



Faculty of Economics and Business

Universitas Pamulang

**INTERNASIONAL CONFERENCE & CALL FOR PAPER**

**ECONOMICS, BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY (EBIC), 30<sup>th</sup> April 2025**

Vol : 2

No.: 1

No. E- ISSN: 3025-4086

**THE EFFECT OF TAX SAVINGS, SALES GROWTH AND  
BUSINESS RISKS ON CAPITAL STRUCTURE**

**Fitri Rosmadita<sup>1</sup>, Wiwit Irawati<sup>2</sup>, Brillian Mufti Farhan<sup>3</sup>**

**Faculty of Economic and Business, Pamulang University**

**Email : rosmaditafitri@gmail.com<sup>1</sup>, wiwitira@unpam.ac.id<sup>2</sup>**

**ABSTRACT**

*This research aims to find out and provide empirical evidence regarding the influence of tax savings, sales growth and business risks on the capital structure of companies. This type of research is quantitative research using secondary data. The data analysis methods used are descriptive statistical tests, panel data model analysis, classical assumption tests, and hypnosis tests using Microsoft Excel and E-Views 12 applications. The population in this study is infrastructure sector companies that are flat on the Indonesia Stock Exchange for the 2019-2023 period. The data collection technique in this study is a purposive sampling and analysis technique used by the Regression Analysis Random Effect Model. The results obtained show that simultaneously tax savings, sales growth and business risks affect the capital structure. The results obtained partially show that tax savings have an effect on capital structure.*

*Keywords: Tax Savings, Sales Growth, Business Risks, Capital Structure*

**ABSTRAK**

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui dan memberikan bukti empiris mengenai pengaruh penghematan pajak, pertumbuhan penjualan dan risiko bisnis terhadap struktur modal perusahaan. Jenis penelitian ini adalah penelitian kuantitatif dengan menggunakan data sekunder. Metode analisis data yang digunakan adalah uji statistik deskriptif, analisis model data panel, uji asumsi klasik, dan uji hipnosis dengan menggunakan aplikasi Microsoft Excel dan E-Views 12. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah perusahaan sektor infrastruktur yang flat di Bursa Efek Indonesia periode 2019-2023. Teknik pengumpulan data dalam penelitian ini adalah purposive sampling dan teknik analisis yang digunakan Regression Analysis Random Effect Model. Hasil yang diperoleh menunjukkan bahwa secara simultan penghematan pajak, pertumbuhan penjualan dan risiko bisnis berpengaruh terhadap struktur modal. Hasil yang diperoleh secara parsial menunjukkan penghematan pajak berpengaruh terhadap struktur modal.

Kata Kunci: Penghematan Pajak, Pertumbuhan Penjualan, Risiko Bisnis, Struktur Modal



**INTERNASIONAL CONFERENCE & CALL FOR PAPER**

**ECONOMICS, BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY (EBIC), 30<sup>th</sup> April 2025**

Vol : 2

No.: 1

No. E- ISSN: 3025-4086

**1. INTRODUCTION**

The Company is encouraged to optimize all aspects in maintaining and advancing its business in line with the rapid development of the global economy. Every company must strive for new ways to continue operating effectively and efficiently in order to provide superior value and compete with other companies. This can be achieved by implementing effective capital management or funding to support the company's performance (Linda et al., 2023).

In 2022, PT Adhi Karya conducted a right issue to and obtain additional State Capital Participation. The funds are used to complete the construction of six PSN projects and three non-PSN projects, The purpose of the right issue is to prevent the company from borrowing to banks, can strengthen the capital structure, increase working capital so that the company's projects and operations can run as planned (Indopremier.com, 2022).

In mid-December 2022, PT Waskita Karya hopes to complete the process of issuing new shares with a rights issue and obtain State Capital Participation, which will be used to complete several toll road projects. However, the Government has canceled the State Capital Participation for the 2022 fiscal year, because in its development Waskita Karya has undergone financial restructuring and has led to a lack of liquidity. The Ministry of Finance also assesses that the potential rights issue will not be absorbed by the public. So that in the end it cannot encourage the improvement of the company's performance and hinder the operations and projects that will be carried out (Nasional.kontan.co.id, 2023).

Based on the background that has been described above, the formulation of the problem in this study is: (1) Do tax savings, sales growth, and business risks simultaneously affect the capital structure? (2) Does tax savings affect the capital structure? (3) Does sales growth affect the capital structure? (4) Does business risk affect the capital structure?

