TAX AUDITOR TEAM LEADER’S QUALITY, TIME BUDGET PRESSURE, TASK COMPLEXITY: HOW WELL TAX AUDIT QUALITY IN INDONESIA?

AJI M. ELVIN NOR
AMRIE FIRMANSYAH (amrie@pknstan.ac.id)
AMARDIANTO ARHAM
BERNADI VITO

Department of Public Sector Accounting, Polytechnic of State Finance STAN, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study’s objective empirically analyzes the effect of tax auditor team leader’s technical competence and experience, time budget pressure, and task complexity on tax audit quality. This study employs secondary data from Indonesian Tax Authority Office. The population in this research is the Tax Assessment issued throughout Indonesia. The sample used amounted to 4,326 observations. The data were analyzed by logistic regression. The results suggest that the tax auditor team leader’s technical competence, time budget pressure, and task complexity are negatively associated with tax audit quality. In contrast, the tax auditor team leader experience is positively associated with the tax audit quality. This study shows that it is essential that the Indonesian Tax Authority rearrange the tax auditor quality criteria in its regulations.
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INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, tax reform aims to create a robust, credible, and accountable taxation institution to generate optimal state revenue and synergy between institutions, high taxpayer compliance, and achievement of Indonesia’s tax ratio of 15% by 2024 (www.tax.go.id). Most of the tax ratio figures have been achieved or are almost achieved by other ASEAN member countries. Indonesia is included in the lower-middle-income country-category and of Cambodia, the Philippines, and Myanmar and has a history of decreased tax ratios from 2012 to 2017. Meanwhile, the Philippines and Cambodia have increased tax ratios, which are significant. Overall, Indonesia’s tax ratio is still classified as very low because it is continuously in the second-lowest position in ASEAN with a still far below the World Bank standard, 15%. Several problems cause Indonesia’s tax ratio to remain below the average tax ratio of the lower-middle-income country, namely the low level of compliance due to high taxpayer compliance costs, lack of legal certainty, and less competitive tax rates in Indonesia compared to other countries in ASEAN (kontan.co.id, 2019).

There is a decrease in revenue achievement, and the compliance ratio can still reduce the overall tax ratio. It is differ-
ent in 2018, where the revenue achievement and compliance ratio increased, Indonesia's tax ratio also increased. Furthermore, in 2019 there was a decrease in revenue achievement and an increase in the compliance ratio so that the tax ratio fell again. The Indonesian Tax Authority explained that the decline in the tax ratio in 2019 was triggered by the Indonesian economy's weakening condition where the economy only grew 5.02%, lower than 2018, namely 5.17% (cnnindonesia.com, 2020). In this regard, its strategy map shows that the achievement of high taxpayer compliance fully supports optimal state revenue (kemenkeu.go.id, 2019), apart from various other factors that have been mentioned, such as the sluggish economy and less competitive tax rates. To support the achievement of high taxpayer compliance, since 2018, the calculation of the compliance ratio used as a measurement of its performance is based not only on compliance with the submission of Annual Tax Returns but also on payment compliance for corporate non-employee personal taxpayers. The Authority Performance Report shows that taxpayers' payment compliance in Indonesia in 2018 was 50.59% and 51.64% in 2019. Even though this performance's achievement exceeds the set target of 50%, this number is not optimal enough to support the achievement of tax revenue targets. Furthermore, it shows that the payout compliance ratio of taxpayers in Indonesia tends to be low, so additional efforts are needed to improve taxpayer compliance, particularly in terms of tax payments.

Taxpayer compliance can be achieved optimal only if there is a part of voluntary compliance and enforced compliance (Kirchler, Hoelzl & Wahl, 2008) so that trust in the state is needed and the strength of the state. Also, the compliance model from the Australian Tax Office (ATO) shows that taxpayers who do not intend to be non-compliant tend to take-action in the form of services and counseling (voluntary compliance), while taxpayers who intend not to comply to be supervised, inspected, and enforced by law compliance (Braithwaite, 2003). One of the efforts to increase enforced compliance, which is also the beginning of law enforcement measures in Indonesia, is tax audits. Alm, Jackson & McKee (1992) concluded that the tax audit probability affects taxpayers' compliance. Dewi & Supadmi (2014) concluded that the tax audit positively affects corporate taxpayers' compliance. These are in line with the Indonesian Tax Authority strategic plan concept as stated in its strategy map for 2019. It shows that practical inspection and collection are among the Authority's strategic goals that support taxpayers' compliance. High practical inspection and billing must be supported by good quality inspection. The examination quality emphasizes competent examination results, supported by solid evidence, and completed on time (DeAngelo, 1981).

The tax audit quality in a deterrent effect that will increase enforced compliance. It can also increase taxpayers' trust in the state so that voluntary compliance can also be increased (Alm et al., 1992; Kirchler et al., 2008). Various internal and external factors can influence the quality of examination results that are not yet optimal. Internal factors come from the tax auditors' quality, while external factors can come from situations influenced by the audit rules. Regarding the quality of human resources, audits are carried out by a tax auditing team called the Tax Auditor Functional, which consists of a supervisor, team leader, and team members. Based on the Indonesian Tax Authority Regulation concerning Guidelines for the Appointment of Supervisors and Tax Auditor Team Leaders, team leaders play a significant role. Therefore, adequate quality of Tax Auditor Functional team leader is needed in an inspection team. This quality in the regulations regarding the guidelines for the appointment of team leaders and supervisors is more emphasized on technical competence and experience, where one of the measurements of technical competence is through the level of education and rank/class. The level of education, class, and particular experience is an absolute requirement for a supervisor's appointment, while the only factors that are an absolute requirement for a team leader's appointment are the
level of education and class. Meanwhile, according to DeAngelo (1981), an essential component of the examiner’s quality is knowledge and experience.

Apart from human resources, regulations have an essential role in supporting audit effectiveness. The Indonesian Tax Authority stated that a more standard tax audit policy regulation is needed to ensure effectiveness (news.ddtc.co.id). The duration of the inspection and the task complexity are examples of this regulation’s scope. In general, Tax Auditor Functional is required to complete the examination promptly. However, there are conditions where the examination is not completed on time. In 2019, the percentage of completion of checks on time was measured by Tax Auditor Functional performance achievement only for special examinations, not including routine examinations, so Tax Auditor Functional tends to pursue special examinations to be completed because it is an indicator of performance achievement. Also, related to the task’s complexity, there are regulations regarding granting a functional credit score whereby an examination with more complex criteria is given a more extensive credit score. Appropriate policies are needed so that the different audit periods and task complexity can ultimately produce fair quality tax assessments.

