International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research

Vol. 4, No. 12; 2020

ISSN: 2456-7760

GOING CONCERN OPINION ON REAL ESTATE AND PROPERTY COMPANY IN INDONESIA

Sigit Handoyo

Reza Nurmeidita

Accounting Department
Universitas Islam Indonesia

Email: sigit.handoyo@uii.ac.id

Abstract

Auditor is an independent party who is needed by the parties whose need the reliable information in Financial Statement reported by management. Opinion is given by auditor will be the reference to many parties in making business decision that may misleading if the opinion of auditor is bias. The purpose of this research is to examine the effect of audit tenure, reputation of public accounting firm, previous year audit opinion, and opinion shopping toward giving going concern audit opinion. The analysis of this research is logistic regression data. The population and sample of this study are 43 real estate and property companies. The results of this study indicate that audit tenure and reputation of public accountant firm negatively affect toward going concern audit opinion, while the previous year's audit opinion has a positive effect on giving going concern audit opinion. In contrast to opinion shopping does not affect to going concern audit opinion.

Keywords: Audit Tenure, Reputation of Public Accounting Firm, Audit Opinion of Previous Year, and Opinion Shopping.

RESEARCH BACKGROUND

Going concern audit opinion is an opinion issued by the auditor to ascertain whether the company can maintain its survival (IAI, 2011). According to Chen & Church (1992), the existence of a business entity is a feature of an economic environment, which in the long run aims to maintain the survival (going concern) of its business through going concern assumptions. Business continuity is always associated with management's ability to manage the company in order to survive. When economic conditions are uncertain, investors expect auditors to give an early warning of the company's financial failure. Therefore, auditor independence is very reliable and is a serious concern in providing good information for investors, as a consideration in making investment decisions. The auditor must ensure that his opinion is relevant and consistent with the actual circumstances of the company, and it is the responsibility of the auditor in evaluating whether a company can maintain its survival within the specified period.

Venuti (2007) stated that going concern audit opinion is bad news for users of financial statements. The difficulty in predicting the survival of a company is a problem that often arises by many auditors who experience a dilemma between morals and ethics in providing going concern opinions. The reason is the self-fulfilling prophecy hypothesis which states that if the auditor gives a going concern opinion, the company will become even more bankrupt because many investors cancel their investment or creditors withdraw their funds. In this regard, auditors should have the courage to disclose problems regarding future survival and disclose honestly and transparently in their audit reports.

Accounting problems such as manipulation of financial statements are rife in both developed and developing countries, such as bankruptcies in the United States that are experienced by several large companies such as Enron, Worldcom, Xerox and Merck. In Indonesia there are examples of large companies that manipulate financial reports such as PT Kereta Api Indonesia (KAI) and PT Kimia Farma. In Japan, for example, Toshiba, Olympus, the Fukushima Daichi nuclear power plant with the operator Tokyo Electric Power Co. (Tepco). This is reasonable, because auditors are said to have played a part in providing false information so that many parties feel disadvantaged. The auditor easily issues an unqualified opinion before the company goes bankrupt. The number of cases of financial data manipulation involving companies and auditors has created a bad view of the auditor profession.

Geiger & Raghunandan (2002) and Junaidi & Hartono (2010) stated that audit tenure has an influence on the acceptance of audit opinion with going concern modification. It is feared that the relationship factor between the client and the auditor within a certain period of time (audit tenure) will affect the independence of the auditor when he finds doubts about the company's going concern. Lennox (2000) in his research argues that companies that change auditors (switching auditors) reduce the possibility of getting unwanted audit opinions, than companies that do not change auditors. Companies that are successful in opinion shopping change auditors in the hope of getting an unqualified opinion from the new auditor. Companies usually change auditors to avoid receiving going concern opinions. Opinion Shopping defined by the Security Exchange Commission (SEC) is the activity of looking for auditors who are willing to support the way the accounting treatment is carried out by managerial parties to achieve the desired goals of the company. The purpose of conducting an opinion shopping is to improve or it can be said to manipulate the results of operations or the company's financial condition, so that the company is expected to obtain a fair audit opinion without exception from the auditors. This is done, so that the management gets what is targeted according to their wishes.

Based on research conducted by Craswell (1995), auditor reputation is less valuable when an industry also has specialist auditors. Auditors who specialize in certain industries will certainly have a better understanding and knowledge of the environmental conditions of the industry. The need for industry specialization encourages auditors to specialize and start classifying clients based on industry fields. For industries that have special accounting technology, specialist auditors will provide a higher assurance of audit quality than non-specialist auditors. In addition, the big four KAPs are also considered to have a better reputation in the eyes of the public than the non-big four KAPs.

According to Setyarno et al.(2006), another factor that determines the auditor in expressing a going concern audit opinion is the audit opinion in the previous year. Companies that receive a going concern modification opinion in the previous year are used as an important consideration by the auditor to issue an opinion in the following year if there are no signs of improvement or there is no realizable managerial plan to improve the company's condition. If the company gets a going concern audit opinion in the previous year, it will reduce the company's value in the eyes of creditors, investors, and the market.