**2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESIS**

**Pecking Order Theory**

According to Fadilah and Ardini (2020), this theory explains how companies prioritize internal funding when deciding on their capital structure. If a company needs outside funding, then it will decide to issue the least risky securities first, such as bonds, and then issue new shares. According to the Pecking Order Theory, companies that have a large percentage of assets in the form of fixed assets will prioritize their own capital when meeting their capital needs. Meanwhile, companies whose assets are mostly current assets will use debt to prioritize their funding needs (Anwar & Wahidahwati, 2019).

**Trade Of Theory**

The first trade-off theory was presented by Jensen Meckling (1976). Trade-off theory explains that if you use debt as a fund, you must be able and able to equalize it by looking at the benefits with the amount of costs incurred. Optimal use of debt depends on the trade-off between profits and losses arising from funding sources. As long as debt still provides benefits to the company, the use of debt is still allowed (Mulyani & Agustinus, 2022).



**INTERNASIONAL CONFERENCE & CALL FOR PAPER**

**ECONOMICS, BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY (EBIC), 30<sup>th</sup> April 2025**

Vol : 2

No.: 1

No. E- ISSN: 3025-4086

**Capital Structure**

Capital structure is a proportion or comparison in determining the fulfillment of a company's spending needs, whether by using debt, equity, or by issuing shares (Brigham and Gapenski: 2003) in (Rodoni and Ali, 2014:129). Meanwhile, according to Keown, et.al. (2005) in (Rodoni and Ali, 2014:129), capital structure is a guide or combination of long-term funding sources used by companies.

**Tax Savings**

Tax savings are a company's efforts to minimize its tax obligations. One of the efforts is the Non Debt Tax Shield or tax savings which are tax benefits that companies will get apart from debt. Non-debt tax shield is tax savings as a result of the imposition of depreciation of tangible assets that can affect the company's capital structure. Non-debt tax shield in the form of imposition of depreciation and amortization costs on profit and loss. (N.P. 1. Wulandari & Artini,2019) in (Linda dkk., 2023).

**Sales Growth**

The increase in sales rate that occurs every time a company does business is referred to as sales growth. Based on the sales growth rate, the company can predict its profits. Sales growth can be measured by comparing total sales for the current period with total sales for the previous period. The sales growth variable shows the extent to which the company can increase sales compared to the overall total sales (Salmawanti & Irawati, 2024).

**Business Risk**

According to Munandar et al. (2019) Business risk is the uncertainty faced by companies over the rate of return on total assets. The higher the business risk, the smaller the debt that the company must use compared to the company that has low business risk. Business risk refers to uncertainty related to the revenue generated by the company's operational activities, higher levels of debt directly contribute to the increased business risks faced (Nurlita & Indradi, 2024).

**3. RESEARCH METHOD**

This research uses quantitative and the data used is secondary in the form of company financial statements taken as data in this study, taken from the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX), through the website [www.idx.co.id](http://www.idx.co.id) The sampling method in this study uses the purposive sampling method. According to Sugiyono (2013),

**Tabel 1 : Variable Operional**

No	Variable	Indicator	Scala
1.	Capital Structure	DER = $\frac{\text{Total Liabilities}}{\text{Total Equity}} \times 100\%$	Ratio



## INTERNASIONAL CONFERENCE &amp; CALL FOR PAPER

ECONOMICS, BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY (EBIC), 30<sup>th</sup> April 2025

Vol : 2

No.: 1

No. E- ISSN: 3025-4086

		Source: (Septiananda & Pratiwi, 2023) dan (Sari & Irawati, 2021)	
2.	Tax Saving	$\text{NDTS} = \text{Depreciation Expense}$ $\text{Fixed Assets}$ Source: (Wulandari & Artini, 2019) dan (Mulyani & Agustinus, 2022)	Ratio
3.	Sales Growth	$\text{PP} = \frac{\text{Total Sales}_t - \text{Total Sales}_{t-1}}{\text{Total Sales}_{t-1}}$ Source: (Rindiasih & Wulandari, 2023) dan (Salmawanti & Irawati, 2024)	Ratio
4.	Business Risk	$\text{BRISK} = \text{Profit Before Tax} / \text{Equity}$ Source: (Nurlita & Indradi, 2024)	Ratio

Source: data processed by the author, 2024

## 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive statistical test According to Ghozali (2018) quoted by (Septiananda & Pratiwi, 2023) descriptive statistical analysis provides an overview or description of a data (variable) seen from the mean value, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum.

