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Abstract. The problem in the object of this study is about Company Size, receivables, debt, costs, and profits against tax avoidance and how the results when moderated transfer pricing. The study aims to analyze company size, receivables, debt, costs, profits against tax avoidance through transfer pricing. The research method used is quantitative method with secondary data. Data collection through interview techniques and documentation data collection by recording or collecting data on energy companies listed on the IDX for 2018-2022. From a population of 82 companies, a sample of 52 companies was obtained using purposive sampling according to criteria. Testing panel data regression model data with Chow Test and Hausman Test techniques using E-views application. The results prove that the performance of energy companies: Company Size, receivables, debts, costs, and profits have a significant positive effect on tax avoidance, and transfer pricing moderation positively affects the financial performance of energy companies on tax avoidance.
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Introduction
In this study, researchers explored whether firm size had any association with tax avoidance behavior. Do larger companies tend to have higher tax avoidance rates compared to smaller companies? The study can analyze whether company size has a significant influence on a company's tendency to engage in tax avoidance strategies. Researchers can investigate whether high levels of receivables are associated with higher levels of tax avoidance. Do companies with higher receivables rates tend to have more intensive tax avoidance practices than companies with lower receivables rates? This study can look for a correlation between the amount of receivables owned by companies with tax avoidance behavior carried out. Research can explore the relationship between corporate debt levels and tax avoidance practices. Do companies that have higher levels of debt have a tendency to engage in more significant tax avoidance actions? This study can see whether the existence of debt obligations is a factor that influences the company's decision to do tax avoidance. Researchers can investigate whether a company's level of operating expenses has an influence on tax avoidance practices. Do companies with higher cost levels tend to have a tendency to engage in more deliberate tax avoidance?
avoidance? This study will test whether the amount of a company's operational costs can have an impact on the level of tax avoidance carried out by the company. This study can analyze the relationship between corporate profits and tax avoidance. Are companies that record high profits more likely to engage in more aggressive tax avoidance measures? This study will look for correlations between the level of profit earned by companies and the tax avoidance behavior adopted. When moderated transfer pricing, this study can evaluate how the effect of transfer pricing moderates the relationship between company size, receivables, debt, costs, and profits on tax avoidance. By considering the moderation effect of transfer pricing, this study will indicate what impact transfer pricing practices have on the relationship between these variables and tax avoidance.

**Theoretical studies**

According to Musthafa, (2017) Financial management explains several decisions that must be made, namely investment decisions, funding decisions or decisions to meet fund needs, and dividend policy decisions. According to Dermawan (2008) in Irpan (2010) what is meant by agency theory is a theory that states that there are differences in interests between owners (shareholders), directors (company professionals) and company employees. Then it will cause a conflict between individual interests and company interests. The company must maintain its relationship with stakeholders or parties who play an important role in the company's organization by meeting the needs or providing benefits of stakeholders, especially stakeholders who have the power to influence the availability of resources used by the company to carry out the routine of the company's business operational activities, such as company owners, investors, personnel work, and customers (Hörisch et al., 2014). The controlling shareholder's decision to control minority shareholders in terms of resource transfer leads to agency problems in China in the form of certain tunneling incentives (Chen et al., 2017). Positive accounting theory seeks to explain why firms make certain accounting choices for opportunistic reasons (Godfrey et al., 2010). Wahab et al. (2016) explained that political connection occurs due to new economic policies, where the aim is to ensure better capital market development through wealth balance among ethnic groups. King (2009) explained Transfer Pricing as a form of transfer of profits that cannot be separated from the use of accounting profit measurement in determining tax liabilities, especially multinational companies which have implications for allocating consolidated company income in various countries in different ways. The size of the company can be seen from the total value of the company's assets on the year-end balance sheet (Sujoko and Soebiantoro, 2007). According to Kasmir (2009: 176) Receivable Turnover (RTO) is a ratio used to measure how long the collection of receivables during a period or how many times the funds invested in these receivables rotate in one period. According to Munawir (2004) in Pitaloka (2009) debt is all the company's financial obligations to other parties that have not been fulfilled, where this debt is a source of funds or company capital originating from creditors. Cost is an object that by cost accounting is processed to produce two interpretations, namely: broadly and narrowly (Mulyadi, 2018) According to Harahap (2009), profit is the remaining income after deducting expenses or costs during the accounting period, usually on an annual scale. This process involves matching revenues with related expenses, resulting in unallocated expense allocation obligations on the balance sheet. Profit has three important points, namely value, capital, and scale. According to Fuadah (2008) transfer pricing can also be called intracompany pricing, intercorporate pricing, interdivisional or internal pricing which is a price calculated for the purposes of management control over the transfer of goods and services between members.
(group companies). Tax is an element of profit reduction available, both to be distributed to shareholders and for investment. (Suandy, 2016).

