

TAX INTENSITY, INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL, AND INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONERS ON SUSTAINABILITY REPORTING MODERATED BY COMPANY SIZE (IN NON-CYCLICALS CONSUMER COMPANIES LISTED ON THE IDX 2019-2023)



Putri Lindeawati¹

Universitas Muhammadiyah Tangerang, Tangerang, Indonesia

lindeaputri45@gmail.com

Januar Eky Pambudi²

Universitas Muhammadiyah Tangerang, Tangerang, Indonesia

Jep@umt.ac.id

Abstract

Sustainability reporting serves as a key indicator of a company's implementation of the triple bottom line concept (people, planet, profit). This study aims to examine the influence of tax intensity, intellectual capital, and independent commissioners on sustainability reporting, with firm size as a moderating variable, in consumer non-cyclical companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange during the 2019–2023 period. This sector was chosen due to its stability and critical role in providing essential goods and services, making social and environmental responsibility highly significant. A quantitative approach was employed using secondary data from 14 companies selected through purposive sampling. Data analysis was conducted using panel data regression with the help of EViews 12.0. The results indicate that tax intensity has a negative effect on sustainability reporting, while intellectual capital and independent commissioners have a positive effect. Firm size does not moderate the effect of tax intensity but does strengthen the influence of intellectual capital and independent commissioners on sustainability reporting. The study recommends that companies enhance the quality of their intellectual capital and the role of independent commissioners, as well as manage tax obligations strategically, in order to improve sustainability reporting performance and long-term reputation.

Keywords: Company Size, Independent Commissioners, Intellectual Capital, Sustainability Reporting, Tax Intensity

INTRODUCTION

Initially, the modern business paradigm focused solely on achieving economic gain (profit). However, in today's global developments, this approach is no longer considered adequate. Companies are required to consider social (people) and environmental (planet) aspects in a balanced manner alongside financial ones (Hidayah et al., 2021). This concept is known as the Triple Bottom Line or 3P (Profit, People, Planet), which aims to ensure that companies operate sustainably and continue to receive support from stakeholders (Nugroho et al., 2020).

One of the main indicators that a company has implemented sustainability principles is through sustainability reporting. This report contains information on the economic, social, and environmental impacts of the company's business activities (Al Hawaj & Buallay, 2022). Good sustainability reporting not only increases transparency and accountability but also serves as a strategic tool in building public trust and a company's reputation (GRI, 2021). In Indonesia, the preparation of sustainability reports is encouraged through POJK No. 51/POJK.03/2017, which requires public companies to prepare sustainability reports annually (Hidayah et al., 2019).

This research focuses on companies in the Consumer Non-Cyclical sector listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX). Companies in this sector produce basic necessities such as food, beverages, and household products, which have relatively stable demand, even in fluctuating economic conditions. Given this strategic role, companies in this sector face high expectations from the public and regulators for consistently implementing sustainability principles. However, based on initial observations of several companies in the Consumer Non-Cyclical sector, inconsistencies were found in their sustainability reporting during the 2019–2023 period. This can be seen in Table 1.1 below:

Table 1.
Sustainability Reporting for Consumer Non-Cyclical Companies 2019-2023

No	Company Code	Period				
		2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
1	ANJT	92	113	94	93	103
2	JPFA	72	97	96	90	103
3	WIIM	47	51	83	57	81
4	CHECK	106	121	125	130	77
5	SSMS	81	84	84	125	104

Source: Sustainability report data for the period 2019-2023

Table 1. above shows significant fluctuations, such as a decrease in CEKA's sustainability reporting score from 130 in 2022 to 77 in 2023. This inconsistency indicates that sustainability commitments have not been fully integrated into the company's management system, potentially impacting stakeholder trust.

Another phenomenon is several cases in Indonesia, such as: (1) PT. Sawit Inti Prima Perkasa, causing environmental pollution such as waste dumping by disposing of waste directly (by-pass) and waste water treatment installation (IPAL) management that is not in line with environmental conservation efforts and environmental maintenance efforts (UKL/UPL). On the other hand, some companies do not have permits for waste management and B3 waste (Hazardous and Toxic Materials) (Ppid.menlhk.go.id, 2023). (2) In 2020, PT.

Greenfields Indonesia, located in Blitar, was reported to have polluted river flows due to the company's direct discharge of waste into water bodies (Riady, 2021). In addition, it is known that the company does not yet have an official permit for liquid waste disposal (IPLC), because the permit was still in the processing stage at the time of the incident (Arif, 2021).

Sustainability reporting is a form of reporting that contains information regarding the economic, social, and environmental impacts caused by a company's operational activities. This report is useful in helping companies evaluate, understand, and communicate the impact of their activities on these three aspects, while also reflecting their performance in the eyes of the government. When a company's image is vulnerable or threatened, management needs to pay closer attention to the preparation of sustainability reporting (Noerkholiq & Muslih, 2021).

