

# Fixed Asset Intensity, Thin Capitalization, and Transfer Pricing on Tax Avoidance

---

## ABSTRACT

**Aims:** This research seeks to analyze the influence of Fixed Asset Intensity, Thin Capitalization, and Transfer Pricing on the implementation of Tax Avoidance strategies.

**Study design:** This research employs a quantitative causality approach using secondary data sourced from the annual reports.

**Place and Duration of Study:** Consumer Non-Cyclicals sector companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) during the period 2019–2023.

**Methodology:** This study utilizes multiple linear regression analysis, conducted with the help of SPSS version 25. The research population includes all 126 companies in the consumer non-cyclicals sector. A purposive sampling method was applied, yielding a sample of 27 companies that met the predetermined criteria. Over a five-year observation period, a total of 135 data points were analyzed.

**Results:** The findings of this study show that Fixed Asset Intensity significantly influences Tax Avoidance, while Thin Capitalization does not have any impact. Additionally, Transfer Pricing is found to have a significant effect on Tax Avoidance.

**Conclusion:** The findings of this research may be used as a reference in tax planning efforts to promote adherence to existing regulations and prevent potential long-term reputational risks for the company. Moreover, it is suggested that future studies explore additional variables relevant to tax avoidance beyond the three independent factors examined in this study.

*Keywords: Fixed asset intensity; thin capitalization; transfer pricing; tax avoidance.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Taxes function as the government's main revenue source to finance its duties and activities. This is evident in Indonesia's State Budget (APBN), where the taxation sector consistently provides the largest share of national income. (Pravasanti, 2020). As a key element of national revenue, taxes play a vital role in funding development and covering government expenditures (Mangoting, 2013). Despite their significance, many taxpayers in Indonesia still engage in tax avoidance. According to data from the Tax Justice Network, Indonesia is estimated to lose approximately US\$4.86 billion (or Rp68.7 trillion) annually due to tax avoidance practices. Of this amount, US\$4.78 billion (Rp67.6 trillion) is attributed to corporations, while US\$78.83 million (Rp1.1 trillion) comes from individual taxpayers (Kompas.com, 2020).

Tax avoidance is the practice of utilizing lawful and secure methods by taxpayers to lessen their tax obligations without violating existing regulations. This approach typically takes advantage of gaps within tax laws to decrease the amount of tax payable (Pohan, 2016). This practice is enabled by Indonesia's self-assessment taxation system, where taxpayers are given complete authority and responsibility to compute, settle, and declare their own tax liabilities. With such authority, companies may take advantage of regulatory

35 gaps to control their tax payments, thus opening up opportunities for tax avoidance (Chintia  
36 & Susanto, 2022).

37 Although tax avoidance does not violate the laws and regulations, this practice  
38 can cost the state tens to hundreds of billions of rupiah each year. The decrease in tax  
39 revenue affects the state's income, which ultimately slows down infrastructure  
40 development and leads to unequal public welfare (Hidayat & Prawesty, 2022). From the  
41 government's perspective, taxpayers must fulfill their tax obligations effectively to  
42 maximize tax revenue (Basri et al., 2014). Conversely, from the standpoint of business  
43 owners or taxpayers, it is common for companies to apply tax planning measures aimed  
44 at lowering their income tax burdens, since such taxes diminish overall profitability  
45 (Oktaviyani & Munandar, 2017).

46 Several Indonesian companies have engaged in tax avoidance practices by  
47 exploiting transfer pricing schemes with their subsidiaries outside Indonesia. This practice  
48 has resulted in underreporting revenue and profits in Indonesia, resulting in tax payments  
49 of approximately Rp1.75 trillion (US\$125 million) below the amount paid. (Sugianto, 2019).

50 Fixed asset intensity is considered an element that may influence the likelihood of  
51 tax avoidance. Company management may choose to invest surplus funds in fixed assets,  
52 allowing them to benefit from tax deductions through depreciation, thereby lowering their  
53 taxable income (Uliandari et al., 2021). The larger the share of investment directed into  
54 fixed assets, the more it incurs in depreciation expenses, ultimately decreasing its taxable  
55 income and lessening its total tax obligation (Y. E. Pratiwi & Oktaviani, 2021). A study by  
56 Prihatini & Amin (2022) discovered that the intensity of fixed assets influences the practice  
57 of tax avoidance. However, findings from Rosdiani & Hidayat (2020) and Videya & Irawati  
58 (2022) Conversely, the findings indicate that fixed asset intensity exerts no meaningful  
59 impact on tax avoidance.

60 Another variable thought to affect corporate tax avoidance is thin capitalization.  
61 Companies may attempt to reduce their tax obligations by increasing the use of debt,  
62 especially interest-bearing debt, over equity in their capital structure (Istiqfarosita &  
63 Abdani, 2022). An elevated debt-to-equity ratio causes interest expenses to grow, and  
64 since these costs are tax-deductible, they decrease the total tax obligation (Ravanelly &  
65 Soetardjo, 2023). Equity-based funding leads to dividend payments that are taxed,  
66 whereas debt-based funding enables companies to treat interest costs as deductible  
67 expenses (Jumailah, 2020). Bandang et al (2024) discovered that the intensity of fixed  
68 assets influences the practice of tax avoidance. On the other hand, Millena et al (2023)  
69 stated that thin capitalization has no notable impact on tax avoidance.

70 One aspect that influences tax avoidance behavior is transfer pricing. Based on  
71 the Directorate General of Taxes Regulation No. PER-32/PJ/2011, transfer pricing is  
72 defined as the determination of transaction values carried out between parties that have a  
73 special relationship. This special relationship arises from dependency or affiliation arising  
74 from ownership interests, control, or family relationships, whether through blood or  
75 marriage (Suciati et al., 2024). Companies can exploit loopholes in tax regulations (grey  
76 areas) by implementing transfer pricing, transferring profits from companies in Indonesia  
77 to companies located in other countries with lower tax rates. This strategy is commonly  
78 implemented by companies operating in Indonesia to reduce their tax liabilities and  
79 maximize profits (Rusdiyanti & Nurhayati, 2024). Prior research investigating the  
80 association between transfer pricing practices and tax avoidance was undertaken by  
81 Heristiqomah & Asalam (2023). Their findings indicate that transfer pricing has an impact  
82 on tax avoidance. In contrast, Prasetyo et al (2022) concluded that thin capitalization does  
83 not affect tax avoidance. In light of the critical role tax avoidance plays in corporate tax  
84 strategy and the inconsistent findings of prior studies on the factors that influence it, this  
85 study is entitled The Effect of Fixed Asset Intensity, Thin Capitalization, and Transfer  
86 Pricing on Tax Avoidance.

