



Analysis Of Factors Influencing Tax Management In Manufacturing Companies On The Idx In The 2021-2023 Period

Margareta Febe^{1*}, Bella Novianti²

^{1,2}Bunda Mulia University, Jakarta , Indonesia

¹mfebe@bundamulia.ac.id



*Corresponding Author

Article History:

Submitted: 09-05-2025

Accepted: 25-05-2025

Published: 12-06-2025

Keywords:

Tax Management, Profitability,
Independent, Firm Size,
Leverage, Fixed Asset Intensity

The Journal is licensed under a
Creative Commons Attribution-
NonCommercial 4.0 International
(CC BY-NC 4.0).

ABSTRACT

The decline in company profitability is a problem that needs to be of concern to many parties. Declining profitability will affect the taxes received. The weakening trend in tax revenue from the manufacturing side should be watched out for considering that this sector is relied on to contribute to state revenue and support economic growth. The research data used in this study is secondary data obtained from audited financial reports and annual reports of companies in the Idx-Ic Manufacturing Sector for the 2021-2023 period. The research and testing methods used were the Purposive sampling method, Classical assumption testing, Multiple regression analysis test and Partial t test. The results of this model that no single variable x has a significant influence. The results of this study provide different results compared to previous studies which showed that there was a significant influence, both positive and negative. Further research suggestions use the director or board of directors variable because the director is responsible for the company's operations.

INTRODUCTION

The decline in company profitability is a problem that needs to be of concern to many parties (Pangestu et al, 2023). Declining profitability will affect the taxes received. The weakening trend in tax revenue from the manufacturing side should be watched out for considering that this sector is relied on to contribute to state revenue and support economic growth. Based on an article in Kontan.co.id by Siswanto (2024, March 27), the manufacturing sector or processing industry still has a large contribution to Indonesia's tax revenue. Data from the Ministry of Finance (Kemenkeu) shows that tax revenue from the processing industry reached IDR 85.29 trillion as of March 15, 2024. Tax deposits from this processing industry are the first largest contributor of 25.64% to total tax revenue. Tax deposits from this processing industry fell by 12.3%. Every company strives to continuously improve its company's performance in order to generate profits and be able to survive in the midst of changing times (Pangestu & Margareta, 2024).

Some companies often try to minimize their tax burden. Some companies choose to do it illegally. For example, by carrying out tax avoidance or tax evasion. This activity is often detrimental to tax revenue in Indonesia. Another way can be done through tax management. Tax management is a comprehensive effort carried out by tax managers so that matters related to taxes in a company can be processed effectively, efficiently, and economically so that they can provide more contribution to the company. Management is motivated to manage and plan the taxes paid in order to obtain maximum profit and a low tax burden (Pangestu et al, 2022). Measuring tax management with the Efficient Tax Rate/ETR measuring tool will see how far the current tax burden (current period) is divided by commercial profit before tax compared to the general rate set by the government. Tax management must be carried out properly so as not to lead to violations of tax norms or tax avoidance. This study is interesting and worth studying because it is to see what factors influence the occurrence of tax management in companies. Previous studies have also not provided consistent results so further research is needed.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Agency theory clarifies the relationship between corporate governance and Tax Management / ETR. The company seeks to maximize the interests of shareholders, namely increasing profits and company value. On the other hand, management (as an agent) seeks to increase its interests in maximizing bonuses and achieving achievements. (Setiawan et.al, 2021). The existence of this agency problem will actually affect ETR because management will carry out financial management related to tax management. In fact, ETR will be an indicator of how far policies and estimates will affect bookkeeping practices that can affect fiscal corrections (Ng & Setiawan, 2023). The ETR value does not provide a meaningful explanation before being compared with the general tax rate set by the government or authorized authorities for the tax year. With the ETR value compared to the general tax rate, the deviation can be seen, which can explain the existence of corporate tax management practices, either reducing or increasing the current tax reported and paid. Tax evasion is an act that is contrary to the basic principle of absolute tax obligations and can result in legal consequences, namely fines and imprisonment (Tjendra et al, 2024).