Tax intensity reflects the extent to which a company contributes taxes to national income. Companies with high tax intensity tend to exhibit greater social responsibility, which can contribute to the development of sustainability reports. Investing in transparent tax practices can enhance a company's reputation and attract stakeholder interest, which in turn supports companies in improving the quality of their sustainability reports. Ayuwandari (2020) In his study, he explained that sustainability reporting has a positive influence on economic disclosures, but does not significantly impact environmental and social aspects related to tax avoidance. Conversely, Istanti (2020) revealed that sustainability reporting actually has a negative impact on tax avoidance practices.

Intellectual capital is an intangible asset in the form of information resources, innovation, and knowledge that is useful in strengthening competitive capabilities while still protecting the environment which can increase the value of a company and support the company in achieving sustainability goals (Yusliza et al., 2020). Study results Jawak & Lubis (2023) explained that intellectual capital has no influence on sustainability reporting. Meanwhile, according to Selfiani & Usmar (2023), intellectual capital has a positive influence on sustainability reporting.

An independent board of commissioners is a party that has no business or family ties to the majority shareholder or members of the board of directors. The primary role of independent commissioners is to strengthen the oversight function of company management, thereby encouraging improved performance and the quality of accounting information provided. This finding aligns with the study. Putra et al., (2023) explains that independent commissioners have an influence on sustainability reporting. This is different from the findings Sofa & Respati (2020) And Liana (2019) revealed that independent commissioners have no influence on sustainability reporting disclosure.

Company size is a parameter used to determine the scale or size of a company. Company scale also influences the amount of information presented in a sustainability report; large-scale companies generally provide more information due to their high costs and the greater pressure and scrutiny they face from stakeholders, which encourages them to maintain public trust by aligning their social activities with social norms Widiyanto & Widjajawati (2019). Study findings Mandagie et al., (2022), Nuraeni & Darsono (2020), Sofa & Respati (2020), Yunan & Anwar (2021) And Afifah et al., (2022) found that company size can influence sustainability reporting. This is different from the findings of the study Setiadi (2022) proves that company size has no influence on sustainability reporting.

From the discussion presented, several previous studies have examined the relationship between the influence of tax intensity, intellectual capital, and independent commissioners on sustainability reporting. However, their research yielded inconsistent results. There is a significant research gap between the findings of one study and another, as well as the urgency of sustainability reporting in Indonesia. Furthermore, studies highlighting the role of company size as a moderating variable on sustainability reporting are still limited, as evidenced by the paucity of similar research available, thus providing novelty value for this research. Based on this background description, the purpose of this study is to examine the influence of tax intensity, intellectual capital, and independent commissioners on sustainability reporting by considering company size as a moderating variable, specifically for Consumer Non-Cyclicals companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) in 2019–2023.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder theory was first introduced by Freeman (1983), which defines it as a group or individual who may influence or be influenced by the achievement of a company's goals. The aim of this theory is to help management understand the environment in which the company operates and develop the business more effectively (Setiawan et al., 2022). The practice of disclosing sustainability reporting is based on stakeholder theory. To maintain relationships between stakeholders and the interests of each party, one effort that can be made is to publish sustainability reporting (Hörisch et al., 2020). Sustainability reporting contains transparent information related to the company's position and activities in relation to economic, social, and environmental aspects. The goal is to build trust in the company. Ultimately, stakeholders can directly assess the company's performance through the publication of sustainability reporting.

Legitimacy Theory

Legitimacy theory was first proposed by Dowling and Pfeffer (1975). Legitimacy theory focuses on the interaction between companies, organizations, and society. (Karlina et al., 2019) According to legitimacy theory, companies must function according to societal standards so that society can accept the company's existence (Martens & Bui, 2023). Therefore, legitimacy theory is used to explain how the substance of a sustainability report aligns with societal standards. A company's legitimacy can be threatened if the public believes it is not conducting its business properly. To gain legitimacy from the public, one way a company can achieve this is by publishing sustainability reporting that discloses the company's social and environmental responsibilities.

Hypothesis Formulation

The Effect of Tax Intensity on Sustainability Reporting

According to research Ayuwandari (2020), states that sustainability reporting shows a positive influence in the disclosure of economic aspects on tax avoidance. The higher the tax intensity paid by a company, the more likely the company is to report sustainability activities transparently. Understanding the effect of tax intensity on sustainability reporting is important for companies and stakeholders. By understanding this relationship, companies

can better plan their tax and social responsibility strategies, thereby improving their reputation and long-term sustainability. Therefore, the following hypothesis is formulated.

H1 :Tax intensity has a positive effect on sustainability reporting.

Influence of Intellectual Capital on Sustainability Reporting

According to research conducted by (Septiana (2018) Poh, Kilicman, and Ibrahim (2018) in Selfiani & Usmar (2023) explains that the higher the level of intellectual capital disclosure implemented, the more credible and reliable it is. The information provided will minimize investor errors in evaluating a company's stock price and, at the same time, will increase market capitalization. Based on this, a company's intellectual capital can have a positive influence on sustainability reporting. Therefore, the following hypothesis is formulated.

