Journal of Social Science
jsss.co.id
ISSN : P 2720-9938 E 2721-5202

The Effect of Company Size, Company Profitability, Previous Audit Opinion, and Kap Size as A Determiner of Going Concern Audit Opinions (Empirical Study on Non-Financial Services Companies Listed on The Indonesia Stock Exchange)

Belinda Stella Asherina Djunaedi[1], Fransisca Depitaria Meylanti Manurung[2], Julyane Tomy[3], Tiara Regina[4], Sylvia Fetty Elvira Maratno[5]
Maranatha Christian University, Bandung, West Java, Indonesia[1,2,3,4]
Parahyangan Catholic University, Bandung, West Java, Indonesia[5]
Email: belinda.stella0195@gmai.com, fransiscadepita@gmail.com, acajt09@gmail.com, reginagina.tiara@gmail.com, sylvia.fettry@unpar.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Date received : 19 February 2022
Revision date : 09 March 2022
Date received : 18 March 2022

Keywords:
Non-financial services company; company size; company profitability; previous year audit opinion; accounting firm size; acceptance of going concern audit opinion

ABSTRACT

The study aims to determine the effect of firm size on the acceptance of going concern audit opinion, the effect of corporate profitability on the acceptance of going concern audit opinion, the effect of previous year's audit opinion on the acceptance of going concern audit opinion, the effect of accounting firm size on the acceptance of going concern audit opinion, and the simultaneous influence of company size, company profitability, previous year audit opinion, and accounting firm size on the acceptance of going concern audit opinion. The research method used in this research is a hypothetico-deductive method which is a systematic approach and valuable to produce knowledge to solve fundamental and managerial problems. Initially, the researcher determined the theme or problem area. Furthermore, the researcher identified a problem formula. Based on theories and previous research, the researcher made the hypothesis to be tested. This study focused on non-financial service companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange. The results of the partial test show that there is no significant influence of firm size ongoing concern opinion, there is the significant influence of profitability ongoing concern opinion, there is the significant influence of previous audit opinion of with going concern opinion, and there is no significant influence of accounting firm size ongoing concern opinion. The simultaneous testing result indicates that the firm size, the company profitability, the previous year's audit opinion, and the size of the accounting firm influence the acceptance of going concern audit opinion.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of the world makes everyone required to adapt quickly. With the help of technology, everyone can gain knowledge quickly. This can increase everyone's competitiveness. When everything they want and need can be obtained easily because of technology, companies must adapt and compete to provide convenience with the best quality. However, technology opens up opportunities to explore new markets and threats that can change everything from changes in consumer behaviour. These basic needs vary to changes in one's expectations in obtaining what one wants. This change must be accompanied by rapid

How To Cite: Djunaedi, B. S. A., Manurung, F. D. M., Tomy, J., Regina, T., & Maratno, S. F. E. (2022). Effect of Company Size, Company Profitability, Previous Audit Opinion, and Kap Size as A Determiner of Going Concern Audit Opinions (Empirical Study on Non-Financial Services Companies Listed on The Indonesia Stock Exchange), *Journal of Social Science, 3*(2). https://doi.org/10.46799/jss.v3i2.309
E-Issn: 2721-5202
Published By: Ridwan Institut

adaptation by continuing to innovate, maintain company growth, and facilitate access to obtain suppliers, consumers, and employees who genuinely meet the company's needs. It is undeniable that "customer intelligence" is getting more sophisticated. With so many similar products being offered, customers can think twice about getting the desired product or service without any difficulties. "customer intelligence" will now be the main parameter for companies to forecast revenue growth and profitability (Ball, Bigdely-Shamlo, Mullen, & Robbins, 2016). Moreover, customer experience such as functionality, speed, and service accessibility are all customer cognitive factors (Ameen, Tarhini, Reppel, & Anand, 2021).

Companies need to worry about market expansion which makes competition more challenging. Companies that cannot keep up with developments have the potential to be left behind in the competition and forced to go bankrupt. With so many products and services being choices, companies can lose many customers. This will affect the auditor's decision in providing a going concern audit opinion. One of the ways that companies use to obtain sources of financing is by selling their shares in the capital market. The capital market allows companies to self-evaluate their performance and financial condition. When the company's performance and financial condition improve, the capital market response is positive with increased stock prices.