Based on the literature review, testing the quality of tax audits is still limited. However, the previous research tests the quality of audits/audits in financial statements. Previous studies that used determinants in testing audit quality in an international context include audit tenure (Al-Thuneibat, al Issa & Baker, 2011; Ghosh & Moon, 2005), auditor competence (Mansouri, Pirayesh & Salehi, 2009), time pressure (Al-Qatamin, 2020; Svanström, 2016), auditor experience (Sonu, Choi, Lee & Ha, 2019), and task complexity (Bowrin & King, 2010). Furthermore, in Indonesia, several studies examine the influence of determinants on audit quality, including audit tenure (Siregar, Amarullah, Wibowo & Anggraïta, 2012), independence (Sarcia & Rasmini, 2019), auditor ethics (Kuntari, Chariri & Nurdhiana, 2017), professionalism (Futri & Juliarsa, 2014), skepticism (Sudrajat, Rifai & Pituringsih, 2015), competence (Kurnia, Khomisyah & Sofie, 2014; Widodo, Pramuka & Heriwiyanti, 2016), experience (Futri & Juliarsa, 2014; Kuntari et al., 2017; Sarca & Rasmini, 2019), time budget pressure (Ratha & Ramantha, 2015; Sudrajat et al., 2015; Widodo et al., 2016), and task complexity (Ayuni & Herkulanus, 2016; Ratha & Ramantha, 2015; Sudrajat et al., 2015).

In this study, testing the audit quality variable is employed for tax audit purposes based on the presence or absence of the examiner’s dysfunctional behavior in carrying out his duties within the framework of the theory of reasoned action. The factors that cause dysfunctional behavior can be explained using the MARS (motivation, ability, role perception, and situation) theory and behavior model. When linked with tax audits, this theory states that the examiner’s behavior is influenced by motivation, ability, role perception, and situation. Therefore, this study uses an independent variable covering all MARS factors, namely the team leader’s quality as an internal factor that reflects the ability component represented by technical competence and role perception represented by experience. Furthermore, time budget pressure and task complexity are external factors that reflect motivation (motivation) and situation (situation) components. Also, the inconsistent test results in previous studies were considered in selecting these variables.

Many studies examine the effect of competence on audit quality, including Ismail, Merejok, Dangi & Saad (2019), who found that competence positively affects Malaysia’s audit quality. Furthermore, in Indonesia, there is research related to the influence of competence on the quality of audit in the commercial sector/internal audit by Maulana (2020), Kertarajasa, Marwa & Wahyudi (2019), Prasanti, Ramadharti & Puspasari (2019), Widodo et al. (2016), and Kurnia et al. (2014) who concluded that competence has a positive effect on audit quality. Meanwhile, Arfiantsyah (2020) concluded that competence does not affect audit quality. Research related to the effect of competence on the quality of tax audits conducted by Kristiyanto (2014) concluded
that competence positively affects the tax audit quality, while Mulyani & Purnomo (2019) concluded that competence does not affect the tax audit quality.

The previous research also examined the effect of experience on audit quality, including Sonu et al. (2019), who found that the audit partner experience positively affects Korea's audit quality. Furthermore, in Indonesia, there is research related to the effect of experience on audit quality in the commercial sector by Prasanti et al. (2019), Sarca & Rasmini (2019), and Kuntari et al. (2017). They concluded that experience has a positive influence on audit quality. Meanwhile, the study results by Kertarajasa et al. (2019) and Futri & Juliarsa (2014) concluded that experience does not affect audit quality. Furthermore, research related to the effect of experience on the quality of tax audits was also conducted by Fatah, Wiratno & Ompusunggu (2017), who concluded that experience does not affect tax audit quality.

Furthermore, some studies examined the effect of time budget pressure on audit quality, including Svanström (2016) and Al-Qatamin (2020), which found that time budget pressure has a negative effect on audit quality. Furthermore, in Indonesia, there are studies related to the effect of time budget pressure on the audit quality in the commercial sector/internal audit by Ratha & Ramantha (2015) and Kurnia et al. (2014), who concluded that time budget pressure has a negative effect on audit quality. Meanwhile, Sudrajat et al. (2015) and Widodo et al. (2016) concluded that time budget pressure does not affect audit quality.

Research examining the effect of task complexity on audit quality includes Bowrin & King (2010), who found that task complexity had a negative effect on audit quality in the USA. Furthermore, in Indonesia, there is research related to task complexity on the commercial sector/internal audit quality by Ayuni & Herkulanus (2016) and Ratha & Ramantha (2015), which concluded that task complexity has a negative effect on audit quality. Meanwhile, Sudrajat et al. (2015) found that task complexity positively affects audit quality. On the other hand, Mulyani & Purnomo (2019) conducted research related to task complexity's effect on the quality of tax audits, which concluded that task complexity does not affect tax audit quality. Besides, it is concluded that task complexity can weaken the positive effect of independence on the quality of tax audits, while task complexity does not moderate examiner competence and ethics on the quality of tax audits.

This study is different from the research of Mulyani & Purnomo (2019), Fatah et al. (2017), and Kristiyanto (2014). They included internal elements of auditors with certain positions (competence and experience of tax auditors team leader) and external elements (time budget pressure and task complexity) as independent variables, where previously the quality of the examiner could come from the supervisor, team leader, and team members at random. This study also continues previous research with adjustments based on the recommendations of Mulyani & Purnomo (2019), Sudrajat et al. (2015), Ratha & Ramantha (2015), and Futri & Juliarsa (2014), who concluded that the method using a questionnaire was less representative because it was based on the perceptions of each examiner. Based on these studies' recommendations, the data used to represent the study variables are secondary data from Indonesian Tax Authority. Based on previous research, only Sonu et al. (2019) and Arfiansyah (2020) employed secondary data, and other research employed primary data. Simultaneously, Susilo, Ompusunggu & Djaddang (2018) used the MARS model's attitude and behavior theory on the aspects of ability and motivation, whereas, in this study, all independent variables fulfill all elements of MARS. Also, this study employs tax assessments published in all Indonesia Tax Offices. Thus, this study uses a broader population and data than previous studies whose population is only at a particular Tax Office and Regional Office.

**LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT**

**Theory of Reasoned Action**

The theory of reasoned action is a theory that explains that behavior is carried out
because individuals have an interest/desire to do so (behavioral intention), or behavioral interest will determine their behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). This theory also explains the stages of a person behaving, where behavior is determined by intention at the initial stage. In the second stage, goals can be explained in attitudes toward behavior and subjective norms. In the third stage, subjective norms and attitudes are considered beliefs about the consequences of their behavior and normative expectations about what other people do and determine what we do. It shows that the environment around influences a person’s decision to show his behavior. The theory of reasoned action explains behavior change based on behavioral intentions influenced by individual attitudes towards subjective behavior and norms. Attitudes are influenced by the results of actions that have been taken in the past. Meanwhile, subjective norms are influenced by beliefs in other people’s opinions and motivation to obey others’ opinions/beliefs. Someone will take-action if they have a positive value from existing experiences, and their environment supports the action.

