

# Identifying Non-adopter Consumer Segments: An Empirical Study on Earthquake Insurance Adoption in Turkey

**Basbug Erkan, B., Adiguzel, F., Yozgatligil, C. & Kleijnen, M.**

Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository

**Original citation & hyperlink:**

Basbug Erkan, B, Adiguzel, F, Yozgatligil, C & Kleijnen, M 2018, 'Identifying Non-adopter Consumer Segments: An Empirical Study on Earthquake Insurance Adoption in Turkey' THE JOURNAL OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, vol. (In-Press), pp. (In-Press).

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/joca.12217>

DOI 10.1111/joca.12217

ISSN 0022-0078

ESSN 1745-6606

Publisher: Wiley

**This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: 'Identifying Non-adopter Consumer Segments: An Empirical Study on Earthquake Insurance Adoption in Turkey' which has been published in final form at DOI 10.1111/joca.12217. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.**

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

**Identifying Non-adopter Consumer Segments:  
An Empirical Study on Earthquake Insurance Adoption in Turkey**

ABSTRACT

In recent years, steadily climbing natural disaster losses have increased the need to promote new financial risk transfer mechanisms, including insurance, as a mitigation tool to build resilient communities to recover faster after disaster occurrence. However, while the societal need for such policies is high, demand for natural disaster insurances typically is still low. While there is ample research on positive adoption decisions, reasons for non-adoption has not yet received the attention it deserves. Using the case of earthquake insurance in Turkey, this study investigates how public policy makers and insurance companies can differentiate non-adopter segments and consequently develop targeted strategies to stimulate the uptake of disaster insurance. Our study develops a non-adopter typology consisting of four segments—state reliant positivist, dependers, adversaries and uninformed loners. Differences among segments provide policy makers and insurance companies with meaningful insights to design and consequently introduce affordable natural disaster insurance to the market.

***Key Words: Non-adopters, Consumer resistance, Consumer segments, Protection motivation***

## INTRODUCTION

The recent rise in frequency and severity of natural disasters has amplified the importance of natural disaster insurance for economic wellbeing of both countries and individuals (e.g., the Indian tsunami in 2004; the Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans in 2005; the earthquake in China in 2008, and most recently the Hurricane Irma in the USA and Caribbean). As such events are becoming increasingly common, the burden on governments to support citizens becomes too costly. For example, the 1994 Northridge Earthquake in California, has cost society approximately 50 billion dollars, the Sichuan Earthquake in 2008 even amounting up to 148 billion dollars. Therefore, insurance companies have started offering natural disaster insurances tailored to such events, either as an individual company or in partnership with a government (Mahul 2013). Despite its increased necessity, consumers typically seem to resist adopting natural disaster insurance. For example, despite the fact that nearly all parts of the country are within a high-risk zone and major earthquakes such as the one in Van province in Eastern Turkey are causing large damages and costing many lives, the number of individuals that have adopted earthquake insurance is still not, and will not be any time soon, be meeting the targets of 60% ownership set by the government. As the first example of Public Private Partnership in a developing market, the Turkish Catastrophe Insurance Pool (TCIP i.e., DASK in Turkish) was initiated on September 2000 following the devastating 1999 Marmara Earthquake, and became one of the largest insurance pools in the World. The main aim of the TCIP is to transfer the national risk to world-wide risk by sharing pools under the management of the international reinsurance companies. To date however, there are still many consumers who have not purchased the insurance, despite its mandatory nature.

While previous research has often studied adopters versus nonadopters, this is typically approached as a dichotomous empirical investigation. Different forms of non-adoption segments are not well-studied (Claudy, Garcia, and O’Driscoll 2015; Lee, Kwon, and Schumann 2005). However, describing all non-adopters as a homogeneous population may be inaccurate and inappropriate. Therefore, the main research question investigated in this paper is to understand *which factors drive membership of a specific consumer non-adopter segment*. An initial investigation of segmentation studies in the field of consumer resistance as well as disaster insurance seems to support this differential approach (See Table 1). Consumer resistance research is used as a point of departure, as this stream of literature specifically investigates consumers’ decision *not* to adopt as distinctly different from a positive adoption decision.

(INSERT TABLE 1 HERE)

As Table 1 illustrates, there are indeed few studies that investigate difference between non-adopters in the consumer resistance literature, and there are no segmentation studies on non-adopter segments available in the disaster insurance literature. The notion that “innovation resistance varies in degree” was first suggested by Ram and Sheth (1989). The authors discuss how resistance can vary from a more passive form of resistance (inertia) to more active resistance. Other studies have followed this idea of varying forms of resistance, distinguishing for example postponement, rejection, and opposition (e.g., Kleijnen, Lee, and Wetzels 2009; Laukkanen, Sinkkonen and Laukkanen 2008; Szmigin and Foxall 1998), or simply passive versus active resistance (Talke and Heidenreich 2014). Those that have investigated such differences, typically have used only ad-hoc segmentation to identify resistance segments (Laukkanen, Sinkkonen and Laukkanen 2008, 2009; Kleijnen, Lee and

Wetzels 2009). Despite limited investigation of different segments, theory does suggest that differences between non-adopters are likely to exist and are meaningful to consider in terms of strategy development. Not all drivers of consumer resistance (i.e., non-adoption) impact the different types of resistance in the same degree. Kleijnen et al. (2009) provide a detailed overview of these potential differences in their literature overview and through qualitative interviews uncover that consumers indeed revealed different reasons for distinctive types of resistance when looking at product innovations. Additional studies have conceptualized different drivers to lead to different types of resistance, but empirical support is lacking. Hence, a more fundamental understanding of the different drivers as well as an empirical investigation of these differences is called for in order to move beyond dichotomous segmentation (i.e., adopters versus non-adopters) as well as to provide a more fine-grained understanding of what drives this non-adoption.

For this purpose, we first theoretically recognize a spectrum of factors that are currently recognized in the resistance and natural disaster literature. Across studies, several factors are identified that relate to either the innovation, its provider or the intended adopter. In a similar vein, Table 2 provides a detailed overview of the factors included in our study, which are related to the insurance itself (attitude, price and knowledge), the insurance company (trust and image) and the consumer (risk avoidance and trust in others). These insights are not only theoretically meaningful, but also particularly relevant for public policy; understanding how these factors lead to different non-adoption segments can be used to guide policymakers in the implementation of regulations and provision of incentives to foster innovative insurance market development relevant to society as a whole and which are typically known to have slow take-off times.

