

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### A. Research's Object/Subject Description

This data collection was carried out by sending questionnaires directly or through intermediaries to taxpayer respondents of MSME located in Yogyakarta. The distribution and return of the questionnaires began on September 5, 2019 until October 20, 2019. Below is the table of questionnaire distribution list:

**Table 4. 1**  
**Questionnaire Distributed to Micro Small Medium Enterprises**

<b>Explanation</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Questionnaire distributed	110	100%
Questionnaire not returned	8	7.3%
Questionnaire returned	102	92.7%
Questionnaire cannot be processed	2	1.9%
Questionnaire can be processed	100	98.1%

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

Based on the data from table 4.1, the total questionnaire distributed was 110. There were 8 questionnaires which were not returned so that there were 102 questionnaires that were received. The questionnaires which were not fully filled were 2, so that they could not be processed. Therefore, the number of questionnaires that could be processed is 100.

The questionnaire was distributed to MSME Taxpayers in the city of Yogyakarta. The data of respondents categorized by business life are as follows:

**Table 4. 2**  
**Respondent Business Life Categorization**

		<b>Business Life</b>			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<1 Year	21	21	21	21
	1-5 Year	36	36	36	57
	>5 Year	43	43	43	100
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

Based on the data from table 4.2, the total respondents are 100 respondents in which 21 of them run their business less than 1 year (21%), 36 of them run their business from 1 year until below 5 years (36%), and 43 of them from run their business more than 5 years (14.4%).

The data of respondents categorized by gender is as follows:

**Table 4. 3**  
**Respondent Gender Categorization**

		<b>Gender</b>			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Men	59	59	59	59
	Woman	41	41	41	100
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

Based on the data from table 4.3, the total respondents are 100 respondents. Based on these data it can be said that male respondents are dominant with a percentage of (59%) or 59 people, and 41 of them are female with percentage of (41%).

The data of respondents categorized type of MSME is as follows:

**Table 4. 4**  
**Type of MSME**

		Frequency	Percent's	Valid Percent's	Cumulative Percent's
Valid	Commerce	63	63	63	63
	Industry	15	15	15	78
	Service	22	22	22	100
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

Based on the data from table 4.4, the total respondents were 100 respondents with sixty-three of them were in commerce business (63%), fifteen of them were in Industry (15%), and twenty-two of them were in service business (22%). That categorization indicates that the respondents who are run their business in commerce are dominant in fulfilling the questionnaire.

The data of respondents categorized based on category of MSME are as follows:

**Table 4. 5**  
**MSME Categorization**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	PTKP	34	34	34	34
	Non-PTKP	66	66	66	100
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

Based on the data from table 4.5, the total respondents were 100 respondents in which 34 of them (34%) are listed as PTKP, and 66 of them (66%) are from Non-PTKP Business type of MSME.

## B. Instrument Data Testing

### 1. Descriptive Statistic Test

Descriptive statistics is one of the instrument data testing to reduce the data so that they will be easy for interpretation. One method used in this test is data distribution. The table of 4.7 below is the result of descriptive statistics with the result of total data (N), minimum data collected total value (Min), maximum data collected total value (Max), standard deviation (Std. Deviation) and variance (Var) categorized by each variable in the questionnaire.

**Table 4. 6**  
**Descriptive Statistic Test**

Descriptive Statistics						
	Tariff	Socialization	Control	Understanding of Taxation	Tax Compliance	Valid N
<b>N Statistic</b>	100	100	100	100	100	100
<b>Range Statistic</b>	13	22	11	20	12	
<b>Minimum Statistic</b>	17	18	9	15	18	
<b>Maximum Statistic</b>	30	40	20	35	30	
<b>Sum Statistic</b>	2392	3180	1567	2723	2529	
<b>Mean Statistic</b>	23.92	31.8	15.67	27.23	25.29	
<b>Mean Std. Error</b>	0.294	0.434	0.227	0.408	0.343	
<b>Std. Deviation Statistic</b>	2.939	4.337	2.274	4.077	3.427	
<b>Variance Statistic</b>	8.64	18.808	5.173	16.623	11.743	

