Determinants Of Tax Aggressivity In Manufacturing Companies In The Consumption Goods Industry Sector Registered On The Idx

Helen Tiara Putri [1], Andrian Noviardy [2]

Faculty of Social Humanities, Bina Darma University Palembang, Jl. General Ahmad Yani No. 3, 9/10 Ulu, Seberang Ulu I District, Palembang City, South Sumatra 30111 [1,2,3]
helentiara21@gmail.com [1]   Andrian.noviardy@binadarma.ac.id [2]

ABSTRACT

Tax aggressiveness is an act of tax avoidance carried out by companies by carrying out tax planning (tax plaining) by exploiting loopholes in the law with the aim of reducing company profits so that tax savings can be implemented but carried out both legally and illegally, tax aggressiveness can be measured using the Effective Tax scale Rate (ETR) is the most commonly used in some literature. The range of ETR values that can identify tax aggressiveness or not. This research aims to determine the relationship between capital intensity, liquidity, profitability, leverage and company size on tax aggressiveness. The population in this study was manufacturing companies in the consumer goods industry sector listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (BEI) in 2019–2021. The sample selection method in this research was determined using a *purposive sampling method* which aims to obtain samples that comply with the specified criteria . The research results show that capital intensity has no effect on tax aggressiveness; the liquidity variable has no effect on tax aggressiveness; the profitability variable has a significant negative effect on tax aggressiveness; the leverage variable has no effect on tax aggressiveness; and the company size variable has no effect on tax aggressiveness.

Keywords: Capital Intensity, Company Size, Leverage, Liquidity, Profitability, Tax Aggressiveness

INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, the tax sector functions as a provider of income. The welfare of society and the success of the country are mutually dependent on government financial income. The aim of tax practices based on Pancasila is to improve the welfare and prosperity of the people. The definition of tax as a payment obligation to the government, which must be carried out by individuals or organizations in accordance with the law without direct compensation, with the aim of supporting the welfare of society, can be found in Article 1 of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 28 of 2007 concerning General Provisions and Procedures for Taxation (Amalia, 2021).

Various challenges arise in efforts to maximize tax revenues, including obstacles in ensuring taxpayer compliance with their tax responsibilities. In this context, business actors who act as corporate taxpayers consider tax as a burden that has the potential to reduce total income or net profit. As a result, business entities will implement aggressive tax planning strategies, with the aim of reducing the tax burden they have to bear. Bold tax planning practices like this are able to create taxable income, both through legal methods (tax avoidance) and illegal actions (tax evasion), to reduce the amount of tax that must be paid (Amalia, 2021)

In Indonesia, the manufacturing business sector continues to be the majority of all existing business types. One element of state fiscal revenue is the tax imposed on companies in the manufacturing sector. This tax is collected from trading businesses in the manufacturing sector and paid by the taxpayer concerned. In this framework, the responsibility for paying taxes lies with the company itself. To reduce the amount of tax that must be paid, business people have alternatives in implementing tax management. One strategy in tax management is to utilize debt, where interest expenses from debt can be considered as a deduction from business income. The consequence is a reduction in company profits that are subject to tax, so that the amount of tax that must be paid can also be reduced (Hidayat & Fitria, 2018)

Tax aggressiveness is the actions taken by a company to reduce its tax obligations. Tax aggressiveness is an activity or action that has the aim of reducing a company's taxable income, either actively or illegally, in order to reduce its tax burden so that the company's profits are optimal . The occurrence of tax aggressiveness is caused by differences in interests between the taxpayer (company) and the government. The government needs tax funds to finance the implementation of activities carried out by the government. Meanwhile, companies as taxpayers view taxes as additional costs that the company must pay. By paying taxes, it will reduce the amount of net profit the company will receive. Therefore, company owners are more interested in company management taking aggressive tax actions (Novitasari et al., 2016).