87

88 **2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT**

89

90 **2.1 Theoretical Basis**

91

92 **2.1.1 Agency theory**

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

Agency theory, according to Jensen and Meckling in Yohana et al. (2022), defines "an agency relationship as a contract between one or more owners (principals) who hire another person (agent) to perform certain services on behalf of the owners, which includes delegating decision-making authority to the agent." According to Eisenhardt in Fitri & Dwita (2023), agency theory focuses on resolving agency conflicts that commonly arise between principals and agents. An issue emerges when the interests of the agent and the principal are not aligned.

Perselisihan dapat terjadi antara manajemen perusahaan dan otoritas pajak yang mewakili pemerintah terkait pelaporan laba perusahaan, yang pada akhirnya dapat memicu konflik keagenan. According to agency theory, individuals act based on their self-interest, which can lead to misaligned objectives between the principal and the agent. As a result, companies (acting as agents) may prioritize their interests, thereby creating agency issues with the government (acting as the principal) (Paramita et al., 2023). The tax authority, which represents the government, functions as the principal and considers taxes a crucial component of state revenue, thus striving to collect higher taxes from corporations to boost government income. Conversely, corporate taxpayers, acting as agents on behalf of companies, seek to enhance profitability by lowering their tax obligations, since management often views taxes as costs that diminish overall company earnings (L. P. Nurhidayah et al., 2021).

**2.1.2 Tax avoidance**

Tax avoidance is an effort to reduce the amount of tax payable by exploiting loopholes or imperfections in tax regulations while still being carried out legally (Wahyuda et al., 2024). According to Basri et al. (2014), Tax avoidance represents a legal approach by firms to lessen their tax liability without breaching established tax laws. Although legally permissible, from the government's perspective, tax avoidance is still considered undesirable. In essence, corporate tax avoidance leads to reduced tax payments, thereby boosting the company's earnings. These increased profits can benefit managers, either directly or indirectly, through performance-based compensation or bonuses tied to the improved financial results from these tax-saving strategies (Sugiharti & Machdar, 2023).

**2.1.3 Fixed asset intensity**

Fixed asset intensity is defined as the ratio that illustrates the share of fixed assets in relation to the company's entire asset base. This ratio illustrates the level of the company's commitment to investing in long-term physical assets (Ningsih et al., 2020). As outlined in PSAK No.16, fixed assets refer to tangible, long-term assets that are either acquired in usable condition or built by the company, intended for operational purposes, not for routine sale, and expected to be used for more than one year. The connection between fixed asset intensity and taxation primarily lies in the depreciation component associated with fixed asset investments. Depreciation is recognized as a deductible expense, which allows companies to lower their taxable income (Rindiani & Asalam, 2022).

**2.1.4 Thin capitaliation**

According to Curry & Fikri (2023), Thin capitalization occurs when a company relies more on debt than equity for its financing structure, typically represented by the Debt-to-Equity Ratio (DER). Thin capitalization can involve related parties. Without such a relationship, creditors are generally reluctant to provide loans if they know the debtor (borrower) has insufficient capital. (Ismi, 2016). This practice is often chosen because it enables companies to lower their tax liabilities by treating loan interest payments as deductible expenses rather than paying corporate income taxes (Sumekar et al., 2023). According to Regulation No. 169/PMK.010/2015 issued by the Minister of Finance, the

145 allowable maximum debt-to-equity ratio for income tax calculation purposes is set at 4 to  
146 1. This policy aims to prevent companies from misusing debt-based capital structures as  
147 a tax avoidance strategy. When a company's debt exceeds the prescribed limit, only the  
148 interest expense within the allowed ratio stated in the regulation can be deducted from  
149 taxable income (Afifah & Prastiwi, 2019).

150

#### 151 **2.1.4 Transfer pricing**

152 Transfer pricing is a strategy employed by companies to maximize profits by  
153 determining the price of goods or services produced by one entity within a company and  
154 sold to another entity within the same corporate group (Ramdhani et al., 2021). In a normal  
155 transaction cycle involving unrelated parties, pricing is determined by market forces (the  
156 law of supply and demand). However, if the transaction involves parties with a special  
157 relationship, the resulting price may deviate from the market price because market forces  
158 do not function as they should (Cledy & Amin, 2020). Within consolidated companies,  
159 interactions between parent firms and their subsidiaries that share special relationships  
160 can lead to adjustments in transaction prices. Companies may raise or lower the selling or  
161 purchasing value of transferred items—such as fixed assets, goods, services, intangible  
162 assets, or financial dealings—as part of strategies to minimize tax obligations through  
163 transfer pricing (Arlinda et al., 2021).

164

### 165 **2.2 Hypotesis Development**

166

#### 167 **2.2.1 The effect of fixed asset intensity on tax avoidance**

168

169 Fixed Asset Intensity represents the ratio that shows how much of a company's  
170 total assets are made up of fixed assets, calculated by comparing fixed assets to total  
171 assets. This ratio illustrates the level of the company's commitment to investing in long-  
172 term physical assets (Ningsih et al., 2020). Fixed Asset Intensity reflects how much a  
173 company invests in tangible long-term assets. These assets consist of tangible resources  
174 obtained in ready-to-use condition, employed to support a company's operations, and not  
175 meant for resale (Rochmah & Oktaviani, 2021). Company-owned fixed assets usually incur  
176 depreciation costs each year. These depreciation expenses arise because fixed assets  
177 decrease in value over time as they are used in the company's operations (Rosdiani &  
178 Hidayat, 2020). An increased use of fixed assets leads to higher depreciation costs.  
179 Depreciation costs can be applied to reduce a company's income before tax, thereby  
180 lowering the amount of tax that must be paid. Therefore, the more heavily a company  
181 invests in fixed assets, the more likely it is to use depreciation as a means to reduce  
182 taxable income and minimize its tax liabilities (Nasution & Mulyani, 2020). As a result, a  
183 reduced CETR figure signifies that the company may be participating in more substantial  
184 tax avoidance strategies.

