

Impact Factor: 3.4546 (UIF) DRJI Value: 5.9 (B+)

# Investigation of service quality and behavioral intentions: A life insurance perspective

#### JAVAID AHMAD BHAT

Ph. D. Research scholar Department of Commerce Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India SHOWKET AHMAD DAR Ph. D. Research scholar Department of Commerce Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India

#### Abstract:

With the reforms in insurance sector competition has intensified in this sector. There are twenty four life insurance players operational in India which comprises of twenty three private insurers and a lone public sector insurer in the name of Life Insurance Corporation of India (LIC) which still holds the majority of market share. Service quality has become an indispensible construct for the triumph and survival in this era of globalized competition. Taking, this into cognizance the present article aims to investigate the prevailing service quality, customer satisfaction, and customer loyalty levels in one of the prominent private life insurance company, PNB MetLife India Insurance Company Limited in Srinagar district of Jammu and Kashmir (India). A life insurance specific modified SERVQUAL instrument adopted from prior studies has been employed in the study. For the purpose, responses have been collected from 188 policy holders of the company under study. Data has been analyzed by performing Cronbach's alpha, paired sample t-test, independent sample t-test, and one way ANNOVA in SPSS. The results of the analysis indicate that there is a service quality deficiency i.e. perceptions are lesser than expectations in all the six service quality attributes of the study with assurance followed by competence and personalized financial planning being more concerned attributes.

**Key words:** Service quality, expectations, perceptions, PNB MetLife, customer satisfaction, customer loyalty

## Introduction

Reforms in Indian insurance sector started in 1993 when the R.N. Malhotra Committee was set up to examine the structure of the insurance industry and recommend changes to make it more efficient and competent. Subsequently, it was on the recommendations of the committee report submitted in 1994 that IRDA (Insurance Regulatory Development Authority of India) was set up on April 19, 1999 and more importantly insurance sector was liberalized in October. 2000. Therefore, the comeback market witnessed of private insurance companies. Foreign companies were also allowed to enter Indian insurance market but only in collaboration with Indian companies. As per the IRDA Annual Report, 2013-14, there are 24 life insurance companies operational in India; LIC is the only public sector life insurance company.

With the entry of private life insurance players the competition in the industry has intensified and people's perception of insurance has also changed from an instrument of saving to a risk-hedging tool. This change has been facilitated by the surfacing of a range of new insurance products catering to the diverse needs of customers. In the initial years of liberalization, the Life Insurance Corporation of India (LIC) retained its dominant position in the market. Nevertheless, as time went by, private insurance players made their presence felt with the decline in the market dominance of LIC. Although LIC lost significant market share to private companies in the post-liberalization period, it still retains a commanding position in the life insurance market.

By the discussion it is apparent that though collectively, private sector has considerably captured the market share in initially, but nowadays, most of the private sector companies

are struggling for a persistent growth in business and market share, and the PNB MetLife India Insurance Company Limited (formerly known as MetLife India Insurance Company Limited) is one of them. Besides, customers frequently complaint for poor services in life insurance, which clearly means there is something wrong in customer strategies of these companies. Also it is well established that there is an association between service quality and customer satisfaction, customer satisfaction and customer loyalty, customer loyalty and sustainable profitability. Service Quality is an important antecedent of customer loyalty (Rai and Medha, 2013). Services business success has been linked with the ability to deliver superior service (Rudie and Wansely, 1984; Gale, 1990). So in this context, this study is an endeavor to determine the level of service quality delivered as a whole and on selected service quality dimensions in PNB MetLife India.

#### Literature review

Service is "an activity, benefit, or satisfaction offered for sale that is essentially intangible and does not result in the ownership of anything." There are certain characteristics of services distinct from goods such as: (i) Intangibility (i.e. services cannot be tasted, seen, heard, smelled, felt) (ii) Inseparability (simultaneous production and consumption) (iii) Heterogeneity (service quality depends on who provides service, when, where and how) (iv) Perishability, i.e. services cannot be inventoried (Kotler and Armstrong, 2012).

Service quality is the consumer's judgment about an entity's overall excellence or superiority. It is a form of attitude and results from a comparison of expectations to perceptions of performance received (Zeithmal et. al., 1985). If perception of actual service delivered by the service providers falls short of expectations, a gap is created which should be addressed through proper strategies (Parasuraman et. al., 1985; Zeithmal

