International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Educational Research (IJMCER)
ISSN: 2581-7027 ||Volume|| 3 ||Issue|| 2 ||Pages 72-79 ||2021||

Impact Of Profitability On Dividend Payout Of Listed Consumer Goods Firms In Nigeria

[1,]ONUMOH AHMED YAHAYA, [2,]Dr. Binta Abubakar Nuhu, [3,]Hassanat Salawu Salihu

[1,]Federal College of Education (Technical) Gusau, Zamfara State, Nigeria
[2,] Natioanal Research Iinstitute for Chemical Technology, Zaria, Kaduna State, Nigeria
[3,]StateKogi State Internal Revenue Service, Lokoja, Kogi State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT : The study examine the impact profitability on the dividend payout of listed consumer goods firms in Nigeria. The study covers ten years (2010-2019) period. The study employes correlational research designs using 10 out of the 20 listed consumer goods firms in Nigeria. The data of this study was extracted from the audited annual financial statements of the sampled firm. The study reveals that there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between the profitability and dividend payout of listed consumer goods firms listed in Nigeria. The study recommends that the management of consumer goods firms in Nigeria should utilise retained earnings for expansion in order to improve turnover as it increases profitability which invariably determines dividend payout of the firm.

KEYWORD: Dividend Payout, profitability, Return on Capital Employed, Return on Equity

I. INTRODUCTION

Profitability is the most important aspect of a firm's survival. A firm that recorded for lossess for some years will be face with problem of declearing and lower market value of its share. Shareholders reward for investing in firms is annual dividend, and they are more interest in this dividend than for the profit to be retained for future benefit. On this not a firm needs to make a reasonable profit for constant payment of dividend. A number of previous researchers have found profitability to be oneof the factors that influence firm's dividend payout ratio, and there is a divergence in their findings. Demirgüneş (2015) has suggested that there is a highly negative and significant relationship between profitability and dividend payout ratio, which shows that the firms prefer no pay dividend in favour of investing in firms' assets. Mahdzan, Zainudin and Shahri (2016) have found that the higher the return on equity, the greater is the firms retained earnings for reinvestment or the lower is the dividend payout to firms' shareholders. Contrary to this, Hassonn, Tran, and Quach (2015) and Zayol, Theophilus and Mirian (2017) discover a positive relationship between profitability and dividend payout. This is in line with signal theory, as the positive relationship between profitability shows how healthy and profitable the firm is. The finding of this research work will authenticate any of these previous findings.

The research on dividend policy and profitability will be a continuous one to contribute to this debate until there is generally accepted payout ratio that mandate firms to pay certain percent of it residual profit as dividend to its shareholders at the end of each accounting period.This also could be justified in line with the fact that there are so many factors influence dividend policy and no law subject a firm to pay a certain percentage of its earnings as a dividend to its shareholders in Nigeria. A lot of research in various countries have also been conducted in order to pinpoint the factors that influence the dividend payouts to firms' shareholders.The results of these studies contradict one another between countries and sectors concerning which factors that have an influence on dividend payouts. This void in literature needs to be filled in order to increase our understanding of the relative relationship between dividend payout and profitability of consumer goods firms. The objective of this study is to examine the impact profitability has on the dividend payout of listed Consumer Goods Firms in Nigeria.
There is no significant relationship between profitability and dividend payout of list consumer goods firm in Nigeria.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept of dividend payout :
Frank and Alan (2002) opine that dividend is the amount given to shareholders as their share of the company profits. The reward of shareholders of a limited liability company is dividend which is obtained out of the earnings of the company. They further stress that the directors consider the amount of the profits and decide on the portion

of profits which are to be placed reserves. Out of the profits remaining the directors then propose the payment on a certain amount of dividend. When a company makes a profit there are mainly two alternatives in which the company can make use of the profit. Schreiber and Stroik (2005) define dividend as a distribution of part of the profit earned from firm operations or investment activity that is paid to shareholders. A company's board of directors declares cash dividends periodically (quarterly, semiannually, or annually), and dividends can be paid to shareholders as cash or as additional shares of stock. Although cash dividends are very common, stock dividends are less common and are usually declared when the directors of a company want to reinvest the cash generated from company operations to expand the company. A cash dividend is a return (money) paid to the shareholders for the investment made in the shares of the organisation. It is considered a reward to the investors after considering the future prospects of the firm. The cash dividen d is paid out of the Net Profits made by the firm during the Financial Year.