The behavior of tax auditors in conducting audits is determined by the auditors’ intentions and influenced by the external environment, such as situational factors. The examiner’s behavior determines whether an examination is carried out based on established examination standards or has dysfunctional behavior in carrying out the examination. All Tax Auditor Functionals have met the general audit standards so that they are required to carry out righteous behavior in achieving quality examination results. However, there are conditions both internally (individual attitudes) and externally (subjective and environmental norms) that encourage examiners to behave dysfunctionally by skipping examination standards or giving less quality audit judgment, causing the quality of the examination results to handle to decrease. Therefore, the tax auditors’ dysfunctional behavior can hinder the audit’s effectiveness so that the tax audit quality also decreases.

The theory of attitudes and behavior of the MARS model

McShane & Von Glinow (2017) stated that individual behavior in acting could be explained by presenting a basic model of individual behavior and its consequences. This model is called the MARS (motivation, ability, role perception, and situation) model, which describes the main types of behavior in an organizational environment. The MARS model emphasizes four factors that influence team member behavior and the resulting performance: motivation, ability, role perception, and situation. If one of the factors weakens, the team member’s performance will decrease, for example, if a team member understands his job (role perception), has enthusiasm (motivation), and has sufficient resources (situational factors) but does not have sufficient knowledge (ability). Then he cannot do his job optimally (Susilo et al., 2018).

Individual characteristics influence MARS factors in the MARS model, namely values, personality, perceptions, emotions and attitudes, and stress. This study uses the MARS model’s attitude and behavior theory as a supporting theory because it can explain tax auditors’ behavior in carrying out audit work. This theory explains the attitude of the tax auditors in influencing the tax audit quality. The factors examined in this study are relevant to individual characteristics that influence the MARS model’s factors, namely competence related to ability, experience related to role perception, time budget pressure, and task complexity related to motivational and situational factors.

On the other hand, the pressure factor is also one of the driving forces for the examiner to perform dysfunctional behavior, which is time budget pressure. The imbalance between one of the four MARS factors tends to cause dysfunctional behavior in the tax audit process, such as premature sign-off. According to Otley & Pierce (1995), premature sign-off is an action taken by auditors when carrying out program audits by stopping a specific audit step without replacing it with another step. Dysfunctional behavior can also affect the quality of the audit judgment or the exam-
The tax auditor team leader's technical competence and tax audit quality

The theory of reasoned action describes that behavior can change based on behavioral intentions, and behavioral intention is influenced by social norms and individual attitudes toward behavior. The factors that cause this behavior change are further described by the MARS model's attitude and behavior theory, which shows that one factor directly affects team member behavior and the resulting performance is the ability, where technical competence is one example. Lack of ability factors can increase the likelihood of dysfunctional behavior. Samelson, Lowensohn & Johnson (2006) emphasized that auditor expertise is the most significant predictor of perceived audit quality, where this expertise can be obtained through education (Mansouri et al., 2009). Furthermore, Hogarth (1991) stated that good auditor judgment arises from auditors who have competence supported by auditors' adequate knowledge and audit procedures. Thus, the higher the auditor's knowledge indicates the quality of judgment given in his duties.

Several previous studies found that high auditor competence tends to make the audit quality in the commercial/internal audit sector better (Ismail et al., 2019; Kertarajasa et al., 2019; Maulana, 2020; Kurnia et al., 2014; Prasanti et al., 2019; Widodo et al., 2016). Research related to tax audits quality conducted by Kristiyanto (2014) concluded that auditors' competence positively affects the tax audit quality. Second, auditors/examiners' competence does not affect audit quality in the commercial sector (Arfiansyah, 2020) or the tax audit quality (Mulyani & Purnomo, 2019). Of the two types of research results, the first result is the positive influence of the competence of the auditor/examiner on the quality of the audit/examination in line with the theory of reasoned action and the theory of attitude and behavior of the MARS model which states that the ability affects the behavior of the examiner in conducting the examination, in terms of This means the existence of sufficient competency factors to support the examiner not to behave dysfunctionally and to be able to apply good audit judgment so that the tax audit quality can also be better.

The tax audits quality is reflected in the tax auditors’ quality of tax assessment letters. This examination is carried out through inspection standards consisting of general standards, implementation, and reporting. In each stage, the examiner must carry out the procedure properly according to the audit program to find errors in the SPT submitted by the taxpayer, supported by solid arguments and evidence. Therefore, the right examiner attitude is needed to avoid dysfunctional behavior by the examiner. Tax auditors' lack of technical competence increases the likelihood of dysfunctional behavior in implementing tax audits, reducing audit judgment quality, reflected in fixed corrections in tax audits. Therefore, the first hypothesis of this study is as follows:

H1: The tax auditor team leader's technical competence positively affects the tax audit quality.

The tax auditor team leader's experience and tax audit quality

The theory of reasoned action describes that behavior can change based on behavioral intentions, and behavioral intention is influenced by social norms and individual attitudes toward behavior. The factors that cause this behavior change are further described by the MARS model's attitude and behavior theory, which shows that one factor directly affects team member behavior, and the resulting performance is role perception, where experience is one of the supporters. Inequality in the element of experience can lead to dysfunctional behavior, which leads to a decrease in the quality of audit judgment.

An auditor's experience in various assignments enriches his insight into various phenomena in preparing financial statements. Libby & Frederick (1990) argued that the perceptions of more experienced auditors are becoming more accurate. The amount of experience can affect auditors' ability to make audit judgments
because auditors can better predict and detect fraud in the financial reporting of a company being audited to take appropriate audit judgments (Sumanto & Rosdiana, 2019). An examiner's experience in conducting an examination can be seen from the number of different assignments carried out, the length of time he has been in the profession, and the additional knowledge about error detection (Pektra & Kurnia, 2015). According to William & Anton (2019), less experienced auditors will make more significant mistakes than auditors with more experience. An auditor's experience in doing his job provides lessons for him in conducting audit judgment.

Sonu et al. (2019), Sarca & Rasmini (2019), Prasanti et al. (2019), and Kuntari et al. (2017) concluded that the more experienced auditors tend to make the audit quality of the commercial sector better. Several studies found that auditors'/examiners' competence does not affect the commercial sector's audit quality (Kertarajasa et al., 2019; Putri & Juliarsa, 2014) or the tax audit quality (Fatah et al., 2017). Of the two types of research results, the first result is the positive influence of the auditor's experience on audit quality in line with the theory of reasoned action, and the theory of attitude and behavior of the MARS model, which supports that role perception affects the behavior of the examiner in conducting the examination. The existence of the experience factor is sufficient to support the examiner to understand better the role and responsibility in conducting the examination, not doing dysfunctional behavior, and applying good audit judgment so that the quality of the tax audit results can also be better. Tax auditors' inexperience tends to increase dysfunctional behavior in tax audits, thereby reducing audit judgment quality. Therefore, the second hypothesis of this study is as follows:

H2: The tax auditor team leader's experience positively affects the tax audit quality

Time budget pressure and tax audit quality
The theory of reasoned action describes that behavior can change based on behavioral intentions, and behavioral intention is influenced by social norms and individual attitudes toward behavior. The factors that cause this behavior change are further described by the MARS model's attitude and behavior theory, which shows that motivation and situation directly influence employee behavior and the resulting performance. Time budget pressure is one factor that affects both. Pressure can reduce the motivation for examiners to behave functionally towards their goals. Pressure also affects the situation conducive to the examiner in examining following the examination standards. An excessive pressure factor can lead to the examiner's dysfunctional behavior, so the pressure can make the examiner perform premature sign-off by skipping specific steps in carrying out the examination.