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

Where:

X1 : Tariff  
X2 : Socialization  
X2 : Control  
X3 : Understanding of Taxation  
Y : Tax Compliance

Table 4.6 indicates the total sample in this research is 100 respondents. The variable of Tariff (X1) indicates that the minimum value is 17. It means that the minimum value chosen by respondents in 6 questions of Tariff variable with the range of 1-5 is 17. Meanwhile, the maximum value chosen by the respondents is 30. The mean value of Tariff variable is 23.92. It means the average value chosen by the respondents is 23.92. The standard deviation is 2.939 which is rounded into 3. It means that the difference between mean and the value of each respondents chosen from its original number is around 3. The variance which measure the mathematics index degree of deviation from its mean value of Tariff is 8.640 or that the variance square of Tariff is rounded into 9.

The variable of Socialization indicates that the minimum value is 18. It means that the minimum value chosen by respondents in 8 questions of Socialization variable with the range of 1 - 5 is 18. Meanwhile, the maximum value chosen by the respondents is 40. The mean value of Socialization variable is 31.80. It means the average value chosen by the respondents is 31.80. The standard deviation is 4.337 which is rounded into 4. It means that the difference between mean and the value of each respondents chosen from its original number is around 4. The variance which measure the mathematics index degree of deviation from its mean

value of Socialization is 18.808 or that the variance square of Socialization is rounded into 19.

The variable of Control indicates that the minimum value is 9. It means that the minimum value chosen by respondents in 4 questions of Control variable with the range of 1-5 is 9. The mean value of Control variable is 15.67. It means the average value chosen by the respondents is 15.67. The standard deviation is 2.274 which is rounded into 2. It means that the difference between mean and the value of each respondents chosen from its original number is around 2. The variance which measure the mathematics index degree of deviation from its mean value of Control is 5.173 or that the variance square of Control is rounded into 5.

The variable of Understanding of Taxation indicates that the minimum value is 20. It means that the minimum value chosen by respondents in 7 questions of Understanding of Taxation variable with the range 1-5 is 20. The mean value of Understanding of Taxation variable is 27.23. It means the average value chosen by the respondents is 27.23. The standard deviation is 4.077 which is rounded into 4. It means that the difference between mean and the value of each respondents chosen from its original number is around 4. The variance which measure the mathematics index degree of deviation from its mean value of Understanding of Taxation is 16.623 or that the variance square of Understanding of Taxation is rounded into 17.

The variable of Tax Compliance indicates that the minimum value is 18. It means that the minimum value chosen by respondents in 6 questions of Tax Compliance variable with the range of 1-5 is 18. Meanwhile, the maximum value chosen by respondents is 30. The mean value of Tax Compliance variable is 25.29. Or the average value chosen by the respondents is 25.29. The standard deviation is 3.427 which is rounded into 3. It means that the difference between mean and the value of each respondents chosen from its original number is around 3. The variance which measure the mathematics index degree of deviation from its mean value of Tax Compliance is 11.743 or that the variance square of Tax Compliance is rounded into 12.

## **2. Validity Test**

Validity test is one way to measure the validity of instrument measurement usage in the research. Instrument is defined as valid if it shows the instrument to get the data or is suitable to measure what should be measured (Nazzarudin & Basuki, 2016).

The validity test in this research are measured by correlating each question score with the total construct or variable, by cooperating the Pearson correlation value with the r table product moment with 5% signification for degree of freedom ( $df = N-2$ ). The total sample (N) in this research are 100, so that the (df) value was calculated as follows:  $100-2 = 98$ , so that the r-table 0.198447. If the result of Pearson correlation value are more than r-table value, so it can be concluded that the indicator is

valid. Furthermore, Nazaruddin and Basuki (2016), they explain that the research instrument will be valid if the result of  $KMO > 0.5$ .