From this description, it is necessary to expand the research which is supported by the underlying theory. This study takes a sample of companies in the real estate and property sectors. The real estate and property sector was chosen because previous studies, the object of research that is often used is the manufacturing sector, and real estate and property companies have bright prospects in the future by seeing the potential for the population to continue to grow, the more development in the sector. Housing, apartments, shopping centers and office buildings that attract investors to invest their funds, so the prospect of stock trading is expected to increase.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Agency Theory

Jensen & Meckling (1976) described agency relations as a contract under one or more principals that involve agents to perform some services for them by delegating decision-making authority to agents. Both principals and agents are assumed to be economically rational people and are motivated solely by self-interest. Shareholders or principals delegate decision-making about the company to managers or agents. However, managers do not always act according to shareholdres' wishes, partly because of moral hazard. An independent third party as a mediator is needed in the relationship between the principal and the agent. This third party functions to monitor the behaviour of managers (agents) whether they are acting in accordance with the wishes of the principal.

Jensen & Meckling (1976) also stated that there are three elements that can limit the deviant behaviour carried out by agents. These elements are the operation of the managerial labour market, the operation of the capital market and the operation of the market for the desire to control and own the company (market for corporate control). Agents may have no future if their underperforming are terminated by shareholders. The managerial labour market will eliminate the opportunity for agents who do not perform well and behave deviating from the wishes of shareholders in companies managed by agents. The operation of the market for corporate control can inhibit actions that benefit the manager himself, in terms of stopping the manager from his position if the company he manages has low performance which allows new shareholders to replace him with another manager (agent) after the company is taken over.

In implementing agency theory, it requires agents to provide detailed and relevant information on the financing of the company's capital costs. In fact, it is not that easy for the principal to obtain the information needed or the agent to provide the information to the principal. The difference in interests between the two parties causes the agent to provide or withhold the information requested by the principal if it is profitable for the agent, even though it is an obligation for the agent to provide the information required by the principal. Therefore, research on timeliness is a further development of agency theory which shows that there are differences in views and interests between principals and agents (Jensen & Meckling, 1976).

An auditor is a party who is considered capable of bridging the interests of the principal (shareholders) and the manager (principal) in managing company finances (Setiawan, 2006). This is because, the auditor has the reliability to provide assessment services on the company's financial performance as shown in the financial statements prepared by the agent, and the auditor's job is to express an opinion, whether the reports made are reasonable and in accordance with applicable standards, which can link the interests different between principal (shareholder) and agent (management).

Stakeholders Theory

All stakeholders have the right to obtain information about company activities that affect them. Initially, shareholders were the sole stakeholders of the company. This view is based on the argument presented by Friedman (1962) which stated that the main objective of the company is to maximize the prosperity of its owners. However, Freeman (1983) disagreed with this view and broadens the definition of stakeholders to include more constituents, including adversial groups such as those with certain interests and regulators (Ghozali & Chariri, 2007).

According to Ghazali & Chariri (2007), stakeholder theory is a theory that states that a company is not an entity that only operates for its own interests, but must provide benefits to all its stakeholders (shareholders, creditors, consumers, suppliers, government, society, analysts, etc. and other parties). This stakeholder group becomes a consideration for company management in disclosing whether or not the information in the company report is made. The main objective of stakeholder theory is to assist company management in increasing value creation as a result of the activities carried out and minimizing any losses that may arise for stakeholders.

Stakeholder theory is able to broaden the perspective of company management and clearly explain the relationship between the company and stakeholders, this theory has weaknesses. Gray et al. (1997) said that the weakness of stakeholder theory lies in the focus of the theory which only focuses on the ways companies use to manage their stakeholders. The company is only directed to identify stakeholders that are considered important and influential and the company's attention will be directed to stakeholders that are considered beneficial to the company. They believe that stakeholder theory ignores the influence of society at large (society as a whole) on the provision of information in financial reporting (Ghozali & Chariri, 2007).

Based on the explanation from this stakeholder theory, the entity must provide information about the company's operations as outlined in financial reports to stakeholders and it is hoped that it can increase value creation in order to benefit stakeholders (shareholders, creditors, consumers, suppliers, government, society).

Going Concern Audit Opinion

According to IAI (2001), going concern is the basic assumption for preparing financial statements which explains that an entity will not liquidate or reduce its business scale materially. The going concern of an entity is used as the basic assumption of the financial statements when there is no evidence of contradictory information. Information that is considered to be significantly opposite to the survival assumption of the entity usually relates to information that shows the entity's inability to fulfil its obligations at maturity without selling most of its assets, restructuring debt, and improving operations (IAI, 2011).

AICPA (1988) provides guidance on conditions and events that can be used as material for consideration to find "substantial doubts" about the auditee's future going concern ability, at least up to one financial year ahead.

There are 4 conditions and events that can be identified and taken into consideration by the auditor, namely:

1. Negative Trends

For example: operating losses that occur repeatedly from period to period, working capital shortages that continue to occur, negative cash flow from operating activities, key performance indicators with poor scores.

2. Indication of Financial Distress

Examples: failure to meet debt obligations, delinquent dividend payments, refusal from, suppliers of submitting requests for ordinary credit purchases, the need for debt restructuring, the need to find new sources or funding methods, initiation of fast selling of some of their assets.

