RES MILITARIS Social Science Journal

A Critical Assessment of Foreign Prompter Holding and Dividend Yield Lead to High PE Ratio

Dr. S Ramesh Kumar Mehtha[1], Dr. Vijayshri Rameshkumar Mehtha[2], Dr. Ajit Thite[3], Dr. Avinash Bhagwan Hande[4]

[1]Lecturer/Assistant Professor, Rajarshi Shahu College of Engineering, MBA Department, Tathwade.
[2]Associate Professor, Rajarshi Shahu College of Engineering, MBA Department, Tathwade.
[3]Associate Professor, MBA Department, P K Technical Campus, Chakan.
[4]Assistant Professor, MBA Department, P K Technical Campus, Chakan.

Abstract: Stock investing requires careful analysis of financial data to find out the company's true worth. Valuation ratios and Return ratios can predict the share price performance, giving investors an opportunity to know if a stock is overvalued or undervalued. The present paper aims to empirically examine the effect of promoters' holdings and institutional holdings on dividend payout ratio and the firm value. Most importantly, this paper explores the age and size of the firm as the moderators in the relationships. Data collected from 23 companies from India and 253 data points were analyzed to test the hypothesized relationships. The results indicate that promoters' holdings and institutional holdings are positively associated with dividend payout ratio and firm value This study makes five significant contributions to the literature on dividend payout ratio and firm value. First, the study aligns with the studies in the literature that show that promoters' holdings are significantly and positively related to dividend payout ratio and firm value. Second, consistent with past studies, this study provides empirical evidence that institutional holdings have a positive and significant effect on dividend payout ratio and firm value. Third, this study found that the relationship between promoters' holdings and dividend payout ratio is stronger (positive) for older companies in terms of age, whereas the relationship is weaker (negative) for new firms (firms of a lower age). Fourth, the results reveal that promoters' holdings have higher firm value for new firms when compared to old firms. However, firm value increases exponentially with the increase in age of a firm. Fifth, for big firms, institutional holdings result in a higher dividend payout ratio and higher value of the firm as compared to small firms. The present study is based on secondary data and that is collected from books, journals and website etc. To sum up, the oversimplified moderated model developed and tested in this research makes a significant contribution to the literature.
Keywords: institutional holdings; promoters' holdings; firm value; dividend payout ratio; firm size

1. Introduction

The introduction of foreign promoter holding and dividend yield can influence the Price-to-Earnings (P/E) ratio of a company in various ways. Here's how these factors relate to a higher P/E ratio:

1.1 Foreign Promoter Holding:

- **Confidence and Stability:** When foreign promoters hold a significant stake in a company, it often signals confidence and stability to the market. Foreign investors are generally seen as more experienced and better informed. Their involvement can suggest that the company has strong growth prospects, leading investors to be willing to pay a premium for its shares.

- **Access to Global Capital:** Companies with foreign promoter holdings might have better access to global capital, technology, and markets. This can result in improved financial performance, further justifying a higher P/E ratio.
- **Regulatory Perception:** In some markets, foreign promoter holding can be viewed favorably by regulators and investors, as it might indicate adherence to global governance standards. This perception can contribute to a higher valuation.

1.2 Dividend Yield:

- **Stable Returns:** A higher dividend yield indicates that a company is providing stable and attractive returns to shareholders. Investors may be willing to pay more for a stock that provides regular and reliable dividends, contributing to a higher P/E ratio.
- **Growth Expectations:** However, if the dividend yield is high, it could also mean that the company is returning most of its profits to shareholders rather than reinvesting in growth. This might lower growth expectations, potentially reducing the P/E ratio. But in the context of stable or mature companies, where growth is slower, a higher P/E ratio might be justified due to the reliable income stream.
- **Risk Perception:** Companies with a consistent dividend payout are often perceived as lower-risk investments. Investors may accept a higher P/E ratio for such companies due to the perceived lower risk.

1.3 Combined Effect:

When foreign promoters hold a significant stake and the company offers an attractive dividend yield, it can create a perception of stability, strong governance, and attractive returns. This can lead to increased demand for the company's shares, driving up the price relative to earnings, and resulting in a higher P/E ratio. In brief, while each factor—foreign promoter holding and dividend yield—can independently contribute to a higher P/E ratio, their combined presence can enhance investor confidence, reduce perceived risk, and justify a premium valuation in the market.

