Tax Avoidance: Is There a Difference between Indonesia, Thailand, and Philippines?

Ardhia Pramesti Regita Cahyani[1], Moh. Faisol[2]

*Universitas Wiraraja [1,2,], Jl. Raya Sumenep Pamekasan Km. 05 Patean Sumenep
Jawa Timur, 69451, Indonesia*

✉ Corresponding Author:
Nama Penulis: Moh. Faisol
E-mail: faisol114@wiraraja.ac.id

Abstract

> *Purpose: This study aims to analyze a comparative comparison of tax avoidance practices in manufacturing companies in Developing Countries in the Asian Region, especially in Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines during the covid-19 pandemic (2020-2022 period).*
> *Method: This study uses a quantitative approach by analyzing the comparison of tax avoidance in Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines using the Independent Sample t Test. The measurement of tax avoidance uses CETR.*
> *Results: The results of the study found that there was a significant difference in the level of tax avoidance between manufacturing companies in Indonesia and Thailand, manufacturing companies in Indonesia and the Philippines, but there was no difference in tax avoidance between manufacturing companies in Thailand and the Philippines.*
> *Implications: As a reference for the Directorate General of Taxes and investors related to the motives for tax avoidance carried out by manufacturing companies in three countries during the covid-19 pandemic.*
> *Novelty: This study uses financial data of manufacturing companies during the covid-19 pandemic in three Developing Countries in Asia.*
>
> *Keywords: tax avoidance; tax compliance; developing countries*

Abstrak

> **Tujuan:** Penelitian ini bertujaun untuk menganalisis perbandingan praktik penghindaran pajak pada perusahaan manufaktur di Negara Berkembang di Kawasan Asia khususnya di Indonesia, Thailand, dan Philippines selama pandemi covid-19 (Periode 2020-2022).
> **Metode:** Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif dengan menganalisis perbandingan penghindaran pajak di Indonesia, Thailand, dan Philippines menggunakan Independent Sampel t Test. Pengukuran penghindaran pajak menggunakan CETR.
> **Hasil:** Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan dalam tingkat penghindaran pajak antara perusahaan manufaktur di Indonesia dan Thailand, perusahaan manufaktur di Indonesia dan Philippines, namun tidak terdapat perbedaan penghindaran pajak antara perusahaan manufaktur di Thailand dan Philippines.

Implikasi: Sebagai referensi bagi Direktorat Jenderal Pajak dan investor terkait dengan motif penghindaran pajak yang dilakukan oleh perusahaan manufaktur pada tiga negara selama pandemi covid-19.

Kebaruan: Penelitian ini menggunakan data keuangan perusahaan manufaktur selama pandemi covid-19 pada tiga Negara Berkembang di Asia.

Kata kunci: penghindaran pajak; negara berkembang; kepatuhan pajak

INTRODUCTION

Taxes are fiscal revenues obtained by the State and are an essential budget for an entity (Wang et al., 2020). Tax revenues are governments' primary revenue source for financing public services and driving economic growth in most developing countries (Ameyaw & Dzaka, 2016). From a financial perspective, taxes are defined as transferring resources from taxpayers for the public interest. Taxes, as one of the state revenue sources, will later function as a budget and regulator (Pietersz et al., 2021). Companies consider taxes as a burden, while the government finds taxes as revenue (Lestari et al., 2018). Tax planning is one of the company's initiatives. Management's attempt to lessen the company's tax burden is known as tax planning (Hasanah & Faisol, 2023). The tax planning serves a number of goals, such as (i) preventing double taxation, (ii) postponing income, and (iii) raising or quickening the decrease in the tax burden borne by businesses. By making use of current tax laws to maximise earnings, both domestic and foreign businesses are attempting to reduce their tax obligations. Tax management will be promoted by business owners. Tax management will be promoted by business owners (Alkawsar et al., 2017).

This research relates to agency theory where the situation is caused by differences in interests caused by information asymmetry between principal and agent. On the one hand, the fiscal demands the maximum amount of money from tax collection, and on the other, the corporation and the fiscal are at odds over corporate earnings. In contrast, the company wants significant revenue with a low tax burden to avoid taxes (Agustina & Aris, 2014). These two frames of view lead to disputes between businesses as taxpayers and fiscal authorities as tax collectors (Zulfadina, 2022). Agency Theory discusses how principals and company management can align their company goals (Ramdani & Kamal, 2023). The agency relationship is the cooperative contract that outlines the connection between the principal and the agent.

