E-ISSN : 2721-3013
P-ISSN : 2721-3005
JOURNAL OF ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE MANAGEMENT (JAFM)
https://dinastires.org/JAFM dinasti.info@gmail.com +62 811 7404 455

DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/jafm.v4i5
Received: 9 September 2023, **Revised:** 12 October 2023, **Publish:** 3 November 2023

Factors Influencing Audit Opinion Going Concern

Ahmad Faishal Hanif [1*], Firda Ayu Amalia[2], Agung Prasetyo Nugroho Wicaksono[3]
[1]University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia, faishalhanif52@gmail.com
[2]University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia, agungpnw@umm.ac.id
[3]University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia, firdaayu@umm.ac.id

[*]Corresponding Author: faishalhanif52@gmail.com

Abstract: This study was conducted to investigate the impact of company size, audit tenure, financial distress, and audit quality on going concern audit opinions on all sectors of companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX), except the financial sector in 2019–2021. The sample consisting of 153 companies was selected using purposive sampling techniques, i.e., companies were selected based on certain considerations. The sample of 153 companies was then analyzed using the logistic regression method and assisted by Eviews 10 software. The results in this study are company size, audit tenure, financial distress, and audit quality have no influence on going concern audit opinion.

Keyword: Audit, Going Concern

INTRODUCTION

Audit quality has become a major concern for auditors. A reputable audit allows auditors to detect irregularities in accounting and financial reporting. The auditor's job is to provide clients with audit results on financial statements. An independent, honest, competent, and experienced attitude, as well as professionalism in accordance with the professional ethics of an auditor, can help improve audit quality (Oktaviana & Supriyati, 2021). On November 9, 2016, the Indonesian Institute of Certified Public Accountants (IAPI), through the Public Accountant Professional Committee (KPAP), discussed the need to draft guidelines on the indicators needed to assess audit quality. The discussion was held because of the urgent need to understand the development of the capabilities of auditors and public accounting firms (KAP). Guidelines related to audit quality indicators can help public accountants as a medium or means of communication with stakeholders through transparent and quality reports (Oktaviana & Supriyati, 2021).

One of the tools used by stakeholders to make decisions is the company's financial statements. The preparation of financial statements is a way to be responsible and convey the company's financial information to stakeholders. The Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) has stated that relevance and reliability are two important characteristics of financial statements. Information users need help from third parties, such as public accountants, to

verify the information disclosed in the financial statements by management because these two characteristics are difficult to measure (Rinaldi, Eka, & Herawaty, 2022).

A company is established with the intention of ensuring that its business continuity (going concern) can be maintained over a relatively long period of time. Going concern is the basis or guideline in the preparation of financial statements, where the company is assumed to have no intention or plan to end or reduce the scale of its operations in order to continue operating as a business entity (going concern). The concept of going concern is always related to the ability of company owners to keep their business operating for a relatively long period of time (Juanda & Lamury, 2021). If a company faces financial difficulties and experiences business failure, which can threaten the company's survival or bankruptcy, then the company is considered to be facing problems and may doubt its ability to maintain its business. As a result, the company has the potential to receive a going concern audit opinion from the auditor due to its business conditions.

Several previous studies have explored what affects audit opinion. For example, in research by Kusumawardhani (2018), financial distress and profitability affect the going concern audit opinion, while company size has no effect on the going concern audit opinion. Effendi (2019) states that financial conditions have no influence on going concern audit opinion, but audit quality and company size have an influence on going concern audit opinion.

The variables of company size, audit tenure, financial distress, and audit quality play a crucial role in several studies on "going concern audit opinion" because each variable provides important information about the likelihood of how long the business can survive. Company size can provide an idea of the company's capability to survive for a certain period of time. Audit tenure can help auditors make a more accurate assessment of the risk of the company's business sustainability. Financial distress can be an early indicator of how the company is experiencing problems and cannot survive for a certain period of time, and good audit quality can help auditors make a more accurate assessment of the sustainability of a company. Research that discusses "going concern audit opinion" can provide important and useful information for decision makers, such as investors and creditors, about the likelihood of a company's sustainability.

Based on the previous explanation, research related to going concern audit opinion remains interesting to analyze because the opinion issued by the auditor, which is considered independent, has a significant role for investors to take steps or decisions to invest. Therefore, this study wants to analyze the effect of company size, audit tenure, financial distress, and audit quality on going concern audit opinions. By examining these variables, it is hoped that it can generate new insights into what factors influence going concern audit opinion.