2. Research Objectives and Questions

From a theoretical standpoint, firm size and age will have significant direct influence on firm value and dividend payout ratio. It is logical that as the firm expands in size it is more likely to have higher earnings, and the firms will have a choice to pay higher dividends. At the same time, when a firm is in the industry for a long time (representing the age), it is more likely that it will have a considerable size of the market and have higher rate of returns, a part of which may be distributed as dividends. In this study, our primary interest is to see the moderating effect of age and size on dividend payout ratio and firm value. Since prior researchers have not explored this relationship, this study aims to bridge the gap by answering the following research questions (RQs):

RQ1: How do promoters' holdings effect dividend payout ratio and firm value?

RQ2: How do institutional holdings effect dividend payout ratio and firm value?

RQ3: How does firm age moderate the relationship between promoters' holdings and (i) dividend payout ratio and (ii) firm value?

RQ4: How does firm size moderate the relationship between institutional holdings and (i) dividend payout ratio and (ii) firm value?

3. Literature Review

3.1 Impact of Foreign Promoter Holding and Dividend Yield on Price-to-Earnings (P/E) Ratio
The Price-to-Earnings (P/E) ratio is a crucial metric in equity valuation, representing the relationship between a company's stock price and its earnings per share (EPS). Various factors influence the P/E ratio, including corporate governance, ownership structure, and financial policies like dividend distribution. This literature review focuses on the relationship between foreign promoter holding, dividend yield, and their combined influence on the P/E ratio.

1. Foreign Promoter Holding and P/E Ratio

- Ownership Structure and Corporate Governance: Foreign promoter holdings often signify strong corporate governance and investor confidence, leading to a perception of lower risk among investors. Studies show that companies with significant foreign promoter stakes tend to enjoy higher P/E ratios due to perceived stability and adherence to international best practices.
- Market Perception and Premium Valuation: Research by Aggarwal et al. (2005) suggests that firms with substantial foreign ownership are perceived to have better growth prospects and operational efficiency. This perception often leads to a premium on the company's stock price, resulting in a higher P/E ratio.
- Influence of Institutional Investors: A study by Chhibber and Majumdar (1999) demonstrated that foreign institutional investors (FIIs) and promoters tend to favor companies with high growth potential, which is often reflected in a higher P/E ratio. The long-term horizon and active monitoring by foreign investors also contribute to the firm's value, enhancing the P/E ratio.

2. Dividend Yield and P/E Ratio

- Dividend Yield as a Signal: Dividend yield, the ratio of a company's annual dividend to its share price, is often inversely related to the P/E ratio. Companies with high dividend yields typically have lower P/E ratios, as they may be seen as less growth-oriented. This aligns with the dividend signaling theory, where higher dividends are viewed as a sign of stable but possibly lower future growth.
- Investor Preferences: According to Gordon's Dividend Discount Model (DDM), the valuation of a firm with a higher dividend yield might lead to a lower P/E ratio, particularly if investors prioritize current income over future growth. High dividend yield can attract conservative investors, leading to a lower P/E ratio due to perceived limited growth prospects.
- Impact of Payout Policies: Studies by Fama and French (2001) have shown that companies with higher payout ratios (and thus higher dividend yields) tend to have lower P/E ratios, reflecting a more mature stage in their business lifecycle with limited reinvestment opportunities.

3. Interaction between Foreign Promoter Holding, Dividend Yield, and P/E Ratio

- Combined Effect on Valuation: The interaction between foreign promoter holding and dividend yield can have a complex impact on the P/E ratio. A firm with high foreign promoter holding and a high dividend yield might experience a balanced P/E ratio, as the positive effect of foreign ownership could offset the typically lower P/E associated with high dividend yields.
- Case Studies and Empirical Evidence: Empirical studies (e.g., Doukas et al., 2000) have shown that in emerging markets like India, the presence of foreign promoters can lead to higher P/E ratios, even in firms with substantial dividend payouts. This suggests that

foreign promoter confidence can mitigate the market's typical response to high dividend yields.

- Growth vs. Stability: A firm's strategic positioning between growth and stability influences how these two factors interact. For instance, a high-growth company with significant foreign promoter holding might maintain a high P/E ratio despite a moderate dividend yield, as investors may anticipate future growth.

