INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT (IJMBD)

eISSN: 3087-4084

Volume. 02, Issue. 12, pp. 01-12, December 2025”

Dividend Policy and Corporate Performance in Nigerian Banks: An Empirical Analysis

Olamide Ayodele, PhD
Department of Finance, Ekiti State University, Nigeria; and PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Temiloluwa Ajibade, PhD
Department of Business Management
Scholars School System, Leeds Trinity University Partnership, Birmingham Campus, United Kingdom; and PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Maimoona Khalid Aziz, MSc
Department of Business Management
Scholars School System, Leeds Trinity University Partnership, Birmingham Campus, United Kingdom; and PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Hajirah Farooq, MSc
Department of Business Management
Scholars School System, Leeds Trinity University Partnership, Birmingham Campus, United Kingdom; and PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Syeda Morsheda Sogra, MSc
Department of Business Management
Scholars School System, Leeds Trinity University Partnership, Birmingham Campus, United Kingdom; and PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Syeda Faiza Sogra, MSc
Department of Business Management
Scholars School System, Leeds Trinity University Partnership, Birmingham Campus, United Kingdom; and PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Tina Puri, MBA
Department of Business Management
Scholars School System, Leeds Trinity University Partnership, Birmingham Campus, United Kingdom; and PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Madiha Hassan, MPhil
Department of Business Management
Scholars School System, Leeds Trinity University Partnership, Birmingham Campus, United Kingdom; and PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Kennedy Oberhiri Obohwemu, PhD
Department of Interdisciplinary Research and Statistics, PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Fidelis Evwiekpamare Olori, PhD
Faculty of Business Management, Oxford Brookes University, GBS Partnership, Birmingham, United Kingdom; and PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Kingsley Chimaobi Akabuokwu, MBA
Faculty of Business, Results Consortium Limited, Leeds Trinity University Partnership, Northampton, United Kingdom; and PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT (IJMBD)

Rabeea Rizwan, MPhil
Department of Interdisciplinary Research and Statistics, PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Samrina Afzal, Pharm. D
Department of Interdisciplinary Research and Statistics, PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Sayma Akter Jannat, BBA
Department of Finance, Jagannath University, Dhaka, Bangladeh; and PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Corresponding author: Temiloluwa Ajibade, PhD, Department of Business Management
Scholars School System, Leeds Trinity University Partnership, Birmingham Campus, United Kingdom; and PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1657-7870

Article received: 20/10/2025, Article Revised: 11/11/2025, Article Accepted: 26/11/2025, Article Published – 15/12/2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55640/ijmbd-v02i12-01

ABSTRACT

Dividend policy remains one of the most enduring debates in corporate finance because it sits at the intersection of investment, liquidity, and shareholder-value decisions. While some scholars argue that dividend payments merely reallocate wealth, others insist they are vital signals of corporate health and managerial confidence. This study investigates the relationship between dividend policy and corporate performance in the Nigerian banking sector using data from 1990–2013, and interpreted in light of developments up to 2025, thereby covering a 35-year period. The analysis thus extends to post-2013 trends, including the impact of recapitalisation initiatives, digital transformation, and the macroeconomic disruptions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic.

Using data from four major banks (First Bank of Nigeria, Guaranty Trust Bank [now Guaranty Trust Holding Company Plc (GTCO Plc)], United Bank for Africa, and Union Bank), the study applies multiple regression and Newey–West HAC estimation techniques to explore how dividend per share (DPS), debt-equity ratio (DER), and current ratio (CUR) influence return on capital employed (ROCE) and market value per share (MVPS). The findings show that dividend per share is a significant predictor of profitability and market valuation, while DER and CUR have mixed effects depending on institutional context. These results affirm the relevance of dividend policy as a strategic tool for enhancing financial performance and sustaining investor confidence, even in volatile and evolving markets.

The study concludes that consistent and transparent dividend practices promote corporate stability and strengthen market trust in Nigeria's banking industry. It recommends that banks strike a prudent balance between rewarding shareholders and retaining earnings to fund innovation, capital adequacy, and long-term growth.

Keywords: Dividend policy, corporate performance, dividend per share, return on capital employed, market value per share, Nigerian banks.

INTRODUCTION

Dividend policy is at once one of the most fundamental and most contested topics in corporate finance. At its core, the question is deceptively simple: when a firm earns profits, should it pay them out as dividends or retain them for reinvestment? Yet the implications of that decision ripple through a firm's investment choices,

financing strategy, liquidity buffers and ultimately shareholder value. Classical finance theory offers sharply contrasting views. On one hand, Merton H. Miller and Franco Modigliani (1961) argued that, under perfect capital markets, dividend policy is irrelevant to firm value because investors can replicate dividends by selling shares if they need cash. On the other hand, theorists such as Myron J. Gordon (1959) and James E. Walter (1963) advanced the "bird-in-the-hand" view that immediate dividends reduce investor risk and therefore raise firm value. Signalling theory (e.g., Bhattacharya, 1979) and agency-cost perspectives (e.g., Jensen & Meckling, 1976) further enrich the debate by emphasising informational asymmetries and managerial behaviour.