On the other hand, if the company's performance and financial condition decline, the stock price will also decline. This worries investors and creditors who have already invested and provided loans to companies that are unable or not ready to keep up with the times. Investors and creditors who have invested or will lend their capital will think again and divert investment and capital loans to other more convincing companies. When economic conditions are uncertain, investors expect the auditor to give an early warning of the company's financial failure (Chen & Church, 1996). Therefore, the audit report issued by the auditor must be reliable to provide helpful information for investors and creditors in making decisions. Auditees who receive a going concern audit opinion usually have serious financial problems, do not have sufficient working capital and experience an equity deficit. Without serious handling to improve the company's finances, the longer the company's financial condition will worsen and can increase the possibility of receiving a going concern audit opinion again in the following year.

A mediator is needed as an independent third party in the relationship between investors and creditors as principals and company managers as agents. This third party has the function of supervising the behaviour of managers (agents) in carrying out their duties, whether it is following what is desired by the principal, applicable regulations and standards, and company regulations. The auditor, as the party who "bridges" the principal and agent, is expected to pay more attention to events in the company's external environment that can cause significant losses and end in the company's bankruptcy. Audit reports are used by users of financial statements (principals) to avoid making decisions related to companies managed by agents. Therefore, the information presented in the audit report must be adequate and reliable. Public Accounting Firms must have the courage to disclose the viability of a client company by providing a going concern audit opinion if there is doubt about the client is going Concerned. In Statement on Auditing Standard No. 59 (Brown, Stocks, & Wilder, 2007), auditors must decide whether they believe that the client company can survive until a year later after reporting. However, with the going concern audit opinion given by the auditor to the company, it is feared that it will worsen its economic and operational conditions.

Rational managers will not choose high-quality auditors and pay high audit fees if the company's characteristics are not good (Scott, 2001). This statement is based on the assumption that high-quality auditors will detect companies with poor performance and financial conditions. When these conditions are known, and the auditor expresses a going concern audit opinion, it will worsen its condition. However, when the company's condition is good, managers tend to choose a KAP with good quality with a high reputation, namely the big four *KAP*, so that the company's reputation and trust from the public increase.

With the increasing number of services and types of products offered by manufacturers, business competition is getting tougher. Furthermore, the ability to communicate between machines without the need for human interaction, as well as the analysis of the data collected in this manner, enables for the monitoring and automation of numerous processes (Gierej, 2017). It will make it difficult for companies to continue their survival. Small companies went bankrupt, but many large companies finally decided to close their business. Since the big company Nokia went bankrupt, the business world has realized that it cannot just focus on its success but continue innovating and keeping up with the times. Auditors must be careful to check whether large companies can survive for a long time because they lag behind existing technological advances. Auditors should not only accept the view from management that everything is good (Noverio & Dewayanto, 2011).

In Indonesia, many companies are affected by the changing times. They are starting from the emergence of an internet-based online motorcycle taxi booking service application, namely Gojek. The emergence of the Gojek application has had a significant impact on the development of the business world in Indonesia. Gojek has succeeded in making almost everyone in Indonesia "literate" technology with the features it offers easy jobs to find and other conveniences. Gojek has a significant impact on both consumers and its partners. However, for some companies, the emergence of Gojek is a problem. One of the companies that felt the impact was the taxi operator company Blue Bird. Previously, Blue Bird controlled the middle to upper-class public transportation market. The increasing number of online-based transportation companies impacts the financial performance of conventional taxis, including Blue Bird. This can be seen from the Blue Bird taxi company (Setiawan & Hidayat, 2018). Slowly, users of conventional transportation services are starting to switch to technology-based transportation service providers. Service companies are greatly helped by the existence of technology and become potential companies for potential investors to invest their capital and for creditors to lend their funds. However, many companies in Indonesia cannot adapt to this technological advancement, so the company must close or go bankrupt.