H2 :Intellectual capital has a positive effect on sustainability reporting

The Influence of Independent Commissioners on Sustainability Reporting

According to research (Nuraeni & Darsono, 2020), indicating that independent commissioners have a positive and significant influence on sustainability reporting disclosure. Companies will disclose sustainability reporting information to achieve good internal control. Good internal control is one of the functions of independent commissioners in carrying out their duties. Companies will disclose information as widely as possible, such as sustainability reporting disclosure. To achieve good internal control, the role of an independent board of commissioners is required in developing and implementing it. Independent commissioners can conduct oversight and provide advice to the board of directors objectively. Therefore, the hypothesis is formulated as follows.

H3 :Independent commissioners have a positive influence on sustainability reporting disclosure.

Company Size as a Moderating Variable of Tax Intensity on Sustainability Reporting Disclosure

Referring to legitimacy theory, larger companies often have more incentives to invest in sustainability reporting disclosure and fulfill their tax obligations to maintain legitimacy in the eyes of stakeholders. Company size has a positive influence as a moderating variable on the relationship between tax intensity and sustainability reporting disclosure, indicating that larger companies tend to make more comprehensive disclosures related to sustainability when facing high tax pressure. Therefore, the following hypothesis is formulated.

H4 :Company size can moderate the effect of tax intensity on sustainability reporting.

Company Size as a Moderating Variable of Intellectual Capital on Sustainability Reporting Disclosure

Referring to legitimacy theory, larger companies typically have better access to resources to develop intellectual capital. They can hire more skilled employees and develop better systems. Larger companies also tend to have more incentives to develop intellectual capital and invest in sustainability reporting. This helps them maintain legitimacy among stakeholders. Conversely, smaller companies may face challenges in developing the intellectual capital necessary to implement effective sustainability practices, which can impact their ability to build legitimacy. This suggests that larger companies' size makes them more visible in the market, thus motivating them to utilize their intellectual capital

more effectively in preparing comprehensive and relevant sustainability reporting. Therefore, the following hypothesis is formulated.

H5 :Company size can moderate intellectual capital on sustainability reporting
Company Size as a Moderating Variable of Independent Commissioners on Sustainability Reporting Disclosure

The results of research conducted by (Madonna & Khafid, 2020) explains that the larger the company, the more complex its operational activities will be, and the company's goals will automatically become greater. Independent commissioners have the authority and participate in determining obligations to achieve these targets and objectives, one of which is through the disclosure of sustainability reporting. The company's future prospects will be better, it will be more trusted by domestic and foreign investors, and the general public will believe that the company has social responsibility, which will also provide information for stakeholders. Based on the above description, the researcher formulates the following hypothesis:

H6 : Company size can moderate independent commissioners' commitment to sustainability reporting.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach to systematically test hypotheses through statistical data analysis based on positivistic principles. The data used in this study is secondary, obtained from the financial reports and sustainability reports of non-cyclical consumer sector companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) during the 2019-2023 period.

The main variables studied include Sustainability Reporting, Tax Intensity, Intellectual Capital, and Independent Commissioners, with Company Size as a moderating variable. Sustainability Reporting is measured using the Sustainability Report Disclosure Index (SRDI), which is the ratio between the number of disclosure items made by a company and the total available indicators (Wulandari & Popi Fauziati, 2024). Tax intensity is calculated based on the ratio between income tax expense and profit before tax, also known as the Effective Tax Rate (ETR) (Mardianti & Ardini, 2020). Intellectual Capital is measured using the VAIC (Value Added Intellectual Coefficient) model which includes three components: VACA (capital employed), VAHU (human capital), and STVA (structural capital) (Selfiani & Usmar, 2023). Independent Commissioners are calculated based on the percentage of the number of independent commissioners to the total number of board members (Putra et al., 2023). Company size is determined by the natural logarithm of total assets. (Susanti et al., 2023), to group large and small companies. All data were obtained through a literature review of companies' annual reports and sustainability reports. To test the influence between variables, the data were analyzed using panel data regression methods, using EViews software version 12.0.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistical Analysis Results

Table2.
Descriptive Statistical Analysis Results

Variables	N	Mean	Median	Maximum	Minimum	Std. Dev
Sustainability Reporting (SR)	70	0.5596	0.5530	0.8609	0.2649	0.1259
Tax Intensity (ETR)	70	0.3400	0.2493	1.7143	0.1675	0.2514
Intellectual Capital	70	13,599	7,307	113.03	1,590	22.8131
Independent Commissioner	70	0.5097	0.5000	0.8330	0.3330	0.1348
Company Size	70	30,449	30,656	32,860	27,893	1.3356
Valid N (listwise)	70					

