Abstract: Many cases of tax avoidance are one factor not achieve the target of tax revenue by the government. Some studies have been done to find the causes of the companies have tax avoidance, but the result is unclear. This study aimed to examine determinants tax avoidance on manufacturing companies listed in Indonesia Stock Exchange (BEI)2010-2013. Return on Assets (ROA), leverage, company size, compensation tax losses, and institutional ownership used as independent variables and tax avoidance as the dependent variable. The sampling method used purposive sampling. Based on the selected sample from 128 population, obtained 47 samples with four years of observation. The amount of data 188. Data analysis used multiple regression analysis. This study used ETR (Effective Tax Rate) as Proxy to the calculation of tax avoidance. The results of this study showed that the independent variables are ROA, leverage, and company size significantly influence the partial tax avoidance, but the variable tax loss carryforwards and institutional ownership does not affect partial tax avoidance. This research it has a contribution to the theory and practice of the supports the theory of agency contributions to must which are in taking management decision taxation
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Abstrak: Banyak kasus penghindaran pajak merupakan salah satu faktor yang menyebabkan tidak tercapainya perolehan pajak oleh pemerintah. Beberapa studi telah dilakukan untuk menemukan penyebab penghindaran pajak namun hasilnya tidak jelas. Studi ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis factor penentu penghindaran pajak pada perusahaan manufaktur yang terdaftar pada Bursa Efek Indonesia tahun 2010-2013. Determinan factor yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah Return on assets (ROA), leverage, ukuran perusahaan, kompensasi kerugian pajak, dan kepemilikan institusi. Studi ini menggunakan etr (efektif tax angka-sebagai proxy untuk perhitungan pajak avoidance. Metode pemilihan sampel yang digunakan adalah purposive. Didasarkan pada seleksi sampel maka diperoleh sampel sebanyak 47 perusahaan dari 128 dengan pengamatan selama 4 tahun, sehingga data yang di analisis berjumlah 188 data Regressi berganda digunakan untuk menganalisis data. Hasil studi ini menunjukkan bahwa variabel independen ROA, leverage, dan ukuran perusahaan secara signifikan berpengaruh terhadap penghindaran pajak namun variabel kompensasi kerugian pajak dan kepemilikan institusi tidak berpengaruh signifikan. Penelitian ini memiliki kontribusi pada teori keagenan serta berkontribusi pada praktek pada perusahaan terutama dalam manajemen pajak
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1. Introduction

Tax is a source of the state revenue significant for the implementation of the national development and the central element to support economic activities in moving government's operation and as the public facilities for them, it is expected that tax can increase public prosperity and welfare. Tax revenue until today continues to improve from year to year. Based on information the central bureau of statistics (BPS), the realization of tax revenues in Indonesia in 2010 reached Rp.723,307 billion and continued to rise to 2014 reached Rp.1310,219 billion or increased by 81,14 % over the past five years. Although in reality experienced an increase in tax but the achievements of the state budget every year not been unreachable. The problem caused one of these is the terms of the obligatory nature did not yet have an examination is made tax assessments. Not a few of the taxpayers especially business entities that commit tax avoidance either legally but illegal or tax evasion.

For example a few years ago directorate general of tax has been looking into cases tax evasion by PT.Coca-Cola Indonesia always suspected tax to cause lack of the payment of tax worth rp.49,24 billion (www.kompas.com). The results of the investigation the directorate general of taxes, that the company has been performing the act of tax avoidance would be that the cause tax payments are diminishing manner with following the finding of a swelling a significant amount of capital in the company. The financial burden on the considerable amount of capital to cause to the low level of income taxable grow at a slow pace so that the banks have exceeded the tax examination darwin also is carving things down from. The financial burden on those costs is among other things to advertisements from a span of years 2002-2006 with a total as much as Rp .566,84 billion to the regional budget. As a result, there is a decrease in the low level of income taxable.

From the perspective of the government, taxpayers expected to perform taxation as maximum as possible so that state revenues from tax sector will rise and but if tax paid by taxpayers smaller than they were due to pay, then income the state from the tax sector will be reduced. But, from the employers or taxpayers, tax is one of the factors a deduction income and when a tax paid higher than the amount should it will
be a loss of, because one of the objectives of entrepreneurs is to maximize welfare the shareholders or investors by means of maximize value of enterprise by means of derive profit maximum. Therefore in the discharge of obligation taxation is needed tax good management. In the management of taxation required tax planning is a preliminary step to do the analysis afterward systematically a variety of alternative tax treatment with the purpose of achieving minimum taxation fulfillment of an obligation (Pohan and Hotman, 2013).