**Table 4. 7**  
**Validity Test Tariff**

<b>Instrument</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	<b>R Table</b>	<b>Sig (2-tailed)</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
X1.1	0.575	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X1.2	0.722	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X1.3	0.675	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X1.4	0.711	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X1.5	0.592	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X1.6	0.557	0.1946	0.0000	VALID

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

**Table 4. 8**  
**KMO and Bartlett's Test Tariff**

<b>KMO and Bartlett's Test</b>		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.658
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	123.003
	df	15
	Sig.	0

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

The data on the table 4.8 shows that the Pearson correlation of each indicator of Tariff are more than the r-table, the value of sig (2-tailed) is less than 0.05, and the value of KMO is 0.658. It means higher than 0.5, so that it indicates that all of the indicator in this research are valid.



**Table 4. 9**  
**Validity Test Socialization**

<b>Instrument</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	<b>R Table</b>	<b>Sig (2-tailed)</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
X2.1	0.644	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X2.2	0.676	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X2.3	0.504	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X2.4	0.731	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X2.5	0.737	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X2.6	0.738	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X2.7	0.721	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X2.8	0.542	0.1946	0.0000	VALID

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

**Table 4. 10**  
**KMO and Bartlett's Test Socialization**

**KMO and Bartlett's Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.773
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	273.462
	Df	28
	Sig.	0

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

The data on the table 4.10 shows that the Pearson correlation of each indicator of Socialization are more than the r-table, the value of sig (2-tailed) is less than 0.05, and the value of KMO is 0.773. It means higher than 0.5, so that it indicates that all of the indicator in this research are valid.

**Table 4. 11**  
**Validity Control**

<b>Instrument</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	<b>R Table</b>	<b>Sig (2-tailed)</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
X3.1	0.754	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X3.2	0.772	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X3.3	0.752	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X3.4	0.778	0.1946	0.0000	VALID

Source: Primary Data Processed,2019

**Table 4. 12**  
**KMO and Bartlett's Test Control**

**KMO and Bartlett's Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.674
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	102.743
	Df	6
	Sig.	0

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

Based on the data on the table 4.12 shows that the Pearson correlation of each indicator of Control are more than the r-table, then for value of sig (2-tailed) is less than 0.05, and the value of KMO is 0.674. It means higher than 0.5, so that it indicates that all of the indicator for control in this research are valid.

**Table 4. 13**  
**Validity Test Understanding of Taxation**

<b>Instrument</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	<b>R Table</b>	<b>Sig (2-tailed)</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
X4.1	0.744	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X4.2	0.781	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X4.3	0.714	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X4.4	0.778	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X4.5	0.535	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X4.6	0.766	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
X4.7	0.741	0.1946	0.0000	VALID

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

**Table 4. 14**  
**KMO and Bartlett's Test Understanding of Taxation**

**KMO and Bartlett's Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.771
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	306.569
	Df	21
	Sig.	0

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

Based on the data on the table 4.14 shows that the Pearson correlation of each indicator of Understanding of Taxation are more than the r-table, the value of sig (2-tailed) is less than 0.05, and the value of KMO is 0.771. Therefore, it means higher than 0.5 then it indicates that all of the indicator in this research are valid.

**Table 4. 15**  
**Validity Tax Compliance**

<b>Instrument</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	<b>R Table</b>	<b>Sig (2-tailed)</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
Y1	0.811	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
Y2	0.906	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
Y3	0.899	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
Y4	0.864	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
Y5	0.840	0.1946	0.0000	VALID
Y6	0.775	0.1946	0.0000	VALID

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

**Table 4. 16**  
**KMO and Bartlett's Test Tax Compliance**

**KMO and Bartlett's Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.813
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	526.074
	Df	15
	Sig.	0

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

The data on the table 4.16 shows that the Pearson correlation of each indicator of Tax Compliance are more than the r-table, the value of sig (2-tailed) is less than 0.05, and the value of KMO is 0.826. It means higher than 0.5, so that it indicates that all of the indicator for tax compliance in this research are valid.

### 3. Reliability Test

Reliability is one of the test instruments to measure a questionnaire which is indicator of construct variable (Nazzarudin & Basuki, 2016). A questionnaire can be defined as reliable if the answer of each question has a correlation. The test statistics of Croanbach Alpha is a way to measure the reliability. Based on Sekaran's statement (Zulganef, 2006 as cited in Nazaruddin & Basuki, 2016), the data can be defined as reliable if the value of Croanbach Alpha is more than 0.70.

