

Influence of Audit Opinions, Auditor Reputation, Company Growth, and Profitability on Going Concern Audit Opinions

Niken Lestari Putri, Nur Isna Inayati*, Eko Haryanto, Edi Joko Setyadi

Faculty of Economics and Business, Muhammadiyah University Purwokerto

*) corresponding author, email: nurisnainayati@ump.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 06/05/2021

Revised: 13/11/2021

Accepted: 29/02/2022

Key Words:

Audit Opinion Years
Previously, Auditor
Reputation, Company
Growth, Profitability,
Going Concern Audit
Opinion.

DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/jai.11.1.1-20>

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to determine how previous audit opinion, auditor reputation, company growth, and profitability affect going concern audit opinion. The sample used in this empirical study was mining companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in the 2014-2019 period. Purposive sampling was used to collect as many as 29 samples of research firms over the course of six years. The data used was secondary data collected from that Indonesian Stock Exchange and each company's website. The data analysis technique used is logistic regression. The study revealed that auditor reputation opinion and company growth had no effect on going concern audit opinion. While the audit opinion variable in previous years has a significant effect on going concern audit opinion, and the profitability variable had a negative effect on going concern audit opinion.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menguji pengaruh opini audit tahun sebelumnya, reputasi auditor, pertumbuhan perusahaan, dan profitabilitas terhadap opini audit going concern. Sampel yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah perusahaan pertambangan yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia periode 2014-2019. Metode pengambilan sampel menggunakan purposive sampling sehingga diperoleh sebanyak 29 sampel perusahaan penelitian selama 6 tahun. Jenis data yang digunakan adalah data sekunder yang diperoleh dari Bursa Efek Indonesia dan website setiap perusahaan. Teknik analisis data yang digunakan adalah regresi logistik. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa variabel reputasi auditor dan pertumbuhan perusahaan tidak berpengaruh terhadap opini audit going concern. Sedangkan opini audit tahun sebelumnya berpengaruh positif terhadap opini audit going concern dan profitabilitas berpengaruh negatif terhadap opini audit going concern.



Jurnal Akuntansi Indonesia | Copyright (c) 2022 Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the entity is to maintain survival. Business continuity in a company always lives with management capabilities in the company's survival (Bayudi & Wirawati, 2017). A sustainable condition by a company can indicate business continuity (going concern), such as recurring operating losses that cast doubt on the company (Krissindiastuti & Rasmini, 2016). Financial reports can be used to predict whether or not a company will survive. Stakeholders believe that the issuance of a going concern audit opinion can be used to predict whether or not a company will fail (Purba & Nazir, 2018).

One of the variables that may affect a going concern audit opinion is the previous year's audit opinion. The prior year's audit opinion was a previous year's audit opinion issued to

the auditee (Nainggolan, 2016). This research was previously conducted by Ekarini (2016), Rahayuningsih (2014), Bintang et al (2019), Putri & Fettry (2017), and Savitri and Mahendra (2018) which in his research found that the previous year's audit opinion had a positive effect on going-concern audit opinion. However, different from research conducted by Krissindiastuti & Rasmini (2016), and Syahputra & Yahya (2017) confirmed that the audit opinion from the previous year had no bearing on the audit opinion for the current year.

The second factor that affects going concern audit opinion is the auditors reputation. Auditor reputation is a public trust given to the auditor for the performance of an auditor. Auditors with good reputations can provide good quality to reveal going concern problems, and tend to maintain audit quality to maintain their reputation (Miraningtyas & Yudowati, 2019). Research conducted by Kemuning & Juliarsa (2016), Yuridiskasari & Rahmatika (2017), Sarra & Alamsyah (2018), Rahayuningsih (2014), and Ginting & Surayana (2014) claims that auditor credibility has a positive influence on the acceptance of going concern audit opinions. The findings of this research differed from those of Miraningtyas and Yudowati's study (2017) which states that the auditor's reputation does not significantly affect the going concern audit opinion.