Puspita & Febrianti (2023) explained that tax avoidance in manufacturing companies in developing countries can impact economic development. Companies can lower their tax payments by using tax law loopholes, which has an impact on government revenue. Economic growth may be hampered by the government's inability to finance infrastructure development and public services due to the drop in tax collections. Furthermore, businesses that engage in tax avoidance may have a competitive edge over those that adhere to tax laws, which

can lead to unfair competition (Anggraini & Destriana, 2022). This can hinder foreign investment and hinder the growth of domestic industries. Therefore, overcoming tax avoidance in manufacturing companies is essential to encourage economic development in developing countries. An example of tax avoidance practices at the international level which is also one of the very large and phenomenal cases is the neatly arranged and Swiss financial company HSBC engages in a worldwide tax evasion scheme (Deil, 2015) and the Panama *papers* case (Imagama, 2018).

Several studies that examine the comparison of tax avoidance between countries are comparative research by Korniawan, (2020) which compares Indonesia and Ireland where in the research conducted it was found that there was a common perspective among fiscal and academic scholars in responding to the issue of tax avoidance as a tax issue. Still, in the study there were differences in developing tax avoidance cases in both countries. In contrast to the comparative study conducted by Taylor & Richardson (2013) which compared the United States and Europe, found significant differences in tax avoidance practices that occurred in the country. Further research by (Ermasova, 2021) which compares the United Kingdom with Germany where this study focuses more on how the national cultures of the two countries can affect the perception of tax avoidance. Meanwhile, other research on tax avoidance was also conducted by Azzahra & Ramadhan (2022), Eva Budiana (2022), and Lutfiani et al. (2021). Still, the study did not compare tax avoidance and only identified factors that affect tax avoidance. Referring to several previous studies that there is no comparison of tax avoidance practices between developing countries in the Asian region, this study has the potential to be carried out to find out the comparison of tax avoidance in developing countries, namely between Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines where the selection of countries is based on the same amount of tax rates with different tax policies in each country. The selection of manufacturing companies as the subject of the study is because they are part of the sector that contributes greatly to tax revenue.

Table 1. Comparison of Tax Rates

No.	Country	Tax Rate
1.	Indonesia	22%
2.	Thailand	20%
3.	Philippines	25%

Source: (Yohana, 2023)

Based on the table 1, the tax rate of Indonesia is 22%, Thailand 20%, and the Philippines 20%. With the number of different rates from each country, there is the potential for different tax evasion, so this has the opportunity to be researched. This research was conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic, which had a significant impact on the economic sector, especially in Indonesia,

Thailand, and the Philippines, to provide tax incentive policies such as reduction of corporate income tax rates (Indonesia), acceleration of tax refunds (Indonesia, Thailand), suspension of tax payments (Indonesia, Thailand), and tax exemption (Indonesia, Philippines). The condition of the Covid-19 pandemic certainly also impacts tax avoidance practices in the country (Arham et al., 2021; OEDC, 2020).

So, differences in tax rates and tax policies from each country will cause differences for taxpayers in tax avoidance. The results of research by (Taylor & Richardson, 2013) ound differences in tax avoidance practices between the two countries because the implementation of strategies in tax avoidance between the EU and the US is different. Research conducted found that companies in countries with higher state level governance carried out fewer tax avoidance practices. In contrast, the research undertaken by (Risa, 2016) shows no significant difference in tax savings before and after the 2008 tax reform. The hypothesis is stated as follows in light of the previously provided explanation.

H_0: There was no significant difference of tax avoidance between manufacturing companies in Indonesia, Thailand, and Philippines in the 2020-2022 period.

H_a: There was a significant difference of tax avoidance between manufacturing companies in Indonesia, Thailand, and Philippines in the 2020-2022 period.