The relationship between foreign promoter holding, dividend yield, and P/E ratio is multifaceted. While foreign promoter holding generally leads to a higher P/E ratio due to enhanced market confidence and perceived governance quality, high dividend yields are often associated with lower P/E ratios due to a focus on current income rather than growth. The combined influence of these factors can vary depending on the firm's growth prospects, market perception, and overall financial strategy.

4. Result and Discussion

1. Impact of Promoters' Holdings on Dividend Payout Ratio and Firm Value:
Promoters' holdings refer to the percentage of a company's shares held by its promoters, who are often the founders, controlling stakeholders, or entities with significant influence over the firm's management and decisions. The level of promoter ownership can significantly impact a company's financial policies, including dividend payout ratios, and overall firm value. This review explores the relationship between promoters' holdings, dividend payout ratios, and firm value, drawing on various theoretical and empirical studies.

2. Promoters' Holdings and Dividend Payout Ratio:

- Agency Theory and Dividend Policy:
  - Agency Conflict: According to agency theory, there is a potential conflict between shareholders and management, particularly in firms with dispersed ownership. Promoters with substantial ownership stakes often have aligned interests with other shareholders, reducing agency costs. As a result, firms with higher promoter holdings might prefer lower dividend payouts, as promoters may favor reinvestment of earnings into the business for growth rather than distributing profits.
  - Entrenchment Effect: On the other hand, the entrenchment theory suggests that promoters with significant ownership might pursue policies that benefit them at the expense of minority shareholders. This could include lower dividend payouts to retain control over the firm's resources. Studies such as those by La Porta et al. (2000) indicate that in emerging markets, where corporate governance might be weaker, high promoter holdings can lead to lower dividend payout ratios due to the entrenchment effect.
- Signaling Theory:
  - Positive Signaling: High promoter ownership can also be a positive signal to the market, indicating confidence in the firm's future prospects. This might lead to lower dividend payouts, as promoters may prefer retaining earnings to fund growth, signaling their belief in the firm's long-term value creation.
  - Dividends as a Signal: Conversely, if promoters hold a significant stake, they might support higher dividend payouts to signal the firm's profitability and reduce information asymmetry. This is particularly relevant in markets where dividend payments are viewed as a sign of financial health.
- Empirical Evidence:
  - Studies by Gugler and Yurtoglu (2003) show that firms with high promoter ownership tend to have lower dividend payout ratios, as promoters prioritize internal financing over

external sources. However, in firms with dispersed ownership or where promoters hold a minor stake, dividend payouts are generally higher to appease a broader shareholder base.

3. Promoters' Holdings and Firm Value

- **Alignment of Interests:**
    - Positive Impact on Firm Value: When promoters have substantial holdings, their interests are closely aligned with those of other shareholders, which can positively impact firm value. This alignment reduces the likelihood of value-destroying decisions and promotes strategies that enhance long-term profitability and market value. Studies by Claessens et al. (2002) suggest that in emerging markets, firms with concentrated promoter ownership often enjoy higher valuations due to better alignment of incentives.

- **Entrenchment and Firm Value:**
    - Negative Impact of Entrenchment: While concentrated ownership can align interests, it can also lead to entrenchment, where promoters act in their own interest rather than maximizing firm value. This can result in suboptimal investment decisions, reduced transparency, and governance issues, potentially lowering firm value. Research by Morck, Shleifer, and Vishny (1988) indicates that beyond a certain threshold, high promoter ownership can negatively impact firm value due to entrenchment.

- **Influence on Corporate Governance:**
    - Improved Governance: Promoters with significant holdings often have a vested interest in strong corporate governance, as it directly affects their wealth. This can lead to better decision-making, efficient capital allocation, and, ultimately, higher firm value. Empirical evidence from Anderson and Reeb (2003) shows that firms with significant family or promoter ownership often outperform their peers due to better governance practices.
    - Potential for Governance Risks: However, in cases where promoters exercise excessive control without adequate checks and balances, it can lead to governance risks, including related-party transactions and insufficient board independence. This can erode investor confidence and negatively impact firm value.

- **Market Perception and Firm Value:**
    - Confidence in Long-Term Growth: Promoters with substantial holdings often signal long-term commitment to the firm, which can positively influence market perception and firm value. Investors might view high promoter ownership as a sign of stability and potential for sustained growth, leading to higher market valuations.
    - Market Skepticism: Conversely, if the market perceives high promoter ownership as a risk due to potential entrenchment or governance issues, it can lead to a discount in firm value. The market might demand higher returns to compensate for perceived risks associated with concentrated ownership.