METHOD

The research was conducted using secondary data where the data used was obtained from the official website of the Indonesia Stock Exchange (Indonesia Stock Exchange_www.idx.co.id). The research data used in this study is secondary data obtained from audited financial reports and annual reports of companies in the Idx-Ic Manufacturing Sector for the 2021-2023 period. Financial reports and annual reports were obtained from the IDX website and the company's website. Literature studies were also conducted through books, various articles, journals, and other sources. The research and testing methods used were the Purposive sampling method, Classical assumption testing, Multiple regression analysis test and Partial t test.

Table 1. Variable Indicator

Variable	Variable Indicator (Proxy)	Reference
Tax Management	Tax Expense	Alvares & Yohanes (2021).
	Earning Before Tax	Febriyanti & Susanty (2023) Firmansyah. (2022).
Profitability (X1)	Total Laba (Profit of the year)	Febriyanti & Susanty (2023)
Company Size (X2)	Total Asset	Alvares & Yohanes (2021). Firmansyah. (2022).
	LN Total Aset	
Leverage (X3)	Total Debt	Alvares & Yohanes (2021).
Independent Commissioners (X4)	Total Asset	Febriyanti & Susanty (2023)
	Number of Independent Commissioners	
Fixed Asset Intensity (X5)	Number of Commissioners	Firmansyah. (2022).
	Total Fixed Asset	
	Total Asset	

RESULT

Descriptive statistical analysis is a statistic used in analyzing data by describing or depicting the data that has been collected. From the table results, the average value, minimum value and maximum value of the collected data can be seen.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Mnj_Pajak	125	.009	.453	.22374	.083085
Profitx1	125	.000	.470	.12192	.089836
UkPrushx2	125	25.888	33.731	28.91823	1.852295
LevX3	125	.044	.771	.30771	.164642
KomIDPx4	125	.250	.500	.41211	.078255
Intenasetx5	125	.009	.948	.33676	.206617
Valid N (listwise)	125				

Table 3. Normality test

Table 3. Normality test					Unstandardized Residual
N					125
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}		Mean			.0000000
		Std. Deviation			.08104898
Most Extreme Differences		Absolute			.069
		Positive			.069
		Negative			-.064
Test Statistic					.069
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) ^c					.200 ^d
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed) ^e	Sig.	99% Confidence Interval	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	.160
					.150
					.169
a. Test distribution is Normal.					
b. Calculated from data.					
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.					
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.					
e. Lilliefors' method based on 10000 Monte Carlo samples with starting seed 1993510611.					



The results of the Normality Test show a significance value of 0.200, where this value is above 0.05, thus indicating that the data has passed the normality test.

Table 4. Multicollinearity test

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error				Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	-.018	.125		-.147	.883		
Profitx1	-.068	.083	-.074	-.819	.415	.982	1.018
UkPrushx2	.008	.004	.179	1.861	.065	.864	1.158
LevX3	.018	.048	.035	.372	.711	.890	1.124
KomIDPx4	.020	.097	.019	.211	.833	.967	1.034
Intenasetx5	.013	.037	.032	.355	.724	.959	1.043

a. Dependent Variable: Mnj_Pajak

In the table above, we can see that there are no independent variables that have a Tolerance value of less than 0.1 and there are no independent variables that have a Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value of more than 10. So it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity between independent variables in the regression model.

Table 5. Runs Test

Unstandardized Residual	
Test Value ^a	-.00069
Cases < Test Value	62
Cases >= Test Value	63
Total Cases	125
Number of Runs	64
Z	.091
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.928
a. Median	

From the results of table 4 using the run test, a significant value of 0.0928 was obtained, where if the significant value is greater than 0.05 ($0.0928 > 0.05$), it can be said that the regression model is free from autocorrelation and is suitable for use.

