



INFLUENCE OF INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONERS, AUDIT COMMITTEE, INSTITUTIONAL OWNERSHIP, AND CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ON TAX AVOIDANCE

Apip

Vocational School, Diponegoro University, Indonesia
(apip746@gmail.com)

Dwi Ratmono

Vocational School, Diponegoro University, Indonesia
(dwiratmono@lecturer.undip.ac.id)

Rossiana Aulia Shinta Dewi

Economica and Business Faculty, Diponegoro University, Indonesia
(rossianaauliashintaa@students.undip.ac.id)

ABSTRACT

Introduction/Main Objectives: This study aims to examine the effect of Good Corporate Governance (GCG) proxied by Independent Commissioners, Audit Committee, and Institutional Ownership, as well as Corporate Social Responsibility proxied by the Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure Index (CSRDI) measured based on the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) 4.0 as many as 91 indicators

Background Problems: Tax avoidance remains a major concern in Indonesia's fiscal system, as companies seek to legally minimize their tax burdens. This study aims to answer the research question: How do Independent Commissioners, Audit Committees, Institutional Ownership, and Corporate Social Responsibility affect tax avoidance in healthcare companies?

Novelty: This research contributes by focusing on the healthcare sub-sector manufacturing companies in the 2019-2022 period, combining GCG and CSR factors within a single analytical model that has been underexplored in prior studies.



Research Methods: This study uses secondary data taken from the population of health companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange vulnerable for a period of 4 years, namely 2019-2022 as many as 33 companies. The number of samples in this study amounted to 13 companies with a total sample of 52 data that had been selected using purposive sampling technique. The method used in this research is multiple linear regression assisted by Statistical Program for Social Science (SPSS) Version 25 software.

Findings/Results: The results of this research state that Independent Commissioners, Audit Committees, Institutional Ownership, and Corporate Social Responsibility partially have a significant positive effect on Tax Avoidance in healthcare companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange for the 2019-2022 period.

Conclusion: The results of this research are consistent with previous research which shows that Independent Commissioners, Audit Committees, Institutional Ownership, and Corporate Social Responsibility have an influence on agents' Tax Avoidance practices.

Implementation Potential: The findings provide implications for regulators to strengthen governance and CSR policies and for academics to enhance understanding of ethical tax practices.

Keywords: *Good Corporate Governance;Independent Commissioner;Audit Committee; Institutional Ownership;Corporate Social Responsibility;Tax Avoidance*

JEL Classification: (list the relevant JEL codes separated by commas, refer to <https://www.aeaweb.org/jel/guide/jel.php>)

1. INTRODUCTION

Tax sector revenue plays an important role in improving national development. Especially to support and ensure the sustainability of government programs aimed at improving the welfare and prosperity of the community. According to the economic perspective, taxes are a transfer of resources from the private sector to the public sector (Hamidah et al., 2023). The tax revenue obtained will later be used to finance the needs of state spending which can be allocated according to its function, including being used for defense, public services, economy, health, and others.

Of course, in its implementation, the government hopes that taxpayers will be able to carry out their obligations as much as possible in order to increase state revenue. Contrary for taxpayers

who actually want significant profits with the lowest tax burden. The greater the income or net profit of the taxpayer, the greater the tax burden that must be paid. The difference in interests is one of the factors for taxpayers to reduce the amount of tax payments, both legally and illegally.

Tax avoidance is a taxpayer strategy to minimize the amount of tax burden owed by the company by taking advantage of the weaknesses of the applicable tax laws and provisions legally (Indradi & Sumantri, 2020). Tax avoidance behavior is considered not contrary to legal norms, and is included in the view of positive law. According to the State of Tax Justice report in 2020, Indonesia ranks fourth in Asia in tax avoidance cases under China, India, and Japan (Cobham et al., 2020).

Healthcare companies are one of the taxpayers that make a large contribution to the taxation sector. The Central Bureau of Statistics noted that the GDP in 2022 at constant prices (ADHK) of the chemical, pharmaceutical and traditional medicine industries amounted to IDR 235.48 Trillion, an increase of 0.69% from 2021 of IDR 233.87 Trillion (Sadya, 2023). It is recorded that the potential state revenue through the pharmaceutical sector is IDR 32 Trillion to IDR 40 Trillion, with the percentage obtained by the government is only 40% (Sihombing & Dalimunthe, 2022).

The level of profit obtained by pharmaceutical companies is expected to be proportional to the tax burden paid by the company. Based on data obtained from the Central Bureau of Statistics, state revenue in 2017-2020 experienced a significant increase. Especially in 2019-2020, where tax revenue increased sharply to more than Rp1,300 billion. Meanwhile, in 2021 tax revenue has decreased. The factor in the decline in tax revenue is due to economic contraction and incentives, but it can also be caused by the low level of taxpayer compliance.

Through data obtained from the 2016 financial statements or annual reports in the appendix to the profit and loss statement of PT Pyridam Farma Tbk, it shows that the total income tax expense obtained by PT Pyridam Farma Tbk, is Rp. 1,907,090,128 with profit before tax obtained by the company amounting to Rp. 7,053,407,169. This results in a lower CETR figure of 21% compared to the corporate income tax rate applicable in Indonesia in 2016 which is 25%.

From the case example above, there are several factors that influence a company to take tax avoidance actions. Based on previous research conducted by (Mahdiana & Amin, 2020) shows that profitability and leverage affect tax avoidance, while company size and sales growth have no

effect on tax avoidance. Other factors that can affect tax avoidance are Good Corporate Governance and Corporate Social Responsibility.