Many research has been done to determine the cause of tax evasion Pohan, and Chairil (2009) and Anissa (2011) investigate the influence of ownership institution on tax avoidance, but their research shows that ownership institution does not affect significantly to tax avoidance. Supramono (2010) and Mulyani et al. (2013) found that a significant leverage effect on tax avoidance. Subakti (2012) investigate influence the size of the company and leverage to tax avoidance. The results of the study found that the size of the company significant effect on tax avoidance, but leverage does not affect significantly to tax avoidance. The research conducted by Kurniasih and Sari (2013) said that return on assets (ROA), size of the company and compensation fiscal losses have a significant influence on tax avoidance, but leverage obtain.

Maharani and Suardana (2014), Darmawan and Sukartha (2014) found the result that ROA impact on tax avoidance but leverage do not affect significantly on tax avoidance. Prakosa (2014) said that leverage, the size of the company and compensation tax losers do not have the significant effect on tax avoidance, but profitability has a substantial impact on tax avoidance. Meanwhile, research conducted Pranata et al. (2014) found ownership institutional considerable effect on tax avoidance.

Regarding the previous research, we know that there are differences that are summarizing influence of leverage, size of the company, compensation tax loss and institutional ownership on tax avoidance. But the results were not clear about influence return on assets, leverage, the size of the company, compensation tax losses and institutional ownership against an onset of tax avoidance.
Hence we motivated to emphasize testing back against the variables in hopes of some very consistent. This research develops research Prakosa (2014) using leverage, the size of the company and compensation fiscal loss to influence tax avoidance. This study also used Return on Assets (ROA) and institutional ownership as variables affecting tax avoidance. It is based on research Pranata et al. (2014) and Darmawan and Sukartha (2014) who discovered that ROA and possession of institutional affect tax avoidance.

Another difference the research by previous studies is the use of tax avoidance proxy generally proxy cash effective tax rate (CETR). This research using proxy effective tax rate (ETR) that results in size based in a report profit losers which are generally measuring the effectiveness of reduction strategies taxes and led to profit after high taxes. With differences in this proxy calculation, so the importance of the investigation with ETR as proxy tax avoidance this will be a comparison with the results of the prior research.

Based on the description above this study aims to test the effect of return on assets, size of company, leverage, compensation tax losses and institutional ownership as the determining factor a company do tax evasion. Problem statement in this research is: did Return On Assets (ROA), size of the company, leverage, compensation tax losses, and institutional ownership have a significant effect on tax avoidance?. To answer the purpose of this research explained furthermore.

2. Theoretical Framework And Hypotheses Development

2.1 Agency Theory

A company often occur the separation between the management company manager, also called as an agent with company owner (or the shareholders, also called as the principal). Also, director general for a company that shaped limited companies, the responsibility of the owner is limited to the capital that passed on. It means if it went bankrupt, so their capital interest that has been deposited by the company's owner will likely be missing, personal and the wealth of the owner is not will be
incorporated them to cover the loss. Thus allowing the emergence of the agency problem.

Agency problem appears in two forms, that was between company owner (principals with the management (agent), and between shareholders with a holder of bonds. The normative goals decision-making financial stated that the decision taken to maximize prosperity company owner, only correct for the decision makers finances (agent certainly judge to the interests of the company owner ( Husnan and Pudjiastuti, 2012 )

Agency problem of shareholders the manager potential happened when management did not have the majority of share. Shareholders want specific manager work with the aim of maximizing prosperity shareholders. On the contrary, the manager of a company could act not to optimize prosperity shareholders, but their own. It was a conflict of interest to ensure that manager really work for the benefit of shareholders, shareholders used agency cost and opportunity cost it rise if the manager would not be able to decide any shareholders ( Atmaja, 2008 ).

