



The Effects of Liquidity, Audit Tenure, and KAP Reputation on Going Concern Audit Opinion

Mawaddah¹, Sri Rahayu², Susfa Yetti³

Jambi University, Indonesia | mawaddahtita9@gmail.com¹

Jambi University, Indonesia | sri_rahayu@unja.ac.id²

Jambi University, Indonesia | Susfayetti@gmail.com³

Received: 02-05-2023

Reviewed: 10-05-2023

Accepted: 31-05-2023

Abstract

This study aims to find out how Liquidity, Audit Tenure, and KAP Reputation can affect acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions (Empirical Studies on Hotels, Resorts, and Cruise Lines Sub-Industry Companies listed on the IDX for the 2018-2021 period). The sample in this study is hotels, resorts, and cruise lines sub-industry companies using purposive sampling techniques so that 15 companies with 4 years of observation (60 observational data) were obtained that met the criteria. The data used is in the form of secondary data obtained from the company's annual report via the Indonesian Stock Exchange (IDX) website or the official website of the related company. Researchers use a quantitative approach to describe research problems through trend descriptions or being able to explain the relationship between variables. The analysis technique used in this study is data analysis using descriptive statistical analysis and logistic regression analysis with the help of SPSS 29 software. The data collection method is using documentation and literature study. The results of the study concluded that liquidity can significantly influence the acceptance of going concern audit opinions, while audit tenure and KAP reputation do not significantly the influence acceptance of going concern audit opinions.

Keywords: Liquidity, Audit tenure, KAP Reputation, Going concern, Audit Opinion.

Introduction

Report financial statements published by the company from accountability management on performance that has done to Owner Company or addressed to users report finance other. Information on reports finance is used as base taking decisions, so report finance needs made with actual and presented in a manner honest to user report finance. The goal is to give information on important related condition finance from something expected entity that can beneficial for user report finance in make decision economy (Aldilla, 2019).

Investors use report finance as a base for deciding to invest. Akbar and Ridwan (2019) reveal that before investors decide to invest in a company, investors will especially formerly analyze reports finances that have been published. Investors expect the role of a capable reliable auditor to give information related to the conditions of the actual company.

The opinion given by an independent auditor on presentation report finance is something a company often considered as a guarantee that company the no will experience bankruptcy in time close, so the auditor is often accused guilty of bankruptcy experienced by the company (Akbar and Ridwan, 2019). Auditing Standard 570 (IAPI, 2013) has been confirming that the auditor is the responsible answer in obtaining sufficient and appropriate audit evidence about accuracy using assumption continuity effort by management in drafting report finance and responsible auditors answer conclude ability entity in maintaining continuity his efforts.

Reflect on the case of bankruptcy experienced by the hotels, resorts, and cruise lines sub-industry companies after getting a fair audit opinion without exception namely PT Saraswati Griya Lestari Tbk (HOTL) which is listed on the Stock Exchange since January 10, 2013. The Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) conducted termination temporary trading securities in the Regular Market and Cash Market since the trading session I effect on 1 August 2022 (Cnbcindonesia.com, 2022). But the auditors are not given opinions about doubt on continuity Business Company, but rather the auditor pinned fair audit opinion without exception. The conditions experienced by PT Saraswati Griya Lestari Tbk can impact the public trust in professional accountant public. Auditors are considered to fail in giving an early warning, because can say that the auditor plays a role in conveying error in related information with the condition real entity.

Going concerned got interpreted as the assumption that an entity can keep going and endure until the period that is not determined or no expected liquidation (IAPI, 2013). Going concerned audit opinion is something evaluation doubts the top auditor's ability something entity in maintaining continuity his life in a period time appropriate (Wijaya & Riswan, 2022). Auditors need to understand in a manner careful and reliable related governing standards decision going concern opinion so report audit results finance truly reflect the condition. Remember the importance of understanding will impact issued audit opinion for companies, auditors need to be careful in making decisions going concern audit opinion (Halim, 2021). Going concern audit opinion is also considered as news bad (bad news) for a number company, especially going concern audit opinion can trigger problematic final forecast to become reality. company will more easily experience bankruptcy when the auditor gives deep-going concern opinion report audit (Wijaya & Riswan, 2022). Lots of interesting investors the funds or undo the investment consequence worrying continuity business future entity.