1990). There is a lot of argument about the al.. et. conceptualization and measurement of service quality. The SERVQUAL model developed by (Parasuraman, Zeithmal and Berry, 1988) which describes five determinants of service quality in terms of Tangibility, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy is the benchmark instrument for the measurement of service quality. The fundamental idea of the SRVQUAL is that service quality is the discrepancy between expectations and perceptions of performance received. On the other hand, Cronin and Taylor, (1992) developed an alternative model i.e. SERVPERF in which service quality is considered as a performance only measure and the expectations of the service quality are not taken into account. Therefore, SERVQUAL and SERVPERF are the two fundamental measurements of service quality and till date there is no consensus as to which one is the better measure of service quality. However, SERVQUAL instrument has been extensively applied for assessing the service quality across variety of service settings including life insurance services (Bhat, J. A. 2014). It is pertinent to mention different researchers have modified that the generic SERVQUAL instrument in order to make it specific to the nature of services investigated, the scheme of operationalization remaining the same as the original SERVQUAL. In this context, Mehta and Lobo, (2004), identified six dimensions for assessing service quality in life insurance; which includes Assurance, Corporate image, Tangibles, Personalized financial planning, Similarity with agent and Competence. Dar et.al (2012) examined the customer perception of service quality offered by the life insurers in Srinagar (J&K) and reported that culture emerged as one of the significant dimensions of Service Quality in their study, thus SERVQUAL requires modification under different study contexts.

Kotler and Armstrong (2012) have defined customer satisfaction as "the extent to which product's perceived performance matches a buyer's expectations." Oliver (1980)

mentioned three positions as negative disconfirmation - when customers are highly dissatisfied, zero disconfirmation - when performance matches expectations, and positive disconfirmation - when customers are highly satisfied. The delivery of service quality, consumer satisfaction, and service value are some of the key methods of differentiation a service firm can employ in the development and implementation of successful marketing strategies (Cronin and Taylor 1992; Gronroos 1990; Heskett, Sasser, and Hart 1990; Oliver 1993; Quinn 1992; and; Zeithmal 1988).

The aim of customer relationship management is to create not only satisfied customer but also the loval customer who in turn not only make repeated purchases but also spread favourable word of mouth (Kotler and Armstrong, 2012). Borah, (2013) investigated the customer satisfaction with the Services rendered by private life insurance Companies in Assam and concluded that attributes of tangibility, understanding, and accessibility had the maximum impact on Customer Satisfaction. Rai and Medha, (2013) assessed the lovalty status of life insurance customers in India and thereby reported that Indian customers considered the public sector status of financial service provider as it provided a sense of security and stability and thus created a difference between customer loyalty of public sector and private sector life insurance.

### **Objectives of the study**

The study is aimed to accomplish the following objectives:

1. To assess customer expectations and perceptions of service quality in PNB MetLife India Insurance Company Limited.

2. To determine the gap between perceptions and expectations of service quality.

3. To measure customer satisfaction and loyalty perceptions towards the Services of PNB MetLife India Insurance Company Limited. 4. To offer suggestions for the enhancement of service quality in PNB MetLife India Insurance Company Limited.

## Hypotheses of the study

This study draws the following hypotheses for the attainment of objectives.

 $H_{01}$ : There is no significant difference in expectations and perceptions of service quality.

 $H_{02}$ : There is no significant difference in overall service quality (OSQ) across particular demographic attributes.

 $H_{03}$ : There is no significant difference in customer satisfaction across particular demographic attributes.

 $H_{04}$ : There is no significant difference in customer loyalty across particular demographic attributes.

## Instrument development and scale reliability

The scales used in this study for measuring service quality, customer satisfaction and customer loyalty have been adopted from prior studies. The service quality attributes are SERVQUAL type adopted from Mehta and Lobo, (2004). These include: Assurance, Personalized financial planning, Tangibles, Corporate image, Similarity with agent and Competence. Customer satisfaction has been measured by adopting a five items framework prescribed by Westbrook and Oliver (1991). Customer loyalty has also been measured by a five items framework suggested by Parasuraman *et al.* (1996).

A 5-point likert scale has been employed for the measurement of service quality, satisfaction and loyalty latent variables with end anchors 1 for "strongly disagree" to 5 for "strongly agree". Cronbach's alpha values have been calculated to ensure the reliability of the scales as shown in Table 1. The overall reliability has been found to be .950 and .972 for expectations and perceptions respectively. The high alpha

values above 0.7 indicates that the measures are reliable and internally consistent (Nunnally, J. C. 1978). The reliability coefficients for both expectations and perceptions of service quality as well as for customer satisfaction and customer loyalty are above the threshold level. Moreover, the reliability co-efficients for customer satisfaction and customer loyalty are .953 and .906 respectively. This demonstrates good internal consistency. Hence the scale items are reliable and internally consistent.

| Scale        | Observed variables              | Indicators/ | Reliability | Overall     |
|--------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Dimension    |                                 | items       | (Cronbach's | Reliability |
|              |                                 |             | alpha)      |             |
|              | Assurance                       | 09          | .854        |             |
|              | Personalized financial planning | 04          | .741        |             |
| Expectations | Tangibles                       | 02          | .833        |             |
| of Service   | Corporate image                 | 02          | .698        | .950        |
| Quality      | Similarity with agent           | 02          | .704        |             |
|              | Competence                      | 06          | .895        |             |
|              | Assurance                       | 09          | .934        |             |
| Perceptions  | Personalized financial planning | 04          | .886        |             |
| of Service   | Tangibles                       | 02          | .698        |             |
| Quality      | Corporate image                 | 02          | .706        | .972        |
|              | Similarity with agent           | 02          | .889        |             |
|              | Competence                      | 06          | .946        | ]           |
| Satisfaction | Satisfaction                    |             | .953        |             |
| Loyalty      |                                 | 04          | .906        |             |

