## **DePaul University**

#### From the SelectedWorks of Ali M Fatemi

2009

# Yes, Dividends Are Disappearing: Worldwide Evidence

Ali M Fatemi, *DePaul University* Recep Bildik



## Yes, Dividends Are Disappearing: Worldwide Evidence

### Recep Bildik\* and Ali Fatemi \*\*

#### **Abstract**

This study examines the patterns of payout policies worldwide. Utilizing data from a sample of more than 17,000 companies, from 33 different countries, we show that there is a significant worldwide decline in the propensity to pay dividends. Most of the decline is due to the payout policies of smaller and less profitable firms with comparatively more investment opportunities. We find that larger firms, firms with higher profitability, and firms with low growth opportunities have a greater propensity to pay dividends. The proportion of dividend payers varies substantially across industries as well. However, the proportion of firms paying dividends has declined over time, even after firms' characteristics are controlled for. Moreover, aggregate dividends are highly concentrated, in that they are paid only by a small group of firms. Our findings indicate that there has been a significant decline in the average dividend payout ratios over the years. The decline in the mean dividend payout ratios as well as the proportion of payers is much more pronounced in civil law countries.

This version: 18/06/2009

JEL Classification: G32-G35

Keywords: Dividends, Dividend payout policy.

#### 1. Introduction

The seminal work of Miller and Modigliani (1961), on dividend policy, gave birth to an extensive body of literature dealing with, and examining, the payout policies of firms in the US and elsewhere in the world. This interest on the empirics of dividends seems to have regained momentum following the publication of the paper by Fama and French (2001) that provided evidence indicating a significant shift in the dividend policies of US industrial firms. Specifically, Fama and French find a substantial decline in the proportion of firms paying dividends from a peak of 67% in 1978 to 21% in 1999. This decline is, in part, due to changes in the characteristics of the publicly traded firms toward (1) firms that have never paid dividends, (2) those with low or negative earnings, (3) smaller firms, and (4) those

<sup>\*</sup> Istanbul Stock Exchange, e-mail: recep.bildik@post.harvard.edu

<sup>\*\*</sup> DePaul University. Finance Department, 1 East Jackson Blvd. Suite 6100 Chicago, 60604 IL. Tel: 1-312-362-8826, Fax: 1-312-312-362-6566, e-mail: afatemi@depaul.edu

requiring larger investments. However, Fama and French find a significant decline in the propensity to pay dividends, even after controlling for these characteristics.

Taking a different path of analysis, DeAngelo, DeAngelo, and Skinner (2004) find that dividends paid by US industrial firms actually increased (225% in nominal, and 23% in real terms) over the 1978-2000 period. They attribute their findings to the high, and the increasing concentration of dividends, of the last two decades. Specifically, they find that the largest 25 and 100 dividend payers paid 55% and 82% of aggregate industrial dividends in the year 2000. Therefore, they conclude that not only are dividends not disappearing, but also that they are increasing and becoming more concentrated. The latter phenomenon, they argue, is due to the influence of the very large payers. DeAngelo, et. al., report a pattern of increasing concentration of dividends, attributable to a combination of a decline in the number of payers and an increase in the aggregate dividends. The decline of the number of payers (over the 1978-2000 period) was an artifact of acquisitions and financial distress: 57% of the firms that paid dividends in 1978 were subsequently delisted, due to having been acquired or merged. They report that most firms with very high earnings paid dividends in 2000. However, nearly half of industrial firms reported losses, and only few of these firms paid dividends. Among non-payers in 2000, a majority were firms with negative earnings (averaged over 1996-2000 period). Further, many of these were newly listed, and within the technology sector. DeAngelo, DeAngelo, and Skinner also show that the very large and the more profitable firms, who are also responsible for most stock repurchases, dominate the dividends scene. They further report that there are significant differences between the characteristics of the dividend-payer and non-payer firms. Their findings cast doubt on the importance of dividend clientele and signaling hypotheses as determinants of corporate dividend policy.

Several potential explanations have been offered as to the reason(s) for a declining propensity of firms to pay dividends. Most such arguments have focused on the possibility that improved corporate governance has reduced the need for dividends as a mechanism to control the agency problems of free cash flows.<sup>1</sup> The increasing incidence of share

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Based on the premise that insiders may be tempted to squander any excess cash, the agency-theory based models of dividends hypothesize that outside shareholders have a preference for dividends (e.g., see Easterbrook, 1986, Jensen 1986). Within this framework, the findings of Fama and French regarding a "declining propensity to pay," may be interpreted as a strengthening of corporate governance procedures, at least in the US. See, for example, Laporta, Lopez-de-Silanez, Shleifer and Vishny (2000), who rely on the

repurchases, the possible decline in the information content value of dividends, the observed lower transactions cost for consumption-initiated sale of shares owned, and the catering theory are also among these explanations. The catering theory of Baker and Wurgler (2004a,b) hypothesize that companies pay dividends to meet investor demand, and that the decline in propensity to pay dividends could be the result of shifts in investor sentiment away from dividends and to capital gains.<sup>2</sup> Although, Baker and Wurgler report some empirical evidence in support of their argument, a robust explanation has yet to be offered as to why investors may shift preferences.

Salas and Chahyadi (2006) utilize a unique decomposition technique to measure the propensity to pay dividends while controlling for the effects of size, profitability, growth opportunities and age of the firm. Their findings lead them to conclude that the propensity to pay dividends has, indeed, decreases. However, the rate of decrease has been only 34%, rather than the 46% reported by Fama and French. Additionally, they report that neither the tax nor the dividend premium helps explain the decline in the proportion of dividend payers. On the question of the reasons for the disappearing dividends, their findings are consistent with those of DeAngelo, DeAngelo, and Skinner, in that profitability and age of the firm are the most important explainers. Hobes and Prabhala (2005) also study the question, and report that idiosyncratic risk explains close to 40% of the disappearing dividends. They do not find catering to be of any significance, once the idiosyncratic risk factor is accounted for.

Examining the behavior of firms in the European Union, Eije and Megginson (2006) report an increasing concentration of dividends and earnings within the 15 EU countries, as well. Specifically, they report that the largest decile of the payers paid the 81% of the total dividends. Julio and Ikenberry (2005), on the other hand, report findings suggesting the reappearing of dividends. Specifically, they report a five percent increase in the proportion of US industrial firms paying dividends in the last five-year period covered by their study. However, after controlling for firm and industry characteristics, they find that the actual proportion of dividend payers is still lower than the expected proportion. Insofar as their

strength of corporate governance mechanisms to show that dividend payout ratios are higher, on average, in countries with stronger legal protection of minority shareholders.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For example, when the sentiment for non-payers is high, dividend premium (measured by the difference in the average market-to-book ratios between dividend-paying and non-paying firms) tends to be negative and the propensity to pay dividends tends to decrease. Therefore, firms cater sentiment-driven demand to determine their dividend payments.

observed small increase in the proportion of payers is concerned, they attribute it to the tax cut of 2003, and more to the natural maturing of firms listed in US markets in the 1990s.

Thus, few exceptions aside, little research has been published that deals with the payout polices of non-US companies. In particular, research on the phenomenon of the "disappearing dividends" is confined mostly to the US, and not much is available in the form of international evidence on this issue. LaPorta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer, and Vishny (2000), use a large data set from 33 countries to examine the payout policies of companies in different countries. However, they do not address the question of disappearing dividends. They do conclude that, due to a legal system that provides for stronger corporate governance and investor protection, firms in common law countries are more likely to pay dividends than those in civil law countries. Other international studies utilize data from a fairly limited number of countries in their sample. For example, Dennis and Osobov (2005) find declining propensity to pay in six most developed countries (US, UK, Japan, Germany, France, Canada). They report that, in these countries, larger and more profitable firms are more likely to pay dividend, and that the effect of growth opportunities on dividend payments is dependent on the country's legal system. Further, the propensity to pay is observed to be declining even after controlling for these factors. Their evidence fails to support the catering theory, and lends support to the agency cost model instead.

In a study dealing with the behavior of UK firms, Renneboog and Trojanowski (2005) find evidence in support of a decrease in the propensity to pay dividends. The authors attribute this in part to the differences in the tax systems of the US and UK. They find that the UK dividend-payers are larger, more profitable, and less levered. Further, they also face fewer investment opportunities, and grow slower than non-payers. Their findings provide weak support for the argument that dividends are substitutes by share repurchases. Further, they report a positive relationship between concentration of ownership and the choice of dividends (instead of repurchases) for the payout method. Finally, Bancel, Bhattacharyya, and Mittoo (2005), in their survey study covering 16 EU countries, find that payout policy is determined by a complex interaction of firm's ownership structure of the firm and the legal and institutions structure of its home country.

Therefore, little research addressing the question of whether dividends are disappearing, and the reasons behind such a phenomenon, has been conducted on non-US firms. This study is

intended to fill this gap, and to extend the literature by examining the propensity to pay dividends worldwide. Using a large sample of 17,106 listed firms, in 33 countries; this study is intended to investigate the possible disappearance of dividends at the international level, and the factors responsible for this phenomenon. For this purpose, we utilize data from the Worldscope database of Thompson One Banker Analytics, for the 1985-2006 period. Consistent with previous works, including that of Fama and French, utilities, financials, and firms with negative equity value are excluded. Our sample includes all firms for which Thompson contains financial statements, dividends, and market valuation data. Needless to say, there were few (and in some cases no) traded firms in some of the developing, or less developed, markets prior to 1990. Indeed, organized exchanges did not even exist in some of these markets before this date. However, a wave of liberalization and globalization led to a significant increase in the number of listed companies in the post-1990 period. Naturally, our data, and conclusions, are subject to the biases driven by the availability of this data, and the method of coverage by Thompson.

#### 2. Empirical Findings

Table 1A reports the numbers of firms that paid dividend (payers), those that did not (non-payers), never payers, and former payers for each of the years covered by the study. It also reports the dividend payout ratios for the payers. These results indicate that the proportion of payers declined sharply from 87% to 53% over the 22-year period covered by this study. Strikingly, this decline is continuous and persistent over time, with a solid decrease in the proportion of payers. The number of firms that never paid dividends reached an all time high of 6201 (36%) at the end of 2006, from only 169 (10%) in 1986. This pattern becomes even more striking when we exclude the US firms from our data set as reported in Table 1B. The percentage of payers declines to 59% in 2006 from 96% in 1985.

Among non-payers, the proportion of never-payers does not exhibit a significant change from the 74% level in 1986 to the 78% level in 2006. In other words, the overwhelming

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> This information includes; total assets, aggregate earnings before interest, aggregate earnings available for common, investments, market values, book equity, market equity, book liability, change in treasury stock, research and development expenses, total dividends, dividend payout ratios and other ratios derived by using these information.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Scant availability of the data prior to 1985 dictated the choice for starting with 1985.

majority of firms that do not pay dividends never do so.<sup>5</sup> This evidence also suggests that there is a significant change in the average (median) dividend payout ratio of dividend paying firms. Specifically, we observe a sharp decline in the payout rates from 41% (36%) in 1985 to 34% (29%) in the rest of the world. Globally (i.e., with the US included), the average (median) dividend payout ratio declined from 39% (34%) in 1985 to 34% (29%) in 2006. This decline is more striking, from 33% to 17%, when we consider all firms (including non- and never payers).

We next examine the proportion of payers and non-payers on a country-by-country basis. Table 2 reports the results, which indicate a steady decrease over the 1985-2006 period. In some markets such as Austria, Brazil, Chile, Spain, and Japan the decline in the proportion of payers is smaller than others. However, (in almost all markets) we observe decreases in this ratio, and most noticeably between 1993 and 2003. We note, however, that large changes in the proportion of payers, especially in the developing markets, could be partly attributed to the influence of the smaller firms that were newly listed between 1985 and 1990. Nonetheless, these results show that there are large decreases in the proportion of payers between 1985 and 2006; especially in the more developed and the larger markets. The steepest declines occurred in markets such as Australia (67%), Canada (60%), UK (56%), US (47%), and Germany (45%). An evaluation of proportion of payers in different subperiods (e.g. 1995-2003) also confirms a worldwide decline in the propensity to pay. For example, the 1995-2003 declines in the proportion of payers are 13% for US, 28% for Canada, 33% for U.K, and 42% for Australia. The magnitude of the decline is significantly larger in many smaller and developing markets than it is in the more developed markets. However, the declines are observed across all markets, indicating that the proportion of dividend payers has declined not only in the developed markets but also in the developing markets. Therefore, the disappearance of dividends appears to be a worldwide phenomenon.

Panel B of Table 2 summarizes these results by the legal system of the countries studied. These results indicate that civil law countries are more likely to pay dividends than those

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> A closer evaluation of these results yields some support for the notion that dividends may be reappearing post-2003. (The same is observed for non-US firms, as well.) However, it may be pre-mature to interpret this as "reappearing of dividends", as the increase in the proportion of payers is rather small. It should be noted that this rebound in dividend payments has taken place following the 2003 tax cut in the US, a growing world economy, and the coming of age/maturity of firms that went public during the 1990s.

falling in the common law category. The average proportions of payers in civil law and common law countries were 65% and 40%, respectively, in 2006. Further, the decline in the propensity to pay is significantly more pronounced in common law countries. The average proportion of payers in common law countries declined from 92% in 1985 to 40% in 2006, whereas it dropped from 80% to 65% in civil law countries. This difference becomes even more striking when we compare the gap between the maximum and minimum proportion of payers under the two legal systems. It is also interesting to note that the total number of non-payers and never-payers in our sample grew by a factor of 41.4 and 35.7 respectively, while the number of payers grew only by a factor of 6.3. Note also, that the low numbers of former-payers indicate that payers are usually the same firms that continue with their practice over time. The majority of newly listed firms tend to not pay dividends to their shareholders.

#### 2.1 Concentration of Dividends

We next analyze the data to determine if dividends, and earnings, are concentrated at the global level, as they have been reported to be in the US. To this end, we compute the total dividends paid by the largest ten dividend-paying firms as a fraction of the aggregate amount of dividends by all firms in each country. We repeat the procedure for the earnings numbers as well. Results, as reported in Table 3, indicate that both dividends and earnings are highly concentrated among the largest firms: Almost two-thirds (66%) of the aggregate dividends paid by our sample of 9,121 firms, that did pay dividends in year 2006 were paid by the ten largest dividend-payers. This is consistent with the previous findings of DeAngelo et al, and Eije and Megginson. Note, also, that the average value for these percentages, over the entire sample period of 22 years, is 69%, and that the average value for last five years of this period is 66%. A country-by-country analysis leads us to conclude the same for other countries represented in our sample. The concentration is, indeed, over 90% in four of these countries: Denmark, Austria, Netherland, and China. Consistently high, it exceeds the 80% mark in Belgium, Finland, Norway, Italy, and Spain. For 2006, the ratio is less than 50% only in five countries: the US, Japan, Canada, India, Malaysia. Japan and the US exhibit the lowest concentration ratios, with 27% and 30% respectively (suggesting that dividends are much less concentrated in these two countries than the rest of the world).

Insofar as a possible trend in this concentration ratio is concerned, the data suggests a small decrease. Specifically, the average concentration ratio was 72% during the first five-year period covered by this study, and 66% during the last five-year period.<sup>6</sup> And, the same can be said for the US market. Only for five of these countries do we find evidence suggesting a slight increase in the concentration ratio over time.<sup>7</sup>

Analyzing the influence of the largest 25 firms, we find that (except for the US and the Japanese markets where the fractions fall below 50%) the fraction of dividends paid by the largest 25 payers (relative to the aggregate dividends paid) exceeds the 50% marker. Therefore, it can be argued that the high concentration ratio, observed at the global level, is not driven by the ratios of a few large markets like the US and the UK. On average, the fraction of dividends paid by the largest 25 dividend payers was 73% in 2006 and averaged to 75% for the 2002-2006 period.

#### 2.2 Trends in the Dividend Payout Ratios

We now extend the analysis of Fama and French by evaluating the behavior of payout ratios in the 33 countries covered by our study. As discussed earlier, our data indicate that there has been a significant decline in the average payout ratios from 39% to 34% over this period. However, the results reported in Table 3-A show that, during the period covered by our study, aggregate dividends paid increased approximately by a factor of 15 to \$436.8 billion. From this pool, US companies paid approximately a total of \$50 billion, and \$386.7 billion is attributed to the rest of the world. Over our sample period, total dividends paid by non-US companies grew a factor of 28: A much more pronounced rate than the growth rate of total dividends paid by US firms. Further, as reported in Table 3-B, when we classify the payers by their countries, we find that 27% of the aggregate dividends are paid by firms in the UK and the US, and that 48% are attributed to firms in UK, US, Germany, France, and Japan. Therefore, we find a concentration in aggregate dividends of a different sort: Almost the half of aggregate global dividends paid by just five countries.

<sup>-</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The decline in the concentration ratio is 3.42 percentage points when we compare the first and last values available.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> This number increases to eight countries when the first and last five years' figures are compared.

As reported in Table 3-C, the ratio of aggregate dividends to earnings for the payers' group has actually increased, albeit slightly from 24% (in 1985) to 28% (in 2006). This holds, also, when we compare the average payout ratios of the first and the last three years of this period. We also observe a substantial increase in the payout ratio in the rest of the world (excluding the US) from 20% in 1985 to 29% in 2006. Note also that median earnings have declined consistently, while mean earnings have remained fairly constant over this time period. On the other hand, total dividends as a percentage of earnings have shown a significant decline in the US (from 31% to 20%) while the proportion of firms that have positive earnings remained very high at 95% (was 97% in 1985). In contrast, for the rest of the world, the proportion of firms with positive earnings increased from 56% in 1985 to 74% in 2006. Therefore, our findings here indicate that the propensity to pay dividends has declined and that both earnings and dividends are very concentrated.

We also find large variations in dividend payout ratios, across the various countries, depending on their legal system such as common law or civil law. The results, presented in Panel A of Table 4, indicate that the mean dividend payout ratio of payers in common law countries is higher than that of civil law countries. Interestingly, the dividend payout pattern of firms in common and civil law countries differs from each other strikingly, especially in the post-1994 period. While civil law countries experience sharp decline in the mean payout ratio of payers, from 43% to 36%, in 2006, the mean payout ratio in the common law countries increased from 36% to 43% in the same period. Panels B through F of Table 4 report the mean and median payout ratios of payers in 33 countries between 1985 and 2006. With the exception of Brazil, Denmark, France, Sweden, Thailand, and Taiwan, we observe a global decrease in the mean payout ratios between 1985 and 2006.