Factors that can influence publication going concern audit opinion by the auditor one of them is liquidity. Liquidity describes the ability of something entity to pay an obligation period in short with the use of assets owned (Melania et al., 2016). A capable company fulfills its obligation to its finances at an appropriate time means company the in a "liquid" state. This uses the ratio current (current ratio) as a tool for measuring the level of liquidity something a company. Ratio This measure the ability company fulfills the obligation period short use of asset smoothly. Companies that do not can fulfill their obligation period in short in a manner

The Effects of Liquidity, Audit Tenure, and KAP Reputation on Going Concern Audit Opinion

appropriate time will raise uncertainty in the continuity life company (Indriastuti, 2016). Different from research by Sari (2020) which states that the ratio liquidity has No influential significance to gift-going concern audit opinion.

Another factor that is expected capable of influencing going concern audit opinion is audit tenure. Audit tenure is every period gift audit service by clients certain to a Public Accounting Firm (Buchori & Budiantoro, 2019). The longer the relationship between the auditor and client will cause a close relationship, so can potentially shake the attitude toward auditor independence and will difficult give going concern audit opinion (Buchori & Budiantoro, 2019). Research conducted by Yanuariska & Ardiati (2018) revealed that a KAP tends no emit top audit opinion business company because ffraid lost a contract with a company later in the day and no seldom looked at clients as a source his income. However, the results study the no by research conducted by (Pratiwi & Lim, 2019) states that audit tenure is not influential to going concern audit opinion.

Neither did the going concern audit opinion obtained by the company regardless of the influence of KAP's reputation. Sihombing (2021) explains that KAP's reputation is viewed by the public as a name good and assessed KAP based on the achievement and trust of the relied public to a KAP. Wijaya & Riswan (2022) in their research capable prove the influence of KAP's reputation on reception going concern audit opinion, temporary research by Regina & Paramitadewi (2021) found that KAP's reputation is not affected by acceptance going concern audit opinion.

Studies previously about going concern audit opinion have Lots done and exist no results consistent with the study before. Based on the background behind, the research gap, and the phenomena that have been described above, the study aims to know if liquidity, audit tenures, and reputation hood are influential to reception going concern audit opinion.

Literature Review

Agency Theory

Jensen & Meckling (1976) define the theory of agency as a contract involving company management as an agent and shareholders as the principal to carry out several services by delegating decision-making authority from the principal to the agent. However, as business activities progress, distrust arises between the two parties where management in fulfilling its duties can pursue its interests by sacrificing the interests of the owner which results in various agency problems within the company (Halim, 2021). For this reason, the principal will appoint an auditor to assess management's performance in carrying out their duties based on the year-end financial reports.

Liquidity

The liquidity ratio is a ratio that can be used to measure a company's ability to pay its short-term obligations (Harahap, 2020). The capacity of a company to fulfill its current liabilities is illustrated by the liquidity ratio. The low level of liquidity can be said that the

company lacks the capital to pay debts. This study uses the current ratio (current ratio) as a tool to measure the level of liquidity of a company. The current Ratio is the ratio to measure the company's ability to meet obligations financial short term or which must be paid off immediately by using all of the current asset components (Lau, 2023). The amount of current assets that have a greater value than current liabilities determines whether a company is in a liquid or illiquid condition. Companies that can fulfill their obligations with their sources of funds can be said to be in a liquid state and if the company is not able to fulfill its obligations that are due, it is said to be an illiquid company (Zukarnain, 2020).