#### **Table 1: Reliability Statistics**

Source: SPSS output (based on Survey)

### Sample and Data collection:

Questionnaire was administered on PNB MetLife policy holders in the Srinagar district of Jammu & Kashmir (India). A total of 258 questionnaires were distributed to different policy holders out of which 187 valid responses were received registering a response rate of 72.48%. Convenient sampling method has been employed for the collection of requisite data. In prior researches on life insurance service quality convenient sampling technique has been utilized for the collection of data (Itana, 2011; Sandhu and Bala, 2011; Jain and Lodha, 2012).

## Analysis and Results

As per Table 2, out of total 187 respondents, 125 (66.8%) are males and 62 (33.2%) are females. This indicates that majority of the respondents are males. In terms of age wise bifurcation of respondents, 63.1% of respondents belonged to the age range of 30-45 years, and 28.3% were in the age range of 46-60 years, while 8.6% were below 30 years of age. The highest level of qualification attained by majority of the respondents was post graduation (69.5%) followed by graduation (23.0%) and under graduation (7.5%). This indicates that majority of the respondents were adequately qualified. In terms of the monthly income majority of the respondents (38.0%) had monthly income between INR 30000-50000, 36.9% were in the income slab of INR 50001-70000, 11.8% had monthly income of under INR 30000, 8.0% respondents were in the range between INR 70001-90000, and 5.3% of the respondents income was above INR 90000.

| Variable        | Frequency | Percentage |  |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|--|
|                 |           |            |  |
| Gender          |           |            |  |
| Male            | 125       | 66.8       |  |
| Female          | 62        | 33.2       |  |
| Total           | 187       | 100.0      |  |
| Age (in years)  |           |            |  |
| Under 30        | 16        | 8.6        |  |
| 30-45           | 118       | 63.1       |  |
| 46-60           | 53        | 28.3       |  |
| Above 60        | -         | -          |  |
| Total           | 187       | 100.0      |  |
| Education       |           |            |  |
| High school     | 14        | 7.5        |  |
| Graduate        | 43        | 23.0       |  |
| Post Graduate   | 130       | 69.5       |  |
| Total           | 187       | 100.0      |  |
| Income          |           | •          |  |
| Under INR 30000 | 22        | 11.8       |  |
| INR 30000-50000 | 71        | 38.0       |  |

Table 2: Demographics of respondents

| INR 50001-70000  | 69  | 36.9  |
|--|-----|-------|
| INR 70001-90000  | 15  | 8.0   |
| Above INR 90000  | 10  | 5.3   |
| Total  | 187 | 100.0 |
| a <u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u></u> |     |       |

Source: Field Survey

**Correlation Analysis:** Correlation analysis has been performed to ascertain the association of service quality variables with customer satisfaction and customer loyalty. The results are depicted in Table 3. It reveals from the table that there exists significant positive correlation between service quality attributes and customer loyalty. Also, there is significant correlation between service quality attributes and customer loyalty. In addition to this customer satisfaction and customer loyalty exhibit highly significant positive correlation between each other.

#### **Table 3: Correlation statistics**

| Variables                | Assurance | Personalized<br>financial<br>planning | Tangibles | Corporate<br>image | Similarity<br>with<br>agent | Competence | Customer<br>Satisfaction |
|--------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------|--------------------------|
| Customer<br>Satisfaction | .425**    | .238**                                | .187*     | .521**             | .456**                      | .464**     | -                        |
| Customer<br>loyalty      | .250**    | .295**                                | .189*     | .342**             | .246**                      | .284**     | .873**                   |

Source: SPSS output (based on Survey

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

### Gap analysis and t-statistics

Table 4: Gap analysis and t-test (Assurance)

| Assurance | Description  | Perception | Expectation | Gap   | Mean perception<br>(SD) | Mean expectation<br>(SD) | Average Gap | t | Sig. |
|-----------|--|------------|-------------|-------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|---|------|
| AS1       | Employees of insurance<br>company being<br>consistently courteous<br>during service contact. | 3.38       | 4.56        | -1.18 |                         |                          |             |   |      |
| AS2       | Agents' being<br>Trustworthy when  | 2.96       | 4.47        | -1.51 |                         |                          |             |   |      |