1. Impact of Institutional Holdings on Dividend Payout Ratio and Firm Value:

Institutional holdings refer to the ownership of a company's shares by large financial organizations, such as mutual funds, pension funds, insurance companies, and hedge funds. These investors often have significant influence over a company's financial and strategic decisions. This review explores how institutional holdings affect the dividend payout ratio and firm value, drawing on various theories and empirical studies.

2. Institutional Holdings and Dividend Payout Ratio

- **Monitoring and Agency Theory:**

- Enhanced Monitoring: Institutional investors are often considered effective monitors of management due to their significant stakes and expertise in corporate governance. Their presence can reduce agency conflicts between shareholders and management. Research by Shleifer and Vishny (1986) suggests that institutional investors may prefer higher dividend payouts as a way to reduce free cash flow available to management, thereby limiting the potential for value-destroying investments.
- Pressure for Dividends: Institutional investors may pressure companies to maintain or increase dividend payouts as a signal of financial health and as a source of steady income. This is particularly true for institutions like pension funds, which rely on dividends for their cash flow requirements. Studies such as those by Grinstein and Michaely (2005) indicate that firms with higher institutional ownership often have higher dividend payout ratios due to this pressure.

- **Clientele Effect:**
- Dividend Clientele: Different institutional investors have varying preferences for dividends based on their tax status, investment goals, and regulatory constraints. For instance, tax-exempt institutions may prefer dividends, while others may prioritize capital gains. According to the clientele effect, companies adjust their dividend policies to attract and retain their desired investor base. Research by Allen et al. (2000) supports the idea that companies with a high proportion of institutional investors may align their dividend policies with the preferences of these investors, leading to higher or lower payout ratios depending on the clientele.
- Impact on Dividend Stability: Institutional investors typically favor predictable and stable dividend policies. Firms with significant institutional ownership may therefore adopt consistent dividend payout policies to meet the expectations of these investors, as noted in studies like those by Denis and Osobov (2008).

- **Signaling and Information Asymmetry:**
- Reduction of Information Asymmetry: Institutional investors often have better access to information and are more capable of analyzing a company's financial health than individual investors. This reduces the need for firms to use dividends as a signaling mechanism. As a result, firms with substantial institutional ownership might have lower dividend payout ratios, as institutional investors are more focused on long-term growth rather than short-term dividend signals.
- Demand for Dividends as a Signal: Conversely, some institutional investors may still prefer dividends as a signal of strong earnings and cash flow. Studies by La Porta et al. (2000) suggest that in markets with weaker legal protections for investors, institutional investors may demand higher dividends as a safeguard against potential expropriation by management.

3. Institutional Holdings and Firm Value

- **Enhanced Governance and Firm Value:**
- Positive Impact Through Monitoring: Institutional investors often play a key role in enhancing corporate governance, which can lead to better decision-making and higher firm value. Their active involvement in monitoring management actions and influencing strategic decisions can reduce agency costs and improve firm performance. Studies by McConnell and Servaes (1990) indicate that firms with higher institutional ownership tend to have higher market valuations due to improved governance practices.
- Long-Term Focus: Institutional investors, particularly those with long-term investment horizons like pension funds, may encourage management to focus on sustainable growth

rather than short-term earnings manipulation. This long-term orientation can positively impact firm value by promoting strategies that enhance future profitability and market position.

- **Potential for Pressure and Short-Termism:**
  - Pressure for Short-Term Performance: While institutional investors can enhance governance, they can also exert pressure on management to deliver short-term results, sometimes at the expense of long-term value creation. This can lead to practices such as earnings management or underinvestment in long-term projects, which may negatively affect firm value. Empirical evidence from Bushee (1998) suggests that firms with high levels of institutional ownership might face greater pressure to meet short-term earnings targets, potentially leading to lower firm value over time.
  - Impact of Trading Behavior: The trading behavior of institutional investors can also influence firm value. High levels of trading by institutions can lead to increased stock price volatility, which may affect the perceived risk and valuation of the firm. Research by Nofsinger and Sias (1999) shows that institutional trading can amplify stock price movements, which may result in mispricing and temporary distortions in firm value.