1.1 Problem Formulation

a. Recognition of the problem and its significance

Tax avoidance has become a persistent issue that threatens the effectiveness of tax collection in Indonesia. Although tax avoidance is a legal practice, its increasing frequency among corporate taxpayers—especially healthcare companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX)—raises concerns about transparency and corporate responsibility. According to the 2020 State of Tax Justice Report, Indonesia ranked fourth in Asia for tax avoidance, highlighting the urgency of addressing this issue. Healthcare companies contribute significantly to national revenue; however, discrepancies between corporate profits and tax payments indicate the potential for aggressive tax avoidance behavior. Therefore, understanding the influence of corporate governance mechanisms and social responsibility on tax avoidance is essential to enhance compliance and uphold corporate integrity.

b. Research questions

1. Does the Independent Commissioner have an effect on tax avoidance in healthcare sub-sector manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange during the period 2019-2022?
2. Does the Audit Committee have an effect on tax avoidance in healthcare sub-sector manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange during the period 2019-2022?
3. Does Institutional Ownership have an effect on tax avoidance in healthcare sub-sector manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange during the period 2019-2022?
4. Does Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) have an effect on tax avoidance in healthcare sub-sector manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange during the period 2019-2022?

c. Complexity and novelty

This study integrates both Good Corporate Governance (GCG) components—Independent Commissioners, Audit Committee, and Institutional Ownership—and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) to examine their combined effects on tax avoidance. While many prior studies explored these variables separately or across different sectors, limited research focuses on the healthcare sector in Indonesia, particularly during the 2019–2022 period, when global health and financial crises may have influenced corporate tax behavior. The novelty of this research lies in its focus on healthcare companies and the use of the CSR Disclosure Index (GRI 4.0) comprising 91 indicators to measure CSR comprehensively.

d. Research objectives

The objectives of this study are:

1. To analyze the effect of Independent Commissioners on tax avoidance in healthcare sub-sector manufacturing companies listed on the IDX during 2019–2022.
2. To examine the effect of the Audit Committee on tax avoidance in healthcare sub-sector manufacturing companies listed on the IDX during 2019–2022.
3. To determine the effect of Institutional Ownership on tax avoidance in healthcare sub-sector manufacturing companies listed on the IDX during 2019–2022.
4. To evaluate the effect of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) on tax avoidance in healthcare sub-sector manufacturing companies listed on the IDX during 2019–2022.

1.2 Subsection

This subsection elaborates the theoretical and empirical foundation supporting the study. It discusses the relevance of agency theory in explaining the relationship between company management (agents) and shareholders (principals) concerning tax avoidance practices. It also reviews prior research findings on the influence of corporate governance mechanisms and CSR on tax avoidance to build the basis for hypothesis formulation.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Agency Theory

(Jensen & Meckling, 1976) defines agency theory as an arrangement between the principal and the agent who carries out the company's operational tasks to make decisions on behalf of the principal. The manager (agent) is tasked with managing the company, and the principal is the party who assigns the agent to manage the company. The difference in objectives in making the desired decision can lead to a conflict between the principal and the agent.

The relationship between agency theory and corporate governance arises in relation to the principal, namely to avoid agency problems that occur between the agent and the principal. So that the concept of corporate governance is useful for regulating agents so as not to harm the principal, and protect the principal due to deviant behavior that has been carried out by the agent (Haryanti, 2019).

Agency theory is related to tax avoidance practices, because agency theory defines the relationship between stakeholders or shareholders (principal) and management (agent) who work together to achieve company profits. Where the agent has more information than the principal regarding the condition of the company.

Tax Avoidance

According to (C. A. Pohan, 2019) tax avoidance is a taxpayer activity to avoid paying taxes safely and legally by not violating applicable tax provisions (not contrary to the law). The methods and techniques and strategies applied usually utilize the loopholes (gray areas) in tax laws and regulations to reduce the tax burden that must be paid. Black's Law Dictionary defines tax avoidance as a strategy to reduce the tax payable by utilizing loopholes in tax avoidance without violating tax rules.

There are two tax avoidance efforts that are often carried out by taxpayers to minimize their tax burden, namely in a good way and still meet the provisions of tax law (lawfull) known as tax avoidance, and those that violate regulations (unlawful) known as tax evasion. Tax avoidance, and those that violate regulations (unlawful) are known as tax evasion. Tax avoidance is an engineering of tax affairs that still remains within the framework of tax provisions (lawfull) (Puspita & Febrianti, 2017).



Independent Commissioner

According to the National Committee for Corporate Governance Policy, independent commissioners are members of the board of commissioners who have no relationship with the directors or other members of the board of commissioners, free from business interests that could affect their objectivity for the benefit of the company. Independent commissioners are tasked with making an effective contribution to the quality of the company's financial statements, as well as ensuring reports are free from fraud. Another role of independent commissioners is to provide advice or suggestions and mediate internal managers in the event of a conflict (Pratomo & Rana, 2021).

Based on the decision of the board of directors of the Jakarta Stock Exchange Kep-315/BEJ/062000, the number of independent commissioners must be proportional to the number of shares owned by non-controlling shareholders with a minimum number of independent commissioners of 30% of the total commissioners (H. T. Pohan, 2008). Independent commissioners are expected to help prevent opportunistic behavior by management, as well as supervise including in the tax aspects of the company (Dewi & Oktaviani, 2021).

Audit Committee

According to (Puradiredja in Shanti, 2020) the audit committee was formed with the aim of strengthening and overseeing the financial reporting process, the audit process, risk management, and the implementation of Good corporate governance by the company. In public companies, the audit committee has an important role in implementing Good Corporate Governance, because the audit committee is the "eyes" and "ears" of the board of commissioners in overseeing the performance of a company.

Based on the decision of the board of directors of the Jakarta Stock Exchange Kep-315/BEJ/062000, the audit committee is a committee formed by the board of commissioners, and its members can be dismissed by the board of commissioners. Audit committee members who have expertise and skills in accounting or finance are considered capable of having a great opportunity to take tax avoidance actions, because the audit committee better understands the strategies or opportunities from the loop holes that exist in tax regulations:



Institutional Ownership

Institutional ownership is the proportion of shares owned by institutions and blockholder ownership, where individual ownership is above 5% and is not included in the managerial ownership category (H. T. Pohan, 2008). In the company, institutional ownership acts as a supervisor of the operations of a company, and authorizes management to carry out its profession in accordance with the company's predetermined financial policies.