Audit Tenure

Audit Tenure is the length of time audit services are provided to a Public Accounting Firm in auditing an entity (Buchori & Budiantoro, 2019). According to the Regulation of the Minister of Finance Number: 17/PMK.01/2008, the provision of general audit services on client financial reports can only be performed by a Public Accounting Firm for a maximum of 6 (six) consecutive financial years and by an auditor for a maximum of 3 (three) consecutive financial year. The Public Accounting Firm and auditors can accept the audit assignment again after 1 (one) year of not auditing the client. Buchori & Budiantoro (2019) argues that the longer the auditor's relationship with the client will lead to a close relationship so that it can potentially shake the attitude of the auditor's independence and it will be difficult to give a going concern audit opinion. Companies that have a long audit engagement with a KAP tend to have a smaller probability of receiving a going concern audit opinion.

KAP's reputation

Public Accounting Firm is a business entity that has gotten permission from the Minister as a receptacle for Public Accountants to give services (PMK NUMBER: 17/PMK.01/2008). Sihombing (2021) explains that KAP's reputation is viewed by the public as Name Good and assessed KAP based on the achievement and trust of the relied public to a KAP. Public accounting firms that already have a reputation tend to try to maintain their good name and avoid things that can damage their reputation, so public accounting firms are always objective in their work (Akbar & Ridwan, 2019). Suparmun (2014) states that clients usually want audit services that come from large public accounting firms and have affiliations with international public accounting firms so that they have a higher quality. According to PMK NUMBER: 17/PMK.01/2008, the Office of Public Accountants is a business entity that has obtained permission from the Minister as a forum for Public Accountants to provide their services. KAP groups included in The Big four Four (Fauzan & Dewi, 2016) :

1. Prince Waterhouse Coopers is affiliated with KAP Tanudiredja, Wibisana & Rekan.
2. Deloitte Tohce Tohmatsu Limited is affiliated with KAP Osman Bing Satrio.
3. Ernst & Young is affiliated with KAP Purwantono, Suherman & Surja.
4. KMPG is affiliated with KAP Sidhartha and Widjaja.

The Effects of Liquidity, Audit Tenure, and KAP Reputation on Going Concern Audit Opinion

Going Concern Audit Opinion

Going concern audit opinion is used by the auditor as an evaluation of doubt over the ability of an entity to maintain its viability within a reasonable period. Auditing Standard 570 (IAPI, 2013) regulates the auditor's responsibilities in an audit of financial statements relating to management's use of the going concern assumption in preparing financial reports. The auditor's responsibility in this matter is to obtain sufficient and appropriate audit evidence regarding the appropriate use of the going concern assumption by management in preparing the financial statements and to conclude whether there is material uncertainty about the entity's ability to continue as a going concern. This responsibility is present even when management does not include an explicit assessment of the entity's viability. Doubts about the viability of a company need to be disclosed in an audit opinion report (Going Concern Audit Report) where the auditor is allowed to choose whether to issue an unqualified modified report or disclaimer opinion and included it in the general audit (IAPI, 2013). Going concern audit opinion is a term used for an audit opinion other than an unqualified opinion. An audit report with a modification regarding going concern is an indication that in the auditor's assessment, there is a risk that the auditee cannot survive in business.

Research Method

In research, this researcher uses an approach quantitative. Data used in the study This is secondary data from the report Finance Annual Hotels, Resorts, and Cruise Lines Sub-Industry Companies listed on the IDX 2018 - 2021. Data used was obtained from the IDX website www.idx.co.id and the website's official hotels, resorts, and cruise lines sub-industry companies cruise listed on the IDX from 2018 to 2021.

Research samples were chosen with the use method of purposive sampling, which is limited to the type of party certain can give desired information, because they are the only ones the owning party information or they fulfill specified criteria researcher (Sekaran & Bougie, 2019). Hotels, resorts, and cruise lines sub-industry companies listed on the IDX for 2018-2021 are a total of 31 companies. As for companies that comply with the criteria sample a total of 15 companies with year observation for 4 years, so amount sample is 60 companies.

The researcher used two analyses in the study This that is statistics descriptive and analysis regression logistics. Analysis of the utilized SPSS software version 29.00. The use of data in analysis statistics descriptive and analysis regression logistics is the mark of each indicator in each source variable from results calculation formulations and indicators concerned.