185 The research conducted by H. A. Pratiwi & Pramita (2021) and Prihatini & Amin  
186 (2022) also indicates that fixed asset intensity has an influence on tax avoidance. From  
187 the explanation outlined earlier, the study arrives at the following hypothesis:

188

189  $H_1$ : Fixed Asset Intensity has an effect on Tax Avoidance.

190

#### 191 **2.2.2 The effect of thin capitalization on tax avoidance**

192

193 Thin capitalization describes a situation where a company relies more heavily on  
194 debt than equity for its financing structure, typically represented by the Debt-to-Equity  
195 Ratio (DER) (Curry & Fikri, 2023). From a taxation perspective, financing through debt is  
196 more advantageous. This is due to the difference in treatment between interest expenses  
197 associated with debt and dividends associated with equity (L. I. Nurhidayah & Rahmawati,  
198 2022). Therefore, a higher debt-to-equity ratio indicates that the company relies more  
199 heavily on debt funding compared to equity financing. Consequently, the interest expenses  
200 borne by the company will be greater. Debt financing generates interest expenses, which,  
201 under tax regulations, are considered deductible expenses in calculating taxable income.

202 Greater interest charges can diminish a firm's pre-tax earnings. Conversely, if financing is  
203 conducted through equity, dividends will arise, which are not considered deductible  
204 expenses (Zanra & Zubir, 2023). Companies prefer paying interest and principal on debt  
205 rather than bearing tax burdens.

206  
207 The studies carried out by Curry & Fikri (2023) and Setiawan et al (2024) also  
208 indicates that thin capitalization has an influence on tax avoidance. From the explanation  
209 outlined earlier, the study arrives at the following hypothesis:

210  
211  $H_2$ : Thin Capitalization has an effect on Tax Avoidance.


212  
213 **2.2.3 The effect of transfer pricing on tax avoidance**

214  
215 Transfer pricing is a strategy used by companies to maximize profits by  
216 determining the price of goods or services produced by one entity within a company and  
217 sold to another entity within the same corporate group (Ramdhani et al., 2021). Transfer  
218 pricing can be identified based on the existence of sales data to related parties by  
219 examining accounts receivable from related parties (Setyorini & Nurhayati, 2022). A higher  
220 ratio of related-party receivables indicates larger sales transactions with related parties.  
221 Consequently, the company is likely to implement sales transactions with lower pricing  
222 policies to affiliated companies within the same group or companies with special  
223 relationships. This practice aims to shift the profits earned to affiliated companies located  
224 abroad in jurisdictions with lower tax rates (Ani & Siregar, 2022). As a result, the sales  
225 reported domestically are lower than they should be, which reduces the company's pre-  
226 tax income. Consequently, the company's tax burden is lowered in nations with elevated  
227 tax rates. Meanwhile, the target company benefits from the lower tax rates, resulting in  
228 lower overall tax expenses (Wijaya & Rahayu, 2021). As a result, a reduced CETR figure  
229 signifies that the company may be participating in more substantial tax avoidance  
230 strategies.

231  
232 The study by Ramdhani et al (2021) also demonstrates that transfer pricing plays a  
233 role in influencing tax avoidance. From the explanation outlined earlier, the study arrives  
234 at the following hypothesis:

235  
236  $H_3$ : Transfer Pricing has an effect on Tax Avoidance.

237  
238 Based on the previously discussed theoretical framework, the conceptual framework can  
239 be depicted as follows:



254  
255  
256  
257  
**Fig 1. Conceptual Framework**

258 **3. METHODS**

259

260 **3.1 POPULATION AND SAMPLE**

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

This research utilizes a quantitative approach, drawing on secondary data sourced from the financial statements of companies in the consumer non-cyclical sector. The population under study consists of 27 firms within this sector listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) during the 2019–2023 timeframe. This sector was chosen because it produces and distributes essential everyday products, which generally sustain stable demand and demonstrate resilience amid economic fluctuations. A purposive sampling technique was applied, selecting samples according to specific pre-established criteria. Consequently, 27 companies fulfilled the requirements and were observed over a period of five years, producing a total of 135 data points. Following a normality assessment, 11 outliers were identified and removed, leaving 124 valid observations for subsequent analysis. The research employs several statistical techniques, including descriptive statistics, classical assumption testing, and multiple linear regression, to examine the hypotheses and analyze the data. The analyses were conducted using SPSS version 25. The detailed sampling criteria are presented as follows:

**Table 1. Population and sample criteria**

No.	Criteria	Total
	Population: Consumer non-cyclical sector companies listed on the IDX for the period 2019–2023.	<b>126</b>
1.	Consumer non-cyclical sector companies that did not publish annual reports for five consecutive years during the 2019–2023 period.	(48)
2.	Consumer non-cyclical sector companies that experienced losses during the 2019–2023 period.	(31)
3.	Consumer non-cyclical sector companies that do not have related party transaction data.	(20)
<b>Number of Selected Sample Companies</b>		27
<b>Observation Years</b>		5
<b>Total Observations 2019–2023 (27 companies × 5 years)</b>		135
<b>Outlier</b>		(11)
<b>Total Sample</b>		124

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

The assessment of variables in this research was conducted based on the indicators listed as follows:

**3.2 OPERATIONAL DEFINITION AND MEASUREMENT OF VARIABLES**

**Table 2. Operational Definition and Measurement of Variable**

Variable	Operational Definition	Indicators	Scale
Tax Avoidance (Y)	Tax avoidance is an effort to reduce the amount of tax payable by exploiting loopholes or imperfections in tax regulations while still being carried out legally (Wahyuda et al., 2024).	$CETR = \frac{\text{Cash Tax Paid}}{\text{Pretax Income}}$	Ratio
Fixed Asset Intensity ( $X_1$ )	Fixed Asset Intensity represents the ratio that shows how much of a company's total assets	$\text{Fixed Asset Intensity} = \frac{\text{Total Fixed Asset}}{\text{Total Asset}}$	Ratio

	are made up of fixed assets, calculated by comparing fixed assets to total assets (Ningsih et al., 2020).		
Thin Capitalization ( $X_2$ )	Thin capitalization describes a situation where a company relies more heavily on debt than equity for its financing structure, typically represented by the Debt-to-Equity Ratio (DER) (Curry & Fikri, 2023).	$DER = \frac{\text{Liabilities}}{\text{Equity}}$	Ratio
Transfer Pricing ( $X_3$ )	Transfer pricing is a strategy used by companies to maximize profits by setting the prices of goods or services produced by one entity within a company and transferred to another entity within the same group that has a special relationship (Ramdhani et al., 2021).	$\text{Transfer Pricing} = \frac{\text{Accounting Receivable from Related Parties}}{\text{Total Account Receivable}}$	Ratio