Determinants Of Tax Aggressivity In Manufacturing Companies In The Consumption Goods Industry Sector Registered On The Idx

Helen Tiara Putri [1] , Andrian Noviardy [2]

Faculty of Social Humanities, Bina Darma University Palembang, Jl. General Ahmad Yani No. 3, 9/10 Ulu, Seberang Ulu I District, Palembang City, South Sumatra 30111 [1,2,3]
helentiara21@gmail.com [1] . Andrian.noviardy@binadarma.ac.id [2]

ABSTRACT

Tax aggressiveness is an act of tax avoidance carried out by companies by carrying out tax planning (tax plaining) by exploiting loopholes in the law with the aim of reducing company profits so that tax savings can be implemented but carried out both legally and illegally, tax aggressiveness can be measured using the Effective Tax scale Rate (ETR) is the most commonly used in some literature. The range of ETR values that can identify tax aggressiveness or not. This research aims to determine the relationship between capital intensity, liquidity, profitability, leverage and company size on tax aggressiveness. The population in this study was manufacturing companies in the consumer goods industry sector listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (BEI) in 2019–2021. The sample selection method in this research was determined using a *purposive sampling method* which aims to obtain samples that comply with the specified criteria . The research results show that capital intensity has no effect on tax aggressiveness; the liquidity variable has no effect on tax aggressiveness; the profitability variable has a significant negative effect on tax aggressiveness; the leverage variable has no effect on tax aggressiveness; and the company size variable has no effect on tax aggressiveness.

Keywords: Capital Intensity, Company Size, Leverage, Liquidity, Profitability, Tax Aggressiveness

INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, the tax sector functions as a provider of income. The welfare of society and the success of the country are mutually dependent on government financial income. The aim of tax practices based on Pancasila is to improve the welfare and prosperity of the people. The definition of tax as a payment obligation to the government, which must be carried out by individuals or organizations in accordance with the law without direct compensation, with the aim of supporting the welfare of society, can be found in Article 1 of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 28 of 2007 concerning General Provisions and Procedures for Taxation (Amalia, 2021).

Various challenges arise in efforts to maximize tax revenues, including obstacles in ensuring taxpayer compliance with their tax responsibilities. In this context, business actors who act as corporate taxpayers consider tax as a burden that has the potential to reduce total income or net profit. As a result, business entities will implement aggressive tax planning strategies, with the aim of reducing the tax burden they have to bear. Bold tax planning practices like this are able to create taxable income, both through legal methods (tax avoidance) and illegal actions (tax evasion), to reduce the amount of tax that must be paid (Amalia, 2021)

In Indonesia, the manufacturing business sector continues to be the majority of all existing business types. One element of state fiscal revenue is the tax imposed on companies in the manufacturing sector. This tax is collected from trading businesses in the manufacturing sector and paid by the taxpayer concerned. In this framework, the responsibility for paying taxes lies with the company itself. To reduce the amount of tax that must be paid, business people have alternatives in implementing tax management. One strategy in tax management is to utilize debt, where interest expenses from debt can be considered as a deduction from business income. The consequence is a reduction in company profits that are subject to tax, so that the amount of tax that must be paid can also be reduced (Hidayat & Fitria, 2018)

Tax aggressiveness is the actions taken by a company to reduce its tax obligations. Tax aggressiveness is an activity or action that has the aim of reducing a company's taxable income, either actively or illegally, in order to reduce its tax burden so that the company's profits are optimal . The occurrence of tax aggressiveness is caused by differences in interests between the taxpayer (company) and the government. The government needs tax funds to finance the implementation of activities carried out by the government. Meanwhile, companies as taxpayers view taxes as additional costs that the company must pay. By paying taxes, it will reduce the amount of net profit the company will receive. Therefore, company owners are more interested in company management taking aggressive tax actions (Novitasari et al., 2016).

Tax aggressiveness can be measured using the Effective Tax Rate (ETR) scale which is most commonly used in several literatures. The range of ETR values that can identify tax aggressiveness or not. For example, a low ETR indicates tax aggressiveness. Some companies avoid taxes in various ways , such as reducing the company's taxable income or maintaining financial accounting profits so that they have a lower ETR value. Thus, ETR can be used to regulate tax aggressiveness (Leksono et al., 2019).

Manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (BEI) are divided into three types, namely the basic and chemical industry sector, the miscellaneous industry sector, and the consumer goods industry sector. In this study, researchers chose the consumer goods industrial sector because manufacturing companies in the consumer goods industrial sector produce the basic necessities most needed by society in line with increasing population growth in Indonesia. The sub-sector of manufacturing companies in the consumer goods industry sector is the industrial sector which operates in the fields of food and beverages, cigarettes, pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, and household goods, as well as household equipment.

Companies operating in the consumer goods industry sector have high operating activities, which means that companies must be able to manage each of their activities in order to gain profits and maximize profitability and control working capital turnover. Manufacturing companies operating in the consumer goods industrial sector are one of the industrial sectors that are considered to have an important role in national economic growth, so it does not rule out the possibility that this sector will have quite large profits.