**Research methods**

This research was conducted using quantitative methods, using secondary data in the form of Financial Statements and Annual Reports that have been audited by a Public Accounting Firm, accessed through the Indonesia Stock Exchange website and the company's website. The sampling technique in this study uses the *purposive sampling* method, which is a sample selection method based on certain criteria.

**Results and discussion**

The analysis of financial performance according to what is used is the size of the company, receivables, debts, costs and profits, while the results of data processing can be seen as follows.

### Table Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Company Value</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0,14</td>
<td>1,35</td>
<td>0,446</td>
<td>0,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Receivables</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0,13</td>
<td>0,09</td>
<td>0,740</td>
<td>0,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0,11</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td>0,918</td>
<td>0,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,39</td>
<td>0,101</td>
<td>0,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,53</td>
<td>0,097</td>
<td>0,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Transfer Pricing</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,10</td>
<td>0,752</td>
<td>0,340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data Results Processed by Eviews 2023

In the Company Size Variable with Tobins Q ratio, the minimum value is 0.14, the maximum value is 1.35, the average value is 0.446, and the standard deviation is 0.339 with a total of 260 observational data. The average value is greater than the standard deviation, which indicates a fairly good result. This is to ensure that the distribution of data provides normal results and does not cause bias.

In the Receivables Variable by waiting for the Receivable Turnover ratio, the minimum value is 0.13, the maximum value is 0.09, the average value is 0.740, and the standard deviation is 0.447 with a total of 260 observational data. The average value is greater than the standard deviation, which indicates a fairly good result. This is to ensure that the distribution of data provides normal results and does not cause bias.

An instrument is said to be valid if the number $r$ is calculated $> r$ table. The technique used for this validation test is pearson's "product moment correlation" with a confidence level of 95% ($\alpha = 0.05$). To test whether each indicator is valid or not, you can see the table below.

### Table Validity Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R Calculate</th>
<th>R Table</th>
<th>Ket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0,151</td>
<td>0,126</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0,231</td>
<td>0,126</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From table 4 above, it can be seen that all research variable items have \( r_{\text{hitung}} > r_{\text{table}} \), namely at a significant level of 5% (\( \alpha = 0.05 \)), so it can be known that the count of each item is greater than 0.126 so that it can be known that all research variable items are valid.

Data normality testing in this study was carried out using the method using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test which can be seen in the figure and table below.

**Table Normality Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Jarque</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>0.62 &gt; 0.05 then the data is normally distributed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that if the probability value exceeds 0.05, it can be concluded that the data used has been normally distributed and is feasible to continue at the next stage. Furthermore, in this study, multicollinearity testing was carried out as seen from the value of the correlation coefficient results. In panel data regression analysis, namely:

**Table Multicollinearity Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koefisein</td>
<td>Sym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 Company Size</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 Receivables</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 Cost</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4 Cost</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5 Profit</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, it can be seen that all variables have a correlation coefficient value of < 0.7, so it can be assumed that all variables are free from multicollinearity.

The heteroscedasticity test in this study was used to determine whether in the data regression model heteroscedasticity symptoms occurred:
Based on the residual graph, it can be seen that the limits (500 and -500) mean that the residuals are the same. And on the graph it can be seen that the residual value that the upper limit is 20 and the lower bound is -30 where the limit value does not cross the limit (500 and -500) therefore it can be declared that no symptoms of heteroscedasticity occur.

This autocorrelation test uses the Durbin Watson test and examines the significance of Durbin-Watson. Provided that:
1. D < -2, means that there is a negative autocorrelation.
2. -2 ≤ d ≤ +2, meaning there is no autocorrelation.
3. d > +2, means that there is a positive autocorrelation.

### Table The Automobile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probabilitas</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durbin Watson</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>No Autocorrelation Occurs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data Results Processed by Eviews 2023

Table 7 shows a durbin watson value of 1.43, so the value is not less than -2, and does not exceed 2, the conclusion is that the data used do not occur autocorrelation symptoms and the data used are significant between residual or no errors in the Chow test regression model as a test in order to establish between two models, namely fixed effect or random effect models. The most accurate estimating data.