According to (Sari & Martini) in (Krisna, 2019) defines that institutional ownership is the proportion of share ownership by institutions such as pension fund companies and insurance companies that manage funds on behalf of others. Institutional ownership has a source of power which means that it can be two different parts, namely as a supporter of management actions if it benefits the company, and a threat to management if the actions taken harm the company because it prioritizes personal interests.

Corporate Social Responsibility

According to The World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) In fox in (Said, 2018) Corporate Social Responsibility or corporate social responsibility, is a company's commitment to contribute to sustainable economic development, both for company employees, employee families, and the community in order to improve the quality of life that is beneficial. The community is expected to be involved in the company's development and empowerment efforts, in order to create independence and prosperity through programs from Corporate Social Responsibility.

Corporate Social Responsibility activities are related to Good Corporate Governance, because companies need a good order of rules to regulate the interests of the company and all stakeholders. Corporate Social Responsibility strategy can be a company strategy to realize long-term success. If the Corporate Social Responsibility program run by the company is right on target and in accordance with the needs of the community, it will create social trust from the public to the company, thus creating a positive reputation for the company.

HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Independent commissioners are an important part of implementing policies according to the principles of Good Corporate Governance, which are included in the board of commissioners

(Pratomo & Rana, 2021). (Jensen & Meckling, 1976) in agency theory explains that the principal (independent commissioner) is tasked with supervising the agent (management). The presence of independent commissioners in the company is able to reduce agency problems because independent commissioners play a role in the decision-making process in favor of minority shareholders and parties related to the company, so as to minimize agency conflicts.

Supervision by independent commissioners will be a consideration for agents to reduce the tax burden that should be paid by doing tax avoidance, because tax avoidance is one of the legal actions that does not violate tax regulations in optimizing taxes paid. Research conducted by (Prasetyo & Primasari, 2021) and (Sari et al., 2020) states that independent commissioners have a significant positive effect on tax avoidance. The more the number of independent commissioners, the tighter and higher the supervision carried out, so that the risk and level of corporate tax avoidance will increase. Based on this description, the hypothesis proposed in this study is as follows.

H1: Independent Commissioners have a positive effect on Tax Avoidance

The audit committee acts as a company organization whose job is to assist the independent board of commissioners to oversee the company's performance in accordance with the principles of corporate governance. Companies need an audit committee to control and control the process of preparing financial statements so that they are presented in accordance with applicable accounting principles (Tahilia et al., 2022). Agency theory explains that agency problems can occur due to information asymmetry, so an audit committee with integrity is needed in managing or overseeing the preparation of financial reports that can minimize illegal actions by agents in a company.

In conducting supervision, the audit committee will supervise the company's performance to the maximum extent to maintain the credibility and integrity of the company's profits through the published financial statements, so that they are in accordance with applicable accounting standards. Research conducted by (Ginting & Kartika, 2023) and (Farkhatul et al., 2022) shows the results that the audit committee has a significant positive effect on tax avoidance. Thus, the greater the number of audit committees, the lower the illegal actions in reducing the tax burden,

because the agent will minimize the company's tax burden in a legal way, namely tax avoidance. Based on this description, the hypothesis proposed in this study is as follows.

H2: Audit Committee has a positive effect on Tax Avoidance

Institutional ownership is share ownership owned by institutions such as companies, mutual funds, pension funds, and others in a large amount. These financial institutions can influence corporate policy and governance, as well as changes in stock prices. Institutional ownership will encourage managers to always show good performance in front of shareholders. Agency theory explains that institutional ownership is part of the Good Corporate Governance hierarchy which has an important role in minimizing agency conflicts between agents (management) and principal owners.

Companies that have high institutional ownership will be more aggressive in reducing their tax reporting. The results of research by (Amelia et al., 2022) and (Murtina et al., 2020) show the results that institutional ownership has a significant positive effect on tax avoidance. Which means that the large number of institutional investor ownership can increase the supervisory function to the agent to be aggressive in obtaining profits, so that tax avoidance increases. Based on this description, the hypothesis proposed in this study is as follows.

H3: Institutional Ownership has a positive effect on Tax Avoidance

Corporate Social Responsibility is defined as the commitment of business actors to make a positive contribution by acting ethically, operating legally to improve the quality of life of employees, the wider community, and the local community (Ningtyas et al., 2022). Agency theory states that the principal gives the agent the right to manage the company's operations and make decisions. The amount of Corporate Social Responsibility disclosure of a company can also be influenced by the amount of managerial ownership.

Companies have an obligation to pay taxes by reducing company profits. One way that can be done is to utilize Corporate Social Responsibility, where in Corporate Social Responsibility there are costs that can be deducted in total profit so that the tax burden paid by the company becomes lower. Research conducted by (Laksmi P et al., 2023) and (Setyawan, 2021) shows that Corporate Social Responsibility has a significant positive effect on tax avoidance. This means that

the higher the company discloses Corporate Social Responsibility, the higher the company's level of tax avoidance. Based on this description, the hypothesis proposed in this study is as follows.

H4: Corporate Social Responsibility has a positive effect on Tax Avoidance

3. METHOD

This study uses quantitative research methods with the data used is secondary data obtained from the company's annual report and sustainability report which can be accessed through the website www.idx.co.id, or the official website of each company. The population in this study are healthcare sub-sector manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) for the 2019-2022 period, with the number of samples used being 13 companies out of 33 company populations. Sampling is determined through purposive sampling method as in the following table.