3. Internal Issues (Internal Issues)

For example: strikes or other labor conflicts, high dependence on the success of a particular project, long-term commitments that are not economic in nature, the need to significantly overhaul the company's operations.

4. External Issues

For example: there are lawsuits or court suits that have the potential to interfere with the survival of the company, the issuance of laws or other problems that have the potential to limit or stop the company's operations either partially or completely, loss of management rights, licenses, copyright, and important patents, loss of customers or major suppliers, losses due to major disasters such as earthquake-flood-drought and other force majeure that are not insured or insured but with insufficient coverage.

In terms of auditors evaluating whether there are doubts about the ability of the entity to sustain its survival, according to SA section 341 (IAI, 2011) it is the auditor's responsibility to assess whether there is great doubt about the ability of the business unit to sustain its survival within an appropriate period of time.

From the above explanation, it can be understood that, if the auditor does not provide a going concern audit opinion, the company is considered to be alive and operating for an indefinite period if there are no definite signs or plans that the company will be dissolved. Going Concern is also a prediction of future operational activities.

HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Utama & Badera (2016) stated that the longer period of cooperation between auditors and clients is feared causing the disclosure of going concern problems to lower, due to disturbing the objectivity of auditors from their familiarity with clients. The closeness between the auditor and the auditee is very likely to affect the independence of an auditor, especially in relation to the auditor's unwillingness to lose high fees when faced with the responsibility of issuing an audit opinion with a going concern modification. Based on research by Junaidi & Hartono (2010) and Muttaqin & Sudarno (2012), it is found that audit tenure has a significant effect on going concern audit opinion. Supported by Utama & Badera's research (2016) which stated that audit tenure has a negative effect on the acceptance of audit opinion with going concern modification. Fitriani (2007) argued that going concern opinion appears more often in companies experiencing financial difficulties where the company is audited by auditors who are in big four KAP. KAP big four is expected to have high experience. Likewise, a more precise and accurate disclosure of a company's going concern. Research conducted by Junaidi & Hartono (2010), Muttaqin & Sudarno (2012), and Kusumayanti & Widhiyani (2017) had proven that the reputation of KAP has a significant effect on the acceptance of going concern audit opinion. According to Muttaqin & Sudarno (2012), Wulandari (2014), Tandungan & Mertha (2016), and Ha et al. (2016) stated that auditor reputation negatively affects going concern audit opinion.

Mutchler (1984) conducted an interview with practitioner auditors who stated that companies that received a going concern audit opinion in the previous year were more likely to receive the same opinion in the current year. Mutchler (1984) examined the effect of the availability of public information on the prediction of going-concern audit opinion, which is the type of audit opinion the company has received. The results show that the discriminant analysis model that includes the previous year's type of audit opinion has the highest overall prediction accuracy of 89.9 percent compared to other models.

Research by Carcello & Neal (2000) and Rahmadhany (2004) strengthened the evidence regarding the going concern audit opinion received the previous year with the current year's going concern audit opinion. There is a significant positive relationship between the previous year's going concern audit opinion and the current year's going concern audit opinion. If in the previous year the auditor had issued a going concern audit opinion, the more likely it is that the auditor will re-issue the going concern audit opinion in the following year. Research conducted by Muttaqin & Sudarno (2012), Wulandari (2014), Ha, et al. (2016) and Syahputra & Yahya (2017) found a positive relationship between the previous year's going concern audit opinion and the current year's opinion. If in the previous year the company received a going concern audit opinion, in the current year it will tend to receive back going concern audit opinion

Research with the topic of going concern continues. A new development on this topic is the phenomenon of opinion shopping (auditor switching). Lennox (2000) used an audit reporting model to predict unexamined opinions and test their impact on auditor turnover. The results of this method conclude that companies in the UK practice opinion shopping. This is also supported by research by Muttaqin & Sudarno (2012), Kusumayanti & Widhiyani (2017) who said that opinion shopping has an effect on going concern audit opinion acceptance. According to

Praptitorini & Januarti (2007), Susanto (2009), Utama & Badera (2016) stated that opinion shopping has a negative effect on going concern audit opinion. conceptual and empirical studies, then the following hypothesis is drawn:

H1: Audit tenure has a negative effect on going concern audit opinion acceptance

H2: The reputation of KAP has a negative effect on the acceptance of going concern audit opinion

H3: Previous Year's Audit Opinion has a positive effect on the acceptance of going-concern audit opinion

H4: Opinion Shopping has a negative effect on going concern audit opinion acceptance

RESEARCH METHOD

The population in this study are all real estate and property companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange that have complete financial reports and are published in the Indonesian Capital Market Directory (ICMD) or the Indonesian Stock Exchange (IDX). The population that will be used in this study are real estate and property companies during the study period 2013 to 2017 which are listed on the IDX.

Research variables are audit tenure, public accounting firm reputation, previous year's audit opinion, and opinion shopping as independent variables, while the dependent variable is going concern audit opinion.