#### 2.3 Firm Characteristics of Payers and Non-payers

The observed decrease in the proportion of payers can, of course, be attributed to the changing characteristics of firms, or to other factors fostering a degree of reluctance to pay dividends. To explore this, we analyze the characteristics of our representative firms over time, and in each country. We report the mean and median values of certain these characteristics in Table 5. These results reveal substantial differences between payers, non-payers and never-payers. Consistent with previous findings, payers are much larger (judged

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Results do not change when we compare the first and last five years' data.

by either by median total assets, or by market capitalization), and more profitable than non-payers. They also have fewer investment opportunities, and spend less in R&D than the non-payer group. For example, in 2006, the average median (mean) of total value of the assets of a dividend payer firm is \$220 million (\$2.741m), while it is only \$42 million (\$299m) for the non-payer firm. Judged by the measure of their market values, the corresponding numbers are \$456 million (\$2.929m) and \$65 million (\$545m). Dividend payers have a profitability ratio of 8.12% versus 1.20% for non-payers. Similarly, the average earnings before interest is \$146.86 million for payers, and \$13.63m for non-payers. This gap is even more striking when evaluate the net earnings measure: \$61.35m vs. \$0.01m. Further,  $V_t/A_t$ ,  $RD_t/A_t$ , and asset growth rates are larger for the non- and never-payers than they are for the dividend payers. <sup>10</sup>

An examination of the means and medians of these firm characteristics across the countries represented in our study confirms our findings for the overall sample. On average, dividend payers are larger, more profitable, having less R&D expenditure, and are less leveraged than non-payers. This holds across all the countries examined. However, the relationship between dividend payments and growth opportunities is not uniform across all countries. There are also significant differences between common law and civil law countries. A time-series comparison of firm within each country indicates that the characteristics of the average firm move closer to those of the firms that are less likely to pay dividends in that country. That is to say that the characteristics of the average firm in each market trend toward those of a smaller, less profitable, and a more leveraged firm. Interestingly, up until 1996, non-payers have less leverage, and lower  $V_t$  /  $A_t$  than payers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Profitability  $(E_t / A_t)$  is measured as the ratio of earnings before interest (net income + interest expense) to the book value of total assets and as the ratio of after-tax earnings to the book value of equity  $(Y_t / BE_t)$ . Growth opportunities are measured as the ratio of the market value of total capital (book value of total assets – book value of equity + market value of equity) to the book value of total assets  $(V_t / A_t)$ . Firm size is represented by book value of total assets  $(A_t)$ . The market value of equity is measured as the market capitalization at fiscal year-end if available. Alternatively, market equity is measured as the number of shares outstanding times the year-end closing price of firm's stock. Leverage is measured as the ratio of book liability to the total assets.

<sup>10</sup> Although not reported, we observe that the change in treasury stock has a negative sign for payers and a

Although not reported, we observe that the change in treasury stock has a negative sign for payers and a positive one for non-payers. The negative change for payers indicates that dividend payers are also repurchasing their shares. Therefore, it appears that share repurchases are not used as a substitute for dividends, but instead complimentarily. The positive change in the treasury stock measure for non-payers suggest that, on average, they do not repurchase their shares; They issue new shares to secure their additional funding needs, as dictated by their investment opportunities. We also note that the financial characteristics of never-payers are very similar to those of non-payers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Country-based statistics are not reported here due to space restrictions but can be obtained from the authors by request.

The pattern reverses for the 1996-2006 period, which may be attributed to the significant increase in the new listings across all markets.

Table 5-A reports the relative importance of dividend paying firms as measured by the fraction of aggregate values of earnings, investments, earnings, and other measures, attributed to them as a group. According to these results, payers account for 78-80% of the aggregate book values, and the aggregate market values of assets of all firms during the 1988-90 period when 83% of these firms paid dividends. Contrast this with the 2003-06 period, when only half of the firms pay dividends, and payers account for 87-88% of the aggregate book and market values of assets. Note also that even former payers are much larger than non-payers and never payers. Indeed, these former payers are about double the size of firms that never paid. During the latter part of this period, as the number of firms increases and the number of payers decreases, payers become even larger relative to non-payers. Dividend payers are also more profitable, as they account for a very large percentage of the aggregate earnings; higher than the percentage of the aggregate assets and market values that they represent.

To further study the influence of the policies of larger firms, we grouped the firms into size deciles by each year and by each country covered. These results, as reported in Table 5-B, indicate that although the proportion of payers decreases in all deciles, the largest decreases occur in the lower size deciles. For example, the proportion of payers in the smallest size group was 63% in 1985, and dropped to 21% by 2006. In the largest size group, we observe a much smaller decline from 97% to 82%<sup>12</sup>. Therefore, the propensity to pay dividend seems to decrease with the size of the firm<sup>13</sup>.

#### 2.4 Industry Effects

Next, we undertake to study the possible effect of industry affiliation on the propensity to pay dividends. Accordingly, we classify our sample firms based on their SIC codes. Our results indicate that although the proportion of payers exhibits a steady decline over time, the proportions of dividend payers vary substantially across the 53 industries examined. As

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> The impact of size is even more striking for the US firms. While the average proportion of payers in the smallest deciles group dropped from 40% in 1985 to 10% in 2006, the proportion of payers in the largest deciles dropped from 93% to 64% during the same period.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> This holds in a country-by-country analysis as well.

reported in Table 6, the proportion of payers in certain industries such as building materialshardware, tobacco, pete refining, food, and electric-gas-sanitary services (SIC codes: 52, 21, 29, 54, 49) is above 75% and significantly higher than that of other industries. In contrast, some industries such as metal mining, oil and gas extraction, mining-non metal minerals, health services, and business services (SIC codes 10, 13, 14, 80, 73), the proportion of payers remains below 35%. 14 Similar results are obtained when we repeat this analysis for each of the countries covered.

An analysis of the proportion of payers over time, at the industry-level, indicates that firms in the metal mining, mining-non metal minerals, communications, textile mill products, hotels, and furniture industries (SIC codes 10, 14, 48, 22, 70, and 25) exhibit the largest decreases in the proportion of payers. On the other hand, the proportion of payers increased for firms in membership organizations, legal services, government, admin-environmental quality, and museum-gallery (SIC codes 86, 81, 91, 95, 84)<sup>15</sup>. The proportions declined only modestly for firms in petroleum refining, building materials, home furniture, and water transportation (SIC codes 29, 52, 57, 44) relative to other industries examined. These results also indicate that industries with high contemporary proportions of payers are the same ones that held the same status in the past. A comparison of average payout ratios across the industries indicates that a few industries pay a relatively larger share of their earnings as dividends than do others. Specifically, the mean payout ratio is 45% and higher for firms in the electric-gas-sanitary services, holdings, and real estate (SIC codes 49, 67, and 65). 16 On the other hand, payout ratios are lower in the non-depository credit institutions and building materials-hardware industries.

Further, scrutinizing the characteristics of firms in different industries, we find that the size of the firm does not play a significant role. As a matter of fact, when we rank our industry groupings by their proportion of payers, we find that only two of the ten industries with the highest proportion of payers, are among the ten industries with the largest average firm size. Therefore, it can safely be concluded that the industry effect has a much more pronounced influence on the propensity to pay, then does firm size.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Industry-level proportions of payers are compared by averaging the first and last five years average annual proportions for each industry. We also checked the first and last years which provided similar results.

The number of companies in these industries is very low, even less than ten.

#### 2.5 The Changing Characteristics of Firms and Logit Regressions

To provide further evidence on the differences in the characteristics of payers and non-payers, and to assess the impact of changes in characteristics on the propensity to pay dividends, we utilize logit models that relate the probability of paying dividends to firm size, growth opportunities, and profitability. Data from the 1985-1995 period (the base period) is used to estimate the model's coefficients. These estimates are then used to compute the expected probability of dividend payments for each of the following periods, and compared to the actual rate of dividend payments. The differences between expected and actual rates are then used as proxies for changes in the propensity to pay dividends. The methodology is, therefore, similar to that of Fama and French. Our dependent variable assumes a value of one in year t if a firm pays dividends, and zero otherwise. Explanatory variables are  $E_t/A_t$ ,  $V_t/A_t$ ,  $dA_t/A_t$ , and  $NYP_t$ , as proxies for profitability, growth opportunities, and size, respectively<sup>17,18</sup>.

Table 7 reports the results from our annual logit regressions. Here, again (to isolate the effect of the data from the US sample), we have performed analysis by classifying the data into two groups, "global: including the US", and "rest of the world: excluding the US". Consistent with our prior univariate results, we find that the likelihood of paying dividends is positively related to firm size. The estimated coefficients for all variables have the expected signs, and are consistent with the findings of previous studies. Profitability and size both have estimates that are positive, and statistically significant. However, our proxy for investment opportunities, dA/A, has estimates that are negative, and significantly so, for most periods.

We, now, proceed to estimate the effect of these characteristics on the percentages of firms paying dividends. In line with our approach up to this point, we estimate the logit regressions for the base period of 1985-1995. Using these results, we arrive at an estimate of the proportion of payers. This is, in turn, is compared to the actual proportions. The difference, therefore, represents the change in the propensity to pay dividends, after the effect of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> These are the industries in which the number of firms is 100 or more. There are also some industries where the mean payout ratio is higher around 60% such as Admin-Quality Housing and Pipe Lines and Ex Natural Gas but the number of firms in these industries is very low.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> NYP<sub>t</sub>, the proxy for a firm's size is the percentage of firms with the same or lower market capitalization as of the end of the firm's fiscal year.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> The median firm size in most countries decreases over time. This is probably an artifact of the influence of the newly listed companies and their smaller sizes.

firms' characteristics is controlled for. These differences between the actual and expected proportion of payers will be used as a measure of changes in the propensity to pay dividends. <sup>19</sup> Table 8 reports the expected proportion of payers for the forecast period of 1996-2006. Consistent with the presentation to this point, results for the global sample (including the US firms) are reported in Panel A, and those for the rest of the world are presented in Panel B. These results indicate, clearly, that the proportion of firms expected to pay dividends, after the changes in the characteristics of firms are accounted for, is consistently and universally higher than the actual percentage of firms paying dividends. <sup>20</sup> Interestingly, the difference between the expected proportions and the actual proportions of payers increases over time. These findings are consistent with those of Fama and French, who show that the spread between the expected and actual percent widens, and attribute the shortfall to a reduced propensity to pay.

For the sake of brevity, we will refrain from reporting the results by each country. However, our results indicate that, while these are significant differences across the sample, the differences between the expected proportions of payers and the actual proportions are as high as those in the US, and grow wider over time in the majority of our sample countries.<sup>21</sup> Thus, it is clear that the declining proportion of payers (once changes in characteristics are accounted for) is a global phenomenon, present both in the developed and the emerging markets. The changing characteristics of listed firms (toward those that are less profitable, smaller, more leveraged, and having more growth opportunities) explains only part of the decline in the propensity to pay dividends of firms.

It can be argued that the declining propensity to pay dividends may be attributable to the tax disadvantage of dividends.<sup>22</sup> A compelling counter-argument, however, is that repurchases can not fully explain this phenomenon; Repurchases are undertaken primarily by payers (and not by never-payers), and their magnitude is quite small. Furthermore, share repurchases are not legally allowed in many of the countries in our sample. (Rules governing repurchases

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Regressions for the base period utilize only the data from the payers group. The average annual coefficients are used to compute the probability of dividend payments for each firm in following years based on their characteristics in that year. Taking the averages of probabilities of each firm in each year, we compute the expected proportion of payers, which is then compared with the actual proportion of payers.

The only exception is 1997 for the global sample.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> These are available from the authors.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> See Bagwell and Shoven (1989), and Dunsby (1995) for evidence in support of the hypothesis that a substitution of share repurchases for dividends, generates tax savings. See also Grullon and Michaely (2002) for evidence indicating that a shift away from dividends to repurchases represents a substitution effect.

have been liberalized in some of civil law countries such as Japan, Germany and France.)<sup>23</sup> Additionally, as Grullon and Ikenberry have shown, firms that pay dividends are similar in type to those that repurchase shares. In other words, the available empirical evidence shows that repurchases and dividends are complements, not substitutes.

#### 2.6 Robustness of Results

To test for the robustness of our logit regression findings, and to deal with the potential misspecification problems in these regressions, we employ a portfolio approach similar to that utilized by Fama and French. For each year covered, we construct 27 portfolios by sorting firms into three equal groups on the basis of variables used to measure their profitability, investment and growth opportunities, and size. Sample firms are first divided into three groups on the basis of market capitalization. These portfolios are then divided into three profitability classes, resulting in nine portfolios. These nine portfolios are subsequently divided into three groups based on growth (low, medium, high). For each of the 27 portfolios, thus obtained, we estimate the base period probability of paying dividends as the sum of the number of payers divided by the number of firms in the portfolio.

Results as reported in Table 9 indicate that larger firms are more likely to pay dividends after controlling for profitability, E/A, and investment opportunities, V/A or dA/A. More profitable firms are more likely to pay dividends after controlling for size and investment opportunities. Firms classified into higher profitability portfolios (i.e., high E/A firms) have higher proportion of payers in the base period, than those in the low E/A portfolios. Further, firms with more investments are less likely to pay dividends. Additionally, high V/A portfolios in a given size group typically have lower proportions of payers than the low V/A portfolio. Consider 2006 for example: the proportion of payers among the small and the very profitable firms that have high V/A is 39.8%, compared to that of firms with a low V/A at 57%. The group with the lowest proportion of payers consists of firms with low market capitalization, low-to-medium profitability (as proxied by E/A), and high investment opportunities (as proxied by V/A). Additionally, the steepest drop in the proportion of payers (when comparing the proportion of payers for each of the 27 portfolios during the base

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> Share repurchases have long been legal in common law countries like the US and the UK These activities gained momentum in the 1990s, following the adoption of the so-called harbor rule by SEC to protect firms from allegations of manipulation in 1982.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> This approach addresses the misspecification problem by letting the probabilities of base period to change with the characteristics of the firms.

period versus the average of the last five years) occurs in portfolios of high V/A and low E/A firms, especially in the small size portfolios. In general, the decline is more pronounced for the smaller firms. Interestingly, however, the proportion of payers also decreased sharply, from 88% to 23% in the largest-size group with low profitability and high investment outlays. The smallest decline is observed to take place in the portfolio of the largest firms with high profitability and low investment outlays (from 92% to 82%). Consistent with previous findings, this group (of large firms with high and medium E/A and low V/A) had the highest proportion of payers both during the base period (higher than 90%) and as of 2006 (higher than 80%). Although these proportions are higher in magnitude than those reported by Fama and French, they are consistent with their findings.

When dA/A (rather than V/A) is used as a proxy for growth opportunities, the proportion of payers is found to be smaller across almost all portfolios. However, with only a few exceptions, these results are similar to our earlier findings. For example, the proportion of payers is found to be higher in high dA/A groups (compared to low dA/A groups) especially for the small and medium size portfolios. In other words, firms with high growth opportunities are less likely to pay dividends in small size and low profitability portfolio. Noticeable decreases are also observed in the percentages of payers in small and medium size firms with low profitability. Additionally, over time, the proportion of payers declines sharply for low growth firms of small size and low profitability.

Next, we estimate the expected proportions of payers for all 27 portfolios for the period following the base period, and compare these expected values to the actual proportions. Our results, reported in Table 10 are consistent with our previous findings: While the expected proportion of payers remains almost constant at around 77%, the actual proportion of payers has decreased significantly. The gap between the expected and actual percentages of payer has widened over time to reach to 25% in 2006.

Summarizing, the results of the portfolio approach indicate that the changing characteristics of firms (to a profile of smaller firms that are less profitable and face high investment outlays) is the primary factor responsible for the decrease in the proportion of firms that pay dividends. However, even after controlling for the influences of these changing characteristics, a significant decline in the proportion of payers is observed. This leads us to conclude that the propensity to pay dividends has decreased over time.

#### 3. Conclusions

Fama and French's findings provide evidence in support of the notion that there has been a significant decline in the propensity of US firms to pay dividends. However, only a few studies have focused their attention on the pattern of dividend payments at an international level. This study is designed to make a contribution to this body of literature and fill this gap. We investigate the pattern of dividend payments, and their trend over time, in 33 different countries over the 1985-2006 period. Utilizing data from a large sample of more than 17,000 firms, we find a substantial variation in the propensity to pay dividends at the global level. However, the common trend across these markets is a declining tendency to pay dividends. Specifically, over the 22 years covered by this study, the proportion of payers has declined sharply from 87% to 53%. Importantly, this decline is persistent and consistent over the sub-periods, and across all 33 countries studied. Therefore, these results indicate that there has been a significant decline in the propensity to pay dividends worldwide. The inevitable conclusion, therefore, is that dividends are disappearing at the global level.<sup>25</sup>

We also identify a number of cross-sectional determinants of the propensity to pay dividends. We find that larger firms, firms with higher profitability, and firms with lower growth opportunities have a greater propensity to pay dividends. Our results indicate that the changing characteristics of the publicly traded firms to those typified by the smaller firms that are less profitable and that face more investment opportunities, explains a significant portion of the decline in the proportion of dividend payers. However, the proportion of firms paying dividends exhibits a significant decline even after controlling for such factors.

As expected, we also find that the proportion of dividend payers varies substantially across industry lines. For example, the proportion of payers in industries such as building materials, hardware, tobacco, petroleum refining, food, electric, gas, and sanitary services is above 75%, and significantly higher than that of other industries. In contrast, the proportion

However, in line with Julio and Ikenberry's results for US firms, that a small (but significant) pattern of reappearing dividends may be afoot, we also find some evidence in support of the notion that global dividends may be on their way back. Specifically, we observe a small increase in the proportion of payers in the post-2003 period. The generally positive state of world economy in the pre-2007 period, and the coming of age of the large number of firms that went public during the 1990s, may be the primary factor responsible for this small rebound. Therefore, the evidence may be insufficient to be interpreted as a reappearing of dividends.

of payers is well below 35% in industries such as metal mining, oil and gas extraction, mining, non-metal minerals, health services, and business services. The lowest proportion of payers is comprised of firms with low market capitalization, low-to-medium profitability, high investment outlays, and high rates of asset growth.