Source: Eviews12.0 Output 2025

Observing the findings of the descriptive statistical study presented in table 2, the sustainability reporting (SR) variable has a mean value of 0.5596, meaning the average level (SR) based on the GRI Standard is 55.96 percent of the total indicators, and starting from a median of 0.5530, this value explains the average disclosure (SR) of sample companies during the study period moving towards the maximum value. The tax intensity variable (X1) has a mean value of 0.3400 with a median value of 0.2492, this value indicates the average level of tax intensity implemented by companies in reducing the tax burden owned by 34 percent of the company's total pre-tax profit, with a mean value greater than the median value of the data indicating that the average tax intensity that occurred during the study period moved towards the maximum value. The intellectual capital variable (X2) has a mean value of 13,599 with a median value of 7,307, this indicates that the average level of intellectual capital contained in the company's resources to create competitive value is 13,599 with a mean value greater than the median value. The data shows that the average level of intellectual capital moves towards the maximum value of the variable which indicates a positive direction for the sample company by having competitive value from the human resources it has. The Independent Commissioners variable (X3) has a mean value of 0.5096 and a median value of 0.5000, this indicates that the average number of Independent Commissioners on the board of commissioners of sample companies is 50.96%, this indicates that the sample companies have fulfilled the rules that require companies to have a minimum of 30 percent of the number of Independent Commissioners on the board of commissioners of the company. The company size variable (Z) has a mean value of 30.44 and a median value of 30.65, this indicates that the average size of sample companies during the study period is log n total assets of 30.44 or 35.11 trillion rupiah, and the average size of sample companies is lower than the median value of the variable which indicates that the average total assets are more mobile or closer to the minimum value of the company size variable data.

Panel Data Regression Model Estimation

Chow Test

Table 3.
Chow Test (Common Effect Model / Fixed Effect Model)
Common Effect Model (CEM)

Redundant Fixed Effect Tests			
Equation: FINAL			
Test cross-sections fixed effects			
Effects Test	Statistics	df	Prob.
Cross-sections F	4.532482	(13.50)	0.0833
Cross-sections Chi-square	54.502800	13	0.0741

Source: EvIEWS 12, 2025

Examining the Chow Test results in Table 3, the Cross-section F and Cross-section Chi-Square probabilities are 0.0741, exceeding the 0.05 significance level. Therefore, H1 is accepted, indicating that the Common Effect Model is more appropriate for panel data regression estimation than the Fixed Effect Model.

Hausman Test

Table 4.
Hausman Test
Fixed Effect Model (FEM)

Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test			
Equation: FINAL			
Cross-section random effects test			
Test Summary	Chi-Sq. Statistic	Chi-Sq. df	Prob.
Random cross-section	4.813753	6	0.0108

Source: EvIEWS 12, 2025

Reading the data presented in table 4, the random cross-section probability value is $0.0108 < 0.05$, thus it can be concluded that the Fixed Effect Model is a more appropriate model to use than the Random Effect Model.

Lagrange Multiplier Test

Table 5.
Lagrange Multiplier Test
Common Effect Model (CEM)

LagrangeMultiplier Tests for Random Effect			
Null hypothesis: No effect			
Alternative hypotheses: Two-sided (Breusch-Pagan) and one-sided (all others) alternative			
	Hypothesis Test		
	Cross-section	Time	Both
Breusch-Pagan	11.69656 (0.0667)	0.935124 (0.3335)	12.63168 (0.0554)
Honda	3.420023 (0.0703)	-0.967018 (0.8332)	1.734536 (0.0714)

King Wu	3.420023 (0.0503)	-0.967018 (0.8332)	0.813322 (0.2080)
---------	----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------

Source: Eviews 12, 2025

Observing the calculation results in table 5, the Breusch–Pagan Cross-sections probability value is $0.0667 > \alpha 0.05$, this value can be interpreted as the Common Effect Model being more suitable for use than the Random Effect Model.

Conclusion of the Panel Data Regression Model Used

Table6.

Conclusion of Panel Data Regression Model

No.	Method	Testing	Results
1	Chow Test	CEM vs FEM	CEM
2	Hausman test	REM vs FEM	FEM
3	Lagrange Multiplier Test	CEM vs REM	CEM

F test

Table7.

F test

RootMSE	0.118801	R-squared	0.681511
Meandependent var	0.667404	Adjusted R-squared	0.603560
SDdependent var	0.280296	SEO regression	0.125227
Sum squaredresid	0.987956	F-statistic	2.358518
Durbin-Watsonstat	0.976064	Prob.(F-statistic)	0.042903

Source: Eviews 12, 2025

Examining table 7 shows the F-statistic value of 2.358 while the Ftable level $\alpha 5\%$ df = 5, (nk) 65, the Ftable value is 2.356, so the F-statistic value (2.358) > from Ftable (2.356), and the probability value (F-statistic) $0.042903 < 0.05$, meaning H1 is accepted.

Coefficient of Determination

Table8.

Coefficient of Determination

RootMSE	0.118801	R-squared	0.681511
Meandependent var	0.667404	Adjusted R-squared	0.603560
SDdependent var	0.280296	SEO regression	0.125227
Sum squaredresid	0.987956	F-statistic	2.358518
Durbin-Watsonstat	0.976064	Prob.(F-statistic)	0.042903

Source: Eviews 12, 2025

Examining Table 8, the Adjusted R-Squared value is 0.6035. This value indicates that the independent variables tax intensity, intellectual capital, independent commissioners, and company size explain 60.35% of the variation in changes in the dependent variable, sustainability reporting. The remaining 39.65% is influenced by other factors outside the model that were not examined in this study.