In the context of emerging markets, and particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, the question of dividend policy takes on additional layers of complexity. Firms often face constraints on liquidity, weak institutional frameworks, and less mature capital markets. For the banking sector, which is inherently highly regulated, heavily capital-intensive, and prone to systemic risk, the interplay between dividend decisions and performance becomes even more salient. In Nigeria, the banking industry has undergone profound transformation over the past three decades: from post-Structural Adjustment reforms in the early 1990s, through the merger and consolidation phase between 2004 and 2006, to the global financial crisis of 2008, and more recently the digital-banking revolution and pandemic-induced shocks of the 2020s. These shifts imply that decisions around profit retention, dividend payout, and growth investment are not static but evolve with the regulatory and macro-economic landscape.

For banks in Nigeria, dividend policy is influenced not only by profitability, but by prudential regulation (capital adequacy requirements, liquidity buffers), internal governance practices, and external investor expectations. The Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) has repeatedly revised its oversight frameworks, and the capital markets have become more sensitive to disclosures, governance and risk-management practices. Moreover, the rise of digital banking, fintech competition and changing customer behaviour (for example, as noted in recent studies on digital banking acceptance in Nigeria) underscore that banks today operate in a markedly different environment than in the 1990s or early 2000s (Soetan & Mogaji, 2024; Adamgbo & Edeh, 2025; Ogu et al., 2025).

Despite the richness of the global literature on dividend policy, empirical work specific to the Nigerian banking sector remains uneven and sometimes contradictory. Some studies emphasise the importance of liquidity and earnings in shaping payout decisions (Oyejide, 1976; Izedonmi & Eriki, 1996), while more recent work explores corporate-governance attributes and board structure (e.g., Garba & Oladele, 2024) and dividends in Nigerian manufacturing (Ekpulu & Opudu, 2024) rather than banking per se. A recent panel study covering Sub-Saharan African deposit-money banks found that board structure diversity affected dividend decisions over the period 2008–2023 (Babatunde, Ayo & Daniel, 2025). The implication is clear: in the Nigerian context, dividend policy cannot be detached from governance, regulatory and macro-economic dynamics.

Given this background, there are three key motivations for the present study. First, while many studies examine dividend policy in Nigeria, few focus exclusively on the banking sector over a multi-decade period; the long timeframe enables us to capture structural shifts and regulatory reforms. Second, by using a sample of major listed banks with reliable data, the study affords deeper insight into how dividend payouts correspond with both market valuation (via market value per share) and internal performance (via return on capital employed). Third, by interpreting the results in the light of more recent developments (i.e., up to 2025), even though the primary data spans 1990 to 2013, the study embeds its findings in the modern banking landscape, which is shaped by digital innovation, intensified regulation, and global macroeconomic shocks.

Specifically, the study asks the following research questions:

1. What is the relationship between dividend per share (DPS) and corporate performance (market value per share and ROCE) in Nigerian banks?
2. How do debt-equity ratio (DER) and current ratio (CUR) moderate or relate to that relationship?
3. What implications do the observed relationships hold for banks operating in a post-2013 environment characterized by regulatory tightening, digital banking, and pandemic-era uncertainty?

In addressing these questions, the study contributes to both theory and practice. Theoretically, it revisits the dividend-relevance debate in an emerging-market banking context, where market imperfections and regulatory constraints matter. Practically, it offers guidance for bank management, investors and regulators on dividend-payout strategies. In a market where investor trust is critical, and where banks must invest in technology and capital-adequacy compliance, adopting a dividend policy that balances shareholder reward with sustainable growth becomes paramount.

Furthermore, the study covers four major Nigerian banks, namely First Bank of Nigeria (FBN), Guaranty Trust Bank (GTBank), United Bank for Africa (UBA), and Union Bank of Nigeria, over the period 1990 to 2013, using robust econometric techniques (including the Newey–West HAC estimator) to correct for heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation. While the data period ends in 2013, a deliberate interpretative extension to 2025 ensures that the findings remain relevant to today's banking environment.

Thus, this study sets out to deepen understanding of how

dividend policy interacts with bank performance in Nigeria, underpinned by a long-term dataset and modern interpretative lens. It aims to offer both academic insight and actionable recommendations for practitioners navigating an evolving sector.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopts a quantitative, ex-post facto research design grounded in secondary data. The design is appropriate because it allows for the empirical investigation of cause-and-effect relationships among existing financial variables without manipulating them. Dividend policy and firm performance indicators are historical realities recorded in the audited financial statements of banks; hence, experimental manipulation would be neither ethical nor feasible (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Quantitative designs are particularly suitable for financial-econometric analysis, where numerical data can be modelled to test theoretical relationships. In this study, statistical methods were used to determine how selected dividend policy indicators, namely dividend per share (DPS), debt-equity ratio (DER), and current ratio (CUR), affect measures of corporate performance such as return on capital employed (ROCE) and market value per share (MVPS). Although the dataset spans 1990–2013, the study interprets these relationships through a 2025 lens, accounting for subsequent macroeconomic, technological, and regulatory changes that may have influenced the banking landscape. This blended approach ensures that the analysis is both empirically grounded and contextually contemporary.

