

IS LIFE INSURANCE A SOCIAL SECURITY TOOL OR AN INVESTMENT? POST REFORMS KARNATAKA EXPERIENCE

Mahesh R. Rajgopal

Associate Professor, Business Administration, University of Mysore, Mysore, India.

Email-id:maheshrajgopal@yahoo.com

Abstract Life insurance is regarded as an essential commodity in terms of social security, which reduces or eliminates the risk of life and property. But delivering world class insurance products to the clientele has been one of the priorities for the policy makers at the time of liberalizing the insurance market in India. Hence, India has moved from the traditional insurance products that function as social security to products that are linked to investments in stock market.

The present study attempts to know whether the Indian insurance buyers still perceive life insurance as a social security tool or as an attractive investment option linked to equity after deregulation. Various statistical analyses are carried out using tools such as Descriptive statistics, ANOVA, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, Tukey-HSD Multiple Comparisons to arrive at concrete findings and based on which suggestions are offered.

Keywords: Deregulation, Social Security, ULIPs, Demographic Variable, Economic Variable, Tukey-HSD Multiple post hoc Test, and ANOVA.

1. INTRODUCTION

Life insurance is originally conceived as a social security tool which covers the life risk of a person against death, old age, loss of income, etc. But as the life insurance industry went for a major transformation because of deregulation process initiated during 2000 that led to entry of private life insurance companies, investment element of life insurance started getting attention in the form of Unit Linked Insurance Policies that combines cover for life risk, and also an attractive investment option.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Christiansen and Niels (1988) in their study focused on the consumer perception of products, services and companies of the U.S. life insurance industry. They found that life insurance companies shared a common theme of negative consumer perceptions; but found a positive change in the consumer's view of life insurance policies for funding college education for their children; and concluded that the role of insurance agents in affecting consumer perception is highly significant.

Lawrence A. Crosby et al. (1991) in their research article

conclude that an investor rebating appears to delay consumer purchase behavior of insurance products. Alternatively, this delay is of value only if the improved product fit and/or price reduction offsets the extended exposure of mortality risk incurred due to inadequate coverage and cost of search.

Thorsten Beck and Ian Webb (2003) found that economic indicators such as inflation, income per capita, banking sector development and religious and institutional indicators are the robust predictors of the use of life insurance. They opine that education, life expectancy, the young dependency ratio, and the size of the social security system appear to have no robust association with life insurance consumption. Their results highlight the importance of price stability and banking sector development in fully realizing the savings and investment functions of life insurance of an economy.

Naren N Joshi (2003), in a prominent study highlights changing customer expectations in the sector during the post-liberalization period in India. This is a sample survey conducted in five major metros in the country, and the results show that liberalization of the sector has helped improve it and increase customer satisfaction.

Madhukar Palli (2006) in his report focuses on risk security, the core product of life insurance. He provides estimates of the Life Insurance Gap to maintain dependents' living

standards after the death of the primary wage earner. Because inadequately protected families often put burden on public resources for their welfare. The primary drivers of demand for risk security are Age, Income, Affordability, Wealth, and finally the desire to protect income from Inflation. Though aggregate demand is driven by these factors, various researches have shown that there is little correlation between a specific family's need for security and its actual purchase of insurance. Many families, especially young ones, have either no risk security or inadequate security. This report examines the extent to which people are under-insured by measuring a "life assurance security gap". This gap is computed as the mean ratio of recommended insurance to household earnings and the mean ratio of actual insurance to household earnings.

Tanmay Acharya et al. (2006) in their article stressed upon changes in tastes and preferences of the consumers because of the fast changing liberalization policies in Indian insurance sector. The paper analyses the factors that influence the buying decision of the consumer regarding any general insurance policy. The result of the research reveals that the purchasing decision of the consumer depends on quality, accessibility, company type, recommendations, and promptness of service.

Chadha S. K. and Deepa Kapoor (2008) showed that customers' insurance buying decision is influenced by customer relationship management practices and reputation of the company. In a competitive market, each of the players should create its niche domain. Only this would ensure that the customer derives the best benefits out of the competition. Branding life insurance is thus important as the companies have to realize the inevitability of creating an impression in the minds of the consumers, which would help them in facing the competition.