Badaruddin (2018) analyzes growth possibilities in six sectors likely to win business in 2017. The six sectors are agriculture, health and education; production; retail; financial and transportation services (transport and communication). Five of the six sectors identified by PwC are sub-sectors within the services sector. The financial services sector is considered to be experiencing the expansion of access. Technology investment plays a vital role in increasing the reach and access to financial services. Not only used for business people but everyone and households are familiar with digital transactions. Alternative payments such as non-cash transactions for digital trading companies, mobile network operators such as payments for electricity, credit and so on are now being carried out using alternative payments provided by companies in the financial services sector. Therefore, companies in the financial services sector do not need to worry about the going concern threat. Transportation services also play an essential role in changing economic growth in Indonesia. This service can open up other business opportunities, such as increasing third party logistics services and increasing mobile phone and internet market penetration in both urban and rural communities in countries with increasingly mature economies (Ball et al., 2016).

The auditor must consider the company's external environment as consideration for determining the acceptance of a going concern audit opinion to the client company. New issues that arise in Indonesia determine the company's viability in the next few years. Auditors should not only focus on the company's financial information but must pay attention to the consequences that arise due to changes in business behaviour. Companies engaged in the service sector are currently getting attention because they significantly impact people's lives, especially in Indonesia. Financial and non-financial information known by the auditor can be considered in providing a going concern audit opinion. In addition, non-financial service companies that are growing, such as in the tourism and telecommunications sectors, are a fairly significant source of income for the country. This can attract foreign investors to invest in non-financial service companies because of the excellent investment opportunity (Lestari & Cahyonowati, 2013).

The factors that determine the acceptance of this opinion include the company's size, company profitability; previous year's audit opinion; and KAP size. The bigger the company, the stronger the company's resilience in dealing with problems. With the going concern audit opinion given by the auditors, large companies are better able to survive and bounce back in the not too distant future. However, suppose the company is still relatively small and is still developing. In that case, it is suspected that the company will find it more challenging to gather strength to improve its performance and finances so that it has the potential to go bankrupt. The higher the value of the company's profitability, the greater the company's ability to generate profits. Investors can see the company's financial condition in its financial statements. Companies with positive profitability indicate that the company is making a profit, while negative profitability indicates that the company is experiencing losses. Loss or net loss also causes the company's profitability to be negative. Usually, a going concern audit opinion is given if the company suffers losses or deficits in a row for several years.

In addition to company size and company profitability, the acceptance of audit opinion is influenced by the previous year's audit opinion. The auditee receives the previous year's audit opinion in the previous year or one year before the research year. This is because the business activities in a certain period cannot be separated from the situation and conditions of the previous year. The company can potentially lose its source of funds because the going concern audit opinion received in the previous year makes the company lose the trust of its source of funds, including investors and creditors. This can worsen the company's condition, and the possibility of receiving a going concern audit opinion again will be even greater.

Public Accounting Firm is a business entity that has obtained permission from the Minister of Finance to provide accounting services. The public accounting firm used by the company also affects the acceptance of going-concern audit opinions. The size of the Public Accounting Firm (*KAP*) is classified into two, namely *KAP*, the big four and *KAP* non the big four. The bigger the *KAP*, the more likely it is that the auditor will issue a going concern opinion to provide relevant and reliable information. (Mutchler, Hopwood, & McKeown, 1997) found evidence that auditors at large *KAPs* (big six) are more likely to issue going-concern audit opinions than auditors at small *KAPs* (non-big six).

Indonesia has a unique culture, rules, customs and socio-political conditions. This research was conducted to obtain empirical evidence that company size, company profitability, previous year's audit opinion and *KAP* size are factors that determine going concern audit opinion. This research was conducted using empirical studies on non-financial service companies listed on the Indonesia (Purwaningsih & Wibowo, 2020).

The company, the previous year's audit opinion, and the size of the *KAP* on the going concern audit opinion acceptance. The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of company size ongoing concern audit opinion acceptance, company profitability ongoing concern audit opinion acceptance, previous year's audit opinion ongoing concern audit opinion acceptance, *KAP* size ongoing concern audit opinion acceptance, and company size, profitability. While the benefits of this research are to provide additional knowledge and information regarding going concern audit opinions to investors and potential investors, and creditors and prospective creditors as consideration for investing and providing loans, the results of this study can be used as a reference for conducting further research related to factors that can affect the acceptance of going concern audit opinion.