Table 1. Sample Selection Criteria

No.	Sample Criteria	Total
	Healthcare companies listed on the IDX for the period 2019-2022	33
1	Healthcare companies that did not publish annual reports in the period 2019-2022	(13)
2	Healthcare companies that incurred losses in the 2019-2022 period	(6)
3	Healthcare companies that do not have complete data according to the variables used	(1)
	Number of company samples (n)	13
	Sample observations n x research period (13 x 4)	52

Source : Bursa Efek Indonesia (2015)

Tax Avoidance

Tax avoidance can be measured by the Current ETR ratio, namely current income tax divided by total audited profit before tax (Hanlon & Heitzman, 2010). The Current ETR value is inversely proportional to tax avoidance, so that if the company's Current ETR value is high, the company's tax avoidance level is low, and vice versa. In this study, the dependent variable is measured using the Current ETR (CETR) ratio proposed by (Hanlon & Heitzman, 2010) using the following formula:

$$\text{Current ETR} = \frac{\text{Current Tax Expense}}{\text{Pre - Tax Income}}$$

Independent Commissioner

Public companies are required to have independent commissioners, with a board of commissioners consisting of more than 2 (two) people, and the percentage of independent commissioners must be at least 30% of the total number of members of the board of commissioners (Wahyuningrum, 2018). The number of independent commissioners and the total board of commissioners can be seen in the company's general information section or in the company's annual report in the audited financial statements. In this study, the independent commissioner variable (INDP) is calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{INDP} = \frac{\text{Number of Independent Commissioners}}{\text{Total Board of Commissioners}} \times 100\%$$

Audit Committee

Based on Bapepam Regulation through Circular Letter No.SE-03 / PM / 2000 states that each public company consists of at least 3 people and 1 of them is an independent commissioner who doubles as chairman of the audit committee (Hasnati, 2014: 49). The number of audit committees is seen in the company information section or the company's annual appendix of the audited financial statements. In this study, the audit committee variable (KA) is calculated using the following formula:

$$KA = \sum \text{Audit Committee}$$

Institutional Ownership

Companies with greater share ownership by institutions or institutions, tend to be supervised by institutional investors in management performance to obtain the desired profit (Mulyani et al., 2018). Institutional ownership is measured by the percentage of institutional shares, taking into account the number of shares available for trading. In this study, the institutional ownership variable (KI) is calculated using the following formula:

$$INST = \frac{\text{Total Institutional}}{\text{Total Shares Outstanding}} \times 100\%$$

Corporate Social Responsibility

In this study, CSR is proxied by the CSR Disclosure Index (CSRDI) disclosure ratio. CSR disclosure indicators issued by the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) use a checklist table. With GRI used is GRI 4.0 as many as 91 indicators. In this study, the variable Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure Index (CSRDI) is calculated using the following formula:

$$CSRDI_i = \sum \frac{X_i}{n}$$

Description

CSRDI_i : Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure Index

$\sum X_i$: Number of indicators worth 1 in company i

n : Number of GRI 4.0 CSR disclosure indicators (91 indicators)

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Tabel 2. Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
INDP	52	0,33	0,67	0,4433	0,09899
KA	52	3,00	4,00	3,0385	0,19418
INST	52	0,14	1,00	0,6603	0,27878
CSR	52	0,15	0,57	0,3614	0,10695
CETR	52	0,18	0,38	0,2450	0,04686
Valid N (listwise)	52				

Source: Processed by researchers, 2024

In descriptive statistical analysis, the independent commissioner variable (INDP) has an average (mean) value of 0.4433. The minimum value is 0.33 or around 33% and the maximum value is 0.67 or around 67%, and the standard deviation value is 0.9899. The audit committee variable (KA) has a positive average (mean) value of 3.0385. The audit committee variable has a minimum value of 3.00 and a maximum value of 4.00, and a standard deviation value of 0.19418. Institutional ownership variable (INST) has a positive average (mean) value of 0.6603 or around 66%. The institutional ownership variable has a minimum value of 0.14 or around 14% and a maximum value of 1.00 or around 100%, and a standard deviation value of 0.27878. The Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) variable has a positive average (mean) value of 0.3614 or around 36%. The minimum value of the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) variable is 0.15 or around 15% and the maximum value is 0.57 or around 57%, and the standard deviation value is 0.10695. The tax avoidance variable (CETR) has a positive average (mean) value of 0.2450 or around 24%. The minimum value of the tax avoidance variable (CETR) is 0.18 or around 18% and the maximum value is 0.38 or around 38%, and the standard deviation value is 0.04686.

Tabel 3. Normality Test

<i>One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test</i>	
Unstandardized Residual	
N	52
Normal	Mean 0
Parameters ^{a,b}	Std. Deviation 0,03596193
Most Extreme	Absolute 0,098
Differences	Positive 0,098
	Negative -0,065
Test Statistic	0,098
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	,200 ^{c,d}

Source: Processed by researchers, 2024

The normality test results above show that the residual significance value obtained is 0.200, a significance value of $0.200 > 0.05$, which means that the normality assumption is met because the residual data is normally distributed.

Tabel 4. Autocorrelation Test Durbin-Watson Test

Model Summary ^b					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	,641 ^a	0,411	0,361	0,03746	1,922

a. Predictors: (Constant), CSR, INST, KA, INDP
b. Dependent Variable: CETR

Source: Processed by researchers, 2024

Based on the Durbin-Watson test results above, it is known that the value $du < dw < 4 - du$ and obtained $1.722 < 1.922 < 2.277$. So it can be concluded that the regression model does not occur autocorrelation, and this research data is free from autocorrelation problems.