2.2 Tax Avoidance

In general, compliance meet obligations taxation usually measured and compared with the amount saving the tax tax saving, tax avoidance and tax evasion which were all aims to minimize the tax charges, In many ways among others with an exception, reduction, tax incentives, income tax object not, the tax suspension, the bear came to cooperation with tax officer, bribes, and forgery (Zain, 2007 )

Pohan ( 2013 ) argue that tax evasion is the efforts made legally and safe for a taxpayer because of not doing against the taxation, where methods and technique used tend to use the weakness ( grey ) contained in the laws and regulations taxation itself to reduce the amount of tax owed. Tax avoidance was one effort to minimize the tax charges often done by the company because it is still are in a frame tax regulations apply. Although legally modifying tax avoidance, from the government, would remain did not want this. The phenomenon of tax avoidance in Indonesia can be seen from the tax ratio ( tax ratio ) the state of Indonesia. The tax ratio shows the government ability
in collects revenue a tax or resorbs the GDP of the community in the form of tax. The higher the tax ratio of a country, then it would be more good the performance of taxes withheld the country (Darmawan and Sukartha, 2014)

2.3 Hypothesis Development

The effect of Return On Asset (ROA) on tax avoidance

According to Prihadi (2013) ROA that can be defined as measuring the company capacity the effective use assets to derive profit. Return On Asset (ROA) show approach that the size of the company profit obtained by the use of the total of the assets it holds. The higher this ratio, the better the performances of using its assets in the granting of a company with a net profit.

To improve corporate profits can be done by minimizing the and expenses become a deduction profit, one of which is pressing tax charges. In reducing the tax charges, the company can make use of assets as a taxable deduction profit to use its depreciation and amortization arising from assets of the company, as described in regulation no. 36, 2008 article 6 paragraph 1b explained that depreciation of expenditure to obtain wealth remain intangible and amortization on spending to obtain wealth remain intangible with the benefits more than a year can be used as a deduction taxable profit company.

According to the research conducted Darmawan and Sukharta (2013) that ROA impact on tax avoidance because the company able to manage their assets well one of them by using its depreciation and amortization, and the research and development that can be used as a deduction touches and income tax have benefited from tax incentives and loose other taxes that the company was seen do tax avoidance. The results and Suardana (2014) and Darmawan and Sukartha (2014) find the result that ROA from explaining reflected the bank sound assets.

Based on this is, it can be taken hypothesis as follows:

**H1. Return on assets had a significant effect on tax avoidance**
The effect of leverage on tax avoidance

Kasmir (2010) said that the ratio leverage is used to measure the extent to which the company assets financed by debt. It means how much debt that borne by the company compared with their assets. The company made possible use is owed to meet operational needs and company investment. But, will find debt has no fixed rate of return which with interest.

The interest burden is borne by the company that can be used as a deduction company to reduce taxable income tax burden. So that the higher the test scores of the ratio leverage, means the higher the number of debt funding from the third party used the company and the higher the increase in interest costs arising from the debt. The higher interest costs will give impact reduced the tax charges to the company. The higher the debt so taxable profit will be smaller because of incentives a tax on the interest rate the higher the. This is the implication of an increase in the use of debt by a corporation (Prakosa, 2014). The results of the study Supramono (2010) and Mulyani et al. (2013) shows leverage influenced tax avoidance. Based on this is, it can be taken hypothesis as follows:

H2. Leverage had a significant effect on tax avoidance

The effect of company size on tax avoidance

According to Hasibuan (2009) in Surbakti (2013), the size of the company is a scale where can be classified according to various ways, among other: total assets, logs size, sales, and market capitalization, etc. The higher the company, the more total assets it. But the total assets company, in measuring the size of the company can be seen from the number of shares company published; large companies tend to require massive capital, capital can be obtained by issuing stock.

In conducting tax planning to order the tax charges to be least possible harm, Company can manage total assets to reduce taxable income and use the depreciation and amortization arising from spending to acquire the assets. Not only that, but burden dividends arising from the issue of shares by the company is also can be used as a taxable deduction income. From the explanation, it can be indicated more critical
company more substantial total assets present and the higher the number of shares published. Due to burden arising from assets and the shares can be used as a taxable deduction income. Ngadiman Puspitasari (2014) and reveal the greater total assets then pointed out that the company has good prospects in the extended period. Companies with massive asset illustrate that the company is more stable and better able to deliver profit compared to companies with total assets is small. Therefore, the possibility to make tax evasion smaller. The results of the study Surbakti (2012) show the size of the company has an impact on tax avoidance. Based on this is, it can be taken hypothesis as follows:

**H3. Size of a company had a significant effect on tax avoidance**

*The Effect of compensation tax losses to tax avoidance*

Based on regulation act no. 136 / 2008 article 6 paragraph 1 on income tax, the company which had a loss of in one of an accounting period given dispensation from this tax to pay. The loss was can transaction costs over the next five years, and corporate profits will be used to reduce the size of the compensation for a loss. As a result, those five years, the company will be given the tax charges, net as a fiscal will be used to reduce the size of the company compensation for a loss.

