School level	33	48.5
2	College	23	33.8
3	University	12	17.6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100</b>

From the Table 4 it revealed that majority of them are college level (33.3%) and 48.5% of them have completed school level.

**Table 5: Company Adopted Sales Promotion**

S.No	Company adopted sales promotion	Frequency	Percent
1	Adopted	53	77.9
2	Not Adopted	15	22.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 5 shows that 77.9% of the respondents have adopted sales promotion techniques and 22.1% of the respondents do not adopted sales promotion techniques.

**Table 6: Promotion Mix Adopted**

S.No	Promotion mix adopted	Frequency	Percent
1	Advertising	16	30.2
2	Personal selling	14	26.4
3	Sales promotion	16	30.2
4	Public relation	7	13.2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 6 shows that 60.4% of the respondents have adopted both sales promotion and advertising as their promotion mix sharing 30.2% respectively, 26.4% of the respondents adopted personal selling and 13.2% of the respondent use public relation as their promotion mix.

**Table 7: Business Alliance Made**

S.No	Business alliance	Frequency	Percent
1	Joint venture	24	35.3
2	Licensing	20	29.4
3	Franchising	24	35.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 7 details the business alliance made by the traders. From the table it was understood that 70.6 percent of the respondents have adopted joint venture and franchising and a 29.4 percent of them have adopted licensing.

**Table 8: Type of Organic tea (Multiple Ticks)**

S.No	Type of Organic tea	Frequency	Percent
1	Green tea	40	58.8
2	CTC green tea	40	58.8
3	Organic ginger	39	57.4
4	Organic tulsi	40	58.8

5	Black tea	36	52.9
6	White tea	32	47.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 8 detail the type of tea which is traded. From the table it was understood that 176.4 percent of the respondents were involved in the trading of green tea, CTC green tea, and Organic Tulsi Tea sharing 58.8 percent respectively. 57.4 percent of the respondents were involved in Organic ginger tea, 52.9 percent of them were involved in the trade of black tea, and a least of 47.1 percent of them were involved in white tea.

**Table 9: Differentiation**

S.No	Differentiation	Frequency	Percent
1	Variety	16	23.5
2	Quality	26	38.2
3	Brand	16	23.5
4	Package	10	14.7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 9 shows that 38.2 of the respondents provide quality product, 47% of the respondent provide both variety and branded products, sharing 23.5% respectively and 14.7% of the respondents provide good packaged product.

**Table 10: Cost Control Method**

S.No	Company focus on cost control methods	Frequency	Percent
1	Focused	61	89.7
2	Not focused	7	10.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 10 shows that 89.7% of the respondents have focused cost control method and 10.3% of the respondents do not focus cost control method.

**Table 11: Technology your Company Adopts**

S.No	Technology your company adopts	Frequency	Percent
1	E – commerce	15	22.1
2	ERP	19	27.9
3	Both	34	50.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 11 shows that 50% of the respondents adopted both E- Commerce and ERPO system, 27.9% of the respondents adopted only ERP method and 22.2% of the respondents adopted E – Commerce method.

**1.7 Opinion of the traders on the marketing activities carried for the sale of organic tea.**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.764
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1134.990
	df	325
	Sig.	.000

	Initial	Extraction
The budget for creating awareness is getting increased every year	1.000	.709
The advertising agency creates wilful advertisements	1.000	.729
Quality is perfectly maintained	1.000	.606
Quality standards on different markets is assured	1.000	.817
Achieving short delivery time is the secret of success	1.000	.736
Zero cost based is the technique adopted to monitor sales	1.000	.690
Many product line are in the pipe line	1.000	.736
Most customers prefer value added organic tea.	1.000	.596
The products of our company is shelved in all the stores	1.000	.683
Our products are displayed as point of sales	1.000	.859
Different flavours add business volume	1.000	.817
The package differentiation gains more attention	1.000	.649
All the departments of the organisation use E commerce	1.000	.572
ERP is systematically practiced	1.000	.737
Every year new machines are procure to meet competition	1.000	.795
The equipment are mostly imported	1.000	.871
Value added tea brings good business	1.000	.681
All the markets covered has a huge demand for organic tea.	1.000	.707
The packaging materials, raw materials for tea are purchased in huge quantity to reduce cost	1.000	.690
Proper merchandising for the product is made	1.000	.668
The sales people device the volume	1.000	.820
The distributors make our business is appropriately made	1.000	.781
Franchising is the best strategy for improving sales	1.000	.685
The different size, packs have a good impact on sales	1.000	.749
The vision of the organisation is to create more awareness	1.000	.756
The organisation have business alliances with all sorts of distributors	1.000	.757
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