Tabel 5. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
	(Constant)	0,713	0,101		7,072	0,000
1	INDP	-0,202	0,058	-0,426	-3,471	0,001
	KA	-0,088	0,028	-0,366	-3,169	0,003
	INST	-0,056	0,019	-0,334	-2,898	0,006
	CSR	-0,202	0,053	-0,462	-3,845	0,000

a. Dependent Variable: CETR

Source: Processed by researchers, 2024

Based on the results of the SPSS output from the multiple linear regression analysis above, the results of the multiple linear regression analysis equation are as follows:

$$\text{CETR} = 0.713 - 0.202 \text{ INDP} - 0.088 \text{ KA} - 0.056 \text{ INST} - 0.202 \text{ CSRDI}$$

Tabel 6. Test Coefficient of Determination (R²)

Model Summary ^b				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,641 ^a	0,411	0,361	0,03746

a. Predictors: (Constant), CSR, INST, KA, INDP

b. Dependent Variable: CETR

Source: Processed by researchers, 2024

Based on the SPSS output above, it is known that the coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.361 or 36.1%, meaning that the influence of the independent commissioner variable (INDP), audit committee (KA), institutional ownership (INST), and corporate social responsibility (CSR) on the dependent variable tax avoidance (CETR) is 36.1%.

Tabel 7. F Statistical Test

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	0,046	4	0,012	8,201	,000 ^b
	Residual	0,066	47	0,001		
	Total	0,112	51			

a. Dependent Variable: CETR
b. Predictors: (Constant), CSR, INST, KA, INDP

Source: Processed by researchers, 2024

Based on the results of the F statistical test, the significance value in the F test is 0.000. While the F-count value is 8.201 and the F-table value is 2.57 or $F\text{-count} > F\text{-table}$ with a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$, then H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. This means that the independent commissioner variable (INDP), audit committee (KA), institutional ownership (INST), and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) simultaneously have a significant effect on the tax avoidance variable (CETR).

Tabel 8. T Statistical Test

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0,713	0,101		7,072	0,000
	INDP	-0,202	0,058	-0,426	-3,471	0,001
	KA	-0,088	0,028	-0,366	-3,169	0,003

INST	-0,056	0,019	-0,334	-2,898	0,006
CSR	-0,202	0,053	-0,462	-3,845	0,000
a. Dependent Variable: CETR					

Source: Processed by researchers, 2024

Based on the table of t statistical test results above, it can be explained as follows.

- a. Partial test on the independent commissioner variable (INDP) on tax avoidance (CETR) shows the t-count value of 3.471 and the t table value of 1.67793 or $t \text{ count} > t \text{ table}$. While the significance value is 0.001 so that $P < 0.05$. Based on this, it can be proven that H1 is accepted, meaning that the independent commissioner variable in healthcare companies has a significant influence on the dependent variable tax avoidance.
- b. Partial test on the audit committee variable (KA) on tax avoidance (CETR) shows the t- count value of 3.169 and the t table value of 1.67793 or $t \text{ count} > t \text{ table}$. While the significance value is 0.003 so that $P < 0.05$. Based on this, it can be proven that H2 is accepted, meaning that the audit committee variable in healthcare companies has a significant effect on the dependent variable tax avoidance.
- c. Partial test on the institutional ownership variable (INST) on tax avoidance (CETR) shows the t-count value of 2.898 and the t table value of 1.67793 or $t \text{ count} > t \text{ table}$. While the significance value is 0.006 so that $P < 0.05$. Based on this, it can be proven that H3 is accepted, meaning that the institutional ownership variable of healthcare companies has a significant influence on the dependent variable tax avoidance.
- d. Partial test on the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) variable on tax avoidance (CETR) shows the t-count value of 3.845 and the t table value of 1.67793 or $t \text{ count} > t \text{ table}$. While the significance value is 0.000 so that $P < 0.05$. Based on this, it can be proven that H4 is accepted, meaning that the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) variable in healthcare companies has a significant effect on the dependent variable tax avoidance

The Effect of Independent Commissioners on Tax Avoidance

Based on the results of the analysis of the independent commissioner variable hypothesis test, it can be seen that the t-count value is 3.471 and the t-table is 1.67793 or the t-count value > t-table, and the significance value is 0.001 ($0.001 < 0.05$). The regression coefficient value of the independent commissioner variable is -0.202, which means that independent commissioners have a significant negative effect on tax avoidance (CETR). The more the number of independent commissioners, the lower the CETR value will be. The lower the CETR value, the more aggressive the tax avoidance actions taken by the company, and vice versa. With this it can be concluded that **H1 is accepted**, where independent commissioners have a significant positive effect on tax avoidance.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by (Prasetyo & Primasari, 2021) and (Sari et al., 2020) which state that independent commissioners have a positive effect on tax avoidance. The greater the percentage of independent commissioners, the higher the level of tax avoidance. Where company owners want low tax payments with maximum profits legally with tax avoidance. However, the results of this study are not in line with research conducted by (Ginting & Kartika, 2023) and (Kirana & Sundari, 2022) which shows that independent commissioners have no effect on tax avoidance, namely the large proportion of independent commissioners in a company cannot reduce or prevent tax avoidance.

The Effect of Audit Committee on Tax Avoidance

Based on the results of the analysis of the audit committee variable hypothesis test, it can be seen that the t-count value is 3.169 and the t-table is 1.67793 or the t-count value > t-table, and the significance value is 0.003 ($0.003 < 0.05$). The regression coefficient value of the audit committee variable is -0.088, which means that the audit committee has a significant negative effect on tax avoidance (CETR). The more the number of audit committees, the lower the CETR value. if the company's CETR value is high, the company's tax avoidance level is low. Conversely, if the company's CETR value is low, the level of corporate tax avoidance is high. With this it can be concluded that **H2 is accepted**, where the audit committee has a significant positive effect on tax avoidance.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by (Ginting & Kartika, 2023) and (Farkhatul et al., 2022) which state that the audit committee has a positive effect on tax avoidance. The greater the percentage of the audit committee, the more ways it can be done to control company finances in a legal way, so that there is no difference in interests between the agent and the principal. However, the results of this study are not in line with research conducted by (Utami & Yohanes, 2023) and (Pratomo & Rana, 2021) which shows that the audit committee has no effect on tax avoidance, namely the large number of audit committees in a company does not guarantee that the company can take tax avoidance actions.