Our findings also indicate that there has been a significant decline in the average payout ratios of dividend payers. Each country's legal system also exerts a significant influence on the dividend payout ratios of its corporate sector, i.e., variations are observed to be dependent on whether the country's legal system conform to common law or civil law. Although the proportion of payers is lower in common law countries, than it is in civil law countries, we observe a sharp decline in the mean dividend payout ratios of firms in civil law countries. This takes place at the same time that a significant increase is observed to have taken place in common law countries. These results indicate that starting with 1994, the mean dividend payout ratios of firms in common law countries have been consistently higher than those of the firms in civil law countries.

Additionally, our results indicate that dividends exhibit a high degree of concentration, as they are paid by a limited number of large and profitable firms. For example, as much as 66% of the aggregate dividends paid in 2006 (by the 9,121 firms that did pay dividends) were paid by the ten largest dividend-payers. However, this concentration does exhibit wide variations with regard to the countries studied. Whereas it exceeds 90% in some countries, it is at its lowest in Japan and the US, at 27% and 30%, respectively. Also worthy of note is the observation that, the average fraction of dividends paid by the largest 25 payers over the 2001-2006 period stands at 75%; an increase of around four percentage points relative to the beginning of the period studied.

These results indicate that the phenomenon of disappearing dividends, first reported by Fama and French for the US firms, is global. It is present in other markets, developed and developing alike. The changing characteristics of the average publicly traded firm (to the smaller and less profitable firm, that requires high investment outlays) are the primary factor behind the declining proportion of firms that pay dividends. However, the decline in the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> These findings are consistent with the earlier results of DeAngelo, et al. (2004), and Eije and Megginson (2006)

proportion of payers, and a lower propensity to pay does persist, even after controlling the changing characteristics of firms.

#### References:

Bancel, Franck; Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya, and Usha R. Mittoo, (2005), Cross-Country Determinants of Payout Policy: A Survey of European Firms, Working Paper.

Baker, M. and J. Wurgler (2004a), 'Appearing and Disappearing Dividends: The Link to Catering Incentives', *Journal of Financial Economics*, 73 (2), 271 – 288.

Baker, M. and J. Wurgler (2004b), 'A Catering Theory of Dividends', *Journal of Finance*, 1125-1164.

Black F. (1976), 'The Dividend Puzzle', Journal of Portfolio Management, Vol. 2, pp. 5-8.

Brav, A., J. R. Graham, C. R. Harvey and R. Michaely (2003), 'Payout Policy in the 21st Century', NBER Working Paper No. W9657, http://ssrn.com/abstract=398560.

De Angelo, H., L. De Angelo and D. J. Skinner (2004). 'Are Dividends Disappearing? Dividend Concentration and the Consolidation of Earnings', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 72, pp. 425-456.

Denis, David J. and Igor Osobov, (2005), 'Disappearing dividends, catering incentives and agency costs: International Evidence', Purdue University, Working paper

Easterbrook, F. H. (1984), 'Two Agency-Cost Explanations of Dividends', *American Economic Review*, Vol. 74, pp. 650-659.

Eije H. and Megginson W. (2008), 'Dividends and Share Repurchases in the European Union', Journal of Financial Economics, Volume 89, Issue 2, August 2008, pp. 347-374

Fama, Eugene and Harvey Babiak, 1968, 'Dividend Policy: An Empirical Analysis', Journal of American Statistical Association, 63 (324), 1132-1161.

Fama, E. F. and K. R. French (2001), 'Disappearing Dividends: Changing Firm Characteristics or Lower Propensity to Pay?', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 60, pp. 3-43.

Ferris, S., Jayaraman N., and Sabherwal S. (2009), 'Catering Effects in Corporate Dividend Policy: The International Evidence', Journal of Banking and Finance, forthcoming.

Grullon, G. and R. Michaely (2002), 'Dividends Share Repurchases, and the Substitution Hypothesis', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 57, pp. 1649-1684.

Grullon, G. and R. Michaely (2004), 'The Information Content of Share Repurchase Programs', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 59, pp. 651-680.

Hoberg, G. and Prabhala N. (2005), 'Disappearing Dividends: The Importance of Idiosyncratic Risk and the Irrelevance of Catering Catering', University of Maryland, working paper.

Jensen, M. C. (1986), 'Agency Costs of Free Cash Flow, Corporate Finance, and Takeovers', *American Economic Review*, Vol. 76, pp. 323-329.

Julio, Brandon and David Ikenberry, (2004), 'Reappearing Dividends', Journal of Applied Corporate Finance, 16 (4), 89-100

La Porta R., F. Lopez-de-Silanez, A. Shleifer and R. W. Vishny (2000), 'Agency Problems and Dividend Policies Around the World', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 55, pp. 1-33.

Lintner, John, (1956), 'Distribution of Incomes of Corporations Among Dividends, Retained Earnings, and Taxes', American Economic Review, 46 (2), 97-113.

Miller, M. and F. Modigliani (1961), 'Dividend Policy, Growth, and the Valuation of Shares', *Journal of Business*, Vol. 34, pp. 411-433.

Renneboog, L. and G. Trojanawski (2005), 'Patterns in Payout Policy and Payout Channel Choice of UK Firms in the 1990s", ECGI Working Paper Series in Finance, Vol. 34, pp. 411-433.

Salas, J. and C. Chahyadi (2004), 'Is There a Lower Propensity to Pay Dividends? A Decomposition of Dividend Payers', *University of Oklohama, Working Paper* 

Table 1-A: Summary Statistics: The Number of Dividend Payers and Non-Payers, Never Payers and Former Payers, Means and Medians of Payout Ratios, Numbers (and Percentages) of Payers and Non-Payers by Year, 1985-2006 for all Countries.

Payers pay dividends in year t; non-payers do not. The two subgroups of non-payers are firms that have never paid and former payers (firms that do not pay in year t but did pay in a previous year).

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
All Firms	1434	1623	2059	2433	2697	3052	3556	3855	4105	4823	5519	6459	6997	8047	9128	10837	12407	13388	13895	14928	15714	17106
Mean of Dividend Payout Ratio of Payers	38.47	37.72	36.84	33.47	33.94	35.08	36.50	37.65	38.19	35.77	35.04	34.97	33.56	34.58	33.58	33.14	35.33	36.64	35.90	34.49	34.10	33.81
Median of Dividend Payout Ratio of Payers	34.23	34.25	33.12	29.88	29.65	30.84	32.19	33.54	34.23	31.43	30.65	30.23	28.93	29.78	28.92	28.29	30.12	31.59	31.21	29.49	28.94	28.57
	1246	1393	1707	2020	2236	2529	2883	3048	3157	3418	3867	4425	4642	4951	5282	5882	6427	6843	7208	7809	8367	9121
Payers	(86.9)	(85.8)	(82.9)	(83.0)	(82.9)	(82.9)	(81.1)	(79.1)	(76.9)	(70.9)	(70.1)	(68.5)	(66.3)	(61.5)	(57.9)	(54.3)	(51.8)	(51.1)	(51.9)	(52.3)	(53.2)	(53.3)
Non-Payers	188	230	352	413	461	523	673	807	948	1405	1652	2034	2355	3096	3846	4955	5980	6545	6687	7119	7347	7985
Non-rayers	(13.1)	(14.2)	(17.1)	(17.0)	(17.1)	(17.1)	(18.9)	(20.9)	(23.1)	(29.1)	(29.9)	(31.5)	(33.7)	(38.5)	(42.1)	(45.7)	(48.2)	(48.9)	(48.1)	(47.7)	(46.8)	(46.7)
	0	169	202	284	343	387	444	571	674	805	1201	1469	1773	2061	2635	3246	4200	5106	5453	5662	5907	6201
Never Payers		(10.4)	(9.8)	(11.7)	(12.7)	(12.7)	(12.5)	(14.8)	(16.4)	(16.7)	(21.8)	(22.7)	(25.3)	(25.6)	(28.9)	(30.0)	(33.9)	(38.1)	(39.2)	(37.9)	(37.6)	(36.3)
	0	14	25	21	28	49	76	100	122	142	108	150	203	329	354	392	468	617	514	413	367	485
Former Payers		(0.9)	(1.2)	(0.9)	(1.0)	(1.6)	(2.1)	(2.6)	(3.0)	(2.9)	(2.0)	(2.3)	(2.9)	(4.1)	(3.9)	(3.6)	(3.8)	(4.6)	(3.7)	(2.8)	(2.3)	(2.8)

Table 1-B: Summary Statistics: The Number of Dividend Payers and Non-Payers, Never Payers and Former Payers, Means and Medians of Payout Ratios, Numbers (and Percentages) of Payers and Non-Payers by Year, 1985-2006 for All Countries other than the U.S.

Payers pay dividends in year t; non-payers do not. The two subgroups of non-payers are firms that have never paid and former payers (firms that do not pay in year t but did pay in a previous year).

-	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
All Firms	861	1024	1409	1714	1967	2299	2700	2950	3127	3471	3990	4755	5157	5957	6908	8460	9976	10902	11342	12199	12861	14085
Mean of Dividend Payout Ratio of Payers Median of Dividend	40.70	39.58	38.41	34.36	34.46	34.97	36.35	37.98	38.79	36.70	35.94	35.87	34.44	35.55	34.27	33.76	35.73	37.10	36.63	35.11	34.76	34.28
Payout Ratio of Payers	35.95	35.90	34.85	30.33	29.99	30.62	31.74	33.54	34.77	32.17	31.52	31.30	30.08	30.90	29.67	28.92	30.36	32.25	32.14	30.27	29.75	29.23
	821	966	1268	1556	1764	2055	2393	2563	2657	2878	3297	3847	4059	4354	4682	5297	5851	6277	6598	7097	7579	8290
Payers	(95.4)	(94.3)	(90.0)	(90.8)	(89.7)	(89.4)	(88.6)	(86.9)	(85.0)	(82.9)	(82.6)	(80.9)	(78.7)	(73.1)	(67.8)	(62.6)	(58.7)	(57.6)	(58.2)	(58.2)	(58.9)	(58.9)
Non Bayons	40	58	141	158	203	244	307	387	470	593	693	908	1098	1603	2226	3163	4125	4625	4744	5102	5282	5795
Non-Payers	(4.6)	(5.7)	(10.0)	(9.2)	(10.3)	(10.6)	(11.4)	(13.1)	(15.0)	(17.1)	(17.4)	(19.1)	(21.3)	(26.9)	(32.2)	(37.4)	(41.3)	(42.4)	(41.8)	(41.8)	(41.1)	(41.1)
N. D.	0	30	44	95	116	146	178	229	290	362	420	542	686	854	1223	1709	2503	3346	3660	3864	4042	4255
Never Payers	-	(2.9)	(3.1)	(5.5)	(5.9)	(6.4)	(6.6)	(7.8)	(9.3)	(10.4)	(10.5)	(11.4)	(13.3)	(14.3)	(17.7)	(20.2)	(25.1)	(30.7)	(32.3)	(31.7)	(31.4)	(30.2)
	0	8	11	13	18	37	65	90	104	131	98	130	180	317	336	357	436	585	489	396	338	451
Former Payers	-	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.9)	(1.6)	(2.4)	(3.1)	(3.3)	(3.8)	(2.5)	(2.7)	(3.5)	(5.3)	(4.9)	(4.2)	(4.4)	(5.4)	(4.3)	(3.2)	(2.6)	(3.2)

Table 2: Panel A: Average Proportion of Payers (P) and Non-Payers (NP) for Each of the Countries Included. Grouped by Their Legal Systems: Civil Law Countries

	A	UT	BI	EL	BF	RA		HE	СН	п.	D	EU	DN	JK	E	SP	FI	N	FI	RA
	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP
1985	57.14	42.86	87.50	12.50	-		86.67	13.33	-		92.65	7.35	77.78	22.22	66.67	33.33	100.00	0.00	84.62	15.38
1986	85.71	14.29	69.23	30.77			92.31	7.69			87.50	12.50	90.00	10.00	75.00	25.00	100.00	0.00	91.11	8.89
1987	75.00	25.00	72.00	28.00			86.36	13.64	100.00	0.00	80.00	20.00	91.67	8.33	75.00	25.00	91.67	8.33	85.86	14.14
1988	76.92	23.08	88.46	11.54			90.20	9.80	87.50	12.50	82.80	17.20	88.00	12.00	84.62	15.38	87.50	12.50	86.67	13.33
1989	86.67	13.33	92.59	7.41	90.91	9.09	92.73	7.27	100.00	0.00	82.86	17.14	93.55	6.45	83.87	16.13	91.67	8.33	89.47	10.53
1990	86.67	13.33	96.43	3.57	84.62	15.38	93.44	6.56	92.86	7.14	85.42	14.58	89.47	10.53	87.50	12.50	93.94	6.06	91.97	8.03
1991	88.24	11.76	89.66	10.34	52.94	47.06	90.00	10.00	89.47	10.53	88.78	11.22	77.50	22.50	74.36	25.64	88.89	11.11	86.84	13.16
1992	84.21	15.79	79.31	20.69	73.33	26.67	85.00	15.00	100.00	0.00	85.86	14.14	73.33	26.67	75.61	24.39	64.10	35.90	86.75	13.25
1993	76.47	23.53	80.00	20.00	100.00	0.00	70.18	29.82	93.33	6.67	80.93	19.07	73.47	26.53	63.41	36.59	60.98	39.02	83.93	16.07
1994	68.42	31.58	79.31	20.69	100.00	0.00	65.57	34.43	91.89	8.11	75.32	24.68	73.08	26.92	64.29	35.71	68.18	31.82	75.56	24.44
1995	76.19	23.81	85.71	14.29	100.00	0.00	76.56	23.44	92.86	7.14	77.96	22.04	87.27	12.73	65.22	34.78	89.13	10.87	82.01	17.99
1996	80.77	19.23	87.50	12.50	100.00	0.00	78.95	21.05	93.62	6.38	74.37	25.63	78.57	21.43	64.00	36.00	89.09	10.91	77.22	22.78
1997	75.00	25.00	75.61	24.39	100.00	0.00	80.49	19.51	97.92	2.08	71.95	28.05	78.38	21.62	75.47	24.53	90.32	9.68	70.83	29.17
1998	80.00	20.00	75.93	24.07	75.00	25.00	82.61	17.39	92.06	7.94	69.21	30.79	78.75	21.25	65.45	34.55	95.59	4.41	73.79	26.21
1999	80.00	20.00	71.67	28.33	50.00	50.00	83.00	17.00	84.95	15.05	63.35	36.65	79.75	20.25	67.92	32.08	88.37	11.63	70.02	29.98
2000	75.00	25.00	70.49	29.51	74.12	25.88	80.53	19.47	89.47	10.53	52.08	47.92	75.58	24.42	70.59	29.41	79.38	20.62	65.29	34.71
2001	67.44	32.56	67.69	32.31	67.42	32.58	80.00	20.00	83.70	16.30	48.00	52.00	67.05	32.95	66.67	33.33	79.80	20.20	62.77	37.23
2002	60.47	39.53	63.08	36.92	59.56	40.44	62.28	37.72	87.76	12.24	45.70	54.30	55.06	44.94	62.34	37.66	76.77	23.23	59.08	40.92
2003	60.00	40.00	62.69	37.31	67.15	32.85	59.65	40.35	87.76	12.24	43.75	56.25	54.95	45.05	62.67	37.33	75.76	24.24	59.71	40.29
2004	68.18	31.82	71.88	28.13	67.59	32.41	64.10	35.90	88.78	11.22	44.39	55.61	57.78	42.22	67.57	32.43	82.47	17.53	60.13	39.87
2005	69.57	30.43	69.33	30.67	70.67	29.33	63.20	36.80	84.76	15.24	45.61	54.39	60.22	39.78	73.42	26.58	79.41	20.59	60.97	39.03
2006	66.67	33.33	63.64	36.36	75.95	24.05	65.89	34.11	85.98	14.02	47.79	52.21	65.26	34.74	73.56	26.44	77.78	22.22	61.67	38.33

Table 2, Panel A: (Continued)
Average Proportion of Payers (P) and Non-payers (NP) for Civil Law Countries

	GI	RC	IT	Δ	NI	LD	NO	)R	SW	/IE	TU	R
	- Р	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP
1985	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	95.00	5.00	100.00	0.00	93.75	6.25		
1986	50.00	50.00	100.00	0.00	95.24	4.76	66.67	33.33	100.00	0.00		
1987	83.33	16.67	89.47	10.53	88.57	11.43	72.73	27.27	100.00	0.00		
1988	100.00	0.00	93.48	6.52	88.37	11.63	60.00	40.00	100.00	0.00		
1989	100.00	0.00	93.75	6.25	88.64	11.36	55.00	45.00	96.15	3.85	100.00	0.00
1990	100.00	0.00	85.71	14.29	81.48	18.52	50.00	50.00	93.33	6.67	100.00	0.00
1991	90.48	9.52	87.76	12.24	83.61	16.39	45.45	54.55	91.67	8.33	85.71	14.29
1992	88.57	11.43	83.67	16.33	80.33	19.67	53.33	46.67	80.43	19.57	87.50	12.50
1993	82.93	17.07	78.72	21.28	84.62	15.38	59.38	40.63	61.11	38.89	94.44	5.56
1994	80.36	19.64	75.51	24.49	88.41	11.59	78.13	21.88	67.80	32.20	100.00	0.00
1995	81.82	18.18	75.44	24.56	86.11	13.89	78.13	21.88	80.95	19.05	95.65	4.35
1996	84.62	15.38	75.81	24.19	80.52	19.48	76.32	23.68	84.93	15.07	86.11	13.89
1997	88.76	11.24	80.28	19.72	81.40	18.60	57.89	42.11	75.76	24.24	82.00	18.00
1998	86.17	13.83	78.48	21.52	74.47	25.53	54.84	45.16	68.85	31.15	71.64	28.36
1999	83.67	16.33	80.23	19.77	76.04	23.96	48.44	51.56	60.90	39.10	68.18	31.82
2000	77.30	22.70	72.22	27.78	70.00	30.00	50.65	49.35	51.81	48.19	51.82	48.18
2001	78.46	21.54	64.54	35.46	68.09	31.91	41.98	58.02	48.62	51.38	41.67	58.33
2002	72.66	27.34	65.99	34.01	65.96	34.04	35.63	64.37	44.55	55.45	21.17	78.83
2003	77.08	22.92	63.01	36.99	64.44	35.56	45.05	54.95	46.12	53.88	22.76	77.24
2004	77.37	22.63	60.53	39.47	64.95	35.05	46.08	53.92	46.02	53.98	22.22	77.78
2005	76.58	23.42	63.47	36.53	68.27	31.73	46.15	53.85	48.26	51.74	46.71	53.29
2006	72.40	27.60	64.29	35.71	66.67	33.33	42.31	57.69	50.80	49.20	52.71	47.29