The next factor is company growth. Company growth is the amount of a company's ability to improve and maintain its economic position in the industry and as a whole (Muslimah & Triyanto, 2019). In research conducted by Immanuel & Aprilyanti (2019), Ginting & Surayana (2014), Krissindiastuti and Rasmini (2016), Ekarini (2016), Savitri & Mahendra (2018), and Ariska et al (2019) confirmed that company growth does have a negative impact on the audit opinion of a going concern. But contrary to research conducted by Muslimah and Triyanto (2019), Purba & Nazir (2018), Santrian and Alfia (2020), and Djoko & Yanti (2019) which states that the company's growth does not affect the going concern audit opinion.

Another factor is profitability. According to Purba & Nazir (2018) profitability is a ratio that measures the level of profit or company performance. Apart from being used to assess company performance, profitability can also influence the business decisions of investors and creditors. Companies with a good level of profitability will be considered better in the eyes of investors. Ariasetiawan & Rahayu (2015) Research conducted by Ariasetiawan & Rahayu (2015), Haryanto (2019), Santrian and Alfia (2020), Djoko & Yanti (2019), Purba & Nazir (2018), and Tryansyah & Khairunnisa (2019) state that profitability does have a negative effect on going concern opinion.

Based on the above background, the researcher raised the research theme with the title "**Influence of Audit Opinions, Auditor Reputation, Company Growth, and Profitability on Going Concern Audit Opinions**".

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

2.1. Agency Theory

Agency theory, according to Jensen and Meckling (1976), is a theory that explains the relationship between two individuals who have opposing interests, the principal (business owner) and the agent (management of a company). According to Jensen and Meckling (1976) in Sarra & Alamsyah (2019), the agency relationship has a contract where one or more principals instruct others to distribute services on behalf of the principal and authorize the

agent to make decisions for business owner.

The relationship between principals & agents raises two problems, namely: (1) the presence of asymmetric information, more information is known to managers than company owners regarding financial reports and company operations. (2) there is a conflict of interest between owners and managers, where their goals are not in line and managers always act according to their own wishes (Suharto, 2020).

2.2. Going Concern Audit Opinion

Going concern is described by Tuanakotta (2014) in Suharto (2020) as a business entity's ability to sustain its business continuity for a period of not more than one year from the date of audited financial statements. If the auditor finds any concerns regarding the company's financial position in preserving its business continuity, a going concern audit opinion will be issued (Muslimah & Triyanto, 2019). The auditor determines the acceptance of a going concern audit opinion if conditions and events are found in the audit process that lead to doubts about the survival of the company.

2.3. Previous Year's Audit Opinion

The audit opinion received by the company in the year prior to the research year is called the previous year's audit opinion. There are two forms of audit opinion, among others, going concern opinion and non goingconcern opinion. Auditors can consider opinions to reissue opinions in the following year (Putri & Fettry, 2017).

2.4. Auditor's Reputation

Auditor's reputation is the trust of the public on the achievements of the auditors. Craswell et al. (1995) in Ardi et al (2019) state that clients usually perceive auditors who come from big four public accounting firms and have affiliations with KAPs that have international networks of higher quality because the auditors from these KAPs have audit quality standards, training and peer- better review.

2.5. Company Growth

Company growth is the ability of a company to finance the company's operational activities and indicates that the company can maintain its survival (Purba & Nazir, 2018). The sales growth ratio can be used to gauge a company's progress. The sales growth ratio shows an increase in sales volume or revenue that supports the company in its efforts to increase profits to show the company's strength in maintaining its business continuity (Tryansyah & Khairunnisa, 2019).

2.6. Profitability

According to Tryansyah & Khairunnisa (2019) Profitability ratio is the ratio used to measure the level of company profit which shows the better management in managing the company. The performance of a company and its ability to use its assets productively are used to determine its profitability; Thus, a company's profitability can be determined by comparing the profit received over a period to the total assets or capital held by the company (Purba and Nazir (2018).

2.7. The Influence of the Prior Opinion on the Going Concern Audit Opinion

The previous year's audit opinion refers to the prior opinion. This opinion will have an impact on the acceptance of a going concern audit opinion. Companies that got a going

concern audit opinion the previous year are thought to be having difficulties retaining their business continuity, so the auditor may return this year to provide a going concern audit opinion (Princess & Fettry, 2017).

H1: PreviousYear's Audit Opinion has a positive effect on going concern audit opinion.