Agency Theory

According to Jensen & Meckling (1976), agency theory is a theory that describes the contractual relationship agreed between the owner (principal) who hires another person (agent) to perform a service or service and gives decision-making authority to the agent, where the agent relationship is regulated by a contract between the two parties. The parties in this contract are between the agent and the principal who require management to provide services to the principal. According to Agency Theory, agents and principals have their own interests that cause conflicts. This is because each party is driven by their own personal motivations. Information asymmetry is a term used to describe the conflict gap between the agent and the principal (Yolanda, Arza, & Halmawati, 2019).

Effect of Company Size on Going Concern Audit Opinion

Company size is a standard or measure used to classify companies as large or small based on various criteria, such as assets, log size, stock market value, and so on. Companies with a size that includes large ones have better abilities than small ones in managing company operations and also in producing financial reports that are more qualified than small companies (Sarra et al, 2019).

The findings of previous research by Ardi et al (2019) that company size has no influence on going concern audit opinion. These findings are supported by Suryani (2020) and Averio (2020) with the same results. Based on this discussion, it produces the following hypothesis:

H1: Company size has a negative effect on going concern audit opinion.

Effect of Audit Tenure on Going Concern Audit Opinion

Audit tenure is the period of time agreed upon between the client and the auditor or with the public accounting firm (KAP) to provide audit services, measured on an annual basis. If the tenure is short, the auditor may experience difficulties in collecting data and evidence to prepare the company's financial statements. (Tandungan & Mertha, 2016).

The findings of previous research by Sarra et al (2019) that Audit Tenure has a negative influence on going concern audit opinion. These findings are supported by Sari & Triyani (2018), Kurnia & Mella (2018), and Simamora & Hendarjatno (2019) with the same results. Based on this discussion, it produces the following hypothesis:

H2: Audit tenure has a negative effect on going concern audit opinion.

Effect of Financial Distress on Going Concern Audit Opinion

Financial distress conditions that occur in a company can be a sign that the company is at risk of bankruptcy. Financial distress is a phase when a company faces a decline in its sales turnover and suffers losses continuously and for a long period of time before finally experiencing bankruptcy. When a company faces an unfavorable financial situation, the auditor tends to give a going concern audit opinion to the company. (Nugroho et al, 2018).

The findings of previous research by Nugroho et al. (2018) show that financial distress has a negative effect on going concern audit opinion. These findings are supported by Listantri & Mudjiyanti (2016) and Yuliyani & Erawati (2017), with the same results. Meanwhile, Kusumawardhani (2018) found that financial distress affects going concern audit opinion. Based on this discussion, it produces the following hypothesis:

H3: Financial distress has a negative effect on going concern audit opinion.

Effect of Audit Quality on Going Concern Audit Opinion

According to Pertiwi et al. (2016), audit quality includes consideration of various possibilities where the auditor, when examining the client's financial statements, finds irregularities in the application of the client's accounting system. The auditor then reports these findings in the form of audited financial statements, following auditing standards and the public accountant code of ethics as guidelines in their work.

The findings of previous research by Sari and Triyani (2018) show that audit quality has a negative effect on audit opinion. These findings are supported by Nadzif & Durya (2022) and Averio (2020), with the same results. Meanwhile, Afnan et al. (2020) found that audit quality has an effect on audit opinion. Based on this discussion, it produces the following hypothesis:

H4: Audit quality has a positive effect on going concern audit opinion.

METHOD

This research is quantitative research, where the data used is secondary data, namely data that has been processed or published either through company or government websites that are used by organizations that are not processors. The variables examined in this study are company size, audit tenure, financial distress, and audit quality as independent variables, and going concern audit opinion as the dependent variable.

The population that is the focus of this study includes all company sectors except the financial sector listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) for the 2019–2021 period. The sampling method used in this study was purposive sampling. The criteria applied to select samples are as follows:

1. All company sectors except the financial sector are listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) for the 2019–2021 period.
2. The company has financial statements for the 2019–2021 period.
3. The company experienced negative net income (loss) for at least two periods of financial statements.
4. Financial statements use rupiah currency.