Other researchers have done previous research on this issue; audit quality, financial condition, and opinion shopping have no significant effect on the acceptance of audit opinions. The previous year's audit opinion and company growth significantly affect the acceptance of going concern audit opinions (Kartika, 2012). Moreover, audit tenure and company growth have a negative effect on ongoing concerns about audit opinions, while *KAP* reputation and opinion shopping positively affect ongoing concerns. Company size and previous audit opinion do not affect going concern audit opinion (Krissindiastuti & Rasmini, 2016). However, this current research analyzes company size, company profitability, previous audit opinion, and kap size as a determiner of going concern audit opinions.

METHOD

The research method used in this research is the hypothetico-deductive method, a systematic and helpful approach to generate knowledge to solve fundamental and managerial problems.

The type of data used in this research is secondary data. Secondary data has been available and obtained indirectly by researchers (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). The data is obtained from the annual audited financial statements of companies listed on the Indonesia (Purwaningsih & Wibowo, 2020). The audited annual financial reports of companies listed on the IDX are available on the IDX website, www.IDX.co.id. The population used in this study were all service companies listed on the Indonesia (Purwaningsih & Wibowo, 2020). Namely, there were 258 service companies listed on the Indonesia (Purwaningsih & Wibowo, 2020). The sample selection was carried out using a purposive sampling technique in this study.

This is based on the following criteria:

1. Companies in the non-financial service industry (based on the classification of OK Shares (2018)) listed on the IDX during the period 2013-2017.
2. Companies that have an annual financial reporting period ending December 31.
3. Annual financial statements are presented in Rupiah currency.
4. Completely available audited annual financial report.
5. The company did not change sectors during 2012-2017.

There were 258 service companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) during

2013-2017. The sample selection process using this purposive sampling technique is as follows:

Table 1
Sample selection process

Service industry companies listed on the IDX during 2013-2017	**258**
(-) Financial Services Company	(65)
(-)Financial reporting period other than December 31	(0)
(-) Currencies other than Rupiah	(26)
(-) Annual Financial Report is not completed available	(10)
(-) The company changed sectors during 2012-2017	(8)
Number of sample service companies	**149**

Source: Indonesia Stock Exchange (2018), reprocessed

The data in this study. The data collection technique comes from the audited annual financial statements of non-financial service companies listed on the Indonesia (Purwaningsih & Wibowo, 2020), which have been published on the IDX website, namely www.IDX.co.id.

Data analysis technique
Descriptive Analysis

The method used to process the data in this study was carried out using descriptive statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics provide an overview or description of data seen from the average value, standard deviation, variance, maximum, and minimum (Ghozali, 2005). In this study, the descriptive statistical analysis used is to calculate the mean, maximum, minimum and standard deviation for variables that use a ratio scale, namely profitability and firm size. As for the dummy variables, namely KAP size, previous year's audit opinion and going concern audit opinion, the descriptive statistical analysis used is to calculate the frequency.

Logistics Regression Analysis

This study carried out the model and hypothesis testing using logistic regression. Logistic regression is similar to discriminant analysis which tests whether the probability of occurrence of the dependent variable can be predicted with the independent variable (Ghozali, 2009). In this study, logistic regression was used to examine the effect of firm size, firm profitability, previous audit opinion, and KAP size on the going concern auditor's audit opinion. The logistic regression model in this study is as follows:

$$\text{Ln} \frac{GC}{1-GC} = ß_0 + ß_1(UP) + ß_2\,(Pro) + ß_3(OTS) + ß_4(KAP) + \epsilon$$

Information :

$\text{Ln} \frac{GC}{1-GC}$ = Probability of getting a going concern audit opinion

$ß_0$ = constant

$ß_{1-4}$ = The coefficient of each variable

UP = Company size

Pro = Company profitability

OTS = Previous year's opinion

KAP = *KAP* Size

ϵ = Error

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2
Partial Hypothesis Test Results (Wald's Test)

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	X1	-.162	.122	1.786	1	.181	.850
	X2	-2.562	.751	11.629	1	.001	.077
	X3	5.889	.562	109.741	1	.000	361.164
	X4	-.374	.616	.369	1	.544	.688
	Constant	-1.420	1.686	.709	1	.400	.242

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Company Size, ROA, OpinionBefore, KAP.
Source: results output SPSS version 23.