METHOD

This kind of research employs a quantitative methodology in which numerical data pertaining to tax evasion in Thailand, the Philippines, and Indonesia will be statistically examined for comparison. Manufacturing firms listed on the IDX (Indonesia Stock Exchange), the SET (Stock Exchange of Thailand), and the PSE (Philippine Stock Exchange) for the 2020–2022 timeframe make up the study's population. The researcher employed purposive sampling, a type of probability sampling as indicated in the following table 2.

Table 2. Research Sample Criteria

No	Sample Criteria	Indonesia	Thailand	Philippines
1.	Manufacturing companies listed on the IDX, SET, and PSE for the period 2020-2022	175	103	112
2.	Manufacturing companies that present complete financial statements from 2020-2022	175	61	59
3.	Manufacturing companies that have not suffered losses consecutively	112	59	42
4	Top ten manufacturing companies	10	10	10
	Total samples used	*10*	*10*	*10*
	Number of observations (3 years)	*30*	*30*	*30*

Source: Processed Data (2024)

This study measures tax evasion using the Cash Effective Tax Rate (CETR), which is determined using the formula below.

$$Cash\ ETR = \frac{Cash\ tax\ paid}{Pretax\ Income}$$

The measurement of tax avoidance in this study is measured using CETR referring to research by Susanti (2018) who argues that tax measurement using *Cash* ETR can describe the company's activities in real terms in the company's efforts to reduce its tax liability. Hanlon and Heitzeman in Risa (2016a) also said that the measurement of tax avoidance with *Cash* ETR is often used as a tax avoidance proxy in various researches. The smaller the value of CETR owned by a company, the higher the level of tax avoidance carried out by the company (Tristianto & Oktaviani, 2016). Previous studies conducted by Ahmadi & Rahman, (2020), Lutfiani et al., (2021), and Susanti, (2018) measured tax avoidance using the Cash ETR as the same measurement tool as previous researchers. Then, the CETR data that has been tabulated is analyzed using descriptive statistics and independent t-test samples.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Descriptive statistics
The following results were from the descriptive statistical analysis conducted using SPSS software.

Table 3. Results of Descriptive Statistical Tests

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Indonesia	30	.0002	.1247	.040511	.0319591
Thailand	30	.0022	.1090	.032440	.0291046
Philippines	30	.0004	.0622	.023734	.0177913
Valid N (listwise)	30				

Source: Processed Data (2024)

Table 3 provides a summary or description of the variables employed in this investigation based on the findings of descriptive statistical tests. The mean is the average value of each survey variable, which can be computed by dividing the total number of data points by the number of data points available; the maximum is the significant value of each variable in the study; the minimum is the smallest value of each variable in the research; and the observation is the number of observations in this study, which is up to 30 of each research variable.

The firsth, Indonesia. The results of the descriptive statistical analysis of independent variables, namely tax avoidance measured using CETR from Indonesia (X1), can be seen that the amount of data used is a total of 30 data for three years, the maximum value is 0.1247 which means that there are companies that pay more taxes than their pre-tax profit obtained from Pelat Timah

Nusantara Tbk in 2020, while the minimum value is 0.0002, indicating that companies that commit high tax evasion were obtained from Indocement Tunggal Prakasa Tbk in 2022. ***The Second, Thailand.*** The results of the descriptive statistical analysis of independent variables, namely tax avoidance measured using CETR from Thailand (X2), show that the amount of data used is a total of 30 data for three years, the maximum value is 0.1090; this indicates that there are companies that pay more taxes than their pre-tax profit obtained from Carabao Group Public Company Limited in 2020 and the minimum value is 0.0022 shows that the company committed significant tax evasion obtained from Seafresh Industry Public Company Limited in 2020. ***The third, Philippines.*** The results of the descriptive statistical analysis of independent variables, namely tax avoidance measured using CETR from the Philippines (X3), show that the amount of data used is 30 data for three years, and the maximum value is 0.0622; this indicates that there are companies that pay more taxes than their pre-tax profits which were acquired from SFA Semicon Philippines Corporation in 2020. The minimum value is 0.0004, obtained from Basic Energy Corporation in 2021.

Normality Test

The findings of the normality test using SPSS are as follows.