2.8. The Effect of Auditor's Reputation on Going Concern Audit Opinions

Auditors must be brave in expressing the problems of the client's company survival. Large-scale auditors can provide quality audit reports than small-scale auditors, including going-concern audit opinion disclosures. The reputation of an auditor is proxied by an auditor who works at KAP affiliated with Big Four KAP.

H2: Auditor's reputation has a positive effect on going concern audit opinion.

2.9. The Effect of Company Growth on Going Concern Audit Opinions

The pace of revenue growth influences company growth, which indicates the company's ability to sustain business continuity. This ratio can be used to determine a company's ability to sustain its financial position across all industrial and economic activities (Suharsono, 2018). Sales is the main business activity of the company. Year after year, the company's revenues rise, which provides opportunities for the company to increase profits. Therefore, the auditor will issue a going concern non-audit opinion if the company's sales growth rate is high (Suharsono, 2018).

H3: Company growth has a negative effect on going concern audit opinion.

2.10. The Effect of Profitability on Going Concern Audit Opinions

According to Hery (2016, 192) in Angel (2018), profitability is a ratio that tries to explain the company's capabilities and resources, namely the capabilities and resources of sales activities, use of assets, and use of capital. Companies that have high profitability indicate that they can carry out their business, and on the other hand, companies that have low profitability indicate that the company is in a bad monetary situation & become the auditor's consideration to provide a going concern audit opinion.

H4: Profitability has a negative impact on the audit going-concern opinion.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

3.1. Types of research

The analysis is a descriptive quantitative research study. Quantitative research, namely research based on quantitative data, is data in the form of numbers or numbers (Suliyanto, 2018). This study was conducted to analyze the factors that influence going concern audit opinion on mining companies listed on the Indonesian Stock Exchange.

3.2. Population and Sample

The sampling technique is using purposive sampling technique, purposive sampling is a sampling method that uses certain parameters and is based on characteristics defined by the researcher himself, requiring that the sample used follow these criteria. The requirements for determining the sample for the purposive sampling are 1) Mining companies were listed on the IDX in 2014 until 2019, 2) The company publishes audited financial reports and published successively from 2014-2019, 3) The annual report includes reports independent

auditors, as well as complete available data required.

3.3. Types and Sources of Data

Secondary data is information derived indirectly from the research topic in this report. The data for this analysis came from the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) website at www.idx.co.id from 2014 to 2019.

3.4. Variable Types and Measurements Dependent Variable

In this analysis, the audit going concern opinion is the dependent variable. A going concern audit opinion is the opinion provided by the auditor to ensure that the company will be able to continue operating in the future (Syahputra, 2017). In this analysis, a dummy is used to measure the going concern audit opinion. A value of 1 is assigned to companies that receive a going concern audit opinion, while a value of 0 is assigned to companies that receive a non-going concern audit opinion.

3.5. Independent Variable Previous Year's Audit Opinion

The previous year's audit opinion is referred to as the prior year's duration of prior audit opinion. A dummy variable coded 1 if the auditor released a going concern audit opinion the previous year and 0 if the auditor issued a non-going concern audit opinion is used to determine this variable (Syahputra & Yahya, 2017).

3.6. Auditor's Reputation

Auditor's reputation is a public trust given to auditors for the achievements of an auditor. The size of the Public Accounting Firm is used to measure the auditor's reputation in this report (Tryansyah & Khairunnisa, 2019). The auditor's reputation variable is measured using a dummy. If the auditor comes from a KAP that is included in the big four, it will be given code 1, whereas if it is not included in the non-big four KAP, it will be coded 0 (Miraningtyas and Yudowati, 2019).

3.7. Company Growth

Company growth is a measure of a company's ability to maintain economic conditions in industry and business as a whole (Ginting & Suryana, 2018). Company growth can be proxied by the ratio of sales growth (Muslimah & Triyanto, 2019). The following is the sales growth formula:

$$\frac{Net\ Sales(t) - Net\ Sales(t-1)}{Net\ Sales(t-1)} \quad (1)$$

3.8. Profitability

Profitability shows how the company's ability to generate profits in carrying out its operational activities (Angel, 2018). The return on assets (ROA) profitability ratio was used in this analysis (Purba & Nazir, 2018).

$$ROA = \frac{Net\ Profit}{Total\ Assets} \times 100\% \quad (2)$$

3.9. Data Analysis Technique

Data that is ready to be processed will be tested using the SPSS version 25 program. To test the hypotheses that have been formulated.