Based on the sample selection criteria, 153 companies were obtained as samples in this study. The data acquisition technique used is the documentation technique, where data that is already available and has been collected by other parties is used as a source of information in this study. The data used in this study were obtained from the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) website.

In this study, the dependent variable is going concern audit opinion, measured by looking at the company's financial statements. If there is a going concern audit opinion, 1 point is given, and if there is none, 0. The independent variables are company size, audit tenure, financial distress, and audit quality. The company size variable is measured by looking at the company's total assets in the company's audited financial statements. The audit tenure variable is measured by looking at whether there is a change of auditors in the company's audited financial statements. The financial distress variable is measured using three Altman z-score measurement models:

First model

$$Z = 1{,}2\ \frac{Working\ Capital}{Total\ Assets} + 1{,}4\ \frac{Retained\ Earnings}{Total\ Assets} + 3{,}3\ \frac{EBIT}{Total\ Assets} + 0{,}6\ \frac{Market\ Value\ of\ Equity}{Total\ Liabilities} + 1{,}0\ \frac{Income}{Total\ Assets} \ldots (1)$$

Second Model

$$Z = 0{,}717\ \frac{Working\ Capital}{Total\ Assets} + 0{,}847\ \frac{Retained\ Earnings}{Total\ Assets} + 3{,}107\ \frac{EBIT}{Total\ Assets} + 0{,}420\ \frac{Market\ Value\ of\ Equity}{Total\ Liabilities} + 0{,}998\ \frac{Income}{Total\ Assets} \ldots (2)$$

Third Model

$$Z = 6{,}56\ \frac{Working\ Capital}{Total\ Assets} + 3{,}26\ \frac{Retained\ Earnings}{Total\ Assets} + 6{,}72\ \frac{EBIT}{Total\ Assets} + 1{,}05\ \frac{Market\ Value\ of\ Equity}{Total\ Liabilities} \ldots (3)$$

The audit quality variable is measured by looking at the auditors used by the company, whether using auditors from the big four public accountants or from other public accountants. The logistic regression analysis method used in hypothesis testing is:

$$Ln\frac{OGC}{1-OGC} = \alpha + \beta_1 Ukuran\ Perusahaan + \beta_2 Audit\ Tenure + \beta_3 Financial\ Distress + \beta_4 Kualitas\ Audit + \epsilon \ldots (4)$$

With conditions:

OGC : Auditor's opinion (1 = going concern audit opinion and 0 = non-going concern audit opinion)
α : Constant
β : Regression Coefficient
ε : Standard Error

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Descriptive Statistics Test

Table 1. Descriptive Statistical Test Results

Model 1

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Going Concern Audit Opinion	459	0,000000	1,000000	0,080610	0,272532
Company Size	459	8,091321	32,43986	24,77537	4,609497
Audit Tenure	459	0,000000	1,000000	0,206972	0,405577
Financial Distress	459	-20602,74	10,79524	-75,61318	1051,138
Audit Quality	459	0,000000	1,000000	0,141612	0,349032
Valid N (listwise)	459				

Model 2

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Going Concern Audit Opinion	225	0,000000	1,000000	0,106667	0,309377
Company Size	225	14,54175	31,51070	24,75794	4,009420
Audit Tenure	225	0,000000	1,000000	0,217778	0,413656
Financial Distress	225	-194,7039	9,726067	-4,296268	25,07806
Audit Quality	225	0,000000	1,000000	0,142222	0,350057
Valid N (listwise)	225				

Model 3

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Going Concern Audit Opinion	234	0,000000	1,000000	0,055556	0,229552
Company Size	234	8,091321	32,43986	24,79213	5,129358
Audit Tenure	234	0,000000	1,000000	0,196581	0,398265
Financial Distress	234	-20602,74	10,79524	-144,1871	1470,240
Audit Quality	234	0,000000	1,000000	0,141026	0,348794
Valid N (listwise)	234				