Concept of profitability : Pandey (2004) defines the profitability of the firm as the state of yielding financial earnings or gain. He emphasised that profits depend on three primary structural aspects of financial institutions: financial leverage, net interest margin and non-portfolio income sources. Pandey still defines profitability as the ability of the firm to create profit. He emphasised that gaining an advantage is the ability of the company to utilise its resources to generate more revenue in excess of its expenses. Pandey affirms that profitability is one of the top building blocks for analysing financial statement and the performance of a firm as a whole. The others are market prospects, efficiency, and solvency. Profitability measures firms' profits and helps to determine the success or failure of a firm. It isn't an absolute number; instead, it looks at what the firm's profits mean in the form of proportion or decimals (Blakely, 2017). Profitability is the excess of revenue over expenses incurred in earning that revenue. So profitability measures on how capable the firm can utilise its resources to generate revenues in excess of its expenses incurred (Baskerville, 2017)

Parsian and Koloukhi (2014) describe profitability as a financial word interpreted in different ways by different firms. In a business enterprise, the state or quality of being profitable is expressed as net income to total assets. In the long term, profitability involves not only financial measures but also those measures not immediately expressed in financial terms that, however, eventually have a financial effect.Khemani and Shapiro (1993) opine that profits may be calculated before-or after-tax and may or may not include interest payments. They emphasised that normally, interest payments are excluded when calculating the rate of return on equity, but are included when calculating the rate of return on assets. They further stressed that the rate of return on assets reflects operating results and, if interest rates are included, should not reflect financing decisions. They say business is profitable when it generates more income than expenses, an area or Department in a company is profitable when generating higher revenues than costs.

Baker (2009) suggests that to maintain growth and profitability, the firm needs to generate innovations. Baker emphasised that as the firm grows, its ability to process information deteriorates, and the risk-taking incentives of the average manager diminish. According to him, these factors place a limit on the ability of a large firm to grow through innovations. As a result, as the company reached a point that did not have the opportunity to invest in the cash generated from its current operations. He argues that at this maturity stage, a firms' shareholder-value-maximizing would begin distributing its earnings to its shareholders. Profitability can, therefore, be described as the ability of the firm manages to effectively use the firm's resources to generate profit.

Profitability and dividend payout : Profitability as one of the important factors in a firm's financial statement, it has been widely utilised in the previous research as to determine the association that exists between firm's profitability and dividend payout ratio (Hellström & Inagambaev, 2012). Various studies have been verified the association between profitability and dividend payout; some found a positive relationship between profitability and the firm's dividend payouts, some found a negative relationship between profitability and the firm's dividend payouts while some found no relationship between profitability and the firm's dividend payouts. Azeez and Muhibudeen (2015) explored the determinants of dividend payout ratios for the OANDO Plc for the period of 1999 to 2013. They discover that profitability had influence over dividend payout ratio. Profitability is measured by Parua (2009), using multiple regression and correlation, as potential determinants of dividend policy in the Indian Stock Exchange. The study affirms that that profitability appears to be one of the most determinants of dividend payout.

The relationship between profitability and dividend payout in Iran firm during 2000 – 2008 is examined by Mehdi (2010) using panel data. The study discover very strong, significant, and consistent evidence that the firm pays more dividends. In a relation to this is the study done out by Roomi, Chaudhry, and Azeem (2011) to examine the factors determining dividend for non- financial sector of Pakistan during 2004 - 2010. It is revealed that profitability is not functioning adequately with regard to dividends. It is on record that growth opportunity is financed by the firms' earnings, but to keep pace with growth opportunities and endeavoring to transform them for shareholders only the stable profitable sectors can sustain this.

Rehman and Takumi (2012) study dividend policies of 50 firm listed on the Karachi Stock Exchange and to explain their dividend payment behavior. To examine the impact of firm profitability on dividend payout ratios, they formulated some models. The results reveal that profitability has a positive influence on dividend payout. On the other hand, factors affecting dividend payout evidence from listed non-financial firms of Karachi was explored by (Rafique, 2012). A negatively associated was found between profitability and dividend payout.