(INSERT TABLE 2 HERE)

## METHOD

### Sample

In total, 802 respondents were surveyed face-to-face based on simple random sampling of addresses provided by the Turkish Statistical Institute. Respondents consisted of inhabitants of six different regions of Ankara which have different socio-economic characteristics. Despite the fact that this insurance is compulsory by law, the numbers indeed showed insufficient take-off, with only 36% (285 respondents) actually owning an earthquake insurance. Only non-adopters (517 respondents, 55.5% women, with an average age of 39) were included in the latent class analysis, as the focus of our study is to distinguish non-adoption segments.

### Measures

The survey contained previously developed five-point likert scales (Table 3) and some socio-demographics (age, gender, income, and education). To measure trust-in-other variables, respondents were asked to rank seven alternatives, including state, family, relatives, charity, friends, none, and fate. When coding, the alternative ranked first, was coded with seven, so that a higher mean implied more importance and vice versa. In case an alternative was not ranked, a zero was assigned. Seven trust-in-other variables were created for each alternative with this way. Three additional questions were included to inspect the relationship with the latent class cluster solution. These questions were 1) “ownership of any insurance”, 2) “purchase intention of TCIP”, 3) whether they want to purchase TCIP if they have more income. We also measured experience with disasters (Browne and Hoyt 2000; Palm and Hodgson 1992) to control for its effects. However, we did not include this variable in our final analysis, because there were few respondents (23) with such an experience.

(INSERT TABLE 3 HERE)

## Latent Class Cluster Analysis

Latent class cluster analysis (LCA) is a model-based clustering where individuals are assumed to belong to one of  $K$  latent classes, with the number of classes and their sizes unknown a priori (Vermunt and Magidson 2005). In this approach, the assumption is that consumers belonging to the same latent class are similar in the sense that their observed scores come from the same probability distributions. Advantages of this method over traditional ad-hoc clustering method are 1) the possibility of including variables of different scales within the same model, 2) the convenience due to statistical model selection criteria and probability-based classification, 3) the possibility of classifying new cases with scoring equation, and 4) the simultaneous estimation of segments and covariate effects on segments (for a more extensive discussion see Wedel and Kamakura 2000).

After deciding on the number of latent classes based on statistical criteria, indicators and external variables, namely covariates and distal outcomes, can be examined regarding the latent class membership in three-step LCA, providing further understanding of the unobserved heterogeneity (Vermunt 2010; Asparouhov and Muthén 2014). Covariates are the external variables predicting the class membership. Distal outcomes (i.e., dependent) are the external variables that are predicted by the class membership.

To decide the final number of segments, multiple criteria were considered: Bayesian information criterion (BIC), CAIC, model parsimony and easiness of interpretability of the segments. Bayesian information criterion (BIC) is the most widely used one and is more effective for detecting correct models in LCA compared to other information criteria such as AIC (Vermunt and Magidson 2005). Internal stability of the segment solution is assessed using a split samples procedure.

## RESULTS

### Construct Validity

We conducted confirmatory factor analysis using LISREL 8.8 (Jöreskog and Sörbom 1999) to assess construct validity of multi-item scales. All factor loadings, average variance extracted (VEs), construct reliabilities (CRs) are reported in Table 3. After removing the non-significant item three in trust and item three-five in risk avoidance construct, the measurement model illustrated a good fit ( $\chi^2(194) = 650.275$ ,  $p < .000$ , CFI = .946, NNFI = .936, RMSEA = .071) (Hair et al. 2006). Thirteen of the loadings met the .70 criteria and the remaining exceeded the .50 criteria (Hair et al. 2006). All construct reliabilities are above the .70 cut-off (Hair et al. 2006). Only one VE, namely risk avoidance (.45), was below the recommended cut-off. We maintained this item given that the construct reliability was still acceptable (.70). Discriminant validity is also met with all VE estimates for two constructs were greater than the squared of the correlation between latent two constructs (Hair et al. 2006).

### Latent Class Model Estimation Results

We employed the three-step latent class cluster analysis with Latent GOLD 5.1 (Vermunt and Magidson 2005). First, we decide the number of segments and then inspected the relationship between non-adoption segments and external variables. Among external variables, socio-demographics were covariates and ownership of any insurance, purchase intention of TCIP, purchase intention of TCIP when more income is available were used as distal outcomes.

The six models including one-six classes were analyzed by using the non-adoption drivers as indicators. Considering the BIC and the corresponding decreasing patterns, the

most viable solution is that of four segments (Table 4). Figure 1 illustrates the BIC's decreasing pattern with an elbow at  $S = 4$ . The sizes of each segment were 249, 143, 81 and 44, respectively.

(INSERT TABLE 4 and FIGURE 1 HERE)

All indicators were significant (i.e., the p-value of the Wald statistic is below .05), indicating a significant contribution to the ability to discriminate between segments (Table 5). The  $R^2$  displays how much variance of each indicator is explained by the model. The significant indicators in order of importance based on  $R^2$  were trust in none ( $R^2 = .69$ ), risk avoidance ( $R^2 = .36$ ), image insurance company ( $R^2 = .33$ ), attitude towards insurance ( $R^2 = .30$ ), price ( $R^2 = .28$ ), trust in state ( $R^2 = .26$ ), trust in insurance company ( $R^2 = .18$ ), trust in family ( $R^2 = .14$ ), relatives ( $R^2 = .14$ ), trust in friends ( $R^2 = .08$ ), trust in charity ( $R^2 = .05$ ), knowledge ( $R^2 = .04$ ) and trust in fate ( $R^2 = .01$ ). Among covariates, age ( $W = 16.00$ ,  $p < .001$ ), gender ( $W = 36.44$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and education ( $W = 12.74$ ,  $p < 0.10$ ) significantly influenced the latent class segments, but income did not ( $W = 4.34$ ,  $p = .63$ ). Among distal outcomes, purchase intention when there is more income ( $W = 29.11$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and ownership of any insurance ( $W = 11.43$ ,  $p < .001$ ) were strongly significant; but purchase intention was marginally significant ( $W = 13.60$ ,  $p < .10$ ). In the next section, we describe each of the segments (using Table 6, 7, and 8), which is the ultimate purpose of our study.