### Table Test Chow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Chow</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H0 : Common Effect Model (CEM) &gt; 0,05</td>
<td>0,13</td>
<td>CEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha : Fixed Effect Model (FEM) &lt; 0,05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data Results Processed by Eviews 2023

Table 8 explains that in the chow test the best approach is the common effect model (CEM), which means H0: accepted because of the probability of 0.13 > 0.05 with the proposed approach chosen Fixed Effect Model (FEM). Hausman test, which is statistical testing in order to be able to choose whether the fixed effect model or random effect is most appropriate to use.
Table Uji Hausman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uji Hausman</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H0 : Random Effect Model (REM) &gt; 0.05</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>BRAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha : Fixed Effect Model &lt; 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data Results Processed by Eviews 2023

Table 9 shows that the hausman test choosing a better approach is the Random effect model (FEM), which means Ha: accepted because of the probability of 0.22 > 0.05 with the proposed approach chosen Random effect model (REM). The lagrange multiplier test aims to test whether the random effect or common effect model is most appropriate.

Table Uji Lagrange Multiplier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uji Lagrange Multiplier</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H0 : Common Effect Model (CEM) &gt; 0.05</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>HUNDRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha : Random Effect Model (REM) &lt; 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data Results Processed by Eviews 2023

Table 10 shows that the hausman test for choosing a better approach is the Common Effect Model (CEM), which means H0: accepted because of the probability of 0.376 > 0.05 with the proposed approach chosen Common Effect Model (CEM). (Napitul et al., 2021: 138-139) The results of the chow, hausman, and lagrange multiplier tests show that the dominance of the chosen approach is the Common Effect Model (CEM), then panel data regression is carried out with the Common Effect Model (CEM) approach with the following equation:

\[ Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{1it} + \beta_2 X_{2it} + \beta_3 X_{3it} + \beta_4 X_{4it} + \beta_5 X_{5it} + \beta_6 X_1 + \beta_7 X_2 + \beta_8 X_3 + \beta_9 X_4 + \beta_10 X_5 + \beta_11 Z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \]

Information:
- \( Y_{it} \) = Bound variable (Transfer Picing)
- \( \alpha \) = Known constant
- \( \beta_{1,2,3,STD} \) = Line direction coefficient
- \( X_1 \) = Company Size
- \( X_2 \) = Receivables
- \( X_3 \) = Debt
- \( X_4 \) = Cost
- \( X_5 \) = Good
- \( X_5 \) = Good
- \( Z_{it} \) = Moderating by Tax Avoidance

Table Panel Data Regression (CEM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-Statistic</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>3.307</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>7.891</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
X4 0.132 0.001 0.458 0.047
X5 0.473 0.134 0.909 0.000
X1_Z 0.879 1.425 0.317 0.009
X2_Z 0.619 0.048 0.819 0.031
X3_Z 0.312 0.001 0.412 0.001
X4_Z 0.764 0.002 0.164 0.000
X5_Z 0.538 0.089 0.751 0.011
Y_Z 0.916 0.003 0.918 0.003

R-squared 0.197 Mean dependent var 0.164
Adjusted R-squared 0.188 S.D. dependent var 2.361
S.E. of regression 2.128 Akaike info criterion 4.363
Sum squared resid 1159.348 Black criterion 4.418
Log likelihood 563.2651 Hannan-Quinn criter. 4.385
F-statistic 21.018 Durbin-Watson stat 1.435
Prob(F-statistic) 0.000

Source: Data Results Processed by Eviews 2023

Y = 0.497 + 0.210*X1 + 0.230*X2 + 0.911*X3+ 0.132*X4+ 0.473*X5+ 0.879*X1 Z+ 0.619*X2 Z+ 0.312*X3 Z+ 0.764*X4 Z+ 0.538*X5 Z+ 0.916*Z

From the results of regression panel data with the Common Effect Model (CEM) approach above produces a positive constant value of 0.497, this shows a positive influence, if significant < 0.05, the potential transfer pricing will increase by 0.497 and it can be stated that all results are quite good.

The value of the variable coefficient of Company Size (X 1) obtained a positive result of 0.201 meaning that every increase or decrease in Company Size (X1), the potential transfer pricing (Y) will increase by 0.201.

The value of the variable coefficient of receivables (X 2) obtained a positive result of 0.230 means that for every increase or decrease in receivables (X2), the potential transfer pricing (Y) will increase by 0.230.