Table 4. Results of Normality Tests

		INDONESIA	THAILAND	PHILIPHINA
N		30	30	30
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.1739	.0324	.0237
	Std. Deviation	.13168	.02910	.01779
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.115	.150	.126
	Positive	.115	.146	.126
	Negative	-.093	-.150	-.095
Test Statistic		.115	.150	.126
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200[c,d]	.085[c]	.200[c,d]

Source: Processed Data (2024)

Indonesia and the Philippines received a significance value (sig.) of 0.200, according to the normalcy test findings shown in table 4 above. The significance value (sig.) for the state of Thailand is 0.85. The research data is therefore normally distributed, as indicated by the Asymp.sig value > 0.05, which is the basis for decision-making in the Kolmogorov-Smirnovnormality test mentioned above.

It is known that the value of sig is based on the previously mentioned homogeneity test findings in the Test of Homogeneity of Variances table 5. The CETR variables for Thailand, the Philippines, and Indonesia were found to be 0.058 > 0.05, indicating that, based on the homogeneity test decision-making

criteria, the variance of CETR data between these nations is the same or homogeneous.

Homogeneity Test

The findings of the homogeneity test using SPSS are as follows.

Table 5. Results of Homogeneity Tests

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
X1	Mean	2.946	2	87	.058
	Median	.519	2	87	.597
	Median and with adjusted df	.519	2	54.661	.598
	Trimmed mean	1.817	2	87	.169

Source: Processed Data (2024)

Independent Sample t-Test

The outcomes of independent testing of t-test samples conducted with SPSS software are listed below.

Indonesia and Thailand

Table 6. Results of Independent Samples t Test from Indonesia and Thailand

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
	Equal variances assumed	4.369	.041	2.853	58	.006	.57455	.20138	.17145	.97766
X1	Equal variances not assumed			2.853	45.663	.006	.57455	.20138	.16912	.97999

Source: Processed Data (2024)

It is known from the output in table 6 that the value of sig. (2-tailed) in the Equal Variances Assumed column is 0.006 < 0.05. Therefore, H0 is rejected as the foundation for decision-making in the independent test of the t-test sample. This indicates that industrial firms in Thailand and Indonesia engage in varying degrees of tax evasion.

Indonesia and Philippines

The result in table 7 indicates that the sig. (2-tailed) value in the Equal Variances Assumed column is 0.001 < 0.05. This information serves as the foundation for the conclusion that H0 is rejected in the independent test of the t-test sample. This indicates that Indonesian and Philippines manufacturing enterprises' rates of tax avoidance differ significantly.

Table 7. Results of Independent Samples t Test from Indonesia and Philippines

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
X1	Equal variances assumed	2.694	.106	3.440	58	.001	.72016	.20935	.30109	1.13922
	Equal variances not assumed			3.440	49.786	.001	.72016	.20935	.29961	1.14070

Source: Processed Data (2024)

Thailand and Philippines

Since the sig. (2-tailed) value in the Equal Variances Assumed column is 0.33 > 0.05, as may be inferred from the output in table 8, it is possible to conclude that H0 cannot be rejected in the independent test of the t-test sample. This indicates that there is no discernible difference between the tax evasion rates of Philippines and Thai manufacturing firms.

Table 8. Independent Results of T-Test Samples from Thailand and Philippines

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
X1	Equal variances assumed	.292	.591	.965	58	.338	.14560	.15083	-.15632	.44752
	Equal variances not assumed			.965	56.822	.338	.14560	.15083	-.15646	.44766

Source: Processed Data (2024)

Comparison of Tax Avoidance in Indonesia, Thailand, and Philippines
Indonesia and Thailand

Significant variations can be seen when comparing the tax evasion strategies of industrial companies listed on the IDX and SET. Tax evasion methods in Indonesia are higher than those in Thailand because of the country's higher tariff rate of 22% compared to Thailand's 20%, which is only a 2% difference. Furthermore, the disparities in tax laws and economic structures may also have an impact on tax evasion in both nations. Another factor contributing to the high prevalence of tax evasion is the absence of oversight and execution of

penalties against corporate taxpayers, such as manufacturing companies. Notably, Indonesia uses the Self Assessment System, which entrusts businesses or taxpayers with the power, trust, and obligation to determine, deposit, and disclose the tax liability. Because the Self Assessment System gives taxpayers the power to determine, pay, and report their tax obligations without the involvement of tax authorities, taxpayers utilise it to engage in tax avoidance (Hasna et al., 2022).