Audit tenure is measured by calculating the years in which the same KAP has engaged with the auditee. Audit tenure has a maximum value of 5 as regulated in the Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20/2015 Article 11 that the length of the audit engagement between KAP and the company is no longer than 5 consecutive years. Audit tenure is proxied by counting the number of years a KAP performs audit services on the same entity in a row. The tenure audit has a minimum value of 1, a maximum value of 5 (Tandungan & Mertha, 2017).

The reputation of the Public Accounting Firm (KAP) is measured using a dummy variable. Where the KAP that audits the company's financial statements is assessed based on the reputation of the KAP. Researchers give a value of 1 if the KAP is included in the big four, and 0 if it is not included in the big four accounting firm. KAP the big four includes Deloitte, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Ernst & Young, and KPMG (Tandungan & Mertha, 2017).

The regression model developed in this study is as follows:

$$GC = \alpha + \beta 1TENURE + \beta 2REPUTATION + \beta 3OPINBR + \beta 4OPINSP + \varepsilon$$

Information:
GC (going concern opinion): 1 for going concern opinion, and 0 for non going concern.
A: Constant
$\beta 1$- $\beta 4$: Regression Coefficient

ISSN: 2456-7760

TENURE: Long client relationship with the accounting firm
Public (Maximum 5)
REPUTATION: Auditor's reputation, 1 if the big four, and 0 if non big four.
OPINBR: Previous going concern audit opinion (1), opinion previous non going concern audit (0).
OPINSP: Companies that change auditors independent (1), for companies that do not change their independent auditors for the following year (0).
E: Residual / error coefficient

The feasibility of the regression model was assessed using the Hosmer and Lemeshow's Goodness of Fit Test. Hosmer and Lemeshow's Goodness of Fit Test is intended to test whether the empirical data fits or fits the model (there is no difference between the model and the data so that the model can be said to be fit). If the statistical value of Hosmer and Lemeshow's Goodness of Fit Test is equal to or less than 0.05, then there is a significant difference between the model and the observation value so that the Goodness fit model is not good because the model cannot predict the observation value. If the statistical value of Hosmer and Lemeshow; s Goodness of Fit Test is greater than 0.05, then the model is able to predict the value of the observation or it can be said that the model is acceptable because it fits the observation data (Ghozali, 2007).

Cox and Snell's R Square is a measure that tries to mimic the R measure of multiple regression which is based on a likelihood estimation technique with a maximum value of less than 1 so it is difficult to interpret. To get a coefficient of determination that can be interpreted as the value of R2 in multiple regression, Nagelkerke R Square is used. Nagelker's R Square is a modification of the Cox and Snell R Square coefficients to ensure that the value varies from 0 to 1. This is done by dividing the Cox and Snell R2 values by their maximum values (Ghozali, 2007). A small value means that the ability of the independent variables to explain the dependent variable is very limited. A value close to one means that the independent variables provide almost all the information needed to predict the variation in the dependent variable.

DISCUSSION RESULT

Research Sample Overview

The description of the research object examines the profile of the companies that are the samples in this study, namely real estate and property companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (BEI) from 2013 to 2017. The population used in this research is all real estate and property companies listed on the Stock Exchange. Indonesian Stock Exchange (IDX) from 2013 to 2017.

The data used are secondary data obtained from the annual financial reports of real estate and property companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) from 2013 to 2017. From these financial reports, data tabulation is carried out (data presentation in table form) Audit Tenure, Reputation, Previous Year's Audit Opinion, Opinion Shopping, and Going Concern Audit Opinion (Y). After being tabulated, the maximum, minimum, mean, and standard deviation values of each variable were interpreted.

Sample results that meet the criteria:

Table 1
Result of Data Collected

No.	Items	Result
1	Real estate and property companies on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) that publish complete and consistent financial reports from 2013-2017.	44
2	Real estate and property companies that do not have a complete independent auditor's report consistently in 2013-2017.	(1)
3	Company sample	43
4	Observation (43 x 5 years)	215

Logistic Regression Analysis
Goodness of Fit Test Regression Model

Table 2
Hosmer and Lemeshow's *Goodness of Fit Test*

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	1,629	3	,653

Based on the results of data processing, the probability value of Hosmer and Lemeshow's Goodness of Fit Test = 0.653. The probability value of Hosmer and Lemeshow's Goodness of Fit Test = 0.653> 0.05. This means that the model can predict the value of its observations or the model is acceptable.

Nagelkerke's R^2 Test

Table 3
Result Nagelkerke's R^2 Test

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	43,304[a]	,244	,639

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 20 because maximum iterations has been reached. Final solution cannot be found.

Nagelkerke's R2 test is intended to see the ability of the variability of the independent variable to explain the dependent variable. Based on the results of data processing, the Nagelkerke's R2 value is 0.639 which means that the variability of the dependent variable (going concern audit opinion) can be explained by the variability of the independent variable audit tenure, KAP reputation, previous year's audit opinion, and opinion shopping of 63.9%, while the rest 36.1% was explained by other variables not included in the model.