Source: data processed, 2022

The results of descriptive statistics using measurement model 1 show that going concern audit opinion shows a minimum value of 0.000000, a maximum value of 1.000000, a mean value of 0.080610, and a standard deviation value of 0.272532. This value indicates that in the research sample, there are few companies that get a going concern audit opinion, which is given code 1. Of the 153 manufacturing and non-manufacturing companies for the 2019–2021 period analyzed, 21 companies received a going concern audit opinion, while 132 other companies did not get a going concern audit opinion. Furthermore, the descriptive statistical results show that company size has a minimum value of 8.091321, a maximum value of 32.43986, a mean value of around 24.77537, and a standard deviation value of around 4.609497. The audit tenure in the descriptive statistical results shows a minimum value of 0.000000, a maximum value of 1.000000, a mean value of 0.206972, and a standard deviation value of around 0.405577. Financial distress in the descriptive statistical results shows a minimum value of -20602.74, a maximum value of 10.79524, a mean value of -75.61318, and a standard deviation value of around 1051.138. Meanwhile, audit quality shows a minimum value of 0.000000, a maximum value of 1.000000, a mean value of 0.141612, and a standard deviation value of 0.349032.

The results of descriptive statistics using measurement model 2 show that going concern audit opinion shows a minimum value of 0.000000, a maximum value of 1.000000, a mean value of 0.106667, and a standard deviation value of 0.309377. This value indicates that in the research sample, there are few companies that get going concern audit opinions, which is given code 1. Of the 75 manufacturing companies for the 2019–2021 period analyzed, 13 received a going concern audit opinion, while 62 did not get a going concern audit opinion. The results of descriptive statistics show that company size has a minimum value of 14.54175, a maximum value of 31.51070, a mean value of 24.75794, and a standard deviation value of 4.009420. The descriptive statistical results show that audit tenure has a minimum value of 0.000000, a maximum value of 1.000000, a mean value of 0.217778, and a standard deviation value of 0.413656. The descriptive statistical results show that financial distress has a minimum value of -194.7039, a maximum value of 9.726067, a mean value of -4.296268, and a standard deviation value of 25.07806. The results of descriptive statistics show that audit quality has a minimum value of 0.000000, a maximum value of 1.000000, a mean value of 0.142222, and a standard deviation value of 0.350057.

The results of descriptive statistics using measurement model 3 show that going concern audit opinion has a minimum value of 0.000000, a maximum value of 1.000000, a mean value of 0.055556, and a standard deviation value of 0.229552. This value indicates that in the research sample, there are few companies that get a going concern audit opinion, which is given code 1. Of the 78 non-manufacturing companies for the 2019–2021 period analyzed, 7 received a going concern audit opinion, and 71 did not receive a going concern audit opinion. The results of descriptive statistics show that company size has a minimum value of 8.091321, a maximum value of 32.43986, a mean value of 24.79213, and a standard deviation value of 5.129358. The descriptive statistical results show that audit tenure has a minimum value of 0.000000, a maximum value of 1.000000, a mean value of 0.196581, and a standard deviation value of 0.398265. The descriptive statistical results show that financial distress has a minimum value of -20602.74, a maximum value of 10,79524, a mean value of -144.1871, and a standard deviation value of 1470.240. The results of descriptive statistics show that audit quality has a minimum value of 0.000000, a maximum value of 1.000000, a mean value of 0.141026, and a standard deviation value of 0.348794.

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Table 2. Hosmer and Lemeshow Test Results

Model 1	H-L Statistic	9.2802	Prob. Chi-Sq 8	0.3192
	Andrews Statistic	35.7698	Prob. Chi-Sq 10	‘0.0001
Model 2	H-L Statistic	12.2008	Prob. Chi-Sq 8	0.1425
	Andrews Statistic	56.9105	Prob. Chi-Sq 10	0.0000
Model 3	H-L Statistic	11.4525	Prob. Chi-Sq 8	0.1774
	Andrews Statistic	100.3611	Prob. Chi-Sq 10	0.0000

Source: data processed, 2022

Based on the calculation results using measurement model 1, the value of Prob. Chi Square is 0.3192. Since the significance value exceeds the value of 0.05 (5%), it can be concluded that this regression model can predict the observed value well. This finding also illustrates that this model is appropriate or "fits" the existing data.

Based on the results of calculations using measurement model 2, the value of Prob. Chi Square is 0.1425. Since the significance value exceeds the value of 0.05 (5%), it can be concluded that this regression model can predict the observed value well. This finding also illustrates that the model is appropriate or "fits" the existing data.

Based on the results of calculations using measurement model 3, the value of Prob. Chi Square is 0.1774. Since the significance value exceeds the value of 0.05 (5%), it can be concluded that this regression model can predict the observed value well. This finding also illustrates that the model is appropriate or "fits" the existing data.