This research is related to the theory of compliance which explains that compliance is based on taxpayers' awareness of their tax obligations which refer to the regulations that have been set (Ike Tristanti & Aisyaturrahmi, 2023). The government implements rules and laws so that the desired goal can be achieved, namely getting the maximum income sourced from taxes. However, often this regulation is actually abused by taking advantage of loopholes so that the taxes paid can be minimized, namely by practicing tax avoidance. This is undoubtedly contrary to the theory of obedience (Rafiq, 2021).

Since it has been demonstrated that the Thai government is more adept than Indonesia in identifying revenue opportunities within its borders, another comparison is warranted. Tax revenues can be raised more easily by investigating the best tax sources (Madarina, 2019). Large businesses frequently engage in tax avoidance tactics, particularly manufacturing firms, which typically generate substantial profits. The greater the business, the more it will weigh the risks in controlling its tax liability. Big businesses have a lot of resources, including tax professionals, which they can utilise to minimise taxes. In terms of tax management, it is still not as well as small businesses with limited resources. The substantial amount of resources that big businesses control allows for the execution of tax avoidance (Dewanta & Achmad, 2017).

The annual financial statements of manufacturing businesses listed on the IDX and SET for the 2020–2022 period, which use the CETR to quantify tax evasion, served as the secondary data source for this study. This study used a number of tests, including the T-Test Sample Independent Test, the Normality Test, the Homogeneity Test, and the Descriptive Statistical Analysis Test, to determine whether tax avoidance differed between the two nations. The t-test results showed that the sig value was $0.006 < 0.05$, indicating a significant difference in the degree of tax avoidance between manufacturing companies listed on the SET and IDX. The amount of tax evasion in each nation can be impacted by variations in tax rates (Tabalisa et al., 2023 and Wardani, 2023). found that changes and differences in tax rates can affect the level of tax avoidance in each country.

Indonesia and Philippines

Manufacturing companies listed on the IDX and PSE exhibit considerably different tax avoidance strategies, according to a comparison of tax avoidance in

these two types of businesses. Manufacturing firms in Indonesia are more likely than those in the Philippines to evade taxes, according to statistical study. The disparities in tax laws among various nations may be the root reason of this. This can be caused by differences in tax policies in each of these countries. In Indonesia, in terms of supervision and enforcement of sanctions, it is still relatively weak and on the other hand, the limited access obtained by fiscal authorities in tracking corporate taxpayers, especially foreign business actors, is a problem in optimizing tax revenue, especially digital taxes (Istiarti & Gunadi, 2023).

In contrast to the Philippines which implements a territorial system which means that only income sourced from the country is subject to Philippines taxes. Foreign companies are entitled to a reduction in the corporate income tax (CIT) rate of 25%, down from the regular rate of 30%. A significant VAT reduction was passed by the CREATE *(Corporate Recovery and Tax Incentives for Enterprises)* Law which also stipulates a further reduction in VAT tariffs by 1% per year until it finally reaches 20% in 2027 for foreign companies (Medina, 2023). A significant difference in the degree of tax avoidance between Indonesia and the Philippines is indicated by the sig value of 0.001 < 0.05, which was obtained from the t-test used to determine whether there is a difference in tax avoidance in manufacturing companies listed on the IDX and PSE for the 2020–2022 period.

The findings of this study are consistent with earlier research by Andalia et al., (2023), which claimed that tax evasion is accomplished by exploiting inconsistencies in tax laws. Different tax policies and enforcement laws in each Country can affect and contribute to variations in tax avoidance rates.

Thailand and Philippines

Several factors, including the difference in tax rates—the State of the Philippines has a higher tax rate of 5% than the current tax rate in Thailand—are used to compare tax avoidance practices between manufacturing companies listed on the SET and PSE. In addition, differences in tax policies can also affect the difference in tax practices in the two countries. In Thailand, it has proven to be more optimal in exploring tax sources in the country. With the exploration of optimal tax sources, tax revenues will be more able to be increased (Hanum & Faradila, 2022). In the Philippines, the Internal Revenue Bureau (BIR) has intensified its efforts in conducting tax investigation checks to identify and sanction tax evaders. By utilizing advanced technology and data analysis, tax authorities can detect irregularities and non-conformities more efficiently (Harold, 2023). Although the two countries have different incentives and policies to attract investment, the effectiveness and implementation of these policies are more visible in Thailand, resulting in better monitoring of tax avoidance practices. Despite reform efforts, the rate of tax avoidance is still high in the Philippines due to various challenges in *enforcement* and regulation.