(INSERT TABLE 5-8 HERE)

### **Description of Segments**

*Segment 1: State reliant positivists (47%).* Respondents in this segment can be characterized by the highest level of trust ( $M = 3.16$ ), a positive image of insurance

companies and ( $M = 3.54$ ), and the most positive price perception ( $M = 3.65$ ) compared to other segments. Together with segment three, it is also most knowledgeable about insurances ( $M = 3.10$ ). This favourable set of perceptions matches the highest percentage of purchase intention among all segments, as well as the highest number of respondents that are not sure yet (11% for both). Two factors that might drive the reasons for non-adopting so far might be the fact that this segment, together with segment three, is the least risk avoidant ( $M = 3.62$ ). Additionally, they put more trust in the state than any of the other segments ( $M = 5.56$ ). Finally, this segment can be described as the youngest ( $M = 35.84$ ), relatively equal in terms of gender (53% women), and highly educated relative to other three segments (32%).

*Segment 2: Dependents (27%).* This segment can be characterized by a high level of risk avoidance ( $M = 5.00$ ), which could imply these consumers are more prone to adopt insurances. Indeed, this segment, together with segment four, also illustrates the most positive attitude to insurances ( $M_{\text{segment2}} = 4.52$ ;  $M_{\text{segment4}} = 4.53$ ) and a high purchase intention of TCIP in case of more income (66%). However, this segment also has an overwhelming amount of trust in their social network (family,  $M = 5.81$ ; relatives,  $M = 3.84$ ; friends,  $M = 2.48$ ; and charity,  $M = 1.85$ ). Rather than adoption the insurance, these consumers simply rely on their environment as a coping mechanism. This might be caused by a lack of means, given that this segment consists of mostly women (78%) with a mean age of 41.16 years and the lowest level of education (42%) among all segments.

*Segment 3: Adversaries (17%).* Segment 3 (together with one) is most knowledgeable about insurances ( $M = 3.10$ ) and the least risk avoidant ( $M = 3.58$ ). However, contrary to segment 1, this segment holds strongly negative perceptions about insurance on all levels, including its attitude ( $M = 3.31$ ), price perceptions ( $M = 2.47$ ), trust in the insurance companies ( $M = 2.05$ ) and their image ( $M = 2.06$ ). This segment has more trust in fate than any of the other segments ( $M = 0.29$ ), but overall, its main characteristic seems to be a

crushingly adverse predisposition towards insurances. This translates into the lowest values for purchase intention (0%), purchase intention when more income is available (23%) and the second lowest for ownership of any insurances (33%). This segment is mostly male (73%) with a mean age of 40.68 years.

*Segment 4: Uninformed Loners (9%).* This segment has the second highest purchase intention when income increases (59%), similar to segment two (66%). Strikingly however, these respondents do not rely in any way on others or fate as a coping mechanism (trust in state,  $M = .06$ ; family,  $M = 1.80$ ; relatives,  $M = .02$ ; charity,  $M = .01$ ; friends,  $M = .01$ ; fate,  $M = .00$ ). Their trust in none is exceptionally high ( $M = 6.71$ ), implying that they are strongly self-reliant. Their attitude towards insurance is most positive (together with segment 2;  $M = 4.53$ ), but insurance ownership is the lowest (31%). Additionally, these respondents are also the least knowledgeable about insurance ( $M = 2.38$ ). The majority are women (64%) and it is the oldest segment with an average age of 43.59 years.

(INSERT FIGURE 1-3 HERE)

## CONCLUSION

Empirical studies on differences in consumer non-adoption categories with regard to natural disaster insurance have been somewhat neglected in the literature. Our study illustrates important differences between non-adopter groups, which should be considered by policy makers and insurance companies when developing their marketing strategy. Especially trust in others (in insurance literature also referred to as “charity hazard”) was an important factor in differentiating the four segments. Interestingly, our study adds new insights into how the segments differ in which sources they trust. Segment one, segment two and segment three rely on the state, strong ties and fate respectively, whereas segment four has trust in none. This suggests, in line with earlier research in insurances, that social trust is a key

predictor of whether or not a homeowner chooses to adopt risk-sharing measures or to buy insurance (Siegrist and Cvetkovich 2000; Browne and Hoyt 2000). However, even when willing, the increasing occurrence of events makes it impossible for governments, non-profit initiatives, or even consumers' social networks to maintain previous levels of support. Unlike other events a consumer might insure (e.g., health, car, and etcetera), the event of a natural disaster does not impact one individual, but a society (and thus the social network) as a whole. As a result, the very people and networks consumers depend on for help, might be equally affected, a reality that needs to become more salient in consumers' minds.

In disaster insurance literature, risk has conflicting effects on adoption (Lo 2013; Antwi-Boasiako 2017; Palm and Hodgson 1992). In our non-adoption study, risk avoidance was an important factor to explain differences in non-adoption segments. Among the remaining factors, the most important one is image, followed by attitude towards insurance, price and trust in insurance companies. While an early study on natural disaster insurances in the US (Kunreuther 1978) found that a lack of knowledge is an important factor in explaining the lack of adoption, we find that when looking at different segments, knowledge is far less important in determining the resistance segments than other factors. Finally, in line with Lin (2002) and Wedel and Kamakura (2000), our results confirm that socio-demographics are also relevant in an insurance context. The significant covariates to explain segment membership are—in the order of importance— gender, age, and education. Income did not explain differences in non-adoption segments in line with the findings of Browne and Hoyt (2000).

Based on our findings, we recommend following strategies for each segment to successfully market TCIP:

- *State reliant positivists*: This is the biggest segment. As perceptions are overall positive in this segment, it is important to deal with its inertia to purchase, which is mostly driven by

a reliance on state. Communications should focus on changing this reliance and the implementation of nudges to buy in order to capitalize on the generally positive perceptions.