In Table Bartlett's test of sphere city and KAISER MEYER OLKIN measures of sample adequacy were used to test the appropriateness of the factor model. Bartlett's test was used to test the null hypothesis that the variables of this study are not correlated. Since the approximate chi square value is 1134.990 is significant at 5% level, the test leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

The value of KMO statistics (0.764) was also large and it revealed that factor analysis might be considered as an appropriate technique for analysing the correlation matrix. The communality table showed the initial and extraction values.

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	8.150	31.345	31.345	8.150	31.345	31.345	4.894	18.824	18.824
2	4.135	15.904	47.249	4.135	15.904	47.249	4.132	15.891	34.715
3	2.363	9.089	56.338	2.363	9.089	56.338	4.093	15.741	50.457
4	2.046	7.871	64.208	2.046	7.871	64.208	2.744	10.553	61.010
5	1.246	4.793	69.002	1.246	4.793	69.002	1.791	6.888	67.897
6	.957	3.681	72.682	.957	3.681	72.682	1.244	4.785	72.682

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

From the table it was observed that the labelled "Initial Eigen Values" gives the EIGEN values. The EIGEN Value for a factor indicates the "Total Variance" attributed to the factor. From the extraction sum of squared loadings, it was learnt that the

- I factor accounted for the variance of 8.150 which was 31.345%.
- The II factor accounted for the variance of 4.135 which was 15.904%
- The III factor accounted for the variance of 2.363 which was 9.089%
- The IV factor accounted for the variance of 2.046 which was 7.871%
- The V factor accounted for the variance of 1.246 which was 4.793%
- The VI components extracted accounted for total cumulative variance of 72.682%.

### Determination of factors based on Eigen Values

In this approach only factors with Eigen values greater than 1.00 are retained and the other factors are not included in this model. The six components possessing the Eigen values which were greater than 1.0 were taken as the components extracted.

	Component						Labelled as
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
The vision of the organisation is to create more awareness	.862						Market promotion
The budget for creating awareness is getting increased every year	.654						
The advertising agency creates wilful advertisements	.768						

The products of our company is shelved in all the stores	.575							
Our products are displayed as point of sales	.880							
Proper merchandising for the product is made	.779							
The sales people device the volume	.877							
The organisation have business alliances with all sorts of distributors		.806					Strategic partnership	
The distributors make our business is appropriately made		.784						
Franchising is the best strategy for improving sales		.715						
Different flavours add business volume			.888				Product diversification	
The package differentiation gains more attention			.564					
The different size, packs have a good impact on sales			.839					
Quality is perfectly maintained			.629					
Quality standards on different markets is assured			.833				Cost leadership	
The packaging materials, raw materials for tea are purchased in huge quantity to reduce cost				.693				
Achieving short delivery time is the secret of success				.581				
Zero cost based is the technique adopted to monitor sales				.758				
All the departments of the organisation use E-commerce					.517		Technological Innovation	
ERP is systematically practiced					.824			
Every year new machines are procure to meet competition					.835			
The equipment's are mostly imported					.681			
Value added tea brings good business						.695	Value addition	
All the markets covered has a huge demand for organic tea.						.701		
Many product line are in the pipe line						.734		
Most customers prefer value added organic tea.						.601		
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.								
a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.								

### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)