3. NEED FOR THE STUDY

The studies conducted so far in insurance industry have been predominantly on the perceptions of Indian consumers towards life insurance services offered by LIC. After liberalization, private sector insurance companies are also making an impact on life insurance buyers through innovations in products. This has changed the insurance scenario. No study has been undertaken to understand and analyze this in detail. The present study attempts to bridge this gap by analyzing significant changes in the perception of Indian insurance buyers as to whether life insurance is still social security tool or investment option post liberalization.

4. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The following are the objectives of the present study:

1. To measure the significant perceptions of life insurance buyers towards life insurance as a social security tool;
2. To measure the significant perception of insurance buyers towards life insurance as a social security tool on the basis of demographic variables;
3. To measure the significant perception of insurance buyers towards life insurance as a social security tool on the basis of economic variables; and
4. To offer suggestions based on the findings.

5. MAIN HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

The following are the main hypotheses for the present research study:

H0: Majority of the life insurance buyers do not view life insurance as a social security tool.

H1: Majority of the life insurance buyers view life insurance as a social security tool.

5.1. Sub Hypotheses

H0: There is no significant difference among life insurance buyers on the basis of demographic variables with respect to their perception towards life insurance as a social security tool.

H1: There is a significant difference among life insurance buyers on the basis of demographic variables with respect to their perception towards life insurance as a social security tool.

H0: There is no significant difference among life insurance buyers on the basis of economic variables with respect to their perception towards life insurance as a social security tool.

H1: There is a significant difference among life insurance buyers on the basis of economic variables with respect to their perception towards life insurance as a social security tool.

6. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study attempts to analyze the life insurance buyers' perception towards various aspects of life insurance after India embarked on the journey of deregulation of life insurance industry since 2001. Variables such as age, gender, occupation, income, marital status, number of dependents, qualification, location etc., have been analyzed thoroughly in this study. The present study covers the insurance buyers of 5 major areas in Karnataka viz., Bangalore, Mysore, Mangalore-Udupi, Hubli-Dharwar, and Shimoga.

7. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

A combination of exploratory and descriptive research design is used for conducting this study. This study required primary data. Primary data on perceptions of the insurance buyers was collected through a structured questionnaire. It was administered to the targeted respondents in selected places in Karnataka. The population of the study consists of all current insurance buyers of life insurance in Karnataka. To investigate the significant perceptions of insurance buyers, respondents have been selected on convenience sampling basis which is a non-probability sampling technique. 500 questionnaires were administered but 394 respondents responded. These variables are measured using 5 point Likert scale with the following responses: Strongly Agree=1, Agree = 2, Cannot Say = 3, Disagree =4 and Strongly Disagree =5.

For data analysis, mean and standard deviation are used for descriptive statistics. Cronbach's alpha is used for determining the predictive validity and reliability of the variables used in the study (Table 1). The hypotheses are tested using One Sample T-test, ANOVA, Levene's Test for equality of variances, Tukey-HSD Multiple post hoc test. The data collected from respondents are analyzed with the help of SPSS.

8. DATA ANALYSIS

Indian life insurance market thus traveled from loosely regulated non-standardized product based market to a well-regulated competitive market with virtually standardized life insurance products. This part of the study attempts to understand whether life insurance buyers still view life insurance as a social security tool or as investment after deregulation of insurance sector, through various statistical analyses.

Table 2 reveals that the mean scores for the above statements range between 2.0812 to 2.9315. And the standard deviation for all the statements being less than 1 indicates that there is consistency in the views expressed by the respondents, though marginal differences do exist among the insurance buyers in their perception towards need for life insurance services offered by LIC.

There is a very strong affirmation of the fact that tax benefit is the most important factor in investing in life insurance as indicated by the least mean score of 2.0812. This is followed by the next least mean score (2.2919) for statement, "Life insurance takes care of old age through assurance of pension after retirement". Next positive agreement is for the statement, "Life insurance buyers buy policies to take care of funding of their children's future necessities," with a mean score of 2.3680. The least mean score is for the statement, "Life insurance is an attractive investment option

linked to equity," with a mean score of 2.9315. Therefore, it can be inferred that life insurance is essentially bought as a social security instrument rather than an investment.

8.1. Testing of Main Hypothesis

To test the main hypothesis whether majority of the life insurance buyers view life insurance as a social security tool or not, one sample T test is used with assumed mean 3. The calculated mean value of "perception towards life insurance as a social security tool" is less than the assumed mean 3, i.e., 2.4742, and the observed P value 0.000 is less than 0.05. This result indicates that the above null hypothesis that says "Majority of the life insurance buyers do not view life insurance as a social security tool" is rejected and the alternative hypothesis that says "Majority of the life insurance buyers view life insurance as a social security tool" is accepted.