The phenomenon of tax aggressiveness in the form of tax evasion is still widely found. The Tax Justice Network reports that as a result of tax evasion, Indonesia is estimated to lose up to 4.86 billion US dollars per year or the equivalent of IDR 68.7 trillion. The report states that multinational companies divert their profits to countries that are considered tax havens. The goal is not to report how much profit is actually generated in the country where the business is conducted. Corporations end up paying lower taxes than they should (news.ddtc.co.id, 2020).

Capital Intensity or capital intensity ratio is a company's investment activity which is associated with investment in fixed assets and inventory. The capital intensity ratio can show the efficiency of using assets to generate sales. (Hidayat & Fitria, 2018) capital intensity can also be defined by how the company sacrifices funds for operational activities and asset funding in order to obtain company profits. Capital intensity ratio can be defined as a company investing its assets in fixed assets and inventory.

In this research, capital intensity is proxied using the fixed asset intensity ratio. Fixed asset intensity is how large the proportion of the company's fixed assets is in the total assets owned by the company. (Ardyansah, 2014) says that company fixed assets allow companies to reduce their taxes due to depreciation that arises from fixed assets each year.

According to the Financial Services Authority (OJK), liquidity is the ability to fulfill all obligations that must be paid immediately within a short time. A company is said to be liquid if it has means of payment in the form of current assets that are greater than all its liabilities (liquidity). Liquidity is a ratio that measures a company's ability to fulfill its maturing obligations, both obligations to parties outside the company and within the company.

According to (Putri, 2016) the profitability of a company can be used by investors or creditors to assess whether the company generates sufficient profits from the company's assets and equity, which shows how efficient the company is in using its assets to generate profits. By looking at the profitability generated by the company, it can be seen to what extent the company is effective in utilizing its assets in obtaining company profits and a consistent level of profitability will be a measuring tool for how the company is able to survive in the business it carries out. Apart from that, according to(Fakhrudin & Wulandari, 2022) profitability also shows the performance carried out by management in managing company assets as shown by the profits generated. In general, the profits generated by the company come from sales and investments made by the company.

Profitability is the company's ability to generate profits during a certain period. Profitability can be measured using Return On Assets (ROA) to see how big the profitability ratio is in a company. A company that has a low profitability ratio will have an impact on the company's low tax burden and vice versa. According to (Utomo & Fitria, 2021)they conducted research on the effect of profitability on tax aggressiveness which proved that profitability had a significant positive effect on tax aggressiveness. However, contrary to the results of research conducted by (Yuliana & Wahyudi, 2018) that profitability has a significant negative effect on tax aggressiveness because a high level of profitability is considered capable of increasing awareness and compliance with applicable tax obligations because it has special attention from the government.

According to (Masrurroch et al., 2021) Leverage is the level of debt used by a company in financing. If a company uses debt, there will be interest charges that must be paid by the company, which in turn can reduce a company's profits. Positive accounting theory explains that the higher the use of third party funds, the company

will maintain profits for the current period which aims to maintain the stability of a company's performance. Companies that use leverage levels will have the effect of reducing the tax burden, so that companies with leverage levels will not be aggressive in taxation. The higher the debt value of a company, the smaller the ETR value obtained.

Company size is a scale that determines the size of the company which can be seen from the equity value, sales value, number of employees and total asset value which are context variables that measure the demand for an organization's services or products. Company size (firm size) describes the size of a company as indicated by total assets, number of sales, average sales level and average total assets. Small large scale companies. Large companies have relatively greater growth than small companies, so that the rate of return on shares in large companies is greater than the share returns in small companies. Therefore, investors will speculate more on large companies with the hope of large returns.

This research refers to previous research conducted by (Amalia, 2021), but there are differences with that research or previous research. The difference between this research and previous research lies in the independent variables, namely the researcher added 2 independent variables, namely profitability and company size.

This research aims to investigate whether the independent variable (X) consisting of capital intensity, liquidity, profitability, leverage and company size has an impact on the dependent variable (Y). This is analyzed in the context of tax aggressiveness on consumer goods manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange during the 2019-2021 period.