Tabel 2 : Descriptive Statistical Test Results

	SM	P_PJK	P_PNJ	RB
Mean	0.775556	0.194459	0.070226	0.120831
Median	0.833408	0.056270	0.033535	0.083699
Maximum	1.935686	1.904424	1.621646	1.059329
Minimum	0.038822	0.000833	-0.499058	0.000750
Std. Dev.	0.504052	0.355403	0.337795	0.147346
Skewness	0.244507	3.032199	1.571507	4.243614
Kurtosis	2.094540	12.67688	8.525164	26.59601
Jarque-Bera	2.868103	353.2178	109.4328	1703.013
Probability	0.238341	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
Sum	50.411115	12.63985	4.564670	7.853999
Sum Sq. Dev.	16.26039	8.083933	7.302771	1.389490

Source: data processed by the author, 2024

## Panel Data Regression Model Selection Test

The three types of tests used are the Chow Test, the Hausman Test, and the Lagrance Multiplier Test. The table of results from the testing of the three models is as follows:

Tabel 3 : Model Selection Results

No	Method	Significance Value	Model Selection Results
1	Uji Chow	FEM < 0.05	Fixed Effect Model (FEM)



## INTERNASIONAL CONFERENCE &amp; CALL FOR PAPER

ECONOMICS, BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY (EBIC), 30<sup>th</sup> April 2025

Vol : 2

No.: 1

No. E- ISSN: 3025-4086

		CEM > 0.05	
2	Uji Hausman	FEM < 0.05 REM > 0.05	Random Effect Model (REM)
3	Uji Lagrance Multiplier	REM < 0.05 CEM > 0.05	Random Effect Model (REM)
Model Selection Results			Random Effect Model (REM)

Source : Data processed by the author E-views 12 (2024)

## Classical Assumption Test

## Normalitas Test



Source : Data processed by the author E-views 12 (2024)

Figure 1 : Normalitas Test Results (After Outlier)

Through the outlier process, there were 5 infrastructure sector companies during the 2019-2023 period that were excluded from the study due to extreme value data. Based on figure 4.1 showing the results of the normality test with a Jarque-Bera value of 4.130189 and with a probability value of 0.126806. If viewed from these values, it can be concluded that the probability value > a significant value of 0.05, then the data is normally distributed.

## Multicollinearity Test

Tabel 4 : Multicollinearity Test Results

	P_PJK	P_PNJ	RB
P_PJK	1.000000	-0.012046	-0.123927
P_PNJ	-0.012046	1.000000	0.043304
RB	-0.123927	0.043304	1.000000

Source : Data processed by the author E-views 12 (2024)

Where the correlation value of the variable < 0.80 so it can be concluded that in this study there is no multicollinearity between independent variables.

**INTERNASIONAL CONFERENCE & CALL FOR PAPER****ECONOMICS, BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY (EBIC), 30<sup>th</sup> April 2025**

Vol : 2

No.: 1

No. E- ISSN: 3025-4086

**Heteroskedastisitas Test****Tabel 5 : Heteroskedastisitas Test Result**

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.434342	0.076768	5.657888	0.0000
P_PJK	0.009433	0.074982	0.125799	0.9003
P_PNJ	0.034403	0.044862	0.766861	0.4461
RB	0.121442	0.123615	0.982416	0.3298

Source : Data processed by the author E-views 12 (2024)

Based on the results in table 4.12, the results of the heteroscedasticity test can be obtained on the probability value of each independent variable where the probability value is greater than  $\alpha$  (0.05), so it can be concluded that it is not present in the heteroscedasticity problem test

**Autokorelasi Test****Tabel 6 : Autokorelasi Result Test**

R-squared	0.152243	Mean dependent var	0.081621
Adjusted R-squared	0.110550	S.D. dependent var	0.133758
S.E. of regression	0.126148	Sum squared resid	0.970713
F-statistic	3.651528	Durbin-Watson stat	1.483969
Prob(F-statistic)	0.017288		

Source : Data processed by the author E-views 12 (2024)

Based on the results of the submission in table 4.13, a D-W value of 1.483969 can be obtained. According to Sunyoto (2016:98) in (Septiananda & Pratiwi (2023) one of the measures in determining whether or not there is an autocorrelation problem with the Durbin Watson (DW) test using the DW criterion There is no autocorrelation, if the DW value is between -2 and +2 where the result of this study is 1.483969 is between -2 to +2, then it can be concluded that there is no autocorrelation in this study.