Gundry & Liyanarachchi (2007) found a relationship between time pressure and decreased audit quality. The audit quality decline is caused by auditors' behavior when carrying out audit engagements, especially when carrying out audit programs to find the required audit evidence. Time pressure impacts changes in auditor behavior and the audit process itself. Suprianto (2009) concluded that the dysfunctional audit behavior would also increase if time budget pressure increases. For example, high-time pressure audits perform premature sign-off from audit program steps (Alderman & Deitrick, 1982). Svanberg & Ohman (2013) concluded that risk assessment and sample size decrease when auditors are under time pressure.

Svanström (2016), Al-Qatamin (2020), Ratha & Ramantha (2015), and Kurnia et al. (2014) found that high time budget pressure encourages dysfunctional behavior of the examiners, resulting in a decrease in audit quality. On the other hand, Sudrajat et al. (2015) and Widodo et al. (2016) concluded that time budget pressure tends not to cause dysfunctional auditor behavior not to affect audit quality. Of the two types of research results, the first result is the negative effect of the auditor's time budget pressure on audit quality in line with the theory of reasoned action and the theory of
attitude and behavior of the MARS model, which supports that motivation and situation influence the examiner’s behavior. Time budget pressure encourages examiners to behave dysfunctional, such as making premature sign-offs, which results in decreased quality of tax audit results. High-time budget pressure tends to increase the possibility of dysfunctional behavior in implementing tax audits, especially in the form of premature sign-offs. Therefore, the third hypothesis of this study is as follows: H3: Time budget pressure has a negative effect on the tax audit quality.

**Task complexity and tax audit quality**

The theory of reasoned action describes that behavior can change based on behavioral intentions, and behavioral intention is influenced by social norms and individual attitudes toward behavior. The factors that cause this behavior change are further described by the MARS model's attitude and behavior theory, which shows that motivation and situation directly influence employee behavior and the resulting performance. Task complexity is one factor that influences team member behavior.

In conducting an examination, good judgment is needed to maximize the quality of tax audits, especially those related to fiscal corrections accompanied by regulatory solid and audit evidence. High task complexity will affect an auditor in producing a judgment. The more complex the task it faces, the resulting judgment tends to be less valuable and less precise (Ruky, 2006). The auditing task's high complexity makes auditors behave dysfunctional, causing a decrease in audit quality (Restuningdiah & Indriantoro, 2000). In line with this statement, Sumanto & Rosdiana (2019) concluded that the audit's high complexity could cause the auditor to behave dysfunctionally to become inconsistent and influence judgment. Task complexity can reduce auditors' effort or motivation, increase/decrease efforts directed at developing strategies, and lead to decreased performance (William & Anton, 2019).

Bowrin & King (2010), Ayuni & Herkulanus (2016), and Ratha & Ramantha (2015) found that high task complexity encourages the dysfunctional behavior of auditors, resulting in a decrease in audit quality. While, Sudrajat et al. (2015) concluded that the higher the task complexity, the better the audit quality. Mulyani & Purnomo (2019) concluded that task complexity does not affect tax audit quality. Of the three types of research results, the first result is the negative effect of task complexity on audit quality in line with the theory of reasoned action and the theory of attitude and behavior of the MARS model, which supports that motivation and situation influence the examiner’s behavior in conducting the examination. The task's complexity encourages examiners to behave dysfunctionally, reducing audit judgment quality, impacting decreasing the quality of tax audit results. High task complexity makes the examiner's behavior inconsistent, impairs the quality of judgment, and increases the likelihood of dysfunctional behavior in tax audits. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis of this study is as follows:

H4: Task complexity has a negative effect on the tax audit quality.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

This research uses quantitative methods. Testing in this study was carried out on tax assessments produced at Indonesia Tax Offices from the fourth quarter of 2018 to the third quarter of 2019. The fourth quarter of 2018 was used as the start of the data sample because, at that time, the inspection criteria were applied. Therefore, it represents the task's complexity, while the third quarter of 2019 is used as the end of the sample because underpayment tax assessment letters issued in that period cannot be objected to. This study's data type is secondary data from Indonesian Tax Authority Office and uses cross-sectional data. This study used a sample selected through the purposive sampling method, with the following criteria (Table 1).

This study divides the data on underpayment tax assessments letters in Java and Non-Java as additional analysis because the Tax Assessment Letters issued during 2019 that have not been submitted for objection are the lowest in the Tax Of-
fices in the Java Island area.

The dependent variable in this study is the tax audit quality. Kristiyanto (2014) stated that a reliable audit report's quality is shown based on predetermined standards. Irawan & Maharani (2017) concluded that the quality of the tax audit outcome, one of its measurement dimensions, is represented by whether tax assessment letters issued can be maintained if the taxpayer objects. The Indonesian Tax Authority circular letter concerning the Audit Policy and The Authority Performance Report 2019 states that tax audits' quality can be reflected in taxpayers' minimum legal action on tax assessment letters. Based on the Indonesian Tax Authority 2019 Key Performance Indicator Manual (IKU), the quality of the examination results is determined based on the tax assessment letter's parameters that are objected to. If the tax assessment letter is filed with an objection by the taxpayer, it indicates that the audit results carried out by the tax auditor function are deemed of low quality because it does not reflect the actual situation, so that the taxpayer dares to file an objection. Therefore, by adjusting the proxy in Arfiansyah (2020), the audit quality in this study is measured on a scale of 0 for tax assessments filed with taxpayers' objections and 1 for taxpayer assessments that are not objected to taxpayers.

The independent variables are the tax auditor team leader's technical competence, the tax audit team leader's experience, time budget pressure, and task complexity. The measurement of the tax auditor team leader's technical competence in this study is adjusted from Arfiansyah (2020), which used Continuing Professional Education credits obtained by public accountants in the year before the audit engagement. As well as Kartiko & Siregar (2015) uses an auditor quality proxy based on an academic master's degree in accounting and business and a professional certificate obtained by the person in charge of the audit. Technical competence in this study uses the calculation of technical competence based on the regulations regarding the career position pattern at the Indonesian Tax Authority. Competency requirements related to technical competencies are obtained by measuring technical competency levels or formal education levels and rank/class. Based on the information provided by the Indonesian Tax Authority representative, the results of measuring the level of technical competence have not been carried out thoroughly to tax auditors, but only for tax auditors who are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax assessment letters issued at all Indonesia Tax Offices</td>
<td>702,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax assessments letters other than underpayment tax assessments letters resulting from routine audits, and underpayment tax assessments letters resulting from special audits</td>
<td>(595,295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The underpayment tax assessments letter is the result of a particular individual tax audit</td>
<td>(22,574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The underpayment tax assessments letter with audited tax year other than 2014-2019</td>
<td>(644)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The underpayment tax assessment letter of the particular audit result is not timely, and the tax underpayment assessment letter of the particular audit result is not dated</td>
<td>(1,636)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The underpayment tax assessment letter with a value of less than 500 million rupiah</td>
<td>(77,389)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The underpayment tax assessments letter with incomplete data attributes</td>
<td>(565)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>4,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consists of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The underpayment tax assessments letter issued at the Indonesia tax office in the Java region</td>
<td>3,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The underpayment tax assessments letter issued at the Indonesia tax office outside the Java region</td>
<td>1,053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
about to be promoted. Besides, there is an element of judgment inseparable from subjectivity, so it is not comparable. Therefore, the proxies in determining technical competence in this study are the scores from the level of formal education and the rank/class of the tax auditor team leader in the last condition before starting the particular audit with each component's calculation of the regulation. The election for proxy use was also carried out because the latest education and certain ranks/groups were an absolute requirement for a team leader's appointment following the authority provision.