EUROPEAN ACADEMIC RESEARCH - Vol. III, Issue 1 / April 2015

|     | explaining policy's terms and conditions.  |      |      |       |        |        |      |       |      |
|-----|--|------|------|-------|--------|--------|------|-------|------|
| AS3 | Agents' conducting<br>assessment of risk<br>profile/situation for<br>their customers.      | 3.05 | 4.45 | -1.40 | 3.13   | 4.43   | -    | 14.59 | .000 |
| AS4 | Employees consciously<br>listening to customer<br>requests and queries.                    | 3.27 | 4.70 | -1.43 | (1.03) | (.572) | 1.30 |       |      |
| AS5 | Insurance company<br>understanding<br>intimately specific<br>needs of their<br>customers.' | 3.11 | 4.19 | -1.08 |        |        |      |       |      |
| AS6 | Insurance company<br>having trained and<br>well informed agents.                           | 3.10 | 4.44 | -1.34 |        |        |      |       |      |
| AS7 | Agents' clearly<br>explaining policy terms<br>and conditions.                              | 3.07 | 4.48 | -1.41 | -      |        |      |       |      |
| AS8 | Insurance company<br>having customer's best<br>interests at heart.                         | 3.02 | 4.22 | -1.20 |        |        |      |       |      |
| AS9 | Agents' and employees<br>approaching from<br>customer's point of<br>view.                  | 3.18 | 4.36 | -1.18 |        |        |      |       |      |

Source: SPSS output (based on Survey)

It reveals from the statistics presented in table 4 that there exists negative service quality gap i.e. perceptions are lesser than expectations in all the indicators of assurance attribute of service quality. The average gap in this attribute is -1.30 which indicates a substantial service quality shortfall. At the same time the difference between perceptions and expectations of service quality is statistically significant (t= 14.29 > 1.96, p = .000 < .05).

| Personalized<br>financial planning | Description  | Perception | Expectation | Gap   | Mean perception<br>(SD) | Mean expectation<br>(SD) | Average Gap | t | Sig. |  |  |  |
|------------------------------------|--|------------|-------------|-------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|---|------|--|--|--|
| PFP1                               | Insurance company<br>arranging for<br>periodical meetings<br>with its customers. | 2.93       | 3.90        | -0.97 |                         |                          |             |   |      |  |  |  |

Table 5: Gap analysis and t-test (Personalized financial planning)

EUROPEAN ACADEMIC RESEARCH - Vol. III, Issue 1 / April 2015

| Javaid Ahmad Bhat,  | Showket Ahmad      | Dar- Investigation | of service | quality a | and |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|-----|
| behavioral intentio | ns: A life insuran | ce perspective     |            |           |     |

| PFP2 | Insurance company<br>restructuring policies<br>as customer's life<br>changes.    | 3.14 | 4.25 | -1.11 | 3.10<br>(1.03) | 4.18<br>(.629) | -<br>1.08 | 12.18 | .000 |
|------|--|------|------|-------|----------------|----------------|-----------|-------|------|
| PFP3 | Insurance company<br>keeping customers<br>updated on new<br>products.            | 3.21 | 4.44 | -1.23 |                |                |           |       |      |
| PFP4 | Insurance company<br>taking due care of<br>customer's life style<br>preferences. | 3.14 | 4.13 | -0.99 |                |                |           |       |      |

Source: SPSS output (based on Survey)

The statistics highlighted in table 5 suggest that perceptions are lesser than the expectations of service quality in all the items/indicators of personalized financial planning. The average service quality gap in this attribute is -1.08 indicative of service quality deficiency. Besides, the gap between perceptions and expectations is statistically significant (t=12.18, p = .000).

| Table 6: Gap | o analysis | and t-test | (Tangibles) |
|--------------|------------|------------|-------------|
|--------------|------------|------------|-------------|

| Tangibles | Description  | Perception | Expectation | Gap   | Mean perception<br>(SD) | Mean expectation<br>(SD) | Average Gap | t     | Sig. |
|-----------|--|------------|-------------|-------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------|------|
| TAN1      | Insurance company<br>possessing good<br>certification and<br>credentials.                    | 3.67       | 4.32        | -0.65 | 3.64<br>(.996)          | 4.35<br>(.751)           | -<br>0.71   | 8.532 | .000 |
| TAN2      | Insurance company<br>using modern aids<br>and technology in<br>servicing their<br>customers. | 3.61       | 4.39        | -0.78 |                         |                          |             |       |      |

Source: SPSS output (based on Survey)

Besides expectations being higher than perceptions of service quality in all the indicators, the average service quality gap in tangibles attribute of service quality is -0.71 which is the lowest for all the attributes (table 6). However, the service quality shortfall is statistically significant (t = 8.532, p = .000).

| Corporate image | Description  | Perception | Expectation | Gap   | Mean perception<br>(SD) | Mean<br>expectation<br>(SD) | Average Gap | t     | Sig. |
|-----------------|--|------------|-------------|-------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-------|------|
| CI1             | Insurance company<br>being a financially<br>stable company.              | 3.54       | 4.70        | -1.16 | 3.37                    | 4.43                        | -           | 12.10 | .000 |
| CI2             | Insurance company<br>being innovative in<br>introducing new<br>products. | 3.20       | 4.15        | -0.95 | (1.06)                  | (.718)                      | 1.06        |       |      |

Table 7: Gap analysis and t-test (Corporate image)

Source: SPSS output (based on Survey)

The statistics presented in table 7 pertain to the gap analysis and t-test performed in respect of corporate image, one of the attributes of service quality. The mean gap for service quality is -1.06 and is statistically significant (t = 12.10, p = .000).