**Hipotesis Test****F Test (Simultan)****Tabel 7 : F Test**

R-squared	0.152243	Mean dependent var	0.081621
Adjusted R-squared	0.110550	S.D. dependent var	0.133758
S.E. of regression	0.126148	Sum squared resid	0.970713
F-statistic	3.651528	Durbin-Watson stat	1.483969
Prob(F-statistic)	0.017288		

Source : Data processed by the author E-views 12 (2024)

**INTERNASIONAL CONFERENCE & CALL FOR PAPER****ECONOMICS, BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY (EBIC), 30<sup>th</sup> April 2025**

Vol : 2

No.: 1

No. E- ISSN: 3025-4086

Based on the results in table 4.15 above, the results of the simultaneous significance test show a  $F_{cal}$  value of 3.651528 with a significance value of 0.017288. the value of the  $F_{table}$  is 2,755. Based on the  $F_{table}$  obtained, the test results of  $F_{cal} > F_{table}$  ( $3.651528 > 2.755$ ) and the probability value is lower than the significant rate that has been set at 0.05 ( $0.017288 < 0.05$ ). Thus, it can be concluded that the  $H_0$  hypothesis was rejected and  $H_1$  was accepted, which means that tax savings, sales growth and business risks together (simultaneously) affect the capital structure.

**t Test****Tabel 8 : t Test**

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.805613	0.150238	5.362262	0.0000
P PJK	-0.263091	0.087545	-3.005216	0.0038
P PNJ	0.024426	0.050803	0.480792	0.6324
RB	0.160457	0.140647	1.140851	0.2584

Source : Data processed by the author E-views 12 (2024)

1. The X1 variable of tax savings in the panel data regression test shows a  $T_{cal}$  value of -3.005216 while the  $T_{table}$  is 1.670. Where the value of  $T_{count}$  is smaller than the value of  $T_{table}$  ( $-3.005216 < -1.670$ ) with a probability value ( $0.0038 < 0.05$ ) which means that  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_1$  is accepted, thus it can be concluded that the tax saving variable has an effect on the capital structure.
2. The X2 variable of sales growth in the panel data regression test shows a  $T_{cal}$  value of 0.480792 while the  $T_{table}$  is 1.670. Where the value of  $T_{count}$  is smaller than the value of  $T_{table}$  ( $0.480792 < 1.670$ ) with a probability value ( $0.6324 > 0.05$ ) which means that  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_2$  is rejected, thus it can be concluded that the variable of sales growth affects the capital structure.
3. The X3 variable of business risk in the panel data regression test shows a  $T_{count}$  value of 1.140851 while the  $T_{table}$  is 1.670. Where the value of  $T_{calculate}$  is smaller than the value of  $T_{table}$  ( $1.140851 < 1.670$ ) with a probability value ( $0.2584 > 0.05$ ) which means that  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_3$  is rejected, thus it can be concluded that the variable business risk has no effect on the capital structure.

**Discussion*****The Effect of Tax Savings, Sales Growth and Business Risk on Capital Structure***

*The  $F_{table}$  value is 2,755. Based on the  $F_{table}$  obtained, the test results of  $F_{cal} > F_{table}$  ( $3,651528 > 2.755$ ) and the probability value is lower than the significant rate that has been set at 0.05 ( $0,017288 < 0.05$ ). Thus, it can be concluded that the  $H_0$  hypothesis is rejected and  $H_1$  is accepted, which means that independent variables consisting of tax savings, sales growth and business risks together (simultaneously) affect the dependent variable, namely capital structure.*

*The results of this study show that the high or low capital structure of a company can be influenced by tax savings, sales growth and business risks together. This statement is supported by the results of research by (Afa & Hazmi., 2021), (Wulandari and Artini,*



**INTERNASIONAL CONFERENCE & CALL FOR PAPER**

**ECONOMICS, BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY (EBIC), 30<sup>th</sup> April 2025**

Vol : 2

No.: 1

No. E- ISSN: 3025-4086

2019) and (Mulyani & Augustinus., 2022). *Simultaneously tax savings, sales growth and business risks have an influence on the capital structure).*