T-test

Table 9.
T-test

Dependent Variable: SR				
Method: Panel Least Squares				
Date: 04/20/25 Time: 12:11				
Sample: 2019 2023				
Period included: 5				
Cross-section included: 14				
Total panel(balanced) observations: 70				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.374694	0.050336	7.443821	0.0000
Tax	-0.945218	1.505988	-0.627640	0.5325
Intellectual	0.032505	0.080174	2.405430	0.0365
Commissioner	0.525952	1.860957	2.282624	0.0084
Taxxsize	0.031860	0.049273	0.646590	0.5202
Intellectual size	0.001095	0.002617	3.418361	0.0171
Commissionerxsize	0.005558	0.060220	2.992289	0.0268
RootMSE	0.118801	R-squared		0.681511
Meandependent var	0.667404	Adjusted R-squared		0.603560
SDdependent var	0.280296	SEO regression		0.125227
Sum squaredresid	0.987956	F-statistic		2.358518
Durbin-Watsonstat	0.976064	Prob.(F-statistic)		0.042903

Source: Eviews 12.0 Output

Observing the t-test calculation in table 9, it can be understood that the tax intensity variable (Tax) has a t-statistic of -0.627, while the t-table level $\alpha = 5\%$ $df = 65$, the t-table value is 1.997, therefore the t-statistic of tax intensity is $0.627 < t\text{-table } 1.997$, and the prob. value is $0.5325 > 0.05$, meaning that the tax intensity variable has a negative effect on sustainability reporting, and the hypothesis is rejected. The intellectual capital variable obtains a t-statistic value of 2.405, while the t-table and the α level = 5% $df = 65$, the t-table value is 1.997, therefore, the intellectual capital t-statistic is $2.405 > t\text{-table } 1.997$, and the prob. value is $0.0365 < 0.05$, meaning that the intellectual capital variable has a positive effect on sustainability reporting, and the hypothesis is accepted. The independent commissioner variable has a t-statistic of 2.282, while the t-table and α level = 5% $df = 65$, the t-table value is 1.997, therefore, the independent commissioner t-statistic $2.282 > t\text{-table } 1.997$, and the prob. value is $0.0084 < 0.05$, meaning that the independent commissioner variable has a positive influence on sustainability reporting, and the hypothesis is accepted. The tax intensity variable with company size moderation (TaxxSize) has a t-statistic of 0.646, while the t-table level $\alpha = 5\%$ $df = 65$ obtains a t-table value of 1.997, for that the tax incentive t-statistic with company size moderation ($0.646 < t\text{-table } 1.997$, and the prob. value is $0.0084 < 0.05$. $0.5202 > 0.05$, meaning that company size cannot moderate the effect of tax intensity on sustainability reporting, and the hypothesis is rejected. The intellectual capital variable with company size moderation (IntellectualxSize) has a t-statistic of 3.418, while the t-table level $\alpha = 5\%$ $df = 65$, obtained a t-table value of 1.997, therefore the t-statistic of intellectual

capital with company size moderation is $3.418 > t\text{-table } 1.997$, and the prob. value is $0.0171 < 0.05$, meaning that company size can moderate the effect of intellectual capital on sustainability reporting, and the hypothesis is accepted. Furthermore, the independent commissioner variable with company size moderation (CommissionerxSize) has a t-statistic of 2.992, while the t-table at $\alpha = 5\%$ level obtained a t-table value of 1.997, therefore the t-statistic of independent commissioners with company size moderation $2.992 > t\text{-table } 1.997$, and the prob. value of $0.0268 < 0.05$, meaning that company size can moderate the influence of independent commissioners on sustainability reporting, and the hypothesis is accepted.

Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) Analysis

Table 10.

Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) Analysis

Coefficient Common Effect Model

Dependent Variable: SR				
Method: Panel LeastSquare				
Date: 04/20/25 Time: 12:11				
Sample: 2019 2023				
Period included: 5				
Cross-sections included: 14				
Total panel (balanced) observations: 70				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.374694	0.050336	7.443821	0.0000
Tax	-0.945218	1.505988	-0.627640	0.5325
Intellectual	0.032505	0.080174	2.405430	0.0365
Commissioner	0.525952	1.860957	2.282624	0.0084
Taxxsize	0.031860	0.049273	0.646590	0.5202
Intellectual size	0.001095	0.002617	3.418361	0.0171
Commissionerxsize	0.005558	0.060220	2.992289	0.0268
Root MSE	0.118801	R-squared		0.681511
Meandependent var	0.667404	Adjusted R-squared		0.603560
SDdependent var	0.280296	SEO regression		0.125227
Sumsquared residual	0.987956	F-statistic		2.358518
Durbin-Watson stat	0.976064	Prob.(F-statistic)		0.042903