Table 2, Panel A: (Continued)
Average proportion of payers (P) and non-payers (NP):
Common Law Countries

	A	US	CA	AN .		GBR	NZ	ZL .	U	SA
	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP
1985	96.00	4.00	88.10	11.90	99.14	0.86	100.00	0.00	74.17	25.83
1986	95.83	4.17	82.35	17.65	96.30	3.70	100.00	0.00	71.29	28.71
1987	90.00	10.00	74.65	25.35	94.12	5.88	100.00	0.00	67.54	32.46
1988	84.62	15.38	76.32	23.68	94.89	5.11	100.00	0.00	64.53	35.47
1989	76.67	23.33	70.79	29.21	94.48	5.52	75.00	25.00	64.66	35.34
1990	74.60	25.40	68.32	31.68	92.98	7.02	100.00	0.00	62.95	37.05
1991	70.77	29.23	65.05	34.95	88.12	11.88	100.00	0.00	57.24	42.76
1992	67.65	32.35	60.19	39.81	85.44	14.56	87.50	12.50	53.59	46.41
1993	71.43	28.57	56.52	43.48	86.28	13.72	87.50	12.50	51.12	48.88
1994	72.50	27.50	55.93	44.07	84.30	15.70	92.86	7.14	39.94	60.06
1995	71.30	28.70	53.74	46.26	86.65	13.35	93.75	6.25	37.28	62.72
1996	69.35	30.65	48.19	51.81	81.88	18.12	88.89	11.11	33.92	66.08
1997	72.73	27.27	47.92	52.08	75.93	24.07	100.00	0.00	31.68	68.32
1998	62.84	37.16	34.90	65.10	76.44	23.56	86.21	13.79	28.56	71.44
1999	53.82	46.18	28.57	71.43	73.91	26.09	86.21	13.79	27.03	72.97
2000	39.77	60.23	25.00	75.00	64.00	36.00	75.68	24.32	24.61	75.39
2001	30.86	69.14	24.91	75.09	57.88	42.12	60.71	39.29	23.69	76.31
2002	28.70	71.30	23.65	76.35	54.83	45.17	53.23	46.77	22.77	77.23
2003	31.39	68.61	25.96	74.04	53.34	46.66	59.68	40.32	23.89	76.11
2004	29.48	70.52	26.00	74.00	50.37	49.63	62.69	37.31	26.09	73.91
2005	30.08	69.92	28.11	71.89	45.53	54.47	69.57	30.43	27.62	72.38
2006	28.89	71.11	28.56	71.44	43.41	56.59	70.59	29.41	27.51	72.49

Table 2, Panel A: (Continued)
Average Proportion of Payers (P) and Non-payers (NP):
Civil Law and Common Law Countries

	TH	ÍΑ	ZI	FA
-	P	NP	P	NP
1985			95.24	4.76
1986			95.65	4.35
1987	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
1988	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
1989	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
1990	80.00	20.00	100.00	0.00
1991	96.88	3.13	100.00	0.00
1992	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
1993	91.67	8.33	92.86	7.14
1994	89.23	10.77	89.13	10.87
1995	82.43	17.57	93.33	6.67
1996	81.37	18.63	88.24	11.76
1997	77.40	22.60	90.48	9.52
1998	35.19	64.81	67.91	32.09
1999	43.83	56.17	61.08	38.92
2000	48.39	51.61	63.16	36.84
2001	54.78	45.22	53.23	46.77
2002	62.35	37.65	57.06	42.94
2003	69.60	30.40	63.33	36.67
2004	69.65	30.35	67.98	32.02
2005	74.65	25.35	67.20	32.80
2006	72.63	27.37	63.96	36.04

Table 2, Panel A: (Continued)
Average Proportion of Payers (P) and Non-payers (NP): Civil Law/Common Law and Customary Law Countries

	Cl	HN	I	SR	JI	PN	KC	)R	TV	VN	Н	KG
	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP
1985			·		98.91	1.09	100.00	0.00	-		95.24	4.76
1986					97.37	2.63	100.00	0.00			95.83	4.17
1987					94.60	5.40	100.00	0.00			96.55	3.45
1988					94.31	5.69	96.43	3.57	100.00	0.00	96.88	3.13
1989					91.30	8.70	95.00	5.00	100.00	0.00	94.59	5.41
1990					91.98	8.02	95.65	4.35	83.33	16.67	87.80	12.20
1991					94.27	5.73	90.74	9.26	64.71	35.29	90.74	9.26
1992	57.14	42.86			94.14	5.86	84.62	15.38	63.64	36.36	89.55	10.45
1993	33.33	66.67	0.00	100.00	93.45	6.55	85.71	14.29	51.28	48.72	91.04	8.96
1994	71.43	28.57	71.43	28.57	90.54	9.46	80.65	19.35	35.37	64.63	95.29	4.71
1995	77.97	22.03	86.67	13.33	88.20	11.80	84.25	15.75	43.90	56.10	90.38	9.62
1996	62.16	37.84	64.71	35.29	87.16	12.84	83.33	16.67	30.00	70.00	82.49	17.51
1997	60.49	39.51	72.00	28.00	88.15	11.85	83.15	16.85	23.76	76.24	76.79	23.21
1998	53.26	46.74	52.00	48.00	90.08	9.92	66.79	33.21	29.15	70.85	71.15	28.85
1999	50.86	49.14	70.37	29.63	88.70	11.30	60.52	39.48	32.39	67.61	57.47	42.53
2000	47.46	52.54	58.33	41.67	84.68	15.32	65.55	34.45	45.08	54.92	50.95	49.05
2001	54.19	45.81	41.82	58.18	84.75	15.25	64.19	35.81	45.23	54.77	47.62	52.38
2002	84.45	15.55	36.92	63.08	85.23	14.77	61.94	38.06	52.51	47.49	44.52	55.48
2003	87.25	12.75	43.28	56.72	81.21	18.79	65.98	34.02	56.92	43.08	47.75	52.25
2004	84.90	15.10	39.71	60.29	81.93	18.07	68.35	31.65	64.34	35.66	49.54	50.46
2005	49.03	50.97	45.45	54.55	84.65	15.35	71.14	28.86	61.63	38.37	54.89	45.11
2006	44.74	55.26	47.46	52.54	85.45	14.55	72.69	27.31	100.00	0.00	57.08	42.92

Table 2, Panel A: (Continued)
Average Proportion of Payers (P) and Non-payers (NP): Civil Law/Common Law, Muslim Law and Customary Law Countries

	**			TID.		TVC		ND.
		ON	IN	-	·	YS		
	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP
1985					92.00	8.00	94.12	5.88
1986					92.86	7.14	94.44	5.56
1987					88.24	11.76	90.91	9.09
1988					88.57	11.43	95.65	4.35
1989			100.00	0.00	88.10	11.90	100.00	0.00
1990	50.00	50.00	100.00	0.00	86.54	13.46	100.00	0.00
1991	89.47	10.53	71.43	28.57	88.89	11.11	90.70	9.30
1992	96.23	3.77	62.50	37.50	90.00	10.00	86.79	13.21
1993	96.08	3.92	64.29	35.71	91.06	8.94	90.38	9.62
1994	97.10	2.90	84.62	15.38	92.48	7.52	89.71	10.29
1995	94.74	5.26	86.96	13.04	92.39	7.61	94.06	5.94
1996	96.19	3.81	92.83	7.17	91.07	8.93	89.26	10.74
1997	92.31	7.69	92.37	7.63	89.91	10.09	85.94	14.06
1998	47.87	52.13	91.63	8.37	79.25	20.75	84.78	15.22
1999	38.52	61.48	88.80	11.20	68.68	31.32	74.83	25.17
2000	64.44	35.56	86.88	13.12	67.39	32.61	67.84	32.16
2001	45.73	54.27	80.56	19.44	68.76	31.24	65.38	34.62
2002	45.16	54.84	82.48	17.52	65.97	34.03	57.06	42.94
2003	46.73	53.27	79.60	20.40	61.57	38.43	58.68	41.32
2004	45.81	54.19	81.53	18.47	60.45	39.55	57.14	42.86
2005	48.08	51.92	79.60	20.40	61.83	38.17	61.76	38.24
2006	54.74	45.26	68.85	31.15	63.18	36.82	65.31	34.69

Table 2, Panel B: Average Proportion of Payers (P) and Non-payers (NP), Classified by the Legal System of the Countries Included

	Civil	Law	Comm	on Law		l Law non Law	Comm	l Law/ non Law mary Law	Comm Muslin	l Law/ on Law, n Law & nary Law
_	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP
1985	80.14	19.86	91.48	8.52	95.24	4.76	98.05	1.95	93.06	6.94
1986	84.83	15.17	89.15	10.85	95.65	4.35	97.73	2.27	93.65	6.35
1987	85.12	14.88	85.26	14.74	100.00	0.00	97.05	2.95	89.58	10.43
1988	86.75	13.25	84.07	15.93	100.00	0.00	96.91	3.10	92.11	7.89
1989	89.87	10.13	76.32	23.68	100.00	0.00	95.22	4.78	96.03	3.97
1990	88.30	11.70	79.77	20.23	90.00	10.00	89.69	10.31	84.14	15.87
1991	81.96	18.04	76.24	23.76	98.44	1.57	85.12	14.89	85.12	14.88
1992	80.08	19.92	70.87	29.13	100.00	0.00	77.82	22.18	83.88	16.12
1993	77.74	22.26	70.57	29.43	92.27	7.74	59.14	40.87	85.45	14.55
1994	78.24	21.76	69.11	30.89	89.18	10.82	74.12	25.88	90.98	9.02
1995	83.19	16.81	68.54	31.46	87.88	12.12	78.56	21.44	92.04	7.96
1996	82.03	17.98	64.45	35.55	84.81	15.20	68.31	31.69	92.34	7.66
1997	80.13	19.87	65.65	34.35	83.94	16.06	67.39	32.61	90.13	9.87
1998	76.43	23.57	57.79	42.21	51.55	48.45	60.41	39.60	75.88	24.12
1999	72.28	27.72	53.91	46.09	52.46	47.55	60.05	39.95	67.71	32.29
2000	69.15	30.85	45.81	54.19	55.78	44.23	58.68	41.33	71.64	28.36
2001	64.62	35.38	39.61	60.39	54.01	46.00	56.30	43.70	65.11	34.89
2002	58.63	41.37	36.64	63.36	59.71	40.30	60.93	39.07	62.67	37.33
2003	59.53	40.47	38.85	61.15	66.47	33.54	63.73	36.27	61.65	38.36
2004	61.88	38.12	38.93	61.07	68.82	31.19	64.80	35.21	61.23	38.77
2005	64.16	35.84	40.18	59.82	70.93	29.08	61.13	38.87	62.82	37.18
2006	64.59	35.41	39.79	60.21	68.30	31.71	67.90	32.10	63.02	36.98

Table 3: Country-by-Country Analysis of Concentration of Dividends: The Percentages of Aggregate Dividends Accounted for by those of the Largest Ten Dividend Payers

Year	AUS	AUT	BEL	BRA	CAN	CHE	CHL	CHN	DEU	DNK	ESP	FIN	FRA	GBR	GRC	HKG	IDN
1985	77%				90%				73%				72%	65%		90%	
1986	83%				87%	78%			77%				66%	65%		89%	
1987	76%				84%	63%			74%				61%	64%		86%	
1988	74%		93%		81%	59%			70%		94%		60%	60%		80%	
1989	73%		94%		80%	61%			69%	88%	92%	91%	61%	61%		78%	
1990	80%		91%		77%	58%			67%	87%	91%	85%	57%	57%		79%	
1991	76%		90%		79%	59%			67%	89%	93%	80%	61%	57%		72%	84%
1992	74%		92%		78%	64%	87%		66%	88%	88%	89%	60%	56%	82%	68%	72%
1993	73%		93%		77%	71%	85%		66%	88%	93%	91%	56%	63%	82%	66%	71%
1994	67%		92%		80%	72%	80%		67%	84%	91%	86%	58%	61%	73%	65%	71%
1995	64%		91%		72%	67%	74%	64%	62%	87%	92%	80%	53%	61%	64%	55%	57%
1996	62%	93%	92%		67%	60%	69%	65%	63%	84%	93%	82%	48%	64%	77%	59%	52%
1997	61%	90%	91%		63%	61%	61%	55%	62%	81%	93%	79%	54%	61%	78%	58%	58%
1998	64%	87%	87%		58%	56%	66%	61%	76%	83%	93%	81%	54%	67%	79%	55%	88%
1999	63%	87%	84%		55%	52%	53%	58%	63%	82%	90%	79%	57%	66%	76%	62%	86%
2000	68%	88%	86%	81%	56%	61%	70%	84%	61%	82%	84%	84%	52%	60%	81%	54%	86%
2001	65%	86%	86%	85%	60%	53%	84%	83%	59%	88%	82%	85%	56%	66%	63%	59%	79%
2002	69%	89%	85%	79%	43%	61%	64%	59%	57%	86%	74%	85%	56%	66%	77%	54%	82%
2003	64%	86%	85%	80%	43%	57%	68%	74%	58%	87%	86%	81%	55%	63%	75%	64%	84%
2004	61%	98%	86%	72%	35%	58%	77%	74%	55%	84%	87%	78%	60%	62%	73%	55%	86%
2005	57%	90%	85%	74%	38%	55%	63%	91%	57%	77%	80%	78%	55%	64%	75%	58%	83%
2006	59%	93%	86%	73%	31%	51%	57%	92%	59%	95%	80%	72%	57%	62%	73%	59%	84%
Avg <sup>1</sup>	68.62%	89.67%	88.94%	77.81%	65.26%	60.77%	70.53%	71.61%	64.90%	85.47%	88.15%	82.61%	57.73%	62.33%	75.20%	66.66%	76.51%
last5 <sup>2</sup>	61.78%	91.06%	85.65%	75.80%	38.26%	56.24%	66.03%	77.82%	57.22%	85.63%	81.41%	78.86%	56.51%	63.53%	74.66%	57.99%	83.99%
first5 <sup>3</sup>	76.46%	88.93%	93.16%	81.72%	84.47%	65.26%	78.85%	60.66%	72.55%	88.43%	92.85%	91.04%	64.34%	62.97%	75.67%	84.64%	71.00%
diff5 <sup>4</sup>	- 14.69%	2.13%	-7.52%	-5.92%	-46.21%	-9.02%	-12.82%	17.16%	15.33%	-2.80%	- 11.44%	12.17%	-7.83%	0.56%	-1.02%	-26.65%	12.99%
<sup>2</sup> Average <sup>3</sup> Average <sup>4</sup> Change:	17.70% : All period : Last five y : First five y Last five ye Last year –	years' perce years' perce ears' averag	ntages e – first five	-7.36%	-58.71% age	27.19%	-29.90%	27.53%	13.47%	6.29%	14.42%	19.15%	15.54%	-2.53%	-9.76%	-31.34%	0.50%

Table 3 (Continued)

Year	IND	ISR	ITA	JPN	KOR	MYS	NLD	NOR	SGP	SWE	THA	TUR	TWN	USA	ZAF	avg
1985				25%		73%		92%						35%		69%
1986				25%		79%	95%	93%						29%		72%
1987			83%	23%		72%	93%	92%	82%					36%		71%
1988			83%	24%	75%	73%	91%	92%	80%					36%	81%	72%
1989			84%	22%	70%	66%	90%	90%	78%	89%				39%	76%	74%
1990			84%	21%	70%	63%	89%	89%	80%	87%				44%	72%	73%
1991			83%	22%	67%	49%	89%	89%	75%	87%	78%			34%	70%	72%
1992			81%	21%	60%	48%	89%	89%	73%	85%	63%			32%	73%	71%
1993			83%	21%	54%	47%	87%	90%	74%	87%	54%			33%	63%	71%
1994			78%	21%	52%	55%	89%	85%	70%	85%	55%		72%	34%	62%	69%
1995	95%		89%	20%	49%	42%	89%	91%	73%	77%	52%		58%	33%	67%	67%
1996	37%		90%	23%	51%	42%	89%	82%	74%	74%	52%	69%	53%	31%	72%	66%
1997	38%		87%	20%	50%	39%	88%	82%	73%	72%	55%	69%	60%	36%	65%	65%
1998	37%		87%	20%	54%	53%	86%	93%	75%	70%	76%	73%	60%	37%	64%	68%
1999	39%		89%	20%	64%	47%	95%	89%	73%	77%	61%	68%	53%	37%	65%	66%
2000	45%	80%	84%	26%	63%	42%	85%	93%	83%	69%	63%	77%	46%	29%	63%	68%
2001	47%	80%	82%	33%	61%	39%	82%	89%	81%	70%	54%	79%	66%	31%	77%	69%
2002	60%	78%	84%	22%	57%	51%	80%	86%	66%	63%	61%	80%	57%	39%	76%	67%
2003	61%	76%	84%	25%	58%	44%	88%	79%	68%	67%	65%	81%	50%	31%	65%	67%
2004	51%	80%	90%	26%	67%	45%	85%	79%	58%	70%	64%	81%	47%	33%	50%	66%
2005	47%	71%	88%	26%	57%	43%	94%	81%	60%	67%	64%	74%	51%	31%	57%	65%
2006	45%	85%	84%	27%	54%	46%	90%	84%	56%	69%	70%	67%	51%	30%	62%	66%
$Avg^1$	50.03%	78.72%	84.88%	23.35%	59.64%	52.66%	88.73%	87.66%	72.51%	75.83%	61.80%	74.36%	55.89%	34.11%	67.30%	69.38%
last5 <sup>2</sup>	52.65%	78.06%	86.06%	25.52%	58.63%	45.83%	87.45%	81.83%	61.68%	67.28%	64.83%	76.59%	51.28%	32.69%	62.10%	66.40%
first5 <sup>3</sup>	49.02%	79.63%	83.16%	23.72%	72.33%	72.61%	92.46%	91.66%	80.10%	88.55%	60.61%	69.76%	60.97%	34.90%	78.36%	71.68%
diff5 <sup>4</sup>	3.63%	-1.58%	2.89%	1.80%	-13.70%	-26.78%	-5.01%	-9.83%	-18.42%	- 21.27%	4.22%	6.83%	-9.69%	-2.21%	- 16.26%	-5.28%
	-									-			-		-	
<sup>2</sup> Average <sup>3</sup> Average <sup>4</sup> Change:	49.40%  E All period  E Last five y  E First five y  Last five y  Last year –	years' perce years' perce ears' averag	ntages e – first five	2.29% e year's ave	-20.80% rage	-27.39%	-5.00%	-8.10%	-25.52%	19.05%	-7.91%	-1.94%	21.15%	-4.54%	18.81%	-3.42%