Nagelkerke R Square Test

Table 3. Nagelkerke R Square Test Results

Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
McFadden R-squared	0.035680	McFadden R-squared	0.050019	McFadden R-squared	0.051099

Source: data processed, 2022

Based on the results of calculations using measurement model 1, the McFadden R-squared value is 0.035680. This indicates that the value of 0.03 (3%) is less than 0.05 (5%), which means that the dependent variable cannot be influenced by the independent variables in this model.

Based on the results of calculations using measurement model 2, the McFadden R-squared value is 0.050019. This indicates that about 0.05 (5%) of the variation in the dependent variable can be influenced by the independent variables in this model.

Based on the results of calculations using measurement 3, the McFadden R-squared value is 0.051099. This indicates that about 0.05 (5%) of the variation in the dependent variable can be influenced by the independent variables in this model.

Likehood Test

Table 4. Likehood Test Results

Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Prob (LR Statistic)	0.056765	Prob (LR Statistic)	0.105632	Prob (LR Statistic)	0.274114

Source: data processed, 2022

Based on the calculation results using measurement model 1, it can be seen that the prob (LR statistic) value is 0.056765. If the value is less than 0.05 (5%), it is declared significant or influential. From the table above, the prob (LR statistic) is 0.056765, or 5%, which means it is not significant or has no effect.

Based on the calculation results using measurement model 2, it can be seen that the prob (LR statistic) value is 0.105632. If the value is less than 0.05 (5%), it is declared significant or influential. From the table above, Prob (LR Statistic) is 0.105632, or 10%, which means it is not significant or has no effect.

Based on the calculation results using measurement model 3, it can be seen that the prob (LR statistic) value is 0.274114. If the value is less than 0.05 (5%), it is declared significant or influential. From the table above, the probability (LR statistic) is 0.274114, or 27%, which means it is not significant or has no effect.

Logistic Regression Test

Table 5. Measurement Model 1

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-statistic	Prob
Constanta	-0,8932	0,91879	-0.972099	0,331
Company Size	-0,0555	0,03691	-1,5035	0,1327
Audit Tenure	-0,2141	0,46634	-0,4592	0,6461
Financial Distress	-3,95E-05	0.000102	-0.388906	0,6973
Audit Quality	-2,0238	1,03482	-1,9557	**0,0505***

Source: data processed, 2022

The calculation results using model 1 measurement for the Constanta variable produce a coefficient value of -0.893155 with a prob value of 0.3310. The company size variable produces a coefficient value of -0.055496 with a prob value of 0.1327. For the audit tenure variable, the coefficient value is - 0.214130, with a prob value of 0.6461. For the financial distress variable, the coefficient value is -3.95E-05, with a prob value of 0.6973. For the audit quality variable, it produces a coefficient value of -2.023764 with a prob value of 0.0505.

Table 6. Measurement Model 2

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-statistic	Prob
Constanta	-2,032230	1,543238	-1,316861	0,1879
Company Size	0,001783	0,060451	0,029502	0,9765
Audit Tenure	-0,462233	0,652033	-0,708911	0,4784
Financial Distress	-0,010902	0,005783	-1,885304	**0,0594***
Audit Quality	-1,486418	1,061761	-1,399956	0,1615

Source: data processed, 2022

The calculation results using measurement model 2 for the Constanta variable produce a coefficient value of -2.032230 with a prob value of 0.1879. The company size variable produces a coefficient value of 0.001783, with a prob value of 0.9765. For the audit tenure

variable, the coefficient value is -0.462233, with a prob value of 0.4784. For the financial distress variable, the coefficient value is -0.010902, with a prob value of 0.0594. For the audit quality variable, the coefficient value is -1.486418, with a prob value of 0.1615.

Table 7. Measurement Model 3

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-statistic	Prob
Constant	-0,475882	1,242849	-0,382896	0,7018
Company Size	-0,098934	0,052220	-1,894565	**0,0582***
Audit Tenure	0,335661	0,694456	-0,483345	0,6289
Financial Distress	-3,89E-05	0,000108	-0,361757	0,7175
Audit Quality	-0,987250	1,084347	-0,910455	0,3626

Source: data processed, 2022

The calculation results using measurement model 3 for Constanta variables produce a coefficient value of -0.475882, with a prob value of 0.7018. The company size variable produces a coefficient value of -0.098934, with a prob value of 0.0582. For the audit tenure variable, the coefficient value is 0.335661, with a prob value of 0.6289. For the financial distress variable, the coefficient value is -3.89E-05, with a prob value of 0.7175. For the audit quality variable, the coefficient value is -0.987250, with a prob value of 0.3626.