- *The Dependents*: this segment heavily relies on others. This is likely to be an ineffective strategy in case of natural disasters, as their social network is often subjected to the same consequences of a disaster. Rather than focusing on their own risk, respondents in this segment should be made aware of the risk of their social network and community as a whole. Creating awareness about the potentially disastrous consequences of relying on strong ties as a coping strategy and the pressure this puts on their peers may help to overcome their initial lack of adoption. Recent TV advertisements of TCIP have started to focus on these aspects by asking consumers “where will you stay over/live if your house is damaged by an earthquake?” and giving examples of “uncomfortable, non-voluntary, long-term stay-overs with relatives after an earthquake”.
- *Adversaries*: This segment might be the most difficult to target, as it exhibits a strong negative predisposition which is difficult to reform. Campaigns targeting this segment should developed more positive image and trust in insurance perceptions, as well as consider ways to create new salient attributes as a way to diminish the impact of strongly held existing beliefs. Unbiased, trustworthy information will be extremely important for these consumers, hence transparency will play an important role in developing meaningful campaigns and programs that will be accepted by the public.
- *Uninformed Loners*: This segment might be the prospect segment because they are more self-reliant. This segment seemingly has not discovered insurances as a coping mechanism yet to deal with unexpected events. These consumers are positive about insurance but display a significant lack of knowledge. Educating consumers about disaster insurances might be a key enabler here, especially as a way to cope with such

events independently of others, as this segment values their self-reliance highly. Disaster insurance needs to be positioned in the consumer's mindset as part of a toolset that allows them to be self-reliant.

In sum, our study offers governments, policy makers and insurance companies to develop meaningful strategies to address the problematic uptake of disaster insurance.

## REFERENCES

- Antwi-Boasiako, Benjamin A. 2017. It's beyond my control: The effect of locus of control orientation on disaster insurance adoption. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 22: 297-303.
- Asparouhov, Tihomir, and Bengt Muthén. 2014. Auxiliary variables in mixture modeling: three-step approaches using Mplus. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 21(3): 329-341.
- Baumann, Duane D., and John H. Sims. 1978. Flood Insurance: Some Determinants of Adoption. *Economic Geography*, 54(3): 189-196.
- Bearden, William O., and Terence A. Shimp. 1982. The Use of Extrinsic Cues to Facilitate Product Adoption. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19(2): 229-239.
- Blackford, George H. 2014. Where Did All the Money Go? How Lower Taxes, Less Government, and Deregulation Redistribute Income and Create Economic Instability. Flint, Michigan.
- Bolkenstein, Matthijs, Rob Faasen, Claudine Maeijer, Manish Bahl, and Eline Ketelaars 2014. Recent anti-corruption initiatives in the EU. *Eversheds Newsletters*, [http://www.eversheds.nl/en/newsletter/recent\\_anti-corruption\\_initiatives\\_in\\_the\\_eu](http://www.eversheds.nl/en/newsletter/recent_anti-corruption_initiatives_in_the_eu).
- Browne, Mark J., and Robert H. Hoyt. 2000. The Demand for Flood Insurance: Empirical Evidence. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 20: 291–306.
- Bruner, Gordon C., II, and Paul Hensel. 1992. *Marketing Scales Handbook: A Compilation of Multi-Item Measures*. Chicago: American Marketing Association
- Burton, Scot, Donald R. Lichtenstein, Richard G. Netemeyer, and Judith A. Garretson. 1998. A Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Private Label Products and an Examination of its Psychological and Behavioral Correlates. *Academy of Marketing Science*, 26(4): 293-306.

- Chen, Mei-Fang, and Liang-Hung Mau. 2009. The Impacts of Ethical Sales Behavior on Customer Loyalty in the Life Insurance Industry. *The Service Industries Journal*, 29(1): 59-74.
- Claudy, Marius C., Rosanna Garcia, and Aidan O'Driscoll. 2015. Consumer resistance to innovation—a behavioral reasoning perspective. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 43 (4): 528-544.
- De Bettignies, Henri-Claude de, Francois Lepineux, and Cheon Kheong Tan. 2006. The Insurance Business and its Image in Society: Traditional Issues and New Challenges. Working paper series INSEAD, [www.insead.edu/facultyresearch/research/doc.cfm?did=2016](http://www.insead.edu/facultyresearch/research/doc.cfm?did=2016).
- Ellen, Pam Scholder, Lois A. Mohr, and Deborah J. Web. 2000. Charitable Programs and the Retailer: Do they Mix?. *Journal of Retailing*, 76(3): 393-406.
- Garcia, Rosanna, Fleura Bardhi, and Colette Friedrich. 2007. Overcoming Consumer Resistance to innovation. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 48(4): 82-88.
- Gurenko, Eugene, Rodney Lester, Olivier Mahul, and Serap Oguz Gonulal. 2006. *Earthquake Insurance in Turkey: History of the Turkish Catastrophe Insurance Pool*, Washington, DC: World Bank. ©World Bank, <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/7142> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.
- Hair, Joseph F., Black William C., Babin Barry J., Anderson Rolph E., and Tatham Ronald L. 2006. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Pearson Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Herbig, Paul A., and Ralph Day. 1992. Customer acceptance: the key to successful introductions of innovations. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 10(1): 4-15.
- Herbig, Paul A., and Hugh Kramer. 1994. The Effect of Information Overload on the Innovation Choice Process: Innovation Overload. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 11(2): 45-54.

- Hirschman, Elizabeth C. 1987. Adoption of an incredibly complex innovation: Propositions from a humanistic viewpoint. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 14: 376-377.
- Jöreskog, Karl G., and Dag Sörbom. 1999. *LISREL 8 user's guide*, Scientific Software International, Chicago.
- Kim, Chung K., and Anne M. Lavack. 1996. Vertical Brand Extensions: Current Research and Managerial Implications. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 5(6): 24-37.
- Kleijnen, Mirella H.P., Nick Lee, and Martin G.M. Wetzels. 2009. An Exploration of Consumer Resistance to Innovation and its Antecedents. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 30(3): 344–357.
- Kunreuther, Howard. 1978. *Disaster Insurance Protection: Public Policy Lessons*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Laukkanen, Tommi. 2016. Consumer adoption versus rejection decisions in seemingly similar service innovations: The case of the Internet and mobile banking. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(7): 2432-2439.
- Laukkanen, Tommi, and Vesa Kiviniemi. 2010. The role of information in mobile banking resistance. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 28(5): 372-388.
- Laukkanen Tommi, Suvi Sinkkonen, and Pekka Laukkanen. 2009. Communication Strategies to Overcome Functional and Psychological Resistance to Internet Banking. *International Journal of Information Management*. 29(2): 111-118.
- Laukkanen, Pekka, Suvi Sinkkonen, and Tommi Laukkanen. 2008. Consumer Resistance to Internet Banking: Postponers, Opponents and Rejectors. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 26(6): 440-455.
- Laukkanen, Tommi, Suvi Sinkkonen, Marke Kivijarvi, and Pekka Laukkanen. 2007. Innovation Resistance Among Mature Consumers. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 24(7): 419–427.