Table 3-A: Aggregate Dividends Paid (in Millions of Dollars)

	Global Amou	unt
Year	Number of Firms	Total (\$ millions)
1985	1434	\$27,661
1986	1623	\$30,593
1987	2059	\$39,646
1988	2433	\$45,701
1989	2697	\$55,739
1990	3052	\$67,785
1991	3556	\$67,862
1992	3855	\$62,985
1993	4105	\$68,260
1994	4823	\$77,988
1995	5519	\$93,489
1996	6459	\$103,298
1997	6997	\$105,465
1998	8047	\$129,383
1999	9128	\$146,900
2000	10837	\$146,287
2001	12407	\$168,785
2002	13388	\$164,275
2003	13895	\$204,540
2004	14928	\$280,971
2005	15714	\$338,286
2006	17106	\$436,806

	The Rest of the World						
Year	Number of Firms	Total (\$ millions)					
1985	861	\$13,393					
1986	1024	\$18,255					
1987	1409	\$24,662					
1988	1714	\$29,395					
1989	1967	\$36,648					
1990	2299	\$43,443					
1991	2700	\$46,056					
1992	2950	\$45,784					
1993	3127	\$46,986					
1994	3471	\$57,061					
1995	3990	\$72,060					
1996	4755	\$82,170					
1997	5157	\$81,465					
1998	5957	\$104,783					
1999	6908	\$120,370					
2000	8460	\$126,264					
2001	9976	\$149,300					
2002	10902	\$140,108					
2003	11342	\$180,895					
2004	12199	\$247,497					
2005	12861	\$299,481					
2006	14085	\$386,698					

Table 3-B: Country-by-Country Aggregate Amounts of Dividends Paid in 2006 (in millions of dollars), and the Relative Share of Each Country

Country	Number of Firm	Total Dividends Paid (\$m)	Relative Share
AUS	1177	\$18,458	4.23%
AUT	48	\$1,497	0.34%
BEL	77	\$3,340	0.76%
BRA	158	\$13,107	3.00%
CAN	1012	\$18,157	4.16%
CHE	129	\$1,266	0.29%
CHL	107	\$2,313	0.53%
CHN	152	\$12,061	2.76%
DEU	655	\$36,369	8.33%
DNK	95	\$10,941	2.50%
ESP	87	\$10,118	2.32%
FIN	108	\$6,627	1.52%
FRA	527	\$34,049	7.80%
GBR	1274	\$67,442	15.44%
GRC	221	\$2,351	0.54%
HKG	671	\$13,834	3.17%
IDN	137	\$2,105	0.48%
IND	1268	\$8,814	2.02%
ISR	59	\$2,256	0.52%
ITA	182	\$15,780	3.61%
JPN	1821	\$21,772	4.98%
KOR	553	\$8,866	2.03%
MYS	679	\$3,392	0.78%
NLD	108	\$18,262	4.18%
NOR	130	\$2,912	0.67%
NZL	68	\$1,320	0.30%
SGP	493	\$5,350	1.22%
SWE	250	\$11,455	2.62%
THA	369	\$4,930	1.13%
TUR	129	\$2,380	0.54%
TWN	1144	\$17,974	4.11%
USA	3021	\$50,107	11.47%
ZAF	197	\$7,200	1.65%

Table 3-C: Analysis of Payout Ratios for Dividend Payers

Year	Total Number of Firms	Total Number of Profitable Firms	Mean Profits (\$m)	Median Profits (\$m)	Aggregate Earnings (\$m)	Aggregate Dividends (\$m)	Payout Ratio	Percentages of Firms with Positive Earnings
1985	1434	1034	\$110.18	\$29.28	\$113,925	\$27,661	24.3%	72.1%
1986	1623	1112	\$104.71	\$27.68	\$116,440	\$30,593	26.3%	68.5%
1987	2059	1391	\$131.48	\$25.96	\$182,891	\$39,646	21.7%	67.6%
1988	2433	1659	\$139.40	\$23.17	\$231,258	\$45,701	19.8%	68.2%
1989	2697	1862	\$150.15	\$25.30	\$279,586	\$55,739	19.9%	69.0%
1990	3052	1985	\$147.08	\$24.47	\$291,947	\$67,785	23.2%	65.0%
1991	3556	2278	\$134.64	\$18.02	\$306,717	\$67,862	22.1%	64.1%
1992	3855	2542	\$100.41	\$16.31	\$255,242	\$62,985	24.7%	65.9%
1993	4105	2775	\$93.55	\$16.29	\$259,602	\$68,260	26.3%	67.6%
1994	4823	3404	\$94.21	\$16.07	\$320,702	\$77,988	24.3%	70.6%
1995	5519	4108	\$100.96	\$16.42	\$414,763	\$93,489	22.5%	74.4%
1996	6459	4820	\$95.82	\$15.85	\$461,852	\$103,298	22.4%	74.6%
1997	6997	5152	\$95.12	\$15.11	\$490,042	\$105,465	21.5%	73.6%
1998	8047	5853	\$89.01	\$11.12	\$520,984	\$129,383	24.8%	72.7%
1999	9128	6403	\$89.66	\$10.58	\$574,067	\$146,900	25.6%	70.1%
2000	10837	8476	\$88.16	\$9.45	\$747,261	\$146,287	19.6%	78.2%
2001	12407	9610	\$51.97	\$5.75	\$499,430	\$168,785	33.8%	77.5%
2002	13388	10067	\$42.84	\$5.21	\$431,260	\$164,275	38.1%	75.2%
2003	13895	10472	\$76.33	\$6.76	\$799,326	\$204,540	25.6%	75.4%
2004	14928	11163	\$98.57	\$9.49	\$1,100,321	\$280,971	25.5%	74.8%
2005	15714	12051	\$112.94	\$9.53	\$1,361,028	\$338,286	24.9%	76.7%
2006	17106	13253	\$120.03	\$9.71	\$1,590,736	\$436,806	27.5%	77.5%

Table 3-C: Analysis of Payout Ratios for Dividend Payers; the US

Year	Total Number of Firms	Total Number of Profitable Firms	Mean Profits (\$m)	Median Profits (\$m)	Aggregate Earnings (\$m)	Aggregate Dividends (\$m)	Payout Ratio	Percentages of Firms with Positive Earnings
1985	573	555	\$83.51	\$21.67	\$46,349	\$14,268	30.8%	96.9%
1986	599	581	\$57.39	\$17.25	\$33,344	\$12,338	37.0%	97.0%
1987	650	636	\$97.46	\$20.48	\$61,981	\$14,984	24.2%	97.8%
1988	719	699	\$107.06	\$20.98	\$74,832	\$16,306	21.8%	97.2%
1989	730	714	\$128.24	\$21.28	\$91,565	\$19,091	20.8%	97.8%
1990	753	743	\$107.68	\$22.38	\$80,004	\$24,342	30.4%	98.7%
1991	856	842	\$101.74	\$16.48	\$85,663	\$21,806	25.5%	98.4%
1992	905	886	\$69.88	\$13.94	\$61,915	\$17,201	27.8%	97.9%
1993	978	959	\$74.98	\$15.67	\$71,905	\$21,274	29.6%	98.1%
1994	1352	1292	\$61.81	\$10.88	\$79,860	\$20,927	26.2%	95.6%
1995	1529	1462	\$64.24	\$9.92	\$93,912	\$21,429	22.8%	95.6%
1996	1704	1612	\$65.21	\$10.96	\$105,122	\$21,127	20.1%	94.6%
1997	1840	1733	\$63.14	\$12.61	\$109,416	\$24,000	21.9%	94.2%
1998	2090	1969	\$61.39	\$7.94	\$120,881	\$24,601	20.4%	94.2%
1999	2220	2070	\$59.79	\$8.68	\$123,767	\$26,530	21.4%	93.2%
2000	2377	2198	\$68.30	\$8.61	\$150,133	\$20,023	13.3%	92.5%
2001	2431	2281	\$32.65	\$5.14	\$74,470	\$19,486	26.2%	93.8%
2002	2486	2351	\$31.75	\$4.59	\$74,633	\$24,167	32.4%	94.6%
2003	2553	2416	\$55.59	\$5.97	\$134,312	\$23,645	17.6%	94.6%
2004	2729	2603	\$64.74	\$8.86	\$168,508	\$33,474	19.9%	95.4%
2005	2853	2715	\$80.77	\$10.00	\$219,281	\$38,805	17.7%	95.2%
2006	3021	2862	\$86.44	\$10.05	\$247,392	\$50,107	20.3%	94.7%

Table 3-C: Analysis of Payout Ratios for Dividend Payers; Rest of the World

Year	Total Number of Firms	Total Number of Profitable Firms	Mean Profits (\$m)	Median Profits (\$m)	Aggregate Earnings (\$m)	Aggregate Dividends (\$m)	Payout Ratio	Percentages of Firms with Positive Earnings
1985	861	479	\$141.08	\$41.94	\$67,576	\$13,393	19.8%	55.6%
1986	1024	531	\$156.49	\$45.83	\$83,096	\$18,255	22.0%	51.9%
1987	1409	755	\$160.15	\$31.44	\$120,910	\$24,662	20.4%	53.6%
1988	1714	960	\$162.94	\$24.89	\$156,426	\$29,395	18.8%	56.0%
1989	1967	1148	\$163.78	\$27.38	\$188,021	\$36,648	19.5%	58.4%
1990	2299	1242	\$170.65	\$27.13	\$211,944	\$43,443	20.5%	54.0%
1991	2700	1436	\$153.94	\$19.32	\$221,054	\$46,056	20.8%	53.2%
1992	2950	1656	\$116.74	\$17.53	\$193,327	\$45,784	23.7%	56.1%
1993	3127	1816	\$103.36	\$16.59	\$187,697	\$46,986	25.0%	58.1%
1994	3471	2112	\$114.03	\$19.30	\$240,841	\$57,061	23.7%	60.8%
1995	3990	2646	\$121.26	\$19.86	\$320,851	\$72,060	22.5%	66.3%
1996	4755	3208	\$111.20	\$18.46	\$356,730	\$82,170	23.0%	67.5%
1997	5157	3419	\$111.33	\$16.18	\$380,626	\$81,465	21.4%	66.3%
1998	5957	3884	\$103.01	\$12.27	\$400,103	\$104,783	26.2%	65.2%
1999	6908	4333	\$103.92	\$11.14	\$450,300	\$120,370	26.7%	62.7%
2000	8460	6278	\$95.11	\$9.69	\$597,128	\$126,264	21.1%	74.2%
2001	9976	7329	\$57.98	\$5.82	\$424,960	\$149,300	35.1%	73.5%
2002	10902	7716	\$46.22	\$5.35	\$356,627	\$140,108	39.3%	70.8%
2003	11342	8056	\$82.55	\$6.89	\$665,015	\$180,895	27.2%	71.0%
2004	12199	8560	\$108.86	\$9.67	\$931,813	\$247,497	26.6%	70.2%
2005	12861	9336	\$122.30	\$9.37	\$1,141,746	\$299,481	26.2%	72.6%
2006	14085	10391	\$129.28	\$9.66	\$1,343,344	\$386,698	28.8%	73.8%

Table 4: Means and Medians of Dividend Payout Ratio (Mean=Mn, Median=Md)

Panel A: Results Classified by The Legal System of Countries Included

	Civil	Law	Comm	on Law		Law and	Law and	w/Common I Customary Law	Law, M	w/Common uslim Law tomary Law
	Mn	Md	Mn	Md	Mn	Md	Mn	Md	Mn	Md
1985	43.41	41.51	36.31	32.74	51.69	53.76	49.11	44.40	51.40	50.05
1986	38.60	37.18	39.43	36.53	47.30	43.16	43.32	42.57	49.94	45.81
1987	42.83	39.52	35.46	33.01	29.87	29.23	43.25	39.18	42.21	38.06
1988	36.96	34.49	32.88	31.03	37.31	34.88	37.19	33.41	38.91	32.26
1989	38.69	36.53	33.14	30.97	33.57	30.05	40.15	32.79	32.82	31.16
1990	41.67	38.07	39.26	36.27	45.56	44.80	37.39	34.40	29.22	25.94
1991	40.17	37.40	43.51	40.21	48.63	44.94	40.61	37.18	33.28	27.56
1992	43.67	39.75	41.99	39.59	49.18	48.51	38.65	37.61	33.48	28.10
1993	37.92	34.08	34.90	32.46	47.87	43.84	34.80	30.34	34.48	31.56
1994	34.47	31.30	36.47	31.96	44.03	41.22	38.12	33.22	33.33	30.31
1995	34.55	31.48	36.39	33.00	40.29	38.72	38.70	35.17	29.62	25.06
1996	36.23	32.82	40.31	36.38	39.17	35.77	37.46	34.47	29.09	24.59
1997	37.77	33.60	38.12	34.83	37.79	38.12	35.98	32.35	29.81	26.09
1998	35.59	32.65	40.28	37.51	30.15	26.34	36.83	31.42	31.29	27.36
1999	35.68	30.08	40.32	37.18	34.40	33.37	33.99	29.48	29.11	23.82
2000	35.53	31.10	41.89	38.21	33.73	31.24	34.59	28.93	29.78	24.74
2001	38.25	34.13	43.15	40.74	35.62	30.74	36.82	32.86	31.72	26.88
2002	38.84	35.02	42.75	38.43	37.10	32.56	35.85	30.39	32.75	27.58
2003	40.43	37.25	43.72	39.22	37.16	34.13	35.19	30.66	33.46	27.79
2004	38.23	33.83	42.11	37.85	41.49	38.23	35.45	31.13	31.07	25.78
2005	37.25	33.65	42.74	39.57	40.25	38.69	36.12	32.91	32.84	28.30
2006	35.83	31.85	43.10	39.14	41.89	41.37	35.34	32.24	33.24	28.21

Table 4 (Continued)

Panel B: Payout Ratios for Each Country: Civil Law Countries

	A	UT	BI	EL	BI	RA	CI	ΗE	CI	IL	DI	EU	Dì	ΝK	ES	SP	FI	N	FF	RA	GI	RC	IT	À	N	LD	NO	OR	SV	VE	TU	JR
	Mn	Md	Mn	Mn	Md	Mn	Md	Mn	Mn	Md																						
1985	73.90	90.91	38.10	27.10			49.50	41.47			55.10	50.83	24.31	22.33	53.48	40.52	52.87	53.68	29.28	26.01	0.00	0.00	48.60	55.37	29.40	31.38	69.96	69.96	39.89	30.07		
1986	56.14	58.30	27.09	28.55			38.41	35.13			52.39	48.16	27.75	29.40	37.42	28.52	44.56	39.26	27.93	24.76	43.07	43.07	43.35	47.19	29.21	30.92			35.91	32.93		
1987	45.17	29.79	41.31	34.47			39.45	35.96	40.53	29.27	55.87	51.64	32.35	24.99	41.14	39.97	57.66	67.57	27.73	24.55	50.98	47.18	39.70	39.75	32.91	32.95	62.11	65.57	32.74	29.61		
1988	31.72	31.63	34.21	28.46			43.11	37.65	51.55	43.27	50.70	48.60	26.96	22.91	39.29	36.04	30.64	33.64	24.48	22.98	44.64	44.27	40.45	42.06	32.10	32.05	35.70	32.66	31.82	26.69		
1989	30.65	33.21	30.64	24.21	33.58	26.17	40.04	35.22	55.73	57.36	48.43	44.10	27.54	23.69	44.44	39.84	51.55	48.92	23.34	20.71	53.82	51.74	45.31	45.36	27.66	28.54	39.24	38.99	29.08	26.72	37.91	39.72
1990	42.93	39.35	42.56	34.68	39.41	30.34	40.64	36.26	54.35	39.77	49.75	44.32	23.98	19.89	46.32	40.74	50.12	52.68	25.70	22.40	57.91	57.60	47.86	45.53	31.81	34.54	47.72	51.89	35.84	32.75	29.86	26.38
1991	44.05	37.50	49.67	45.25	40.19	40.19	48.69	46.01	54.85	57.64	52.75	53.08	28.81	19.79	42.83	38.84	42.09	35.28	29.36	26.36	44.93	42.17	45.75	38.87	30.11	34.14	12.88	9.91	43.75	40.93	32.03	32.41
1992	61.55	58.31	40.50	32.13	42.76	28.28	44.40	40.85	51.01	55.91	48.78	44.39	22.55	17.07	56.44	52.63	39.37	36.69	31.62	29.52	59.45	60.31	47.22	40.46	35.42	36.29	36.50	26.74	42.97	44.09	38.17	32.37
1993	53.05	54.35	40.56	35.63	19.98	13.79	39.86	31.96	51.20	46.78	50.36	49.22	21.99	19.16	53.24	47.87	26.02	18.22	34.40	28.08	42.05	35.67	44.69	38.83	38.91	39.78	21.38	22.27	29.34	26.22	39.69	37.48
1994	42.60	40.45	46.24	40.24			35.75	30.66	41.25	39.87	49.26	45.54	20.35	17.68	43.33	41.55	26.02	20.89	30.40	24.96	41.24	39.99	34.65	31.73	28.92	30.12	24.75	21.36	23.84	20.81	28.49	23.58
1995	33.87	30.62	42.64	43.72			33.54	27.64	47.81	42.93	44.34	43.63	22.93	17.81	45.23	41.13	30.48	22.51	33.19	30.09	42.48	37.91	31.51	28.51	32.02	34.95	22.10	20.99	25.72	23.00	30.44	26.72
1996	35.83	27.35	30.19	29.49			35.73	29.78	50.17	48.45	48.22	44.71	26.63	17.52	41.93	43.76	33.04	28.92	33.07	28.17	47.54	43.91	41.06	38.12	26.72	31.66	26.94	22.15	33.59	30.90	32.86	27.37
1997	45.17	39.33	35.41	30.91	84.69	84.69	30.26	26.44	46.39	40.41	43.46	42.21	26.69	21.00	36.51	29.89	33.68	28.75	30.07	25.89	46.12	38.81	34.10	32.43	23.32	19.00	21.09	16.66	31.19	28.43	36.15	32.80
1998	31.76	31.91	35.54	28.67	46.98	46.98	30.29	26.81	47.95	46.58	41.46	38.58	27.09	22.42	35.42	34.53	40.41	38.10	31.40	26.80	40.83	38.47	31.68	29.24	24.38	21.86	30.80	26.37	33.04	29.02	40.37	36.13
1999	46.33	34.96	32.90	27.66	53.60	32.70	31.86	26.93	39.94	35.76	42.15	40.06	29.02	23.31	32.62	28.82	36.44	30.77	27.81	24.50	33.52	31.53	36.67	33.58	25.18	19.76	33.95	29.17	32.97	30.51	35.94	31.19
2000	34.58	28.47	33.28	27.40	41.06	37.25	31.29	26.78	49.54	43.82	39.89	37.48	28.50	20.99	31.24	25.88	33.63	33.20	29.91	26.55	38.32	34.58	34.17	26.52	22.93	15.51	43.77	38.05	33.81	29.24	42.48	45.86
2001	36.02	30.47	36.97	30.17	41.63	37.10	39.83	36.73	46.88	44.91	44.84	41.43	29.28	25.39	34.96	30.52	42.44	41.74	32.62	26.54	46.51	42.94	37.45	33.94	31.73	31.39	37.88	30.19	40.44	32.91	32.50	29.65
2002	44.51	45.03	38.65	34.68	42.74	34.82	38.69	36.42	40.31	33.81	44.70	41.11	33.23	30.40	31.31	27.86	46.32	43.75	33.78	29.45	40.06	33.28	38.83	31.27	30.91	29.23	36.15	33.53	44.97	36.70	36.32	38.91
2003	42.62	39.63	41.62	42.15	37.87	33.14	33.77	29.05	44.92	40.76	44.36	40.95	31.04	27.91	38.02	29.60	52.52	50.71	34.45	29.36	41.26	35.75	40.93	36.38	40.26	36.40	37.79	38.39	45.55	41.83	39.95	44.02
2004	33.21	29.17	37.06	32.67	40.70	35.81	31.54	29.23	39.69	35.73	38.74	33.52	31.32	26.96	36.47	30.41	50.18	48.51	33.25	29.05	40.96	35.37	38.27	32.99	38.03	32.22	38.85	33.17	40.56	38.71	42.80	37.81
																														37.09		
2006	29.41	24.86	33.41	32.28	42.52	35.90	28.15	25.13	41.29	36.86	35.25	30.76	33.01	26.99	34.92	29.77	41.87	39.91	32.36	28.56	36.69	30.87	37.87	35.26	33.67	29.10	32.31	28.63	40.95	36.28	39.63	38.39