RESEARCH METHODS

This type of research is quantitative research, the population in this research is manufacturing companies in the consumer goods industry sector listed on the Indonesian Stock Exchange (BEI) in 2019-2021. The sample for this research was 34 companies over three years of observation, and with 102 observation data. The data analysis process involves the use of multiple linear regression techniques, as well as the application of the first classical assumption test to evaluate aspects of normality, multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation in the data. The success of the model is measured through the coefficient of determination ($R2$), while additional hypothesis testing is carried out by referring to the significance test (F test) and partial significance test (T test). each of these stages is based on relevant methodological guidelines and conforms to the guidelines outlined by relevant sources in the scientific literature. This research then examines all variables to show whether these variables have an effect on tax aggressiveness or not.

This research was conducted based on the hypothetico-deductive method. Research using this method involves seven stages, namely:

Observation
This stage tries to identify by seeing whether there really is a certain phenomenon (in this case whether capital intensity, liquidity, profitability, leverage and size have a positive relationship with tax aggressiveness).

Preliminary Information Gathering
In this stage, researchers collect information regarding corporate income tax and conditions that identify factors that influence tax aggressiveness.

Theory Fomulation
At this stage the researcher attempts to collect and integrate all the information obtained so that it becomes a unit that has logical meaning so that the problem raised (in this case tax aggressiveness has a positive relationship with capital intensity, liquidity, profitability, leverage and company size).

Hypothesis
A combination of underlying theories and various related information such as previous empirical research. The formulation of this research hypothesis was carried out using a deductive method. Based on research on tax aggressiveness, the researcher assumes that there is a positive relationship with the reference sample, namely manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector in Indonesia.

Further Scientific Data Collection
Because the hypothesis formulated will be tested, the next stage is collecting the variables to be measured, which will later become the basis for the next analysis.

Data Analysis
In this stage, the data that has been obtained is processed statistically to see whether the hypothesis that has been built can be supported.

Deduction

It is a process in which sample researchers come to conclusions, namely by interpreting the meaning of the results of the data analysis obtained. Based on this deduction, the researcher can recommend whether the problems raised have been answered according to the hypothesis.

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Variable Description

Descriptive analysis of the data taken for this research is secondary data in the form of annual reports from 34 manufacturing companies in the consumer goods industry sector listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange for the 2019-2021 period. The following is a descriptive statistics table for each research variable:

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics
Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimun	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Capital Intensity	85	0.06	0.76	0.3399	0.16182
Likuiditas	85	0.41	13.31	2.8914	2.42335
Profitability	85	0.01	0.73	0.1697	0.13983
Leverage	85	0.12	3.41	0.7517	0.67621
Company Size	85	13.62	30.88	23.3067	5.91068
Tax Aggressiveness	85	0.17	0.31	0.2317	0.02959
Valid N (listwise)	85				

Source: Processed data, 2023

The descriptive statistical results of the research are documented in Table 1 showing the values of each research variable. The average capital intensity variable is 0.3399 with a standard deviation of 0.16182, and has a value range between 0.06 to 0.76. The liquidity variable has a mean of 2.8914 and a standard deviation of 2.42335, with the lowest value being 0.41 and the highest being 13.31. Profitability yields a mean of 0.1697 and a standard deviation of 0.13983, and a range of values between 0.01 and 0.73. Leverage has an average value of 0.7517 and a standard deviation of 0.67621, with a minimum value of 0.12 and a maximum value of 3.41. Company size shows an average of 23.3067 with a standard deviation of 5.91068, and the lowest value is 13.62 and the highest is 30.88. Tax aggression produces a mean of 0.2317 and a standard deviation of 0.02959, with a minimum value of 0.17 and a maximum of 0.31. This descriptive statistical data details the characteristics of each variable, forming the basis for further analysis in this study.

Classic Assumption Test Results
Table 2. Summary of Classical Assumption Tests

Testing	*Capital Intensity*	Likui ditas	Profita bilitas	*Leverage*	Ukuran Perusahaan	Kesimpulan
Normalitas						
Kolmogrov-Smirnov			Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) 0.200			Berdistribusi normal
Multikolineritas						
Tolarance	0.749	0.612	0.775	0.662	0.803	Bebas
VIF	1.335	1.634	1.290	1.510	1.245	Multikolineritas
Heteroskedastisitas						
Scatterplot		Titik-titik menyebar dan tidak membentuk Sebuah pola				Bebas heteroskedastisitas
Autokeralasi						
Run test		*Asym. Sig* (2-tailed) 0.064			Tidak terjadi	autokeralasi

Source: Processed data, 2023

Based on the data in Table 2, the results of traditional assumption testing show that this stage is passed, allowing continuation at the next stage. Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) normality analysis indicated that the data conformed to a normal distribution. The multicollinearity test uses an Asymp.Sig (2-tailed) value > 0.05 indicating a good tolerance level. The results of the heteroscedasticity test, which can be seen from the scatterplot pattern which is evenly distributed without a particular pattern, and the autocorrelation test with the Run test produce Asymp values above 10% for all variables and VIF below 10, indicating the absence of multicollinearity problems in this research data. In fact, the signature (2-tailed) > 0.05 indicates that there is no autocorrelation in this study.