According to the results of the t-test, which was used to determine whether tax avoidance differed between manufacturing companies listed on the SET and PSE for the 2020–2022 period, the sig value of 0.33 > 0.05 indicates that there is no discernible difference in the degree of tax avoidance between Thailand and the Philippines. This analysis is supported by earlier research, such as that conducted by Korniawan (2020), which demonstrates how variations in tax laws and enforcement practices impact the degree of tax evasion around the world.

Indonesia's current tax system is extremely complex, with multiple levels of regulations and bureaucracy that confuse taxpayers and may be used by them to engage in tax avoidance. This is why tax avoidance practices differed between Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines during the COVID-19 pandemic. The level of taxpayer compliance in Indonesia is comparatively low because to a number of factors, including weak law enforcement, which encourages taxpayers to engage in tax avoidance. Of course, this differs from Thailand and Philippines, which have simple, efficient, and user-friendly tax systems. Hence, the level of taxpayer compliance is higher than that of Indonesia (Gultom et al., 2024).

According to this report, Indonesia must successfully streamline its tax system, education system, and legal system in order to reduce the likelihood of tax evasion and increase taxpayer compliance. With the low level of tax protection carried out, it will impact the optimal amount of state revenue. Meanwhile, this study shows the effectiveness of the tax system implemented so far for Thailand and the Philippines. However, improving and anticipating various new policies in the relevant tax field that align with future economic and business developments is necessary.

CONCLUSION

According to the study's findings, manufacturing enterprises in Indonesia and Thailand and those in the Philippines significantly differed in their levels of tax evasion. Still, there was no difference in tax avoidance between manufacturing companies in Thailand and the Philippines. The difference in tax avoidance practices between Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines during the pandemic Covid-19 in Indonesia is due to the high complexity of the existing tax system in Indonesia, with several layers of regulations and bureaucracy that confuse taxpayers and have the potential to taxpayers to use to carry out tax avoidance. Weak law enforcement is also one factor that encourages taxpayers to commit tax avoidance, so the level of taxpayer compliance in Indonesia could be much higher. Of course, this differs from Thailand and Philippines, which have simple, efficient, and user-friendly tax systems. Hence, the level of taxpayer compliance is higher than that of Indonesia. With these conditions, researchers can further develop tax avoidance practices in other developing countries or developed countries by considering the regulation and simplicity of the tax system in that country.

REFERENCES

Agustina, T. N., & Aris, M. A. (2014). Tax Avoidance : Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhinya (Studi Empiris Perusahaan Manufaktur yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Periode 2012-2015). *Seminar Nasional Dan The 4th Call for Syariah Paper*, 295–307.

Ahmadi, I. S., & Rahman, A. (2020). Pengaruh faktor keuangan dan non keuangan terhadap tindakan penghindaran pajak. *National Conference on Accounting & Finance (NCAF)*, 2, 86–97. https://doi.org/10.20885/ncaf.vol2.art8

Alkawsar et al. (2019). Pengaruh Transaksi Afiliasi Perusahaan Terhadap Penghindaran Pajak (Tax Avoidance). *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa (JOM) Budang Akuntansi*, 6(1), 1–12.

Ameyaw, B., & Dzaka, D. (2016). Determinants of Tax Evasion: Empirical Evidence from Ghana. *Modern Economy*, 07(14), 1653–1664. https://doi.org/10.4236/me.2016.714145

Andalia, Kartini, Y., & Jaya, At. (2023). Tingkat penghindaran pajak pada perusahaan manufaktur di masa pandemi. *Jurnal Mirai Management*, 8(2), 253–261. https://doi.org/10.37531/mirai.v8i2.5320

Anggraini, N. F., & Destriana, N. (2022). Penghindaran Pajak pada Perusahaan Manufaktur. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi TSM*, 2(2), 959–970.