- Lee, Eun-Ju, Kyoung-Nan Kwon, and David W. Schumann. 2005. Segmenting the non-adopter category in the diffusion of internet banking. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 23(5): 414-437.
- Lin, Chin-Feng. 2002. Segmenting Customer Brand Preference: Demographic or Psychographic. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 11(4): 249-268.
- Lo, Alex Y. 2013pwe. The likelihood of having flood insurance increases with social expectations. *Area*, 45(1): 70-76.
- Mahul, Olivier. 2013. Innovation and Insurance: Protection against the Costs of Natural Disaster. World Bank Blog, April 4, 2013, <http://blogs.worldbank.org/psd/innovation-and-insurance-protection-against-costs-natural-disaster>.
- Mangleburg, Tamara, and Terry Bristol. 1998. Socialization and Adolescents' Skepticism Toward Advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 27(3): 11-21.
- Mani, Zied and Inès Chouk (2017). Drivers of consumers' resistance to smart products. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 33(1-2): 76-97.
- Mossin, Jan. 1968. Aspects of Rational Insurance Purchasing. *Journal of Political Economy*, 76(4-1): 553-568.
- Oreg, Shaul. 2006. Personality, context, and resistance to organizational change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 15(1): 73-101.
- Palm, Risa I., and Michael E. Hodgson. 1992. Earthquake Insurance: Mandated Disclosure and Homeowner Response in California. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 82(2): 207-222.
- Park, Hoon, Stephen F. Borde, and Yoon K. Choi. 2002. Determinants of Insurance Pervasiveness: a Cross National Analysis. *International Business Review*, 11(1): 79-96.
- Penaloza, Liza, and Linda L. Price. 1993. Consumer Resistance: A Conceptual Overview. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 20(1): 123-128.

- Pomerantz, Eva M., Shelly Chaiken, and Rosalind S. Tordesillas. 1995. Attitude Strength and Resistance Processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69: 408-419.
- Ram, Sundaresan, and Jagdish N. Sheth. 1989. Consumer Resistance to Innovations: The Marketing Problem and its Solutions. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 6(2): 5-14.
- Raschky, Paul R., and Hannelore Weck-Hannemann. 2007. Charity Hazard—A Real Hazard to Natural Disaster Insurance?. *Environmental Hazards*, 7: 321-329.
- Schlesinger, Harris. 2000. The Theory of Insurance Demand,” in: G. Dionne (ed.), *Handbook of Insurance*, Huebner International Series on Risk, Insurance and Economic Security, Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 131-151.
- Schwarcz, Daniel. 2010. Insurance Demand Anomalies and Regulation. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 44 (3): 557–577.
- Sheth, Jagdish N. 1981. Psychology of Innovation Resistance. *Research in Marketing*, 4, 273-282.
- Shoemaker, Robert W., and F. Robert Shoaf. 1975. Behavioral Changes in the Trial of New Products. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2(2): 104-109.
- Siegrist, Michael, and George Cvetkovich (2000). Perception of hazards: The role of social trust and knowledge. *Risk analysis*, 20(5): 713-720.
- Slovic, Paul, Melissa L. Finucane, Ellen Peters, and Donald G. MacGregor. 2004. Risk as analysis and risk as feelings: Some thoughts about affect, reason, risk, and rationality. *Risk Analysis*, 24: 1–12.
- Sweeney, Jillian C., and Geoffrey N. Soutar. 2001. Consumer Perceived Value: The Development of a Multiple Item Scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 77: 203-220.
- Szmigin, Isabelle, and Gordon Foxall. 1998. Three Forms of Innovation Resistance: The Case of Retail Payment Methods. *Technovation*, 18(6/7): 459-468.

- Talke, Katrin, and Sven Heidenreich. 2014. How to overcome pro-change bias: incorporating passive and active innovation resistance in innovation decision models. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 31(5): 894-907.
- Tanner, John F. Jr., Ellen Day, and Melvin R. Crask. 1989. Protection motivation theory: An extension of fear appeals theory in communication. *Journal of Business Research*, 19(4): 267-276.
- Tax, Stephen S., Stephen W. Brown, and Murali Chandrashekar. 1998. Customer Evaluation of Service Complaint Experiences: Implications for Relationship Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(2): 60-76.
- Venard, Bertrand, and Mohamed Hanafi. 2008. Organizational Isomorphism and Corruption in Financial Institutions: Empirical Research in Emerging Countries. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81: 481-498.
- Vermunt, Jeroen K. 2010. Latent class modelling with covariates: Two improved three-step approaches. *Political Analysis*, 18: 450-469.
- Vermunt, Jeroen K., and Jay Magidson. 2005. *Latent GOLD 4.0 users' guide*. Belmont, MA: Statistical Innovations.
- Wedel, Michel, and Wagner Kamakura. 2000. *Market Segmentation: Conceptual and Methodological Foundations*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Wiedmann, Klaus-Peter, Nadine Hennigs, Lars Pankalla, Martin Kassubek, and Barbara Seegebarth (2011). Adoption barriers and resistance to sustainable solutions in the automotive sector. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(11): 1201-1206.