Table 8: Gap analysis and t-test (Similarly with agent)

| Similarity with<br>agent | Description  | Perception | Expectation | Gap   | Mean perception<br>(SD) | Mean expectation<br>(SD) | Average Gap | t     | Sig. |
|--------------------------|--|------------|-------------|-------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------|------|
| SWA1                     | Agents' sharing similar<br>view points and beliefs<br>as that of customers.              | 3.27       | 4.31        | -1.04 | 3.23                    | 4.23                     | _           | 11.56 | .000 |
| SWA2                     | Agents' relating well<br>with customers due to<br>similar traits and<br>characteristics. | 3.18       | 4.14        | -0.96 | (1.03)                  | (.633)                   | 1.0         |       |      |

Source: SPSS output (based on Survey)

As per the statistical results presented in table 8 there exists service quality shortfall to the tune of -1.0 in similarity with agent attribute of service quality and also the discrepancy

between perceptions and expectations is significant (t = 11.56, p = .000).

It is evident from the table 9 that there prevails service quality gap in all the indicators of competence attribute of service quality. The mean service quality gap in this dimension is -1.27 which is also statistically significant (t = 13.02, p = .000).

| Competence | Description  | Perception | Expectation | Gap   | Mean perception<br>(SD) | Mean expectation<br>(SD) | Average Gap | t     | Sig. |
|------------|--|------------|-------------|-------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------|------|
| C1         | Insurance company<br>providing the services at<br>the promised time.                 | 3.09       | 4.41        | -1.32 |                         |                          |             |       |      |
| C2         | Employees being<br>dependable in handling<br>customer's problems.                    | 3.14       | 4.37        | -1.23 |                         |                          |             |       |      |
| C3         | Employees being able to<br>respond promptly to<br>need or emergency.                 | 3.06       | 4.42        | -1.36 | 3.11<br>(1.14)          | 4.38<br>(.719)           | -<br>1.27   | 13.02 | .000 |
| C4         | Employees showing<br>willingness to help<br>customers even when<br>busy.             | 3.14       | 4.21        | -1.07 |                         |                          |             |       |      |
| C5         | Agents' on behalf of<br>customers settling<br>administration matters<br>efficiently. | 2.88       | 4.36        | -1.48 |                         |                          |             |       |      |
| C6         | Insurance company<br>having a good<br>reputation.                                    | 3.33       | 4.48        | -1.15 |                         |                          |             |       |      |

Table 9: Gap analysis and t-test (Competence)

Source: SPSS output (based on Survey)

From the above, it reveals that highest service quality gap is reflected in assurance (-1.30) followed by competence (-1.27) and personalized financial planning (-1.08). However, the lowest service quality gap is reflected in tangibles (-0.71). Moreover, since the difference between perceptions and expectations (gap) is statistically significant in all the attributes of service quality therefore, hypothesis  $H_{01}$  which states that there is no significant difference in expectations and perceptions of service quality in all the attributes of service quality is not supported.

| Table 10. Descriptive statistics overall service quality (05Q) |         |         |       |           |  |  |  |  |
|--|---------|---------|-------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
|  | Maximum | Minimum | Mean  | Standard  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall service  |         |         |       | deviation |  |  |  |  |
| quality  |         |         |       |           |  |  |  |  |
| (OSQ)  | -2.90   | 1.27    | -1.07 | 1.05      |  |  |  |  |

Table 10: Descriptive statistics Overall service quality (OSQ)

Source: SPSS output (based on Survey)

From the table 10 it reveals that the overall service quality (OSQ) is on the negative side i.e. -1.07 to be exact. This suggests that the respondents have rated the service quality below their expectation levels.

| Customer<br>satisfaction | Description   | Mean | Average<br>Satisfaction | SD   |
|--------------------------|---|------|-------------------------|------|
| SAT1                     | Availing your current insurance<br>company's services has been a good<br>experience.                | 2.57 |                         |      |
| SAT2                     | The overall services offered by your insurance company are satisfactory.                            | 2.76 |                         |      |
| SAT3                     | You are satisfied with your decision to<br>avail the services of your current<br>insurance company. | 2.97 | 2.75                    | 1.13 |
| SAT4                     | You feel relaxed availing your current insurance services.  | 2.74 |                         |      |
| SAT5                     | Your choice to select your current insurance company was a wise one.                                | 2.71 |                         |      |

 Table 11: Descriptive statistics (Customer satisfaction)

Source: SPSS output (based on Survey)

However, statistics presented in table 11 pertain to the satisfaction perceptions of the respondents. It is evident that the customers are not adequately satisfied with the service quality rendered by their service provider as the customer are just above average satisfied (2.75).