The study by Ajanthan (2013) determine the dividend policies of listed hotels and restaurant companies in Sri Lanka for the period of 2009 – 2013. The study employs the regression analysis and hence the random effects models were found more favorable than the pooled models. It is revealed that the dividend policy in Sri Lanka hotels and restaurant firms is a function of profitability. In another study to determine the dividend policy of selected listed firms in Nigeria by Uwuigbe (2012), dividend payout is reveal to be positively affected by the profitability. This implies that firms increase their dividend payout as their profitability is increasing.

Using a panel data set of non-financial firms listed on Nairobi Securities Exchange, Kenya exchanges and a series of random effect models, Musiega (2013) investigate the determinants of dividend policies. Impact of firm profitability on dividend payout ratios was found to be negatively insignificant. This implies that firms' dividend payout is not a function of profitability. Supported by the study of Agyemang (2013) who examine the determinants of dividend payout policy of listed financial institutions in Ghana during 2005-2009 using purposive sampling technique for the sample selection of 11 listed financial institutions and descriptive statistics and multiple regressions for analysis. The study affirms that external borrowing is expensive to acquire for companies with little profitable assets, dividends are less attractive.

An exploration of the impact of dividend payout on corporate profitability evident from the Colombo Stock Exchange during 2007 – 2011 by Thafani and Abdullah (2014). The study reveals that corporate managers do not care for investors' needs in their dividend initiation. The determinants of the firm's dividend policies in the Colombo manufacturing companies, it reveals that dividend payout is a function of profitability. The implication of this is that the dividend payout will depend on the level of profitability. Also, Nuhu (2014) investigate the determinants of dividend payout of financial firms and non-financial firms in Ghana during 2000-2009 using the judgmental sampling technique and regression analysis method. The analysis reveals that there is an insignificant negative relationship between firms' financial performance on the dividend payouts decisions of listed firms in Ghana.

Mubin, Ahmed, Farrukh, Lal, and Hussain (2014) study determinants of dividend payout with industry-wise effect – evidence from KSE 100 Index for the period of 2006 to 2011 and affirm that profitability had a negative effect on dividend payout, which implies that the more profitable firms pay little dividends and retain a larger part of their earning for expansion. Profitability measured by return on assets and earnings per share are negatively associated with the dividend payout ratio but the results are not statistically significant. Contrarily to this is the study of Khan, Shehzad, Anuar, Melati, Ramakrishnan, and Malik (2015) who conduct a study on the effect of firm profitability on dividend payout of Karachi Stock Exchange covering five years period. The firms' profitability has positive significant effects on dividend payout ratio, and this in support signaling hypothesis.

Innocent, Uchechukwu, and Ikechukwu (2015) investigate cement companies on the Nigeria stock exchanges covering a period of 12 years. They discover that a firms profitability had a positive relationship with dividends payout. This connotes that as the profitability of the firm is improving then dividends payout follows the same suit. This in agreement with Dada, Malomo, and Sunday (2015), in their research on a critical evaluation of the determinants of dividend policy of the banking sector in Nigeria from 2008 – 2013. An empirical study on banking firms listed in Nigeria found that profitability shown by earnings per share (EPS) has the highest effect on dividends and it was significant.

Contrarily, research on determinants of target dividend payout ratio using a panel autoregressive distributed lag analysis for a period of 11 years by Demirgüneş (2015), the results reveal that EPS was negatively significant to dividend payout policy. It was found that as firms' Earnings Per Share increases, dividend payout ratio reduces. Thus, the results point out that the effect of profitability on dividend policy may differ over time.

In a related development Elizabeth (2015) observs that firm performance has an insignificant impact on the dividend payout of listed commercial banks in Kenya covering 16 years period. Affirm that an increase or decrease in the financial earnings of a firm tends not to have an impact on dividend payout. However, a study on factors influencing dividend payout policy decisions of the Nigerian listed Firms for a period of 1997 – 2011 using panel data by Kajola (2015) concludes that the profitability had a positive effect dividend payout ratio of a firm. This is not in agreement with the assertion made by Mahdzan (2016) on their study on inter-industry dividend policy determinants covering 5 years period, their empirical findings suggest that firm profitability had an inverse relationship with the dividend policy of firms in Malaysia.