8.2. Testing of Sub-Hypotheses

Further, the above statements are tested on the basis of various demographic variables such as age, gender, qualification, occupation, marital status, number of dependents, location, and economic variables such as monthly income and savings to analyze the variances among these variables with respect to the statements using ANOVA, Levene's Test for Equality of Variance, and Multiple HSD post hoc tests.

After analyzing the results of ANOVA (Table 4), and Levene's Test for Equality of Variance (Table 6) it is found that there is a significant difference in the opinions of life insurance buyers on the basis demographic variables such as age, gender, marital status, number of dependents, educational qualification, occupation, and location with respect to their perception towards life insurance post deregulation since the observed p value (0.000) is less than 0.05 on all demographic variables. Thus, the decision is to reject the null hypothesis: "There is no significant difference among Indian insurance buyers on the basis of demographic variables with respect to their perception towards their need for buying life insurance," and accept the alternative hypothesis: "There is significant difference among Indian insurance buyers on the basis of demographic variables with respect to their perception towards their need for buying life insurance".

After analyzing the results of ANOVA Table 5, it is found that there is a significant difference in the opinions of Indian insurance buyers on the basis of economic variables such as monthly income and monthly savings with respect to their perception towards life insurance post deregulation since the observed p value (0.000) is less than 0.05 on all economic variables. Thus, the decision is to reject the null

hypothesis: “There is no significant difference among Indian insurance buyers on the basis of economic variables with respect to their perception towards their need for buying life insurance,” and accept the alternative hypothesis: “There is significant difference among Indian insurance buyers on the basis of economic variables with respect to their perception towards their need for buying life insurance”.

9. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

9.1. Overall Findings

As per the results of the study, tax benefit is the most important factor in investing in life insurance. The next important parameter to buy life insurance is that it takes care of old age through assurance of pension after retirement. Next positive agreement is for the statement, “Life insurance buyers buy policies to take care of funding of their children’s future necessities.” The least mean score is for the statement, “Life insurance is an attractive investment option linked to equity”. Therefore, it can be inferred that life insurance is essentially bought as a social security instrument rather than an investment.

9.2. Findings by Demographic and Economic Variables

a. Age

After analyzing the results of ANOVA (Table 4), it is found that there is a significant difference in the opinions of life insurance buyers on the basis of the age with respect to need for buying life insurance, since the observed p value (0.000) is less than 0.05.

The results of Tukey-HSD Multiple Comparisons (Table 8) indicate that there is no significant difference between the perception of insurance buyers in the age group 18-30 and 31-46 ($1.000 > 0.05$), with age group 18-30 and 46-60 ($0.173 > 0.05$), with age group 31-45 and 46-60 ($0.167 > 0.05$), and hence they share the same perceptions.

It is evident from the above analysis that age group 18-30 and 31-45 share similar views indicating that these two groups look at the investment part of life insurance whereas the more aged respondents have inclination towards looking at life insurance as a social security tool.

b. Gender

The results from independent samples t-test (Table 5) indicate that the observed P value is less than set P value of 0.05, and therefore, it can be inferred that there is a highly significant difference between the perception of males and females as to their perceptions towards life insurance as a social security tool.

The mean scores and standard deviation (Table 6) for male respondents are 2.3701 and 0.66539 respectively, whereas for female respondents the mean and the standard deviation are 2.6529 and 0.61348 respectively. Male respondents more positively perceive life insurance as a social security tool compared to their female counterparts. But, female respondents are relatively more consistent with their opinions compared to male respondents.

c. Qualification

As revealed in the ANOVA (Table 4), the F value and P value are 32.375 and 0.000 ($P < 0.05$) respectively. The results indicate that there is a significant difference in the need for buying life insurance among the life insurance buyers based on their qualifications like matriculation, graduation, post-graduation, and others.