The regression model formed based on Table 1. is as follows:

$$\text{Ln} \frac{GC}{1-GC} = -1{,}420 - 0{,}162\ UP - 2{,}562\ Pro + 5{,}889\ OTS - 0{,}374\ KAP$$

Description:

$\text{Ln} \frac{GC}{1-GC}$ = Probabilitas get opini audit *going concern*

$ß_0$ = constant

$ß_{1-4}$ = The coefficient of each variable

UP = Company size

Pro = Company profitability

OTS = Previous year's opinion

KAP = Size KAP

The interpretation of the logistic regression equation above is as follows:

1. The value of the Odds Ratio of the size of the company (X1) is 0.850, which means that for every one-unit increase in the size of the company which is assessed based on the natural logarithm of its total assets, the company tends to receive a going concern audit opinion of 0.850 times.
2. The profitability Odds Ratio (X2) is 0.077, which means that for every 1% increase in profitability as measured by return on assets, the company tends to receive a going concern audit opinion of 0.077 times.
3. The Odds Ratio value of the previous year's audit opinion (X3) is 361.164, which means that companies that received a going concern audit opinion in the previous year will tend to receive a going concern audit opinion back by 361.164 times.
4. The value of the Odds Ratio of KAP size (X4) is 0.688, which means that if the company uses the big four KAP, it will tend to get a going concern audit opinion of 0.688 times.

The effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable is based on Table 4.10. is as follows :

1. Firm size variable (X1) has a significance value of 0.181 which is greater than 0.05 (0.181 > 0.05). This shows that H0-1 is accepted. There is no significant effect of firm size ongoing concern audit opinion.
2. The profitability variable (X2), which is calculated using the return on assets ratio, has a significance value of 0.001, which is smaller than 0.05 (0.001 <0.05). It can be concluded that Hα-2 is accepted. There is a significant effect of ROA's ongoing ConcernConcern about audit opinion.
3. The previous year's audit opinion variable (X3) has a significance value of 0.000, so the significance value is lower than 0.05 (0.000 <0.05). This shows that Hα-3 is accepted. There is a significant effect of the previous year's opinion with going concern audit opinion.
4. KAP size variable (X4) has a significance value of 0.554, more excellent than 0.05 (0.554 > 0.05), so it can be concluded that H0-4 is accepted. There is no significant effect of *KAP's* ongoing concern audit opinion.

Discussion

A. The Effect of Company Size (X1) on the Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions

From the results of partial hypothesis testing in Table 1, the firm size variable (X1) has a significance value of 0.181, which is greater than 0.05 (0.181 > 0.05). This shows that H0-1 is accepted. There is no significant effect of firm size ongoing concern audit opinion (Y). Therefore, it can be concluded that the company's size does not reflect the possibility of receiving a going concern audit opinion. Company size is a categorization that can classify companies into large or small companies, which in this study were measured based on their total assets and calculated using the natural logarithm. Large companies have more ability to solve their financial problems because they have better management than small companies, so auditors will tend not to issue going concern audit opinions on large companies (Pradika & Sukirno, 2017). However, a going concern audit opinion is given when the company is deemed unable to generate profits or has a deficit and cannot pay its debts. When the company experiences a deficit in its profits or has debt, when the value of its assets is lower than the total deficit and debt, the company will tend to accept a going concern audit opinion. However, suppose the company's assets are still more significant than the total deficit and debt. In that case, the company can still cover the profit deficit from operating results and pay its debts, so the going concern audit opinion is not accepted. However, small companies can also operate and still make a profit. A going concern audit opinion will not be given when a small company can carry out its operations properly. In this study, the company's size is not a consideration in granting a going concern audit opinion. Auditors are suspected of paying more attention to the company's overall financial condition and not just looking at the company's size. In providing a going concern audit opinion, the auditor assesses the possibility of the company's bankruptcy based on the company's performance from time to time. Therefore, it can be concluded that company size does not affect ongoing concern audit opinion.