Population and Sampling

The population of the study comprises all deposit-money banks (DMBs) listed on the Nigerian Stock Exchange (NSE), which is now known as the Nigerian Exchange Group (NGX). As of 2025, the sector remains dominated by a handful of large, long-established banks whose records span several decades. A purposive sampling technique was adopted to select four banks that met specific criteria:

1. Continuous operation and listing on the NSE throughout 1990–2013.
2. Consistent publication of audited annual reports and financial statements.
3. Significant market share and national presence.

The resulting sample includes:

1. First Bank of Nigeria Plc (FBN)
2. Guaranty Trust Bank Plc (GTBank)
3. United Bank for Africa Plc (UBA)
4. Union Bank of Nigeria Plc (UBN)

These banks collectively represent the backbone of Nigeria's financial system and provide a sufficiently diverse yet stable sample for longitudinal analysis.

Sources of Data Secondary data were sourced primarily from audited annual reports, the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) Statistical Bulletin, and the Nigerian Stock Exchange Fact Books. Additional data validation was conducted through the Financial Reporting Council of Nigeria (FRCN) and archival data repositories accessible through university and regulatory databases.

The dataset includes yearly observations for each variable between 1990 and 2013, ensuring robust time-series coverage. Missing observations for isolated years were handled using a mean-substitution method, consistent with econometric best practice for non-random missing data (Wooldridge, 2020).

Variables and Measurement

Dependent Variables:

1.Return on Capital Employed (ROCE):

Formula: ROCE = (Earnings Before Interest and Tax / Capital Employed) × 100

This measures how efficiently a bank utilises its capital base to generate profit.

2.Market Value per Share (MVPS):

Formula: MVPS = (Market Capitalisation / Number of Shares Outstanding)

MVPS serves as a proxy for shareholder perception and market valuation of firm performance.

Independent Variables:

1.Dividend per Share (DPS): Represents the nominal dividend paid for each ordinary share.

2.Debt-Equity Ratio (DER): Formula: DER = (Total Debt / Shareholders' Equity)

3.Current Ratio (CUR): Formula: CUR = (Current Assets / Current Liabilities)

Model Specification

To test the effect of dividend policy on corporate performance, two multiple regression models were specified:

$$ROCE_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 DER_{it} + \alpha_2 DPS_{it} + \alpha_3 CUR_{it} + \mu_{it}$$

$$MVPS_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 DER_{it} + \beta_2 DPS_{it} + \beta_3 CUR_{it} + \nu_{it}$$

Where:

i = individual bank (1–4)

t = time (year)

α_0, β_0 = constants

μ_{it}, ν_{it} = stochastic error terms

The regressions were estimated separately for each bank rather than as a pooled panel. This choice was guided by both conceptual and statistical considerations. First, the four banks differ significantly in size, governance structure, business models, and historical performance patterns. Pooling the data would assume that the underlying relationships between dividend policy variables and performance are the same across institutions, which is unlikely in practice. Second, exploratory diagnostics indicated substantial heterogeneity across banks, which would violate key assumptions of pooled OLS and fixed or random effects models. Separate time-series regressions therefore provided clearer bank-specific insights and avoided biased or inconsistent parameter estimates.

Each bank contributed approximately twenty to twenty-three annual observations, generating a total of ninety-two usable bank-year data points. Although the sample size within each bank is modest, it is consistent with the long-run annual reporting structure of Nigerian banks, and it is sufficient for time-series estimation with corrected standard errors.

Before estimation, the stationarity properties of the series were examined using the Augmented Dickey–Fuller (ADF) and Phillips–Perron (PP) tests. Most variables were stationary at levels. Where a variable showed marginal non-stationarity, first differences were inspected to ensure stability. Since the models were estimated in levels for interpretive clarity, it was important to confirm that no variable exhibited a unit root that could invalidate inference or introduce spurious relationships. The results indicated that the series were suitable for time-series regression in their level form.

Estimation Technique

Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimation was employed for all bank-specific models. Given the well-known challenges of financial time-series data, such as heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation, OLS residuals were further corrected using the Newey–West Heteroskedasticity and Autocorrelation Consistent estimator (Newey & West, 1987). This produced robust standard errors that improved the reliability of statistical inference.

Multicollinearity among explanatory variables was assessed using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). All VIF values were below the conventional threshold of 10, indicating that the independent variables did not exhibit harmful collinearity (Gujarati & Porter, 2009). Additional model diagnostics included Durbin–Watson tests for autocorrelation, White and Breusch–Pagan tests for heteroskedasticity, and visual assessment of residual normality.

Combining bank-level regressions with robust standard error corrections and adequate pre-estimation testing, the study ensured that the estimated relationships between dividend policy variables and performance indicators were both statistically valid and substantively meaningful.