Source: Eviews 12.0 Output

Examining table 10, the coefficient in the moderated regression analysis in this article has the following model equation:

$$Y = 0.374694 - 0.945218 \text{ Tax} + 0.032505 \text{ Intellectual} + 0.525952 \text{ Commissioner} + 0.031860 \text{ TaxxSize} + 0.001095 \text{ IntellectualxSize} + 0.005558 \text{ CommissionerxSize} + e$$

The constant value of 0.374694 explains that if all independent variables are in a constant condition, then the valuesustainability reportingestimated at 0.374694. The tax intensity variable (X1) has a negative regression coefficient of -0.945218, which indicates that every 1% increase in tax intensity, assuming the other independent variables are in constant condition, will cause a decrease in the value ofsustainability reporting0.945218. Next,intellectual capital(X2) has a positive regression coefficient of 0.374694. This means

that the increase in intellectual capital by 1%, assuming the other variables do not change, will increase the value of sustainability reporting of 0.374694. Meanwhile, the independent commissioner variable (X3) has a positive regression coefficient of 0.525952, which indicates that every 1% increase in the proportion of independent commissioners, assuming that other independent variables remain constant, can increase the value of sustainability reporting of 0.525952.

The tax intensity variable moderated by company size (X1Z) shows a positive regression coefficient of 0.031860. This value indicates that every 1% increase in company size, assuming other independent variables remain constant, will strengthen the effect of tax intensity on sustainability reporting of 0.031860. Furthermore, the variable intellectual capital which is moderated by company size (X2Z) has a positive regression coefficient of 0.001095, this can be interpreted as a 1% increase in company size, assuming that other variables do not change, will increase the influence of intellectual capital on sustainability reporting of 0.001095. The independent commissioner variable moderated by company size (X3Z) has a positive regression coefficient of 0.005558, which indicates that every 1% increase in company size, assuming all other variables remain constant, can increase the influence of independent commissioners on sustainability reporting of 0.005558.

The tax intensity variable (Tax) has a t-statistic value of -0.627, while the t-table value at a significance level of $\alpha = 5\%$ and degrees of freedom (df) of 65 is 1.997. Therefore, the t-statistic value of 0.627, < t-table 1.997, and the probability value (p-value) of 0.5325 exceeds the significance limit of 0.05. From these values, it can be concluded that tax intensity does not have a significant effect on sustainability reporting. Therefore, the proposed hypothesis is rejected. This finding is in line with the study Hidayat (2023) which states that tax intensity has no significant influence on sustainability reporting. However, this result contradicts the findings Mukaromah (2022), which shows that tax intensity has a significant effect on sustainability reporting.

The intellectual capital variable has a t-statistic value of 2.405, while the t-table value at a significance level of $\alpha = 5\%$ and degrees of freedom (df) of 65 is 1.997. Because the t-statistic value of 2.405 is greater than the t-table value of 1.997, and the probability value (p-value) of 0.0365 is below the significance threshold of 0.05, it can be concluded that the intellectual capital variable has a significant influence on sustainability reporting. This explains that the proposed hypothesis is accepted. This finding is in line with the study Selfiani & Usmar (2023) which explains that intellectual capital has a significant influence on sustainability reporting. This is different from the study Setiawan (2021) which proves that intellectual capital does not have a significant effect on sustainability reporting.

The independent commissioner variable has a t-statistic value of 2.282, while the t-table value at a significance level of $\alpha = 5\%$ and degrees of freedom (df) of 65 is 1.997. Because the t-statistic value of 2.282 is greater than the t-table value of 1.997, and the probability value (p-value) of 0.0084 is below the 0.05 significance level, it can be concluded that the independent commissioner variable has a positive and significant effect on sustainability reporting. This explains that the proposed hypothesis is accepted. This finding is in line with the study Mujiani (2021), which states that independent commissioners have a significant influence on sustainability reporting. However, these results differ from the study Friday (2021), which shows that independent commissioners do not have a significant influence on sustainability reporting.

The tax intensity variable moderated by company size (Tax $\times$ Size) has a t-statistic value of 0.646, while the t-table value at a significance level of $\alpha = 5\%$ and degrees of freedom (df) of 65 is 1.997. Because the t-statistic value of 0.646 is smaller than the t-table of 1.997, and the probability value (p-value) of 0.5202 exceeds the significance limit of 0.05, it can be interpreted that company size is unable to moderate the effect of tax intensity on sustainability reporting. Thus, the proposed hypothesis is rejected. This finding is in line with the study of Setiadi & Hidayat (2023) which proves that company size is unable to moderate the effect of tax intensity on sustainability reporting, in contrast to the study of Mukaromah (2022) which proves that company size can moderate the effect of tax intensity on sustainability reporting.

Intellectual capital with company size moderation (Intellectual $\times$ Size) has a t-statistic of 3.418, while ttable and α level = 5% df = 65, the ttable value is 1.997, therefore the intellectual t-statistic with company size moderation is $3.418 > \text{ttable } 1.997$, and the prob. value is $0.0171 < 0.05$, thus company size can moderate the influence of intellectual capital on sustainability reporting, thus the hypothesis is accepted. This finding is in line with the study by Selfiani & Usmar (2023) which explains that company size can moderate the influence of intellectual capital on sustainability reporting, in contrast to the findings of Novira (2023) which proves that company size is unable to moderate the influence of intellectual capital on sustainability reporting.