Odawo and Ntoiti (2015) study determinants of dividend payout policy in money deposit banks in Kenya, the study adopted a descriptive research design and used CFC Stanbic Bank as the target population; using secondary data covering 11 years period (2003-2013). The results of the study suggeste that profitability had a strong positive effect on dividend payout. Also, Hassonn et al (2015) investigate the determinants of corporate dividend policy of listed firms in Palestine Stock Exchange for a period of 2008 to 2012. The paper documents that profitability had a positive significant effect on dividend payout. This is contrary to the study of Zayol et al (2017), the findings from the study revealed that profitability is reveal to affect the dividend policy of petroleum firms in Nigeria. The study affirms that profitability is one of the factors to be considered when determining the dividend policy of listed petroleum firms in Nigeria. There are various ways in which profitability can be measured; it can be by earnings before interest and tax (EBIT) to total assets or profit after tax (PAT) to equity that is the return on equity (ROE). Each of these methods has its own advantage and drawback. Like that of EBIT to total assets; firm where larger investment in property, plant, and equipment is needed, EBIT to total assets are usually low and if the firm requires low investments in property, plant, and equipment, the EBIT to Total assets is usually high. Also, the same varies to the extent of EBIT to total assets. The research adopts the PAT to equity to measure profitability.

The bird in hand theory : The Bird in Hand Theory was used to anchor the study. Gordon's theory of dividend payout is one of the concepts that believe in the 'importance of the idea'. Bird-in-the-Hand believes that dividend is now more important in determining the company's value to the dividends expected in the future time. Gordon's model is one of the most popular mathematical models to calculate the market value of the company using its dividend policy (Sanjay, 2012). Most investors would prefer to get the returns on their investment in the form of cash dividends rather than capital appreciation. The bird-in-hand theory postulated that the worth of near future dividend is incomparably higher than the worth of distant future dividend. He buttressed his position further by highlighting that future uncertainty will impair negatively on the value of dividend if it is to be received in the future. The bird-in-hand argument suggests that investors need to realize wealth in order to consume and therefore have a preference for cash dividends over capital gain. Dividend Irrelevance Arguments put forth by Modigliani and Miller (1961) who stated that dividend policy does not affect share price because the value of the firm is a function of its earning capacity and the risk of its assets.

Gordon (2014) maintains that the Bird in the Hand Theory conjectures that individuals, who are assumed risk-averse, prefer a naira in dividends over a naira in future uncertain capital gains (another means of rewarding shareholders). If you have two identical firms, and one pays regular a dividend and the other does not, then there will be a higher demand of stock of the firm that pays a regular dividend and this results to increase in stock price. From the supply side viewpoint, as the stock value of the firm improves due to regular payment there will a firm higher demand for its stock. To payout generous dividend is the optimal dividend policy.

The study therefore adopt Bird in Hand theory and the mathematical model adap is $dpo_{it} = \beta_{0it} + \ + \beta_1 ce_{it} + \beta_2 re_{it} \ + \ \varepsilon_{it}$

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The correlation research design is used as the study is to ascertain the relationship between the profitability and dividend payout. Twenty-seven (20) listed Consumer Goods Firms in Nigeria as of December 2019 serve as population of this study and 10 out of this number used as sample of the study after employing filter method. This study employs secondary data generated from audited annual reports and accounts (2010-2019) of the selected listed Consumer Goods Firms listed in Nigeria. Multiple regression and correlation is adopted as a technique of data analysis to examine the study. n

The following model was used to empirically test the hypotheses formulated

$dpo_{it} = \beta_{0it} + \ + \beta_1 ce_{it} + \beta_2 re_{it} \ + \ \varepsilon_{it}$ Where:

β_1 -β_2 = Coefficients of Determination

dpo = Dividend Payout Ratio

β_o= Intercept of the regression line

ce = Return on capital employed

re = Return on equity

The following table presents the variables used in the model above and their measurements.