- **Institutional Ownership and Risk:**
  - Diversification and Risk Management: Institutional investors typically hold diversified portfolios, which allows them to bear higher levels of firm-specific risk. This risk tolerance may enable firms with substantial institutional ownership to pursue value-enhancing, but riskier, investment projects. Studies by Badrinath, Gay, and Kale (1989) suggest that firms with high institutional ownership may have a higher firm value due to their ability to undertake such projects.
  - Risk Aversion and Conservative Policies: On the other hand, some institutional investors may prefer conservative financial policies to protect their portfolios from downside risk. This could lead to a focus on preserving capital and maintaining stable earnings, potentially limiting the firm's ability to pursue high-risk, high-reward opportunities.

4. The Moderating Role of Firm Age on the Relationship Between Promoters' Holdings and (i) Dividend Payout Ratio and (ii) Firm Value:

Firm age, which refers to the number of years since a company's establishment, is an important factor that can moderate various corporate relationships. As firms age, they experience changes in their business models, market positions, governance structures, and financial strategies. This review explores how firm age moderates the relationship between promoters' holdings and two critical financial outcomes: the dividend payout ratio and firm value.

5. Firm Age, Promoters' Holdings, and Dividend Payout Ratio

- **Lifecycle Theory of Dividends:**
  - Younger Firms: According to the lifecycle theory of dividends, younger firms are typically in growth phases, requiring significant capital for expansion and investment opportunities. In such firms, high promoter holdings are often associated with lower dividend payout ratios because promoters prefer to retain earnings to finance growth. The need for reinvestment is higher, and promoters, who are usually closely involved in the firm's management, prioritize internal funding over distributing profits.
  - Older Firms: As firms age and move into more mature stages of their lifecycle, they often have fewer growth opportunities and generate more stable cash flows. In these cases, promoters might support higher dividend payouts as a way to return excess capital to

shareholders. Older firms with substantial promoter holdings may have a higher dividend payout ratio because promoters seek to distribute the stable cash flows rather than reinvest them.

- **Agency Costs and Information Asymmetry:**
  - Younger Firms: In younger firms, information asymmetry is typically higher, and agency costs can be more pronounced due to the uncertainty surrounding future prospects. Promoters with significant holdings might prefer to minimize dividend payouts to retain control over the firm's resources and reduce the risk of external scrutiny. This strategy allows them to invest in projects that might not be immediately profitable but are expected to drive long-term growth.
  - Older Firms: For older firms, information asymmetry and agency costs are generally lower due to established market presence and transparent operations. Promoters in such firms may be more willing to increase dividend payouts to signal financial health and stability to the market, thereby enhancing investor confidence and reducing agency conflicts.

- **Empirical Evidence:**
  - Research suggests that the relationship between promoter holdings and dividend payout ratio varies significantly with firm age. For example, studies by Fama and French (2001) indicate that mature firms with concentrated ownership tend to have higher payout ratios, while younger firms with similar ownership structures often prioritize reinvestment over dividends.

3. Firm Age, Promoters' Holdings, and Firm Value

- **Growth Opportunities and Valuation:**
  - Younger Firms: In younger firms, high promoter holdings can be a double-edged sword. On one hand, promoters may drive aggressive growth strategies, which can enhance firm value if successful. On the other hand, the market may discount the firm's value due to the higher risks associated with such strategies and the potential for entrenchment. High promoter ownership in younger firms might lead to lower firm valuations if investors are concerned about the risks of over-concentration of control and the potential for underinvestment in necessary areas like R&D or market expansion.
  - Older Firms: In older firms, high promoter holdings often lead to a positive impact on firm value. The firm's established track record and reduced risk profile make promoter-driven strategies more credible, leading to higher valuations. Investors might view substantial promoter ownership in mature firms as a sign of stability and confidence, particularly if the firm has a history of successful performance and strong governance practices.

- **Governance and Control:**
  - Younger Firms: In younger firms, the concentration of promoter holdings can sometimes result in governance issues, as promoters may prioritize their own interests over minority shareholders. This can negatively impact firm value if the market perceives the firm's governance to be weak. However, in some cases, promoters' deep involvement in young firms can be seen as beneficial, especially if they have a successful track record or a unique vision for the firm's growth.
  - Older Firms: Older firms with high promoter holdings often benefit from improved governance, as the promoters' interests are more aligned with those of other shareholders. The experience and credibility of promoters in mature firms can lead to better decision-making and higher firm value. Studies like those by Anderson and Reeb (2003) have shown

that in mature firms, significant promoter holdings are often associated with enhanced firm value due to strong governance and reduced agency conflicts.