The value of the variable coefficient of debt (X 3) obtained a positive result of 0.911 means that for every increase or decrease in debt (X3), transfer pricing (Y) will increase by 0.911.

The value of the variable cost coefficient (X 4) obtained a positive result of 0.132 means that every increase or decrease in costs (X4), then transfer pricing (Y) will increase by 0.132.

The value of the variable coefficient of profit (X 5) obtained a positive result of 0.473 means that for every increase or decrease in profit (X5), transfer pricing (Y) will increase by 0.473.

The value of the Transfer Pricing variable coefficient moderating Company Size (X 1) by Tax Avoidance obtained a positive result of 0.879 meaning that every increase or decrease in the Transfer Pricing variable moderating Company Size (X 1) by Tax Avoidance, then the potential transfer pricing (Y) moderating Company Size (X 1) by Tax Avoidance (Z) will increase by 0.879.
The value of the Transfer Pricing variable coefficient moderating receivables (X 2) by Tax Avoidance obtained a positive result of 0.619 meaning that every increase or decrease in the Transfer Pricing variable moderating receivables (X 2) by Tax Avoidance, then the potential transfer pricing (Y) moderating receivables (X 2) by Tax Avoidance (Z) will increase by 0.619.

The value of the Transfer Pricing variable coefficient moderating debt (X 3) by Tax Avoidance obtained a positive result of 0.312 meaning that every increase or decrease of the Transfer Pricing variable moderating debt (X 3) by Tax Avoidance, then the potential transfer pricing (Y) moderating debt (X 3) by Tax Avoidance (Z) will increase by 0.312.

The value of the Transfer Pricing variable coefficient moderating costs (X 4) by Tax Avoidance obtained a positive result of 0.764 meaning that every increase or decrease in the Transfer Pricing variable moderates costs (X 4) by Tax Avoidance, then the potential transfer pricing (Y) moderating costs (X 4) by Tax Avoidance will increase by 0.764.

The value of the Transfer Pricing variable coefficient moderating profit (X 5) by Tax Avoidance obtained a positive result of 0.538 meaning that every increase or decrease of the Transfer Pricing variable moderating profit (X 5) by Tax Avoidance, then the potential transfer pricing (Y) moderating profit (X 5) by Tax Avoidance (Z) will increase by 0.538.

The value of the transfer pricing variable coefficient (Y) obtained a positive result of 0.916 meaning that every increase or decrease in transfer pricing (Y), the Tax Avoidance (Z) will increase by 0.916 According to Sujarweni (2015: 161) The t test is an individual regression coefficient test used to find out whether the variable is independent (X 1) individually affects the dependent variable (Y). Based on the table below it can be seen that hypothesis testing is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>t count</th>
<th>t table</th>
<th>Say.</th>
<th>Ket.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company Size (X1) to (Y)</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>H1: accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables (X2) to (Y)</td>
<td>7.891</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>H2: accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt (X3) to (Y)</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>H3: accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (X4) to (Y)</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>H4: accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit (X5) to (Y)</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>H5: accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderation of Company Size (X1) to (Y) by (Z)</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>H6: accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderation of Receivables (X2) to (Y) by (Z)</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>H7: accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>t count</td>
<td>t table</td>
<td>Say.</td>
<td>Ket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Moderation (X3) to (Y) by (Z)</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>H8: accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Moderation (X4) to (Y) by (Z)</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>H9: accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Moderation (X5) to (Y) by (Z)</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>H10: accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Pricing (Y) Terhadap Tax Avoidance (Z)</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>H11: accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : Data Results Processed by Eviews 2023

Based on the data above, the hypothesis testing can be concluded as follows:

**Hypothesis testing 1 (H1)**

H1: Company Size has a positive and significant effect on Tax Avoidance.

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the results of the statistical test t on variable X1 obtained the value of t calculated > t table (0.719 > 0.104) and the significance value < 0.05 (0.026 < 0.05) then there is a significant positive influence. This means that the Company's Size has a significant positive effect on the Tax Avoidance of Energy Company Taxpayers listing on the IDX in 2018-2022. Which means H1 is accepted and H0 is rejected.

**Hypothesis testing 2 (H2)**

H2: Receivables have a positive and significant effect on Tax Avoidance.

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the results of the statistical test t on the variable X2 obtained the calculated t value > t table (7.891 > 0.104) and the significance value < 0.05 (0.00 < 0.05) so there is a significant positive influence. This means that Receivables have a significant positive effect on the Tax Avoidance of Energy Company Taxpayers listed on the IDX in 2018-2022. Which means H2 is accepted and H0 is rejected.