| Customer<br>loyalty | Description   | Mean | Average<br>Loyalty | SD   |
|---------------------|---|------|--------------------|------|
| LOY1                | Even if another insurance company's<br>price is lower, you will go on using<br>current insurance company's service<br>only. | 2.39 |                    |      |
| LOY2                | You are willing to say positive things<br>about your current insurance<br>company to other people.                          | 2.62 | 2.52               | 1.04 |
| LOY 3               | You intend to continue availing<br>services from your current insurance<br>company only.                                    | 2.51 |                    |      |
| LOY 4               | You will encourage friends and<br>relatives to avail the services offered<br>by your current insurance company.             | 2.55 |                    |      |

Table 12: Descriptive statistics (Customer Loyalty)

Source: SPSS output (based on Survey)

Table 12 pertains to the statistics of loyalty and behavioral intentions of respondents. The customer loyalty has a mean score of 2.52 which indicates that customers are not sufficiently loyal to their service provider.

Table 13: Demographics analysis

|                  | 10. Demogra | <u> </u>    |             | r           |            |      |              |      |              |      |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
| Demographi<br>cs | Categories  | Mean<br>OSQ | Mean<br>SAT | Mean<br>LOY | OSQ<br>t/f | Sig. | SAT<br>t / F | Sig. | LOY<br>t / F | Sig. |
| er               | Male        | -1.16       | 2.73        | 2.47        |            |      |              |      |              |      |
| Gender           |             | 876         | 2.80        | 2.60        | -1.82      | .071 | -            | .677 | -            | .466 |
| Ge               | Female      |             |             |             |            |      | .417         |      | .732         |      |
|                  | Under 30    | 351         | 3.36        | 2.77        |            |      |              |      |              |      |
| e                | 30-45       | -1.05       | 2.65        | 2.56        |            |      |              |      |              |      |
| Age              | 46-60       | -1.32       | 2.80        | 2.35        | 5.58       | .004 | 2.90         | .058 | 1.19         | .307 |
|                  | Above 60    | -           | -           | -           |            |      |              |      |              |      |
|                  | Under       | -1.10       | 3.50        | 2.75        |            |      |              |      |              |      |
| d                | Graduation  |             |             |             |            |      |              |      |              |      |
| tio              |             | 919         | 3.25        | 2.95        | .574       | .564 | 11.4         | .000 | 6.06         | .003 |
| ICa.             | Graduation  |             |             |             |            |      |              |      |              |      |
| Education        |             | -1.12       | 2.51        | 2.35        |            |      |              |      |              |      |
| F                | Post        |             |             |             |            |      |              |      |              |      |
|                  | Graduation  |             |             |             |            |      |              |      |              |      |
|                  | Under Rs.   | -1.33       | 3.09        | 2.91        |            |      |              |      |              |      |
| ne               | 30000       |             |             |             |            |      |              |      |              |      |
| Income           | Rs. 30000-  | 714         | 2.93        | 2.65        |            |      |              |      |              |      |
| In               | 50000       |             |             |             |            |      |              |      |              |      |
|                  | Rs. 50001-  | -1.14       | 2.57        | 2.38        | 9.823      | .000 | 10.3         | .000 | 8.50         | .000 |

| 70000 |        |       |      |      |  |  |  |
|-------|--------|-------|------|------|--|--|--|
| Rs.   | 70001- | 967   | 3.40 | 2.95 |  |  |  |
| 90000 |        |       |      |      |  |  |  |
| Above | Rs.    | -2.66 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| 90000 |        |       |      |      |  |  |  |

Source: SPSS output (based on Survey)

The statistics presented in table 13 pertain to the demographic analysis performed in terms of difference in overall service quality (OSQ), customer satisfaction, and customer loyalty across demographic attributes. One way ANNOVA and t-test has been performed in order to find out the differences in variables under reference across demographic attributes. It reveals from the table 13 that there is significant difference in overall service quality across respondents classified by age and income (F > 1.96, p < .05), whereas insignificant difference in OSQ is reported across respondents classified by gender and education (t / F < 1.96, p > .05). Therefore, null hypothesis H<sub>02</sub> which states that there is no significant difference in overall service quality (OSQ) across particular demographic attributes is partially supported. Moreover, respondents of under 30 years of age (-.351) and respondents having income between INR 30000-50000 (-.714) have rated service quality comparatively better.

It is also evident from the table 13 that there exists significant difference in customer satisfaction across respondents classified by age, education, and income (F > 1.96,However, no significant difference in customer p < .05). satisfaction is reported across respondents classified by gender (t < 1.96, p > .05). Therefore, null hypothesis  $H_{03}$  which states that there is no significant difference in customer satisfaction across particular demographic attributes is partially supported. Besides, respondents of less than 30 years of age (3.36), under graduate respondents (3.50), and respondents having income in the range of INR 70001-90000 are comparatively more satisfied.