The results of the study Kurniasih and Sari (2013) find that compensation tax losses having influenced a significant impact on tax avoidance.

Information from cases the can be taken hypothesis as follows:

**H4. Compensation losers fiscal had a significant effect on tax avoidance**

*The effect of institutional ownership on tax avoidance*

The ownership structure of the stock in a public company can be grouped into two groups are individual shareowners or the shareholder's institution, and ownership of a share of managerial included in the holders of shares owned by sector cooperation or director thus included in the category of individual
shareowners (Pohan, 2009). The existence of institutional investors will reduce conflicts of interest have made efforts to increase tax management the aggressiveness. The size of the concentration of ownership of going to influence policy institutional so aggressive tax by the company.

According to Faisal 2004) institutional ownership were the ones who monitor the company institutions large (more than 5 %) identify its ability to monitor management larger. Institutional ownership in an enterprise will encourage an increase in to create more optimal management of the performance. That supervision by institutional investors relies heavily on the investment. The institutional share of the larger than other shareholders be able to supervise policy management, and higher also management will avoid behavior that damage to the shareholders. More significant institutional ownership the stronger control done external sides of the company, so it influences behavior tax evasion.

Based on the information, it can be taken hypothesis as follows :

**H5. Institutional ownership had a significant effect on tax avoidance**

3. **Research Model**

This research used a dependent variable the tax avoidance and independent variable Return On Assets ( ROA ), leverage, the size of the company, compensation tax losses, and ownership institutions. The research will be done in the testing partial to test the influence of any independent variable on dependent variables. The framework of this research can be explained in figure 1
4. Research Method

4.1 Population and Sample

The population of this research is manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia stock exchange (BEI) year 2010 – 2013. Selection the sample used purposive sampling method with criteria: a company with an effective tax rate of less than one, have data on institutional ownership of the company and its positive; companies must submit annual notifications.

Based on the selection sample obtained 47 samples of 128 manufacturing companies listed in BEI. A period of observations on this research is in the four years. The total observation is as much as 47 x 4 years = 188 observation.
Several criteria become the base for sample selection, which are:

Table 1. Sample Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Companies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing companies listed on BRI in the year of 2010-2013</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies without data completeness</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data collected for this study is taken from secondary data that is shaped complete financial report that is sourced from the Indonesia stock exchange website (www.idx.co.id) data company ownership of institutional from *Indonesian Capital Market Directory* (ICMD).

4.2 The measurement of variable

**Tax Avoidance**

Tax avoidance measured using an effective tax rate (ETR). ETR is resulted in size based on profit and loss statement which are generally measuring the effectiveness of the tax reduction of the strategy and be steered on a high profit after tax. Etr used because they are considered able to look back on the difference it stays between profit and its book fiscal calculation that is formulated as follows:

\[
\text{ETR}_{it} = \frac{\text{Tax Expense}}{\text{Earnings before tax}_{es}}
\]

**Return on Asset**

Return on Asset is the comparison between on Wednesday its net profit with a total of assets at the end of the period that is used as an indicator of the company capacity in generating profit, by the use of what is the formula as follows
**ROA** = \( \frac{\text{Earning after tax}}{\text{Total Assets}} \times 100\% \)

**Leverage**

Leverage was the ratio measures the debt both long and short term to finance the company assets. Leverage with the formula as follows:

\[
\text{Leverage} = \frac{\text{Total Liabilities}}{\text{Total Assets}}
\]

**Size of Company**

In this research, the indicators used to measure the degree of the size of the company is the total assets because the size of the company proxy with the total assets in PT Tugu Pratama pledged by foreign countries. The use of natural a log \( \text{Ln} \) of the data to reduce the fluctuations of the data that excessive without changing the proportion of the total value of origin which actually.

\[
\text{SIZE} = \text{Ln} (\text{Total Asset})
\]

**Compensation tax losses**

Compensation tax losses can be measured using a dummy variable, to be given the tax loss 1 if there is compensation, given the 0 if there is no compensation at the beginning of the t and referred to research conducted Prakosa (2014), Kurniasih and Sari (2013).