B. The Effect of Company Profitability (X2) on the Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions

Based on Table 1, the profitability variable (X2), which is calculated using the return on asset (ROA) ratio, has a significance value of 0.001, more diminutive than 0.05 (0.001 <0.05). This shows that H0-2 is accepted. There is a significant effect of profitability ongoing concern audit opinion. The results of this study are not in line with the research conducted by Januarti and (Januarti & Fitrianasari, 2008), which states that profitability does not affect going concern audit opinion. This follows Noverio and Dewayanto (2011) and Pradika and Sukirno (2017), who state that profitability has a significant effect on ongoing concern audit opinions. Profitability is the company's ability to profit in its operating activities. Profitability in this study is calculated using the ratio of return on assets (ROA), which measures the company's level of effectiveness in generating profits by using the assets owned. High profits are proven to show the company's ability to maintain its business continuity in the future. Therefore, the profitability calculated using ROA significantly affects the acceptance of going-concern audit opinions.

C. The Effect of the Previous Year's Audit Opinion (X3) on the Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions

The previous year's audit opinion variable (X3) based on Table 1 has a significance value of 0.000, so the significance value is lower than 0.05 (0.000 <0.05). This shows that Hα-3 is accepted. There is a significant effect of the previous year's opinion with going concern audit opinion. Sultanoglu, Mugan, Sekerdag, and Oran (2018) on going concern Tuanakotta (2013) states that when carrying out risk assessment procedures, the auditor must consider whether some events or conditions make the entity's ability to survive (or continue its business as a going concern) in doubt, such as The company suffers recurring losses over a certain period, has negative cash flows from operating activities, and accumulated past-due debt that exceeds its total current assets. According to Sultanoglu et al. (2018) concerning going concern (Tuanakotta, 2013), the going concern assumption states that general purpose financial statements are prepared based on business continuity unless management intends to plan to liquidate the entity or cease operations. In the previous year, companies that received a going concern audit opinion tend to receive a going concern audit opinion again in the next period. This is because companies that received a going concern audit opinion in the previous year will experience a decline in stock prices, difficulties in increasing loan capital, distrust of investors, creditors, customers and employees (Alichia, 2013). This will continue if management takes no corrective action, so the company will likely get a going concern audit opinion again. Therefore, the previous year's audit opinion significantly affects the going concern audit opinion acceptance. The Effect of *KAP* Size (X4) On Accepting Going Concern Audit Opinions

Based on Table 1, the *KAP* size variable (X4) has a significance value of 0.554, more excellent than 0.05 (0.554 > 0.05), so it can be concluded that H0-4 is accepted. That is, there is no significant effect of KAP's ongoing concern audit opinion (Nogler, 2008). Based on the Regulation of the Minister of Finance Number 17/PMK.01/2008 concerning Public Accountant Services, a Public Accounting Firm (*KAP*) is a business entity that has obtained permission from the Minister as a forum for Public Accountants to provide their services. Therefore, *KAP* Public Accountants, as a capital market supporting the profession, must follow the relevant regulations. These regulations include regulations from *OJK* and regulations relating to its clients as public companies registered in the capital market. Both large and small, public accounting firms must provide reliable, relevant, and objective opinions to maintain their independence. S.A. section 120, paragraph 01 on the Principles of Objectivity (Publik, 2011) states that the auditor is required to have the principle of objectivity, i.e. not to allow conflicts of interest, or influence from other parties, to influence professional judgment. Both large and small KAPs must apply the principle of objectivity as well as possible. Therefore, large and small KAPs do not significantly influence the acceptance of going concern audit opinions.

D. The Influence of Company Size (X1), Company Profitability (X2), Previous Year's Audit Opinion (X3), and KAP Size (X4) On Accepting Going Concern Audit Opinions

Table 3
Coefficient of Determination Test Results (*Nagelkerke R. Square*)

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log-likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	158.971[a]	.328	.718

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 7 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

Source: SPSS version 23 output results

The value of Nagelkerke R. Square is 0.718, which is in Table 4.9. shows that as many as 71.8% of the variables of company size, company profitability, previous year's audit opinion, and *KAP* size affect going concern audit opinion. Based on Table 2, the Nagelkerke R. Square value of 0.718 shows that 71.8% of the variables of company size, company profitability, previous year's audit opinion, and *KAP* size affect going concern audit opinion. Meanwhile, 28.2% of going concern audit opinions were influenced by other reasons not included in the research model, such as company liquidity (Pradika & Sukirno, 2017), liquidity and solvency (Noverio & Dewayanto, 2011), and audit tenure (Sihaloho, 2017). Meanwhile, 28.2% of going concern audit opinions were influenced by other reasons not included in the research model.