The Effect of Institutional Ownership on Tax Avoidance

Based on the results of the analysis of the institutional ownership variable hypothesis test, it can be seen that the t-count value is 2.898 and the t-table is 1.67793 or the t-count value > t table, and the significance value is 0.006 ($0.006 < 0.05$). The regression coefficient value of the institutional ownership variable is -0.056, which means that institutional ownership has a significant negative effect on tax avoidance (CETR). The higher the amount of institutional ownership of a company, the lower the CETR value. The lower the CETR value, the more aggressive the tax avoidance actions taken by the company. Conversely, if the company's CETR value is low, the company's tax avoidance level is high. With this, it can be concluded that **H3 is accepted**, where institutional ownership has a significant positive effect on tax avoidance.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by (Nurmawan & Nuritomo, 2022), (Amelia et al., 2022), and (Murtina et al., 2020) which state that institutional ownership has a positive effect on tax avoidance. This means that the large number of institutional investor ownership is able to increase the supervisory function to the agent to be aggressive in obtaining profits, so that tax avoidance increases. Contrary to research conducted by (Dewi & Oktaviani, 2021) and (Sari et al., 2020) which shows the results of institutional ownership has no effect on tax avoidance, meaning that the size of institutional ownership of a company does not make tax avoidance practices carried out by the company can be avoided.

The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Tax Avoidance

Based on the results of the analysis of the Corporate Social Responsibility variable hypothesis test, it can be seen that the t-count value is 3.845 and the t-table is 1.67793 or the t-count value > t table, and the significance value is 0.000 ($0.000 < 0.05$). While the regression coefficient value of the audit committee variable is -0.202, which means that Corporate Social Responsibility has a significant negative effect on tax avoidance (CETR). The higher the disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility, the lower the CETR value. If the company's CETR value is high, the company's tax avoidance level is low, and vice versa. With this, it can be concluded that **H4 is accepted**, where Corporate Social Responsibility has a significant positive effect on tax avoidance.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by (Laksmi P et al., 2023), (Putri & Yanti, 2022), and (Setyawan, 2021) which state that Corporate Social Responsibility affects tax avoidance. The higher the company's Corporate Social Responsibility disclosure, the higher the tax avoidance practice, because the agent tries to keep the Corporate Social Responsibility program running and the company's profits remain optimal, so the action taken by management is to do tax avoidance. There are differences in the results of research conducted by (Kirana & Sundari, 2022) which (Batubara et al., 2021) state that Corporate Social Responsibility has no effect on tax avoidance, where the company's Corporate Social Responsibility activities cannot affect the tax avoidance actions taken.

5. CONCLUSION

In this study, the variables of independent commissioners, audit committees, institutional ownership, and Corporate Social Responsibility have a positive and significant effect on tax avoidance in healthcare companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) for the 2019-2022 period.

6. IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study is limited because it only has a sample of 13 companies that focus on healthcare sub-sector manufacturing companies in the 2019-2022 period. The limited sample is due to the large number of companies that experience losses so that they must be eliminated in the sample. This research obtained the results of the coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.361 or 36.1%, which



means that the variables in this study only have an effect of 36.1% on tax avoidance, while 63.9% of them are influenced by other variables not contained in this study. And this research is limited in finding item information on the Corporate Social Responsibility variable, due to the unavailability of the index in the Annual Report and Sustainability Report of several companies. So that it makes it difficult for researchers to conclude what items are in the company.

For future researchers, it is suggested that they can increase the range of research year periods, expand the population, and choose different industry samples. And can add or use other independent variables outside the variables used in this study, such as profitability, leverage, and so on.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to express his gratitude to Diponegoro University, particularly the Vocational School, Tax Accounting Study Program, for the support, facilities, and opportunities provided during this research process. Appreciation is also extended to the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) for providing the data used as the basis for this research analysis. Sincere thanks are extended to the academic community for their valuable scientific guidance and direction, as well as to family and colleagues for their constant moral support and motivation, which enabled this research to be completed successfully.

REFERENCES

- Almasyah, Y. H., & Durya, N. P. M. A. (2021). Pengaruh Corporate Governance Dan Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Accounting Cycle Journal*, 2(2), 1–20. <http://journal.podomorouniversity.ac.id/index.php/ACJ/article/view/212/161>
- Am, G. G., & Friantin, S. H. E. (2023). Analisis Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) dan Good Corporate Governance (GCG) Terhadap Tax Avoidance Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Sektor Industri Barang Konsumsi yang Terdaftar di BEI. *CEBONG Journal*, 2(3), 101–107. <https://plus62.isha.or.id/index.php/cebong/article/view/146>
- Amelia, R., Muslih, M., & Kurnia. (2022). *The Effect of Good Corporate Governance on Tax Avoidance in Mining Companies Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange for the 2018-2020 Period*. 9(5), 3046–3052.
- Andriyanto, T., & Marfiana, A. (2021). Pengaruh Struktur Kepemilikan Perusahaan Terhadap Tax Avoidance di Indonesia Dengan Corporate Governance Sebagai Variabel Moderasi. *Jurnal Pajak Dan Keuangan Negara*, 3(1), 178–196. <https://jurnal.pknstan.ac.id/index.php/pkn/article/view/1226/688>
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2024, January). *Realisasi Pendapatan Negara (Milyar Rupiah)*.
- Batubara, M. B., Sari, R. H. D. P., & Fahria, R. (2021). Pengaruh Good Corporate Governance dan Corporate Social Responsibility Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Business Management, Economic, and Accounting National Seminar*, 2, 1202–1217. <https://conference.upnvj.ac.id/index.php/biema/article/view/2054>
- Bayhaqi, D. Al. (2023). Pengaruh Kepemilikan Institusional, Dewan Komisaris Independen, Komite Audit, Kualitas Audit, dan Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *DIPONEGORO JOURNAL OF ACCOUNTING*.
- Cobham, A., Bernardo, J. G., Palansky, M., & Mansour, M. B. (2020). *The State of Tax Justice 2020: Tax Justice in the time of COVID-19*.