Arham, A., & Firmansyah, A. (2021). Kebijakan Pajak Selama Pandemi Covid-19 di Kawasan Asia Tenggara. *Jurnal Pajak Dan Keuangan Negara (PKN)*, 3(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.31092/jpkn.v3i1.1258

Azzahra, M., & Ramadhan, M. R. (2022). Perbandingan Insentif Pajak Indonesia, Malaysia, dan Singapura dalam Kondisi Pandemi Covid-19. *InFestasi*, 18(1), InPress. https://doi.org/10.21107/infestasi.v18i1.13231

Budiana, E. (2022). *Hubungan Keragaman Gender dan Praktik Penghindaran Pajak (Studi Kasus pada Perusahaan Manufaktur yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Asia Tenggara Periode 2015-2020)*.

Deil, S. A. F. (2015). HSBC Swiss Diduga Lindungi Orang Kaya yang Mangkir Pajak. *12 Februari*.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2020). *Tax and Fiscal Policy in Response to the Coronavirus Crisis: Strengthening Confidence and Resilience*. OECD. https://doi.org/10.1787/60f640a8-en

Dewanta, & Achmad. (2017). Pengaruh Perencanaan Pajak Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan dengan Kualitas Corporate Governance Sebagai Variabel Moderasi. *Diponegoro Journal Of Accounting*, 6(1), 1–7.

Ermasova, N. (2021). The Relationship between Culture and Tax Evasion across Countries: Cases of the USA and Germany. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 44(2), 115–131.

Gultom, E. N., Dafina, C., Tasiah, T., Eryanto, B. D., Tsani, H., & Santoso, R. S. (2024). Analisis Komparasi Sistem Administrasi Perpajakan Indonesia Dan Thailand. *NOVA IDEA*, 1(2), 25–35. https://doi.org/10.14710/nova_idea.47987

Hamidah, M. A., Junaidi, S.H., M. H., C.L.A. Novien Rialdy, S.E., M. ., Edy Suhartono S.E., M. ., & Dr. Amusiana M.Pd, Wildoms Sahusilawane, SE., M.Si, Dr. Rika Lidyah, S.E., M.Si, Ak, CA, CRA, CRP, Dr. Eliya Isfaatun, S.E., M.M, Thorman Lumbanraja, S., M. . (2023). *perpajakan* (paput tri Cahyono

(ed.)). yayasan cendekia mulia mandiri.

Hanum, Z., & Faradila, J. (2022). Pengaruh Corporate Social Responsibility Terhadap Agresivitas Pajak Pada Perusahaan Makanan dan Minuman Yang Terdaftar Di BEI. *Owner*, *7*(1), 479–487. https://doi.org/10.33395/owner.v7i1.1114

Harold, A. (2023). Tax Evasion in the Philippines. *RESPICIO & CO.*

Hasanah, L. F., & Faisol, M. (2023). Eksplorasi Penghindaran Pajak Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Di Indonesia. *PERFORMANCE: Jurnal Bisnis & Akuntansi*, *13*(2), 98–113.

Hasna, I., Nadhira, S., & Suhardjo, F. (2022). Faktor - Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Agresivitas Pajak Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Di Bei. *Jurnal Bisnis & Akuntansi Unsurya*, *7*(2), 193–208. https://doi.org/10.35968/jbau.v7i2.900

imagama.fe. (2018). Panama Paper, Bukti Kemakmuran Tersembunyi dalam Tax Havens. *10 June 2018, 19.42.*

Istiarti, P., & Gunadi. (2023). Analisis SWOT Terhadap Kebijakan Pajak Digital di Indonesia. *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi & Perpajakan (JRAP)*, *10*(1), 33–47.