3.10. Regression Coefficient Analysis

The following is the regression model that was used to evaluate the hypothesis:

$$\ln \frac{Gc}{1 - Gc} = \alpha + b_1OATS + b_2RA + b_3PTP + b_4PF + e \quad (3)$$

Information:

- $\ln \frac{Gc}{1 - Gc}$ = Audit Opinion *Going Concern*
 a = Constant
 OATS = Previous Year's Audit Opinion
 RA = Auditor's reputation
 PTP = Company Growth
 PF = Profitability
 $b_1b_2b_3$ = Regression Coefficient
 e = *Error term*

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics Test Results

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
COMPANY GROWTH	174	-0.98	67.43	1,0100	6,57290
PTOFITABILITY	174	-3.93	1.01	0.0060	0.33442
Valid N (listwise)	174				

Source: Processed by the author, January 2021

The results of descriptive analysis in table 1 show that the number of observed samples is 174, the lowest (minimum) company growth value in this study is -0.98 and the highest (maximum) is 67.43 with an average (mean) value of 1.0100 and a standard deviation amounting to 6,57290. The average or mean value of company growth is 1.0100 and is smaller than the standard deviation, which is $1.0100 < 6.48610$, which means that the overall data distribution of the value of company growth is said to be not good, because the data distribution varies, which means that the average profitability has deviations. tall one. The lowest (minimum) profitability value in this study was -3.93 and the highest (maximum) was 1.01 with an average (mean) value of 0.0060 and a standard deviation of 0.33442. The average or mean valueprofitability the little one from the data obtained amounting to 0.33442and smaller than the standard deviation, namely $0.33442 > 0.32728$, it can be concluded that the overall data distribution of the value of profitability is said to be good.

4.2. Frequency Analysis

Table 2. Frequency of Going Concern Audit Opinion Variable
GOING CONCERN

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NONGOING CONCERN	135	77.6	77.6	77.6
	GOING CONCERN	39	22.4	22.4	100.0
Total		174	100.0	100.0	

Source: Processed by the author, January 2021

Based on table 2 above shows a total sample of 174 in the period 2014 to 2019. A total of 135 data (77.6 percent) are included in the non-going concern audit opinion category, while the remaining 39 data or 22.4 percent are included in the going concern audit opinion category.

Table 3. Frequency of Previous Year's Audit Opinion Variable
PREVIOUS YEAR AUDIT OPINION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	OATS NON OAGC	137	78.7	78.7	78.7
	OATS OAGC	37	21.3	21.3	100.0
Total		174	100.0	100.0	

Source: Processed by the author, January 2021

Based on table 3 above shows a total sample of 174 companies in the period 2014 to 2019. As many as 137 or 78.7% of companies received non-going concern opinions in the previous year and as many as 37 or 21.3% of companies received going concern audit opinions in the previous year.

Table 4. Auditor Reputation Variable Frequency
AUDITOR'S REPUTATION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NON BIG4	82	47.1	47.1	47.1
	BIG4	92	52.9	52.9	100.0
Total		174	100.0	100.0	

Source: Processed by the author, January 2021

Table 4 shows the number of observation samples as many as 174, out of 174 samples of observations categorized as 0 (companies audited by KAP Non Big Four) as many as 82 or 47.1 percent, and the rest categorized as 1 (companies audited by Big Four KAP) as many as 92 or 52.9 percent.

4.3. Assessing the Feasibility of a Regression Model

Table 5. Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	1,518	8	0.992

Source: Processed by the author, January 2021

Based on table 5 shows that the value *Hosmer and Lemeshow's Goodness of Fit* 1,518 with a significant probability value of 0.992, which means the value is > 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that the model is appropriate and can predict the variables in this study, so that the model can be used in further analysis.