**The Effect of Tax Savings on Capital Structure**

Based on the results of the T (partial) test on the tax saving variable, it shows that the value of  $T_{cal}$  is -3.005216 while the  $T_{table}$  is -1.66980, where the value of  $T_{cal}$  is smaller than the  $T_{table}$  of  $(-3.005216 < -1.66980)$  with a probability value  $(0.0038 < 0.05)$ . So it can be concluded that  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_1$  is accepted, thus the tax saving variable affects the capital structure. Depreciation and amortization can be used to reduce debt, because depreciation and amortization are cash flows from a company's capital. In line with the trade off theory, a company with a high fixed asset investment can be defined as a company that has a high depreciation value to reduce the company's tax liability. Because the tax savings from loan interest can be exchanged for tax savings from depreciation and amortization, then companies with high depreciation will use less debt.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by (Mulyani and Augustineus, 2022) and (Hendra and Yusuf, 2022) which concluded that tax savings measured by non-debt tax shield partially have an influence on capital structure. Which means that the higher the value of a company's non-debt tax shield, the higher the capital structure, the company with fixed assets will increase tax benefits in the form of depreciation costs.

**The Effect of Sales Growth on Capital Structure**

Based on the results of the T (partial) test on the sales growth variable, it shows a T-Count value of 0.480792 while the T-table value is 1.66980. Where the value of  $T_{count}$  is smaller than the value of the Table  $(0.480792 < 1.66980)$  with a probability value  $(0.6324 > 0.05)$ . So it can be concluded that  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_2$  is rejected, thus it can be concluded that the sales growth variable has no effect on the capital structure.

The results of this study show that the Trade-Off theory cannot explain sales growth that does not have an impact on the company's debt and capital mix, where in determining the optimal composition of the capital structure, whether or not a sales growth condition does not affect the company to choose internal or external funding. Sales growth is not paid attention to by the company in determining the use of external or internal funds in using debt.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by (Setiawati and Veronica, 2020), (Febtian and Isbanah, 2024) and (Asiah et al., 2022) which stated that sales growth has no effect on capital structure.

**The Effect of Business Risk on Capital Structure**

Based on the results of the T (partial) test on the variable shows a  $T_{cal}$  value of 1.140851 while the Table is 1.66980. Where the value of  $T_{count}$  is smaller than the value of  $T_{table}$   $(1.140851 < 1.66980)$  with a probability value  $(0.2584 > 0.05)$ . Therefore, it can be concluded that  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_3$  is rejected, thus it can be concluded that the variable business risk has no effect on the capital structure.

The results of this study show that the high and low business risks experienced by a company do not affect the capital structure. because companies with a high level of risk do not necessarily prefer internal funding compared to external funding (Afa and Hazmi, 2021). According to pecking order theory, companies will use the safest funds first, then internal funds to keep their business risks under control. The results of this study show that the pecking order theory cannot explain business risks in determining the amount of debt to be used. This can happen because the company is more adjusted to the conditions



**INTERNASIONAL CONFERENCE & CALL FOR PAPER**

**ECONOMICS, BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY (EBIC), 30<sup>th</sup> April 2025**

Vol : 2

No.: 1

No. E- ISSN: 3025-4086

and circumstances of its business and there are differences of opinion between the company and investors.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by (Arini, and Rohyani, 2022) and (Afa and Hazmi, 2021) stating that business risk has no effect on the capital structure.

## **5. CONCLUSION & SUGGESTION**

### **Conclusion**

Based on the results of the research that has been obtained from data processing with Microsoft excel software and E-views 12 regarding the influence of tax savings, sales growth and business risk on the capital structure, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The test results show that the variables of tax savings, sales growth, and business risk simultaneously affect the capital structure. This shows that together tax savings, sales growth and business risk can affect the capital structure.
2. The test results show that the tax saving variable affects the capital structure of infrastructure companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in the period 2019-2023
3. The test results show that the sales growth variable has no effect on the capital structure of infrastructure companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in the period 2019-2023
4. The test results show that business risk variables have no effect on the capital structure of infrastructure companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in the period 2019-2023

### **Suggestion**

1. Based on the results and discussions and conclusions regarding the influence of tax savings, sales growth and business risks on capital structure, the researcher gave suggestions, including: For the next researcher, it is hoped that it is better to use companies with other types of sectors in order to obtain a larger sample so that it can strengthen the conclusions of previous research.
2. For the next researcher, it is expected to add other variables that can affect capital structure variables, such as asset structure, company size, liquidity, profitability and managerial ownership. And it is also recommended to add a period of research years

## **REFERENCES**

Afa, A., & Hazmi, S. (2021). Pengaruh Likuiditas, Risiko Bisnis dan Struktur Aktiva terhadap Struktur Modal. *Jurnal Al-Qardh*, 6(1), 30–44. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jaq.v6i1.2691>

Anwar, N. P., & Wahidahwati. (2019). PENGARUH STRUKTUR AKTIVA , TINGKAT PERTUMBUHAN Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Indonesia ( STIESIA ) Surabaya. *Ilmu Dan Risetakuntansi*, 8(4), 19.