Table 4 (Continued)

Panel C: Payout Ratios for Each Country: Common Law Countries

	Al	JS	CA	AN	G	BR	N	ZL	U	SA
	Mn	Md								
1985	46.83	44.73	32.80	25.86	36.04	31.05	31.99	31.99	33.91	30.08
1986	51.39	47.36	31.52	27.17	34.76	31.51	46.42	46.42	33.08	30.17
1987	38.56	29.70	25.82	22.91	30.01	27.57	50.71	54.73	32.18	30.12
1988	45.33	45.79	30.25	25.75	27.50	24.97	30.95	30.95	30.38	27.71
1989	56.73	56.79	31.17	26.08	30.81	28.50	15.12	15.12	31.89	28.35
1990	47.83	49.35	36.75	32.45	36.58	34.07	39.55	33.57	35.57	31.89
1991	51.61	51.61	36.84	34.30	44.28	40.62	47.52	39.67	37.32	34.85
1992	48.31	46.73	41.41	42.70	43.44	38.21	41.00	36.74	35.78	33.58
1993	42.47	40.19	30.08	25.29	40.26	37.75	26.59	26.68	35.09	32.37
1994	41.64	36.64	27.20	22.52	37.64	34.68	44.66	37.41	31.21	28.56
1995	43.08	42.44	25.58	21.66	38.21	35.90	45.06	39.30	30.04	25.72
1996	55.66	60.26	28.83	21.83	36.69	34.93	51.08	39.73	29.27	25.17
1997	48.24	44.87	25.00	19.35	36.33	34.86	53.17	51.42	27.85	23.65
1998	51.06	52.85	27.22	19.27	36.47	33.41	58.40	57.96	28.26	24.07
1999	52.51	52.66	29.45	23.21	38.03	34.41	52.95	51.82	28.66	23.79
2000	49.60	51.09	28.15	21.47	39.64	35.22	64.25	60.27	27.81	23.01
2001	52.40	54.78	29.42	22.33	41.14	37.05	61.41	64.63	31.39	24.90
2002	47.88	45.32	33.04	24.52	42.90	40.69	58.10	55.89	31.83	25.73
2003	49.30	46.82	35.93	24.07	42.32	38.65	62.84	63.90	28.21	22.64
2004	47.23	46.16	33.79	20.83	40.28	37.51	60.86	61.56	28.38	23.18
2005	48.23	46.45	36.15	24.94	37.58	33.84	64.13	70.71	27.60	21.89
2006	49.18	47.59	40.14	28.08	35.84	33.33	61.41	64.24	28.95	22.44

Panel D: Payout Ratios for Each Country: Civil Law and Common Law Countries

	TH	IA		ZFA
•	Mn	Md	Mn	Md
1985			51.69	53.76
1986			47.30	43.16
1987	15.94	15.94	43.79	42.51
1988	34.85	31.34	39.77	38.41
1989	29.01	27.18	38.13	32.91
1990	46.84	50.63	44.28	38.97
1991	48.54	43.28	48.71	46.60
1992	49.50	49.11	48.86	47.90
1993	52.72	48.39	43.02	39.29
1994	49.48	46.90	38.57	35.54
1995	49.59	48.68	30.99	28.75
1996	52.15	49.95	26.18	21.58
1997	51.00	52.33	24.58	23.91
1998	35.40	29.59	24.89	23.08
1999	40.17	40.50	28.63	26.23
2000	40.04	35.72	27.41	26.76
2001	40.39	36.23	30.84	25.24
2002	42.43	39.03	31.77	26.09
2003	44.04	40.85	30.28	27.41
2004	48.59	46.60	34.38	29.85
2005	48.14	47.98	32.36	29.39
2006	49.53	48.45	34.25	34.29

Table 4 (Continued)

Panel E: Payout Ratios for Each Country: Civil Law/Common Law and Customary Law
Countries

Panel F: Payout Ratios for Each Country: Civil Law/Common Law, Muslim Law and Customary Law Countries

	CH	ΗN	IS	SR	JF	'n	K	OR	TV	VN	Н	KG		II	ON	IN	ID	M	YS	SC	GP
	Mn	Md		Mn	Md	Mn	Md	Mn	Md	Mn	Md										
1985		-		_	37.91	32.55	44.59	39.52			64.83	61.14	1985					52.21	51.73	50.58	48.36
1986					39.53	35.45	40.22	46.32			50.21	45.93	1986					55.53	49.42	44.35	42.19
1987					40.26	36.95	44.93	40.54			44.56	40.06	1987					45.95	38.11	38.47	38.01
1988					33.83	30.00	28.82	28.15			48.92	42.08	1988					43.47	36.96	34.34	27.55
1989					31.14	26.88	42.87	41.38	40.27	20.14	46.30	42.76	1989			26.99	26.99	40.88	37.59	30.59	28.89
1990					28.24	24.18	46.26	40.29	24.82	24.82	50.22	48.30	1990	22.45	22.45	25.40	25.40	33.04	27.42	35.99	28.50
1991					28.54	23.71	42.48	33.84	40.19	41.42	51.24	49.73	1991	37.60	30.76	22.82	18.79	34.93	32.23	37.76	28.46
1992	43.31	44.62			32.35	27.17	35.13	30.71	39.58	43.25	42.86	42.32	1992	44.23	33.83	22.48	21.72	32.69	29.80	34.51	27.03
1993	15.43	9.22			37.16	31.04	31.10	25.46	45.75	40.89	44.58	45.07	1993	37.08	33.07	32.98	33.49	33.69	28.84	34.15	30.84
1994	54.55	49.40	29.11	31.23	37.44	30.76	26.19	18.48	38.52	32.40	42.92	37.07	1994	37.60	32.53	37.36	40.77	31.04	23.96	27.32	23.97
1995	51.51	52.52	32.49	24.59	36.00	29.66	27.42	25.60	43.33	40.33	41.46	38.32	1995	35.89	30.27	27.97	25.30	26.14	21.07	28.47	23.60
1996	44.64	46.56	36.38	32.10	35.82	29.20	33.94	28.45	35.45	34.19	38.50	36.31	1996	34.41	30.37	23.37	20.07	26.75	20.86	31.84	27.05
1997	48.52	47.15	25.38	18.00	34.16	28.50	34.82	28.43	36.93	38.02	36.08	34.01	1997	30.89	28.69	29.76	25.69	28.06	23.62	30.51	26.35
1998	43.39	42.89	34.99	28.46	37.12	31.70	22.80	15.89	41.59	31.45	41.11	38.14	1998	20.13	18.12	31.37	26.97	38.14	32.35	35.52	31.98
1999	34.49	31.65	38.55	35.16	37.58	31.63	16.43	12.36	38.38	32.03	38.48	34.06	1999	28.17	23.10	29.64	26.36	24.88	18.19	33.73	27.61
2000	33.68	33.48	45.42	32.61	31.13	26.26	23.86	18.91	34.89	28.76	38.53	33.57	2000	28.16	20.95	30.48	27.14	31.78	27.46	28.69	23.42
2001	49.62	54.56	38.23	32.11	30.08	24.72	25.26	19.74	36.12	27.83	41.61	38.20	2001	31.51	29.75	29.94	23.83	32.40	28.24	33.02	25.71
2002	45.11	42.84	38.45	28.19	34.73	28.61	22.25	17.92	34.07	27.99	40.46	36.81	2002	31.34	27.00	32.37	27.50	32.46	26.33	34.81	29.49
2003	42.08	37.48	37.19	32.39	30.90	26.13	26.86	21.38	37.62	33.07	36.46	33.49	2003	34.10	27.44	27.52	22.01	34.11	28.71	38.09	32.98
2004	42.02	37.71	44.06	38.08	28.60	24.04	24.92	19.96	37.83	34.41	35.27	32.58	2004	27.68	22.08	25.43	20.81	33.56	29.27	37.62	30.94
2005	38.69	36.60	46.90	44.88	26.31	22.09	24.50	19.98	44.11	42.04	36.23	31.87	2005	31.34	26.91	24.85	21.02	35.67	31.86	39.48	33.40
2006	36.30	31.28	40.76	43.89	26.88	21.98	26.65	21.03	44.26	42.75	37.17	32.53	2006	36.09	29.33	23.84	18.68	35.96	32.07	37.05	32.77

Table 5: Characteristics of Payers and Non-Payers (Means)

Average Firm Size, and Ratios of Aggregate Earnings, Investment, Firm Value, and Liabilities to Aggregate Assets and Book Equity, for Different Dividend Groups and for New Lists

 $A_t$ , BE<sub>t</sub>, ME<sub>t</sub>, L<sub>t</sub>= $A_t$ . BE<sub>t</sub>, and V<sub>t</sub>= $L_t$ + ME<sub>t</sub> are assets, book common equity, market value of common equity, book liabilities, and total market value, at the end of fiscal year t.  $E_t$ , Y<sub>t</sub>,  $D_t$ , and RD<sub>t</sub> are earnings before interest but after taxes, after-tax earnings to common stock, dividends, and R&D expenditures for fiscal year t. Investment, d $A_t$ , is  $A_t$ - $A_{t-1}$ . The ratios shown are ratios of the year t aggregate values of the variables for the firms in a group, averaged over the years in a period. Results are shown for all firms and for firms grouped according to dividend status. Results are also shown for dividend payers and non-payers.

	1005	1007	1005	1000	1000	1000	1001	1002	1002	1001	1005	1007	1005	1000	1000	2000	2001	2002	2002	2004	2005	2006
	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
$\mathbf{E}_{t}/\mathbf{A}_{t}$																						
All Firms	10.68	10.37	11.15	11.82	12.28	10.56	9.25	8.79	9.16	9.94	9.62	9.12	7.93	5.69	5.72	6.32	-1.66	-1.72	0.81	3.49	2.25	2.59
Payers	10.93	10.58	11.60	12.42	13.09	12.09	10.92	10.35	10.58	11.29	11.05	10.67	9.81	9.78	9.69	9.98	7.94	7.20	8.36	9.23	9.15	9.46
Non Payers	5.24	6.72	6.59	5.03	4.33	-1.44	-1.47	0.18	2.25	3.85	3.21	2.48	0.68	-4.22	-2.18	-0.32	-17.13	-14.75	-10.53	-5.23	-8.64	-8.41
Never Payers	-	3.98	4.22	1.08	3.34	-3.26	-3.22	-0.42	1.52	2.92	1.98	2.10	-0.54	-5.15	-2.59	-4.25	-17.79	-19.34	-12.67	-8.86	-10.34	-12.43
Former Payers	-	7.23	10.65	1.44	19.20	0.38	-0.20	2.25	3.69	2.19	2.99	2.16	1.39	1.89	0.35	0.67	-3.02	-1.97	-3.30	-1.55	-0.06	1.72
$Y_t/BE_t$																						
All Firms	24.96	23.23	20.74	24.77	25.44	19.18	17.98	12.69	15.49	19.64	16.26	15.51	11.42	9.51	4.18	6.37	-12.06	-16.22	-3.36	2.94	2.60	0.77
Payers	25.84	24.39	22.10	25.74	28.64	23.46	23.61	18.36	19.37	23.41	21.34	19.83	17.08	24.27	17.57	16.34	13.89	10.96	14.87	18.01	17.61	19.01
Non Payers	5.55	2.97	7.14	13.85	-6.01	-14.55	-17.85	-18.65	-3.20	2.66	-6.42	-2.96	-10.41	-26.02	-22.29	-11.36	-52.87	-55.13	-30.35	-19.74	-21.01	-28.31
Never Payers	-	2.03	-16.80	-11.04	-8.85	-19.69	-22.75	-25.34	-4.36	-0.14	-12.38	-8.06	-18.37	-23.32	-20.88	-28.60	-64.50	-63.26	-37.05	-28.05	-23.52	-38.20
Former Payers	-	5.77	166.01	-3.41	27.11	-9.15	-22.30	3.32	-1.86	-4.40	-15.92	-10.84	-8.50	-47.76	-56.50	-19.69	-27.03	-39.52	-21.13	-22.76	-35.89	-7.93
$dA_t/A_t$																						
All Firms	1.44	23.19	22.60	14.29	10.82	11.59	8.52	2.80	3.13	12.19	13.44	0.10	-6.85	2.09	5.77	4.90	-9.95	-0.21	9.42	11.99	6.00	11.14
Payers	1.46	23.47	23.04	15.16	10.86	12.31	10.16	4.85	5.56	13.23	14.45	0.15	-6.44	2.24	6.39	6.53	-4.28	4.45	12.76	13.21	6.61	11.04
Non Payers	1.02	17.33	15.96	4.31	10.42	4.98	-4.68	-11.30	-11.39	6.92	7.98	-0.13	-8.48	1.65	4.25	1.73	-19.18	-6.66	4.77	10.26	5.11	11.28
Never Payers	-	13.14	9.69	4.22	9.44	4.53	-2.00	-8.90	-9.98	5.95	7.32	0.22	-8.93	-2.77	0.71	-0.09	-24.55	-9.91	2.92	7.10	1.93	7.87
Former Payers	-	22.99	21.47	-2.50	-6.06	0.63	-15.89	-19.72	-15.97	6.69	9.13	-6.34	-23.61	-4.35	-3.58	1.99	-13.67	-4.93	2.29	4.30	-5.65	4.18

Table 5: Characteristics of Payers and Non-Payers (Means) (Continued)

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
$V_t/A_t$																						
All Firms	1.44	1.61	1.60	1.62	1.75	1.62	2.77	1.40	1.59	1.60	1.49	1.66	1.61	1.52	2.02	1.87	1.48	1.39	1.54	1.65	1.74	1.88
Payers	1.46	1.62	1.61	1.63	1.72	1.61	1.55	1.41	1.60	1.58	1.46	1.57	1.49	1.43	1.74	1.63	1.34	1.31	1.37	1.42	1.51	1.65
Non Payers	1.02	1.45	1.52	1.54	1.97	1.68	12.32	1.34	1.50	1.68	1.64	2.07	2.04	1.74	2.60	2.27	1.68	1.49	1.78	1.97	2.07	2.23
Never Payers	-	1.12	1.31	1.48	1.74	1.66	1.48	1.38	1.46	1.70	1.62	1.91	2.08	1.78	2.14	2.20	1.57	1.43	1.66	1.90	1.98	2.17
Former Payers	-	1.33	1.24	1.33	1.36	1.36	1.02	1.07	1.22	1.30	1.27	1.27	1.32	1.07	1.70	1.38	1.20	1.07	1.15	1.17	1.20	1.34
$RD_t/A_t$																						
All Firms	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
Payers	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Non Payers	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06
Never Payers	-	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
Former Payers	-	0.02	0.00	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
$\mathbf{A_t}$																						
All Firms	1,565	1,830	1,818	1,744	1,875	1,924	1,864	1,823	1,837	1,959	2,127	1,863	1,687	1,706	1,628	1,558	1,338	1,258	1,441	1,592	1,608	1,736
Payers	1,617	1,908	1,928	1,867	2,030	2,099	2,031	1,994	2,054	2,217	2,412	2,152	2,009	2,178	2,219	2,274	2,088	1,941	2,192	2,408	2,526	2,741
Non Payers	497	517	834	527	526	451	558	690	610	704	768	639	497	425	385	358	273	331	398	456	291	299
Never Payers	-	657	725	517	487	548	427	662	655	648	749	765	496	433	447	344	305	261	295	332	257	309
Former Payers	-	870	2,216	989	355	428	1,312	1,140	704	1,088	1,575	807	621	592	570	1,025	554	890	791	2,060	503	506
$L_t/A_t$																						
All Firms	0.38	0.39	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.43	0.45	0.47	0.49	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.52	0.53	0.53
Payers	0.38	0.39	0.40	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.44	0.43	0.44	0.46	0.47	0.48	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Non Payers	0.30	0.32	0.35	0.35	0.36	0.36	0.37	0.35	0.38	0.38	0.41	0.43	0.45	0.46	0.49	0.52	0.53	0.52	0.52	0.55	0.56	0.57
Never Payers	-	0.32	0.30	0.34	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.35	0.37	0.39	0.39	0.43	0.44	0.45	0.48	0.51	0.52	0.53	0.53	0.54	0.56	0.58
Former Payers	-	0.30	0.31	0.38	0.37	0.32	0.36	0.28	0.35	0.31	0.31	0.34	0.41	0.37	0.40	0.39	0.43	0.46	0.42	0.48	0.47	0.47

Table 5: Characteristics of Payers and Non-Payers (Medians)

Average firm size, and ratios of aggregate earnings, investment, firm value, and liabilities to aggregate assets and book equity, for different dividend groups and for new lists

 $A_t$ , BE<sub>t</sub>, ME<sub>t</sub>, L<sub>t</sub> =  $A_t$ . BE<sub>t</sub>, and V<sub>t</sub> =  $L_t$  + ME<sub>t</sub> are assets, book common equity, market value of common equity, book liabilities, and total market value, at the end of fiscal year t.  $E_t$ , Y<sub>t</sub>,  $D_t$ , and RD<sub>t</sub> are earnings before interest but after taxes, after-tax earnings to common stock, dividends, and R&D expenditures for fiscal year t. Investment, d $A_t$ , is  $A_t$ -  $A_{t-1}$ . The ratios shown are ratios of the year t aggregate values of the variables for the firms in a group, averaged over the years in a period. Results are shown for all firms and for firms grouped according to dividend status. Results are also shown for dividend payers and non-payers.