Table 1: Variable Measurement

	Variable	Measurement of Variable	Authors
1.	Dividend Payout	Dividend per equity share / Earnings per share	Uwuigbe (20013), Nurul, Mahdzen &Nikoo (2016)
2.	Return on Capital Employed	Profit before interest and tax / Capital Emplyed	Anupam &Arindam (2009), Demirgüneş (2015)
3.	Return on Equity	Net Profit after Tax / Shareholders' Equity	Muhammad et al (2014), Elizabeth (2015), Nurul, Mahdzen & Nikoo (2016)

Source: Compiled by the Author, 2021

IV. DISCUSION OF RESULT

Table 2: Correlation Matrix

	Dpo	CE	RE
DPO	1		
CE	0.5403**	1	
	0.0000		
RE	0.1337**	0.0671	0.1695
	0.0042	0.5072	0.0919

Source: STATA 13.0 Output 2021

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

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

The result from the correlation analysis indicates that there is a positive and significant relationship between the dependent variable (dividend payout) and independent variable (return on capital and return on Equity). However, the result shows that there is an insignificant relationship between explanatory variables of listed consumer goods firms in Nigeria.

Table 3: Robustness Tests

	Prob> chi2	VIF	1/VIF
CE		1.09	0.820781
RE		1.19	0.888795
Mean		1.25	
Hottest	0.0673		
Hausman Test	0.6757		
xttest0	0.0333		

Source: STATA 13.0 Output 2021

Table 3 shows the robustness test to checks for the possibility of multicollinearity. The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) reveals the absence of it as all factors are below 10 and tolerance values are below 1. This is based on Gujarati (2013) rule of thumb, who says that if the VIF of value exceeds 10, that value is said to be highly collinear. Table 3 also presents the Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity which shows p-value of 0.0673, indicating an absence of heteroscedasticity as the p-value is greater than 0.05. This is based on Gujarati (2013) who says that if heteroscedasticity test is significant means there is a problem of heteroscedasticity. Panel data was tested using a fixed effect, random effect, and pooled OLS regression models. In order to determine which of the models was appropriate for the study, two main tests were conducted. These are the Hausman test and the Breusch-Pagan Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test. The Hausman test determines the more suitable methodology between fixed and random effect, whiles the Breusch-Pagan Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test determines the more suitable method between random effect and pooled OLS regression.

The result in Table 4.4 also indicates that we fail to reject the null hypothesis that the differences between the coefficients of the fixed and random effect models are not significant. This is because the prob Chi2 of 0.6757 is greater than 0.05. Therefore the test concludes that fixed effect is not the optimal model to be employed in this study, but does not at the same time guarantee that the random effect model is also optimal. In order to test whether the random effect model is optimal, the Breusch-Pagan Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test is employed to compare the random effect model and the pooled OLS regression model. From table 3, the results of the LM test conclude that random effect model is the better model to use with the panel data. This is because the prob<chi2 0.0328 is not greater than 0.05 implying that there is a significant difference in the variance across the selected companies. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis that there is no variance across the selected companies. Consequently, we conclude that random effect is the most appropriate model for the study.

Table 4: Summary of regression result

Variables	Coefficient	t value	p value
Constant	-.5472068	7.15	0.000
CE	1.184753	3.59	0.000
Fs	0.064083	3.07	0.004
R^2			0.5343
Wald chi^2			68.70
F-sig			0.000

Source: STATA 13.0 Output 2021

The R2 overall (0.5343) which is the total variation of determination gave the proportion of the total variation in the dependent variable explained by the independent variable jointly. Hence, it signified that 53.43% of the total variation in a dividend payout of listed Consumer Goods firms in Nigeria was caused by their CE and RE.The Wald Chi2 of 68.70 which is significant at 1% indicates that the dividend payout and the determinants model is fit. This indicates that the model is fit and the independent variables are properly selected, combined and used. This implies that for any changes in the explanatory variables of listed Consumer Goods Firms in Nigeria, their dividend payout will be directly affected. The value of Wald Chi2 which is statistically significant at a level of 0.000, means that there is a 99.9% probability that the relationship between the variables was not due to a mere change