Hypothesis Test Results

Coefficient of Determination (R ^{2})

The Coefficient of Determination (R2) aims to measure how far the model's ability is to explain variations in the dependent variable. The coefficient of determination value is between zero and one. The results of the coefficient of determination (R2) in this study show the following results.

Table 3. Coefficient of Determination Results

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.305[a]	0.093	0.035	0.029

Source: Data processed

The adjusted R2 value is used to analyze the significance of the coefficient of determination, which describes the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable. The variables included in this study contributed 3.5% to the variation in the independent variables, in accordance with an adjusted R2 of 0.035. Meanwhile, variables not examined in this study had an impact of 28.6%, which includes another part of the variation.

Simultaneous Significance Test (F Test)

Table 4. Simultaneous Significance Test Results (F Test)

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
1	Regression	0.007	5	0.001	1.615	0.166[b]
	Residual	0.067	79	0.001		
	Total	0.074	84			

Source: Processed data, 2023

The F test was used to assess the validity of the regression model in this research. The estimated F value is 1.615 while the critical F value in the table is 2.329, with a significance level of 0.000 < 0.05 for the results of the ANOVA test or F test. The results of this test indicate that simultaneously all dependent factors do not have a significant influence on the independent variables.

Partial Significance Test (T Test)

The t statistical test is used to show how much influence an explanatory (independent) variable individually has in explaining variations in the dependent variable. To determine this influence, a significance level of 5% was used. From partial hypothesis testing, the results obtained are as follows:

Table 5. T test

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	0.255	0.019		13.720	0.000
Capital Intensity	-0.006	0.023	-0.034	-0.276	0.783
Likuiditas	-0.001	0.002	-0.064	-0.464	0.644
Profitabilitas	-0.061	0.026	-0.278	-2.356	0.021
Leverage	0.007	0.006	0.168	1.276	0.206
Ukuran Perusahaan	-0.001	0.001	-0.118	-0.985	0.328

Source: Processed data, 2023

The results of the multiple regression analysis are found in Table 5 listed above. The regression coefficient of each variable can be integrated into a multiple linear regression equation, which is formulated as follows.

$$Y = 0.255 - 0.006 X1 – 0.001 X2 - 0.061 X3 + 0.007$$

Based on Table 5 listed above, the results of observations on the variables capital intensity, liquidity, profitability, leverage and company size show interesting results. The first hypothesis cannot be accepted considering that the Sig value is 0.783, which exceeds the significance level (α) of 0.05, indicating that capital intensity does not have a significant impact on tax aggressiveness. The second hypothesis did not receive support because the Sig value for liquidity was 0.644, also exceeding the significance level (α) of 0.05 , which indicates that liquidity does not have a significant influence on tax aggressiveness. However, the third hypothesis is accepted because the Sig value is 0.021 (α = 0.05) , indicating that there is a significant influence of profitability on tax aggressiveness. On the other hand, the Sig value for leverage is 0.206 (> α = 0.05) , revealing that leverage does not have a substantial impact on tax aggressiveness, so the fourth hypothesis is not relevant. The

fifth hypothesis is also not proven because the Sig value is 0.328 (> α = 0.05) , implying that company size does not have a significant influence on tax aggressiveness.

DISCUSSION

The Influence of *Capital Intensity* on Tax Aggressiveness

The results of testing the first hypothesis show that the hypothesis is not accepted, because *capital intensity* has no effect on tax aggressiveness with a significance of 0.783, which is a value greater than 0.05 (α = 5%) and the regression coefficient value is -0.276. Therefore, based on the results of this hypothesis, *capital intensity* does not have a positive effect on tax aggressiveness.

The results of this research are in line with research conducted by (Awaliyah et al., 2021) which found evidence that capital intensity does not have a significant effect on tax aggressiveness, but it is not in line with research conducted by (Suyanto, 2018) where these results prove that capital intensity has a positive effect on tax aggressiveness.