**H0:** There was no significant difference among demographic profile of the respondents and market promotion.

**H1:** There was significant difference among demographic profile of the respondents and market promotion.

**Table 16: ANOVA**

	Sum of	df	Mean	F	Sig.	Result
--	--------	----	------	---	------	--------

Gender of the respondents	Between Groups	23.821	17	1.401	3.824	0.000	S
	Within Groups	17.956	49	0.366			
	Total	41.776	66				
Age group of the respondents	Between Groups	28.936	17	1.702	2.593	0.006	S
	Within Groups	32.168	49	0.656			
	Total	61.104	66				
State the tenure of experience	Between Groups	25.459	17	1.498	3.220	0.000	S
	Within Groups	22.789	49	0.465			
	Total	48.248	66				
Level of education	Between Groups	22.337	17	1.314	3.769	0.000	S
	Within Groups	17.081	49	0.349			
	Total	39.418	66				
Sales promotion	Between Groups	33.545	17	1.973	5.352	0.000	S
	Within Groups	18.066	49	0.369			
	Total	51.611	66				
Promotion mix adopted	Between Groups	37.253	14	2.661	2.564	0.024	S
	Within Groups	38.403	37	1.038			
	Total	75.656	51				
Business alliance you make	Between Groups	20.029	17	1.178	3.405	0.000	S
	Within Groups	16.956	49	0.346			
	Total	36.985	66				
Made differentiate	Between Groups	44.686	17	2.629	2.657	0.022	S
	Within Groups	48.478	49	0.989			
	Total	93.164	66				
Company focus on cost control methods	Between Groups	1.916	17	0.113	1.269	0.252	NS
	Within Groups	4.353	49	0.089			
	Total	6.269	66				
Technology your company adopts	Between Groups	26.316	17	1.548	2.059	0.031	S
	Within Groups	36.848	49	0.752			
	Total	63.164	66				

The above table indicates demographic profile of the respondents do not have significant difference between market promotions. Hence, the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) was rejected in 9 cases and the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) was accepted for in 1 case.

Hence, it was concluded that gender, age group, experience, education, sales promotion, promotion mix adopted, business alliance, differentiation and technology adopted have significant difference between market promotions

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There was no significant difference among demographic profile of the respondents and strategic partnership.



**H1:** There was significant difference among demographic profile of the respondents and strategic partnership.

		Sum of	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	Between Groups	14.618	12	1.218	5.948	0.000
	Within Groups	11.264	55	0.205		
	Total	25.882	67			
Age group	Between Groups	19.571	12	1.631	2.282	0.021
	Within Groups	39.312	55	0.715		
	Total	58.883				
Tenure of experience	Between Groups	23.761	12	1.980	2.017	0.027
	Within Groups	54.004	55	0.982		
	Total	77.765	67			
Level of education	Between Groups	26.286	12	2.191	3.738	0.000
	Within Groups	32.229	55	0.586		
	Total	58.515	67			
Sales promotion	Between Groups	9.231	12	0.769	4.044	0.000
	Within Groups	10.461	55	0.190		
	Total	19.692	67			
Promotion mix adopted	Between Groups	30.785	12	2.565	2.072	0.024
	Within Groups	49.517	40	1.238		
	Total	80.302	52			
Business alliance	Between Groups	29.365	12	2.447	3.484	0.000
	Within Groups	38.635	55	0.702		
	Total	68	67			
Differentiation	Between Groups	29.839	12	2.487	2.430	0.023
	Within Groups	56.279	55	1.023		
	Total	86.118	67			
Cost control methods	Between Groups	17.829	12	1.486	5.671	0.000
	Within Groups	14.41	55	0.262		
	Total	32.239	67			
Technology	Between Groups	14.623	12	1.219	2.229	0.027
	Within Groups	30.068	55	0.547		
	Total	44.691	67			

The above table indicates demographic profile of the respondents do not have significant difference between strategic partnership. Hence, the null hypothesis (H0) was rejected in all the 10 cases.

Hence, it was concluded that gender, age group, experience, education, sales promotion, promotion mix adopted, business alliance, differentiation, cost control and technology adopted have significant difference between strategic partnership

**H0:** There was no significant difference among demographic profile of the respondents and product diversification.

**H1:** There was significant difference among demographic profile of the respondents and product diversification.

Table 18: ANOVA						
		Sum of	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	Between Groups	2.134	11	0.194	0.852	0.590
	Within Groups	12.748	56	0.228		
	Total	14.882	67			
Age group	Between Groups	25.159	11	2.287	2.929	0.000
	Within Groups	43.724	56	0.781		
	Total	68.883	67			
Tenure of experience	Between Groups	16.876	11	1.534	2.101	0.011
	Within Groups	40.888	56	0.730		
	Total	57.764	67			
Level of education	Between Groups	27.444	11	2.495	4.497	0.000
	Within Groups	31.071	56	0.555		
	Total	58.515	67			
Sales promotion	Between Groups	22.055	11	2.005	5.707	0.000
	Within Groups	19.673	56	0.351		
	Total	41.728	67			
Promotion mix adopted	Between Groups	24.719	11	2.247	2.917	0.006
	Within Groups	31.583	41	0.770		
	Total	56.302	52			
Business alliance	Between Groups	16.966	11	1.542	2.105	0.011
	Within Groups	41.034	56	0.733		
	Total	58	67			
Differentiation	Between Groups	23.491	11	2.136	2.272	0.017
	Within Groups	52.627	56	0.940		
	Total	76.118	67			
Cost control methods	Between Groups	6.412	11	0.583	5.564	0.000
	Within Groups	5.867	56	0.105		
	Total	12.279	67			
Technology	Between Groups	17.531	11	1.594	2.468	0.015
	Within Groups	36.16	56	0.646		
	Total	53.691	67			

