The Economics of Stock vs. Mutual (takaful) Insurance in the U.S.A.

> Mahmoud A. El-Gamal Rice University

Prologue

₩ Prof. Siddiqi:

 ethical and efficiency considerations are in harmony more often than not

* Dr. Malaikah: (questions for this talk)

- What is the driving force behind recent demutualizations? Lack of capital vs.
 "irrational exuberance"
- Hybrid mutual/stock: best of both worlds or worst of both worlds?

Empirical background c.f. Mayers and Smith (1988), Born, Gentry, Viscusi and Zeckhauser (1998) ***** We concentrate on property and casualty • Other religious factors affect life insurance. * "Stocks" and "Mutuals" co-exist in most lines of property and casualty insurance. * They are equally likely to concentrate their activities in a few lines of business.

Mutuals are more important in certain lines, and were not losing market share through early 1990s:

Takaful talk

© 2000 Mahmoud A. El-Gamal

<i>(using NAIC data)</i> <i>Line of business</i>	<u>1984</u>		<u>1991</u>	
	stocks	mutuals	stocks	mutuals
Home owners multi peril	43	54	38 🌡	59 ↑
Commercial multi peril	75	19	71 🌡	19 ≈
General liability	87	11	52↓	6↓
Medical malpractice	58	17	40 ↓	17 ≈
Auto private bodily injury	58	33	56↓	35 ↑
Auto comm. bodily injury	79	18	79 ≈	18 ≈
Auto private physical damage	56	35	53↓	38 ↑
Auto comm. physical damage	78	19	77 \downarrow	20 ↑

© 2000 Mahmoud A. El-Gamal

General patterns

 Mutuals' share in property/casualty insurance:
grew from 10% in the 1920s to 30+% in the 1960s and has remained stable ever since.

* There is no clear size-pattern when comparing mutuals with stocks.

* There is no clear profitability-pattern when comparing mutuals with stocks:



Detected empirical differences

Stocks collect more premiums nation-wide, but mutuals write more contracts per-line per-state

- Born, Gentry, Viscusi and Zeckhauser (1998)
- For given amount of premiums, stocks have higher losses than mutuals.
 - Lamm-Tennant and Starks (1993): stocks bear more risk
- **Stocks are more cost efficient (higher return on equity),** while mutuals are more X-efficient (cheaper insurance):
 - Gardner and Grace (1993, 1994): in life insurance
 - Cummins, Weiss and Zi (1999): in property-liability insurance
 - Swiss Reinsurance Co. (1999): mutuals have lower return on equity but higher solvency ratios

***** This evidence is consistent with economic theory:

Takaful talk

© 2000 Mahmoud A. El-Gamal

7

Stocks vs. Mutuals: Theoretical underpinnings *c.f. Mayers and Smith (1988), and Smith and Stutzer (1995)*

- *** Stock ownership**
 - Reduces *owner*manager agency costs
 Provides access to capital markets

Should dominate in

- commercial coverage and areas requiring managerial discretion
- Lines with significant economies of scale

*** Policyholder ownership**

- Eliminates *policyholder*manager agency costs
- Reduces moral Hazard

Should dominate in

- personal lines (*less* discretion required), and
- liability insurance (lags may provide opportunities for managerial abuse)
- Environments with aggregate uncertainty

Back to hybrid model

***** Who has control over management?

 The interests of policy-holders are often in conflict with those of share-holders (good intentions not withstanding!)

***** Two different technologies:

- What is the hybrid model good for, beyond raising capital?
- Should we interpret the absence of hybrids as evidence of their relative inefficiency?

Bounded rationality considerations

--<u>-</u>----

***** Mutual to stock conversion trend:

- Investors are seeking higher profits, upswing of the insurance cycle (c.f. Gron and Lucas (1998))
- This increases the supply of insurance in profitable lines and reduces it in less profitable ones (c.f. Born, Gentry, Viscusi and Zeckhauser (1998))
- Buyers of stock insurance company shares are increasing their risk exposure, and may seek increased insurance coverage at higher prices.
- Is the net effect positive or negative?

Bounded rationality considerations

* Human decision making in the face of risk:

- It is consistent with experimental and empirical evidence (prospect theory) that individuals may:
 - Choose to take a high-risk, high-return position.
 - To reduce the resulting risk, pay an insurance premium which results in a net loss.
- The higher efficiency of stocks may be an illusion. More research is needed to include risk-adjusted efficiency measures industry- and economy-wide.
- See El-Gamal (2000): <u>http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~elgamal/gharar.pdf</u> for a summary of the evidence, a model of risk-trading leading to inefficiency, and a link to the Islamic prohibition of *bay`u al-gharar*

References

- Born, P., W. Gentry, W.K. Viscusi, and R. Zeckhauser "Organizational Form and Insurance Company Performance: Stocks vs. Mutuals"; D. Bradford (ed.) *The Economics of Property-Casualty Insurance*, Chicago: UC Press, 1998.
- Cummins, D., M. Weiss, and H. Zi "Organizational Form and Efficiency: The Coexistence of Stock and Mutual Property-Liability Insurers", *Management Science*, 45(9), 1254-1269, 1999.
- El-Gamal, M. "An Economic Explication of the Prohibition of <u>Gharar</u> in Classical Islamic Jurisprudence", (prep. for 4th IDB International Conference, August 2000).
- Gardner, L. and M. Grace "X-efficiency in the U.S. Life Insurance Industry", J. Banking & Finance, 17, 497-510, 1993.
- Gardner, L. and M. Grace "Efficiency Comparisons Between Mutual and Stock Life Insurance Companies", manuscript, UNLV, 1994.
- Mayers, D. and C. Smith, "Ownership Structure across Lines of Property-Casualty Insurance", J. Law and Econ., 31, 351-78, 1988.
- Smith, B. and M. Stutzer "Adverse Selection, Aggregate Uncertainty, and the Role of Mutual Insurance Contracts", J. of Business, 63(4), 493-510, 1990.
- Smith, B. and M. Stutzer "A Theory of Mutual Formation and Moral Hazard with Evidence from the History of the Insurance Industry", R. Ec. Stud., 8(2), 545-77, 1995.
- Swiss-Re, "Are Mutual Insurers an Endangered Species", Sigma, no.4, 1999.

Takaful talk

© 2000 Mahmoud A. El-Gamal