The results of this study show the irrelevance of agency theory which implies that companies that have a high level of capital intensity will tend to adopt tax aggressiveness strategies. The cause of its apparent lack of influence most likely lies in the annual fluctuations in the value of capital intensity in this research sample, while the value of tax aggressiveness shows a consistent downward trend over time. Therefore, this conclusion supports the argument that other factors, besides capital intensity, can have a more significant impact on corporate tax policy.

Companies, both large and small, experience a close relationship between the amount of fixed assets they own and the tax obligations they have to pay. The unique characteristics of the tax system make fixed assets play a role as a stable component in determining the size of a company's tax obligations. This happens because the depreciation value of fixed assets is used to reduce the fixed tax burden each year, creating consistency in the contribution of fixed assets to taxes.

The Effect of Liquidity on Tax Aggressiveness

The results of testing the second hypothesis show that the hypothesis is not accepted, because liquidity has no effect on tax aggressiveness with a significance of -0.644, which is a value greater than 0.05 (α = 5%) and the regression coefficient value is -0.064. Therefore, based on the results of this hypothesis, it states that liquidity has no positive effect on tax aggressiveness. The results of this research are not in line with research conducted by(Awaliyah et al., 2021) where the results prove that liquidity has a positive effect on tax aggressiveness.

These results are not relevant to agency theory which indicates a tendency for companies to have liquidity those who are high will carry out tax aggressiveness, the reason these two variables have no effect is most likely due to the liquidity value The research sample fluctuates every year, while the tax aggressiveness value tends to decrease. Thus, it can be concluded that the focus of the companies in the sample of this research is most likely to attract the attention of investors and creditors, not to save on tax burden.

In this case, if the company is able to fulfill its financial obligations on time, then the company is in a liquid condition, which is indicated by a fairly good level of liquidity and the company has the ability to fulfill its short-term obligations, including its tax obligations, so that the company does not carry out tax aggressiveness.

The Effect of Profitability on Tax Aggressiveness

The results of testing the third hypothesis show that the hypothesis is accepted, because profitability influences tax aggressiveness with a significance of 0.021, which is a value smaller than 0.05 (α = 5%) and the regression coefficient value is -2.356. Therefore, based on the results of this hypothesis, it states that profitability has a negative effect on tax aggressiveness. Based on the results of data analysis, it shows that hypothesis 3 is rejected, profitability has a significant negative effect on tax aggressiveness.

The results of this research are consistent with research conducted by Putri (2016), which proves the results that profitability has a negative influence on tax aggressiveness. However, it is not consistent with research conducted by (Krisna & Supadmi, 2023), which proves the results that profitability has a positive influence on tax aggressiveness.

These results are not relevant to agency theory which indicates that companies with high profitability will carry out tax aggressiveness because profitability has a negative effect on tax aggressiveness because most of the research samples have profitability values that increase during the year of observation, but tax aggressiveness tends to decrease during the year of observation in most of the research sample. In this case, it shows that the

company's focus is on attracting investors' attention through achieving adequate financial performance, rather than carrying out tax aggressiveness.

The results of this research explain that the level of company profitability obtained, even though the results are small or large, has no bearing on corporate tax payments. Furthermore , the negative direction shows that the higher the company's profitability, the lower its tax aggressiveness, and conversely, if the company's profitability is lower, the higher its tax aggressiveness. This can be influenced by income that should not be included as a tax object but is included as a tax object.

The Effect of *Leverage* on Tax Aggressiveness

The results of testing the fourth hypothesis show that the hypothesis is not accepted, because *leverage* has no effect on tax aggressiveness with a significance of 0.206, which is a value greater than 0.05 (α = 5%) and the regression coefficient value is 1.276. Therefore, based on the results of this hypothesis, it states that *leverage* has no positive effect on tax aggressiveness.

The results of this research are in line with research conducted by (Dewi, 2021), which found evidence that leverage has no significant effect on tax aggressiveness, but is not in line with research conducted by (Awaliyah et al., 2021), where the results This proves that leverage has a positive effect on tax aggressiveness.

These results are not relevant to agency theory which indicates that there is a tendency for companies with high *leverage* to be tax aggressive, the reason these two variables have no effect is most likely because the *leverage value* of the research sample fluctuates every year while the tax aggressiveness value tends to fall. Thus, it can be concluded that the focus of the companies in the sample of this research is most likely to attract the attention of investors and creditors, not to save on tax burden.