4.4. Assessing Model Fit

Table 6. Overall Model Fit Test Results

<i>Block number - 0 -2 Log likelihood</i>	<i>Block number - 1 -2 Log likelihood</i>
185,762	82,704

Source: Processed by the author, January 2021

Based on table 6, it shows that the initial -2LogLikelihood value of block number 0 is 185.762 and the final -2LogLikelihood value of block number 1 is 82.704. This value has decreased, namely $185,762 - 82,704 = 103,058$. This means that the null hypothesis is accepted, and the hypothesized model is in agreement with the data to be evaluated, or the data is fit with the hypothesized model.

4.5. Determination Coefficient Test (Nagelkerke's R Square)

Table 7. Test result *Nagelkerke's R Square* Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	56,895a	0.522	0.796

Source: Processed by the author, January 2021

Table 7 shows that the Cox & Snell R Square value is 0.518 and the Nagelkerke R Square value is 0.796, implying that 79.6% of the variability of the dependent variable can be explained by the variability of the independent variable. Other variables outside the model account for the remaining 20.4 percent.

4.6. Logistic Regression Coefficient Test Results

Table 8. Test result Regression *Coefficient* Variables in the Equation

		B	SE	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp (B)
Step 1a	OATS	4,556	0.779	34,182	1	0,000	95,229
	RA	-1,156	0.949	1,482	1	0.223	0.315
	PTP	0.012	0.037	0.099	1	0.753	1,012
	PF	-10,176	4,039	6,348	1	0.012	0,000
	Constant	-2,719	0.613	19,657	1	0,000	0.066

Source: Processed by the author, January 2021

$$\ln \frac{G_c}{1 - G_c} = -2,719 + 4,556 \text{ OATS} - 1,156 \text{ RA} + 0.012 \text{ PTP} - 10,176 \text{ PF} + e \quad (4)$$

4.7. Hypothesis test

First Hypothesis Testing

In the analysis of the hypothesis, it can be seen based on table 8 that the value of β_1 (previous year's audit opinion) is 4.556 with a significance value of 0.000. So it can be seen that the significance value <0.05 , namely $0.000 < 0.05$. The results of this study can be rejected that the first hypothesis which states that prior opinion has a positive effect on going concern audit opinion is accepted. This means that those who get a going concern audit opinion in the previous year tend to get a going concern audit opinion again in the following year.

This research can be proven that the previous year's audit opinion has a positive effect on going concern audit opinion. In agency theory, it is explained that the acceptance of a going

concern audit opinion is if the agent is in charge of carrying out the company's operational activities and producing financial reports as a form of management accountability to the company. The resulting financial statements will later show the company's performance and be used by the principal as a basis for decision making. Auditors are independent parties who are able to bridge the interests of principals and agents in monitoring the performance of company management. The auditor will assess whether the agent has acted in the interests of the principal through a means, namely the company's financial statements. The task of the auditor is to provide services to assess the fairness of the company's financial statements prepared by agents, with the final result of an audit opinion. The auditor must also disclose the going concern problems faced by the company, if the auditor doubts the company's ability to maintain its viability. This means that companies that get a going concern audit opinion in the previous year tend to get a going concern audit opinion again in the following year.

This research is in line with research conducted by Ekarini (2016), Rahayuningsih (2014), Bintang et al (2019), Putri & Fettry (2017), and Savitri and Mahendra (2018) which stated that the previous year's audit opinion had a positive effect on the acceptance of the opinion. going concern audits. However, the results of this study contradict the research of Krissindiastuti & Rasmini (2016), Shulhiyyah (2019), and Syahputra & Yahyu (2017) which stated that the previous year's audit opinion had no effect on going concern audit opinion.

Second Hypothesis Testing

In the analysis of the hypothesis, it can be seen based on table 8 that the value of β_2 (Auditor Reputation) is -1.156 with a significance value of 0.223. As can be shown, the significance value is greater than 0.05, namely $0.223 > 0.05$. Its findings of this study show that the auditor's reputation has little impact on going concern audit opinions. The results of this study indicate that there is no effect of auditor reputation on going concern audit opinion. This means that companies that use auditors who work at KAP big four and KAP non big four do not affect the audit to be given, the auditor will give a going concern audit opinion if a company experience doubts about its survival.