In calculating the value of technical competence, the level of formal education is given a weight of 40%, the value of each level is shown in Table 2, while the class and tenure are given a weight of 30%, the value of each level is shown in Table 3. The formula used to calculate technical competence in this study is as follows:

\[
\text{Competence} = (40\% \times \text{Value of Formal Education}) + (30\% \times \text{Score of Goals & Years of Employment})
\]

The proxy of the tax auditor team leader’s experience in this study follows Sonu et al. (2019) with some adjustments. Sonu et al. (2019) conducted the proxy by calculating the number of years the audit partner involved had worked as CPAs identified from the audit partner registration year. The experience of the tax auditor team leader in this study is proxied using the number of months from the date the tax auditor team leader began starting date to the date of the Audit Warrant was issued for each particular audit case he handled, minus the period in which tax auditor temporarily does not have the status of the position. For example, on a study assignment, on leave outside the state’s responsibility, and is temporarily placed as an executor after completing study assignments/leave outside the state’s responsibility. In

### Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Education Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>The Education Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S3 Oversees - scholarship</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>S1/D-IV - Scholarship</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 Domestics - scholarship</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 Oversees - scholarship</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Diploma III - Official Education</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 Domestics - scholarship</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Diploma III</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 Domestics</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Diploma I and Below</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 Domestics</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PER-01/PJ/2012 and PER-25/PJ/2015

### Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Working Period (Years)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group Working Period (Years)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above IV/a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>III/c</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV/a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>III/c</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV/a</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>III/c</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV/a</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>III/c</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV/a</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>III/b</td>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/d</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>III/b</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/d</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>III/b</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/d</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>III/b</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/d</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>III/b</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/c</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>III/a and Below</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/c</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PER-01/PJ/2012 and PER-25/PJ/2015
summary, the proxy of experience in this study is shown as follows:

\[
\text{Experience} = \frac{\text{number of days the team leader is active as tax auditor as of December 31, 2019} \text{ } \text{ } \text{of} \text{ } \text{December 31, 2019, and the date of issuance of Audit Warrant}}{30}
\]

This study’s proxy of time budget pressure is based on Widodo \textit{et al.} (2016), who employed primary data with the dimensions of time constraints in the assignment, completing a predetermined team, meeting the assignment’s target time, and decreasing the audit quality. However, based on the recommendations of Sudrajat \textit{et al.} (2015) and Ratha & Ramantha (2015), the method using primary data is less representative, so another method is needed to measure time budget pressure. Thus, the time budget pressure is measured based on secondary data derived from the recapitulation of the examination period data for each special examination, which reflects the limited time in the assignment, the completion of the predetermined time, and the fulfillment of the target time of the assignment according to the measurement dimensions of Widodo \textit{et al.} (2016). Based on the information provided by several tax auditors, time budget pressure in this study was measured using an ordinal scale of 1 up to 3, where 1 shows the time budget pressure level is low, 2 shows the time budget pressure level is medium, and 3 shows the time budget pressure level is high. According to the Indonesia Ministry of Finance Decree concerning Audit Procedures, the criteria used for grouping the scale are the period of inspection. The criteria for classifying the time budget pressure aspects are shown in Table 4.

The testing period is categorized using the number of months from the date the Audit Warrant was issued to the date the Audit Result Notification Letter was issued due to limited information regarding the date of submission of the related documents. In summary, the proxy of time budget pressure in this study is shown as follows:

\[
\text{TBPressure} = \text{ordinal scale from 1 up to 3,}
\]

with a 1 showing the lowest time budget pressure & a scale of 3 showing the highest time budget pressure.

This study’s measuring task complexity based on the recommendations of Mulanyi & Purnomo (2019), Sudrajat \textit{et al.} (2015), and Ratha & Ramantha (2015), the method using primary data is less representative, so another method is needed to measure task complexity. Therefore, this study’s complexity is measured based on secondary data from the Indonesian tax authority, reflecting the difficulty of the task and the structure of the task following Ratha & Ramantha (2015). Based on the information provided by several tax auditors, the complexity of the tasks in this study is measured using the cumulative number of components that determine the difficulty of the task and the structure of the task, namely the criteria for the sub-elements of the examination, which are determined based on the taxpayer’s business cycle, the scope of the examination, and the purpose of the examination, as well as the type of tax office. For more complex task components, the number 1 is given, while 0 for components tends to be less complicated in the 2019 Indonesian Tax Authority IKU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Testing Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The first and second months of the initial testing period or an extended testing period of a maximum of 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The third and fourth months of the initial testing period or an extended testing period of a maximum of 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The fifth and sixth month of the initial testing period or the extended testing period is a maximum of 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The first and second months for an extended testing period of a maximum of 2 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.
Time Budget Pressure Proxy

Source: PMK No. 17/PMK.03/2013 and PMK No. 184/PMK.03/2015
Manual. Based on this explanation, Table 5 provides a summary of the points per component determining task complexity.

As explained on the theoretical basis, a special inspection is one of the examinations that aim to test the taxpayer's compliance, so for each examination, they will obtain point 1 for the exam objective component. Therefore, the maximum value obtained from measuring the task's complexity in this study is 4 points, while the minimum score is 1. In summary, the measurement of task complexity in this study is shown as follows:

Complexity = 1 to 1 ordinal scale. 4, with a scale of 1 showing the accumulation of the smallest determinants of task complexity & scale 4 showing the accumulation of task complexity determinants the largest.

Furthermore, the value of underpayment tax assessments letter is used as a control variable, referring to Nor, Hasianna & Naki (2020), which stated that the underpayment tax assessments letter value increases the motivation of the taxpayers to file an objection, regardless of whether the results of the examination indicate the actual situation or not. Therefore, the underpayment tax assessments letter value is measured by the natural logarithm of the letter value resulting from a particular examination.

\[ \text{LnValue} = \ln (\text{underpayment tax assessment letter value from special examination}) \]

Besides, the tax office's working area is used as a control variable, referring to the Indonesian Tax Authority's engagement survey in 2020, which states that the work environment area is a significant factor affecting tax auditor motivation to work. The working area is measured by the score from 1 up to 12, based on the Authority regulation concerning Patterns of Transfer of Career Positions in the Indonesian Tax Authority.