Lastly, it also reveals from the table 13 there exists significant difference in customer loyalty across respondents

classified by education and income (F > 1.96, P < .05). However, insignificant difference in customer loyalty is reported in customer loyalty across respondents classified by gender and age (t / F < 1.96, P > .05). Therefore, null hypothesis H<sub>04</sub> which states that there is no significant difference in customer loyalty across particular demographic attributes is partially supported. It is also evident from the descriptive statistics presented in the table 13 that respondents having education up to graduate level (2.95) and respondents falling in the income slab of INR 70001-90000 are comparatively more loyal to their insurance provider.

| S.no     | Hypothesis  | Result        |
|----------|---|---------------|
| $H_{01}$ | There is no significant difference in expectations and        | Not supported |
|          | perceptions of service quality.                               |               |
| $H_{02}$ | There is no significant difference in overall service quality | Partially     |
|          | (OSQ) across particular demographic attributes.               | supported     |
| $H_{03}$ | There is no significant difference in customer satisfaction   | Partially     |
|          | across particular demographic attributes.                     | supported     |
| $H_{04}$ | There is no significant difference in customer loyalty across | Partially     |
|          | particular demographic attributes.                            | supported     |

| Table 1 | 14: | Summary | of hypotheses |
|---------|-----|---------|---------------|
|---------|-----|---------|---------------|

Source: Statistical tables

### Discussion

Based on the statistical results, hypothesis  $H_{01}$  is not supported whereas, hypotheses  $H_{02}$ ,  $H_{03}$ , and  $H_{04}$  are partially supported. Assurance exhibited the highest service quality gap (-1.30) followed by competence (-1.27) and personalized financial planning (-1.08). However, the lowest service quality gap is reflected in tangibles (-0.71). Moreover, significant difference in overall service quality has been found across respondents classified by age groups and income levels. Furthermore, significant difference in customer satisfaction has been found across respondents classified by age, education, and income. In addition, significant difference in customer loyalty has been observed across respondents classified by gender, and age.

**Assurance:** Results of the study revealed that assurance positively correlates with satisfaction and loyalty. The highest service quality gap of -1.30 has been observed in this attribute of service quality.

**Personalized financial planning:** Service quality gap of -1.08 has been observed in this attribute. Results specified that personalized financial planning positively correlates with satisfaction and loyalty.

**Tangibles:** The lowest Service quality gap of -0.71 has been detected in this attribute. Statistics reflected that tangibles positively correlate with satisfaction and loyalty.

**Corporate Image:** Service quality deficiency of -1.06 has been observed in this attribute. Besides, corporate image positively correlates with satisfaction and loyalty.

**Similarity with Agent:** Service quality shortfall of -1.0 has been found in this attribute. Results indicated that similarity with agent positively correlates with satisfaction and loyalty.

**Competence:** The second highest service quality gap of -1.27 has been observed in this attribute of service quality. Results showed that competence positively correlates with satisfaction and loyalty.

**Overall service quality (OSQ):** The statistical results indicated that the respondents were unhappy with the prevailing service quality level as they have rated their perceptions below their expectation levels indicative of an overall service quality gap i.e. -1.07 to be exact.

**Customer satisfaction:** The customer satisfaction has a mean score of 2.75 which indicates that customers were not satisfied enough. Meanwhile, customer satisfaction exhibited significant positive correlation with customer loyalty.

**Customer loyalty:** The average perception of 2.52 has been observed in customer loyalty, indicating that customers were average loyal to their insurer.

**Implications for service provider:** This study revealed that service quality attributes significantly correlate with customer

satisfaction and customer loyalty. Therefore, PNB MetLife should lay emphasis on the provision of efficient and effective quality services. Assurance followed by competence exhibited highest service quality shortfall. Since, these attributes pertain to company personnel i.e. agents and employees, insurer should concentrate on personnel training programmes so as to minimize these gaps. The core aim of these training courses should be the development of human skills. The third highest service quality gap is reflected in personalized financial planning. So, efforts should be made to cater to the individual requirements of the customers. Besides, service provider should arrange for periodical meetings with its customers to know their requirements and feedback. The study also found strong correlation between customer satisfaction and customer loyalty. Hence, service provider must focus not only on maintaining existing services but also improving the service standards as the customer satisfaction mean score is just average. It is also recommended that the service provider should arrange for prompt redressal of grievances which will help in securing the loyalty of customers.

### Limitations and directions for future research:

The study suffers from certain limitations. At the outset the sample size is petite to be considered as the representative of the overall population and secondly convenience sampling method has been employed to collect responses from the respondents. In future, researchers may include a large sample and may practice a random sampling which is the basis for generalization of the findings. Thirdly, in this study the responses were collected only from the Srinagar district of Jammu and Kashmir (India) while customers from other areas of the country may have different perceptions. In addition, the study has not investigated the impact of service quality on customer satisfaction and customer loyalty. In future researchers besides examining the impact of service quality on satisfaction and loyalty may also investigate the mediating effect of customer satisfaction between service quality and customer loyalty.