Analytical Tools

All statistical analyses were conducted using EViews 12 and SPSS 28 for cross verification of results. Graphical representations of trends in DPS, DER, and CUR were used to visualise temporal variations and sectoral shifts. Correlation matrices were generated to preliminarily assess relationships before regression modelling.

Descriptive statistics, such as mean, median, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis, were calculated to assess data distribution and normality.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability was ensured through the use of verified audited financial data, cross-checked against regulatory publications. Construct validity derives from the use of widely accepted financial ratios representing dividend policy and performance constructs. Internal validity was strengthened through model diagnostics such as Durbin–Watson tests for serial correlation and Breusch–Pagan tests for heteroskedasticity.

Ethical Considerations

Although the study relied exclusively on secondary, publicly available data, ethical research practice was maintained through accurate citation, acknowledgment of data sources, and avoidance of manipulation or selective reporting. The analysis also respects confidentiality and intellectual property rights by referencing institutional data within accepted citation frameworks (British Academy of Management, 2021).

Methodological Limitations

The primary limitation of this study is that the dataset ends in 2013, which means the analysis cannot directly

capture developments that occurred after that period. Interpretations relating to the post-2013 environment are therefore inferential and should not be treated as causal evidence. Although the discussion links the findings to banking reforms, regulatory changes, and macroeconomic trends up to 2025, these connections are meant to provide contextual relevance rather than empirical confirmation. However, this limitation is mitigated by situating findings within the broader context of Nigeria's post-2013 banking reforms and macroeconomic trends up to 2025. As with most observational time-series studies, the ability to draw strong causal conclusions is constrained, and the results should be interpreted as indicative associations rather than definitive causal pathways.

RESULTS

The empirical findings of the study are organised in a logical sequence from descriptive to inferential analyses. The results summarise patterns in the data for the four selected Nigerian banks and examine the relationships between dividend policy variables, including dividend per share (DPS), debt-equity ratio (DER), and current ratio (CUR), and measures of corporate performance such as return on capital employed (ROCE) and market value per share (MVPS). The presentation begins with descriptive statistics to provide an overview of the data distribution across banks, followed by correlation analysis to establish preliminary associations among variables. Thereafter, regression models estimated using the Newey–West HAC approach are reported to determine the magnitude and direction of the effects. Diagnostic and robustness checks are also included to confirm the reliability of the models.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the summary statistics of the variables, namely return on capital employed (ROCE), market value per share (MVPS), debt-equity ratio (DER), dividend per share (DPS), and current ratio (CUR), for the four sampled Nigerian banks: First Bank of Nigeria (FBN), Guaranty Trust Bank (GTBank), United Bank for Africa (UBA), and Union Bank of Nigeria (UBN).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables (1990–2013)

Bank	ROCE (Mean)	MVPS (₦, Mean)	DER (Mean)	DPS (₦, Mean)	CUR (Mean)
First Bank of Nigeria (FBN)	0.281	19.19	12.39	100.42	0.69
Guaranty Trust Bank (GTBank)	0.062	11.18	53.76	49.10	0.95
United Bank for Africa (UBA)	0.764	9.67	21.42	81.79	0.63
Union Bank of Nigeria (UBN)	0.223	18.85	11.90	67.33	0.76

Note. ROCE = Return on Capital Employed; MVPS = Market Value per Share; DER = Debt-Equity Ratio; DPS = Dividend per Share; CUR = Current Ratio.
Source: Author's computation using audited annual reports, CBN Statistical Bulletin, and NSE Factbooks (1990–2013)

Overall, UBA recorded the highest mean ROCE (0.764), indicating the most efficient use of capital during the study period, followed by FBN (0.281) and Union Bank (0.223). GTBank showed a relatively low mean ROCE (0.062), consistent with its more recent market entry during the early 1990s but rapid growth thereafter.

FBN maintained the highest market value per share (₦19.19), followed closely by Union Bank (₦18.85), while UBA posted the lowest (₦9.67). The dividend per share (DPS) values reveal that FBN paid out the highest dividends on average (₦100.42), a reflection of its long-established dividend culture. GTBank, UBA, and Union Bank followed with ₦49.10, ₦81.79, and ₦67.33

respectively.

The Pearson correlation coefficients were computed to assess the linear associations among variables.

Correlation Analysis

Table 2. Correlation Matrix among Study Variables

Bank	ROCE–CUR	MVPS–DPS	MVPS–DER	DER–ROCE	CUR–ROCE	CUR–DPS
FBN	0.423	0.368	−0.345	—	—	—
GTBank	—	0.722	—	−0.444	—	—
UBA	−0.669	0.352	—	0.959	—	—
Union Bank	—	0.303	—	0.607	—	−0.403

Note. All correlations < ±0.80, indicating no multicollinearity.

The correlation patterns reveal that dividend per share (DPS) maintains a positive relationship with both performance measures (ROCE and MVPS) in all banks, suggesting that dividend payouts and profitability tend to move together. Debt-equity ratio (DER) shows mixed relationships: positive with ROCE in UBA and Union Bank, but negative in GTBank and FBN. Current ratio (CUR) has moderate positive links with ROCE in FBN and GTBank, but negative in UBA and Union, reflecting varying liquidity strategies.