This research can be proven that the auditor's reputation has no effect on going concern audit opinion. In accordance with agency theory which assumes that humans are always self-interested, then the presence of an independent third party who acts as a mediator in the relationship between the principal and the agent is very necessary, in this case the independent party is the auditor. From these results it is evident that the big four KAPs do not always provide going concern audit opinions on the audited companies. KAP will try to maintain its good name and as much as possible to avoid problems that can damage the image and reputation of the KAP. So that a KAP is required to always be objective about its work, if a company has doubts about its business continuity, the auditor will give a going concern opinion.

The results of this study contradict the research of Kemuning & Juliarsa (2016), Yuridiskasari & Rahmatika (2017), Sarra & Alamsyah (2018), Rahayuningsih (2014), and Ginting & Surayana (2014) which state that auditor reputation has a positive effect on audit opinion. going concern. But this research is in line with research conducted by Miraningtyas & Yudowati (2017) which states that auditor reputation has no effect on going concern audit opinion.

Third Hypothesis Testing

In the analysis of the hypothesis, it is seen based on table 8 showing that β_3 (company growth) is 0.012 with a significance value of 0.753. As a result, the significance value can be shown > 0.05 , namely $0.753 > 0.05$. The findings of this study show that company growth has little bearing on the audit opinion of a going concern. The result of third hypothesis, that company growth has not impact on audit going concern opinion, These findings show that when giving a fair audit opinion on a going concern statement, increases or decreases in income are not considered by the auditor in establishing the audit opinion going concern.

This research can be proven that the company's growth has no effect on going concern audit opinion. In relation to agency theory, management as an agent who prepares financial statements will have the motivation to report financial statements with high assets and profits so that it can foster trust from investors and capital providers. The auditor has a duty to ensure that management prepares fair financial statements and provides signals to users of financial statements when there are doubts about the company's business continuity. These results prove that the auditor does not need to consider the increase or decrease in sales in providing a fair audit opinion with a going concern statement, because the auditor will see the overall financial condition, for example the existence of maturing debts that must be paid, thereby reducing the company's income.

This research is not in line with research conducted by Immanuel & Aprilyanti (2019), Ginting & Surayana (2014), Krissindiastuti and Rasmini (2016), Ekarini (2016), Savitri & Mahendra (2018), and Ariska et al (2019), stating that the company's growth has a negative effect on going concern audit opinion. But this research is in line with research conducted by Muslimah and Triyanto (2019), Purba & Nazir (2018), Santrian and Alfia (2020), Tryansyah & Khairunnisa (2019), Djoko & Yanti (2019), and Angel (2018) which states that the company's growth has no effect on going concern audit opinion.

Fourth Hypothesis Testing

In the analysis of the hypothesis, it is seen based on table 8 showing that β_4 (profitability) is -10.176 with a significance value of 0.012. So it can be seen that the significance value > 0.05 is $0.012 < 0.05$. The findings of this study show that profitability have a negative impact on going- concern audit opinion. The results of this study can be concluded that the fourth hypothesis, that profitability has a negative impact on going concern audit opinion, is agreed based on the findings of this report. This assumes that the higher the profitability value, the less likely the auditor will give a going concern audit opinion, and the smaller the profitability value, then the going concern audit opinion is likely to be high.

This research can be proven that profitability has a negative effect on going concern audit opinion. In accordance with agency theory which states that the larger the company managed to earn a profit, the greater the benefits that the agent will get. Meanwhile, company owners (shareholders) are only tasked with supervising and monitoring the running of the company managed by management and developing an incentive system for management managers to ensure that they work in the interests of the company. This means that the higher the profitability value, the company tends to get a low going concern audit opinion, otherwise if the profitability value is low, the company's probability of getting a going concern audit is high.