Results/Findings

Researchers used two analyses in this study, namely descriptive statistics and logistic regression analysis.

Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Means	std. Deviation
Liquidity	60	.15	16.20	3.3062	3.46489
audit tenures	60	1	9	3.58	2,324
KAP's reputation	60	0	1	.05	.220
Going Opinion concern	60	0	1	.15	.360
Valid N (listwise)	60				

Source: Data processed by researchers

The results of the 60 samples explain that the liquidity variable has a minimum value range of 0.15 and a maximum of 16.20. Audit tenures have a minimum value range of 1.00 and a maximum of 9.00. KAP's reputation has a minimum value range of 0.00 and a maximum of 1.00. Going concern audit opinion variables has a minimum value range of 0.00 and a maximum of 1.00.

Logistic Regression Analysis

Assessing Regression Model Feasibility

Hosmer and Lemeshow test

step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	3,983	8	.859

Source: Data processed by researchers

Hosmer and Lemeshow test results with a significance probability of $0.859 > 0.05$. The significance value is greater than 0.05, so H_0 cannot be rejected (accepted). This means that the model can predict the value of its observations or it can be said that the model is acceptable because it matches the observed data.

Assessing the Overall Model (Overall Model Fit)

Iterations History ^{a, b, c}

The Effects of Liquidity, Audit Tenure, and KAP Reputation on Going Concern Audit Opinion

			Coefficients
Ite ratio		-2 log-likelihoods	Constant
Step 0	1	51,650	-1,400
	2	50,734	-1,701
	3	50,725	-1,734
	4	50,725	-1,735

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. Initial -2 Log-Likelihood: 50,725

c. Estimation terminated at iterations number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than,001.

Source: Data processed by researchers

Test it shows a value of -2 Log Likelihood before entering the independent variable of 50.725 which will be compared with the Chi-Square table value with a significance level of 5%. The Chi-Square value is calculated with a df of 59 (60 – 1), which results in a value of 77.930. Thus, -2 Log Likelihood < Chi-Square table (50.725 < 77.930), then the null hypothesis is not rejected, which means that the model before adding the independent variables meets the test requirements.

Coefficient of Determination (Nagelkerke R Square)

Summary models

step	-2 log-likelihoods	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	33,454 ^a	.250	.438

a. Estimation terminated at iterations number 20 because maximum iterations have been reached. The final solution cannot b found.

Source: Data processed by researchers

Nagelkerke R Square value is 0.438 which states that the dependent variable (audit opinion going concern) can be influenced by independent variables (liquidity, audit tenure, and KAP reputation) of 43.8%. The rest, 56.2% is explained by other variables not included in this research model. Such as the company's financial condition, company size, and company growth that can influence the acceptance of going concern audit opinion (Akbar & Ridwan, 2019).

Wald's test**Variables in the Equation**

	B	SE	Wald	Df	Sig.	Exp (B)	95% CI for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Step 1 ^a Liquidity	-1,188	.506	5512	1	.019	.305	.113	.822
audit tenures	.349	.204	2,926	1	.087	1,418	.950	2.114
KAP's reputation	-19,877	23008.750	.000	1	.999	.000	.000	.
Constant	-.958	.992	.932	1	.334	.384		

a. Variable (s) entered on step 1: Liquidity, audit tenure, KAP reputation.

Source: Data processed by researchers

Based on the results of the table above, the above results can be interpreted as follows:

1. Liquidity (X1)

The coefficient value is -1.188 and a significance value of 0.019. The significance value for variable X1 (liquidity) is $0.019 < 0.05$, meaning that liquidity affects the going concern audit opinion significantly.

2. Audit Tenures (X2)

The coefficient value is 0.349 and the significance value of 0.087. The significance value for variable X2 (audit tenure) is $0.087 > 0.05$ so it can be concluded that audit tenure does not affect the going concern audit opinion significantly.

3. KAP Reputation (X3)

The results of the coefficient of -19.877 and a significance value of 0.999. The significance value for variable X3 (KAP reputation) is $0.999 > 0.05$ so it can be concluded that KAP reputation does not affect the going concern audit opinion significantly.