Zone = Score from 1 up to 12, representing the working area.

The research model used is defined through the logistic regression equation. Logistic regression analysis is used to explain the relationship between the dependent variable in the form of dichotomic/binary data and the independent variable in interval scale or Hosmer & Lemeshow's (1989) categorical data. The logistic regres-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Checked year business turnover</td>
<td>≤100 miliar</td>
<td>&gt;100 miliar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The scope of the examination</td>
<td>Single tax/some types of tax</td>
<td>All taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purpose of the examination</td>
<td>Other purposes</td>
<td>Examining taxpayer compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tax Service Office where the taxpayer is registered</td>
<td>Small Tax Office</td>
<td>Medium/Large/Special Tax Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit Quality</td>
<td>0.6983</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>50.7199</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.3706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>142.0210</td>
<td>117.6833</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>351.73</td>
<td>67.0479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBPPressure</td>
<td>2.3331</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>2.9679</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LnValue</td>
<td>21.1417</td>
<td>20.8593</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>26.82</td>
<td>0.9938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>10.5215</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.3025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regression equation in this study is as follows:
\[
\text{logit(AuditQuality)}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Competence}_i + \beta_2 \text{Experience}_i + \beta_3 \text{TBPressure}_i + \beta_4 \text{Complexity}_i + \beta_5 \text{LnValue}_i + \beta_6 \text{Zone}_i
\]

Where: AuditQuality: tax audit quality; Competence: technical competence of the tax auditor team leader; Experience: experience of the tax auditor team leader; TBPressure: time budget pressure; Complexity: the task complexity; LnValue: natural logarithm of underpayment tax assessment letter value; Zone: Work Unit Work Area (Tax Office)

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION
A summary of the descriptive statistical test results from the variable data in this study is presented in Table 6. Table 7 shows the hypothesis testing results, while Table 8 shows the results by dividing the sample into two regional categories, Java and outside Java.

### Table 7. Hypothesis Testing Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.0155</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>0.0000 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-0.0405</td>
<td>-3.30</td>
<td>0.0005 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.0043</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>0.0000 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBPressure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.1863</td>
<td>-3.83</td>
<td>0.0000 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.1504</td>
<td>-3.25</td>
<td>0.0005 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LnValue</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.5471</td>
<td>-15.28</td>
<td>0.0000 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0743</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.0000 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR chi2</td>
<td></td>
<td>351.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; chi2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where: "***" significant at level 1%, "**" significant at level 5%, "*" significant at level 10%

### Table 8. Hypothesis Testing Result Based on Area Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Java Area</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>Non-Java Area</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>17.7922</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>15.9535</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>-0.0126</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>-0.1026</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.0042</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBPressure</td>
<td>-0.2168</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>-0.0187</td>
<td>0.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>-0.1430</td>
<td>-2.66</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LnValue</td>
<td>-0.5456</td>
<td>-13.52</td>
<td>-0.5740</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>-0.3743</td>
<td>-6.16</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR chi2</td>
<td>346.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>108.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; chi2</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where: "***" significant at level 1%, "**" significant at level 5%, "*" significant at level 10%
ber’s technical competence in the Indonesian Tax Authority is used as a benchmark in carrying out civil servant duties in general. In a broad sense, competence includes standards, professional techniques, and technical issues (William & Anton, 2019).

Meanwhile, the technical competence as regulated by the Indonesian Tax Authority consists of the knowledge, skills, and technical experience needed to carry out tasks according to the job description successfully. Therefore, technical competence is obtained by measuring technical competence, or if it is not available, formal education level and rank/class can be used. Meanwhile, based on the authorized representative’s information, the factors are considered in determining the overall competency score are knowledge, skills, and behavior. These knowledge and skills are then measured by technical competency scores, while behavioral competencies measure behavior.

Technical competence represented by the last education score and class is insufficient to represent the skill factor. The latest education and the group have not explained the examiner’s ability to carry out technical examination matters, such as performing acceptable audit standards and providing quality audit judgment. The nature of education that includes knowledge globally (such as accounting, taxation, and management) is more towards knowledge in conducting audits in general, not yet explaining the technical skills needed to carry out examinations (skills). Technical competence in its application can be achieved through education and training (education and training) for essential examiner functions that all tax auditor team leaders should have obtained, higher-level examiner functional training, and other types of training related to increasing expertise in conducting examinations. Therefore, technical competence in recent education and class does not always affect the tax audit quality because it cannot explain the overall ability factor. This statement is in line with the hypothesis test results. If the sample used is only tax assessment letters issued on the Island of Java, technical competence does not affect the tax audit quality.

However, the resulting hypothesis test results in the sample outside Java and the Indonesian sample emphasize that technical competence represented by education and class has a negative effect on the tax audit quality. Therefore, it is further reviewed based on descriptive statistical and supporting analysis due to a team leader’s appointment with a higher class but less experience. One crucial component of competence is experience (DeAngelo, 1981). The measurement of technical competency scores in the Authority regulation includes an experience element, namely the group’s work period. However, the group’s tenure does not adequately represent the tax auditor position’s technical experience because the group tenure only represents the team leader’s experience as a civil servant, not as a tax auditor.

Meanwhile, a team leader’s appointment in the regulations for team leaders and supervisors specifies a particular class, rank, and education level as the main requirement, not experience. Therefore, the Examination Implementing Unit tends to choose a team leader based on these regulations. Furthermore, based on the provisions concerning team leaders’ and supervisors’ appointments, tax auditors with less than the main requirements can be appointed with prior approval from the Head of the Indonesian Tax Regional Office. However, some Examination Implementing Unit may consider this requires a more complicated administrative/bureaucratic process than appointing a team leader who has met the rank and class requirements but lacks experience.

Another more extreme condition is outside Java, where the Master graduates who are team leaders with the lowest range of experience have the highest percentage of objections to tax assessment letters, 72%. It indicates that the leading cause of the negative influence between the last education and class on the quality of the examination results is that the team leader lacks experience conducting the examination. One of the reasons for the negative influence of the latest education on the quality of underpayment tax assessment
Discussion on the Effect of the Experience of the Tax Auditor Team Leader on the Tax Audit Quality

Based on the hypothesis testing results, the tax auditor team leader's experience positively affects the tax audit quality, both at the sample level in Indonesia, Java, and outside Java. The result is in line with Kuntari et al. (2017), Prasanti et al. (2019), Sarca & Rasmini (2019), and Sonu et al. (2019). Meanwhile, the result is not in line with Kertarajas et al. (2019), Futri & Juliarasa (2014), Fatah et al. (2017).