Table 6. Heteroscedasticity Test

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
1 (Constant)	.216	.080		2.695	.008
Profitx1	-.020	.054	-.034	-.375	.708
UkPrushx2	-.004	.003	-.148	-1.557	.122
LevX3	.058	.031	.179	1.902	.060
KomIDPx4	-.108	.062	-.156	-1.734	.085
Intenasetx5	-.007	.024	-.027	-.303	.763

a. Dependent Variable: absres

From the table above, it can be seen that the significant value of the t-test of all independent variables with Absolute Residual (ABS_RES) is more than 0.05. So it can be concluded that in the regression model of this study there is no heteroscedasticity problem.

Table 7. Uji- F

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	.041	5	.008	1.211	.308 ^b
Residual	.815	119	.007		
Total	.856	124			

a. Dependent Variable: Mnj_Pajak

b. Predictors: (Constant), Intenasetx5, Profitx1, LevX3, KomIDPx4, UkPrushx2

From the results of the F test above, it can be seen that the Sig. value is 0.308, where in the table above, the Sig F value is $0.308 > 0.05$ so it can be concluded that simultaneously there is no significant influence of the independent variables on tax management. The researcher suggests that further research take other independent variables that are



suspected of having an influence on tax management.

Table 8. Coefficient of Determination Test

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.220 ^a	.048	.008	.082734

a. Predictors: (Constant), Intenasetx5, Profitx1, LevX3, KomIDPx4, UkPrushx2

The table shows that the R Square value is 0.048, this can be interpreted that 4.8% of the variation in tax management in this study can be explained by the five independent variables used in this study. The remaining 95.2% can be explained by other variables outside the model in this study that are not included in the regression model.

Table 9. T-Test (Partial)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	-.018	.125			-.147	.883
	Profitx1	-.068	.083		-.074	-.819	.415
	UkPrushx2	.008	.004		.179	1.861	.065
	LevX3	.018	.048		.035	.372	.711
	KomIDPx4	.020	.097		.019	.211	.833
	Intenasetx5	.013	.037		.032	.355	.724

a. Dependent Variable: Mnj_Pajak

The results of the t-test show that no single variable x has a significant influence. The results of this study provide different results compared to previous studies which showed that there was a significant influence, both positive and negative.

DISCUSSION

Profitability (Profitx1) has no influence on tax management (Mnj_Tax)

The Profitability variable (Profitx1) shows a significance value of 0.415 where the value is greater than 0.05, therefore H1 is rejected, so it can be concluded that Profitability (Profitx1) in this research sample does not have a significant effect on tax management (Mnj_Tax)

The results of this study are in accordance with the research of Fitriana & Isthika (2021). However, the results of the study are also not in accordance with Nataherwin et al (2024), Noviatna & Safitri (2021), Mulia (2021), Pangestu & Rusli (2020). This result of no influence is rarely obtained by previous researchers with the theme of tax management research or effective tax rates. Profitability has no effect on tax management. The calculation of taxes paid by the company is calculated based on the profitability generated by the company from economic activities during a certain period (Pangestu et al, 2022). However, the level of the company's ability to generate profits (Profitability) is not the basis for carrying out tax management. The results of the company samples show that both companies with large and small profitability have varying tax management values, which are in accordance with the results of statistical tests that show no influence. Tax management can occur or not occur at all levels of company profitability. Further research suggestions are to use last year's profitability as a basis for measuring its influence on the current year's tax management value.

Company Size (UkPrushx2) has no influence on tax management (Mnj_Tax)

Company Size shows a significance value of 0.065, where the significance value of this t-test is greater than 0.05, therefore H2 is rejected, so it can be concluded that Company Size has no effect on tax management. Companies that have large total assets are considered large and vice versa. However, it turns out that tax management can occur or not occur at all levels of company size. Statistically and observationally, data shows no significant effect. Taxes are calculated not based on the size of the company's total assets but rather on performance results. The sample also shows that companies that are large in terms of asset size do not necessarily show good performance and vice versa. The results of this study are in line with the research of Nataherwin et al (2024). However, this study is not in line with the research of Ng & Setiawan (2023), Fitriana & Isthika (2021).