The hypotheses of the study are tested as follows: The result in table 4 shows that profitability as measured by CE and RE is strongly significant in predicting dividend payout of listed Consumer Goods Firms in Nigeria. The profitability of listed consumer goods firms in Nigeria has a positive and significant relationship to the dividend payout. Since the p-value in respect of two measure of proftitability to dividend payout is significant at 1%, the result provides evidence of rejecting the hypothesis. Therefore the finding is inline with Hellström & Inagambaev (2012), Mehdi (2010), Roomi et al (2011), Rehman and Takumi (2012), and Zayol et al (2017) who are of the view that profitability has direct effect on dividend payout but this is against the findings of Mubin et al (2014) and Parua (2009).

The R2 overall (0.4335) which is the total variation of determination gave the proportion of the total variation in the dependent variable explained by the independent variable jointly. Hence, it signified that 43.34% of the total variation in a dividend payout of listed Consumer Goods firms in Nigeria was caused by their corporate tax, profitability, firm size, leverage, sales growth, and liquidity.The Wald Chi2 of 69.90 which is significant at 1% indicates that the dividend payout and the determinants model is fit. This indicates that the model is fit and the independent variables are properly selected, combined and used. This implies that for any changes in the explanatory variables of listed Consumer Goods Firms in Nigeria, their dividend payout will be directly affected. The value of Wald Chi2 which is statistically significant at a level of 0.000, means that there is a 99.9% probability that the relationship between the variables was not due to a mere change

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Again, profitability has a positive and significant relationship with dividend payout. The result reveals that higher profitability of listed consumer goods firms in Nigeria would lead to a higher dividend payout which aid in the retention of shareholders who seek to invest in firms that pay dividends. The study following recommend that the management of consumer goods firms in Nigeria should utilize the retained earnings for expansion in order to improve turnover as it increases profitability which invariably determines dividend payout of the firm.

REFERENCE

1. Agyemang, E. B. (2013). Determinants of dividend payout policy of listed financial institutions in Ghana. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, *4*(7), 2222–2847. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2298/PAN1306725N
2. Ajanthan, A. (2013). Corporate governance and dividend policy: a study of listed hotels and restaurant companies in Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Scientific & Research Publications*, *3*(12), 98–114.
3. Azeez, A., & Muhibudeen, L. (2015). Relationship between dividend payout and firms' performance: evaluation of dividend policy of Oando Plc. *International Journal of Contemporary Applied Sciences*, *2*(6), 2308–1365. Retrieved from www.ijcas.net
4. Baker, H. K. (2009). *Dividends and dividend policy*. New Jersey: JohnWiley & Sons, Inc.
5. Baskerville, P. (2017). What is the meaning of liquidity vs. profitability? Retrieved from https://www.quora.com/What-is-the-meaning-of-liquidity-vs-profitability
6. Blakely, R. (2017). What's the Difference Between Profit and Profitability. Retrieved from https://www.patriotsoftware.com/accounting/training/blog/difference-between-profit-profitability/
7. Dada, F. B., Malomo, E., & Sunday, O. (2015). Critical evaluation of the determinats of dividend policy of banking sector in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, *III*(2), 1–11.
8. Demirgüneş, K. (2015). Determinants of target dividend payout ratio : a panel autoregressive distributed lag analysis. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, *5*(2), 418–426. Retrieved from http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-84927947849&partnerID=tZOtx3y1
9. Elizabeth, W. M. (2015). *The effect of profitability on dividend policy of commercial bnaks in Kenya*. University of Nairobi.
10. Frank, W. & Alan, S. (2002). *Business accounting I* (9^{th} ed.). England: Peason Education Ltd.
11. Gordon, D. M. (2014). Financial edifiction in a 21st Century economic environment. *ASBBS Annual Conference: Las Vega*, *21*(1), 300–304. Retrieved from http://asbbs.org/files/ASBBS2014/PDF/G/GordonD(P300-304).pdf
12. Gujitari, D. N. (2013). *Basic econometrics* (5^{th} ed.). United State of America: McGraw Hill Education.
13. Hassonn, A., Tran, H., & Quach, H. (2015). The determinants of corporate dividend policy: evidence from Palestine. *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal*, *5*(4), 29–41.
14. Hellström, G., & Inagambaev, G. (2012). *Determinants of dividend payout ratios a study of Swedish large*

and medium Caps. Umeå University.