**Hypothesis testing 3 (H3)** testing

H3: Debt has a positive and significant effect on Tax Avoidance.

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the results of the statistical test t on the variable X3 obtained the value of t calculated > t table (0.441 > 0.104) and the significance of < 0.05 (0.00 < 0.05) so there is a significant positive influence. Debt has a significant positive effect on the Tax Avoidance of Energy Company Taxpayers listed on the IDX in 2018-2022. Which means H3 is accepted and H0 is rejected.

**Hypothesis testing 4 (H4)** testing

H4: Cost has a positive and significant effect on Tax Avoidance.

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the results of the statistical test t on the
variable X4 obtained the value of t calculated > t table (0.458 > 0.104) and the significance value < 0.05 (0.047 < 0.05), so there is a significant positive influence. Costs have a significant positive effect on the Tax Avoidance of Energy Company Taxpayers listed on the IDX in 2018-2022. Which means H4 is accepted and H0 is rejected.

**Hypothesis testing 5 (H5)**

H5: Profit has a positive and significant effect on Tax Avoidance.

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the results of the statistical test t on the variable X5 obtained the calculated t value > t table (0.909 > 0.104) and the significance value < 0.05 (0.00 < 0.05), so there is a significant positive influence. This means that Profit has a significant positive effect on the Tax Avoidance of Energy Company Taxpayers listed on the IDX in 2018-2022. Which means H5 is accepted and H0 is rejected.

**Hypothesis testing 6 (H6)**

H6: Transfer Pricing in moderating Company Size has a positive and significant effect on Tax Avoidance.

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the results of the statistical test t on the moderated variable X1 obtained a calculated t value > t table (0.317 > 0.104) and a significance value of < 0.05 (0.009 < 0.05), so there is a significant positive influence of the moderation variable. This means that the Company's Size has a significant positive effect on the Company's Taxpayer Tax Avoidance, moderated by the transfer pricing of Energy IDX listing for 2018-2022. Which means H5 is accepted and H0 is rejected.

**Hypothesis testing 7 (H7)**

H7: Transfer Pricing in moderating Receivables has a positive and significant effect on Tax Avoidance.

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the results of the statistical test t on the variable X2 Moderated obtained a calculated t value > t table (0.819 > 0.104) and a significance value of < 0.05 (0.031 < 0.05), so there is a significant positive influence of the moderation variable. This means that the company's receivables have a significant positive effect on the Corporate Taxpayer's Tax Avoidance, moderated by the transfer pricing of Energy listing IDX for 2018-2022. Which means H7 is accepted and H0 is rejected.

**Hypothesis testing 8 (H8)**

H8: Transfer Pricing in moderating Debt has a positive and significant effect on Tax Avoidance.

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the results of the statistical test t on the variable X3 Moderated obtained the value of t calculated > t table (0.412 > 0.104) and the significance value < 0.05 (0.001 < 0.05), so there is a significant positive influence of the moderation variable. This means that corporate debt has a significant positive effect on Corporate Taxpayer Tax Avoidance, moderated by the transfer pricing of Energy IDX listing for 2018-2022. Which means H8 is accepted and H0 is rejected.

**Hypothesis 9 (H9) testing**

H9: Transfer Pricing in moderating Fees has a positive and significant effect on Tax Avoidance.

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the results of the statistical test t on the
variable X3 Moderated obtained the value of t calculated > t table (0.164 > 0.104) and the significance value < 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), so there is a significant positive influence of the moderation variable. This means that the company's costs have a significant positive effect on the Corporate Taxpayer's Tax Avoidance, moderated by the transfer pricing of Energy IDX listing for 2018-2022. Which means H9 is accepted and H0 is rejected.

**Hypothesis testing 10 (H10)**

H10 : *Transfer Pricing* in moderating Profit has a positive and significant effect on *Tax Avoidance*.

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the results of the statistical test t on the variable X4 Moderated obtained the value of t calculated > t table (0.751 > 0.104) and the significance value of < 0.05 (0.011 < 0.05), so there is a significant positive influence of the moderation variable. This means that the company's profit has a significant positive effect on the Corporate Taxpayer's Tax Avoidance, moderated by the transfer pricing of IDX listing Energy for 2018-2022. Which means H10 is accepted and H0 is rejected.