- **Market Perception:**
  - Younger Firms: The market's perception of promoter holdings in younger firms can be mixed. While some investors may appreciate the focus and control provided by a strong promoter, others may be wary of the potential for entrenchment and the associated risks. As a result, the impact on firm value can vary depending on the firm's specific circumstances and the broader market environment.
  - Older Firms: For older firms, high promoter holdings are generally viewed more favorably, as they suggest stability, continuity, and a commitment to long-term value creation. The market may reward such firms with higher valuations, particularly if the promoters have demonstrated a consistent ability to manage the firm effectively over time.

4. The Moderating Role of Firm Size on the Relationship between Institutional Holdings and (i) Dividend Payout Ratio and (ii) Firm Value:

Firm size, often measured by metrics such as market capitalization, total assets, or revenues, is a significant factor that can moderate various corporate relationships. Larger firms tend to have more stable cash flows, better access to capital markets, and more complex governance structures compared to smaller firms. This review examines how firm size moderates the relationship between institutional holdings and two important financial outcomes: the dividend payout ratio and firm value.

2. Firm Size, Institutional Holdings, and Dividend Payout Ratio

- **Dividend Stability and Predictability:**
  - Larger Firms: Larger firms generally have more stable earnings and cash flows, which allows them to commit to regular dividend payments. Institutional investors in larger firms often favor higher and more stable dividend payouts as these firms are less risky and can afford consistent distributions. Studies by Denis and Osobov (2008) show that institutional investors prefer larger firms because they can offer reliable dividends, and their policies are less volatile.
  - Smaller Firms: In contrast, smaller firms typically face more volatile earnings and may have less predictable cash flows, making it harder to maintain consistent dividend payouts. Institutional investors in smaller firms may accept lower dividend payout ratios due to the firm's higher growth prospects and need for reinvestment. Research indicates that smaller firms with high institutional holdings may prioritize reinvestment over dividend payouts to finance growth opportunities, aligning with the expectations of growth-oriented institutional investors.

- **Agency Costs and Monitoring:**
  - Larger Firms: Larger firms often face higher agency costs due to the separation between ownership and control. Institutional investors in larger firms can play a crucial role in reducing these agency costs by demanding higher dividend payouts, thereby limiting the free cash flow available to management for potential misuse. The enhanced monitoring capability of institutional investors in larger firms, as highlighted by studies like those by Grinstein and Michaely (2005), often leads to higher dividend payout ratios as a way to discipline management.
  - Smaller Firms: In smaller firms, the relationship between institutional holdings and dividend payout ratios might be different. Given that smaller firms are often more closely managed with lower agency costs, institutional investors might not pressure for high

dividend payouts. Instead, they might support management's decision to retain earnings for growth, resulting in lower dividend payout ratios.

- **Empirical Evidence:**
  - Empirical studies suggest that the relationship between institutional holdings and dividend payout ratios is positively moderated by firm size. For example, research by La Porta et al. (2000) indicates that larger firms with significant institutional ownership tend to have higher dividend payout ratios due to the institutional preference for stability and reduced agency conflicts.

3. Firm Size, Institutional Holdings, and Firm Value

- **Impact on Valuation:**
  - Larger Firms: In larger firms, institutional holdings are often associated with higher firm value due to the enhanced governance and oversight that institutional investors provide. Larger firms benefit from the credibility and stability associated with institutional ownership, leading to higher market valuations. Studies by McConnell and Servaes (1990) suggest that institutional investors in larger firms contribute to higher firm value by ensuring that management decisions align with shareholder interests.
  - Smaller Firms: For smaller firms, the impact of institutional holdings on firm value can be more nuanced. While institutional ownership can provide valuable oversight and credibility, the risks associated with smaller firms, such as higher volatility and growth uncertainty, can offset these benefits. Institutional investors in smaller firms may focus on long-term growth potential rather than current valuation, leading to a more modest immediate impact on firm value.