Every company wants to advance its business, make the company continue to advance and develop to become significant. To achieve this, companies must obtain sources of funds that can advance their business. By gaining the trust of the financier, the company has more power to continue its operations. Going concern audit opinion is usually obtained because of a deficit that occurs in the company and large amounts of debt that are due but have not been paid by the company. In addition, a going concern audit opinion can be accepted if the company's deficit or the debt has exceeded its total assets. The possibility of the company to obtain a going concern audit opinion is small because the company is estimated to be still able to cover the deficit experienced and pay off its debts. The company's size is a factor that is considered in giving a going concern audit opinion while still looking at other factors.

The greater the profitability of the company, the better its performance. The company's profitability can measure how efficient it is in utilizing its assets. Profitability based on the ROA ratio is essential in providing a going concern audit opinion. The previous year's audit opinion also influences the provision of going-concern audit opinion. If the auditor sees no improvement in management performance, the auditor tends to return a going concern audit opinion. The size of the *KAP* generally reflects the quality of the services provided so that a larger *KAP* usually has a better reputation. However, large and small *KAPs* must maintain objectivity in providing going-concern audit opinions. Overall, company size, company profitability, previous year's audit opinion, and *KAP* size are simultaneously proven to affect going concern audit opinion.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research and data analysis that has been carried out to determine the effect of company size, company profitability, previous year's audit opinion, and *KAP* size, there is no significant effect of company size ongoing concern audit opinion. The company's size is not the primary consideration in terms of giving a going concern audit opinion. If their business continuity is in doubt, both large and small companies will receive a going concern audit opinion.

Profitability is the main thing that can describe its ability to maintain its business continuity. There is a significant effect of profitability ongoing concern audit opinion. Negative profitability from year to year indicates the disruption of the company's business continuity so that companies with negative and significant ROA tend to accept going concern audit opinions.

There is a significant effect of the previous year's opinion concerning audit opinion. The auditor's opinion in the previous year was very much considered in providing a going concern audit opinion. Companies that received a going concern audit opinion in the previous year and were unable to improve their business conditions would receive it.

There is no significant effect of *KAP* size ongoing concern audit opinion. Both big four KAPs and non-big four *KAPs* are responsible for giving opinions objectively and independently. Going concern audit opinion will be given by *KAP* both big four and non-big four if the company's business continuity is in doubt.

The size of the company, the profitability of the company, the previous year's audit opinion, and the size of the Public Accounting Firm affect the acceptance of going concern audit opinions. Going concern audit opinion is influenced by several factors simultaneously, including the company's total assets, company ROA, whether the company received a going concern audit opinion in the previous year, and whether the company was audited by big four *KAPs* or non-big four *KAPs*.

REFERENCES

Alichia, Yashinta Putri. (2013). Pengaruh Ukuran Perusahaan, Pertumbuhan Perusahaan, Dan Opini Audit Tahun Sebelumnya Terhadap Opini Audit Going Concern (Studi Empiris Perusahaan Manufaktur yang terdaftar pada Bursa Efek Indonesia). *Jurnal Akuntansi*, *1*(1). Google Scholar

Ameen, Nisreen, Tarhini, Ali, Reppel, Alexander, & Anand, Amitabh. (2021). Customer experiences in the age of artificial intelligence. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *114*, 106548. Scopus

Badaruddin, Muhammad. (2018). *Dinamika Industri Migas dan Pertambangan di Indonesia*. Google Scholar

Ball, Kenneth, Bigdely-Shamlo, Nima, Mullen, Tim, & Robbins, Kay. (2016). PWC-ICA: a method for stationary ordered blind source separation with application to EEG. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, *2016*. Google Scholar

Brown, Phil A., Stocks, Morris H., & Wilder, W. Mark. (2007). Ethical exemplification and the AICPA Code of Professional Conduct: An empirical investigation of auditor and public perceptions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *71*(1), 39–71. Google Scholar

Chen, Kevin C. W., & Church, Bryan K. (1996). Going concern opinions and the market's reaction to bankruptcy filings. *Accounting Review*, 117–128. Google Scholar

Ghozali, Imam. (2005). Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan SPSS. *Semarang: Badan Penerbit UNDIP*, 82–83.