285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312

### 3.3 MODEL AND DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES

According to Ghozali, as cited in the study by (Laeladevi et al., 2021), Multiple linear regression is a statistical method employed to assess how several independent variables impact on a dependent variable (Cao et al, 2022) . Therefore, multiple regression analysis will be conducted using multivariate analysis as follows:

$$TA = \alpha + \beta_1 FAI_1 + \beta_2 TC_2 + \beta_3 TP_3 + \varepsilon$$

Explanation:

Y = Dependent Variable (*Tax avoidance*)

$X_1$  = Independent Variable 1 (*Fixed Asset Intensity*)

$X_2$  = Independent Variable 2 (*Thin capitalization*)

$X_3$  = Independent Variable 3 (*Transfer pricing*)

$\alpha$  = Constant Value

$\beta$  = Regression Coefficients

$\varepsilon$  = standard error

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 RESULTS OF DESCRIPTIPTIVE STATISTICS

Descriptive statistics serve to offer a general summary or initial insight into the dataset, including details such as the total number of observations, highest and lowest values, average (mean), and data variability as reflected by the standard deviation. The results of the descriptive statistical analysis carried out in this study are displayed in Table 3 below.

313  
314

**Table 3. Descriptive Statistics**

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
<b>CETR</b>	135	0.0620	3.2232	0.353791	0.4575739
<b>Fixed Asset Intensity</b>	135	0.1137	0.7622	0.345448	0.1543951
<b>Thin Capitalization</b>	135	0.1028	4.9350	1.109798	0.9078112
<b>Transfer Pricing</b>	135	0.0005	0.9971	0.300014	0.3304860
<b>Valid N (listwise)</b>	135				

315 The descriptive statistical analysis shows that the average score of tax avoidance  
316 (Y) is 0.3538, accompanied by a standard deviation of 0.4576, suggesting a relatively wide  
317 variation within the data. For the fixed asset intensity variable ( $X_1$ ), the mean value is  
318 0.3454 with a standard deviation of 0.1544, indicating a more consistent data pattern. The  
319 thin capitalization variable ( $X_2$ ) records an average of 1.1098 and a standard deviation of  
320 0.9078, reflecting limited variation across observations. Meanwhile, transfer pricing ( $X_3$ )  
321 has a mean of 0.3000 and a standard deviation of 0.3305, signifying a broader spread and  
322 higher heterogeneity in the dataset.

323

## 324 **4.2 CLASSICAL ASSUMPTION TEST**

325

### 326 **4.2.1 Test of normality**

327

328 The normality test is conducted to evaluate whether the independent and  
329 dependent variables in the regression model follow a normal distribution (Ghozali, 2018).  
330 A dataset can be considered normally distributed if the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test reports  
331 a significance value greater than 0.05. After removing outliers and applying data  
332 transformation, the test result was 0.200, which indicates that the dataset fulfills the criteria  
333 for normal distribution.

334

**Table 4. One-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

335

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		124
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	0,0000000
	Std. Deviation	0,39962582
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	0,071
	Positive	0,071
	Negative	-0,066
Test Statistic		0,071
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		0.200 <sup>c,d</sup>
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.		
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.		

336

337

### 338 **4.2.2 Multicollinearity test**

339

340 According to Ghozali (2018), the multicollinearity test is conducted to determine  
341 whether there is a correlation among the independent variables in a regression model. A  
342 good regression model should be free from multicollinearity, which can be assessed using  
343 tolerance ( $> 0.10$ ) and VIF ( $< 10$ ). Based on Table 5, all independent variables meet these  
344 criteria, indicating no multicollinearity in the model.

345  
346  
347

**Table 5. Multicollinearity test**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>		
Model	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
1 LN_X1	0,966	1,035
LN_X2	0,912	1,097
LN_X3	0,923	1,083

**a. Dependent Variable: LN\_Y**

348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356

**4.2.3 Heteroscedasticity test**

According to Ghozali (2018), explains that heteroscedasticity can be examined using the Glejser test, which is among the most widely applied statistical methods. The issue of heteroscedasticity is identified when the significance value falls below 0.05 (5%). Referring to Table 6, all variables display significance levels greater than 0.05, suggesting that heteroscedasticity is not present in this research.

**Table 6. Heteroscedasticity test**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	0,291	0,068		4,275	0,000
LN_X1	0,000	0,050	0,000	-0,003	0,997
LN_X2	0,026	0,028	0,087	0,917	0,361
LN_X3	-0,005	0,012	-0,039	-0,412	0,681

**a. Dependent Variable: ABRESID**

357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367

**4.2.4 Autocorrelation test**

According to Ghozali (2018), the autocorrelation test is intended to assess whether a linear regression model shows a correlation between residuals from the current period (t) and the preceding period (t-1). A regression model can be considered valid if it does not suffer from autocorrelation problems. Based on the autocorrelation results presented in Table 7, the Durbin-Watson (DW) value is 1.411. Since this figure falls within the acceptable threshold of -2 to +2, it suggests that the dataset in this research is free from autocorrelation.

**Table 7. Autocorrelation test**

Model Summary <sup>b</sup>					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0.319 <sup>a</sup>	0,102	0,079	0,40459	1,411

**a. Predictors: (Constant), LN\_X3, LN\_X1, LN\_X2**  
**b. Dependent Variable: LN\_Y**

368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376

**4.3 MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS**

The results of data processing using multiple linear regression analysis are presented in the following table:

Table 8. Coefficients

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>				
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-1,815	0,102		-17,728	0,000
	LN_X1	-0,165	0,076	-0,192	-2,181	0,031
	LN_X2	-0,015	0,043	-0,031	-0,341	0,734
	LN_X3	-0,049	0,018	-0,242	-2,690	0,008

a. Dependent Variable: LN\_Y

378 Based on Table 8 above, the regression model equation can be formulated as follows:

379

380

$$Y = -1,815 - 0,165X1 - 0,015X2 - 0,049X3 + \varepsilon$$

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

#### 4.4 RESULTS OF HYPOTHESIS TEST

391

392

##### 4.4.1 Variable significance test (T-test)

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

##### 4.4.2 Simultaneous test (F-test)

421

422

The F-test is conducted to assess whether the independent variables, taken together, have a statistically significant impact on the dependent variable within a

423 regression model. A P-value less than 0.05 suggests that the independent variables jointly  
 424 affect the dependent variable.