Effect Of Liquidity On Acceptance Of Going Concern Audit Opinion

Going concern audit opinion with a coefficient of -1.188 and the significance value of the liquidity variable is smaller than the significance level, namely $0.019 < 0.05$ ($\alpha = 5\%$), indicating that the liquidity variable affects the acceptance of going concern audit opinion.

Liquidity affects the going concern audit opinion, which means that a company that is illiquid or unable to pay debts with all of its current assets will have a greater chance of getting

The Effects of Liquidity, Audit Tenure, and KAP Reputation on Going Concern Audit Opinion

a going concern audit opinion from the auditors. The calculation of the liquidity ratio, which indicates the inability of a company to pay all or part of its debts that are due, provides quite a lot of benefits for the auditor's consideration in issuing a going concern audit opinion. An auditor in giving a going concern audit opinion will certainly pay attention to the company's financial condition, including its liquid or illiquid condition.

The results of the study show that the liquidity variable influences the acceptance of going concern audit opinion. Companies that cannot fulfill their obligations or in circumstances illiquid will have greater potential to receive a going concern audit opinion. These results are in line with research conducted by Indriastuti (2016) , Saifudin & Trisnawati (2016), and Byusi & Achyani (2018) which state that liquidity affects the acceptance of going concern audit opinion, this is because this ability affects the credibility of the company and can be considered as a signal that the company is facing problems that can disrupt its business continuity. These results are different from research conducted by Sari (2020) and Yuliyani & Erawati (2017) which state that the liquidity ratio has no significant effect on giving a going concern audit opinion.

Effect Of Audit Tenure On Acceptance Of Going Concern Audit Opinion

Audit tenure variables on the acceptance of going concern audit opinion with a coefficient of 0.349 and the significance value of the liquidity variable are greater than the significance level, namely $0.087 > 0.05$ ($\alpha = 5\%$), indicating that the audit tenure variable does not affect acceptance of going concern audit opinion.

Audit tenure does not affect acceptance of going concern audit opinion for an entity. An auditor will tend to maintain his professionalism and not be afraid of losing contracts and fees from the auditee when issuing a going concern audit opinion. Even a long audit engagement period cannot guarantee that the auditor will be able to better recognize and understand the problems faced by an entity. An auditor will tend to maintain independence in their work along or without a long agreement before.

The results of this study are supported by research conducted by Rahmat et al. , (2022), Suryo et al., (2019), Pratiwi & Lim (2019) and Andyny (2017) which state that audit tenures do not affect the acceptance of going concern audit opinion. The absence of this influence indicates that the auditor is not disturbed by the length of the contract period between the KAP and its client. This is because the Public Accounting Firm in giving an opinion on the fairness of the financial statements regardless of the length of time the audit period is with the client to maintain professionalism and independence. These results are different from research conducted by Panjaitan & Chariri (2014) and Yanuariska & Ardiati (2018) which state that audit tenures affect acceptance of going concern audit opinion.

Effect Of KAP's Reputation On Acceptance Of Going Concern Audit Opinion

The results of the KAP's reputation variable analysis on the acceptance of going concern audit opinion had a coefficient of -19.877 and the significance value of the liquidity variable is greater than the significance level, namely $0.999 > 0.05$ ($\alpha = 5\%$), indicating that the KAP reputation variable does not affect acceptance of going concern audit opinion.

These results indicate that both companies audited by KAP are big four or non big four does not guarantee receipt of the going concern audit opinion for the company will be smaller or bigger. Auditors from KAP's big four or nonbig four will continue to be objective in providing opinions for the companies they audit. If the company experiences signs of bankruptcy, then the audit opinion is going concern will be received regardless of whether KAP is big four or non- big KAP four.