Ghozali, Imam. (2009). Analisis Multivariate dengan program SPSS. *Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro*.

Gierej, Sylwia. (2017). The framework of business model in the context of Industrial Internet of Things. *Procedia Engineering*, *182*, 206–212. Scopus

Januarti, Indira, & Fitrianasari, Ella. (2008). Analisis Rasio Keuangan Dan Rasio Non Keuangan Yang Mempengaruhi Auditor Dalam Mempengaruhi Auditor Dalam Memberikan Opini Audit Going Concern Pada Auditee. *Jurnal Maksi*, *8*(1), 42–58. Google Scholar

Kartika, Andi. (2012). Pengaruh kondisi keuangan dan non keuangan terhadap penerimaan opini going concern pada perusahaan manufaktur di BEI. *Dinamika Akuntansi Keuangan Dan Perbankan*, *1*(1). Google Scholar

Krissindiastuti, Monica, & Rasmini, Ni Ketut. (2016). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi opini audit going concern. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas Udayana*, *14*(1), 451–481.

Lestari, Prastya Puji, & Cahyonowati, Nur. (2013). Pengaruh Good Corporate Governance Terhadap Kinerja Perusahaan (Studi Empiris pada Perusahaan Jasa non Keuangan yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2009-2011). *Diponegoro Journal of Accounting*, 418–430. Google Scholar

Mutchler, Jane F., Hopwood, William, & McKeown, James M. (1997). The influence of contrary information and mitigating factors on audit opinion decisions on bankrupt companies. *Journal of Accounting Research*, *35*(2), 295–310. Google Scholar

Nogler, George E. (2008). Going concern modifications, CPA firm size, and the Enron effect. *Managerial Auditing Journal*. Google Scholar

Noverio, Rezkhy, & Dewayanto, Totok. (2011). *Analisis Pengaruh Kualitas Auditor, Likuiditas, Profitabilitas dan Solvabilitas terhadap Opini*

Audit Going Concern pada Perusahaan Manufaktur yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia. Universitas Diponegoro.

Pradika, Rizka Ardhi, & Sukirno, Sukirno. (2017). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Likuiditas, Dan Ukuran Perusahaan Terhadap Opini Audit Going Concern (Studi Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Yang Terdaftar Di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2012-2015). *Jurnal Profita: Kajian Ilmu Akuntansi*, *5*(5).

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

Purwaningsih, Endang, & Wibowo, Maria Novita Kurniawati. (2020). Pengaruh Corporate Governance, Karakterstik Perusahaan, dan Kesulitan Keuangan terhadap Pengungkapan Sukarela pada Laporan Tahunan Perusahaan (Studi Empiris pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Periode 2016-2018). *Media Akuntansi*, *32*(01). Google Scholar

Scott, W. Richard. (2001). Institutions and organizations second edition Sage Publications. *Inc. Thousand Oaks, Calif.* Google Scholar

Sekaran, Uma, & Bougie, Roger. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. john wiley & sons. Google Scholar

Setiawan, Budi, & Hidayat, Muhammad. (2018). Perbandingan Dampak Ekonomi Transportasi Berbasis Jaringan dan Transportasi Konvensional di Negara Berkembang: Studi Kasus di Kota Palembang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Global Masa Kini*, *9*(2), 111–116. Google Scholar

Sihaloho, Maria. (2017). *Pengaruh Opini Audit Tahun Sebelumnya, Ukuran Perusahaan, Audit Tenure, Reputasi Kap dan Audit Lag terhadap Pemberian Opini Audit Going Concern pada Perusahaan Manufaktur yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Periode 2013-2016*. Google Scholar

Sultanoglu, Banu, Mugan, Can Simga, Sekerdag, Umut, & Oran, Adil. (2018). The auditor's opinion modifications around domestic and global financial crises. *Meditari Accountancy Research*. Google Scholar

Tuanakotta, Theodorus M. (2013). Audit Berbasis ISA (International Standards on Auditing). *Jakarta: Salemba Empat*. Google Scholar