Arini, L. S., & Rohyani, T. (2022). Pengaruh Resiko Bisnis, Likuiditas dan Pertumbuhan Asset Terhadap Struktur Modal Perusahaan Jasa Konstruksi yang Terdaftar Di



**INTERNASIONAL CONFERENCE & CALL FOR PAPER**

**ECONOMICS, BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY (EBIC), 30<sup>th</sup> April 2025**

Vol : 2 No.: 1 No. E- ISSN: 3025-4086

BEI Tahun 2014 – 2016. Syntax Idea, 4(2), 364–375.  
<https://doi.org/10.46799/syntax-idea.v4i2.1777>

Asiah, N., Widati, S., Nurjanah, R., & Yahya, A. (2022). Pengaruh Penghindaran Pajak, Pertumbuhan Penjualan Dan Struktur Aset Terhadap Struktur Modal. *Jurnal Manajemen Kewirausahaan*, 19(02), 123–134.

Brigham, E. F., & Ehrhardt, M. C. (2017). *Financial Management: Theory & Practice* (15th Editi). Cengage Learning.

Fadilah dan Ardini, L. (2020). Pengaruh Struktur Aktiva, Size dan Sales Growth Terhadap Struktur Modal. *Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Akuntansi*, 9(5), 16. <https://doi.org/10.47134/jampk.v2i1.441>

Hendra, & Yusuf, M. (2022). Faktor-Faktor Determinan Struktur Modal Pada Perusahaan Sub Sektor Tekstil Dan Garmen. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Tsm*, 2(2), 127–136. <http://jurnaltsm.id/index.php/EJMTSM>

Indopremier.com. (2022). ADHI Akan Right Issue Oktober, Uangnya Untuk Kebut 6 Proyek. [Indopremier.com](https://www.indopremier.com/legacy/newsDetail.php?jdl=ADHI_Akan_Right_Issue_Oktober_Uangnya_Untuk_Kebut_6_Proyek&news_id=152563&group_news=IPOTNEWS&taging_subtype=ADHI&name=&search=y_general&q=A DHI&halaman=1).

[https://www.indopremier.com/legacy/newsDetail.php?jdl=ADHI\\_Akan\\_Right\\_Issue\\_Oktober\\_Uangnya\\_Untuk\\_Kebut\\_6\\_Proyek&news\\_id=152563&group\\_news=IPOTNEWS&taging\\_subtype=ADHI&name=&search=y\\_general&q=A DHI&halaman=1](https://www.indopremier.com/legacy/newsDetail.php?jdl=ADHI_Akan_Right_Issue_Oktober_Uangnya_Untuk_Kebut_6_Proyek&news_id=152563&group_news=IPOTNEWS&taging_subtype=ADHI&name=&search=y_general&q=A DHI&halaman=1)

Linda, Umdiana, N., & Hapsari, D. P. (2023). Pengaruh Beban Pajak, Non Debt Tax Shield, Profitabilitas, Kepemilikan Manajerial Terhadap Struktur Modal. “LAWSUIT” *Jurnal Perpajakan*, 2(1), 29–45. <https://doi.org/10.30656/lawsuit.v2i1.5546>

Mas, I. A. D. P., & Dewi, sayu K. S. (2020). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, perumbuhan Penjualan Dan Struktur Aktiva terhadap Struktur Modal. *E-Jurnal Manajemen*, 9(8), 3105–3124.