**Table 4. 17**  
**Reliability Test**

No	Variable	Croanbach Alpha	N of item	Explanation
1	Tariff	0.705	6	Reliable
2	Socialization	0.817	8	Reliable
3	Control	0.762	4	Reliable
4	Understanding of Taxation	0.844	7	Reliable
5	Tax Compliance	0.923	6	Reliable

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

Based on the table 4.17, the values of Croanbach Alpha for all of the variables are more than its significant value (0.70) so that it could be concluded that all of the variables in this research are reliable.

### 4. Classic Assumption Test

#### a. Normality Test

Normality test is a way to calculate whether the residual value is normally distributed or not. A good regression model will follow by normally distribution. The normality test is calculated with One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test with significant value is more than

0.05. If the significant value is more than 0.05, it means the data is distributed normally, while if its value is less than 0.05 it means that the data is distributed abnormal. The normality test of this research can be seen in Table 4.18 as follows:

**Table 4. 18**  
**Normality Test**

No	KolmogorovSmirnov Z	Standard Value	Explanation
1	0.587	0.05	Normally distributed

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

The result of normality test shows that the calculation using One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test is normally distributed. The significant value from its normality test is 0.587. Therefore, the result from normality test are more than 0.05. Based on this test, it can be concluded that the regression model in this research is fulfilled the normality assumption.

#### **b. Autocorrelation Test**

Autocorrelation test is conducted to test whether there is a correlation between residuals in one observation with another observation (Nazzarudin & Basuki, 2016). To detect the existence of autocorrelation used Run Test with the requirement, if the value of Asymp.Sig.(2-tailed) is less than ( $<0.05$ ) it is means that there is Autocorrelation, while if the value of Asymp.Sig.(2-tailed) is  $> 0.05$ ) there is no autocorrelation.

**Table 4. 19**  
**Autocorrelation Test**

	<b>Unstandardized Residual</b>
Test Value(a)	-0.70153
Cases < Test Value	50
Cases >= Test Value	50
Total Cases	100
Number of Runs	52
Z	0.201
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.841

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

From the table above it can be concluded that the value of Asymp.Sig.(2-tailed) Run Test is 0.841, which means higher than 0.05. Therefore, it means that there is no autocorrelation.

**c. Multicollinearity Test**

Multicollinearity is one of the tests that used to value the relation of each independent variables. The multicollinearity test is generally using Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value with the terms if the VIF <10 and the Tolerance more than 0.1 so that the regression model are free from multicollinearity assumption. While vice versa, if the VIF >10 means there is obstruction on the regression model. The table of 4.20 below is the multicollinearity test result of this research.

**Table 4. 20**  
**Multicollinearity Test**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics		
		<b>B</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>Beta</b>			<b>Tolerance</b>	<b>VIF</b>	<b>B</b>
1	(Constant)	1.284	3.276		0.392	0.696			
	<b>Tariff</b>	0.316	0.136	0.233	2.321	0.022	0.633	1.58	
	<b>Socialization</b>	0.037	0.107	0.037	0.341	0.734	0.535	1.869	
	<b>Control</b>	0.54	0.18	0.304	3.004	0.003	0.621	1.609	
	<b>Understanding of Taxation</b>	0.225	0.114	0.208	1.973	0.051	0.571	1.752	

a Dependent Variable: Tax Compliance

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

The result of multicollinearity test in the table 4.20 shows that the VIF value of all variables independent (Tariff, Socialization, Control, Understanding of Taxation) is less than 10, and the Tolerance of all variable is more than 0.1. It can be concluded that the regressions are free from multicollinearity.

#### d. Heteroscedasticity Test

Heteroscedasticity test is one of the instrument test which aims to test whether there is a similarity between regression model in one residual to the others. If the variance of one residual to others is still going constantly, it will be free from a heteroscedasticity, while if it is different, the result is Heteroscedasticity. Heteroscedasticity test using Spearman test which is resumed in the table 4.21 below.