Independent commissioners with company size moderation (Commissioner $\times$ Size) have a t-statistic of 2.992, while the t-table at the α level = 5%, obtained a t-table value of 1.997, therefore the t-statistic of independent commissioners with company size moderation $2.992 > \text{t-table } 1.997$, and the prob value $0.0268 < 0.05$, thus company size can moderate the influence of independent commissioners on sustainability reporting, and the hypothesis is accepted. These findings are in line with the study of Fitriani (2020) which proves that company size can moderate the influence of commissioners on sustainability reporting. However, this is different from the study of Juliana (2022) which proves that company size cannot moderate the influence of independent commissioners on sustainability reporting.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis, it can be concluded that tax intensity negatively impacts sustainability reporting. Intellectual capital and independent commissioners both positively impact sustainability reporting in this study. Company size was unable to moderate the effect of tax intensity on sustainability reporting. However, company size did moderate the influence of intellectual capital and independent commissioners on sustainability reporting.

This study has several limitations that should be considered in developing further studies. First, although it was found that tax intensity has a negative effect on sustainability reporting, and that intellectual capital and independent commissioners have a positive effect, the scope of the variables studied is still limited and does not include other factors such as institutional ownership, profitability, or regulatory pressure that may also influence sustainability reporting. Furthermore, the finding that company size cannot moderate the effect of tax intensity suggests that there may be other, more relevant moderating variables that need to be explored. Therefore, it is recommended that future studies expand the model by adding other variables, both as predictors and moderators, and expanding the population

and observation period to obtain a more comprehensive picture of the determinants and dynamics of sustainability reporting across various corporate contexts.

REFERENCES

- Afifah, N., Fujianti, L., & Mandagie, YRO (2022). The Effect of Profitability, Leverage, and Company Size on Sustainable Reporting Disclosure. *Pancasila University Journal*, 2(1), 19–34.
- Al Hawaj, AY, & Buallay, AM (2022). A worldwide sectorial analysis of sustainability reporting and its impact on firm performance. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 12(1), 62–86.
- Arif.s. (2021). Revealed, PT Greenfields in Blitar Has Not Yet Obtained a Waste Processing Permit. Sindonews.Com. <https://daerah.sindonews.com/read/500796/704/terungkap-pt-greenfields-di-blitar-belum-kantongi-izin-pengolahan-limbah-%0A1627999717>
- Ayuwandari, M. Dwi. (2020). The influence of sustainability reporting disclosure on tax avoidance practices. <https://www.globalreporting.org/standards/>
- Frisca Tania, F., & Mukhlisin. (2020). The Effect of Corporate Governance on Tax Avoidance: Evidence from Indonesia. *Management & Economics Research Journal*, 2(4), 66–85. <https://doi.org/10.48100/merj.v2i4.126>
- Hidayah, N., Badawi, A., & Nugroho, L. (2019). Factors affecting the disclosure of sustainability reporting. *International Journal of Commerce and Finance*, 5(2), 219–229.
- Hidayah, N., Nugroho, L., Prihanto, H., & Prihantini, D. (2021). Company Characteristics, Disclosure of Social Responsibility, and Its Impact on Company Performance: An Empirical Study in Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(6), 0889–0895. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no6.0889>
- Hörisch, J., Wulfsberg, I., & Schaltegger, S. (2020). The influence of feedback and awareness of consequences on the development of corporate sustainability action over time. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 29(2), 638–650. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2394>
- Istanti, Y.P. (2020). The Effect of Sustainability Reports and Profitability on Tax Avoidance in Companies in Indonesia 2015-2019. STIE Perbanas Surabaya.
- Jawak, AYP br, & Lubis, I. (2023). The Effect of Corporate Environmental Performance and Intellectual Capital on Sustainability Reporting with Good Corporate Governance as Moderation. *Jurnal Maneksi*, 12(4), 756–767. <https://doi.org/10.31959/jm.v12i4.1924>
- Karlina, W., Mulyati, S., & Putri, TE (2019). the Effect of Company'S Size, Industrial Type, Profitability, and Leverage To Sustainability Report Disclosure. *JASS (Journal of Accounting for Sustainable Societies)*, 1(1), 32. <https://doi.org/10.35310/jass.v1i01.68>
- Liana, S. (2019). The Effect of Profitability, Leverage, Company Size, and Independent Board of Commissioners on Sustainability Report Disclosure. *Jesya (Journal of Economics & Sharia Economics)*, 2(2), 199–208. <https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v2i2.69>
- Madona, M.A., & Khafid, M. (2020). Journal of Industrial System Optimization: The Effect of Good Corporate Governance on Sustainability Report Disclosure with Company Size as a Moderator. 1, 22–32. <https://doi.org/10.25077/josi.v19.n1.p22-32.2020>