425  
 426  
 427

**Table 9. ANOVA**

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2,229	3	0,743	4,538	0.005 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	19,643	120	0,164		
	Total	21,872	123			

428 Based on the F-test presented in Table 9, the  $P_{value}$  obtained is 0.005. Since this  
 429 figure is below the 0.05 significance threshold, it demonstrates that Fixed Asset Intensity,  
 430 Thin Capitalization, and Transfer Pricing jointly exert a significant influence on the  
 431 dependent variable, namely tax avoidance.

432

#### 433 **4.4.3 Test coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ )**

434 According to Ghozali (2018), the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) is utilized to  
 435 evaluate the extent to which the regression model is able to account for variations in the  
 436 dependent variable. The results of the  $R^2$  analysis are presented below:

437

438

439

**Table 10. Model Summary**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.319 <sup>a</sup>	0,102	0,079	0,40459

**a. Predictors: (Constant), LN\_X3, LN\_X1, LN\_X2**

440

441 Based on the coefficient of determination shown in Table 10, the Adjusted R  
 442 Square value is 0.079. This means that Fixed Asset Intensity, Thin Capitalization, and  
 443 Transfer Pricing together explain only 7.9% of the variation in tax avoidance. The  
 444 remaining 92.1% is affected by other factors outside the scope of this study. Therefore, it  
 445 can be concluded that these three variables exert only a limited influence on tax avoidance  
 446 within consumer non-cyclical companies.

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

The findings of this research suggest that fixed asset intensity has an influence on tax avoidance. This variable reflects the proportion of a company's total assets that consist of fixed assets, measured by comparing fixed assets to overall assets. In the context of tax planning, a higher level of fixed asset intensity can lower the tax liability because depreciation charges are considered deductible expenses, thereby reducing the company's taxable profit (Ningsih et al., 2020). This study concludes that the greater the company's fixed asset ownership, the higher the likelihood of engaging in tax avoidance practices. A large amount of fixed assets increases tax avoidance because it leads to higher depreciation expenses, which can be utilized to reduce taxable income (Hafizh et al., 2022). Consequently, companies tend to exploit this opportunity by investing in fixed assets as a means of tax avoidance.

The results of this study align with the findings of H. A. Pratiwi & Pramita (2021) and Prihatini & Amin (2022), who concluded that fixed asset intensity has a significant influence on tax avoidance. In contrast, this study's results differ from those of Ningsih et al. (2020) and Heristiqomah & Asalam (2023), who found that fixed asset intensity does not impact tax avoidance.

468  
469  
470  
471

#### **4.5.2 The Effect of Thin Capitalization on Tax Avoidance**

472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485

The second hypothesis in this study states that thin capitalization affects tax avoidance. Thin capitalization describes a situation where a company relies more heavily on debt than equity for its financing structure, typically represented by the Debt-to-Equity Ratio (DER) (Curry & Fikri, 2023). When a firm chooses to finance its activities through debt, it generates interest costs that may be utilized as deductible expenses in determining taxable income. Conversely, if the company uses equity financing, dividends arise, which are not deductible in taxable income calculations. Therefore, in an effort to minimize tax burdens, companies tend to use debt as a source of financing. Tax regulations allow interest expenses to be deducted in the calculation of fiscal profit, which ultimately helps companies reduce the amount of tax payable (Zanra & Zubir, 2023). Even though the Indonesian Ministry of Finance has enacted Regulation No. 169/PMK.010/2015, which sets the maximum allowable debt-to-equity ratio at 4:1 for the purpose of determining taxable income, in reality, some taxpayers still take advantage of gaps in the regulation to carry out tax avoidance practices (Rahmadhani & Lastanti, 2024).

486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497

Nevertheless, the findings of this research demonstrate that thin capitalization has no significant influence on tax avoidance, leading to the rejection of the proposed hypothesis. Firms operating in the consumer non-cyclicals sector generally do not depend extensively on debt as a source of funding for their business operations. This is because debt financing is not primarily aimed at minimizing tax liabilities but rather at funding the company's operations (Lestari & Suharna, 2024). Moreover, companies consider that the benefits of tax avoidance through high levels of debt are not worth the risks it may entail. Excessive use of debt exposes companies to significant risks. A high debt ratio not only undermines the company's reputation in the eyes of investors but also increases the risk of default, which could ultimately threaten business continuity (Putri & Yuliafitri, 2024). A large amount of debt can trap a company in a heavy debt burden, making it difficult to escape (Liza et al., 2022).

498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503

The results of this study align with the findings of Nisa & Hidajat, (2024) and Yoshida & Handayani (2024), who concluded that fixed asset intensity has a significant influence on tax avoidance. In contrast, this study's results differ from those of Curry dan Fikri (2023); and Zanra and Zubir (2023), who found that thin capitalization does not impact tax avoidance.

504  
505

#### **4.5.3 The Effect of Transfer Pricing on Tax Avoidance**

506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521

The findings of this research demonstrate that the transfer pricing variable (X3) has an influence on tax avoidance. A higher transfer pricing value leads to a lower CETR value. A lower CETR indicates an increase in tax avoidance. Transfer pricing is a strategy used by companies to maximize profits by determining the price of goods or services produced by one entity within a company and sold to another entity within the same corporate group (Ramdhani et al., 2021). The primary motivation for implementing transfer pricing is to minimize the company's tax burden by shifting income to countries with lower tax rates (Suandy, 2011). In practice, companies with special relationships often conduct transactions by setting selling prices lower than market prices. This is intended so that the originating company records lower revenues, thereby reducing its tax liabilities. The company can transfer its profits to another entity located in a country with lower tax rates. The receiving company benefits from the lower tax rate, resulting in an overall reduction in the total tax burden for the entire group. This aligns with Stiglitz's (1986) general theory of tax avoidance, which states that differences in tax rates are an effective method to reduce tax burdens (Wijaya & Rahayu, 2021).

522  
523

The results of this study align with the findings of Ramdhani et al. (2021) and Heristiqomah & Asalam (2023), who concluded that fixed asset intensity has a significant influence on

524 tax avoidance. In contrast, this study's results differ from those of Prasetyo et al (2022),  
525 who found that fixed asset intensity does not impact tax avoidance.