The above table indicates demographic profile of the respondents do not have significant difference between product diversification. Hence, the null (H0) is rejected in 9 cases and the alternative hypothesis (H1) was accepted for a first case.

Hence, it is concluded that age group, experience, education, sales promotion, promotion mix adopted, business alliance, differentiation, cost control and technology adopted have significant difference between product diversification.

**H0:** There was no significant difference among demographic profile of the respondents and Cost leadership.

**H1:** There was significant difference among demographic profile of the respondents and Cost leadership.

		Sum of	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	Between Groups	11.762	10	1.176	5.110	0.000
	Within Groups	13.12	57	0.230		
	Total	24.882	67			
Age group	Between Groups	12.738	10	1.274	2.009	0.049
	Within Groups	36.145	57	0.634		
	Total	48.883	67			
Tenure of experience	Between Groups	40.599	10	4.060	2.586	0.007
	Within Groups	89.482	57	1.570		
	Total	67.765	67			
Level of education	Between Groups	23.561	10	2.356	3.842	0.000
	Within Groups	34.954	57	0.613		
	Total	58.515	67			
Sales promotion	Between Groups	1.381	10	0.138	0.763	0.663
	Within Groups	10.311	57	0.181		
	Total	11.692	67			
Promotion mix adopted	Between Groups	8.06	10	0.806	0.702	0.717
	Within Groups	48.242	42	1.149		
	Total	56.302	52			
Business alliance	Between Groups	24.919	10	2.492	3.296	0.000
	Within Groups	43.09	57	0.756		
	Total	68.009	67			
Differentiation	Between Groups	25.552	10	2.555	2.621	0.006
	Within Groups	55.567	57	0.975		
	Total	81.119	67			
Cost control methods	Between Groups	3.565	10	0.357	4.037	0.000
	Within Groups	5.033	57	0.088		
	Total	8.598	67			
Technology	Between Groups	17.006	10	1.701	2.642	0.006
	Within Groups	36.686	57	0.644		
	Total	53.692	67			

The above table indicates demographic profile of the respondents do not have significant difference between Cost leadership. Hence, the null (H<sub>0</sub>) was rejected in 8 cases and the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) was accepted for in 2 cases.

Hence, it is concluded that gender, age group, experience, education, business alliance, differentiation, cost control and technology adopted have significant difference between Cost leadership.

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There was no significant difference among demographic profile of the respondents and technological innovation.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** There was significant difference among demographic profile of the respondents and technological innovation.

**Table 20: ANOVA**

		Sum of	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	Between Groups	12.787	13	0.984	4.392	0.000
	Within Groups	12.095	54	0.224		
	Total	24.882	67			
Age group	Between Groups	27.942	13	2.149	2.835	0.000
	Within Groups	40.94	54	0.758		
	Total	68.882	67			
Tenure of experience	Between Groups	22.681	13	1.745	3.033	0.000
	Within Groups	31.058	54	0.575		
	Total	53.739	67			
Level of education	Between Groups	27.759	13	2.135	3.749	0.000
	Within Groups	30.756	54	0.570		
	Total	58.515	67			
Sales promotion	Between Groups	2.144	13	0.165	0.933	0.527
	Within Groups	9.548	54	0.177		
	Total	11.692	67			
Promotion mix adopted	Between Groups	37.919	13	2.917	4.008	0.000
	Within Groups	28.383	39	0.728		
	Total	66.302	52			
Business alliance	Between Groups	22.761	13	1.751	2.608	0.000
	Within Groups	36.25	54	0.671		
	Total	59.011	67			
Differentiation	Between Groups	26.986	13	2.076	2.865	0.000
	Within Groups	39.132	54	0.725		
	Total	66.118	67			
Cost control methods	Between Groups	9.747	13	0.750	7.319	0.000
	Within Groups	5.532	54	0.102		
	Total	15.279	67			
Technology	Between Groups	15.794	13	1.215	2.352	0.000

	Within Groups	27.896	54	0.517		
	Total	43.69	67			

The above table indicates demographic profile of the respondents do not have significant difference between technological innovation. Hence, the null (H<sub>0</sub>) is rejected in 9 cases and the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) was accepted for case I.