Mulyani, N., & Agustinus, E. (2022). Pengaruh Profitabilitas dan Non-Debt Tax Shield Terhadap Struktur Modal Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Yang Terdaftar di BEI Periode 2016-2020. *JIMF (Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Forkamma)*, 5(2), 162. <https://doi.org/10.32493/frkm.v5i2.19529>

Munandar, A., Pratiwi, A., & Hasan, I. (2019). Pengaruh Risiko Bisnis Terhadap Struktur Modal Pada Perusahaan Pabrik Kertas Pt. Tjiwi Kimia Tbk Periode 2013 - 2018. *SULTANIST: Jurnal Manajemen dan Keuangan*, 7(2), 53–61. <https://doi.org/10.37403/sultanist.v7i2.143>

Nasional.kontan.co.id. (2023). Kemenkeu Beberkan Alasan Membatalkan Rp 3 Triliun Waskita Karya (WSKT). [Nasional.kontan.co.id](https://nasional.kontan.co.id/news/kemenkeu-beberkan-alasan-membatalkan-pmn-rp-3-triliun-ke-waskita-karya-wskt).  
<https://nasional.kontan.co.id/news/kemenkeu-beberkan-alasan-membatalkan-pmn-rp-3-triliun-ke-waskita-karya-wskt>

Nurlita, & Indradi, D. (2024). Pengaruh Struktur Aset, Kebijakan Deviden, Pertumbuhan Perusahaan Terhadap Kebijakan Utang. Seminar Nasional dan The 3rd Call for Syariah Paper, 6(2), 1–27.

Rindiasih, R., & Wulandari, R. (2023). Pengaruh Risiko Bisnis, Pertumbuhan Penjualan Dan Struktur Aktiva Terhadap Struktur Modal. *Jurnal Maneksi*, 12(3), 554–563. <https://doi.org/10.31959/jm.v12i3.1516>

Rodoni, A., & Ali, H. (2014). *Manajemen Keuangan Modern* (Asli). Mitra Wacana Media.

Salmawanti, & Irawati, W. (2024). Pengaruh Cost of Debt, Capital Intensity dan Sales Growth Terhadap Tax Avoidance. *Monex Journal Research Accounting* Politeknik Tegal, 13(01), 17–31. <https://doi.org/10.30591/monex.v13i01.5647>

Sari, D., & Irawati, W. (2021). Pengaruh Perencanaan Pajak , Struktur Modal Dan Kepemilikan Manajerial Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan Moderasi. *Jurnal Akuntansi Barelang*, 6(1), 1–12.



**Faculty of Economics and Business**

**Universitas Pamulang**

**INTERNASIONAL CONFERENCE & CALL FOR PAPER**

**ECONOMICS, BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY (EBIC), 30<sup>th</sup> April 2025**

Vol : 2

No.: 1

No. E- ISSN: 3025-4086

Septiananda, N., & Pratiwi, A. P. (2023). Struktur Modal: Inflasi, Non-Debt Tax Shield, Dan Agresivitas Pajak. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi dan Keuangan (JIAKu)*, 2(3), 242–257. <https://doi.org/10.24034/jiaku.v2i3.5999>

Setiawati, M., & Veronica, E. (2020). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Struktur Aset, Ukuran Perusahaan, Risiko Bisnis, Pertumbuhan Penjualan, Pertumbuhan Perusahaan, Likuiditas Terhadap Struktur Modal Pada Perusahaan Sektor Jasa Periode 2016-2018. *Jurnal Akuntansi*, 12(2), 294–312. <https://doi.org/10.28932/jam.v12i2.2538>

Sugiyono. (2013). Metode penelitian kuantitatif kualitatif dan R&D. In Penerbit Alfabeta (Cetakan ke). CV Alfabeta. [https://elibrary.stikesghsby.ac.id/index.php?p=show\\_detail&id=1879&keyword\\_s](https://elibrary.stikesghsby.ac.id/index.php?p=show_detail&id=1879&keyword_s)

Sungkar, H. I., & Deitiana, T. (2021). Pengaruh Current Ratio, Return On Asset, Risiko Bisnis, Ukuran Perusahaan dan Pajak Terhadap Struktur Modal. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Tsm*, 1(1), 37–44. <https://www.scribd.com/document/511375073/979-Article-Text-2795-2-10-20210329>

Tusadia, A. (2023). Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Penjualan dan Non Debt Tax Shield Terhadap Struktur Modal. Universitas Pamulang.

Wulandari, N. P. I., & Artini, L. G. S. (2019). Pengaruh Likuiditas, Non-Debt Tax Shield, Ukuran Perusahaan Dan Pertumbuhan Penjualan Terhadap Struktur Modal. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 8(6), 3560. <https://doi.org/10.24843/ejmunud.2019.v08.i06.p10>