The Tukey HSD test results (Table 9) indicate that there is no significant difference between the awareness of insurance buyers whose qualification is matriculation and others ($0.109 > 0.05$), and also graduation and post-graduation share same perceptions ($0.999 > 0.05$). It can be noted that the opinions of graduation and post-graduation perfectly correlate and fall in line with the concept of life insurance being a social security tool. Whereas respondents belonging to matriculation and others are not aware of the fact that life insurance is a social security tool.

d. Occupation

The results of ANOVA (Table 4) the F value and P value are 32.585 and 0.000 ($P < 0.05$) respectively. The results indicate that there is a significant difference in the need for buying life insurance among the life insurance buyers in various occupations like government service, business, professionals, private service, retired, and students as the observed significance value is less than 0.05.

The Tukey HSD test results (Table 10) indicate that there is no significant difference between the perception of insurance buyers in the occupations of government service and professionals ($0.622 > 0.05$), with private sector ($0.367 > 0.05$), and with students ($0.398 > 0.05$), businessmen share same perceptions with professionals ($0.190 > 0.05$), with private services ($0.161 > 0.05$), and with students ($0.253 > 0.05$); private sector share the same perception with professionals ($1.000 > 0.05$), and with students ($1.000 > 0.05$).

It is vindicated in the above analysis that, the opinions of government service, businessmen and retired are inclined towards perceiving life insurance as a social security tool whereas professionals, private service, and students perceive life insurance as an investment tool also.

e. Marital Status

The results from independent samples t-test (Table 5) indicate that the observed P value is less than set P value of 0.05, and therefore, it can be inferred that there is a highly

significant difference between the perception of single and married respondents with respect to their need for buying life insurance.

The mean scores and standard deviation (Table 13) for single respondents are 2.667 and 0.3681 respectively whereas for married respondents the mean and the standard deviation are 2.936 and 0.5190 respectively. This indicates the single respondents would like to experiment with investment component of life insurance whereas married are more inclined towards social security aspect. Moreover, single respondents are relatively more consistent in their opinions compared to married respondents.

f. Number of Dependents:

From the results of ANOVA (Table 4), it is indicated that there is a significant difference in the need for buying life insurance among the life insurance buyers based on the number of dependents ranging from nil, one, two, three, and four and above like as the observed significance value is less than 0.05.

The Tukey HSD test (Table 12) results indicate that there is no significant difference between the awareness of insurance buyers with nil dependents and buyers with one dependent ($0.191 > 0.05$), with two dependents ($0.157 > 0.05$), with four and above ($0.059 > 0.05$), and two dependents with four and above ($0.986 > 0.05$).

Therefore, number of dependents is exerting considerable influence on whether the life insurance buyers perceive life insurance as social security tool or not, with the results above indicating that respondents with fewer dependents are willing to experiment life insurance as an investment, whereas respondents with three or more dependents solidly view life insurance as social security tool.

i. Location:

The results of ANOVA (Table 4) show that there is a significant difference in the need for buying life insurance among the life insurance buyers based on location which is categorized as urban, semi-urban, & rural as the observed significance value is less than 0.05.

The Tukey HSD test (Table 11) results indicate that there is no significant difference between the perception of insurance buyers from semi-urban area and buyers from the rural area ($0.058 > 0.05$), but there is a significant difference between the perception of insurance buyers in all other groups since the P value in other groups is less than 0.05. Respondents belonging to semi urban and rural have gone with life insurance as a social security instrument whereas only urban respondents have perceived life insurance as an investment also as evident above.

j. Household monthly income:

On the basis of the results of ANOVA (Table 7), it is shown that there is a significant difference in the need for buying life insurance among the life insurance buyers based on monthly income which is categorized as less than Rs. 10000, Rs. 10000-30000, Rs. 30000-50000 & Rs. 50000 and above, as the observed significance value is less than 0.05.

The Tukey HSD test (Table 13) results indicate that there is no significant difference between the perception of insurance buyers in the monthly income group of less than Rs. 10000 and Rs. 10000-30000 ($0.517 > 0.05$), with Rs. 30000-50000 ($0.614 > 0.05$); monthly income group of Rs. 30000-50000 and Rs. 50000 & above ($0.169 > 0.05$).

It can be seen that respondents belonging to income group with less than Rs.30000 have gone with the traditional products with social security as the focal point, whereas respondents with the income more than Rs.30000 have experimented with life insurance products that have equity exposure.

k. Household monthly savings:

As shown in the ANOVA (Table 7), the calculated P value 0.000 is less than the observed P value ($P < 0.05$). The results indicate that there is a significant difference in the need for buying life insurance among the life insurance buyers based on monthly savings.