- Dewi, S. L., & Oktaviani, R. M. (2021). Pengaruh Leverage, Capital Intensity, Komisaris Independen dan Kepemilikan Institusional Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Jurnal Studi Akuntansi Dan Keuangan*, 4(2), 179–194.
- Dilinanda, C. A., & Laturette, K. (2023). Analisis Pengaruh Good Corporate Governance dan Corporate Social Responsibility Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Media Akuntansi Dan Perpajakan Indonesia*, 4(2), 201–224.
<https://journal.uc.ac.id/index.php/mapi/article/view/3715>
- Farkhatul, H., Susanto, B., & Pramita, Y. D. (2022). Pengaruh Corporate Governance dan Kualitas Audit Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Borobudur Accounting Review*, 2(2), 109–122.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31603/bacr.6778>
- Ghozali, I. (2021). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariative dengan Program IBM SPSS 26* (4th ed.). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Ginting, R. M. B., & Kartika, T. P. D. (2023). Analisis Pengaruh Tata Kelola Perusahaan Terhadap Penghindaran Pajak. *AKUNESA: Jurnal Akuntansi Unesa*, 11(3), 300–310.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26740/akunesa.v11n3.p300-310>
- Hamidah, Junaidi, Rialdy, N., Suhartono, E., Amusiana, Sahusilawane, W., Lidyah, R., Isfaatun, E., Lumbanraja, T., & Surayuda, R. N. I. (2023). *PERPAJAKAN* (P. T. Cahyono, Ed.). Yayasan Cendikia Mulia Mandiri.
- Hanlon, M., & Heitzman, S. (2010). A Review of Tax Research. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 127–178.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0165410110000340>
- Haryanti, A. D. (2019). Pengaruh Corporate Governance Terhadap Tax Avoidance (Studi Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur yang Terdaftar di BEI Tahun 2017). *Jurnal Akademisi Akuntansi*, 2(1), 36–49. <https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/jaa/article/view/8210/6714>
- Hasnati. (2014). *Komisaris Independen & Komite Audit: Organ Perusahaan yang Berperan untuk Mewujudkan Good Corporate Governance di Indonesia* (A. D. Sulistya, Ed.). Absolute Media.

Hermawan, I. (2019). *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan (Kualitatif, Kuantitatif dan Mixed Method)*.

Hidayatul Quran.

Ilham, R. D., Handayani, D., & Dwiharyadi, A. (2022). Pengaruh Corporate Governance dan Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) terhadap Tax Avoidance (Studi Empiris pada Perusahaan Pertambangan yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Periode 2017-2020). *Jurnal Akuntansi, Bisnis Dan Ekonomi Indonesia (JABEI)*, 2(1), 56–64. <https://akuntansi.pnp.ac.id/jabei/index.php/jabei/article/view/30>

Indradi, D., & Sumantri, I. I. (2020). Analisis Penghindaran Pajak Dengan Pendekatan Financial Distress dan Profitabilitas Studi Empiris Pada Perusahaan Sektor Industri Barang Konsumsi di BEI Tahun 2013-2017. *JOURNAL OF APPLIED MANAGERIAL ACCOUNTING*, 4(2), 262–276.

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305–360. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0304405X7690026X>

Kamayanti, A., Qomariyah, N., Muwidha, M., & Ernawati, W. D. (2023). The Significance of Financial Distress on Tax Avoidance Compared to Gender Diversity and Social Responsibility: A Study from Indonesia. *MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTING REVIEW*, 22(2), 402–419.

Kirana, A. S., & Sundari, S. (2022). Mekanisme Corporate Governance dan Corporate Social Responsibility Terhadap Tax Avoidance Pada Perusahaan Sektor Pertambangan Batu Bara. *Journal of Management and Bussines (JOMB)*, 4(2), 742–756. <https://journal.ipm2kpe.or.id/index.php/JOMB/article/view/4265>

Krisna, A. M. (2019). Pengaruh Kepemilikan Institusional dan Kepemilikan Manajerial pada Tax Avoidance dengan Kualitas Audit sebagai Variabel Pemoderasi. *Wacana Ekonomi (Jurnal Ekonomi, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi)*, 18(2), 82–91. https://www.ejournal.warmadewa.ac.id/index.php/wacana_ekonomi/article/view/1162

- Laksmi P, K. W., Ariwangsa, I. G. N. O., & Trisna, N. N. P. B. (2023). Leverage Keuangan dan Corporate Social Responsibility Terhadap Tax Avoidance Pada Perusahaan Perbankan yang Terdaftar di BEI. *Journal of Economics and Banking*, 5(1), 100–108.
- Lupiyoadi, R., & Ikhsan, R. B. (2015). *Good Corporate Governance: Teori dan Implementasi* (2nd ed.). Salemba Empat.
- Mahdiana, M. Q., & Amin, M. N. (2020). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Leverage, Ukuran Perusahaan, dan Sales Growth Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Jurnal Akuntansi Trisakti*, 7(1), 127–138.
- Makki, S. (2021, September 14). *Pajak Global Bisa Raib Rp3.360 T Gegara Penghindaran Pajak*. CNN INDONESIA. <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/ekonomi/20210913194843-532-693711/pajak-global-bisa-raib-rp3360-t-gegara-penghindaran-pajak>
- Mukaromah, S. (2022). Pengaruh Good Corporate Governance, Corporate Social Responsibility, dan Profitabilitas Terhadap Penghindaran Pajak. *Mercu Buana University Institutional Repository*. <https://repository.mercubuana.ac.id/71121/>
- Mulyani, S., Wijayanti, A., & Masitoh, E. (2018). Pengaruh Corporate Governance Terhadap Tax Avoidance (Perusahaan Pertambangan yang Terdaftar di BEI). *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi Dan Bisnis Airlangga*, 3(1), 322–340.
- Murtina, W. S., Putra, W. E., & Yustien, R. (2020). Pengaruh Good Corporate Governance Terhadap Penghindaran Pajak (Tax Avoidance) (Studi Empiris Perusahaan Perbankan Terdaftar di BEI Tahun 2015-2019). *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Auditing*, 17(2), 47–66.
- Ningtyas, C. P., Kambolong, M., & Makmur, M. (2022). Implementasi Corporate Social Responsibility pada PT. Aneka Tambang Tbk. UBPN Sulawesi Tenggara. *Journal Publicuho*, 5(4), 1091–1112. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35817/publicuho.v5i4.50>
- Noorprasetya, Y., & Prasetya, M. T. (2023). Pengaruh Good Corporate Governance dan Corporate Social Responsibility Terhadap Tax Avoidance (Studi Empiris Pada Perusahaan Food and Beverage yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia 2019-2022). *Jurnal Akuntansi Trisakti*, 10(2), 291–3014. <https://www.e-journal.trisakti.ac.id/index.php/jat/article/view/17746/10314>