TABLE 1

*Overview Resistance Segmentation Studies (in chronological order)*

<b>Source</b>	<b>Context: Resistance or Adoption</b>	<b>Method/ Sample</b>	<b>Unit of analysis</b>	<b>Segmen- tation</b>	<b>Findings</b>
<i>Disaster Insurance literature:</i>					
Baumann and Sims (1978)	Adoption Flood insurance	Empirical	Both adopters and nonadopters	No	Significant: previous experience of flood damage, social class, and personality (internal/external locus of control) Not significant: age, marital status, family size, belief in protection, expectations regarding future floods, attitude toward disaster relief
Palm and Hodgson (1992)	Adoption Earthquake insurance	Empirical	Both adopters and nonadopters	No	Significant: perceived risk Not Significant: spatially geophysical risk, income, equity in the home, age of the head of household, or other socioeconomic characteristics
Browne and Hoyt (2000)	Adoption Flood insurance at state level	Empirical	Adopters # and value of insurance buy	No	Significant: Income, price (-), the level of flood losses in the state during the prior year, disaster relief, mortgages (-) Not significant: Mitigation
Raschky and Weck-Hannemann (2007)	Adoption natural disaster insurance	Conceptual	Not applicable	No	Charity hazard was discussed as a barrier. However, it is only discussed as an expectation from the government aid
Lo (2013)	Adoption Flood insurance	Empirical	Both adopters, nonadopters	No	Significant: perceived social expectations Not significant: Perceived risk, income
Antwi-Boasiako (2017)	Adoption natural disaster insurance	Empirical	Both adopters and nonadopters	No	Significant: Locus of control (+), knowing a victim (-) Not significant: the value of the building (wealth), length of occupancy, level of education, risk perception, being a victim of a disaster
<i>Consumer Resistance literature</i>					
Sheth (1981)	Resistance	Conceptual	Not applicable	No	Habit or satisfaction with an existing behavior and perceived risks
Ram and Sheth (1989)	Resistance	Conceptual	Not applicable	No	Functional barriers (usage, value and risk) Psychological barriers (tradition and image)
Szmigin and Foxall (1998)	Resistance to retail payment systems	Qualitative	Nonadopters	No	Resistance to an innovation can take the form of outright rejection, postponement or opposition.
Lee, Kwon and Schumann (2005)	Nonadopter segments for Internet banking	Empirical	Both adopters and nonadopters	Yes (a-priori)	Segments: Adopters, persistent nonadopters, prospect adopters Perceived attributes of technology-based services, perceived risk, compatibility, experience

Laukkanen et al. (2007)	Resistance to mobile banking by mature consumers	Empirical	Both adopters and nonadopters	No	Functional barriers: Usage, value, risk Psychological barriers: Tradition and image Value barrier is the most intense barrier. Risk and image barrier are the most intense for mature ones.
Garcia, Bardhi and Friedrich (2007)	Resistance to screw-cap wine closures	Qualitative	Both adopters, nonadopters	No	The role of vertical and horizontal cooperation as marketing strategies for resistant innovations
Laukkanen, Sinkkonen and Laukkanen (2008)	Resistance to Internet banking	Empirical	Nonadopters	Yes (a-priori)	Segments: rejection, postponement and opposition Barriers: Usage, value, risk, tradition and image Risk is the most intense barrier, then tradition and image (i.e., psychological barriers)
Kleijnen, Lee, and Wetzels (2009)	Resistance to new products: Food, domestic appliances and electronics	Qualitative	Nonadopters	Yes (a-priori)	Segments: rejection, postponement and opposition Antecedents: Risk (physical, functional, economic, social), traditions and norms, usage pattern, perceived image
Laukkanen, Sinkkonen and Laukkanen (2009)	Resistance to internet banking	Empirical	Nonadopters	Yes (a-priori)	Segments: Non-Resistors, Functional Resistors, psychological resistors and dual resistors. Barriers: Usage, Value, Risk, Tradition and Image
Laukkanen and Kiviniemi (2010)	resistance to mobile banking	Empirical	Both adopters and nonadopters	No	Barriers: Usage, value, risk, tradition and image Information/guidance decreased the most usage barrier, followed by image, value and risk barriers. No effect on tradition barrier
Wiedmann et al. 2011	resistance to natural gas vehicles in the automotive sector	Empirical	Not specified	Yes (post-hoc) Cluster analysis	Segments: Status-Oriented Skeptics, Ecology-Minded Non-Drivers, Performance-Oriented Traditionalists, Risk-Averse Drivers Barriers: Financial, technological Performance, Infrastructural Performance, Physical, Time, Social, psychological risk
Talke and Heidenreich, (2014)	Active and passive resistance	Conceptual	Not applicable	Not applicable	Segments of passive resistance: Low, cognitive, situational dual passive resistance. Active resistance: no segment was specified
Claudy et al (2015)	Resistance to micro wind turbines/car sharing	Empirical	Nonadopters	No	Reasons for adoption: benefits Reasons against adoption: barriers (e.g. value, risk, usage)
Laukkanen (2016)	Resistance to internet and mobile banking	Empirical	Both adopters, nonadopters	Yes (a-priori)	Segments: Adopters, postponers, rejecters Barriers: usage, values, risk, tradition, image
Mani and Chouk (2017)	Resistance to smart products	Empirical	Both adopters, nonadopters	No	Innovation characteristics (uselessness, novelty, price, intrusiveness) Consumer characteristics (privacy concerns, dependence, self-efficacy)
Current study	Nonadopter segments of earthquake insurance	Empirical	Nonadopters	Yes (post-hoc) Latent class model	Segments: State-reliant positivists, dependers, adversaries, uninformed loners Factors driving non-adoption: Risk avoidance, trust in others, attitude insurance, price, knowledge, image insurance company, trust insurance company