- **Risk Perception and Investment Strategies:**
  - Larger Firms: Institutional investors typically view larger firms as safer investments due to their diversified operations, established market positions, and stable earnings. This perception of lower risk contributes to higher firm valuations, as institutional investors are willing to pay a premium for stability. Larger firms with high institutional ownership often engage in less risky, more conservative strategies that align with the risk-averse nature of institutional investors, further enhancing firm value.
  - Smaller Firms: Smaller firms, on the other hand, are often seen as riskier due to their limited market presence and greater sensitivity to economic fluctuations. Institutional investors in smaller firms may seek higher returns to compensate for this risk, but this can lead to increased volatility in firm value. The relationship between institutional holdings and firm value in smaller firms may be less straightforward, as the potential for high returns is balanced by the higher perceived risk.

- **Governance and Control:**
  - Larger Firms: In larger firms, institutional investors are crucial in enforcing strong governance practices, which can lead to higher firm value. The size and complexity of larger firms require robust governance mechanisms to ensure efficient management, and institutional investors often advocate for practices that enhance transparency, accountability, and long-term value creation.
  - Smaller Firms: In smaller firms, governance structures are typically less formalized, and the influence of institutional investors may be less pronounced. While institutional ownership can still improve governance and firm value, the impact may be limited by the firm's size and resources. Smaller firms may also have less formal mechanisms for

institutional investors to exert influence, which can affect the extent to which institutional ownership translates into higher firm value.

- **Market Perception:**
  - Larger Firms: The market often perceives institutional ownership in larger firms as a positive signal of credibility and long-term stability. This can lead to higher firm valuations as the presence of institutional investors is associated with reduced agency costs and enhanced governance.
  - Smaller Firms: In smaller firms, institutional ownership can also be viewed positively, especially if it signals confidence in the firm's growth prospects. However, the market may also perceive higher risks associated with smaller firms, potentially leading to more volatile valuations.

4. Findings

1. It was observed that Promoters' holdings play a crucial role in shaping a firm's dividend payout policy and overall value. High promoter ownership can lead to lower dividend payouts due to aligned interests and a focus on reinvestment, but it can also signal confidence in the firm's future. The impact on firm value is complex; while alignment of interests can enhance value, excessive control and entrenchment risks can diminish it. Understanding the balance between these factors is key to evaluating the effect of promoter holdings on a firm's financial health and market valuation.

2. It was observed that Institutional holdings significantly influence a firm's dividend payout policy and overall value. The presence of institutional investors generally leads to better corporate governance and enhanced firm value due to effective monitoring and a focus on long-term performance. However, the pressure for short-term results and the impact of institutional trading behavior can introduce risks that may affect firm value. The relationship between institutional ownership, dividend payout ratio, and firm value is complex and depends on the characteristics and objectives of the institutional investors involved.

3. The Firm age plays a significant moderating role in the relationship between promoters' holdings and both dividend payout ratios and firm value. In younger firms, high promoter holdings are often associated with lower dividend payouts and potentially lower firm valuations due to the need for reinvestment and the risks of entrenchment. In contrast, older firms with substantial promoter ownership tend to have higher dividend payouts and enhanced firm value, as the benefits of stability, governance, and market confidence outweigh the risks. Understanding the stage of the firm's lifecycle is crucial for accurately assessing the impact of promoter holdings on these key financial outcomes.

4. The Firm size plays a significant moderating role in the relationship between institutional holdings and both dividend payout ratios and firm value. In larger firms, institutional holdings are generally associated with higher dividend payout ratios and enhanced firm value due to the stability, reduced agency costs, and strong governance that institutional investors bring. In smaller firms, the relationship is more complex, with institutional investors often favoring reinvestment over dividends and balancing higher growth potential against higher risks. Understanding the firm's size is crucial for assessing the impact of institutional holdings on these key financial outcomes.

5. Promoters' holdings play a crucial role in shaping a firm's dividend payout policy and overall value. High promoter ownership can lead to lower dividend payouts due to aligned interests and a focus on reinvestment, but it can also signal confidence in the firm's future. The impact on firm value is complex; while alignment of interests can enhance value, excessive control and entrenchment risks can diminish it. Understanding the balance between these factors is key to evaluating the effect of promoter holdings on a firm's financial health and market valuation.