The Tukey HSD test (Table 14) results indicate that there is no significant difference between the perception of insurance buyers in the monthly saving group of less than Rs. 1000 & Rs. 1000-3000 ($0.069 > 0.05$), group with Rs. 3000-5000 & Rs. 5000-10000 ($0.873 > 0.05$), with Rs. 10000 and above ($0.945 > 0.05$) & group with Rs. 5000-10000 & Rs. 10000 and above ($0.999 > 0.05$).

It can be noted that respondents who save less than Rs.3000 per month are inclined towards traditional life insurance products whereas respondents who save more Rs.3000 are willing to buy life insurance products that are linked to capital market.

10. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

After opening of Indian life insurance industry for private participation in 2000, the industry is witnessing dramatic changes in terms of a slew of new products and services, new channels of distribution along with the discernible shift in consumer preferences. But the results of this study show that life insurance is still being perceived as a social security tool. The investment angle of life insurance has not sunk into the insurance buyers mind as yet. Hence the following suggestions can be given.

1. Young insurance buyers have shown inclination towards buying life insurance products that are linked to equity. This is good sign for all insurers who can

effectively tap this market to maximum. At the same time, the benefits of having products that combine social security as well as investment should be campaigned more effectively to middle aged buyers who have better financial strength than the young buyers.

2. This study reveals that equity linked insurance products are more popular with only urban buyers since they have the exposure and access to technology through which they can manage their insurance accounts themselves. But majority of the semi-urban and rural affluent insurance buyers need to be targeted with these products through continuous advice with respect to managing their investments on line. Both public and private life insurers can take positive steps in this direction.
3. This study shows that only professionals and private employees have shown positive inclination towards investment linked insurance products. Whereas government officials and businessmen have remained non committal to buy this equity linked insurance products since the results of the study suggest that they have not experimented with such products. They do not know that they can follow the investments themselves and appropriately change their options according to the situation and still maximize their returns. The life insurers can think of effective e-CRM application to address this problem.

This study has shown that the investment angle of life insurance has penetrated only in certain segments of buyers like younger ones, businessmen, higher income groups, urban buyers, etc. If life insurance is projected as a combination of both social security as well as attractive investment linked to capital markets depending on the risk taking attitudes of the buyers, the life insurers can penetrate even better since majority of life insurance buyers are apprehensive about the exposure to equity. For this, the life insurers should take the lead in offering advices on a continuous basis to help the insurance buyers to take the decisions wisely.

11. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acharya, T., Mishra, H. & Sessaiah, S. V. (2006). Customer Preferences in General Insurance Industry in India. *The ICFAI Journal of Services Marketing*, September, 4(3), pp. 19-24.
- Beck, T., & Ian Webb, I. (2003). Economic, Demographic and Institutional Determinants of Life Insurance Consumption across Countries. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 17(1), pp. 51-88.
- Chadha, S. K., & Kapoor, D. (2008). An Attribute Based Perceptual Mapping of the Selected Private Life Insurance Companies: An Empirical Study in Ludhiana. *The Journal of Business Perspective*, 12(3), pp. 53-60.
- Christiansen, & Neils. (1988). Consumer Perception and the Life Insurance Industry. *The Journal of the American Society of CLU & CHFC*, 42 (2), pp. 9-10.
- Crosby, L. A. & Jacobs, R. S. (1991). Effects of Life Insurance Price Rebating on Simulated Sales Encounters. *The Journal of Risk and Insurance*, 58 (4), pp. 583-615.
- Dagudu, V. R. (2006). Internet Impact on Insurance Distribution. *The Icfai Journal of Services Marketing*, 4(4), pp. 23-27.
- Joshi, N. N. (2003). Changing Customer Expectations in the Post Liberalization Era. Presentation at the FORTE Conference organized by FICCI, New Delhi.
- Oza, A. (2009). Consumer Education in Insurance-Towards Correct Risk Perception. *IRDA Journal*, March, 7(3), pp. 30-32.
- Palli, M. (2006). A Study on Assessing Life Insurance Potential in India. *Bimaquest*, 6(2), pp. 22-38.
- Srivatsava, A. (2004). Effect of Demographical Factors in Consumer Buying Behavior - A Study with Specific Reference to Indian Life Insurance Industry. *Journal of Synthesis*, pp. 34-37.
- The Hartford Financial Services Group Inc. (2003). Life Insurance Perception Gap American Banker. 00027561, 168(81), pp. 19.