Leverage (LevX3) has no influence on tax management (Mnj_Tax)

The Leverage variable (LevX3) shows a significance value of 0.711 where the value is greater than 0.05, therefore H3 is rejected, so it can be concluded that Leverage in this research sample does not have a significant effect on tax management. The results of this study are in accordance with the research of Chytia & Pradana (2021) but do not match the research of Mulia (2021). Leverage in this study is obtained from the comparison between debt and assets



owned by the company. Companies with large or small Leverage Values do not affect the occurrence or non-occurrence of tax management. The research sample also shows that companies that have high or low leverage also have low or high tax management values so that it is in accordance with the results of the study that leverage does not have a significant effect on the occurrence of tax management.

Independent Commissioners (KomIDPx4) have no influence on tax management (Mnj_Tax)

The Independent Commissioner variable (KomIDPx4) shows a significance value of 0.833 where the value is greater than 0.05, therefore H4 is rejected, so it can be concluded that Independent Commissioners do not have a significant influence on tax management. The results of this study are in accordance with the research of Ng & Setiawan (2023), Noviatna & Safitri (2021). The results of the study show that although Independent Commissioners supervise the company, tax management can occur or not occur in the company. This is shown that even though the sample companies have small or large independent commissioners, the resulting tax management value can also be low or high. These results are in accordance with the results of statistical calculations. Further research suggestions use the director or board of directors variable because the director is responsible for the company's operations.

Fixed Asset Intensity (Intenasetx5) has no influence on tax management (Mnj_Tax)

The Intenasetx5 variable shows a significance value of 0.724 where the value is greater than 0.05, therefore H5 is rejected, so it can be concluded that fixed asset intensity does not have a significant effect on tax management. The results of this study are in accordance with the research of Monica & Josephine (2024), Chytia & Pradana (2021) Noviatna & Safitri (2021), Mulia (2021) but not in accordance with the research of Pangestu & Rusli (2020) Fixed asset intensity is calculated based on the comparison of fixed assets owned by the company to its total assets. Fixed asset intensity can be used to reduce the company's tax burden, but it turns out that in this study sample it does not show that there is a significant effect of this value on tax management.

CONCLUSION

The results of this model that no single variable x has a significant influence. The results of this study provide different results compared to previous studies which showed that there was a significant influence, both positive and negative. The research sample also shows that companies that have high or low leverage also have low or high tax management values so that it is in accordance with the results of the study that leverage does not have a significant effect on the occurrence of tax management. Fixed asset intensity can be used to reduce the company's tax burden, but it turns out that in this study sample it does not show that there is a significant effect of this value on tax management. Tax management can occur or not occur at all levels of company profitability. Further research suggestions use the director or board of directors variable because the director is responsible for the company's operations.