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
E <sub>t</sub> /A <sub>t</sub>																						
All Firms	8.56	8.36	9.11	9.63	9.09	8.23	7.35	7.25	7.08	7.57	7.59	7.39	6.95	6.82	6.71	5.86	4.64	4.24	4.82	5.54	5.62	6.21
Payers	8.64	8.57	9.53	10.07	9.52	8.88	8.06	7.86	7.84	8.01	8.16	8.01	7.57	7.87	7.88	7.37	6.42	6.34	6.83	7.55	7.70	8.12
Non Payers	4.88	3.98	5.96	4.74	5.05	3.25	3.37	3.67	3.36	4.84	4.57	4.20	3.91	3.03	3.17	1.96	-1.05	-1.60	-0.19	0.72	0.03	1.20
Never Payers		3.15	4.82	4.01	4.46	3.48	3.04	3.27	3.01	4.69	4.81	4.11	3.61	2.72	2.68	1.88	-0.83	-3.36	-0.81	0.38	-0.19	0.04
Former Payers		7.23	16.72	5.70	7.42	1.55	3.19	3.84	3.64	3.97	3.22	3.42	3.28	4.21	4.04	2.42	1.71	1.48	0.93	2.30	2.69	2.49
$Y_t/BE_t$																						
All Firms	14.02	14.02	16.03	17.50	15.66	13.08	11.22	10.85	10.77	11.98	12.18	11.43	11.23	9.91	9.96	9.21	6.46	6.25	8.00	9.81	10.01	10.90
Payers	14.34	14.34	16.54	18.14	16.56	14.52	12.53	11.93	12.05	13.35	13.58	12.90	12.61	13.01	13.05	12.80	10.80	10.94	12.37	14.27	14.71	15.14
Non Payers	5.28	4.89	7.07	5.34	4.36	0.33	-0.01	2.91	2.33	5.95	3.95	3.90	3.56	0.18	1.24	0.19	-7.22	-7.35	-4.17	-1.11	-2.49	-0.03
Never Payers		1.68	4.43	2.06	3.58	2.22	-1.06	1.63	1.07	5.29	4.00	3.75	3.14	0.20	0.36	-0.55	-7.32	- 10.45	-5.06	-1.89	-3.15	-2.79
Former Payers		5.77	45.59	-0.41	4.36	-7.02	-2.74	1.09	1.57	3.26	1.02	1.37	2.05	0.03	1.91	1.83	-2.50	-0.99	-2.94	2.16	1.94	2.71
$dA_t/A_t$																						
All Firms		25.88	22.27	15.94	9.09	12.87	11.02	5.36	6.67	11.82	14.14	0.04	-5.92	3.24	6.31	7.43	-5.11	4.78	11.37	12.75	5.43	11.38
Payers		26.11	22.43	16.68	9.20	13.31	11.70	6.18	7.94	12.36	14.59	0.22	-5.61	2.59	6.91	7.85	-3.78	6.20	12.60	13.48	5.58	11.14
Non Payers		22.63	16.14	7.51	8.48	8.80	0.26	-4.47	-7.44	8.27	10.34	-0.88	-7.41	4.80	4.54	6.11	-8.38	2.07	8.58	10.77	4.96	12.11
Never Payers		21.85	11.75	7.82	6.72	7.83	3.99	-2.97	-5.55	8.11	10.27	-0.51	-8.15	1.86	2.93	3.33	-9.60	0.73	7.84	9.11	3.21	10.58
Former Payers		23.31	15.28	4.30	7.40	9.10	-7.70	-11.1	-11.7	5.83	11.22	-8.88	-13.8	1.59	1.45	5.08	-9.13	2.09	4.94	7.44	-2.17	6.92

Table 5: Characteristics of Payers and Non-Payers (Medians) (Continued)

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
$V_t/A_t$																						
All Firms	1.22	1.37	1.36	1.43	1.51	1.42	1.37	1.23	1.30	1.34	1.24	1.31	1.22	1.10	1.15	1.12	1.07	1.06	1.13	1.21	1.26	1.35
Payers	1.23	1.38	1.38	1.44	1.51	1.42	1.38	1.25	1.31	1.35	1.24	1.31	1.20	1.09	1.13	1.10	1.06	1.07	1.12	1.20	1.23	1.31
Non Payers	0.96	1.17	1.22	1.31	1.57	1.41	1.15	1.09	1.20	1.28	1.28	1.36	1.32	1.11	1.19	1.18	1.08	1.04	1.14	1.25	1.34	1.44
Never Payers		1.08	1.06	1.24	1.36	1.40	1.23	1.13	1.23	1.25	1.24	1.38	1.28	1.15	1.15	1.10	1.06	1.03	1.12	1.21	1.30	1.43
Former Payers		1.22	1.09	1.37	1.25	1.26	0.96	0.99	1.13	1.19	1.20	1.07	1.07	0.95	0.99	1.02	0.99	0.95	1.01	0.99	1.01	1.03
$RD_t/A_t$																						
All Firms	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Payers	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Non Payers	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
Never Payers		0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Former Payers		0.02	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
$\mathbf{A_t}$																						
All Firms	394	448	369	334	341	308	282	268	277	300	313	254	222	185	166	136	101	104	111	116	112	115
Payers	405	463	395	375	370	345	326	315	321	341	349	292	267	232	228	213	183	179	194	215	214	220
Non Payers	297	244	160	99	136	130	96	102	109	146	161	126	104	82	72	61	42	42	42	41	39	42
Never Payers		368	307	147	108	164	103	96	105	117	154	157	119	113	78	74	50	40	42	44	40	43
Former Payers		748	236	100	131	138	154	196	162	220	415	211	155	137	159	141	95	94	99	98	90	93
$L_t/A_t$																						
All Firms	0.37	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.39	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.42	0.43	0.45	0.48	0.49	0.50	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.51
Payers	0.38	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.40	0.40	0.41	0.41	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.42	0.43	0.45	0.46	0.47	0.49	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.49
Non Payers	0.28	0.29	0.28	0.31	0.30	0.29	0.32	0.30	0.32	0.33	0.38	0.41	0.44	0.45	0.47	0.51	0.52	0.51	0.51	0.54	0.55	0.56
Never Payers		0.28	0.26	0.28	0.30	0.29	0.30	0.31	0.31	0.35	0.35	0.40	0.43	0.43	0.45	0.49	0.51	0.52	0.52	0.53	0.54	0.57
Former Payers		0.24	0.27	0.38	0.34	0.24	0.34	0.23	0.29	0.26	0.28	0.33	0.41	0.34	0.39	0.38	0.41	0.46	0.39	0.46	0.47	0.47

Table 5-A: The Relative Importance of Dividend Paying Firms as Measured by the Percentage of Aggregate Values Accounted for by the Dividend Payers

 $A_t$ ,  $BE_t$ ,  $ME_t$ ,  $L_t = A_t - BE_t$ , and  $V_t = L_t - ME_t$  are assets, book common equity, market value of common equity, book liabilities, and total market value, at the end of fiscal year t.  $dA = A_t - A_{t-1}$  is the change in assets in fiscal year t.  $dT_t$  is the change in treasury stock. The table shows average values for the indicated periods of the year t percents of the aggregate values of the variables (sums over all firms in the sample) accounted for by firms that pay dividends.

Year	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Et	87	92	78	88	90	94	90	88	84	78	84	83	85	86	84	90	97	97	89	93	95	94
$dA_t$	-	80	52	81	88	88	89	75	159	80	81	-23	60	86	75	88	-386	98	93	85	109	92
$\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{t}}$	77	79	70	78	79	82	78	74	77	76	76	77	80	84	85	86	88	85	85	84	90	90
$\mathbf{V_t}$	79	80	77	79	77	80	28	76	77	76	76	77	79	84	84	85	88	86	85	85	90	90
$\mathbf{BE_t}$	80	82	64	81	84	82	80	81	80	76	78	78	78	79	81	84	86	85	86	88	90	90
$ME_t$	85	84	83	82	75	78	14	82	79	77	77	78	78	83	81	84	87	87	86	88	90	89
$\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{t}}$	75	78	72	77	78	82	78	72	76	76	75	77	81	85	87	87	89	86	84	83	90	90
$dT_t$	-	100	100	68	138	95	107	61	65	118	84	94	112	80	28	83	100	93	408	96	100	94

Table 5-B: The Proportion of Payers Across Size Deciles (1 = the smallest, 10 = the largest decile group, sorted by total market values of the firm)

Year	Decile	Total	Payers	% of payers	Year	Decile	Total	Payers	% of payers	Year	Decile	Total	Payers	% of payers
1985	1	143	91	63.64%	1995	1	551	260	47.19%	2006	1	1710	363	21.23%
1985	2	143	108	75.52%	1995	2	552	305	55.25%	2006	2	1711	647	37.81%
1985	3	144	112	77.78%	1995	3	552	331	59.96%	2006	3	1711	759	44.36%
1985	4	143	119	83.22%	1995	4	552	388	70.29%	2006	4	1710	846	49.47%
1985	5	144	131	90.97%	1995	5	552	389	70.47%	2006	5	1711	893	52.19%
1985	6	143	132	92.31%	1995	6	552	407	73.73%	2006	6	1711	983	57.45%
1985	7	144	137	95.14%	1995	7	552	422	76.45%	2006	7	1710	1015	59.36%
1985	8	143	138	96.50%	1995	8	552	435	78.80%	2006	8	1711	1087	63.53%
1985	9	144	139	96.53%	1995	9	552	442	80.07%	2006	9	1711	1133	66.22%
1985	10	143	139	97.20%	1995	10	552	488	88.41%	2006	10	1710	1395	81.58%

Table 6: The Proportion of Payers Across Industries

SIC Cod-	Average Percen	tage of Payers	Change in the Daysout f.D.
SIC Code	1985-1989	2002-2006	Change in the Percentage of Payers
10	76.04	13.65	-62.39
12	100.00	55.28	-44.72
13	62.25	27.84	-34.41
14	82.95	29.31	-53.65
15	89.72	63.88	-25.84
16	79.61	68.52	-11.09
17	87.64	65.57	-22.07
20	93.55	73.53	-20.02
21	100.00	79.70	-20.30
22	94.44	52.05	-42.40
23	97.19	63.24	-33.94
24	88.89	54.65	-34.24
25	95.76	59.07	-36.69
26	94.51	67.44	-27.07
27	96.89	70.52	-26.38
28	88.47	53.59	-34.89
29	81.14	78.62	-2.52
31	66.67	55.46	-11.21
32	91.58	66.76	-24.83
33	85.00	65.22	-19.77
34	89.35	67.21	-22.14
35	84.43	59.37	-25.06
37	91.94	70.49	-21.45
40	89.81	72.34	-17.47
41	100.00		
		73.63	-26.37
44	76.84	67.39	-9.46
45	78.58	54.43	-24.16
46	80.00	61.99	-18.01
47	81.81	67.80	-14.01
48	86.94	43.45	-43.49
49	100.00	74.17	-25.83
51	92.74	69.93	-22.81
52	89.00	84.02	-4.98
53	91.48	72.18	-19.30
54	91.41	76.59	-14.82
55	79.48	70.11	-9.36
56	86.04	55.76	-30.27
57	68.96	63.57	-5.39
58	83.36	55.05	-28.32
59	86.07	54.62	-31.44
70	93.46	54.81	-38.65
73	69.13	34.50	-34.63
75	80.00	55.75	-24.25
80	59.31	33.06	-26.25
81	0.00	38.05	38.05
83	92.14	48.78	-43.37
84	40.00	50.00	10.00
86	20.00	100.00	80.00
89	100.00	35.06	-64.94
91	14.29	47.92	33.63
95	0.00	25.00	25.00
96	90.00	90.00	0.00
99	90.00	32.03	-57.97

## Table 7: Logit Regression Results

The logit regressions are estimated separately for each year t of the 1985-2006 period for (i) firms that paid dividends in year t-1 (Dividend Payers), (ii) firms that have Never Paid as of year t-1, and (iii) firms that did not pay in t-1 but did pay in an earlier year (Former Payers). The dependent variable is 1.0 in year t if a firm pays dividends, 0.0 otherwise. The explanatory variables are the percentage of firms with the same or lower market capitalization (NYP<sub>t</sub>), the market-to-book ratio( $V_t/A_t$ ), the rate of growth of assets ( $dA_t/A_t$ ), and profitability ( $E_t/A_t$ ). The table shows means (across years) of the regression intercepts and slopes, and t-statistics for the means, defined as the mean divided by its standard error (the times-series standard deviation of the regression coefficient divided by the square root of the number of years in the period).

Panel A: Global Sample (Including the US) with the Market-to-Book Ratio

		Averag	e Coeffici	ent			t.	-statistic		
•	Intercept	NYP <sub>t</sub>	V <sub>t</sub> /A <sub>t</sub>	dA <sub>t</sub> /A <sub>t</sub>	$E_t/A_t$	Intercept	NYP <sub>t</sub>	V <sub>t</sub> /A <sub>t</sub>	dA <sub>t</sub> /A <sub>t</sub>	E <sub>t</sub> /A <sub>t</sub>
1986	-0.34	0.04	0.00	-1.54	5.74	-1.91	10.60	0.09	-3.69	4.98
1987	-1.04	0.04	0.00	-0.32	7.65	-5.42	11.51	0.10	-0.95	5.33
1988	-0.63	0.04	0.00	-0.21	5.33	-4.02	12.00	0.08	-0.55	5.17
1989	-0.45	0.03	0.00	-0.71	5.50	-3.37	12.56	0.12	-2.21	6.17
1990	-0.43	0.03	0.00	-0.89	8.95	-3.43	11.28	0.17	-2.56	9.30
1991	-0.57	0.03	0.00	-0.26	5.34	-5.03	14.08	0.22	-1.14	7.21
1992	-0.64	0.03	0.00	-0.71	6.39	-6.18	14.70	0.27	-3.13	9.13
1993	-0.56	0.03	0.00	-0.15	5.60	-5.81	14.46	0.24	-1.38	8.98
1994	-0.26	0.02	0.00	-0.19	5.37	-2.69	10.58	0.28	-3.49	9.39
1995	-0.57	0.02	0.00	-1.27	5.50	-6.94	15.73	0.28	-5.96	11.76
1996	-0.66	0.02	0.00	-2.08	6.04	-8.77	17.27	0.30	-12.05	13.35
1997	-0.83	0.02	0.00	-1.77	5.45	-11.85	18.60	0.32	-14.74	15.38
1998	-0.98	0.02	0.00	-1.82	6.65	-14.35	18.63	0.33	-16.46	20.34
1999	-1.08	0.02	0.00	-1.91	6.61	-16.88	18.98	0.45	-14.65	20.33
2000	-1.03	0.02	0.00	-0.34	3.52	-17.95	21.71	-0.80	-4.25	16.40
2001	-1.27	0.02	0.00	-0.80	4.54	-22.18	26.27	-0.85	-8.66	22.18
2002	-1.35	0.02	0.00	0.00	3.82	-24.98	28.00	-0.80	0.31	20.96
2003	-1.42	0.02	0.00	-0.14	5.12	-26.57	28.36	0.79	-1.66	23.29
2004	-1.52	0.03	0.00	-0.43	2.84	-29.69	33.84	0.95	-5.47	17.01
2005	-1.52	0.03	0.00	-0.79	5.48	-30.03	33.11	1.12	-8.98	25.29
2006	-1.51	0.03	0.00	-1.50	5.47	-29.69	35.44	1.20	-16.67	26.56

Table 7, Panel B: Global Sample (Including the US) without the Market-to-Book Ratio

	Av	erage Coe	efficient					
	Intercept	NYPt	dA <sub>t</sub> /A <sub>t</sub>	$\mathbf{E}_{t}/\mathbf{A}_{t}$	Intercep	t NYP <sub>t</sub>	dA <sub>t</sub> /A <sub>t</sub>	E <sub>t</sub> /A
1986	-0.34	0.04	-1.54	5.74	-1.92	10.61	-3.69	4.98
1987	-1.04	0.04	-0.32	7.65	-5.43	11.52	-0.95	5.33
1988	-0.63	0.04	-0.21	5.33	-4.02	12.01	-0.55	5.17
1989	-0.45	0.03	-0.71	5.50	-3.37	12.57	-2.21	6.17
1990	-0.43	0.03	-0.89	8.95	-3.44	11.31	-2.57	9.30
1991	-0.57	0.03	-0.26	5.34	-5.04	14.12	-1.14	7.20
1992	-0.64	0.03	-0.71	6.39	-6.19	14.74	-3.13	9.13
1993	-0.56	0.03	-0.15	5.60	-5.82	14.49	-1.38	8.97
1994	-0.26	0.02	-0.19	5.37	-2.70	10.61	-3.52	9.38
1995	-0.57	0.02	-1.27	5.50	-6.94	15.75	-5.96	11.7
1996	-0.66	0.02	-2.08	6.04	-8.77	17.28	-12.05	13.3
1997	-0.83	0.02	-1.77	5.45	-11.86	18.62	-14.74	15.3
1998	-0.98	0.02	-1.82	6.65	-14.37	18.65	-16.48	20.3
1999	-1.08	0.02	-1.91	6.61	-16.91	19.03	-14.64	20.3
2000	-1.03	0.02	-0.34	3.52	-17.94	21.70	-4.25	16.4
2001	-1.27	0.02	-0.80	4.54	-22.17	26.26	-8.67	22.1
2002	-1.35	0.02	0.00	3.82	-24.97	27.99	0.32	20.9
2003	-1.42	0.02	-0.14	5.12	-26.60	28.42	-1.66	23.2
2004	-1.52	0.03	-0.43	2.84	-29.73	33.93	-5.49	17.0
2005	-1.52	0.03	-0.79	5.48	-30.08	33.21	-8.99	25.2
2006	-1.51	0.03	-1.50	5.47	-29.75	35.55	-16.69	26.5