According to the theory of reasoned action and the theory of attitudes and behavior of the MARS model, a person can behave dysfunctionally if there is an imbalance in one of the factors of motivation, ability (role perception), and situation. The team leader's experience in carrying out the examination is one factor that increases the team leader's role perception of carrying out his role as a tax auditor and coordinating the team following the authority provisions. Experience can be considered in making decisions and can predict fraud in a company. Therefore, auditors can learn to make decisions (William & Anton, 2019). Besides, work experience will add to auditors' expertise in carrying out their duties, where this expertise makes auditors better able to identify risks in an entity/company (Kuntari et al., 2017). When applied to tax audits, the high experience in conducting audits has enabled the team to analyze specific situations where the solution is unclear. However, the team leader was able to find the right solution based on experience in carrying out similar cases to provide appropriate audit judgment in making fiscal corrections and carrying out examination standards better.

Based on descriptive statistical analysis and supporting analysis, there has been an allocation of experienced human resources based on area and work unit types. The Java area and the 1st level tax office obtain human resources allocation with a better experience. The supporting analysis results also showed that the percentage of tax assessment letters filed for objections decreased relatively with the team leader's experience level. The highest percentage of objections filed was at tax offices outside Java. The team leader has a vital role in the tax auditor team because, besides having adequate technical skills, managerial skills and other analytical skills are also needed, such as assisting supervisors in making program audits. This kind of ability cannot just be achieved by relying on a high level of education or class, but there must be measurable technical capabilities (skills) and sufficient experience in carrying out tax auditor tasks.

Furthermore, the significant negative effect of technical competence on the quality of examination results, which did not occur on the Island of Java, also indicates that there is already a reasonably good human resources arrangement connected with the appointment of a team leader who has sufficient experience. It is supported by descriptive statistical analysis and supporting analysis, which states that the composition of team leaders on the Island of Java with 0-5% experience is less than 10%, while outside Java, it reaches up to 24.8% at 1st level tax office. The team leader has a vital role in the tax auditor team because, besides having adequate technical skills, managerial skills and other analytical skills are also needed, such as assisting supervisors in making program audits. This kind of ability cannot just be achieved by relying on a high level of education or class, but there must be measurable technical capabilities (skills) and sufficient experience in carrying out tax auditor tasks.

The hypothesis test of Java Island may be inconsistent with the relationship between technical competency variables and the tax audit quality. The absence of technical competence on the tax audit quality on the sample of Java Island indicates that tax auditor emphasizes practical training, understanding the taxpayers' business processes, and applicable tax regulations compared to competence (Mulyani & Purnomo, 2019). Training and understanding of taxpayers' business processes and tax regulations are factors that increase tax auditors' ability, which according to the theory of attitudes and behavior of the MARS model, affect whether dysfunctional behavior occurs in tax audits.
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Java with 0-5 years of experience as team leader, 42.4%. It indicates that tax auditor allocation with sufficient experience is needed in tax offices outside Java, especially in 1st level tax offices. Outside Java, the offices' workload has the highest maximum value of special examinations per team in one year, reaching 21 special audits per year per team. Furthermore, at tax offices outside Java, there is a phenomenon where tax auditors, who have just been appointed as functional, have been appointed as the tax auditor team leader. As a whole, tax assessment letters submitted objections whose legal products were produced by team leaders with >15 years of experience had the smallest percentage of objections filed than other range categories, namely less than 20%.

The ideal condition requires a change in the rules for a team leader's appointment where experience is also the main requirement, especially in areas outside Java, which tend to have many team leaders with tenure low tax auditor. In addition, the tax auditor team leader's increased experience can increase the perception of the tax auditor team. Overall, the high long-term experience will improve the team leader's audit judgment quality and prevent dysfunctional behavior caused by a lack of role perception.

Discussion of the Effect of Time Budget Pressure on the Tax Audit Quality

Based on the results of hypothesis testing, time budget pressure has a negative effect on the tax audit quality. These results indicate that an increase in time budget pressure will increase inspectors' tendency to behave dysfunctionally to decrease the tax audit quality. The result is in line with Al-Qatamin (2020), Kurnia et al. (2014), Ratha & Ramantha (2015), and Svanström (2016). Meanwhile, this study's result is not in line with Sudrajat et al. (2015) and Widodo et al. (2016). According to the theory of reasoned action and the theory of attitudes and behavior of the MARS model, a person can behave dysfunctionally if there is an imbalance in one of the factors of motivation, ability (role perception), and situation. The tax auditor's high time budget pressure in carrying out the examination causes the motivational factors and the supporting situation to be lame, affecting the tax auditor team leader's dysfunctional behavior. The high time pressure can reduce the examiner's motivation to carry out the appropriate examination standards (doing premature sign-off) and make the environmental conditions not conducive to affect the examiner's mental condition and ultimately affect the audit quality judgment. This study's time budget pressure occurs when tax auditors must make the set audit period efficient. Therefore, high time budget pressure causes the auditor's condition to be depressed. Auditors tend to behave in two ways, namely functional shown by using efficient and dysfunctional auditing techniques shown by violating auditor standards and principles which can reduce audit quality (Anggreni & Rasmini, 2017).

Time budget pressure can encourage dysfunctional behavior, including premature sign-off, by skipping specific steps in conducting the examination (Margheim, Kelley & Pattison, 2005). This condition is supported by the results of hypothesis testing at the sample level of Indonesia and Java. Meanwhile, time budget pressure can also disregard dysfunctional behavior in tax auditors. It is supported by the results of hypothesis testing on samples outside Java, where it is concluded that time budget pressure does not affect the tax audit quality outside Java. The working mechanism can lead the non-impact of time budget pressure on the tax audit quality in a place where there is an absolute authority in adjusting the time budget with the assignment given, the avoidance of strict audit time budgeting, and the allocation of overtime time (Sudrajat et al., 2015).

Descriptive statistical analysis shows that the tax auditor team leader tended to conduct inspections before maturity at Java and outside Java levels in the last two months. It was later confirmed through an interview conducted with tax auditor representatives, which stated a pattern of completing tasks by prioritizing the examination, which was due first. Furthermore, the percentage of tax assessment letters filed for objections on the Island of Java in-
creased as the time budget pressure increased. It indicates that the high time budget pressure can affect tax auditor performance in the Java region because the team leader tends to complete the examination promptly (there is another motivation because the completion of the special audit on time is an indicator of tax auditor performance appraisal) even with limited resources, making it possible dysfunctional behavior in the form of premature sign-off.

Meanwhile, the highest percentage of tax assessment letter objections for sample areas outside Java was at the lowest time budget pressure level. It indicates that low time budget pressure in areas outside Java does not guarantee that the examination results’ quality will be better than those with high time budget pressure. A workload with a level that tends to be the same as the tax offices in the Java region but with a lower level of complexity also increases the tax auditor team leader outside Java to be more flexible in adjusting the time budget assignment. It indicates that although most of the special examinations in areas outside Java were completed two months before their due date, the pressure was not as tremendous as the pressure felt by the tax auditor team leader in the Java region with a greater level of task complexity.