Overall Fit Model Test

Table 4
Fit Model 1 Test

Iteration History[a,b,c]

Iteration		-2 Log likelihood	Coefficients Constant
Step 0	1	118,273	-1,740
	2	104,519	-2,403
	3	103,562	-2,637
	4	103,552	-2,664
	5	103,552	-2,664

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. Initial -2 Log Likelihood: 103,552

c. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Testing the fit model is assessing the overall fit of the model against the data. This fit model test uses the Likelihood L value. Based on the results of the data processing, the Likelihood L (-2Log L) value for the model is only with a constant = 103.552, while the value of $\chi 2$ table = n - q = 215 - 1 = 214, the value of $\chi 2$ table with α 5% (0.05) = 124.342. The value of -2log L = 103.552 <$\chi 2$ table with α 5% (0.05) = 124.342, so that the model with only constants is fit with the data.

Table 5
Fit Model 2 Test

Iteration History[a,b,c,d]

Iteration		-2 Log likelihood	Coefficients				
			Constant	AT	KAP	OA	OS
Step 1	1	84,124	-1,322	-,203	,244	,839	3,519
	2	55,741	-1,031	-,636	,662	2,062	5,466
	3	46,419	,645	-1,473	1,265	3,536	7,879
	4	43,744	2,292	-2,250	1,827	4,637	10,316
	5	43,356	2,922	-2,584	2,153	5,165	12,024
	6	43,320	3,025	-2,644	2,222	5,273	13,165
	7	43,310	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	14,173
	8	43,307	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	15,174
	9	43,305	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	16,175
	10	43,305	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	17,175
	11	43,305	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	18,175
	12	43,305	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	19,175
	13	43,305	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	20,175
	14	43,305	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	21,175
	15	43,304	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	22,175
	16	43,304	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	23,175
	17	43,304	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	24,175
	18	43,304	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	25,175
	19	43,304	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	26,175
	20	43,304	3,028	-2,646	2,225	5,277	27,175

a. Method: Enter

b. Constant is included in the model.

c. Initial -2 Log Likelihood: 103,552

d. Estimation terminated at iteration number 20 because maximum iterations has been reached. Final solution cannot be found.

Vol. 4, No. 12; 2020

ISSN: 2456-7760

Then for testing the second fit model is to enter the constant and audit tenure variables, KAP reputation, previous year's audit opinion, and opinion shopping. Based on the results of data processing, the value of Likelihood L (-2 Log L) for the constant model with company characteristics variables = 103.552, while the value of 2 table = n - q = 215-5 = 210, the value of χ2 table with α 5% (0.05) = 124,342. The value of -2log L = 103.552 <χ2 table with α 5% (0.05) = 124.342, so the model with audi tenure constants and variables, KAP reputation, previous year's audit opinion, and opinion shopping fit the data.

Parameter Estimation dan Interprestation

The following is Table 7 of the estimation results of the logistic regression equation model:

$$\text{Ln } \frac{P}{1-P} = \alpha + \beta_1\text{ATit} + \beta_2\text{KAP}_{it} + \beta_3\text{OA}_{it} + \beta_4\text{OS}_{it} + e$$

Table 6

Result Logistic Regression with OLS Method

Variable	Coef. Regression	Standart Error	Wald-statistic	Prob.
Constanta	3,028	2,658	1,298	0,255
Audit Tenure	-2,646	1,013	6,827	0,009
Reputation	-2,225	1,007	4,883	0,027
Prev. year Audit Opinion	5,277	1,710	9,522	0,002
Opinion Shopping	-27,175	12415,677	0,0001	0,998
Nagelkerke R^2 : 0,639				
Cox & Snell R^2 : 0,244				
χ2 H & L Test : 1,629, p = 0,653.				
N: 215				

Source: Data Processed 2018.

Here is the maximum likelihood parameter estimate of the model:

$$\text{Ln } \frac{P}{1-P} = 3{,}028 - 2{,}646\text{ATit} - 2{,}225\text{REP}_{it} + 5{,}277\text{OA}_{it} - 27{,}175\text{OS}_{it} + e$$

From the above equation it can be interpreted as follows:

a. Konstanta = 3.028

This means that if the audit tenure, reputation, previous year's audit opinion, and opinion shopping have increased by 1, then the log of odds going concern audit opinion will be 3.028 for companies with going concern audit opinion or not assuming other variables are constant (ceteris paribus).

b. Audit tenure regression coefficient = -2.646

This means that if the audit tenure increases by 1, then the log of odds going concern audit opinion will decrease by 2.646 for companies with going concern audit opinion or not, assuming other variables are constant (ceteris paribus).

c. Reputation regression coefficient = -2,225

This means that if the reputation has increased by 1, then the log of odds going concern audit opinion will decrease by 2,225 for companies with going concern audit opinion or not, assuming other variables are constant (ceteris paribus).

d. The previous year's audit opinion regression coefficient = 5,277

This means that if the previous year's audit opinion has increased by 1, the going concern audit opinion log of odds will increase by 5.277 for companies with going concern audit opinion or not, assuming other variables are constant (ceteris paribus).

e. Opinion shopping regression coefficient = -27,175

This means that if the opinion shopping increases by 1, then the log of odds going concern audit opinion will decrease by 27.175 for companies with going concern audit opinion or not, assuming other variables are constant (ceteris paribus).