**Table 4. 21**  
**Heteroscedasticity Test**

No	Variable	Significant Value	Alpha Significant	Heteroscedasticity
1	Tariff	0.439	> 0.05	No
2	Socialization	0.379	> 0.05	No
3	Control	0.585	> 0.05	No
4	Understanding of Taxation	0.764	> 0.05	No

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2019

Table 4.21 shows the significant value in all variables contains of Tariff (with the significant value of 0.439), Socialization (with the significant value of 0.379), Control (with the significant value of 0.585), and Understanding of Taxation (with the significant value of

0.764), is more than alpha significant 0.05. It means that there is no heteroscedasticity in this regression model.

### C. Hypothesis Test and Data Analysis.

#### 1. Determinant Coefficient Regression Test

The adjusted R square value can show the level of ability of the regression model in explaining the variability of the dependent or dependent variable. The magnitude of the determination coefficient from 0 to 1. If the results of the analysis are known to be closer to 0, the value concluded smaller the ability to explain. Conversely, if the results of the analysis are known to be closer to 1, the greater of the value ability to explain the independent variables on the dependent variable. The result of Coefficient Determination can be seen in the table below:

**Table 4. 22**  
**Determinant Coefficient Test Results (R2)**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	<b>.692a</b>	<b>0.395</b>	<b>0.370</b>	<b>1.955</b>

Predictors: (constant). Understanding of Taxation, Control, Tariff, Socialization  
Source : Output SPSS 15.00 data processed, 2019

Based on the table 4.22 above, it can be seen that the value of Adjusted R square is equal to 0.370. This shows 37% variations of the taxpayer compliance variable variable can be explained by independent variables namely quality system, facility conditions, performance expectancy, effort expectancy, self-efficacy, and social factors. Then, the rest of this 63% is explained by other variables not present in this study.



## 2. Simultaneous Significance Test (Test Statistic F)

The F test is used to prove whether independent variables can explain variations in the dependent variable. If the significant value is  $< 0,05$  it means that  $H_a$  is accepted or  $H_o$  is rejected. Therefore, if a significant value is  $> 0,05$ , it means the  $H_a$  is rejected or  $H_o$  is accepted Ghozali (2009).

**Table 4. 23**  
**F Test Results**

Anova <sup>b</sup>						
	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
1	Regression	237.013	4	59.253	15.508	0.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	362.987	95	3.821		
	Total	600.00	99			

Source : Output SPSS 15.00 data processed, 2019

Based on the table 4.23 above, it can be seen that there is a result of a significance value of  $0,00 < 0,05$ . Thus, it can be said that the hypothesis is supported. Therefore, it can be concluded that the implementation of tariff, socialization, control, and understanding of taxation can explain the variable tax compliance.

## 3. Partial Regression Test Result ( T-Test)

T statistical test shows how far the influence of one variable explanatory or independent individually in explaining variation dependent variable and is used to determine the presence or absence of the effect of each independent variable individually on the dependent variable tested at the 0.05 significance level (Ghozali, 2011).

One Sample t-test is one of the techniques used to indicate whether certain value has significant difference with the mean of the samples or not. The t-table uses the Alpha significant value of 5% with the df: (n-1). If the t-calculation is more than t-table, it means that the Independent Variables (X) is influenced by the dependent variables (Y). If the significant value is less than 5%, then the hypothesis is accepted. Meanwhile, if the significant value is more than 5%, the hypothesis is rejected. The table 4.29 below are explaining more details about this test:

**Table 4. 24**  
**T-Test Result Independent and Dependent Variable**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients <sup>a</sup>		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.284	3.276		0.392	0.696
	Tariff	0.316	0.136	0.223	2.321	0.022
	Socialization	0.037	0.107	0.037	0.341	0.734
	Control	0.54	0.180	0.304	3.004	0.003
	Understanding of Taxation	0.23	0.114	0.208	2.013	0.048