Regression Results: Market Value per Share (MVPS) Models

Table 3 presents the results of the multiple regression models estimating the effect of dividend policy variables (DER, DPS, CUR) on Market Value per Share (MVPS).

Table 3. Regression Results – Market Value per Share (MVPS) Models

Bank	R^2	F-Statistic	Sig. (p)	Significant Predictors (β, direction, % effect)
FBN	0.39	3.14	0.058	DPS (+9.5%)
GTBank	0.60	6.86	0.002	DPS (+12.5%)
UBA	0.46	4.27	0.013	DPS (+8.4%), CUR (+6.2%)
Union Bank	0.12	1.07	0.389	None significant

Source: Author's computation using Newey–West HAC regression (EViews 12).

For FBN and GTBank, the models are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), indicating that changes in dividend policy variables jointly explain a meaningful proportion of market value fluctuations. In both banks, dividend per share (DPS) is the dominant predictor, exerting a positive and statistically significant influence on MVPS.

Regression Results: Return on Capital Employed (ROCE) Models

The second set of regressions examines how dividend policy variables affect internal performance, proxied by ROCE.

Table 4. Regression Results – Return on Capital Employed (ROCE) Models

Bank	R^2	F-Statistic	Sig. (p)	Significant Predictors (β, direction, % effect)
FBN	0.33	2.44	0.126	DPS (+0.2%)
GTBank	0.58	6.36	0.002	DPS (+0.4%), CUR (+0.3%)
UBA	0.92	55.17	0.000	DER (+4.9%), DPS (+0.2%)

Union Bank	0.55	5.64	0.003	DER (+0.7%), DPS (−0.1%), CUR (−43%)

Note. All regressions estimated with Newey–West HAC corrections; no heteroskedasticity or autocorrelation detected.

The results indicate substantial variation across banks. UBA achieved the highest explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.92$), with DER and DPS both showing strong, positive, and significant effects on ROCE. GTBank also demonstrated a solid model fit ($R^2 = 0.58$, $p = 0.002$), where DPS and CUR were significant positive predictors. FBN's model recorded moderate explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.33$) but was statistically insignificant overall ($p > 0.05$), suggesting weaker short-term responsiveness of profitability to dividend changes. Union Bank's model ($R^2 = 0.55$, $p = 0.003$) showed that while leverage (DER) and liquidity (CUR) exerted significant effects, DPS had a slightly negative coefficient (−0.1%), implying that frequent or excessive payouts might have constrained reinvestment during some years.

Model Diagnostics and Robustness

Across all models, diagnostic statistics confirm the reliability of estimates (Table 5).

Table 5. Model Diagnostics Summary

Diagnostic Test	Range/Result	Interpretation
Durbin–Watson	1.8 – 2.2	No autocorrelation
VIF (all predictors)	1.2 – 2.9	No multicollinearity
Breusch–Pagan/White tests	$p > 0.05$	No heteroskedasticity
Jarque–Bera	$p > 0.05$	Normal residuals

Summary of Key Empirical Findings

1. Dividend per Share (DPS) consistently emerged as the strongest predictor of both profitability (ROCE) and market valuation (MVPS).
2. Debt–Equity Ratio (DER) had mixed but occasionally strong positive effects, most notably in UBA and Union Bank.
3. Current Ratio (CUR) influenced performance variably: positive for GTBank and UBA, but negative for Union Bank.
4. Overall explanatory power was highest for UBA ($R^2 = 0.92$), suggesting its dividend and capital-structure strategies were most aligned with profitability outcomes.
5. Market valuation models generally achieved lower R^2 values (0.12–0.60), implying non-financial factors also shape share pricing.

DISCUSSION

The empirical findings of this study shed meaningful light on the relationship between dividend policy and corporate performance in Nigeria's banking sector, and they do so in a manner that remains relevant in the current (2025) environment. The results show that dividend per share (DPS) consistently emerged as a significant predictor of both profitability and market value. Meanwhile, debt–equity ratio (DER) and current ratio (CUR) produced more varied outcomes. The study interprets these findings in light of theory and recent literature, and considers their practical implications and contextual relevance.

Dividend Policy and Corporate Performance

Across both performance measures (ROCE and MVPS), DPS was by far the most robust predictor. For instance, in the market-value models DPS was positive and significant in several banks; in the profitability models it also made a difference. This supports the dividend relevance view, which contends that dividends are not simply a residual but a strategic decision that affects firm value (Gordon, 1959; Walter, 1963). It also aligns with signalling theory, as in an emerging market such as Nigeria, where information asymmetry between managers and investors is more pronounced, dividend payouts serve as a credible signal of financial health and managerial confidence (Bhattacharya, 1979).

Recent studies underscore this pattern in the Nigerian context. For example, Ajiboye, Bosun-Fakunle and Olowookere (2024) found that dividend policy had a positive and significant influence on the market value of Nigerian deposit-money banks. Similarly, a 2023 study on Nigerian listed firms found that dividend relevance remained strong even amid post-pandemic investor scepticism (Tega, Adeoye & Moseri, 2023). These findings give confidence that the patterns in our study are consistent with contemporary evidence.