Effect of Audit Tenure on Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions

The results of the logistic regression estimation of the audit tenure variable on going-concern opinion as the dependent variable show an estimate of -2.646 which has a negative direction, this is in accordance with the negative direction predictions. This means that the longer the audit tenure, the lower the going concern audit opinion acceptance. The significance test with the Wald test obtained Wald-statistical p-value = 0.009 and with a significance level (α) = 5%. Therefore p value = 0.009 <level of significance = 0.05. This means that audit tenure has a significant effect on going concern audit opinion. This shows that the audit tenure has a negative and significant effect on going concern audit opinion. This condition occurs because the long engagement can lead to reduced KAP independence, and if the auditor's independence is reduced, the opinion issued by the auditor is a misleading opinion and will be detrimental to various parties. Based on the above analysis, it can be concluded that H1 is accepted statistically by the research results.

The results of this study are consistent with the results of research by Junaidi & Hartono (2010) and Utama & Badera (2016) which statd that the longer the relationship between the auditor and the client, it is feared the lower the disclosure of the company's inability to maintain its business continuity. This will affect the acceptance of going concern audit opinion on the company (Junaidi & Hartono, 2010). The closeness between the auditor and the auditee is very likely to affect the independence of an auditor, especially in relation to the unwillingness of the auditor to lose high fees when faced with the responsibility of issuing an audit opinion with a modified going concern (Utama & Badera, 2016). Thus, the greater the audit tenure, the lower the possibility of the company receiving going concern audit opinion.

Effect of Public Accountant Firm Reputation on Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions

The logistic regression estimation results of the reputation variable ongoing-concern opinion as the dependent variable shows an estimate of -2,225 which has a negative direction, this is in accordance with the negative direction predictions. This means that the higher the reputation, the lower the going concern audit opinion acceptance. The significance test with the Wald test obtained Wald-statistical p-value = 0.027 and with a significance level (α) = 5%. Therefore p value = 0.027 <level of significance = 0.05. This means that the reputation of KAP has a significant effect on going concern audit opinion. This shows that the reputation of KAP has a negative and significant effect on going concern audit opinion. Companies that use auditing firm that are included in the big four are not guaranteed to get going concern audit opinion, on the other hand companies that don't use auditing firm the big four get going concern audit opinions. Based on the above analysis, it can be concluded that H2 is accepted statistically by the research results.

The research results prove that auditors who are in big Four auditing firm do not always issue going concern audit opinion but in this study more going concern audit opinion is issued or given by auditors who are in non big four. These results support the research results of Muttaqin & Sudarno (2012), Wulandari (2014), Tandungan & Mertha (2016), and Ha et al. (2016) which stated that auditor reputation negatively affects going concern audit opinion.

The Effect of the Previous Year's Audit Opinion on the Acceptance of the Going Concern Audit Opinion

The logistic regression estimation result of the previous year's audit opinion variable on going-concern opinion as the dependent variable shows an estimate of 5,277 which has a positive direction, this is in accordance with the positive direction predictions. This means that the auditor is likely to provide a going concern audit opinion if the auditee receives a going concern audit opinion in the previous year. The significance test with the Wald test obtained Wald-statistical p-value = 0.002 and with a significance level (α) = 5%. Therefore p value = 0.002 <level of significance = 0.05. This means that the previous year's audit opinion has a significant effect on going-concern audit opinion. This shows that the previous year's audit opinion has a positive and significant effect on going-concern audit opinion. Therefore, a company that received a going concern audit opinion in the previous year has the potential to influence the auditor's judgment in issuing a going concern audit opinion in the following year. Based on the results of the above analysis, it can be concluded that H3 is statistically accepted by the research results.

The previous year's audit opinion is the audit opinion received by the company in the previous year or one year prior to the research year. Companies that have received a going concern audit opinion in the previous year are considered to have problems in maintaining their survival, so it is likely that the auditor will provide a going concern audit opinion again in the current year (Santosa & Wedari, 2007). This is because the business activities of a company in the current year cannot be separated from the conditions that occurred in the previous year. Mutchler (1984) conducted an interview with practitioner auditors who stated that companies that received a going concern audit opinion in the previous year were more likely to receive the same opinion in the current year.

Mutchler (1984) examined the effect of the availability of public information on the prediction of going-concern audit opinion, which is the type of audit opinion the company has received. The results show that the discriminant analysis model that includes the previous year's type of audit opinion has the highest overall prediction accuracy of 89.9 percent compared to other models. Research by Carcello & Neal (2000), Rahmadhany (2004) strengthened the evidence regarding the going concern audit opinion received the previous year with the current year's going concern audit opinion. There is a significant positive relationship between the previous year's going concern audit opinion and the current year's going concern audit opinion. If in the previous year the auditor had issued a going concern audit opinion, the more likely it is that the auditor will re-issue the going concern audit opinion in the following year. Research conducted by Muttaqin & Sudarno (2012), Wulandari (2014), Ha et al. (2016), and Syahputra & Yahya (2017) found a positive relationship between the previous year's going concern audit opinion and the current year's opinion. If in the previous year the company received a going concern audit opinion, in the current year it will tend to receive back going concern audit opinion.