Websites

www.Irdaindia.org
www.licindia.com
www.birlasunlife.com
www.indiainfoline.com

ANNEXURE: [FIELD SURVEY DATA]**Table 1: Result of Reliability Analysis of Life Insurance Variables**

Sl. No.	Variables	No. of Statements	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items
1	Perception about need for life insurance	6	0.719	0.716

Source: Field Survey

Table 2: Mean Score and Standard Deviation for the Need for Buying Life Insurance

Sl. No.	Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Tax benefit is the most important aspect of buying life insurance policies.	394	2.0812	1.01816
2	Life insurance is an attractive investment option linked to equity.	394	2.9315	1.40442
3	Life insurance gives permanent risk cover for income replacement in case of death or disability.	394	2.7944	1.48816
4	Life insurance buyers buy policies to take care of funding of their children's future necessities.	394	2.3680	1.20393
5	Life insurance takes care of old age through assurance of pension after retirement.	394	2.2919	1.08826
6	Investment in life insurance offers money back guarantees that can be used in emergencies.	394	2.3782	1.20078
	Aggregate Mean and Standard Deviation	394	2.4742	.66025

Table 3: T Test Statistics - One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 3					
	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Perception towards need for buying life insurance	-15.807	393	.000	-0.5258	-0.5912	-0.4604

Table 4: ANOVA Test Statistics (Demographic Variables)

Demographics variables		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between groups	5339.725	3	1779.908	82.016	.000
	Within groups	8463.760	390	21.702		
	Total	13803.485	393			
Qualifications	Between groups	2752.178	3	917.393	32.375	.000
	Within groups	11051.307	390	28.337		
	Total	13803.485	393			
Occupation	Between groups	4082.060	5	816.412	32.585	.000
	Within groups	9721.425	388	25.055		
	Total	13803.485	393			
Number of dependents	Between Groups	2152.967	5	430.593	14.340	.000
	Within Groups	11650.518	388	30.027		
	Total	13803.485	393			
Location	Between groups	3113.903	3	1037.968	37.869	.000
	Within groups	10689.582	390	27.409		
	Total	13803.485	393			

Table 5: Group Statistics (Demographic Variables)

Particulars		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Marital status	Single	120	2.667	.3681	.44257
	Married	274	2.936	.5190	.37382
Gender	Male	249	2.3701	.66539	.37272
	Female	145	2.6529	.61348	.48343

Table 6: Levene's Test for Equality of Variance (Demographic Variables)

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T – test for equality of Means							
		F	Sig.		F	Df	Sig. (2 tailed)	Mean Difference	Standard error diff	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
										Lower	Upper
Gender	Equal variances assumed	1.463	.227	-3.171	392	.002	-1.94092	.61209	-3.14431	-.73753	
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.180	303.754	.002	-1.94092	.61043	-3.14213	-.73972	
Marital status	Equal variances assumed	23.993	.000	-4.046	392	.000	-2.57524	.63643	-3.82648	-1.32401	
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.445	285.933	.000	-2.57524	.57932	-3.71551	-1.43497	

Table 7: ANOVA Test Statistics (Economic Variables)

Economic variables		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Monthly income	Between Groups	798.653	4	199.663	5.972	.000
	Within Groups	13004.832	389	33.431		
	Total	13803.485	393			
Monthly savings	Between Groups	1691.198	4	338.240	10.835	.000
	Within Groups	12112.287	388	31.217		
	Total	13803.485	393			

Table 8: Age-Wise Need for Buying Life Insurance Tukey-HSD Multiple Comparisons

(I) AGE	(J) AGE	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
18-30	31-45	.02762	.54744	1.000	-1.3849	1.4401
	46-60	-1.62000	.79180	.173	-3.6630	.4230
	+61	-10.42226*	.71590	.000	-12.2694	-8.5751
31-45	18-30	-.02762	.54744	1.000	-1.4401	1.3849
	46-60	-1.64762	.79830	.167	-3.7073	.4121
	+61	-10.44988*	.72308	.000	-12.3155	-8.5842
46-60	18-30	1.62000	.79180	.173	-.4230	3.6630
	31-45	1.64762	.79830	.167	-.4121	3.7073
	+61	-8.80226*	.92201	.000	-11.1812	-6.4234
+61	18-30	10.42226*	.71590	.000	8.5751	12.2694
	31-45	10.44988*	.72308	.000	8.5842	12.3155
	46-60	8.80226*	.92201	.000	6.4234	11.1812