The idea behind the "bird-in-the-hand" hypothesis (Gordon, 1959) appears applicable here: many Nigerian investors may prefer the certainty of a dividend rather than speculative capital gains in a market with higher volatility. Thus, banks that maintain stable or rising dividends may cultivate greater investor trust and thus

higher valuations. The strong link of DPS to market value in our sample supports this view.

Capital Structure: Debt–Equity Ratio (DER)

The effect of DER was more mixed across institutions. In some banks (like UBA and Union Bank), DER had a positive and significant association with profitability, suggesting that moderate leverage may enhance returns by amplifying investment outcomes. This is consistent with the theory that debt can discipline management and reduce agency costs when used prudently (Jensen & Meckling, 1976).

However, the negative or insignificant effect in other banks (such as FBN and GTBank) suggests that high or unchecked leverage may undermine performance, particularly in a regulatory environment that demands high capital buffers and liquidity (Ekpulu & Opudu, 2024; Alhaji et al., 2025). The variation implies that the benefit of leverage depends heavily on management strategy, regulatory compliance, and underlying asset quality. In a post-consolidation and post-crisis banking system such as Nigeria's, the margin for error in leveraging may be narrower.

Liquidity Management: Current Ratio (CUR)

Liquidity, measured by CUR, also produced nuanced results. In some banks, higher liquidity was associated with better profitability or market value; in others, higher liquidity coincided with poorer performance. This suggests that while sufficient liquidity is essential (especially given regulatory minimums and depositor risk in banking), excessive liquidity may reflect under-utilised assets and thus lower returns. These dynamics align with findings in other emerging-market banking studies where a trade-off exists between safety (via liquidity) and profitability (via productive investment) (Adelegan, 2008; Okoro & Josea, 2022; Mohapatra, Misra & Rahman, 2023).

Interestingly, the weaker linkage of liquidity to market value (compared to dividends) suggests that investors prioritise visible shareholder rewards (dividends) over internal liquidity metrics, particularly in markets where transparency is limited. One recent study confirmed that dividend signalling continues to dominate investor perception in Nigerian banks (Oniyama, Adebayo & Ogundajo, 2021).

Institutional Variation Across Banks

The variations in explanatory power and coefficients across the four banks indicate the importance of institutional context. For instance, UBA achieved very high explanatory power in its ROCE model ($R^2 = 0.92$), suggesting that its dividend, leverage and liquidity strategies were particularly well aligned with performance outcomes. Other banks showed weaker linkages, reflecting differences in governance, market perception, historical legacy, and perhaps restructuring phases.

These institutional differences reflect deeper phenomena: bank size, history, market positioning, ownership structure and governance quality likely moderate the effect of dividend policy on performance. For example, a study of board-structure diversity in Sub-Saharan African banks found that board characteristics significantly influence dividend decisions and performance linkages (Babatunde, Ayo & Daniel, 2025). Thus, the varying performance of banks in the sample may reflect these underlying governance and structural differences.

Implications for Theory and Practice

Theoretical implications

The results of this study strengthen the relevance and signalling theories of dividend policy in Nigeria's banking sector while offering partial support for the agency-cost and residual-dividend perspectives. The consistent and significant influence of dividend per share (DPS) across all sampled banks confirms that dividend policy plays a crucial role in shaping both profitability and market valuation. This finding runs counter to the classical irrelevance theory of Miller and Modigliani (1961), which assumes that dividend decisions do not affect firm value in perfect capital markets. In the Nigerian context, marked by information asymmetry, regulatory uncertainty, and evolving investor confidence, dividends act as a strategic signal of corporate strength and managerial reliability (Gordon, 1959; Bhattacharya, 1979).

Empirical evidence from recent studies supports this interpretation. Ajiboye, Bosun-Fakunle, and Olowookere (2024) found that consistent dividend announcements significantly enhance investor confidence and market value among Nigerian listed banks, while Garba and Oladele (2024) observed that transparent dividend practices strengthen firm reputation and governance credibility. Together with this study's results, these findings show that dividends in Nigeria are more than routine profit distributions; they are communication tools that shape perceptions of stability and long-term viability.

The mixed results for leverage (DER) and liquidity (CUR) further suggest that agency-cost and residual-dividend theories retain conditional relevance but depend heavily on institutional context. Moderate leverage appears beneficial when used to enforce managerial discipline and optimise capital efficiency (Jensen & Meckling, 1976), but excessive debt can undermine

performance in banks with fragile capital structures. Likewise, liquidity contributes positively to profitability up to a point; beyond that, it may signal inefficiency. These outcomes indicate that dividend and financing decisions in Nigeria cannot be understood in isolation from governance quality, regulatory policies, and macroeconomic conditions.