526

527

#### 4. CONCLUSION

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

#### COMPETING INTERESTS

540

541

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

542

543

#### REFERENCES

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

Afifah, S. N., & Prastiwi, D. (2019). Pengaruh Thin Capitalization Terhadap Penghindaran Pajak. *AKUNESA: Jurnal Akuntansi Unesa*, 7(3), 1–7.

<http://jurnalmahasiswa.unesa.ac.id/index.php/jurnal-akuntansi/>

Ani, & Siregar, E. M. (2022). Influence Of Taxes, Leverage, And Bonus Mechanism On Transfer Pricing Decisions (Case Study On A Food And Drink Company Listed In Indonesia Stock Exchange Year 2016-2020). *Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3(6), 3337–3345.

<http://journal.yrpiiku.com/index.php/msej>

Arlinda, A. N., Yuliana, A., & Panggiarti, E. K. (2021). Analisis Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Transfer Pricing ANtara Perusahaan Konsolidasi di Indonesia. *Ilmu Sosial, Manajemen, Dan Akuntansi (JISMA)*, 2(1), 861–868.

Bandang, A., Tristan Sarodjie, K. N. ., Haerial, H, & Mahfiza, M. (2024). Pengaruh Profitabilitas , Thin Capitalization , Sales Growth dan Kepemilikan Institusional terhadap Tax Avoidance. 20. *Al-Buhuts*, 20(2), 376–392.

<https://doi.org/10.30603/ab.v20i2.5715>

Basri, Y. M., Waluyo, T. M., & Rusli. (2014). Determinant of Tax Avoidance on Manufacturing Companies. *The Indonesian Journal of Accounting Research*, 17(1), 36–56.

Cao X, Deng Q, Li X, Shao Z. Fine me if you can: Fixed asset intensity and enforcement of environmental regulations in China. *Regulation & Governance*. 2022 Oct;16(4):983-1004

Chintia, V., & Susanto, Y. K. (2022). Pengaruh Corporate Governance terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Media Ilmiah Akuntansi*, 10(1), 43–56.

<https://doi.org/10.34208/mia.v10i1.20>

Cledy, H., & Amin, M. N. (2020). Pengaruh Pajak, Ukuran Perusahaan, Profitabilitas Dan Leverage Terhadap Keputusan Perusahaan Untuk Melakukan Transfer. *Jurnal Akuntansi Trisakti*, 7(2), 247–264. <https://doi.org/10.25105/jat.v7i2.7454>

Curry, K., & Fikri, I. Z. (2023). Determinan Financial Distress, Thin Capitalization, Karakteristik Eksekutif, Dan Multinationality Terhadap Praktik Tax Avoidance Pada Perusahaan Properti Dan Real Estate. *Jurnal Informasi, Perpajakan, Akuntansi, Dan Keuangan Publik*, 18(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.25105/jipak.v18i1.12396>

Fitri, E., & Dwita, S. (2023). Pengaruh Transfer Pricing dan Thin Capitalization terhadap Praktik Penghindaran Pajak. 5(4), 1657–1673.

Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 25* (p. 490).

Hafizh, M. T., Africa, L. A., Hayam, U., & Perbanas, W. (2022). *Journal of Accounting And Financial Issue*. 3.

- 581 Heristiqomah, G., & Asalam, A. G. (2023). *Pengaruh Transfer Pricing, Intensitas Aset*  
582 *Tetap, Leverage, Dan Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure Terhadap Tax*  
583 *Avoidance*. 6(2), 326–337.
- 584 Hidayat, I., & Prawesty, P. (2022). The Effect Of Size, Roa, and Leverage on Tax  
585 Avoidance On Property & Real Estate Companies Listed in The Indonesia Stock  
586 Exchange For The 2018-2020 Period. *Amnesty: Jurnal Riset Perpajakan*, 4(1), 12–  
587 19.
- 588 Ismi, F. (2016). Pengaruh Thin Capitalization, Return on Asset, dan Corporate Pada  
589 Perusahaan Jakarta Islami Indeks (JII). *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Ekonomi Akuntansi*  
590 *(JIMEKA)*, 1(1), 150–165.
- 591 Istiqfarosita, M., & Abdani, F. (2022). English Political Connections and Thin Capitalization  
592 on Tax Avoidance During The Covid-19 Pandemic. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi*, 32(5), 1238.  
593 <https://doi.org/10.24843/eja.2022.v32.i05.p10>
- 594 Jumailah, V. (2020). Pengaruh Thin Capitalization dan Konservatisme Akuntansi terhadap  
595 Tax Avoidance dengan Kepemilikan Institusional sebagai Variabel Moderasi.  
596 *Management & Accounting Expose*, 3(1), 13–21.  
597 <https://doi.org/10.36441/mae.v3i1.132>
- 598 Kompas.com. (2020). *RI Diperkirakan Rugi Rp68,7 Triliun Akibat Penghindaran Pajak*.  
599 [https://money.kompas.com/read/2020/11/23/183000126/ri-diperkirakan-rugi-rp-68-](https://money.kompas.com/read/2020/11/23/183000126/ri-diperkirakan-rugi-rp-68-7-triliun-akibat-penghindaran-pajak)  
600 [7-triliun-akibat-penghindaran-pajak](https://money.kompas.com/read/2020/11/23/183000126/ri-diperkirakan-rugi-rp-68-7-triliun-akibat-penghindaran-pajak)
- 601 Laeladevi, A., Amah, N., & Ubaidillah, M. (2021). Pengaruh Intensitas Modal, Ukuran  
602 Perusahaan, Dan Profitabilitas Terhadap Penghindaran Pajak Dimoderasi Oleh  
603 Koneksi Politik. *Seminar Inovasi Majemen Bisnis Dan Akuntansi 3*.
- 604 Lestari, N. I., & Suharna. (2024). *Issn : 3025-9495*. 7(11).
- 605 Liza, M., Budianto, E., & Khasanah, U. (2022). Pengaruh Current Ratio Dan Debt To  
606 Equity Ratio Terhadap Return On Equity Pada Perusahaan Subsektor Batu Bara.  
607 *POINT: Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Manajemen*, 4(1), 15–26.  
608 <https://doi.org/10.46918/point.v4i1.1247>
- 609 Mangoting, A. O. F. dan Y. (2013). *Arabella. Opera*, 56(9 SUPPLEMENT), 10.  
610 <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt6wq448.53>
- 611 Millena, V., Ningsih, S. S., & Erion. (2023). Pengaruh Thin Capitalization , Capital Intensity  
612 , Dan Return on Asset Terhadap Tax Avoidance Pada Sektor Pertambangan Periode  
613 2017 - 2020 Di Bursa Efek Indonesia. *Liquidity; Jurnal Riset Akuntansi Dan*  
614 *Manajemen*, 12(1), 135–144.
- 615 Nasution, K. M. P., & Mulyani, S. D. (2020). Pengaruh Intensitas Aset Tetap Dan Intensitas  
616 Persediaan Terhadap Penghindaran Pajak Dengan Pertumbuhan Penjualan  
617 Sebagai Variabel Moderasi. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pakar, 2010*, 1–7.  
618 <https://doi.org/10.25105/pakar.v0i0.6871>
- 619 Ningsih, A. N., Irawati, W., Barli, H., & Hidayat, A. (2020). Analisis Karakteristik  
620 Perusahaan, Intensitas Aset Tetap dan Konservatisme Akuntansi terhadap Tax  
621 Avoidance. *EkoPreneur*, 1(2), 245–256.  
622 <http://openjournal.unpam.ac.id/index.php/EPR/article/view/5291>
- 623 Nisa, C., & Hidajat, S. (2024). Pengaruh Sales Growth , Financial Distress , dan Thin  
624 Capitalization terhadap Tax Avoidance pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Sektor Industri  
625 Barang Konsumsi yang terdaftar di BEI Periode 2018-2022 ). *Journal Of Social*  
626 *Science Research Volume*, 4(3), 17003–17016.
- 627 Nurhidayah, L. I., & Rahmawati, I. P. (2022). Menguak Praktik Penghindaran Pajak Pada  
628 Perusahaan Nonkeuangan. *Jurnal Akuntansi Multiparadigma*, 13(2), 393–403.  
629 <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jamal.2022.13.2.29>
- 630 Nurhidayah, L. P., Wibawaningsih, E. J., & Fahria, R. (2021). Pengaruh Leverage,  
631 Kepemilikan Institusional Dan Kualitas Audit Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Prosiding*  
632 *Biema: Business Management, Economic, and Accounting National Seminar*, 2(1),  
633 627–642.
- 634 Oktaviyani, R., & Munandar, A. (2017). Effect of Solvency, Sales Growth, and Institutional  
635 Ownership on Tax Avoidance with Profitability as Moderating Variables in Indonesian  
636 Property and Real Estate Companies. *Binus Business Review*, 8(3), 183.  
637 <https://doi.org/10.21512/bbr.v8i3.3622>
- 638 Paramita, A. S., Ardiansah, M. N., Delyuzar, R. A., & Dzulfikar, A. (2023). The Analysis of