**Institutional Ownership**

In this institutional research, ownership will be measured using the percentage of shares owned the institution's investment company, bank, insurance companies, and other institutions shape as the company stock plus blockholder divided by the number of outstanding shares. Blockholders is individual ownership on behalf of individuals up 5% not included in possession managerial. The formula used is as follows
Institutional ownership = \frac{\text{The number of shares institutions + the number of shares blockholder}}{\text{The number of shares outstanding}}

Methods of Analysis

The method of analyzing data on this research uses multiple regression analysis with the equation:

\[ Y = \alpha + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \beta_4 x_4 + \beta_5 x_5 + e \]

\( Y = \) Tax avoidance
\( X1 = \) Return on Aset
\( X2 = \) leverage
\( X3 = \) Size of Company
\( X4 = \) Compensation Tax losses
\( X5 = \) Institutional Ownership

5. Results and Discussions

Descriptive Statistic

The description at every point can be seen below:

Table 2.

Descriptive Statistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.4245</td>
<td>.1129</td>
<td>.869549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.18140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm size</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>5.0525</td>
<td>13.0537</td>
<td>10.4996</td>
<td>2.0732994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation tax loss</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.0904</td>
<td>.28756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional ownership</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.5723</td>
<td>.21537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective tax rate</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>.7479</td>
<td>.2569</td>
<td>.73808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the results of descriptive statistics in table 2, it can be obtained of every variable subject as follows, return on assets have an average point 0.1129; this indicates that the average capability company sample generates profit from 11% of assets used. Leverage is having an average of 0.40; this shows that the average company sample has 0.4 owed for every 1.00 assets company. The size of the company they have an average point 10.4996, this shows that the average company has stability assets of 10.49. Compensation losers fiscal they have an average 0.09 this indicates that the average company the sample is not received compensation for a loss fiscal. Ownership institutions they have an average point 0.5723, this shows that the average company has ownership institutions by 57%. While the tax evasion has average value 0.2569 25 of earning before tax.

**Hypothesis Test Results**

The results of hypothesis testing used multiple regression can be seen in table 3 below Table 3.

The result of Linear Multiple Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1088.900</td>
<td>333.092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage</td>
<td>13.541</td>
<td>2.934</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiem Size</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation tax losses</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional ownership</td>
<td>2.201</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effective Tax Rate

Based on table 3 result of hypothesis 1 shows p-value 0.042 < 0.05, it means that ROA has a significant effect on tax avoidance The result of the second
hypothesis testing shows the value of p-value 0,000 <0,05, it implies leverage have considerable influence to tax avoidance. Result of the third hypothesis testing shows the value of 0.012 <0.05, meaning firm size have a significant effect on tax avoidance. The results of the testing of hypotheses fourth show p-value 0.237 > 0.05, it means that compensation tax losses do not have a significant influence on tax avoidance. The results of the fifth hypothesis test show the value of significance p-value 0.374> 0.05, meaning that institutional ownership has no significant effect on tax avoidance.

Discussion

The results of first hypotheses testing show ROA has a significant effect on tax avoidance. Higher ROA indicates the company minimizes tax burden. A positive coefficient means that the company which has the higher ROA ratio indicated can do tax avoidance as, by high ROA, the company would maximally have total the assets to derive profit by using the burden depreciation and amortization that can be used as a deduction profit taxable company.

The result of this research consistent with Maharani and Suardana(2014) and Darmawan and Sukartha (2014) that found ROA had an impact on tax avoidance. Return on assets (ROA) reflects the financial performance of corporations, the ability firm to generating profit by using its assets company. Asset management good give benefits company with the tax incentives. Depreciation and amortization advantageous more than a year can be used as a tax deduction.

Leverage has a significant effect on tax avoidance"  is acceptable. Regression coefficient worth positive implying that the company which has the ratio leverage high, so company identical will do tax avoidance, this because out of the total number of sample have the average the ratio leverage as 40 % which suggest that the company has high debt that led to the interest expense of the debt is increased, by the high-interest expense which is borne by the company can be used as a deduction profit taxable that tax owed the lower.

From the research results obtained significant influence between Leverage against tax avoidance. The amount of leverage indicates tax avoidance by utilizing interest
expense as deductible of taxable income. The results of this study support the research (Prakosa, 2014) that leverage affect tax avoidance. The use of the debt that comes from an external source of funding resulted in the emergence of interest expenses by the company. Interest expenses that arise as companies used tax incentives that would reduce the taxable profit of the company. The higher the use of the external debt of the company then the higher the interest expenses payable by the company so that the company's actions indicate tax evasion.