Dependent variable: Tax Compliance

Source : Output SPSS 15.00 data processed, 2019

Based on the table 4.24 above, it can be seen that the significance values in the Tariff, Control, and Understanding of Taxation are  $< 0,05$ . However, the Socialization has a significance value  $> 0,05$  which is equal to 0.734. Thus it can be concluded that the variables of the Tariff, Control, and Understanding of Taxation have a significant influence on Tax Compliance, while the Socialization has a negative effect and is not

significant on Tax Compliance. The results of the hypothesis testing are as follow :

**a. Hypothesis Test 1 ( $H_1$ )**

Table 4.24 shows that the tariff variable has a significance value of  $0.022 < \alpha 0.05$  with a regression coefficient value (B) of 0.316 and the regression coefficient value (B) is positive. Based on the result, it can be concluded that  $H_1$  is accepted, and means that tariff has a positive effect on tax compliance of micro small medium enterprises.

**b. Hypothesis Test 2 ( $H_2$ )**

Table 4.24 shows that the socialization variable has not a significance value of  $0.734 > \alpha 0.05$  with a regression coefficient value (B) of 0.037 and the regression coefficient value (B) is positive. Based on the result, it can be concluded that  $H_2$  is rejected, and means that socialization has no positive effect on tax compliance of micro small medium enterprises.

**c. Hypothesis Test 3 ( $H_3$ )**

Table 4.24 shows that the control variable has a significance value of  $0.003 < \alpha 0.05$  with a regression coefficient value (B) of 0.540 and the regression coefficient value (B) is positive. Based on the result, it can be concluded that  $H_3$  is accepted, and means that control has a positive effect on tax compliance of micro small medium enterprises.

#### d. Hypothesis Test 4 (H<sub>4</sub>)

Table 4.24 shows that the Understanding of Taxation variable has a significance value of  $0.048 < \alpha 0.05$  with a regression coefficient value (B) of 0.225 and the regression coefficient value (B) is positive. Based on the result, it can be concluded that H<sub>4</sub> is accepted, and means that understanding of taxation has a positive effect on tax compliance of micro small medium enterprises

#### D. Explanation

This part explains about data processing and some test results are:

**Table 4. 25**  
**Resume of Hypothesis Test**

No	Hypothesis	F-Test Value Result /Sig	T Test Sig 2-tailed	B	R <sup>2</sup>	Explanation
1.	<b>Government's tariff has a positive influence on the compliance of MSME taxpayers.</b>	15,508 / 0,000	0,022	0,316	0,395	Accepted
2.	<b>Government socialization have a positive influence on the compliance of MSME taxpayer.</b>	15,508 / 0,000	0,734	0,037	0,395	Rejected
3	<b>Control have a positive influence on the compliance of MSME taxpayer.</b>	15,508 / 0,000	0,003	0,540	0,395	Accepted
4.	<b>Understanding of Taxation has a positive influence on the compliance of MSME taxpayer.</b>	15,508 / 0,000	0,048	0,225	0,395	Accepted

Source : Output SPSS 15.00 data processed, 2019

**1. Government's tariff has a positive influence on the compliance of MSME taxpayers.**

On the table 4.25, the first hypothesis states that tariff has a positive significant effect on tax compliance of MSME. Based on the test results using multiple linear analysis, the results of hypothesis one has a significance value of 0,022. The significance value is less than the alpha value of 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that the tariff has a significant effect on tax compliance of MSME, thus the first hypothesis is accepted, it means that the tariff from government for tax final (*PPh Final*) for Micro Small Medium Enterprises has a significant impact on the will of taxpayer from Micro Small Medium Enterprises to pay taxes. Taxpayers has a believe if they have a lower tariff of tax makes them have a more desire to pay taxes to the government.

The results of this study are in line the research of Julianto (2014) which states that the tax rate is an encouragement from other parties who encourage taxpayers to carry out their tax obligations. Because the tariff is deemed not burdensome by the taxpayer, with self-awareness a taxpayer's will obey his tax obligations. Therefore, tariff can affect respondents to take advantage of tariff that given by the government.