The results of this study are supported by research that has been conducted by Yanuariska & Ardiati (2018) and Regina & Paramitadewi (2021) which states that KAP's reputation does not affect acceptance of going concern audit opinion. This happened because the auditor from KAP big four or non- big KAP 4 will always be objective in providing a fair opinion on the financial statements of the companies they audit to maintain their reputation. Companies that use KAP The Big Four are not guaranteed to get unqualified opinions or audit opinions going concerned. The results of this study are not in line with research conducted by Akbar and Ridwan (2019) and Rahmat et al. , (2022) which state that the reputation of the KAP affects the acceptance of going concern audit opinion. The effect of KAP's reputation on acceptance of going concern audit opinion is based on a statement that a large KAP will have high capability in detecting material problems in the client's financial statements.

Conclusion

Based on the results of analysis and testing about influence variable independent liquidity, audit tenure, and KAP reputation variable dependent that is reception going concern audit opinion on hotels, resorts, and cruise lines Sub-industry Company's cruise listed on the Indonesian Stock Exchange, then obtained conclusion as follows:

1. Liquidity affects the acceptance of going concern audit opinion for hotels, resorts, and cruise lines sub-industry companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2018-2021.
2. Audit tenure does not affect acceptance of going concern audit opinion for hotels, resorts, and cruise lines sub-industry companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2018-2021.
3. KAP's reputation does not affect acceptance of going concern audit opinion for hotels, resorts, and cruise lines sub-industry companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2018-2021.

The Effects of Liquidity, Audit Tenure, and KAP Reputation on Going Concern Audit Opinion

Research Limitations

This study has several limitations both in terms of the sample and the use of variables. Some of the limitations of this study are:

1. Researchers only use 3 independent variables including liquidity (X1), audit tenure (X2), and KAP reputation (X3).
2. The data used in this study is only in the 2018-2021 period.
3. The scope of this research is limited to one sub-industry, namely the hotels, resorts, and cruise lines sub-industry.

Suggestion

This research in the future is expected to present more research results in quality again with some input on several things, including :

1. Subsequent research is suggested to add variables that have a relationship related to going concern audit opinions, such as the company's financial condition, company size, and company growth.
2. It is suggested to expand the period of the research period.
3. Further research is expected to broaden the scope of the companies to be studied, such as consumer sector companies cyclical, the energy sector, and financial companies.

References

- Akbar, R., & Ridwan, R. (2019). The Influence of Company Financial Condition, Company Size, Company Growth, and Cap Reputation on Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinions in Mining Companies Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2015-2017. *Scientific Journal of Accounting Economics Students*. <https://doi.org/10.24815/jimeka.v4i2.12239>
- Andyny, RD (2017). The Influence of Company Size, Audit Tenure, and Cap Reputation on Going Concern Audit Opinions in Manufacturing Companies in the Consumer Goods Sector in the 2014-2015 Period. *Simki-Economic*, 01 (02), 12.
- Buchori, A., & Budiantoro, H. (2019). The Effect of Client Company Size, Audit Tenure, and Auditor Specialization on Audit Quality. *Journal of Taxes, Accounting, Information Systems, and Auditing (PAKSI)*, 1 (1), 22–39. <https://doi.org/10.33476/jpaksi.v1i1.965>
- Byusi, H., & Achyani, F. (2018). DETERMINANTS OF GOING CONCERN AUDIT OPINION (Empirical Study of Real Estate and Property Companies Listed on the IDX in 2013-2015). *Indonesian Accounting and Finance Research*, 3 (1), 13–28. <https://doi.org/10.23917/reaksi.v3i1.5552>
- Fauzan, I., & Dewi, R. (2016). The Influence of Audit Tenure, Audit Rotation and Cap Reputation on Audit Quality (Study of Manufacturing Companies Listed on the

- Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2011-2014). *ASET Journal (Research Accounting)*, 8 (1), 39. <https://doi.org/10.17509/jaset.v8i1.4020>
- Halim, KI (2021). Effect of Leverage, Previous Year's Audit Opinion, Company Growth, and Company Size on Going Concern Audit Opinion. *Owners*, 5 (1), 164–173. <https://doi.org/10.33395/owner.v5i1.348>
- Hope, SS (2020). *Critical Analysis of Financial Statements* (10th ed.). PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- IAPI. (2013). *Public Accountant Professional Standards*.
- Indriastuti, M. (2016). Effect of Profitability and Liquidity on Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinion. *Economic Focus: Scientific Journal of Economics*, 11 (2), 37–50.
- Lau, EA (2023). Liquidity Position of PT Bina Karya Jaya Abadi Tbk in Three Periods. *Journal of Business Management and Economic Development*, 1 (02), 114–122.
- Panjaitan, CM, & Chariri, A. (2014). Effect of Tenure, KAP Size, and Auditor Specialization on Audit Quality. *Diponegoro Journal of Accounting*, 3 (3), 1–12. <http://ejournal-s1.undip.ac.id/index.php/accounting>
- Pratiwi, L., & Lim, TH (2019). The Influence of Company Growth, Audit Tenure, and Previous Year's Audit Opinion on Going Concern Audit Opinion. *Journal of Financial and Accounting Research*, 4 (2), 67–77. <https://doi.org/10.25134/jrka.v4i2.1700>
- Rahmat, D., Hizazi, A., & Yustien, R. (2022). Effect of Audit Engagement Period, KAP Size, and Auditor Independence on Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinion. *Jambi Accounting Review*, 3 (1), 95–103.
- Regina, D., & Paramitadewi, HDSL (2021). The Influence of Cap's Reputation, Previous Year's Audit Opinion, Liquidity, Solvency, and Financial Condition on Acceptance of Going Concern Audit Opinion. *BALANCE: Journal of Accounting, Auditing, And Finance*, 18 (1), 52–71. <https://doi.org/10.25170/balance.v18i1.2306>
- Saifudin, A., & Trisnawati, R. (2016). The Influence of Company Size, Profitability, Liquidity, Solvency, and Company Growth on Going Concern Audit Opinion. *Sharia Paper Accounting FEB UMS*, 589–601.
- Sari, PC (2020). The Effect of Audit Lag, Profitability, and Liquidity on Going Concern Audit Opinion in Manufacturing Companies Listed on the Indonesian Stock Exchange. *Journal of Warmadewa Accounting Research*, 1 (1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.22225/jraw.1.1.1509.1-7>
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2019). *Research Methods for Business: Skills-Development Approach* (6th ed.). Salemba Four.
- Sihombing, T. (2021). The Influence of Audit Opinion, Audit Tenure, and Profitability on Audit Delay with the Reputation of a Public Accounting Firm (KAP) as a Moderating

The Effects of Liquidity, Audit Tenure, and KAP Reputation on Going Concern Audit Opinion

- Variable. *Jurakunman (Journal of Accounting and Management)*, 14 (1), 26.
<https://doi.org/10.48042/jurakunman.v14i1.59>
- Superman, H. (2014). The variable that affects the acceptance of the audit opinion with the going concern paragraph. *Journal of Business And Accounting*, 16 (1), 86–93.
- Suryo, M., Nugraha, E., & Nugroho, L. (2019). The Importance of Going Concern Audit Opinion and Its Determination. *Inovbiz: Journal of Business Innovation*, 7 (2), 123.
<https://doi.org/10.35314/inovbiz.v7i2.1164>
- Yanuariska, MD, & Ardiati, AY (2018). The Effect of Financial Conditions, Audit Tenure, and KAP Size on Going Concern Audit Opinions in Manufacturing Companies Listed on the IDX in 2012-2016. *Maksipreneur Journal: Management, Cooperatives, and Entrepreneurship*, 7 (2), 117. <https://doi.org/10.30588/jmp.v7i2.361>
- Yuliyani, NMA, & Erawati, NMA (2017). Effect of Financial Distress, Profitability, Leverage and Liquidity on Going Concern Audit Opinion. *Udayana University Accounting E-Journal*, 19(2), 1490–1520.
<https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/Accounting/article/view/28457/18712>
- Zukarnain, M. (2020). Effect of liquidity and profitability on capital structure. *Journal of Economics, Management, and Accounting*, 1 (1), 49–54.
<https://doi.org/10.32503/jck.v1i1.2258>