- Mandagie, Y., Fujianti, L., & Afifah, N. (2022). The Effect of Profitability, Leverage, and Company Size on Sustainable Reporting Disclosure (An Empirical Study of Companies Listed on the Indonesia Sustainability Reporting Award-Winning Companies Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2015-2019). *Pancasila Accounting Scientific Journal (JIAP)*, 2(1), 19–34. <https://doi.org/10.35814/jiap.v2i1.3032>
- Martens, W., & Bui, C.N.M. (2023). An exploration of legitimacy theory in accounting literature. *Open Access Libraries Journal*, 10(1), 1–20.
- Noerkholiq, SMA, & Muslih, M. (2021). The influence of profitability, leverage, and stakeholder engagement on sustainability report disclosure based on the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Generation 4 (G4). *Scientific Journal of Management, Economics, & Accounting (MEA)*, 5(3), 1361–1378.
- Nugroho, L., Badawi, A., & Hidayah, N. (2019). Discourses of sustainable finance implementation in Islamic banks (Case studies in Bank Mandiri Syariah 2018). *International Journal of Financial Research*, 10(6), 108–117.
- Nugroho, L., Nugraha, E., & Badawi, A. (2019). Discourses of Sustainable Finance Implementation in Islamic Banks (Case Studies in Bank Mandiri Syariah 2018). *International Journal of Financial Research*, 10(6), 6(2), 226–240. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijfr.v10n6p108%0D>
- Nuraeni, N., & Darsono. (2020). The Influence of Company Performance, Independent Commissioners, and Managerial Ownership on Sustainability Reporting Disclosure (Empirical Study on Companies Issuing Sustainability Reporting and Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange for the Period 2014-2019). *Diponegoro Journal of Accounting*, 9(2), 1–13. <https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/accounting/article/view/27552>
- Ppid.menlhk.go.id. (2023). Two Suspects in Riau Environmental Pollution Case to Be Tried Soon. <https://ppid.menlhk.go.id/berita/siaran-pers/7087/dua-tersangka-pencemaran>
- Putra, IGC, Santosa, MES, & Juliantari, NKDP (2023). The Effect of Company Size, Company Characteristics, Foreign Ownership, and Independent Commissioners on Sustainability Reporting in Manufacturing Companies Listed on the IDX. *WACANA EKONOMI (Journal of Economics, Business, and Accounting)*, 22(1), 18–29. <https://doi.org/10.22225/we.22.1.2023.18-29>
- Riady, E. (2021). Milk Factory Waste Pollution in Blitar: Only a Warning Letter, No Enforcement. <https://daerah.sindonews.com/read/500796/704/terungkap-pt-greenfields-di-blitar-belum-kantongi-izin-pengolahan-limbah-1627999717> News.Detik.Com.
- Selfiani, S., & Usmar, U. (2023). The Effect of Intellectual Capital on the Quality of Sustainability Report Disclosures with Financial Performance as a Moderating Variable. *Journal of Accounting*, 15(1), 177–188. <https://doi.org/10.28932/jam.v15i1.6364>
- Setiadi, I. (2022). The Influence of Company Characteristics on Sustainability Reporting Disclosure of Manufacturing Companies in Indonesia. *Digital Journal of Accounting (JUDIKA)*, 2(2), 49–58.
- Setiawan, E., Yuliansyah, Y., & Gamayuni, RR (2022). The Effect of Profitability and Liquidity on Sustainability Report Disclosure in Companies Listed on the Jakarta

- Islamic Index (JII). *Accounting, Finance, and Management Studies*, 1(2), 97–111.
<https://doi.org/10.35912/sakman.v1i2.1163>
- Sofa, FN, & Respati, NW (2020). The Influence of the Board of Directors, Independent Board of Commissioners, Audit Committee, Profitability, and Company Size on Sustainability Report Disclosure (A Study of Manufacturing Companies Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2017). *ECONOMIC DYNAMICS Journal of Economics and Business*, 13(1), 39.
- Susanti, S., Widyawati, D., & Iswara, US (2023). The Effect of Profitability and Firm Size on Capital Structure. *Scientific Journal of Accounting and Finance (JIAKu)*, 2(2), 140–151. <https://doi.org/10.24034/jiaku.v2i2.5883>
- Vivin Mardianti, I., & Ardini, L. (2020). The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility, Profitability, Foreign Ownership, and Capital Intensity on Tax Avoidance. *Journal of Accounting Science and Research*, 9(4), 1–24.
- Wulandari, N., & Popi Fauziati. (2024). Balance Sheet. 12, 787–797.
- Yunan, N., & Anwar, K. (2021). The Effect of Financial Performance, Company Characteristics, and Corporate Governance on Sustainability Report Disclosure. *Fair Value: Scientific Journal of Accounting and Finance*, 4(1), 171–193.
- Yusliza, MY, Yong, JY, Tanveer, MI, Ramayah, T., Noor Faezah, J., & Muhammad, Z. (2020). A structural model of the impact of green intellectual capital on sustainable performance. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 249, 119334.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119334>