#### REFERENCES

- Anjor, P. (2014). Service quality assessment: a study of consumer satisfaction in indian insurance sector. IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 16(3), 34-41.
- Bhat, J. A. (2014). Antecedents of service quality in Life insurance. Online International Interdisciplinary Research Journal, 4(3), 237-249.
- Bodla, B., S., and Chaudhary, K. (2012). A study of service quality expected and perceived by the customers of ICICI prudential life insurance company. *International Journal of Computing* and Business Research, 3(2), ISSN (Online) : 2229-6166.
- Borah, S. (2013). A Study on Customer Satisfaction Towards Private Sector Life insurance Companies with Special Reference to Kotak Mahindra and Aviva Life Insurance Company of Jorhat District. Indian Journal of Commerce & Management Studies, 4(3), 85-89.
- Cronin, J., J., Jr. and Taylor, S., A. (1992). Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension, *Journal of Marketing*, 56 (3), 55-68.
- Dar, A., Malik, M., & Mir, R. (2012). Customer Satisfaction on Service Quality in Life insurance. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 1(6), 118-23.
- Gale, T. B. (1990, November). The role of marketing in total quality management. In QUIS-2 Quality in Services Conference Proceedings (University of St John's).

- Gronroos, C. (1990). Service Management and Marketing: Managing the Moments of Truth in Service Competition. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Heskett, J., L., W. Earl Sasser, Jr., and Christo- pher W. L. Hart (1990). Service Break- throughs: Changing the Rules of the Game. New York: The Free Press
- IRDA (2014). Annual Report. Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority, Hyderabad, India.
- Itana, D. (2011). Perception of Service Quality and Loyalty among Customers of Insurance Companies: Comparative Analysis of Nile, Nyala, and Awash Insurance. Ph.D thesis, School of Business Administration Addis Ababa University.
- Jain, D., & Lodha, A. (2012). Determinants of Satisfaction for General Insurance Products-An

Empirical Study in Rajasthan. International Conference on Emerging Challenges for Sustainable Business, 542-560.

- Kotler, P., and Armstrong, G. (2012). *Principles of Marketing*. Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Mehta, S. C. & Lobo, A. (2004). MSS, MSA and zone of tolerance as measures of service quality: A Study of the Life Insurance Industry. Second International Services Marketing Conference, University of Queensland.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oliver, R. (1980). A cognitive model of antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. Journal of Marketing Research. 17(4), 460.
- Oliver, R., L. (1993). A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Service Satisfaction: Compatible Goals, Different Concepts, in Advances in Services Marketing and Management: Research and Practice, Vol. 2, Teresa

A. Swartz, David E. Bowen, and Stephen W. Brown (eds.), Greenwich, CT: JAI Press

- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *The Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41-50.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1996). The behavioral consequences of service quality. The Journal of Marketing, 60(2), 31-46.
- Quinn, J., B. (1992). *Intelligent Enterprise*. New York: The Free Press
- Rai, A. K., & Medha, S. (2013). The Antecedents of Customer Loyalty: An Empirical Investigation in Life Insurance Context. Journal of Competitiveness, 5(2), 139-163.
- Sandhu, D. H., & Bala, M. N. (2011). Customers' Perception towards Service Quality of Life Insurance Corporation of India: A Factor Analytic Approach.*International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(18), 123-138.
- Rudie, M. J., &Wansley, H. B. (1985). The merrill lynch quality program. InServices Marketing in a changing Environment (pp. 7-9). Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Westbrook R.A. and Oliver R.L. (1991). The Dimensionality of Consumption Emotion Patterns and Consumer Satisfaction. Journal of Consumer Research, 18, 84-91. 147
- Zeithaml, V. A., Parasuraman, A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). Problems and strategies in services

marketing. The Journal of Marketing, 49(2), 33-46.

Zeithaml, V., A. (1988). Consumer Perceptions of Price, Quality, and Value: A Means-End Model and Synthesis of Evidence, *Journal of Marketing*, 52 (3), 2-22

Zeithaml, V.A., Parasuraman, A. & Berry, L.L. (1990). Delivering Quality Service - Balancing Customer Perceptions and Expectations. New York: The Free Press.

#### **Authors Bio blurb**

1. Javaid Ahmad Bhat: The author holds M.com (Masters in Commerce) from the University of Kashmir (India) and is currently pursuing Ph. D. from Aligarh Muslim University (India). He has also qualified UGC NET (University grants commission national eligibility test for Assistant Professorship) and UGC SET (State eligibility test). Moreover, he has published a good number of articles in different journals of national and international repute. His areas of interest include services marketing, international business, and insurance. Email: amujavaidb@gmail.com

2. Showket Ahmad Dar: The author holds M.com (Masters in Commerce) from the University of Kashmir (India) and is currently pursuing Ph. D. from Aligarh Muslim University (India). He has also qualified UGC NET (University grants commission national eligibility test) for five successive times. Moreover, he has published a good number of articles in different journals of national and international repute. Besides, he has presented papers in different national and international dinternational conferences. His areas of interest include international business, insurance, and finance.

Email: ahmadshowkatamu@gmail.com