The Effect of Opinion Shopping on the Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions

The results of research using logistic regression show that opinion shopping has no significant effect on going concern audit opinion on real estate and property companies in 2013-2017. The regression coefficient for opinion shopping is -27.175 with a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$, so the regression coefficient is not significant because the significance is 0.998> 0.05, so it can be concluded that the opinion shopping variable has no significant effect on the acceptance of going concern audit opinion. This means that the size of an opinion shopping cannot determine whether the company is experiencing a going-be-turbulent audit opinion or not. So it can be concluded that H4 failed to be supported, which means that opinion shopping has no effect on going concern audit opinion.

The results of this study explain that management's efforts to cooperate with auditors who are willing to accept the proposed accounting treatment have no effect on going concern audit opinion acceptance. The results of this study are consistent with previous research conducted by Ardiani & Azlina (2012) which stated that opinion shopping has no effect on going concern audit opinion acceptance. Research in Indonesia by Praptitorini & Januarti (2007) shew that companies tend to use the same independent auditors regardless of the audit opinion given, because companies are reluctant to change independent auditors. This can be seen from the issuance of a regulation on the length of time to use an independent auditor for three years and a public accounting firm for five years.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

Based on the results of research using logistic regression, the results show that audit tenure has a negative and significant effect on going concern audit opinion. The results of this study prove that the longer the audit tenure, the lower the going concern audit opinion acceptance. The results of the study using logistic regression showed that the reputation of the public accounting firm had a negative and significant effect on going concern audit opinion. The results of this study prove that the larger the auditor scale, the less likely the auditor will issue a going concern audit opinion.

The results of the study using logistic regression showed that the previous year's audit opinion had a positive and significant effect on going-concern audit opinion. The results of this study prove that the auditor is likely to provide a going concern audit opinion if the auditee receives a going concern audit opinion in the previous year. The result of the research using logistic regression shows that opinion shopping has no effect on going concern audit opinion.

Recommendation

By paying attention to some of the limitations of the research that have been presented, suggestions for further research can be given, namely adding years of research observations, adding other variables, and it is hoped that they can research different company sectors.

REFERENCES

AICPA. 1988. The *Auditor's Considerations of an Entity's Ability to Continue as a Going-Concern*. *Statement on Auditing Standards No.59.* Auditing Standards Board (ASB).

Ardiani, Nurul., Emrinaldi N. D. P., & Nur Azlina. 2012. Pengaruh Audit Tenure, Disclosure, Ukuran KAP, Debt Default, Opinion Shopping, dan Kondisi Keuangan terhadap Penerimaan Opini Audit Going Concern pada Perusahaan Real Estate dan Property di Bursa Efek Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi*, *20*(4). (https://ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JE/article/view/1179/1170)

Carcello, Joseph V. Hermanson., & Roger H. McGrath Neal. 1992. Audit Quality Attributes: The Perception of Audit Partners, Prepares & Financial Statement Users. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory*, 1-15. (https://search.proquest.com/openview/3c614634d67b0236a32fd7fcd12f6f79/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=31718)

Chen, K. C., & B. K. Church. 1992. Default on Debt Obligations and The Issuance of Going Concern Report. *Auditing: Journal Practice and Theory*, *11*(2), 30-49. (http://repository.ust.hk/ir/Record/1783.1-31836)

Craswell, A. T. 1995. Auditor Brand Name Reputations and Industry Specializations. *Journal of Accounting and Economics 20 (December)*, 297-322. (https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0165410195004033)

Fitriani, Lingga. 2007. Disclosure Index Laporan Tahunan 2004 Emiten di BEJ. *Proceeding PESAT (Psikologi, Ekonomi, Sastra, Arsitek dan Sipil*, *2*, 190-194.(http://publication.gunadarma.ac.id/bitstream/123456789/584/1/Lingga___Dharma_TE.pdf)

Freeman, R. Edward. 1983. Stockholders and Stakeholders: A New Perspective on Corporate Governance. *California Management Review* (pre-1986); Spring ABI/INFORM Global

Friedman, M. 1962. *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Geiger, Marshall A., & K. Raghunandan. 2002. Auditor Tenure and Audit Reporting Failures. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, *21*(1), 67-78. (http://aaajournals.org/doi/pdf/10.2308/aud.2002.21.1.67)

Ghozali, Imam., & Anis Chariri. 2007. *Teori Akuntansi*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Ghozali, Imam. 2007. *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program SPSS*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Gray, R. Owen, D, C. Owens, D., Evans, R, & Zadek, S (1997) Struggling With the Praxis of Social Accounting; Stakeholder, Accountability, Audit, and Procedures. *Accounting, Auditing, and Accountability Journal* Vol. *10*, No.3. Pp. 325-64

Ha, Thuy T., Nguyen, Truc A. T., & Nguyen, Trieu T. 2016. Factors Influencing the Auditor's Going Concern Opinion Decision**.** *The 10th International Days of Statistics and Economics.*(https://scholar.google.com.vn/citations?user=Q7tp530AAAAJ&hl=en)

Ikatan Akuntan Indonesia (IAI). 2001. *Pertimbangan Auditor Atas Kemampuan Satuan Usaha Dalam Mempertahankan Kelangsungan Hidupnya*, PSA 30. Standar Profesional Akuntan Publik (SPAP). Jakarta.