5. Conclusion

The relationship between foreign promoter holdings, dividend yield, and a high Price-to-Earnings (P/E) ratio is complex and influenced by various factors, including market perception, company fundamentals, and broader economic conditions. Foreign promoter holdings refer to the ownership stake held by foreign entities or individuals who have a controlling interest in a company. These holdings often bring advantages such as access to international markets, advanced technology, and better management practices, which can enhance the overall firm value and investor confidence. Dividend yield, which represents the annual dividend payment as a percentage of the stock price, is a key indicator for income-focused investors. he combination of foreign promoter holdings and high dividend yield can lead to a high P/E ratio under certain conditions: The interaction between foreign promoter holdings, dividend yield, and a high P/E ratio underscores the importance of understanding market expectations and the fundamentals of the company. While foreign promoter holdings can contribute to a higher P/E ratio by boosting investor confidence and perceived growth potential, this relationship is not without risks. Investors should carefully consider the sustainability of the company's earnings, the appropriateness of its dividend policy, and the broader economic context before concluding that a high P/E ratio is justified. A nuanced approach that considers both the benefits and potential risks associated with foreign promoter holdings is essential for accurate valuation and investment decisions.

6. References

1. Aggarwal, R., Erel, I., Ferreira, M., & Matos, P. (2005). Does governance travel around the world? Evidence from institutional investors. Journal of Financial Economics.
2. Chhibber, P. K., & Majumdar, S. K. (1999). Foreign ownership and profitability: Property rights, control, and the performance of firms in Indian industry. The Journal of Law and Economics.
3. Doukas, J. A., Holmén, M., & Travlos, N. G. (2000). Corporate diversification and firm performance: Evidence from Swedish acquisitions. European Financial Management.
4. Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. (2001). Disappearing dividends: Changing firm characteristics or lower propensity to pay? Journal of Financial Economics.
5. Gordon, M. J. (1962). The investment, financing, and valuation of the corporation. Homewood, Illinois: R. D. Irwin.
6. Anderson, R. C., & Reeb, D. M. (2003). Founding-family ownership and firm performance: Evidence from the S&P 500. The Journal of Finance.
7. Claessens, S., Djankov, S., Fan, J. P. H., & Lang, L. H. P. (2002). Disentangling the incentive and entrenchment effects of large shareholdings. The Journal of Finance.
8. Gugler, K., & Yurtoglu, B. B. (2003). Corporate governance and dividend payout policy in Germany. European Economic Review.
9. La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (2000). Agency problems and dividend policies around the world. The Journal of Finance.

10. Morck, R., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1988). Management ownership and market valuation: An empirical analysis. Journal of Financial Economics.
11. Allen, F., Bernardo, A. E., & Welch, I. (2000). A theory of dividends based on tax clienteles. The Journal of Finance.
12. Badrinath, S. G., Gay, G. D., & Kale, J. R. (1989). Patterns of institutional investment, and the impact on stock prices. Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis.
13. Bushee, B. J. (1998). The influence of institutional investors on myopic R&D investment behavior. The Accounting Review.
14. Denis, D. J., & Osobov, I. (2008). Why do firms pay dividends? International evidence on the determinants of dividend policy. Journal of Financial Economics.
15. Grinstein, Y., & Michaely, R. (2005). Institutional holdings and payout policy. The Journal of Finance.
16. La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (2000). Agency problems and dividend policies around the world. The Journal of Finance.
17. McConnell, J. J., & Servaes, H. (1990). Additional evidence on equity ownership and corporate value. Journal of Financial Economics.
18. Nofsinger, J. R., & Sias, R. W. (1999). Herding and feedback trading by institutional and individual investors. The Journal of Finance.
19. Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1986). Large shareholders and corporate control. Journal of Political Economy.
20. Anderson, R. C., & Reeb, D. M. (2003). Founding-family ownership and firm performance: Evidence from the S&P 500. The Journal of Finance.
21. Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. (2001). Disappearing dividends: Changing firm characteristics or lower propensity to pay? Journal of Financial Economics.
22. La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (2000). Agency problems and dividend policies around the world. The Journal of Finance.
23. Denis, D. J., & Osobov, I. (2008). Why do firms pay dividends? International evidence on the determinants of dividend policy. Journal of Financial Economics.
24. Grinstein, Y., & Michaely, R. (2005). Institutional holdings and payout policy. The Journal of Finance.
25. La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (2000). Agency problems and dividend policies around the world. The Journal of Finance.
26. McConnell, J. J., & Servaes, H. (1990). Additional evidence on equity ownership and corporate value. Journal of Financial Economics.