REFERENCES

- Alvares, B., & Yohanes, Y. (2021). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Manajemen Pajak Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi TSM*, 1(3), 287-298.
- Chytia, C., & Pradana, B. L. (2021). Analisis Pengaruh Capital Intensity, Kepemilikan Institusional, Debt To Asset Ratio (Dar) Dan Return on Assets (Roa) Terhadap Effective Tax Rate (Etr) Pada Perusahaan Sektor Properti Utama Yang Terdaftar Di Bei Periode 2016-2019. *Jurnal Bina Akuntansi*, 8(1), 1-21
- Febriyanti, V., & Susanty, M. (2023). Analisis Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Manajemen Pajak Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi TSM*, 3(3), 139-148.
- Firmansyah. (2022). Pengaruh Leverage, Intensitas Aset Tetap, Transfer Pricing, Dan Komite Audit Terhadap Manajemen Pajak Dengan Indikator Tarif Pajak Efektif. *Jurnal Literasi Akuntansi*, 2(3), 167–174. <https://doi.org/10.55587/jla.v2i3.64>
- Fitriana, E., & Isthika, W. (2021). Pengaruh size, profitabilitas, leverage dan capital intensity ratio terhadap manajemen pajak. *Juara: Jurnal Riset Akuntansi*, 11(1), 18-33.
- Monica, C., & Josephine, K. (2024). Pengaruh leverage, intensitas modal, dan intensitas persediaan terhadap tarif pajak efektif pada perusahaan manufaktur yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2019-2022. *AKURASI: Jurnal Riset Akuntansi dan Keuangan*, 6(2), 243-256.
- Mulia, M. J. (2021). Analisis Pengaruh Fixed Asset Intensity, Debt to Asset Ratio dan Return on Asset terhadap Effective Tax Rates Pada Perusahaan Sub Sektor Makanan dan Minuman di Bursa Efek Indonesia. *FIN-ACC (Finance Accounting)*, 6(4), 560-571.
- Nataherwin, N., Widyasari, W., Febe, M., & Pangestu, J. C. (2024). Analisis Faktor – Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Effective Tax Rate Pada Pada Perusahaan Barang Konsumsi Yang Terdaftar Di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2019-2022. *Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis Digital*, 3(3), 92–99. <https://doi.org/10.47709/jebidi.v3i3.355>
- Ng, O. L., & Setiawan, T. (2023). Pengaruh Tata Kelola Perusahaan Terhadap Effective Tax Rate Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Yang Terdaftar di BEI 2019-2021. *Jurnal Bina Akuntansi*, 10(2), 716-731.



- Noviatna, H., & Safitri, D. (2021). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Leverage, Capital Intensity Ratio dan Komisaris Independen terhadap Manajemen Pajak. *Jurnal Akuntansi Keuangan dan Bisnis*, 14(1), 93-102.
- Pangestu, J. C., & Margaretha, P. (2024). Analisa Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Kinerja Keuangan Perusahaan Barang Sektor Konsumen Non-Primer IDX-IC Periode 2019-2021. *Owner: Riset dan Jurnal Akuntansi*, 8(1), 533-540.
- Pangestu, J. C., Rusli, Y. M., & Margaretha, P. (2022). Peran audit committee sebagai pemoderasi antara tax management policy dan intencity capital terhadap earnings management practices pada saat pandemik Covid-19. *Jurnal Administrasi Kantor*, 10(1), 50-60.
- Pangestu, J. C., & Rusli, Y. M. (2020). Pengaruh Capital Intensity, Profitability, Dan Family Ownership Terhadap Tax Management. In *PROSEDING SEMINAR NASIONAL AKUNTANSI UNPAM* (Vol. 3).
- Pangestu, J. C., Setiawan, T., & Kurniawan, S. (2023). Pengungkapan CSR, Ukuran Perusahaan, Leverage dan Pengaruhnya Terhadap Profitabilitas Perusahaan Basic Materials BEI 2019-2021. *Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis, Manajemen Dan Akuntansi (JEBMA)*, 3(3), 771-778.
- Satria, F., & Nathan, N. (2023). The effect of fixed assets, leverage, company profit and capital intensity ratio on tax management in manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia stock exchange. *International Journal Of Social, Policy and Law*, 4(1), 32-40.
- Siswanto, D (2024, 27 March). Penerimaan Pajak dari Sektor Unggulan Anjlok hingga Pertengahan Maret 2024. *Kontan.co.id*. <https://nasional.kontan.co.id/news/penerimaan-pajak-dari-sektor-unggulan-anjlok-hingga-pertengahan-maret-2024>
- Setiawan, T., Adriana, F., & Sihombing, P. R. (2021). Karakteristik Perusahaan, Profitabilitas dan Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure (CSRD). *Journal of Business & Applied Management*, 14(1), 017-026.
- Tjendra, M. J., Setiawan, T., & Riswandari, E. (2024). Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Memengaruhi Tindakan Penggelapan Pajak (Studi Literatur Tahun 2018-2023). *Owner: Riset dan Jurnal Akuntansi*, 8(3), 2661-2676.