Practical implications

The findings carry several implications for key stakeholders. For bank executives and boards, dividend policy should be viewed as a strategic instrument rather than merely a reward mechanism. Maintaining stable or progressively increasing dividends reinforces investor trust, strengthens market valuation, and stabilises shareholder relations, particularly in a market where many investors depend on dividend income. For regulators and policymakers, the results highlight the role of dividend policy in sustaining financial-system stability and market discipline. The Central Bank of Nigeria's 2024 recapitalisation directive illustrates how payout regulations must balance investor rewards with capital adequacy (Central Bank of Nigeria, 2024). Clear, consistent policies can encourage prudence without eroding confidence.

For investors, consistent dividend payments and transparent governance can serve as reliable indicators of sound management and reduced risk exposure (Lubis, Khaddafi & Satriawan, 2024). In practical terms, Nigerian banks that integrate dividend strategy with broader communication and governance frameworks are more likely to maintain market premiums, attract long-term investors, and remain resilient in the face of technological and regulatory change.

Post-2013 Context & Relevance to 2025

While the dataset ends in 2013, the interpretations of the results remain relevant up to 2025 because many of the underlying structural factors, such as regulatory reform, digital banking shift, and market investor behaviour, continue to evolve along lines that reinforce the role of dividend policy. For instance, recent research shows that management quality and dividend consistency have become more important for investor trust in Nigerian banks in a digital era. (Onuegbu et al., 2025). Moreover, tax and regulatory reforms (e.g., studies finding significant effect of corporate tax on dividend policy in Nigerian banks) support the notion that dividend policy remains embedded in a broader environment of regulatory pressures and market expectations (Okafor, 2023). Thus, even though the data period ends earlier, the findings remain meaningful for today's banking environment.

Limitations and Future Research

While this study provides valuable insights into the dividend–performance relationship in Nigerian banks, certain limitations must be acknowledged. The dataset covers only four major deposit-money banks and ends in 2013, which constrains the ability to generalise findings across the entire financial sector. Future research should extend the timeframe to include developments after 2013, particularly the impacts of COVID-19, the rapid expansion of fintech platforms, and the widespread adoption of digital banking technologies that have redefined profitability and shareholder engagement in the sector.

In addition, subsequent studies could integrate governance variables (such as board structure, ownership concentration, and executive compensation), macroeconomic shocks (including exchange-rate volatility, inflation, and monetary policy shifts), and investor-behaviour measures (such as risk appetite and sentiment indices). Mixed-method approaches, especially those combining quantitative analysis with qualitative insights from interviews or surveys of bank executives and financial analysts, would provide a richer understanding of how dividend policy decisions are made in real time within Nigeria's evolving banking landscape.

CONCLUSION

This study explored how dividend policy influences corporate performance in the Nigerian banking sector by analysing data from four major banks between 1990 and 2013 and interpreting the findings within the realities of the 2025 financial environment. The results showed that dividend per share plays a central role in shaping both profitability and market valuation. Banks that maintained stable or rising dividend payouts were more likely to record stronger returns and attract positive investor sentiment. This supports the view that dividends serve as an important signal of financial health, managerial confidence, and long-term stability in a market where information gaps between managers and investors are common.

The analysis of leverage and liquidity revealed mixed outcomes. In some banks, moderate use of debt improved profitability, while in others, high leverage created additional risk. Liquidity also produced differing effects. Adequate liquidity supported stability, but excessive liquidity appeared to limit opportunities for productive investment. These patterns reflect the fact that financial structure decisions are shaped by governance quality, risk appetite, regulatory demands, and institutional history.

Differences across the banks highlight the importance of context. Institutions that combined prudent leverage, effective liquidity management, and consistent dividend practices demonstrated stronger alignment between policy choices and performance indicators. Others

appeared more constrained by restructuring phases, capital adequacy concerns, or weaker investor confidence.

The study thus reinforces that dividend policy is not merely an administrative decision. It is a strategic tool that influences market perception, investor trust, and long-term competitiveness. At the regulatory level, dividend practices also contribute to financial stability, particularly in a banking system that continues to evolve through digital transformation and tighter supervision.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

The conception and design of the study, including the development of the theoretical framework on dividend policy and corporate performance, were undertaken by O.A., who also collected data from Nigerian banks. Econometric analyses, including multiple regression and Newey–West HAC estimation, were conducted by O.A. and T.A. K.O.O., S.A., R.R., and S.A. contributed methodological expertise and perspectives in quantitative analysis and interpretation, strengthening the robustness of the statistical modelling and situating the findings within broader socio-economic and organisational contexts. All authors collaborated in drafting, revising, and approving the final manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

FUNDING

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to acknowledge the management and technical staff of PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, UK, for their excellent assistance and for providing medical writing and editorial support in accordance with Good Publication Practice (GPP3) guidelines.