Discussion

The Effect of Company Size on Going Concern Audit Opinions

In the table, the test results using models 1 and 2 show that company size has no effect on going concern audit opinion. Meanwhile, in Model 3, it can be seen that company size has an effect on the going concern audit opinion. From these results, the larger the company, the more the auditor tends to withhold the opinion issued to the public, namely whether this company can maintain its survival or not. The size of the company looks at the total assets owned by the company. In this study, points 1 are given if the company has total assets > 100 billion and points 0 if <100 billion. With this measurement, 134 companies were found to have total assets> 100 billion, while 19 companies had total assets <100 billion.

The findings of this study are in line with previous studies by Ardi et al. (2019), which found that company size has no significant effect on going concern audit opinion. This finding is supported by Suryani (2020) with the same results. Thus, researchers agree with the first hypothesis (H1).

The Effect of Audit Tenure on Going Concern Audit Opinions

In the table of test results using models 1, 2, and 3, it can be seen that audit tenure has no effect on going concern audit opinion. According to these results, the longer the period of engagement between the auditor and the same auditee, the more careful the auditor is in providing an opinion regarding the continuity of the business. Audit tenure is seen from the length of auditor changes during a certain period in the company. In this study, 1 point is given if the company changes its auditor within 3 years, and 0 points are given if the company does not change its auditor within 3 years. With this measurement, 75 companies were found to have changed their auditors within 3 years, while 78 companies did not change their auditors within 3 years.

The findings of this study are in line with previous studies by Sarra et al. (2019) that audit tenure has a negative effect on going concern audit opinion. This finding is supported by Sari & Triyani (2018) with the same results. Thus, agree with the second hypothesis (H2).

The Effect of Financial Distress on Going Concern Audit Opinions

In the table, the test results using models 1 and 3 show that financial distress has no effect on the going concern audit opinion. But in Model 2, it can be seen that financial distress has an effect on the going concern audit opinion. From these results, namely when the company experiences a decrease in sales growth, which causes losses, which will ultimately lead to bankruptcy, an audit opinion regarding financial conditions that are of concern reflects the auditor's assessment of whether the company is experiencing serious financial difficulties or has the potential for bankruptcy. Financial distress looks at the type of company, namely general (mixed), manufacturing, and non-manufacturing. For general (mixed) use, use the model 1 calculation formula; for manufacturing use, use the model 2 calculation formula; and for non-manufacturing use, use the model 3 calculation formula. With these measurements, 153 companies were found to have used model 1 calculations; for model 2, 75 companies; and for model 3, 78 companies. Point 1 is given if the value is above 2.99, and if it is below the value of 2.99, then point 0 is given.

The findings of this study are in line with previous studies by Nugroho et al. (2018) that financial distress has a negative effect on going concern audit opinion. These findings are supported by Listantri & Mudjiyanti (2016) with the same results. Thus, agree with the third hypothesis (H3).

The Effect of Audit Quality on Going Concern Audit Opinion

In the table, the test results use models 2 and 3 to show that audit quality has no effect on the audit opinion. Meanwhile, in Model 1, it can be seen that audit quality has an effect on going concern audit opinion. From these results, high-quality auditors apply more rigorous audit procedures, perform more in-depth analysis, and carefully consider potential violations or errors in the client's financial statements. This allows them to find and disclose violations or non-conformities with accounting standards that may occur in the client's accounting scheme. Audit quality looks at the auditors used, whether they come from KAP BigFour or not. In this study, 1 point is given if the company uses KAP BigFour and 0 points are given if the company does not use KAP BigFour. These measurements found 25 companies that use KAP BigFour and 128 companies that do not use KAP BigFour.

The findings of this study are in line with previous studies by Sari and Triyani (2018), which found that audit quality has a negative effect on audit opinion. This finding is supported by Nadzif & Durya (2022), with the same results. Thus, disagree with the fourth hypothesis (H4).

CONCLUSION

From the analysis that has been carried out, it can be concluded that variables such as company size, audit tenure, financial distress, and audit quality have no impact or influence on going concern audit opinion.