Hence, it was concluded that gender, age group, experience, education, promotion mix adopted, business alliance, differentiation, cost control and technology adopted have significant difference between technological innovation.

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There was no significant difference among demographic profile of the respondents and value addition.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** There was significant difference among demographic profile of the respondents and value addition.

**Table 21: ANOVA**

		Sum of	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	Between Groups	11.058	8	1.382	5.899	0.000
	Within Groups	13.824	59	0.234		
	Total	24.882	67			
Age group	Between Groups	17.61	8	2.201	3.146	0.000
	Within Groups	41.282	59	0.700		
	Total	58.892	67			
Tenure of experience	Between Groups	26.937	8	3.367	3.266	0.000
	Within Groups	60.828	59	1.031		
	Total	87.765	67			
Level of education	Between Groups	22.861	8	2.858	4.729	0.000
	Within Groups	35.654	59	0.604		
	Total	58.515	67			
Sales promotion	Between Groups	6.731	8	0.841	4.529	0.000
	Within Groups	10.96	59	0.186		
	Total	17.691	67			
Promotion mix adopted	Between Groups	27.216	8	3.402	3.050	0.000
	Within Groups	49.086	44	1.116		
	Total	76.302	52			
Business alliance	Between Groups	14.751	8	1.844	2.515	0.027
	Within Groups	43.249	59	0.733		
	Total	58	67			
Differentiation	Between Groups	6.157	8	0.770	0.757	0.641
	Within Groups	59.961	59	1.016		
	Total	66.118	67			
Cost control methods	Between Groups	1.836	8	0.230	3.047	0.000
	Within Groups	4.444	59	0.075		
	Total	6.28	67			

Technology	Between Groups	25.391	8	3.174	4.890	0.000
	Within Groups	38.296	59	0.649		
	Total	63.687	67			

The above table indicates demographic profile of the respondents do not have significant difference between value addition. Hence, the null (H<sub>0</sub>) was rejected in 8 cases and the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) was accepted for in 1 case.

Hence, it was concluded that gender, age group, experience, education, sales promotion, promotion mix adopted, business alliance, cost control and technology adopted have significant difference between value addition.

## 1.8 CONCLUSION

Market advancement was observed to be factually huge in clarifying fare tea esteem expansion and along these lines so as to endure and thrive in a quickly evolving condition; the organizations ought to endeavour to meet the “customers” different requirements and inclinations. The organizations should execute suitable promoting methodologies and take quick response to the challenge. The legislature ought to make an empowering situation for organizations to improve their general aggressiveness in the business. The administrative issues ought to energize as opposed to hampering business achievement. This should be possible by helping the trading advancement board in marking Kenya for example in the Brand Kenya stage where the travel industry is showcased, the tea subsector can likewise be elevated to increase worldwide deceivability. The legislature ought to likewise help packers in the marking and in conveyance methodologies which can likewise help in creation or framing of worldwide offices to advertise and advance organic tea.

## 1.9 REFERENCES

- Foekens, W., Leeflang, S.H. & Wittink, D.R. (2009). Varying Parameter Models to Accommodate Dynamic Promotion Effects. *Journal of Econometrics*, 89, 249–268.
- Furseth, P. & Cuthbertson, R. (2013). The service innovation triangle: a tool for exploring value creation through service innovation. *International Journal, Technology Marketing*, 8 (2).
- Gilmore, A. & Carson, D. (2009). Innovative Marketing in SMEs. *European Journal of Marketing*, 43 (1/2), 46-61.
- Grankvist, A. Kollberg, C. & Person, A. (2004). *Promotion Strategies for Banking Services*. Case Study of Nordea in Estonia UnPublished Master’s Thesis. Lulea: Lulea University of Technology.
- International Tea Committee, (2010). *Global Tea Journal* (ITC)/WTO, (2010).