**Hypothesis testing 11 (H11)**

H11 : *Transfer pricing* has a positive and significant effect on *Tax Avoidance*.

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the results of the statistical test t on variable Y obtained the value of t calculated > t table (0.918 > 0.104) and the significance value < 0.05 (0.003 < 0.05) then there is a significant positive influence. This means that transfer pricing has a significant positive effect on the Tax Avoidance of Energy Company Taxpayers listed on the IDX in 2018-2022. Which means H11 is accepted and H0 is rejected. According to Sujarwani (2015: 162) Test F is a test of the significance of the equation used to determine how much influence the independent variables (X1, X2, X3, X4, X5) together have on non-free variables (Y). Below is a table of F test results that have been done:

**Table Test F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>db Regresi</th>
<th>db Residual</th>
<th>Fcalculate</th>
<th>Ftable</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21,02</td>
<td>2,04</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : Data Results Processed by Eviews 2023

Based on table 13 above, Hypothesis 4 is carried out simultaneously from (X1, X2, X3, X4 and X5) it is known that the results of statistical test F obtained F values calculated > F table 21.02 > 2.04 and significance 0.000 < 0.05, then there is a significant positive influence. This means that the variables simultaneously Company Size, receivables, debts, costs, and profits affect transfer pricing, which means H1,2,3,4 is accepted and H0 is rejected. According to Sujarwani (2018: 164) the Coefficient of Determination is used to determine the percentage of changes in non-free variables (Y) caused by independent variables (X). Here is a table of the results of the coefficient of determination:

**Table Coefficient of Determination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : Data Results Processed by Eviews 2023
Based on the test of table 14 can be seen where R = 0.445, explaining that the variables Company Size (X1), Receivables (X2), Payables (X3), Costs (X4) and Profits (X5) there is a very strong and unidirectional or positive correlation to changes in transfer pricing variables (Y) in accordance with the results obtained, namely: R = 0.20 it can be concluded that the independent variable (X) has a weak correlation to the dependent variable (Y).

R square value (r^2) = 0.20. This value shows that the variables Company Size (X1), Receivables (X2), Payables (X3), Costs (X4) and Profits (X5) have a contribution to the dependent variable (Y) by 20% and the remaining 80% are influenced by other factors outside this discussion. Based on the results of bootstrapping testing in the T Test Results Table, conclusions can be drawn on the hypothesis that the overall hypothesis has a positive and significant effect and is acceptable. Based on the table above, it can be seen that the results of the statistical test t on variable X1 obtained the value of t calculated > t table (0.719 > 0.104) and significance < 0.05 (0.026 < 0.05) then there is an influence. This means that the size of the company affects Tax Avoidance. Which means H1 is accepted and H0 is rejected. In accordance with previous research conducted by Panjaitan, T., & Simbolon, R. (2022), stated that the intensity of fixed assets affects Tax Avoidance, this proves that the greater the intensity of fixed assets, the greater the use of fixed assets, so that the depreciation expense of fixed assets will later be a reduction in profits, and will affect the amount of tax to be paid, and this will also affect the level of Tax Avoidance (tax avoidance). However, research conducted by Putra, R. J., Astiani Rizkillah, A. (2022) stated the opposite result, that tunneling incentives have an effect on transfer pricing, intangible assets have no effect on transfer pricing, and profitability has an effect on transfer pricing and Tax Avoidance has no effect on transfer pricing. Then tunneling incentives, intangible assets, profitability have no effect on Tax Avoidance.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the study, it can be seen that the results of the statistical test t on the variable X5 obtained the value of t calculated > t table (0.918 > 0.104) and the significance of < 0.05 (0.003 < 0.05), so there is an influence. This means that transfer pricing affects the Tax Avoidance strategy. Which means H5 is accepted and H0 is rejected. This result is supported by research conducted by Panjalusman, P. A., Nugraha, E., & Setiawan, A. (2018). states that transfer pricing has an effect but not significant on Tax Avoidance (tax avoidance). In addition, Puteri, R. E. (2020) in the results of her research also stated that transfer pricing has a significant positive effect on Tax Avoidance. That is, if the company does transfer pricing, the value of ETR decreases. In other words, if the company does not transfer pricing, the ETR value will be greater Tax Avoidance or look more non-compliant. However, there is a limitation in this study, which is to only use data whose purchases occur in related party transactions and not multinational companies that have groups of companies in tax heaven countries and add related party transaction parameters, such as: sales, receivables, and related party debts.
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