- 639 Leverage, Return on Assets, and Firm Size on Tax Avoidance. *Accounting Analysis*  
640 *Journal*, 11(3), 186–195. <https://doi.org/10.15294/aaj.v11i3.61617>
- 641 Pohan, C. A. (2016). *Manajemen Perpajakan: Strategi Perencanaan Pajak dan Bisnis*. PT.  
642 Gramedia Pustaka Utama.  
643 <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=ptNCDwAAQBAJ&printsec=copyright#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- 644
- 645 Prasetyo, M. G., Ariefiara, D., & Sumilir. (2022). the Effect of Profitability , Transfer Pricing  
646 and Liquidity on Tax Avoidance. *Jurnal Akuinida*, 8(1), 14–24.
- 647 Pratiwi, H. A., & Pramita, Y. D. (2021). Pengaruh Srategi Bisnis, Transfer Pricing, Koneksi  
648 Politik, dan Intensitas Aset Tetap terhadap Tax Avoidance (Studi Empiris pada  
649 Perusahaan Manufaktur yang terdaftar di BEI 2015 – 2019). *Borobudur Accounting*  
650 *Review*, 1(2), 196–209. <https://doi.org/10.31603/bacr.6365>
- 651 Pratiwi, Y. E., & Oktaviani, R. M. (2021). PERSPEKTIF LEVERAGE, CAPITAL  
652 INTENSITY, DAN MANAJEMEN LABA TERHADAP TAX AGREESIVENESS.  
653 *Атеросклероз*, 17(1), 52–61.
- 654 Pravasanti, Y. A. (2020). *Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kepatuhan Wajib*  
655 *Pajak dalam Membayar Pajak Bumi dan Bangunan*. 21(1), 142–151.
- 656 Prihatini, C., & Amin, M. N. (2022). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Leverage, Ukuran Perusahaan,  
657 Intensitas Aset Tetap Dan Kualitas Audit Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Jurnal Ekonomi*  
658 *Trisakti*, 2(2), 1505–1516. <https://doi.org/10.25105/jet.v2i2.14669>
- 659 Putri, S. A., & Yuliafitri, I. (2024). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Leverage, Pertumbuhan  
660 Penjualan dan Ukuran Perusahaan terhadap Penghindaran Pajak. *Jurnal Penelitian*  
661 *Inovatif*, 4(3), 1499–1514. <https://doi.org/10.54082/jupin.543>
- 662 Rahmadhani, G., & Lastanti, H. S. (2024). Pengaruh Thin Capitalization dan Transfer  
663 Pricing Terhadap Tax Avoidance dengan Kepemilikan Instutisional sebagai Variabel  
664 Moderasi. *Jurnal Pajak & Bisnis*, 5(1), 35–47.
- 665 Ramdhani, M. D., Fitria, Y. Z. N., & Rachman, A. A. (2021). The Effect of Transfer Pricing  
666 on Tax Avoidance. *Accounting and Finance Studies*, 2(2), 79–94.  
667 <https://doi.org/10.47153/afs22.3742022>
- 668 Ravelly, T. A., & Soetardjo, M. N. (2023). Pengaruh Financial Distress, Thin  
669 Capitalization dan Capital Intensity Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Klabat Accounting*  
670 *Review*, 4(1), 55. <https://doi.org/10.60090/kar.v4i1.921.55-78>
- 671 Rindiani, S. N. R., & Asalam, A. G. (2022). Pengaruh Intensitas Aset Tetap, Kompensasi  
672 Rugi Fiskal, dan Koneksi Politik Terhadap Tax Avoidance (Studi Empiris Pada  
673 Perusahaan Manufaktur yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2016-2020).  
674 *SEIKO: Journal of Management & Business*, 4(3), 303–312.  
675 <https://doi.org/10.37531/sejaman.v4i3.2526>
- 676 Rochmah, E. R. N., & Oktaviani, R. M. (2021). Pengaruh Leverage, Intensitas Aset Tetap,  
677 Dan Ukuran Perusahaan Terhadap Agresivitas Pajak. *Kompak:Jurnal Ilmiah*  
678 *Komputerisasi Akuntansi*, 14(2), 417–427.  
679 <https://doi.org/10.51903/kompak.v14i2.573>
- 680 Rosdiani, N., & Hidayat, A. (2020). Pengaruh Derivatif Keuangan, Konservatisme  
681 Akuntansi dan Intensitas Aset Tetap terhadap Penghindaran Pajak. *Journal of*  
682 *Technopreneurship on Economics and Business Review*, 1(2), 131–143.  
683 <https://doi.org/10.37195/jtebr.v1i2.43>
- 684 Rusdiyanti, W., & Nurhayati. (2024). *Pengaruh Good Corporate Governance , Csr*  
685 *Disclosure , Dan Transfer Pricing Terhadap*. 5(2), 476–485.
- 686 Setiawan, M., Rahardian, M., Helmina, A., & Respati, N. W. (2024). Pengaruh Inventory  
687 Intensity, Thin Capitalization, Current Ratio dan Pemeriksaan Pajak Terhadap Tax  
688 Avoidance (Studi Empiris Pada Perusahaan Perdagangan Besar di Kantor  
689 Pelayanan Pajak Madya Banjarmasin Periode 2020). *Edunomics Journal*, 5(1), 1–  
690 16.
- 691 Setyorini, F., & Nurhayati, I. (2022). Pengaruh Pajak ( ETR ), Tunneling Incentive ( TNC ),  
692 Mekanisme Bonus ( ITRENDLB ) Dan Firm Size ( Size ) Terhadap Keputusan  
693 Transfer Pricing. *JIMAT (Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Akuntansi)*, 13, 233–242.
- 694 Suandy, E. (2011). *Perencanaan Pajak*. Salemba Empat.
- 695 Suciati, S. E., Sastri, E. T., Studi, P., Akuntansi, S., Ekonomi, F., Bisnis, D., Pamulang, U.,  
696 & Perusahaan, U. (2024). *PENGARUH TRANSFER PRICING , UMUR*