The result of the third hypothesis testing concluded that firm size has a significant effect on tax avoidance. To identify the size of the company can be seen of the total assets and resources owned company, big companies tend to have assets significant having good quality human resources. To the size of the assets company, it can be done maximum management tax. Management will use depreciation and amortization expense as a strategy a deduction profit taxable. This is by the act of taxation where depreciation and amortization expense can be used as a deduction profit taxable so that the tax owed getting smaller.

The results showed that the size of the company's assets would cause the expense also increased which indicates the existence of tax avoidance. The results of this study support Surbakti (2012) study which shows firm size has a significant effect on tax avoidance.

The results of the testing of hypotheses fourth show compensation loss significant fiscal impact on tax avoidance rejected. The results of the study are not conforming to the rules that the existence of compensation for loss of fiscal impact on tax avoidance. This implying that the presence or absence compensation losers fiscal will not affect tax avoidance, for when finding loss fiscal year a tax formerly, the company would be fixed cover losses the net profit who obtained by the company during the following year. This indicates that the existence of compensation for a loss not entirely said the company has lightened to did not pay the tax at all to avoid from the tax charges, but the company continues paying the debt the tax when in next obtained net profit that sufficient to be used as compensation for a loss fiscal. The results of the study
demonstrable that the average companies that obtain compensation for a loss only of nine % of the total sample.

The data shows that the company has mean values 0,09 this indicates that company fiscal loss did not receive compensation. The research is also the same as Prakosa (2014) who discovered that compensation for loss of fiscal no significant impact on tax avoidance.

The results of the fifth hypothesis show institutional ownership do not influence on tax avoidance. This research indicates that low or the high an ownership institutions to companies will not affect tax avoidance. Tax avoidance is part of duty management to increase profit, and improve welfare shareholders are the right of the institutional investors, thus the owner institutions trying to affect management act aggressively against taxes. The results of this study are in line with Pohan (2009) and Anissa (2011) who found the ownership of the institution does not affect tax avoidance.

6. Conclusion, Implication, And Limitation

6.1 Conclusion

Based on the research done above, so a conclusion that obtained is as follows :

1. ROA had a significant effect on tax avoidance in manufacturing company.
2. Leverage had a significant effect on tax avoidance in manufacturing company.
3. The size of the company significant to tax avoidance manufacturing company.
4. Compensation tax losses do not affect the significant impact on tax avoidance in manufacturing company.
5. Ownership institution has not been affecting the tax avoidance in manufacturing company.

6.2 Implication

This research supports the agency theory which states that in the corporate setting the problem happened (big agency problem and hard too) where the problems arise at parties stakeholders of bond issuance will be parties management and of firm owners.
In the decision making of the finances of to the purpose of creating equitable national prosperity maximize plantation owners who argue that company hence the holder of a given stock across the political spectrum wants meanwhile the housing complex manager worked hard to perhaps bring up of a company profit, one of the ways is the avoidance of a tax or should be made to minimize a heavy tax load, even so the number of the management also has a right to make a policy to pay tax was made exact pattern for its construction so as to be firm findings of violations of secured for researcher an abundance and medium micro businesses would.

The implications of this research to practice is contributing to the taxpayer and the tax authorities, it is hoped this research can be knowledge for taxpayers especially corporate taxpayers to keep the right to make decisions that better tax management, where the study was to provide information about -things that may affect the company's management to commit acts of tax avoidance but by exploiting weaknesses in the tax laws, so the company can use the right tax strategy without violating tax regulations. For the tax authorities as well as information useful in controlling the actions of tax avoidance by the company with the aim to get prudential supervision and making decisions. The study also as a reference for the general public that is useful to explore the taxation strategy of the company, especially for investors with their research will provide information about the company's management policy to facilitate the financial management company for investors in taking the right decision.

6.3 Limitation
As for the limited number of this research is 1). This research is only used company sample at the level of several manufacturing companies. The use of other companies for example sample at the level of banking, real estate expected to send the results of research different; 2). This research is only used research four periods, such as in 2010 until 2013. The use of a period longer expected to send the results of research different, 3). The low level of the coefficient of determination in the research indicated that there
are still plenty of other variables that can affect other than tax avoidance of a variable used in this research.

6.4 Suggestions for future research

There are some suggestions for future research. First, future studies may use another company regarding sample to generalize and for it to be valid and heightens the empirical test. Second, we suggested similar conduct research using the longer period so that it will give a total number of samples which is large and the possibility of obtaining the condition is. Finally, we suggested that the measurement of tax avoidance add other variables that affect tax avoidance, so the results better.
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