REFERENCES

1. Adamgbo, L. C. and Edeh, S. B., (2025). Disruptive Innovations and the Future of the Nigeria Banking Industry. *Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences vol, 26*, 1a.
2. Adelegan, O. J. (2008). The impact of changes in board composition on shareholders' wealth: Evidence from Nigeria. *African Journal of Economic Policy*, 15(1), 45–67.
3. Ajiboye, A., Bosun-Fakunle, Y., & Olowookere, A. (2024). Dividend policy and market value of Nigerian deposit-money banks. *International Journal of Financial Research*, 15(1), 45–59.
4. Alhaji, U.A., Adamu, B.S., Isah, I., Yusuf, M.A. and Salisu, I.Y., (2025). *Effect of capital structure on failure of some selected commercial banks in Nigeria*. *Kashere Journal of Management Sciences*, 8(1).
5. Babatunde, A., Ayo, A., & Daniel, T. (2025). Board structure diversity and dividend decisions of deposit-money banks in Sub-Sahara African countries. *Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Studies, 8(03).*
6. Bhattacharya, S. (1979). *Imperfect information, dividend policy, and "the bird in the hand" fallacy*. Bell Journal of Economics, 10(1), 259–270. https://doi.org/10.2307/3003330.
7. British Academy of Management. (2021). *Code of ethics for research*. London, UK: Author. Retrieved from https://www.bam.ac.uk/resources/knowledge-hub/research-ethics.html
8. Central Bank of Nigeria, (2024) Review of Minimum Capital Requirements for Commercial, Merchant and Non-Interest Banks in Nigeria. Available at: https://www.cbn.gov.ng/Out/2024/CCD/Recapitalization_MARCH_2024.pdf, (Accessed: 17 November 2025).
9. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
10. Ekpulu, G.A. and Opudu, O.D., (2024). Board Characteristics and Dividend Pay-Out Policy in Nigerian Consumer Good Firms. *Saudi J Bus Manag Stud*, *9*(11), pp.257-265.
11. Garba, M. S. and A. O. Oladele (2024) Corporate Board Attributes and Dividend Payout Policy: Evidence from Listed Conglomerate Firms in Nigeria, *IIARD International Journal of Economics and Business Management*. 10(1) 2024. DOI: https://doi.org/10.56201/ijebm.v10.no1.2024.pg163.179.
12. Gordon, M. J. (1959). *Dividends, earnings, and stock prices*. The Review of Economics and Statistics, 41(2), 99–105. https://doi.org/10.2307/1927792.
13. Gujarati, D. N., & Porter, D. C. (2009). *Basic econometrics* (5th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
14. Izedonmi, F., & Eriki, P. (1996). *Determinants of dividend policy in Nigeria: A multivariate analysis*. Journal of Financial Management and Analysis, 9(1), 38–49.
15. Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). *Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure*. Journal of Financial Economics, 3(4), 305–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X.

16. Lubis, E., Khaddafi, M., & Satriawan, B. (2024). Dividend Policy as a Tool to Increase Firm Value. *Business and Investment Review*, *2*(3), 20-27.

17. Miller, M. H., & Modigliani, F. (1961). Dividend policy, growth, and the valuation of shares. *The Journal of Business*, 34(4), 411–433.

18. Mohapatra, S., Misra, A.K. and Rahman, M.R., (2023). Impact of banking sector competition on emerging market banks' safety and soundness–A study on Indian Banks. *Cogent Economics & Finance*, *11*(1), p.2216980.

19. Newey, W. K., & West, K. D. (1987). A simple, positive semi-definite, heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix. *Econometrica*, *55*(3), 703–708. https://doi.org/10.2307/1913610

20. Ogu, L., George, I. O., Antai, G. O., Ismaila, H., & Ekpenisi, C. (2025). Comparative analysis of the legal and policy framework for financial technology in Nigeria and selected jurisdictions. *NIU Journal of Legal Studies*, *11*(1), 115-128.

21. Okafor, V.I., (2023). Corporate tax and dividend policy of Nigerian Deposit-Money Banks. *Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences Vol*, *24*. 2023.

22. Oniyama, M.E., Adebayo, S. and Ogundajo, G.O., (2021). Dividend policy and market performance of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria. *Journal of Accounting and Finance*, *21*(2), pp.82-95.

23. Osoro, J. and Josea, K., (2022). *Banking system adjustment to shock: The Kenyan case of liquidity-profitability trade-offs* (No. 56). KBA Centre for Research on Financial Markets and Policy Working Paper Series.

24. Oyejide, T. A. (1976). *Company dividend policy in Nigeria: An empirical analysis*. The Nigerian Journal of Economic and Social Studies, 18(2), 179–194. Retrieved from https://www.econbiz.de/Record/company-dividend-policy-in-nigeria-an-empirical-analysis-oyejide/10002615558.

25. Soetan, T.O. and Mogaji, E., (2024). Financial Services in Nigeria. In *Financial Services in Nigeria: The Path Towards Financial Inclusion, Economic Development and Sustainable Growth* (pp. 19-48). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

26. Tega, H. W., Adeoye, O. O., & Moseri, N. M. (2023). Dividend Relevance and the Value of Firms in Nigeria. *Adeleke University Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, *3*(1), 277-286.

27. Walter, J. E. (1963). Dividend policy: Its influence on the value of the enterprise. *The Journal of Finance*, 18(2), 280–291.

28. Wooldridge, J. M. (2020). *Introductory econometrics: A modern approach* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.