This study has a number of limitations, namely the challenge of identifying relevant theories for research variables, the data tabulation process, in which sometimes the data is incomplete, and limitations on the company sample, which is limited to companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) in the 2019–2021time span. The focus of this study is on the independent variables, namely company size, audit tenure, financial distress, and audit quality, and the dependent variable is going to concern audit opinion.

Suggestions for future researchers include increasing the number of theoretical sources so that the information obtained becomes more valid, looking for more complete data sources, and observation periods that might be even longer, such as 2015, so as to get better results. As suggestions for further research, researchers can enrich or increase research variables such as audit committees, company growth, and audit lag.

REFERENSI

Afnan, Y., Hernawati, E., & Nugraheni, R. (2020). Pengaruh Kualitas Audit, Debt Default, Audit Lag, Dan Disclosure Pada Opini Audit Going Concern. Business Management, Economic, and Accounting National Seminar, 1(1), 1059–1076.

Ardi, F. G., Saputra, I., & Mulyani, S. D. (2019). PENGARUH FINANCIAL DISTRESS, UKURAN PERUSAHAAN, AUDIT TENURE DAN REPUTASI AUDITOR TERHADAP OPINI AUDIT MODIFIKASI GOING CONCERN. Jurnal Magister Akuntansi Trisakti, 6(2), 225–246.

Averio, T. (2020). The analysis of influencing factors on the going concern audit opinion – a study in manufacturing firms in Indonesia. Asian Journal of Accounting Research, 6(2), 152–164. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJAR-09-2020-0078

Cahyono, B., & Widyawati, D. (2018). Pengaruh Asimetri Informasi Dan Ukuran Perusahaan Terhadap Manajemen Laba. Balance Vocation Accounting Journal, 1(8), 1. https://doi.org/10.31000/bvaj.v1i2.472

Doho, S. Z., & Santoso, E. B. (2020). Pengaruh Karakteristik Ceo, Komisaris Independen, Dan Kualitas Audit Terhadap Penghindaran Pajak. Media Akuntansi Dan Perpajakan Indonesia, 1(2), 169–184. https://doi.org/10.37715/mapi.v1i2.1408

Effendi, B. (2019). Kualitas Audit, Kondisi Keuangan, Ukuran Perusahaan dan Penerimaan Opini Audit Going Concern. Owner: Riset & Jurnal Akuntansi, 3(1), 9. https://doi.org/10.33395/owner.v3i1.80

Fandy, F., & Susilowati, D. (2021). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Leverage dan Kepemilikan Institusional Terhadap Financial Distress Pada Perusahaan Sektor Agribisnis Di BEI Tahun 2017-2019. Jurnal Ketahanan Pangan, 5(1), 45–53.

Hermatika, V. P., & Triani, N. N. A. (2022). Pengaruh Ukuran Kap, Audit Tenure, Spesialisasi Auditor dan Audit Capacity Stress terhadap Manajemen Laba (Studi pada Perusahaan Manufaktur yang Terdaftar …. Jurnal Akuntansi AKUNESA, 11(1), 1–10.

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Racial diversity and its asymmetry within and across hierarchical levels: The effects on financial performance. Human Relations, 4(3), 305–360. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726718812602

Juanda, A., & Lamury, T. F. (2021). Kualitas Audit, Profitabilitas, Leverage Dan Struktur Kepemilikan Terhadap Opini Audit Going Concern. Jurnal Akademi Akuntansi, 4(2), 270–287. https://doi.org/10.22219/jaa.v4i2.17993

Kurnia, P., & Mella, N. F. (2018). Opini Audit Going Concern: Kajian Berdasarkan Kualitas Audit, Kondisi Keuangan, Audit Tenure, Ukuran Perusahaan, Pertumbuhan Perusahaan dan Opini Audit Tahun Sebelumnya pada Perusahaan yang Mengalami Financial Distress pada Perusahaan Manufaktur (Studi pa. Jurnal Riset Akuntansi Dan Keuangan, 6(1), 105–122.