- Nurmawan, M., & Nuritomo. (2022). Pengaruh Struktur Kepemilikan Terhadap Penghindaran Pajak. *Proceeding of National Conference on Accounting & Finance*, 4, 5–11.
- Pohan, C. A. (2019). *Pedoman Lengkap Pajak Internasional Konsep, Strategi dan Penerapan* (Revisi). Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Pohan, H. T. (2008). *Pengaruh Good Corporate Governance, Rasio Tobins, Perata Laba Terhadap Penghindaran Pajak pada Perusahaan Publik*.
<http://hotmanpohan.blogspot.com/2010/09/penelitian-hubungan-gcg-dengan-tax.html>
- Prasetyo, A. W., & Primasari, N. H. (2021). Pengaruh Komisaris Independen, Pertumbuhan Penjualan, Profitabilitas, Leverage, dan Ukuran Perusahaan Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Keuangan*, 10(1).
<https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.36080/jak.v10i1.1427>
- Pratomo, D., & Rana, R. A. (2021). Pengaruh Kepemilikan Institusional, Komisaris Independen dan Komite Audit Terhadap Penghindaran Pajak. *Jurnal Akuntansi Kajian Ilmiah Akuntansi*, 8(1), 91–103. <https://ejournal.lppmunsera.org/index.php/Akuntansi/article/view/2487>
- Puspita, D., & Febrianti, M. (2017). Faktor-Faktor Yang Memengaruhi Penghindaran Pajak Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur di Bursa Efek Indonesia. *Jurnal Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, 19(1), 38–46. <https://doi.org/10.34208/JBA.V19I1.63>
- Putri, Y. A., & Yanti, H. B. (2022). Pengaruh Corporate Social Responsibility, Kompensasi Manajemen, Intensitas Modal, Financial Distress Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Jurnal Ekonomi Trisakti*, 2(2), 487–500.
- Sadya, S. (2023, April 13). Kinerja Industri Farmasi Tumbuh Tipis 0,69% Pada 2022. *DataIndonesia.Id*.
- Said, A. L. (2018). *Corporate Social Responsibility dalam Perspektif Governance* (1st ed.). Deepublish.

- Sari, N., Luthan, E., & Syafriyeni, N. (2020). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Leverage, Komisaris Independen, Kepemilikan Institusional, dan Ukuran Perusahaan Terhadap Penghindaran Pajak Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Pada Tahun 2014-2018. *Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Batanghari Jambi*, 20(2), 376–387. <https://doi.org/10.33087/jiubj.v20i2.913>
- Setyawan, S. (2021). Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) dan Good Corporate Governance (GCG): Pengaruh Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Jurnal Akademi Akuntansi*, 4(2), 152–161. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jaa.v4i2.17992>
- Shanti, Y. K. (2020). Pengaruh Komite Audit Terhadap Kinerja Keuangan Perusahaan Dengan Dewan Komisaris Sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Kita*, 9(2), 147–158. <https://ejournal.stiesyariahbangkalis.ac.id/index.php/iqtishaduna/article/view/241>
- Sihombing, D. Y., & Dalimunthe, I. P. (2022). Pengaruh Komisaris Independen, Kepemilikan Institusional, dan Pertumbuhan Laba Terhadap Tax Avoidance (Studi Empiris Pada Perusahaan Sub Industri Pharmaceuticals yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Selama Periode 2016-2020). *Jurnal Revenue: Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi*, 3(1), 345–359.
- Sudarmanto, R. G. (2013). *Statistik Terapan Berbasis Komputer dengan Program IBM SPSS Statistic 19*. Mitra Wacana Media.
- Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Penerbit Alfabeta.
- Sulistiyanti, U., & Saputra, A. D. (2020). Determinants of Tax Avoidance: Evidence from Indonesian Mining Industry. *Journal of Contemporary Accounting*, 2(3), 165–174.
- Tahilia, A. M. S. T., Sulistyowati, & Wasif, S. K. (2022). Pengaruh Komite Audit, Kualitas Audit, dan Konservatisme Akuntansi terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Manajemen (JAM)*, 19(2), 49–62.
- Utami, M., & Yohanes. (2023). Faktor-Faktor Yang Memengaruhi Tax Avoidance Pada Tata Kelola Perusahaan Manufaktur di Bursa Efek Indonesia. *JURNAL AKUNTANSI*, 17(1), 84–109. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25170/jak.v17i1.3478>



Wahyuningrum, N. (2018). *Pengaruh Good Corporate Governance dan Corporate Social Responsibility terhadap Tax Avoidance (Studi pada Perusahaan Pertambangan yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2014-2016)*. <http://repository.ub.ac.id/id/eprint/162666>

Wijayanti, Y. C., & Merkusiwati, N. K. L. A. (2017). Pengaruh Proporsi Komisaris Independen, Kepemilikan Institusional, Leverage, dan Ukuran Perusahaan Pada Penghindaran Pajak. *E- Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas Udayana*, 20(1), 699–728