Institut Akuntan Publik Indonesia. 2011. *Standar Profesional Akuntan Publik.* Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

Jensen, M.C., & W. H. Meckling. 1976. Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behaviour Agency Cost and Ownership Structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *3*(4), 305-360. (https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0304405X7690026X)

Junaidi & Hartono, J. 2010. Faktor Non Keuangan pada Opini Going Concern. *Simposium Nasional Akuntansi XIII Purwokerto*. (accessed : http://akuntansia.com/faktor-nonkeuangan-pada-opini-going-concern/)

Kusumayanti, Ni Putu E., & Ni L. H. Widhiyani. 2017. Pengaruh Opinion Shopping, Disclosure dan Reputasi KAP pada Opini Audit Going Concern. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas*

Udayana, 18 (3), 2290-2317. (https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/Akuntansi/article/view/26390)

Lennox, Clive S. 2000. Going Concern Opinions in Failing Companies: Auditor Independence and Opinion Shopping. *SSRN Electronic Journal.* (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228236036_Going-concern_Opinions_in_Failing_Companies_Auditor_Dependence_and_Opinion_Shopping)

Mutchler, Jane F. 1984. Auditor's Perceptions of the Going Concern Opinion Decision. *A Journal of Practice and Theory, 3*(2), 17-30.

Muttaqin, Ariffandita Nuri., & Sudarno. 2012. Analisis Pengaruh Rasio Keuangan dan Faktor Non Keuangan terhadap Penerimaan Opini Audit Going Concern (Studi Empiris pada Perusahaan Manufaktur di BEI Tahun 2008-2010). *Diponegoro Journal of Accounting, 1*(2), 1-13. (https://ejournal.undip.ac.id/index.php/akuditi/article/view/4684)

Praptitorini, Mirna D., & Indira Januarti. 2007. Analisis Pengaruh Kualitas Audit, Debt Default, dan Opinion Shopping terhadap Penerimaan Opini Audit Going Concern. *Simposium Nasional Akuntansi X. (http://eprints.undip.ac.id/15187)*

Ramadhany, Alexander. 2004. Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Penerimaan Opini Going Concern pada Perusahaan Manufaktur yang Mengalami Financial Distress di Bursa Efek Jakarta. *Jurnal MAKSI, 4*, 146-160. (http://eprints.undip.ac.id/35058/)

Santosa, Arga Fajar., & Linda K. Wedari. 2007. Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kecenderungan Penerimaan Opini Audit Going Concern. *Jurnal Akuntansi dan Auditing Indonesia, 11* (2). (http://journal.uii.ac.id/JAAI/article/view/217/0)

Setiawan, Santy. 2006. Opini *going Concern* dan Prediksi Kebangkrutan Perusahaan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi*, 5(1), 59-67. (https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?user=Xcba1iEAAAAJ&hl=id)

Setyarno, Eko Budi., Indira Januarti., & Faisal. 2006. Pengaruh Kualitas Audit, Kondisi Keuangan Perusahaan, Opini Audit Tahun Sebelumnya, Pertumbuhan Perusahaan terhadap Opini Audit Going Concern. *Simposium Nasional Akuntansi 9 Padang*. (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326207820_Pengaruh_Kualitas_Audit_Kondisi_Keuangan_Perusahaan_Opini_Audit_Tahun_Sebelumnya_Pertumbuhan_Perusahaan_Terhadap_Opini_Audit_Going_Concern)

Susanto, Yulius Kurnia. 2009. Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Penerimaan Opini Audit Going Concern pada Perusahaan Publik Sektor Manufaktur. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Akuntansi, 2*(3), 155-173. (http://jurnaltsm.id/index.php/JBA/article/view/242)

Syahputra, Fauzan., & M. Yahya, Rizal. 2017. Pengaruh Audit Tenure, Audit Delay, Opini Audit Tahun Sebelumnya dan Opinion Shopping terhadap Penerimaan Opini Audit Going Concern pada Perusahaan Manufaktur yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun

ISSN: 2456-7760

2013-2015. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Ekonomi Akuntansi*, *2*(3), 39-47. (http://etd.unsyiah.ac.id/index.php?p=show_detail&id=32032)

Tandungan, Debby., & I Made Mertha. 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. (https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/Akuntansi/article/view/14366)

Utama, I Gusti Putu O. S. & I Dewa N. Badera. 2016. Penerimaan Opini Audit dengan Modifikasi Going Concern dan Faktor-Faktor Prediktornya. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas Udayana*, *14*(2), 893-919. (https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/Akuntansi/article/view/14499)

Venuti, Elizabeth K. 2007. The Going Concern Assumption Revisited : Assessing a Company's Future Viability. *The CPA Journal Online.(* https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291023520_The_going-concern_assumption_revisited_Assessing_a_company%27s_future_viability)

Wulandari, Soliyah. 2014. Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Auditor dalam Memberikan Opini Audit GoingConcern. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas Udayana*, *6* (3), 531-558. (https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/Akuntansi/search/authors/view?firstName=Soliyah&middleName=&lastName=Wulandari&affiliation=&country=)