The results of this study are in line with the results of research from Ariasetiawan & Rahayu (2015), Santrian & Alfia (2020), Haryanto (2019), Purba & Nazir (2018), and Angel (2018) which state that profitability has a negative effect on going concern opinions. However, the results of this study contradict research conducted by Pasaribu (2015) and Suksesi (2016) which states that profitability has no effect on going concern.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the research results obtained, it can be concluded, among others: (1) The previous year's audit had a positive effect on going-concern audit opinion, this means that companies that received a going-concern audit opinion in the previous year tend to get a going-concern audit opinion again in the following year. (2) There is no influence of auditor reputation on going concern audit opinion. From these results it is evident that the big four KAPs do not always provide going concern audit opinions on audited companies. KAP will try to maintain its good name and as much as possible to avoid problems that can damage the image and reputation of the KAP. (3) company growth does not affect the going concern audit opinion. These results prove that the auditor does not need to consider the increase or decrease in sales in providing a fair audit opinion with a going concern statement, because the auditor will see the overall financial condition, for example the existence of maturing debt that must be paid. paid to reduce the company's income. (4) profitability has a negative effect on going concern audit opinion, this means that the higher the profitability value, the company tends to get a low going concern audit opinion, on the other hand if the profitability value is low, the company's probability of getting a going concern audit is high.

5.1. Suggestion

Based on the research writing, the researcher realizes that there are still many shortcomings in it. The sample used in this study is limited, namely mining companies listed on the IDX for the period 2014-2019, further research can consider different company sectors or use all companies listed on the IDX, so that it can be seen from a valid theory, and can extend the observation period. to get different results.

REFERENCES

- Angel, V., & Sumantri, FA (2018). The Effect of Profitability, Solvency, and Company Growth on Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions. *Scientific Journal of Accounting and Technology*. Vol. 10, No.2. 1-13
- Ardi, FG, Saputra, I., & Mulyani, SD (2019). The Effect of Financial Distress, Company Size, Audit Tenure, and Auditor Reputation on Going Concern Modified Audit Opinions. *Journal of Master of Accountancy Trisakti*, 6 (2), 225-246
- Ariska, EY, Maslichah, M., & Afifudin, A. (2019). Effect of Audit Tenure, Opinion Shopping, Leverage and Company Growth on Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions. *Scientific Journal of Accounting Research*, 8 (06). 157-170
- Bayudi, N., & Wirawati, NGP (2017). Factors Affecting the Giving of Going Concern Audit Opinions. *E-Journal of Accounting*, Vol. 19.1. 109-136
- Bintang, FM, Malikhah, A., & Afifudin, A. (2019). The Influence of Previous Year's Audit Opinion, Debt Default, Liquidity Ratio, Leverage Ratio Against Going Concern Audit Opinions (Study: Manufacturing companies listed on the IDX for the period 2016-2018). *Scientific Journal of Accounting Research*, 8 (10).