Table 7, Panel C: Rest of The World (Excluding the US) with the Market-to-Book Ratio

		Avera	ge Coeffic	ient			1	-statistic		
	Intercept	NYPt	$V_t/A_t$	dA <sub>t</sub> /A <sub>t</sub>	$\mathbf{E}_{t}/\mathbf{A}_{t}$	Intercept	NYPt	$V_t/A_t$	dA <sub>t</sub> /A <sub>t</sub>	$E_t/A_t$
1986	0.02	0.03	0.65	0.10	15.39	0.03	2.58	0.91	0.08	2.97
1987	0.17	0.03	0.11	-0.95	11.10	0.29	4.18	0.27	-1.06	2.82
1988	0.39	0.03	0.28	0.30	5.25	0.81	4.97	0.80	0.42	3.13
1989	0.87	0.03	0.00	-1.40	4.59	2.65	6.16	0.00	-2.44	3.56
1990	0.81	0.03	-0.53	0.03	12.96	2.97	6.12	-2.88	0.05	7.39
1991	0.23	0.04	-0.28	0.52	6.81	1.05	9.22	-1.76	1.50	6.03
1992	0.00	0.03	-0.11	0.66	8.57	0.01	9.58	-0.68	2.21	7.29
1993	0.04	0.03	-0.04	0.67	8.15	0.21	9.41	-0.53	2.69	7.87
1994	0.34	0.02	-0.24	0.45	7.31	2.13	8.95	-2.84	1.71	7.49
1995	0.61	0.02	-0.29	0.60	6.69	4.28	8.71	-4.19	2.06	7.48
1996	0.44	0.02	-0.35	-0.70	8.35	3.68	11.35	-6.48	-2.67	10.42
1997	0.54	0.02	-0.48	-0.31	6.18	5.18	13.27	-10.71	-2.20	11.17
1998	-0.17	0.02	-0.21	-0.96	6.72	-1.94	13.99	-5.76	-6.24	14.63
1999	-0.32	0.02	-0.16	-0.91	7.25	-3.89	13.50	-6.86	-5.43	15.51
2000	-0.41	0.02	-0.14	0.11	3.27	-5.75	18.10	-8.90	1.18	11.65
2001	-0.56	0.03	-0.31	-0.11	4.17	-7.93	23.16	-10.68	-2.45	17.39
2002	-0.62	0.03	-0.35	-0.48	5.10	-9.10	23.80	-9.60	-4.44	20.26
2003	-0.76	0.03	-0.34	0.01	5.75	-11.37	25.20	-10.90	0.12	20.52
2004	-0.81	0.03	-0.46	-0.22	2.31	-12.55	32.43	-16.57	-2.84	11.71
2005	-0.85	0.03	-0.45	-0.85	6.82	-13.18	31.39	-16.56	-8.12	23.23
2006	-0.96	0.04	-0.35	-1.39	6.07	-15.43	33.47	-16.73	-15.78	22.97

Table 7, Panel D: Rest of the World (Excluding the US) without the Market-to-Book Ratio

	Α	verage Co	efficient		_		t-statis	stic	
	Intercept	NYPt	dAt/At	Et/At		Intercept	NYPt	dAt/At	Et/At
1986	0.59	0.03	0.38	16.26		1.22	3.03	0.32	3.24
1987	0.27	0.03	-0.99	11.38		0.64	4.45	-1.12	3.00
1988	0.69	0.03	0.41	5.42		2.37	5.22	0.59	3.27
1989	0.87	0.03	-1.40	4.59		3.73	6.26	-2.44	3.57
1990	0.29	0.02	0.07	12.43		1.40	5.73	0.12	7.25
1991	-0.03	0.03	0.47	6.71		-0.17	9.21	1.34	6.11
1992	-0.10	0.03	0.64	8.47		-0.64	9.67	2.14	7.38
1993	-0.02	0.02	0.65	8.12		-0.13	9.45	2.65	7.89
1994	0.07	0.02	0.40	6.75		0.53	8.72	1.55	7.27
1995	0.30	0.02	0.54	6.14		2.43	8.31	1.91	7.33
1996	0.05	0.02	-1.01	7.90		0.49	10.59	-3.97	10.28
1997	0.07	0.02	-0.57	5.63		0.78	11.32	-4.06	10.91
1998	-0.34	0.02	-1.07	6.56		-3.99	13.14	-7.00	14.78
1999	-0.44	0.02	-1.10	7.09		-5.38	12.31	-6.85	15.77
2000	-0.49	0.02	0.02	3.38		-6.97	16.53	0.47	12.41
2001	-0.79	0.02	-0.15	4.13		-11.77	21.30	-1.78	17.67
2002	-0.89	0.02	-0.59	5.15		-14.37	22.30	-5.65	21.15
2003	-1.05	0.02	-0.18	5.77		-16.93	23.53	-2.03	21.64
2004	-1.25	0.03	-0.38	2.65		-21.24	29.96	-4.43	14.31
2005	-1.29	0.03	-1.01	6.25		-21.81	29.24	-10.08	23.77
2006	-1.26	0.03	-1.64	6.01		-21.34	31.32	-15.99	24.65

Table 8: Estimates from Logit Regressions of The Effect of Changing Characteristics of the Percentage of Firms Paying Dividends

We use all firms for each year of the 1985-95 base period to estimate logit regressions that explain whether a firm pays dividends. The explanatory variables are profitability  $(E_t/A_t)$ , the growth rate of assets  $(dA_t/A_t)$ , the market-to-book ratio  $(V_t/A_t)$ , and the percent of firms with the same or lower market capitalization  $(NYP_t)$ . Firms is the number of firms in the sample for a year, or the average for a period. Payers is the number (or average number) of dividend payers. Actual Percent is the percent of payers (the ratio of payers to firms, times 100). The Expected Percent of payers for a year t is estimated by applying the average logit regression coefficients for 1985-95 to the values of the explanatory variables for each firm for year t, summing over firms, dividing by the number of firms, and then multiplying by 100. The evolution of Expected Percent measures the effects of changing characteristics on the percent of dividend payers. Expected - Actual measures the effect of propensity to pay. We use  $V_t/A_t$  and  $dA_t/A_t$  to control for investment opportunities. There are two sets of results, one with both the market-to-book ratio and the growth rate of assets as proxies for investment opportunities, and another with the latter measure only.

Panel A: Global (Including the US)

				$V_t / A_t$ an	d dA <sub>t</sub> / A <sub>t</sub>	$dA_t$	/ A <sub>t</sub>
	Firms	Payers	Actual %	Expected %	Expected – Actual	Expected %	Expected – Actual
1985-95	5732	4002	69.82				
1996	6459	4425	68.51	99.39	30.89	94.16	25.65
1997	6997	4642	66.34	90.37	24.03	99.09	32.74
1998	8047	4951	61.53	90.42	28.90	98.31	36.79
1999	9128	5282	57.87	93.49	35.63	97.94	40.07
2000	10837	5882	54.28	96.32	42.04	90.58	36.30
2001	12407	6427	51.80	99.06	47.26	90.56	38.76
2002	13388	6843	51.11	91.53	40.42	93.10	41.98
2003	13895	7208	51.87	92.08	40.20	98.67	46.80
2004	14928	7809	52.31	91.39	39.08	98.25	45.94
2005	15714	8367	53.25	94.78	41.54	93.87	40.62
2006	17106	9121	53.32	90.49	37.17	90.60	37.28

Table 8, Panel B: The rest of the world (Excluding the US)

				$V_t/A_t$ an	d dA <sub>t</sub> / A <sub>t</sub>	dA <sub>t</sub>	/ A <sub>t</sub>
	Firms	Payers	Actual %	Expected %	Expected – Actual	Expected %	Expected – Actual
1985-95	4128	3412	82.66				
1996	4755	3847	80.90	93.71	12.80	91.96	11.06
1997	5157	4059	78.71	75.72	-2.99	91.48	12.77
1998	5957	4354	73.09	92.12	19.03	94.38	21.29
1999	6908	4682	67.78	91.92	24.14	97.96	30.18
2000	8460	5297	62.61	95.56	32.95	90.74	28.13
2001	9976	5851	58.65	82.03	23.38	82.86	24.21
2002	10902	6277	57.58	89.16	31.58	78.05	20.48
2003	11342	6598	58.17	91.63	33.45	95.46	37.28
2004	12199	7097	58.18	93.16	34.98	98.46	40.28
2005	12861	7579	58.93	93.68	34.75	90.84	31.91
2006	14085	8290	58.86	92.88	34.02	90.92	32.06

Table 9: Percents of Dividend Payers in 27 Portfolios Formed on Size, Profitability, and either Market-to-Book Ratio or Investment Outlays

				Investment Opp	ortunities	Proxied by V	/t/At		
		Low Et/At	:	N	1edium Et/	At		High Et/A	t
	Low	Vt/At	High	Low	Vt/At	High	Low	Vt/At	High
					Small Firm	ns			
1985-1995	44.44	51.96	49.81	55.21	58.47	52.30	74.40	72.95	68.65
1996	57.01	50.00	33.46	60.71	63.53	46.10	74.47	69.50	58.90
1997	46.03	54.50	36.39	68.42	66.67	48.61	87.50	81.94	56.25
1998	37.40	41.41	31.00	28.17	39.25	25.14	66.10	61.45	46.80
1999	37.21	40.31	25.75	27.78	35.78	25.41	65.83	53.59	49.83
2000	40.38	34.94	22.46	22.62	29.92	15.64	59.29	48.58	43.47
2001	32.80	29.52	15.15	5.43	23.19	7.83	43.79	45.89	40.89
2002	26.49	26.80	12.20	10.00	10.00	7.20	33.73	42.63	27.82
2003	39.29	28.81	13.71	13.59	11.61	7.72	47.67	44.79	32.71
2004	39.49	30.15	15.16	19.81	19.50	5.64	48.30	45.86	31.22
2005	37.46	39.92	15.70	18.92	8.93	2.87	45.95	48.03	31.61
2006	36.47	33.40	12.74	25.56	21.11	8.11	57.01	51.05	39.82
				Me	dium-Sized	Firms			
1985-1995	77.00	84.58	69.17	84.43	74.28	67.34	80.90	81.60	70.37
1996	77.91	83.27	44.85	76.19	69.05	54.98	74.29	73.33	64.96
1997	75.13	81.72	41.41	83.53	72.44	46.48	82.98	73.71	58.76
1998	73.39	76.35	44.62	70.97	65.00	44.44	78.71	66.67	61.70
1999	75.09	68.84	41.63	65.09	56.60	45.66	71.59	69.81	61.76
2000	59.23	59.53	31.48	55.88	51.47	41.64	65.20	69.12	66.73
2001	58.09	53.95	30.52	51.01	45.98	35.83	69.48	72.65	60.67
2002	56.71	51.73	29.32	41.46	45.12	28.47	67.40	67.40	59.65
2003	69.44	43.96	29.33	61.35	45.53	29.76	79.49	72.86	57.25
2004	67.05	52.88	28.25	58.82	49.42	23.42	77.82	67.99	56.04
2005	69.96	57.52	28.37	51.65	51.82	21.05	78.62	70.61	54.47
2006	66.53	56.40	25.44	53.81	48.65	22.06	79.64	68.42	56.62
					Large Firm	ıs			
1985-1995	88.16	91.96	88.08	93.15	91.42	82.98	91.56	90.32	81.05
1996	80.72	86.67	67.15	88.51	85.20	65.05	86.64	85.75	68.55
1997	87.06	82.51	59.62	83.73	80.00	65.47	84.48	78.42	63.88
1998	86.97	80.26	51.95	76.88	70.71	65.10	79.42	77.47	66.32
1999	82.64	80.37	38.83	71.36	72.17	58.64	75.80	76.50	63.10
2000	66.35	60.76	22.28	80.56	79.86	65.14	76.04	73.61	66.00
2001	67.44	55.85	20.16	77.01	76.69	61.10	79.39	76.37	67.00
2002	45.83	52.70	54.86	77.06	72.75	63.65	76.15	74.82	67.94
2003	66.20	57.97	33.86	79.22	73.25	56.92	83.06	78.52	66.58
2004	67.19	57.87	30.91	80.15	77.25	58.80	82.26	80.87	67.75
2005	68.78	56.47	24.09	82.75	81.21	59.55	82.94	83.50	69.48
2006	67.30	51.06	23.41	84.27	78.48	60.93	82.17	79.78	74.86

Table 9 (Continued)

				Investment Op		-				
		Low Et/At		N	Iedium Et/A	<u>At</u>	-	High Et/At		
	Low	dAt/At	High	Low	dAt/At	High	Low	dAt/At	High	
					Small Firm	ns				
1985-1995	36.99	43.77	64.06	47.62	54.80	60.99	64.57	76.48	74.14	
1996	42.57	38.89	46.41	51.19	59.46	53.23	74.16	61.82	58.47	
1997	29.71	47.37	50.18	71.01	68.29	45.26	75.00	71.53	66.96	
1998	25.74	36.55	45.64	22.73	29.76	36.88	50.00	65.16	52.53	
1999	18.37	36.08	45.06	34.31	29.90	25.15	56.74	62.89	47.17	
2000	17.85	31.58	39.71	25.00	22.68	16.77	44.71	52.98	48.40	
2001	14.08	18.18	35.01	12.44	18.00	7.78	38.89	42.49	46.44	
2002	8.98	18.78	25.36	10.92	12.59	5.04	24.37	29.29	40.45	
2003	9.42	23.63	30.04	11.40	12.58	7.94	36.95	42.11	38.83	
2004	7.58	23.64	34.20	15.45	14.38	10.20	31.12	45.35	38.84	
2005	14.58	28.54	33.77	4.23	14.10	6.15	38.10	43.70	37.42	
2006	8.29	24.78	31.18	16.23	17.42	13.85	48.92	48.00	42.67	
				Me	dium-Sized	Firms				
1985-1995	65.94	79.04	81.19	71.53	77.97	70.72	74.42	81.38	73.74	
1996	53.01	82.16	58.47	62.70	68.47	60.87	73.62	72.62	63.44	
1997	46.28	73.53	59.73	69.23	70.00	52.74	69.68	83.08	58.15	
1998	45.35	69.84	64.05	71.17	53.73	49.55	75.58	68.57	59.83	
1999	38.16	61.16	64.57	71.85	54.73	41.30	74.09	76.05	55.28	
2000	30.84	56.03	49.44	46.19	52.49	45.21	70.18	73.85	60.68	
2001	28.94	55.26	48.21	32.86	42.79	47.02	60.61	72.07	65.88	
2002	20.24	49.24	47.21	36.52	41.08	32.84	53.33	67.85	65.81	
2003	16.45	53.75	46.60	36.57	46.69	39.05	54.60	71.57	68.90	
2004	24.62	59.97	42.93	34.02	34.41	42.62	58.66	70.32	62.72	
2005	26.61	61.81	45.03	31.63	43.68	34.40	64.88	69.37	60.68	
2006	27.21	58.48	40.98	42.32	33.57	34.98	70.62	66.98	59.18	
					Large Firm	ıs				
1985-1995	82.52	92.00	91.52	86.53	91.34	85.84	87.47	93.55	80.41	
1996	73.06	88.52	69.36	80.45	82.08	69.60	84.27	86.40	67.39	
1997	70.03	86.41	64.22	78.53	86.31	63.34	81.01	84.52	60.64	
1998	68.80	84.12	56.84	77.29	76.84	60.79	82.16	82.86	61.48	
1999	44.57	78.49	56.93	67.20	74.32	58.81	76.76	80.37	59.63	
2000	43.55	58.04	32.82	70.40	77.02	71.16	75.50	81.80	60.64	
2001	38.84	50.00	35.29	76.92	74.54	61.90	81.12	79.46	63.91	
2002	44.84	49.67	58.30	76.45	71.91	64.16	75.29	73.24	69.13	
2003	33.40	48.02	54.50	58.68	68.04	68.46	71.16	76.94	72.35	
2004	37.55	51.66	47.44	59.95	70.86	70.97	74.38	78.87	72.11	
2005	38.72	54.44	37.60	73.75	76.58	65.81	82.67	82.92	69.78	
2006	42.99	47.17	35.31	84.18	70.85	65.12	82.34	82.36	73.10	

Table 10: Effects of Changing Characteristics and Propensity to Pay on the Percentages of Firms Paying Dividends, Estimated from 27 Portfolios Formed on Size, Profitability (Et/At), and either Market-to-Book Ratio (Vt/At) or Investment Outlays (dAt/At)

			$\mathbf{V_t}$	/ A <sub>t</sub>	$dA_t / A_t$		
	Number of Firms	Actual Percentage	Expected Percentage	Expected – Actual	Expected Percentage	Expected – Actual	
1985-95	35156	78.23					
1996	6459	68.51	77.99	9.48	77.99	9.48	
1997	6997	66.34	77.86	11.51	78.42	12.08	
1998	8047	61.53	78.01	16.49	78.15	16.63	
1999	9128	57.87	77.84	19.98	78.08	20.21	
2000	10837	54.28	77.66	23.38	77.71	23.44	
2001	12407	51.80	77.57	25.77	77.53	25.73	
2002	13388	51.11	77.64	26.53	78.26	27.14	
2003	13895	51.98	77.72	25.75	78.48	26.62	
2004	14928	52.31	77.54	25.23	78.18	25.87	
2005	15714	53.25	77.50	24.25	78.13	24.88	
2006	17106	53.32	77.64	24.32	78.14	24.82	