TABLE 2  
*Overview of Factors that Drive Non-Adoption of Disaster Insurance*

Driver	Motivation	Literature stream		Sources
		Resistance	Insurance	
Risk avoidance	Particularly perceptions of risk vary greatly between different types of resistance. Protection motivation theory also suggests that motivation towards protection to a large extent is driven by costs-benefit analysis where risk perceptions play an important role. Specifically, in the context of insurances, findings of indicate that the more risk averse an individual is the higher the amount insured.	x	x	Kleijnen et al. (2009); Antwi-Boasiako (2017); Browne and Hoyt (2000); Mossin (1968); Palm and Hodgson (1992); Park, Borde, and Choi (2002); Schlesinger (2000); Schwarcz (2010)
Trust in others (i.e., Charity hazard)	We specifically focus on charity hazard as a mal-adaptive coping mechanism, i.e., consumers externalizing the solution to the problem to their environment, relying on others to help them cope, even when this is not realistic. Consumers rely on various others, ranging from friends, family, and community, to non-profit organizations or government emergency program. Insurance literature recognizes this as the so-called “charity hazard”. Few studies explicitly investigate the charity hazard effect on earthquake insurance demand and the results are rather ambiguous.		x	Browne and Hoyt (2000); Gurenko et al. (2006); Raschky and Weck-Hannemann (2007); Slovic et al. (2004)
General attitude towards insurance	While insurances typically tend to be classified as unsought products that consumers spend little time thinking about, recent developments have certainly changed that. Some consumers simply look less favorable upon insurances as a category, and tend to insure the bare minimum of what is required. Such consumers are particularly likely to resist new types of insurances as well.		x	De Bettignies, Lépineux, and Tan (2006); Pomerantz, Chaiken, and Tordesillas (1995)
Price	Price is related to economic value consumers perceive, which is frequently discussed as a factor influencing resistance. If the price barrier would be overcome, such consumers would often be inclined to adopt. This is often not the case for those that reject or oppose. These segments tend to be less sensitive to price, as the rejection or opposition are likely to be driven by fundamental issues.	x	x	Kleijnen et al. (2009); Laukkanen, Sinkkonen, and Laukkanen (2008, 2009); Ram and Sheth (1989); Shoemaker and Shoaf (1975); Browne and Hoyt (2000); Mani and Chouk (2017)
Knowledge	By using their knowledge, consumers start to understand the benefits of innovations and how to effectively use them. Protection motivation theory also suggests that by obtaining knowledge, consumers are better able to determine to which extent to newly proposed coping strategy (i.e., adopting the insurance) is effective. At the same time, learning more could also become a burden as consumers perceive information overload, creating cognitive distance from the learning process and in fact stimulating resistance.	x	x	Herbig and Day (1992); Herbig and Kramer (1994); Hirschman (1987); Oreg (2006); Ram and Sheth (1989); Tanner, Day, and Crask (1989)

Trust in insurance company	Insurance companies are often believed to project overly positivistic scenarios as to what consumers can expect from their services. A significant number of consumers does not even trust insurance companies to actually compensate them in case of an event that would warrant compensation. Even worse, a number of malpractices in recent years have made consumers wary of new insurance offerings, making the trust in the insurance company an important resistance factor.	x		Bearden and Shimp 1982; Chen and Mau (2009); De Bettignies, Lepineux, and Tan (2006); Kleijnen et al. (2009)
Image insurance company	Image pertains to a set of impressions consumers have of a certain company and their overall brand evaluation as such. It serves as an extrinsic cue that consumers use as a signal to base their decisions on. Especially in recent years, the insurance industry has been heavily criticized for being too profit-focused and less concerned with their so-called “duty of care”. The public debates on insurance companies, their exorbitant profits, management bonuses, and seeming lack of sensitivity to discussions on public welfare, have caused strong negative reactions by the public.	x	x	Blackford (2014); Bolkenstein et al. (2014); Kim and Lavack (1996); Ram and Sheth (1989); Venard and Hanafi (2008)

TABLE 3  
*Measurement Constructs, Scale Items, and CFA results*

<b>Contract (source), cronbach's alpha, Items</b>	<b>CR/VE<sup>a</sup></b>	<b><math>\lambda</math></b>	<b><math>\lambda^b</math></b>
<b>Risk avoidance (Burton et al. 1998) <math>\alpha = .70</math></b>	.70/.45		
I do not take life risks		.57	.58
I do not take financial risks		.71	.71
I do not bet, gamble, play horse racing (deleted)		-.21	-
I have often concerns about myself and my family (deleted)		.19	-
Almost every day I experience a scary event (deleted)		.04	-
I do not like to take risks		.70	.70
<b>Trust in others variables<sup>c</sup>: In case earthquake hit, who do you think will help you? Please rank the alternatives 1(first) to 7 (last)</b>			
1. Trust in others: state			
2. Trust in others: family			
3. Trust in others: relatives			
4. Trust in others: charity			
5. Trust in others: friends			
6. Trust in others: none			
7. Trust in others: fate			
<b>Attitude towards insurance (Ellen et al. 2000) <math>\alpha = .86</math></b>	.86/.51		
I think about insurance negatively (R)		.77	.77
I donot think good about insurance (R)		.76	.76
I think insurance is useful		.67	.67
I think it's irrational to get insurance (R)		.75	.75
I do not think it will make a difference whether you are insured or not (R)		.69	.69
I think it's important to be insured		.61	.61
<b>Price (Sweeney and Soutar 2001) <math>\alpha = .80</math></b>	.81/.52		
Insurance policies are reasonably priced		.59	.59
Insurance policies offer value for money		.83	.83
Insurance is a good service for the money paid.		.83	.83
Buying an insurance is economical		.60	.60
<b>Knowledge (Mangleburg and Bristol 1998) <math>\alpha = .83</math></b>	.84/.64		
I am a knowledgeable consumer about insurance		.90	.90
I know a lot about different types of insurance		.85	.85
I am usually well-informed about what is a reasonable price to pay for insurance		.63	.63
<b>Trust in the insurance company (Tax et al. 1998) <math>\alpha = .79</math></b>	.81/.59		
I believe insurance companies cannot be relied upon to keep its promises (R)		.82	.81
I believe insurance companies are trustworthy		.88	.89
I find it necessary to be cautious in dealing with insurance companies(R) (deleted)		.35	-
Overall, I believe insurance companies are honest		.57	.57
<b>Image insurance companies (Bruner and Hensel 1992) <math>\alpha = .86</math></b>	.88/.71		
The impression I get from insurance companies is not good (R)		.61	.61
The impression I get from insurance companies is favourable		.94	.94
The impression I get from my insurance companies is satisfactory		.93	.93
Purchase intention in a future time: Yes/No/Not sure			
Purchase intention if more income available: Yes/No			
Own any insurance product: Yes/No			

<sup>a</sup> CR: construct reliability, VE: variance extracted,  $\alpha$ : cronbach's alpha, R: reverse item

<sup>b</sup> All factor loadings ( $\lambda$ , standardized) are significant at 0.05 level

<sup>c</sup> Recoded as 1 indicating last, 7 indicating first and 0 indicating nonrated alternatives