Kusumawardhani, I. (2018). Pengaruh Kondisi Keuangan, Financial Distres, Profitabilitas Dan Ukuran Perusahaan Terhadap Opini Audit Going Concern pada perusahaan pertambangan yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia selama tahun 2011-2015. Buletin Ekonomi, 16(1), 121–136. http://eprints.upnyk.ac.id/16381/

Listantri, F., & Mudjiyanti, R. (2016). Analisis Pengaruh Financial Distress, Ukuran Perusahaan, Solvabilitas, Dan Profitabilitas Terhadap Penerimaan Opini Audit Going Concern. Media Ekonomi, 16(1), 163. https://doi.org/10.30595/medek.v16i1.1281

Nadzif, N., & Agung Durya, N. P. M. (2022). Pengaruh Kualitas Audit, Debt Ratio, Ukuran Perusahaan, Audit Lag Terhadap Opini Audit Going Concern. Inovatif: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, Akuntansi, Bisnis Digital Dan Kewirausahaan, 1(2), 206–221. https://doi.org/10.55983/inov.v1i2.118

Nugroho, L., Nurrohmah, S., Anasta, L. (2020). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Opini Audit Going Concern. Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Bisnis Indonesia (JABISI), 1(1), 12–17. https://doi.org/10.55122/jabisi.v1i1.95

Oktaviana, D., & Supriyati (2021). DAMPAK TIME PRESSURE , AUDIT SWITCHING , AUDIT TENURE DAN RELIGIUSITY TERHADAP KUALITAS AUDIT. Tangible Journal, 6(1), 15–24.

Pertiwi, N., Hasan, A., & Hardi. (2016). Pengaruh Masa Perikatan Audit, Spesialisasi Industri KAP, Reputasi KAP dan Komite Audit Terhadap Kualitas Audit. Jurnal Akuntansi, 4(2), 147–160. https://ja.ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JA/article/view/3366/3283

Rinaldi, Eka, W., Herawaty, N. (2022). THE EFFECT OF AUDIT FEE, AUDIT TENURE, AND AUDIT COMMITTEE ON AUDIT QUALITY WITH INFORMATION ASYMETRICITY AS INTERVENING VARIABLES (EMPIRE STUDY ON PROPERTY, REAL ESTATE, AND CONSTRUCTION COMPANIES LISTED IN 2016-2019 IDX). Jambi Accounting Review (JAR), 3(1), 1–19.

Sari, Yustina Triyani, N. (2018). Pengaruh Audit Tenure, Debt Default, Kualitas Audit Dan Opini Audit Terhadap Opini Audit Going Concern Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Yang Terdaftar Di Bursa Efek Indonesia. Jurnal Akuntansi, 7(1), 71–84. https://doi.org/10.46806/ja.v7i1.456

Sarra, H. D., Alamsyah, S., & Kardiyana, R. (2019). Pengaruh Reputasi Auditor, Ukuran Perusahaan, Audit Tenure Dan Financial Distress Terhadap Pemberian Opini Audit Going Concern Pada Perusahaan Sektor Aneka Industri Yang Terdaftar Di Bursa Efek Indonesia (Bei) Periode 2012-2016. Jurnal Comparative: Ekonomi Dan Bisnis, 2(1), 40–56. http://jurnal.umt.ac.id/index.php/jceb/article/view/3104

Simamora, R. A., & Hendarjatno, H. (2019). The effects of audit client tenure, audit lag, opinion shopping, liquidity ratio, and leverage to the going concern audit opinion. Asian Journal of Accounting Research, 4(1), 145–156. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJAR-05-2019-0038

Suryani, S. (2020). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Ukuran Perusahaan, Debt Default dan Audit Tenure terhadap Opini Audit Going Concern. Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi Kesatuan, 8(3), 245–252. https://doi.org/10.37641/jiakes.v8i3.346

Tandungan, D., & Mertha, I. M. (2016). Pengaruh Komite Audit, Ukuran Perusahaan, Audit Tenure, dan Reputasi KAP terhadap Opini Audit Going Concern. E-Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas Udayana, 16(1), 45–71.

Yolanda, S., Arza, F. I., & Halmawati, H. (2019). Pengaruh Audit Tenure, Komite Audit Dan Audit Capacity Stress Terhadap Kualitas Audit. Jurnal Eksplorasi Akuntansi, 1(2), 543–555. https://doi.org/10.24036/jea.v1i2.94

Yuliyani, N. M. A., & Erawati, N. M. A. (2017). Pengaruh Financial Distress, Profitabilitas, Leverage dan Likuiditas pada Opini Audit Going Concern. E-Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas Udayana, 19(2), 1490–1520.