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 9: Qualification-Wise Need for Buying Life Insurance Tukey-HSD Multiple Comparisons

(I) Qualification	(J) Qualification	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Matriculation	Graduation	6.04348*	.71648	.000	4.1949	7.8921
	Post graduation	6.14704*	.75207	.000	4.2066	8.0875
	Others	2.06522	.91256	.109	-.2893	4.4197
Graduation	Matriculation	-6.04348*	.71648	.000	-7.8921	-4.1949
	Post graduation	.10356	.68040	.999	-1.6520	1.8591
	Others	-3.97826*	.85445	.000	-6.1829	-1.7736
Post graduation	Matriculation	-6.14704*	.75207	.000	-8.0875	-4.2066
	Graduation	-.10356	.68040	.999	-1.8591	1.6520
	Others	-4.08182*	.88451	.000	-6.3640	-1.7997
Others	Matriculation	-2.06522	.91256	.109	-4.4197	.2893
	Graduation	3.97826*	.85445	.000	1.7736	6.1829
	Post graduation	4.08182*	.88451	.000	1.7997	6.3640

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 10: Occupation -Wise Need for Buying Life Insurance Tukey-HSD Multiple Comparisons

(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Govt. service	Business	-3.68655*	.91128	.001	-6.2965	-1.0766
	Professional	-1.33218	.85146	.622	-3.7708	1.1064
	Private service	-1.46115	.74549	.367	-3.5963	.6740
	Retired	-10.34215*	.86187	.000	-12.8106	-7.8737
	Student	-1.54911	.81160	.398	-3.8735	.7753
Business	Govt. service	3.68655*	.91128	.001	1.0766	6.2965
	Professional	2.35438	1.01657	.190	-.5571	5.2659
	Private service	2.22540	.92963	.161	-.4371	4.8879
	Retired	-6.65559*	1.02531	.000	-9.5921	-3.7191
	Student	2.13745	.98343	.253	-.6791	4.9540
Professional	Govt. service	1.33218	.85146	.622	-1.1064	3.7708
	Business	-2.35438	1.01657	.190	-5.2659	.5571
	Private service	-.12898	.87106	1.000	-2.6237	2.3658
	Retired	-9.00997*	.97253	.000	-11.7953	-6.2246
	Student	-.21693	.92827	1.000	-2.8755	2.4417
Private service	Govt. service	1.46115	.74549	.367	-.6740	3.5963
	Business	-2.22540	.92963	.161	-4.8879	.4371
	Professional	.12898	.87106	1.000	-2.3658	2.6237
	Retired	-8.88100*	.88125	.000	-11.4049	-6.3571
	Student	-.08796	.83215	1.000	-2.4712	2.2953
Retired	Govt. service	10.34215*	.86187	.000	7.8737	12.8106
	Business	6.65559*	1.02531	.000	3.7191	9.5921
	Professional	9.00997*	.97253	.000	6.2246	11.7953
	Private service	8.88100*	.88125	.000	6.3571	11.4049
	Student	8.79304*	.93783	.000	6.1071	11.4790
Student	Govt. service	1.54911	.81160	.398	-.7753	3.8735
	Business	-2.13745	.98343	.253	-4.9540	.6791
	Professional	.21693	.92827	1.000	-2.4417	2.8755
	Private service	.08796	.83215	1.000	-2.2953	2.4712
	Retired	-8.79304*	.93783	.000	-11.4790	-6.1071

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 11: Number of Dependents -Wise Need for Buying Life Insurance Tukey-HSD Multiple Comparisons

(I) Number of dependents	(J) Number of dependents	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Nil	One	-3.06387	1.32427	.191	-6.8566	.7289
	Two	1.76883	.73556	.157	-.3378	3.8755
	Three	6.20710*	.85828	.000	3.7490	8.6652
	Four & above	2.33613	.83301	.059	-.0496	4.7219
One	Nil	3.06387	1.32427	.191	-.7289	6.8566
	Two	4.83269*	1.33794	.005	1.0008	8.6646
	Three	9.27097*	1.40914	.000	5.2352	13.3068
	Four & above	5.40000*	1.39389	.002	1.4079	9.3921
Two	Nil	-1.76883	.73556	.157	-3.8755	.3378
	One	-4.83269*	1.33794	.005	-8.6646	-1.0008
	Three	4.43828*	.87922	.000	1.9202	6.9564
	Four & above	.56731	.85457	.986	-1.8802	3.0148
Three	Nil	-6.20710*	.85828	.000	-8.6652	-3.7490
	One	-9.27097*	1.40914	.000	-13.3068	-5.2352
	Two	-4.43828*	.87922	.000	-6.9564	-1.9202
	Four & above	-3.87097*	.96223	.001	-6.6268	-1.1151
Four & above	Nil	-2.33613	.83301	.059	-4.7219	.0496
	One	-5.40000*	1.39389	.002	-9.3921	-1.4079
	Two	-.56731	.85457	.986	-3.0148	1.8802
	Three	3.87097*	.96223	.001	1.1151	6.6268