This is also in line with positive accounting theory which states that companies with high debt levels tend to use accounting methods with the aim of maximizing company profits. This method was chosen because companies with high use of debt will be closer to debt covenant restrictions, namely an agreement to protect lenders, so companies will tend to maximize their profits to widen these restrictions. This can be an indication in trading companies where most of the debt is current, where the company must maximize its profits to gain the trust of suppliers to sell goods to the company on credit. This method of maximizing profits will cause the tax burden to be paid to increase and not be balanced by the interest burden resulting from the company's current debt, so that the company cannot be aggressive in taxes.

The Influence of Company Size on Tax Aggressiveness

The results of testing the fifth hypothesis show that the hypothesis is not accepted, because company size has no effect on tax aggressiveness with a significance of 0.328, which is a value greater than 0.05 (α = 5%) and the regression coefficient value is -0.985. Therefore, based on the results of this hypothesis, company size does not have a positive effect on tax aggressiveness. The results of this research are in line with research conducted by Handayani & Yumsih (2018), which found evidence that company size has no effect on tax aggressiveness. However, this is not in line with research conducted by (Dewi, 2021)), where the results prove that company size has a positive effect on tax aggressiveness.

These results are not relevant to agency theory which indicates that there is a trend in companies with company size those who are high will carry out tax aggressiveness, the reason these two variables have no effect is most likely due to the value of company size The research sample fluctuates every year, while the tax aggressiveness value tends to decrease.

The results of this test indicate that the size of the company does not affect tax aggressiveness activities. Tax aggressive activities are not only carried out by large companies, but even medium or small scale companies will be able to carry out tax aggressive actions, because whether large or small companies are still subject to tax burdens. The difference lies in the impact on state revenue, if tax aggressiveness is carried out by small companies, the impact will not be too big on state revenue, because the amount is not too high, on the other hand, if it is carried out by large scale companies, it will have a big impact on state revenue.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion regarding the Determinants of Tax Aggressiveness in Manufacturing Companies in the Consumer Goods Industry Sector listed on the IDX using the independent variables capital intensity, liquidity, profitability, leverage and company size which the author presents in Chapter IV, the author concludes several things as follows:

The results of testing the first hypothesis show that the capital intensity variable has no effect on tax aggressiveness in manufacturing companies in the consumer goods industry sector listed on the IDX. This shows that the higher the level of capital intensity, the lower the amount of tax aggressiveness in the consumer goods sector, and vice versa. The results of testing the second hypothesis show that the liquidity variable has no effect on tax aggressiveness in consumer goods sector manufacturing companies listed on the IDX. This shows that the higher the level of liquidity, the lower the amount of tax aggressiveness in the consumer goods sector, and vice versa. The results of testing the third hypothesis show that the profitability variable influences tax aggressiveness in manufacturing companies in the consumer goods industry sector listed on the IDX. This shows that if the profits received by the company are high, the level of profitability of the company will also be high, as a result the level of tax aggressiveness burden will also be high with the profits received by the company. The results of testing the fourth hypothesis show that the leverage variable has no effect on tax aggressiveness in manufacturing companies in the consumer goods industry sector listed on the IDX. This shows that the higher the level of leverage , the higher the amount of tax aggressiveness paid by the company, and vice versa. The results of testing the fifth hypothesis show that the company size variable has no effect on tax aggressiveness in manufacturing companies in the consumer goods industry sector listed on the IDX. This shows that the higher the company size , the lower the tax aggressiveness of the consumer goods sector, and vice versa.

For future researchers, opportunities exist to strengthen the impact of independent and dependent variables by developing new variables. In addition, further research is also planned to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of unpaid tax aggressiveness. This research can be carried out on other subjects, over a longer period of time, and involve more diverse factors.

REFERENCES

Amalia, D. (2021). Pengaruh Likuiditas, Leverage Dan Intensitas Aset Terhadap Agresivitas Pajak. *KRISNA: Kumpulan Riset Akuntansi*, *12*(2), 232–240. https://doi.org/10.22225/kr.12.2.1596.232-240

Ardyansah, D. (2014). Pengaruh Size, Leverage, Profitability, Capital Intensity Ratio Dan Komisaris Independen Terhadap Effective Tax Rate (Etr). *Diponegoro Journal of Accounting*, *3*, 1–9. http://ejournal-s1.undip.ac.id/index.php/accounting

Awaliyah, M., Nugraha, G. A., & Danuta, K. S. (2021). Pengaruh Intensitas Modal, Leverage, Likuiditas dan Profitabilitas terhadap Agresivitas Pajak. *Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Batanghari Jambi*, *21*(3), 1222. https://doi.org/10.33087/jiubj.v21i3.1664

Dewi, D. R. (2021). *Analisis Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Leverage, Likuiditas dan Ukuran Perusahaan Terhadap Agresivitas Pajak (Tax Aggressiveness)*. 6.