Besides, other external factors in areas outside Java can support dysfunctional behavior related to motivation and situation. Based on the results of hypothesis testing, it is concluded that the tax office’s working area outside Java has a positive effect on the tax audit quality. It indicates that a better work area makes tax auditor’s motivation in functional behavior better, and motivation is one aspect of team member engagement (West & Dawson, 2012). A work environment condition is excellent or appropriate if humans can carry out their activities optimally, healthy, safe, and comfortable. A suitable work environment affects employees’ motivation and performance (Moulana, Sunuharyo & Utami, 2017). In examining the MARS model’s attitude and behavior theory, low motivation increases dysfunctional behavior. Therefore, the absence of time budget pressure on the tax audit quality in areas outside Java can be caused by external factors such as work areas that influence tax auditors’ behavior.

Discussion on the Effect of Task Complexity on the Tax Audit Quality.
Based on the results of hypothesis testing, task complexity has a negative effect on the tax audit quality. The result indicates increased task complexity will increase examiners’ dysfunctional behavior and decrease tax audit quality. The result is in line with Ayuni & Herkulanus (2016), Bowrin & King (2010), and Ratha & Ramantha (2015). Meanwhile, the study result does not align with Mulyani & Purnomo (2019). According to the theory of reasoned action and the theory of attitudes and behavior of the MARS model, a person can behave dysfunctionally if there is an imbalance in one of the factors of motivation, ability (role perception), and situation. The high complexity of carrying out the examination can cause the motivation and situation factors to be unbalanced, affecting the tax auditor team leader's dysfunctional behavior. High task complexity can reduce the success of the task at hand. This condition occurs due to task difficulties and unclear task structure so that the examiner cannot make an appropriate decision. The complexity of the task can make an examiner behave dysfunctionally. The more complex tasks result in the examiner skipping several tasks or doing the assignments not optimally, resulting in decreased performance (Ratha & Ramantha, 2015). This decline in performance can ultimately affect audit judgment in deciding to affect the examinations’ results. The complexity of auditors’ tasks makes it difficult to provide fast and accurate assessments (William & Anton, 2019). This condition is supported by the results of hypothesis testing at the sample level of Indonesia and Java. Meanwhile, the complexity of the duties may not affect the dysfunctional behavior that occurs in tax auditors. It is supported by the results of hypothesis testing on samples outside Java, where it is concluded that task complexity does not affect the tax audit quality outside Java, which can be caused by condi-
tions where an examiner can still maintain the quality of his examination results even though he is faced with task complexity (Mulyani & Purnomo, 2019).

Descriptive statistical analysis shows that the level of task complexity in the Java region as a whole tends to be greater than that outside Java. The difference in complexity, followed by the same workload and completion time of the inspection, will significantly affect Java’s Island. It indicates that the pressure that the team leader outside Java gets from the complexity of the task is not as tremendous as the pressure felt by the tax auditor team leader in the Java region. Furthermore, the supporting analysis also shows that the distribution of tax assessment letters filed with objections in areas outside Java tends to be random and without a pattern. Therefore, the high percentage of tax assessment letters filed for objections spread across all levels of this task’s complexity, resulting in insignificant adverse effects in areas outside Java.

Besides, other external factors in areas outside Java can support dysfunctional behavior related to motivation and situation. Based on the results of hypothesis testing, it is concluded that the tax office’s working area outside Java has a positive effect on the quality of the tax audit results. It indicates that a better work area level will motivate tax auditors to behave better in functional behavior. In examining the MARS model’s attitude and behavior theory, low motivation increases dysfunctional behavior. Therefore, the task’s complexity does not affect the quality of tax audits in areas outside Java. Instead, it can be caused by other external factors such as work areas that influence tax auditors’ behavior.

CONCLUSIONS
The team leader’s high technical competence increases the possibility of the tax auditor’s dysfunctional behavior. As a result, the tax audit quality decreases and makes the taxpayer’s tax assessment letter objected to even greater. The technical competence represented by the last education and the head of the examination team has not yet represented the ability factor because it only includes knowledge and does not include skills. As for the samples outside Java and Indonesia, there is a phenomenon that the team leader has the latest level of education or a high class but has experience in conducting tax audits that are classified as low. The team leader’s high experience tends to reduce the examiner’s dysfunctional behavior so that the tax audit quality will increase, and the chances of tax assessment letters being objected to by the taxpayer are getting smaller. The team leader’s experience in carrying out the examination is one factor that increases the team leader’s role perception. Based on experience in carrying out cases in the field, the team leader was able to find the right solution to provide appropriate audit judgment in making fiscal corrections and better carrying out examination standards. High time budget pressure increases the possibility of dysfunctional behavior of the examiner so that the tax audit quality decreases and makes the chances of tax assessment letter being objected to by the taxpayer even greater.

Time budget pressure can generally influence dysfunctional behavior by balancing motivation and situation factors. In the Java region, high time budget pressure can affect tax auditor performance, while tax auditor’s time pressure outside Java is not as significant as the tax auditor team leader’s pressure in the Java region, which has a more significant task complexity level with the same workload. Besides, outside Java, other external factors in demotivating factors from the work area. The task’s high complexity increases the possibility of the tax auditor’s dysfunctional behavior. As a result, the tax audit quality results decrease and make the taxpayer’s opportunity for tax assessment letters to be objected to even greater. Task complexity can influence dysfunctional behavior by balancing motivation and situation factors. The high level of task complexity in the Java region can significantly affect tax auditor performance. Meanwhile, outside Java, task complexity is not as great as the tax auditor team leader’s pressure in the Java region. Besides that, other external factors outside Java demotivating factors from the work area.
LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study's limitation is the lack of previous studies that review the tax audit quality in Indonesia and internationally. Also, a few similar studies use secondary data, so justification is needed to determine individual proxies requiring particular time and consideration. In selecting proxies, there are obstacles where there are no measurements explicitly stated in the statutory regulations or the Indonesian Tax Authority provisions for certain variables, including the dependent variable. In the end, the selection of proxies used in this study was also carried out through a confirmation process from informants who understand tax audit practices. A logistic regression model was used in this study because the tax audit quality is represented by a dummy variable of 0 for tax assessment letters with objections and 1 for tax assessment letters that were not objected, whose proxies were determined based on 2019. The Authority KPI Manual. Further research may use other indicators that represent quality. Future research can add other determinants of task complexity components that can be confirmed to tax auditors, such as the taxpayers' business field classification and business process complexity.

This study indicates that the Indonesian Tax Authority should prioritize the tax auditor team leader's appointment rather than the last class and education. The experience seen is based not only on tenure as a tax auditor but also on its history. Therefore, it is necessary to review the rules for a team leader's appointment. It is necessary to measure technical competencies to see the competency gap between the standards set and the actual competence of each tax auditor so that this can be used as the basis of providing targeted competency improvement treatment according to each tax's needs auditor. Furthermore, it is necessary to allocate quality tax auditor human resources with sufficient experience in areas outside Java to fill the team leader's composition with a more experienced tax auditor. The newly appointed tax auditor should first become a team member for a certain period until they have enough experience to become a team leader. Tax auditor human resources allocation also needs to consider motivational factors by prioritizing particular areas.
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