- Djoko, D., & Yanti, LD (2019). The Influence of Company Growth, Profitability, Audit Tenure, and Size of Public Accounting Firms on the Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions. *eCo-Fin*, 1 (2), 22-28.
- Effendi, B. (2019). Financial Conditions, Opinion Shopping, and Going Concern Audit Opinions on Mining Companies Listed on the IDX. *Journal of Accounting and Finance*, 1 (1), 34-46.
- Ekarini, NPK (2016). The Influence of Company Growth, Management Plans, Opinion Shopping, and Previous Year's Audit Opinions on the Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions. *Journal of Professional Accounting*, 7 (2), 33-44.
- Fadmawati, T. N & Amanah L. (2017). The Influence of Financial Ratios, Auditor Reputation, Company Size on Going Concern Opinions. *Journal of Accounting Science and Research* Vol. 6, No. 9. 1-16
- Ghozali, Imam, 2018. Application of Multivariate Analysis with the IBM SPSS 25 Program. Semarang: Diponegoro University Publishing Agency.
- Ginting, S & Surayana L. (2014). Analysis of Factors Affecting Going Concern Audit Opinions on Manufacturing Companies on the Indonesian Stock Exchange. *Journal of Micro-Civil Economics Entrepreneurs: JWEM*, 4 (2), 111-120.
- Haryanto, YA, & Sudarno, S. (2019). The Effect of Profitability, Solvency, Liquidity, and Market Ratios on Going Concern Audit Opinions. *Diponegoro Journal of Accounting*, 8 (4). 1-13
- Immanuel, B., & Aprilyanti, R. (2019). Analysis of Audit Tenure, Opinion Shopping, Company Growth, and Debt to Equity Ratio Effect on Audit Going Concern Opinion. *eCo-Fin*, 1 (2), 29-35.
- Kemuning, NLD, & Juliarsa, G. (2016). The effect of auditor reputation and company size on accuracy in providing going concern opinion. *E-Journal of Accounting*, 15 (2), 847-861.
- Krissindiastuti, M., & Rasmini, NK (2016). Factors Affecting Going Concern Audit Opinions. *E-Journal of Accounting at Udayana University*, Vol. 14.1 January 2016, 451-481.
- Miraningtyas, ASA, & Yudowati, SP (2019). *The Effect of Liquidity, Auditor Reputation, and Disclosure on Giving Going Concern Audit Opinions*. *MEA Scientific Journal (Management, Economics, & Accounting)* 3 (3), 76-85
- Muslimah, O., & Triyanto, N. D (2019). The Influence of Company Growth, Pior Opinion, Debt Default, and Opinion Shopping on the Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Accounting Information Systems*. Vol. 3 No. 2, 229- 242
- Nainggolan, P. (2018). Analysis of the Effect of Audit Tenure, Company Size, Previous Year's Audit Opinion, Audit Quality on Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions in Manufacturing Companies. *The Lantern Journal of Accounting*, 2 (2), 80-100.
- Pasaribu, AM (2015). The Effect of Auditor Quality, Liquidity, Solvency and Profitability on Going Concern Audit Opinions in the Food and Beverage Sub-Sector Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange. *JRAK: Journal of Accounting Research & Computerized Accounting*, 6 (02), 80-92
- Purba S. F & Nazir, N (2018), The Influence of Company Growth, Financial Ratios, and Auditor Quality on Going Concern Opinions. *Trisakti Accounting Journal*, Vol 5 No.2. 199-214.
- Putri, JB, & Fettry, S. (2017). The Influence of Company Size, Audit Lag, Audit Tenure, and Previous Year's Audit Opinion on Giving Going Concern Opinions (Studies in the Mining Sector on the Indonesian Stock Exchange) *Accounting Studies*, 18 (2), 133-147.
- Rahayuningsih, A. (2014). The Influence of Financial Conditions, Auditor Reputation, Disclosure, and Previous Year's Audit Opinion on Going Concern Audit Opinion Disclosures. *Journal of Accounting and Auditing*, 11 (1), 25-38.

- Sarra, HD, & Alamsyah, S. (2019). Effect of Auditor reputation, Company Size, Audit Tenure, and Financial Distress on Giving Going Concern Audit Opinions to Industrial Sector Companies listed on the IDX for the 2012-2016 Period. *Comparative Journal: Economics and Business*, 1 (2), 40-56
- Satriani, E., & Alfia, YD (2020). Influence of Profitability, Solvability, and Company Growth on Going Concern Audit Opinions. *AKSI Journal (Accounting and Information Systems)*, 5 (2), 120-128.
- Savitri, RA, & Mahendra, D. (2018). The Analisis Of Factor Which Affecting The Acceptance Of Going Concern Opinion. *Advance*, 5 (1), 72-80.
- Suharsono, RS (2018). The Effect of Audit Quality, Debt Defaults, and Company Growth on Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions. *Scientific Journal of Accounting, Finance and Tax*, 2 (1), 35-47.
- Suharto AA. (2020). The Effect of Debt Default, Audit Tunure, Opinion Shopping, and Previous Year's Audit Opinion on Going Concern e-Proceeding of Management audit opinion. Vol. 7, No.1, 702-710
- Syahputra, F., & Yahya, M (2017). The Effect of Audit Tenure, Audit Delay, Previous Year's Audit Opinion, and Opinion Shopping on the Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions. *Scientific Journal of Accounting Economics Students (JIMEKA)*. Vol. 2, No. 3, (2017), 39-47.
- Tryansyah, GI, & Khairunnisa, K. (2019). The Effect of Auditor Reputation, Profitability, Leverage, and Company Growth on Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions. *eProceedings of Management*, 6 (2), 3572-3579
- Yuridiskasari, S & Rahmatika, DN (2017). Determinants of Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions in Property and Real Estate Companies. *Journal of Accounting Studies*, 1 (1). 1- 10