TABLE 4  
*Latent Class Model Estimates*

	LL	BIC(LL)	AIC(LL)	CAIC (LL)	Npar	Class.Err.	ICL-BIC
Full Sample (N = 517)							
1-Cluster	-7670.3	15690.5	15452.6	15746.5	56	0.00	15690.5
2-Cluster	-7430.9	15336.7	15013.8	15412.7	76	0.05	15481.5
<b>3-Cluster</b>	<b>-7239.1</b>	<b>15078.0</b>	<b>14670.2</b>	<b>15174.0</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>15292.4</b>
<b>4-Cluster</b>	<b>-6957.6</b>	<b>14639.9</b>	<b>14147.1</b>	<b>14755.9</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>14806.3</b>
5-Cluster	-6853.1	14555.9	13978.2	14691.9	136	0.08	14783.2
6-Cluster	-6705.9	14386.5	13723.8	14542.5	156	0.08	14599.9
Calibration (N = 261)							
1-Cluster	-3816.1	7910.3	7732.1	7960.3	50	0.00	7910.34
2-Cluster	-3694.1	7777.7	7528.2	7847.7	70	0.07	7852.86
3-Cluster	-3596.4	7693.7	7372.9	7783.7	90	0.11	7824.42
<b>4-Cluster</b>	<b>-3472.7</b>	<b>7557.4</b>	<b>7165.3</b>	<b>7667.4</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>7669.67</b>
5-Cluster	-3430.2	7583.7	7120.3	7713.7	130	0.11	7725.81
6-Cluster	-3363.7	7562.0	7027.3	7712.0	150	0.08	7677.43
Validation (N = 256)							
1-Cluster	-3822.1	7943.7	7752.3	7997.7	54	0.00	7943.72
2-Cluster	-3667.4	7745.2	7482.8	7819.2	74	0.04	7795.31
3-Cluster	-3580.6	7682.5	7349.2	7776.5	94	0.07	7769.10
<b>4-Cluster</b>	<b>-3448.1</b>	<b>7528.3</b>	<b>7124.1</b>	<b>7642.3</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>7564.57</b>
5-Cluster	-3385.6	7514.3	7039.3	7648.3	134	0.07	7600.93
6-Cluster	-3328.4	7510.8	6964.8	7664.8	154	0.06	7589.76

LL: Loglikelihood, BIC: Bayesian Information criterion, AIC: Akaike Information criterion, CAIC: Consistent Akaike Information criterion. Npar: Number of parameters, Class. Error: Classification error, ICL-BIC: Integrated completed likelihood criterion with BIC approximation

TABLE 5  
*Models for Indicators*

<b>Indicators (Drivers)</b>	<b>Seg. 1</b>	<b>Seg. 2</b>	<b>Seg. 3</b>	<b>Seg. 4</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>
Attitude towards insurance	0.08	0.37	-0.84	0.39	48.21	0.00	0.30
Price	0.43	0.26	-0.75	0.06	97.24	0.00	0.28
Image insurance company	0.51	0.43	-0.97	0.03	132.50	0.00	0.33
Knowledge	0.25	-0.02	0.25	-0.48	17.04	0.00	0.04
Trust in insurance company	0.46	0.09	-0.66	0.11	48.96	0.00	0.18
Risk avoidance	-0.46	0.92	-0.50	0.04	685.82	0.00	0.36
Trust in state	0.33	0.22	0.20	-0.75	11.57	0.01	0.26
Trust in family	0.04	0.19	0.07	-0.30	36.15	0.00	0.14
Trust in relatives	0.30	0.45	0.27	-1.02	239.64	0.00	0.14
Trust in charity	0.38	0.46	0.30	-1.15	152.98	0.00	0.05
Trust in friends	0.32	0.42	0.38	-1.13	241.20	0.00	0.08
Trust in none	-0.70	-0.66	-0.60	1.96	54.69	0.00	0.69
Trust in fate	0.70	0.59	0.76	-2.05	38.40	0.00	0.01

TABLE 6  
*Segment Profiles*

Indicators Mean	Segment 1 47%	Segment 2 27%	Segment 3 17%	Segment 4 9%
Attitude towards insurance	4.23	4.52	3.31	4.53
Price	3.65	3.48	2.47	3.28
Image insurance company	3.54	3.45	2.06	3.06
Knowledge	3.10	2.84	3.10	2.38
Trust in the insurance company	3.16	2.79	2.05	2.81
Risk avoidance	3.62	5.00	3.58	4.12
Trust in state <sup>a</sup>	5.56	4.77	4.61	0.06
Trust in family <sup>a</sup>	4.98	5.81	5.16	1.80
Trust in relatives <sup>a</sup>	2.93	3.84	2.70	0.02
Trust in charity <sup>a</sup>	1.43	1.85	1.09	0.01
Trust in friends <sup>a</sup>	1.94	2.48	2.21	0.01
Trust in none <sup>a</sup>	0.38	0.44	0.56	6.71
Trust in fate <sup>a</sup>	0.22	0.15	0.29	0.00

<sup>a</sup>. Percentages for ordinal levels have not been presented here, but only means

TABLE 7  
*Profiles for distant outcomes*

	Segment 1	Segment 2	Segment 3	Segment 4
<b>Variables</b>				
<b>Purchase intention TCIP</b>				
Yes	0.11	0.05	0.00	0.05
No	0.78	0.90	0.89	0.93
Not sure	0.11	0.04	0.11	0.02
<b>Purchase intention TCIP if more income</b>				
Yes	0.50	0.66	0.23	0.59
No	0.50	0.34	0.77	0.41
<b>Insurance ownership</b>				
Yes	0.55	0.44	0.33	0.31
No	0.45	0.56	0.67	0.69

TABLE 8  
*Profiles for covariates*

	Segment 1	Segment 2	Segment 3	Segment 4
<b>Covariates</b>				
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	0.53	0.78	0.27	0.64
Male	0.47	0.22	0.73	0.36
<b>Age</b>				
1 (midpoint: 22.80)	0.25	0.13	0.18	0.11
2 (midpoint: 30.08)	0.26	0.21	0.18	0.18
3 (midpoint: 36.42)	0.17	0.18	0.17	0.15
4 (midpoint: 44.76)	0.17	0.23	0.22	0.22
5 (midpoint: 58.73)	0.15	0.26	0.26	0.34
Mean	35.84	41.16	40.68	43.59
<b>Education</b>				
Low	0.23	0.42	0.29	0.40
Middle	0.45	0.45	0.55	0.30
High	0.32	0.13	0.16	0.30
<b>Income</b>				
Low	0.65	0.81	0.69	0.67
Middle	0.19	0.13	0.16	0.21
High	0.16	0.07	0.15	0.12