Korniawan, R. (2020). Opini publik media massa terhadap masalah penghindaran pajak: perbandingan Indonesia dan Irlandia. *PRofesi Humas Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Hubungan Masyarakat*, *4*(2), 237. https://doi.org/10.24198/prh.v4i2.20108

Lestari, D. S. A., Kurnia, I., & Yuniati, Y. (2018). Pengaruh Perencanaan Pajak Dan Ukuran Perusahaan Terhadap Manajemen Laba. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, Ekonomi, & Akuntansi (MEA)*, *2*(3), 129–150. https://doi.org/10.31955/mea.vol2.iss3.pp84-108

Lutfiani, R., Ahmad, G. N., & Kurnianti, D. (2021). Determinan Praktik Penghindaran Pajak : Kasus pada Perusahaan Food and Beverage di Negara Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand dan Filipina. *Jurnal Bisnis, Manajemen, Dan Keuangan*, *2*(3), 685–705.

Madarina. (2019). *Perbandingan Pengenaan Pajak Orang Pribadi Di Indonesia dan Thailand*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Sukabumi.

Medina, A. F. (2023). A Guide to Taxation in the Philippines. *ASEAN Briefing*.

Pietersz, J. J., Picauly, B. C., Widaryanti, W., Katili, A. Y., Ririhena, M. Y., Ferayani, M. D., Dewi, M. S., Faisol, M., Kurniati, N., Sandra, A., Wicaksono, G., Said, H. S., Zulma, G. W. M., Suripto, S., & Koerniawati, D. (2021). Perpajakan (Teori & Praktik). In *Widina Bhakti Persada Bandung*. Widina Bhakti Persada Bandung.

Puspita, D., & Febrianti, M. (2023). Faktor-Faktor Yang Memengaruhi Penghindaran Pajak Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Yang Terdaftar Di Bursa Efek Indonesia. *Trilogi Accounting and Business Research*, *4*(1), 38–46. https://doi.org/10.31326/tabr.v4i1.1601

Rafiq, A. (2021). *Transfer Pricing, Profitabilitas dan Kepemilikan Institusional terhadapPraktik Penghindaran Pajak (Tax Avoidance)*.

Ramdani, O., & Kamal, M. (2023). *Corporate Governance and Shariah Non-compliance Risk: The Case of Islamic Banks in Indonesia*. *11*(1), 49–80. https://doi.org/10.35836/jakis.v11i1.370

Risa, N. (2016). Analisis Perbandingan Penghindaran Pajak Sebelum Dan Sesudah Reformasi Pajak Tahun 2008. *JRAK: Jurnal Riset Akuntansi Dan Komputerisasi Akuntansi*, *7*(2), 11–26.

Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

Susanti, E. (2018). *Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Leverage, Sales Growth Dan Ukuran Perusahaan Terhadap Penghindaran Pajak*. Universitas Islam Indonesia.

Tabalisa, Warongan, & Weku. (2023). Pengaruh Perubahan Tarif Pajak Dan Sales Growth Terhadap Tax Avoidance Pada Perusahaan Sektor Batubara Yang Tercatat Di Bei Periode 2018-2022. *Jurnal EMBA*, *11*(4), 1685–1694.

Taylor, G., & Richardson, G. (2013). The determinants of thinly capitalized tax avoidance structures: Evidence from Australian firms. *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation*, *22*(1), 12–25.

Tristanti, I. A. (2023). Studi Pengaruh Kinerja Keuangan Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Accounting and Management Journal*, *7*(1), 65–83. https://doi.org/10.33086/amj.v7i1.4406

Tristianto, D., & Oktaviani, R. M. (2016). *FAKTOR-FAKTOR YANG MEMPENGARUHI TAX AVOIDANCE DENGAN LEVERAGE SEBAGAI VARIABEL MEDIASI. 5*.

Vivian, Y. F. A. (2023). *Kebijakan Pajak dan Tarif Pajak di 10 Negara di ASEAN*. Pajakku.

Wang, F., Xu, S., Sun, J., & Cullinan, C. P. (2020). Corporate tax avoidance: A literature review and research agenda. *Journal of Economic Survey*, *34*(4), 793–811. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12347

Wardani, D. K. (2023). Pengaruh Tarif dan Sistem Perpajakan Terhadap Niat Melakukan Penggelapan Pajak. *Jurnal Bina Akuntansi*, *10*(1), 73–94.

Zulfadina. (2022). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Sales Growth, Ukuran Perusahaan Dan Kepemilikan Manajerial Terhadap Tax Avoidance Di Bursa Efek Indonesia Periode 2018-2020. In *Skripsi*. Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Indonesia Jakarta.