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 12: Location-Wise Need for Buying Life Insurance Tukey-HSD Multiple Comparisons

(I) Location	(J) Location	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Urban	Semi-urban	-3.45062*	.99478	.003	-6.0173	-.8839
	Rural	-6.16573*	.61384	.000	-7.7495	-4.5819
Semi-urban	Urban	3.45062*	.99478	.003	.8839	6.0173
	Rural	-2.71511	1.07496	.058	-5.4887	.0584
Rural	Urban	6.16573*	.61384	.000	4.5819	7.7495
	Semi-urban	2.71511	1.07496	.058	-.0584	5.4887

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 13: Monthly Income-Wise Need for Buying Life Insurance Tukey-HSD Multiple Comparisons

(I) Household monthly income (in Rs)	(J) Household monthly income (in Rs)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Less than 10000	10000-30000	-1.19269	.75933	.517	-3.2737	.8883
	30000-50000	1.12579	.79219	.614	-1.0453	3.2969
	50000 and above	3.41153*	1.00228	.007	.6647	6.1584
10000-30000	less than 10000	1.19269	.75933	.517	-.8883	3.2737
	30000-50000	2.31847*	.78590	.028	.1646	4.4723
	50000 and above	4.60422*	.99731	.000	1.8710	7.3375
30000-50000	less than 10000	-1.12579	.79219	.614	-3.2969	1.0453
	10000-30000	-2.31847*	.78590	.028	-4.4723	-.1646
	50000 and above	2.28574	1.02256	.169	-.5167	5.0882
50000 and above	less than 10000	-3.41153*	1.00228	.007	-6.1584	-.6647
	10000-30000	-4.60422*	.99731	.000	-7.3375	-1.8710
	30000-50000	-2.28574	1.02256	.169	-5.0882	.5167

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 14: Monthly Savings-Wise Need for Buying Life Insurance Tukey-HSD Multiple Comparisons

(I) Household Monthly savings (in Rs)	(J)Household Monthly savings (in Rs)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Less than 1000	1000-3000	2.76381	1.00767	.069	-.1222	5.6498
	3000-5000	5.27844*	1.15109	.000	1.9817	8.5752
	5000-10000	6.52882*	1.25091	.000	2.9462	10.1115
	10000 and above	6.15827*	1.12303	.000	2.9419	9.3746
1000-3000	less than 1000	-2.76381	1.00767	.069	-5.6498	.1222
	3000-5000	2.51463*	.83510	.033	.1229	4.9064
	5000-10000	3.76501*	.96807	.002	.9924	6.5376
	10000 and above	3.39445*	.79597	.000	1.1148	5.6741
3000-5000	less than 1000	-5.27844*	1.15109	.000	-8.5752	-1.9817
	1000-3000	-2.51463*	.83510	.033	-4.9064	-.1229
	5000-10000	1.25038	1.11659	.873	-1.9475	4.4483
	10000 and above	.87983	.97118	.945	-1.9016	3.6613
5000-10000	less than 1000	-6.52882*	1.25091	.000	-10.1115	-2.9462
	1000-3000	-3.76501*	.96807	.002	-6.5376	-.9924
	3000-5000	-1.25038	1.11659	.873	-4.4483	1.9475
	10000 and above	-.37056	1.08763	.999	-3.4856	2.7444
10000 and above	less than 1000	-6.15827*	1.12303	.000	-9.3746	-2.9419
	1000-3000	-3.39445*	.79597	.000	-5.6741	-1.1148
	3000-5000	-.87983	.97118	.945	-3.6613	1.9016
	5000-10000	.37056	1.08763	.999	-2.7444	3.4856

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.