15. Innocent, C., Uchechukwu, A., & Ikechukwu, C. (2015). The effect of dividend payout on performance evaluation: evidence of quoted cement companies in Nigeria. *European Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance ResearchOnline) European Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance Research*, *33*(1111), 40–59. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00139728.5
16. Kajola, S. O. (2015). Factors influencing dividend payout policy Decisions of Nigerian listed firms. *International Joournal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, *3*(6), 539–557.
17. Khan, S., Anuar, M. A., Ramakrishnan, S.; &Malik, M. F. (2015). A study on the effect of dividend Payout ratio and firm profitability. *Science International (Lahore)*, *27*(2), 1403–1406.
18. Khemani, R. S., & Shapiro, D. M. (1993). *Glossary of statistical Terms*. *Glossary of Industrial Organisation Economics and Competition Law*. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264055087-en
19. Mahdzan, J. (2016). Understanding financial liquidity. *Investopedia*. Retrieved from http://www.investopedia.com/articles/basics/07/liquidity.asp
20. Mehdi, M. M. (2010). Factors affecting dividend policy: empirical evidence of Iran. *Posovna Izvrsnost Zagreb, GOD, IV*(1), 45–58.
21. Miller, M. H. & Modigliani, F. (1961). Dividend Policy, Growth and the Valuation of Shares. *Journal of Business*, *34*, 411-433.
22. Mubin, M., Ahmed, M., Farrukh, M., Lal, I., & Hussain, A. (2014). Determinants of dividend with industry-wise effect – evidence from KSE 100 Index. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, *5*(3), 62–69. Retrieved from www.iiste.org
23. Nuhu, E. (2014). Determinants of dividend payout of financial firms and non-financial firms in Ghana. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, *4*(3), 109–118. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARAFMS/v4-i3/1057
24. Odawo, C., & Ntoiti, J. (2015). Determinants of dividend payout policy in public Ltd banks in Kenya: a case study of CFC Stanbic Bank. *The Strategic Journal of Management*, *2*(54), 182–191.
25. Pandey, I. M. (2004). Theories of capital structure: evidence from an emerging market. *Studies in Economics and Finance*, *22*(2), 1–26.
26. Parua, A. (2009). Dividend history and determinants in selected Indian companies: a study during 1993-’94 to 2004-’05. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal*,*3*(4), 45–84.
27. Rafique, M. (2012). Factors affecting dividend payout : evidence From listed non-financial firms of Karachi Stock Exchange. *Business Management Dynamics*, *1*(11), 76–92.
28. Rehman, A., & Takumi, H. (2012). Determinants of dividend payout ratio: evidence from Karachi Stock Exchange (KSE). *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business Research*, *1*(1), 20–27.
29. Roomi, M. A., Chaudhry, N. I., & Azeem, M. (2011). Dividend payment practices in the non- financial sector of Pakistan : empirical evidence from the Karachi Stock Exchange. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, *59*, 2060–2068.
30. Sanjay, B. (2012). Gordon’S theory on dividend policy. Retrieved from https://efinancemanagement.com/dividend-decisions/gordons-theory-on-dividend-policy#Crux_of_Gordon8217s_Model
31. Schreiber, D., & Stroik, G. E. (2005). *All about dividend investing: The easy way to get started*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
32. Thafani, A. R. F., & Abdullah, M. A. M. (2014). Impact of dividend payout on corporate profitability: evident from Colombo Stock Exchange. *Advances in Economics and Business Management (AEBM)*, *1*(1), 27–33.
33. Uwuigbe, U. (2012). An assessment of the determinants of share price in Nigeria: a study of selected listed Firms. *Acta Universitatis*, *8*(6), 78–88. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx.
34. Zayol, P., Theophilus, M. A., & Mirian, M. (2017). Determinants of dividend policy of petroleum firms in Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance*, *8*(3), 54–62. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.9790/5933-0803045462