- 697            *PERUSAHAAN , DAN Makmur Tbk ( ICBP ) dengan PT Indofood Sukses Makmur*  
698            *Tbk ( INDF ). Berdasarkan laporan. 5(3), 921–935.*
- 699            Sugianto, D. (2019). Mengenal soal Penghindaran Pajak yang Dituduhkan ke Adaro. *Detik*  
700            *Finance*. [https://finance.detik.com/berita-ekonomi-bisnis/d-4612708/mengenal-soal-](https://finance.detik.com/berita-ekonomi-bisnis/d-4612708/mengenal-soal-penghindaran-pajak-yang-dituduhkan-ke-adaro)  
701            [penghindaran-pajak-yang-dituduhkan-ke-adaro](https://finance.detik.com/berita-ekonomi-bisnis/d-4612708/mengenal-soal-penghindaran-pajak-yang-dituduhkan-ke-adaro)
- 702            Sugiharti, & Machdar, N. M. (2023). Transfer Pricing Dan Tax Avoidance: Tinjauan  
703            Literatur Tentang Perspektif Global. *Jurnal Audit Dan Perpajakan (JAP)*, 3(2), 26–  
704            33. <https://jurnal.itscience.org/index.php/jap/article/view/2982>
- 705            Sumekar, D. R., Mulyani, S., & Nuridah, S. (2023). Analisis Pengaruh Thin Capitalization,  
706            Komite Audit Dan Kepemilikan Institusional Terhadap Tax Avoidance Pada  
707            Perusahaan Sektor Keuangan Di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2020-2022.  
708            *INNOVATIVE: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 3(5), 4533–4541. [https://j-](https://j-innovative.org/index.php/Innovative)  
709            [innovative.org/index.php/Innovative](https://j-innovative.org/index.php/Innovative)
- 710            Uliandari, P. D., Juitania, & Purwasih, D. (2021). Pengaruh Intensitas Aset Tetap dan  
711            Sales Growth Terhadap Tax Avoidance Dengan Ukuran Perusahaan Sebagai  
712            Variabel Moderasi. *E-Jurnal Universitas Pamulang*, 1(1), 9.
- 713            Videya, A. A., & Irawati, W. (2022). Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Penjualan, Corporate Social  
714            Responsibility, Intensitas Aset Tetap, Dan Intensitas Persediaan Terhadap Tax  
715            Avoidance. *Jurnal Akuntansi Barelang*, 7(1), 1–15.  
716            <https://doi.org/10.33884/jab.v7i1.6340>
- 717            Wahyuda, D. A., Putri, V. R., & Triastuti, M. R. (2024). *PENGARUH TAX PLANNING DAN*  
718            *THIN CAPITALIZATION TERHADAP TAX AVOIDANCE*. 2(2), 491–506.
- 719            Wijaya, S., & Rahayu, F. D. (2021). Pengaruh Agresivitas Transfer Pricing, Penggunaan  
720            Negara Lindung Pajak, Dan Kepemilikan Institusional Terhadap Penghindaran  
721            Pajak. *Jurnal Informasi, Perpajakan, Akuntansi, Dan Keuangan Publik*, 16(2), 245–  
722            264. <https://doi.org/10.25105/jipak.v16i2.9257>
- 723            Yohana, B., Darmastuti, D., & Widyastuti, S. (2022). Penghindaran Pajak Di Indonesia:  
724            Pengaruh Transfer Pricing dan Customer Concentration Dimoderasi Oleh Peran  
725            Komisaris Independen. *Reviu Akuntansi Dan Bisnis Indonesia*, 6(1), 112–129.  
726            <https://doi.org/10.18196/rabin.v6i1.13468>
- 727            Yoshida, D., & Handayani, Y. D. (2024). *Open Access The Effect of Thin Capitalization ,*  
728            *Capital Intensity , Financial Distress and Independent Commissioners on Tax*  
729            *Avoidance*. 08, 1–8.
- 730            Zanra, S. W., & Zubir. (2023). Pengaruh Multinationality, Tax Haven, Thin Capitalization,  
731            dan Firm Size terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Jurnal IAKP*, 4(2), 142–156.
- 732