Fakhrudin, A. N., & Wulandari, R. (2022). Pengaruh Laba Akuntansi, Pertumbuhan Penjualan, Dan Kapitalisasi Pasar Terhadap Return Saham Pada Idx Perindustrian Tahun 2016-2020. *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi*, *17*(2), 1–23.

Hidayat, A. T., & Fitria, E. F. (2018). Pengaruh Capital Intensity, Inventory Intensity, Profitabilitas dan Leverage Terhadap Agresivitas Pajak. *Eksis: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, *13*(2), 157–168. https://doi.org/10.26533/eksis.v13i2.289

Krisna, i gede putu aditya paramananda, & Supadmi, N. L. (2023). *Ukuran Perusahaan, Leverage , Profitabilitas, dan Agresivitas Pajak*. April, 1847–1860.

Leksono, A. W., Albertus, S. S., & Vhalery, R. (2019). Pengaruh Ukuran Perusahaan dan Profitabilitas terhadap Agresivitas Pajak pada Perusahaan Manufaktur yang Listing di BEI Periode Tahun 2013–2017. *JABE (Journal of Applied Business and Economic)*, *5*(4), 301. https://doi.org/10.30998/jabe.v5i4.4174

Masrurroch, L. R., Nurlaela, S., & Fajri, R. N. (2021). Pengaruh profitabilitas, komisaris independen, leverage, ukuran perusahaan dan intensitas modal terhadap tax avoidance. *Journal FEB UNMUL*, *17*(1), 82–93. http://journal.feb.unmul.ac.id/index.php/INOVASI

Novitasari, S., Ratnawati, V., & Silfi, A. (2016). Pengaruh Manajemen Laba, Corporate Governance, Dan Intensitas Modal Terhadap Agresivitas Pajak Perusahaan. *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Riau*, *4*(1), 1901–1914.

Putri, S. (2016). *117382-ID-pengaruh-ukuran-perusahaan-return-on-ass*. 1506–1519.

Suyanto, U. O. S. (2018). *[Type here]*. *2021*, 117–128.

Utomo, A. B., & Fitria, G. N. (2021). Ukuran Perusahaan Memoderasi Pengaruh Capital Intensity dan Profitabilitas Terhadap Agresivitas Pajak. *Esensi: Jurnal Bisnis Dan Manajemen*, *10*(2), 231–246. https://doi.org/10.15408/ess.v10i2.18800

Yuliana, I. F., & Wahyudi, D. (2018). Likuiditas, Profitabilitas, Leverage, Ukuran Perusahaan, Capital Intensity, dan Inventory Intensity Terhadap Agresivitas Pajak (Studi Empiris pada Perusahaan

Manufaktur yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2013-2017). *Dinamika Akuntansi, Keuangan Dan Perbankan*, *7*(2), 105–120.

LEMBAR LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE (LOA)

Letter Of Acceptance

Congratulations Mr / Ms article entitled **"Determinants Of Tax Aggressivity In Manufacturing Companies In The Consumption Goods Industry Sector Registered On The Idx"** was received in the journal Assets : Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Akuntansi, Keuangan dan Pajak Volume 8 Number 1, January 2024 after going through the review process.

Nama   : Helen Tiara Putri [1] , Andrian Noviardy [2]
Faculty/ Departement : Faculty of Social Humanities / Departement of Accounting
Institution   : Bina Darma University Palembang

In connection with the publication process, we hereby request that you complete the publication fee of Rp 750,000.00 (seven hundred fifty thousand rupiahs) through the STIE WIDYA GAMA LUMAJANG account at BRI Bank (Account No. 004401014654536). If you have made a payment, please send proof of payment to jurnalwiga@gmail.com, so that we immediately run the publication process, no later than January 31, 2024. Thank you for your attention and cooperation.

September 15, 2023

Best regards,

Editor in Chief

Noviansyah Rizal, S.E., M.M., Ak., CA