**2. Government socialization has a positive influence on the compliance of MSME taxpayer.**

On the table 4.25, the second hypothesis states that socialization has a significant positive effect on the compliance of micro small medium

enterprises taxpayer. Based on the test results using multiple linear analysis, the results of hypothesis two have a significance value of 0.734. The significance value is greater than the alpha value of 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that the socialization has not a significant effect on compliance of micro small medium enterprises taxpayer, thus the second hypothesis is rejected, meaning that the socialization from government especially tax fiscus from General Director of Taxation is not have a significant roles in make the awareness of the taxpayers to fulfil their obligation to pay tax. It means the socialization towards to taxpayer did not reach their target as their expectation to make taxpayers from MSME have an awareness to pay taxes.

The results of this study are in line the research Lianty, et al (2017) which states that socialization does not have effect on MSME taxpayer compliance. This shows that the higher or better taxation socialization conducted by tax officials, it does not affect the compliance of MSME Taxpayers in Yogyakarta. Based on the results of the questionnaire that has been analyzed with descriptive statistics, it appears that for the taxation socialization variable the percentage of total score obtained from respondents' answers to the questionnaire is 84.75%, which means that taxation socialization by the government towards MSME is quite good. This can be seen from the response of MSME Taxpayers of Yogyakarta, who mostly knew about the tax socialization either directly or indirectly and participated in the socialization and obtained tax information through

the socialization. However, good tax socialization may not necessarily affect the compliance of MSME Taxpayers in Yogyakarta city. This is due to the incomplete socialization conducted by the tax official

The director general of taxes needs to improve the aspects of giving the socialization the MSME, because it is very important if they want many taxpayers to become aware to pay the taxes. If they do not improve the way of socialization it makes the revenue of government from tax is low because lack of socialization by the government.

**3. Control has a positive influence on the compliance of MSME taxpayer.**

On the table 4.25, the third hypothesis states that control has a significant positive effect on the tax compliance of MSME taxpayer. Based on the test results using multiple linear analysis, the results of third hypothesis have a significance value of 0.03. The significance value is less than the alpha value of 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that control have a significant effect on tax compliance of MSME taxpayers, thus the third hypothesis is accepted, it means that the higher amount of control that given by government or revenue officer, the higher will of the taxpayers from MSME to report and pay the taxes because according to them, it can help the country to develop from the revenue of taxes.

The results of this study are in line the research Pamuji, et al (2014) which states that control have effect on taxpayer compliance. The MSME taxpayers of Yogyakarta city assume that the control that done by general

director of taxation is success, because it motivates them to become more on paying the taxes, and it makes the taxpayers of MSME more aware paying the tax, because more tax that received by the government, the more facilities that they receive for the MSME. This variable have a significant influence on the taxpayer of MSME of the people of Yogyakarta to pay taxes, this indicates that many taxpayers to pay and report the taxes to the government.

**4. Understanding of Taxation has a positive influence on the compliance of MSME taxpayer.**

On the table 4.25, the fourth hypothesis states that understanding of taxation has a significant positive effect on the tax compliance of MSME taxpayer. Based on the test results using multiple linear analysis, the results of fourth hypothesis have a significance value of 0.0048. The significance value is less than the alpha value of 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that Understanding of Taxation have a significant effect on tax compliance of MSME taxpayers, thus the fourth hypothesis is accepted. The higher understanding of taxpayer on taxation. It means the higher will of the taxpayers from MSME to report and pay the taxes because they have a knowledge that tax is important for their country and also can improve the facility for MSME from Director general of taxation.

The results of this study are in line the research Pamuji, et al (2014) which states that Understanding of Taxation have effect on taxpayer compliance. The MSME taxpayers of Yogyakarta city assume that the



knowledge of tax by Understanding of Taxation can make their business more growth because the good understanding, it reflects by the government that support them by giving incentive of training and help the MSME to became more growth in all aspects. This variable have a significant influence on the taxpayer of MSME of the people of Yogyakarta to pay taxes, this indicates that many taxpayers aware they will receive feedback from government if they had a good knowledge on Understanding of Taxation.