REPUBLIK INDONESIA
KEMENTERIAN HUKUM

SURAT PENCATATAN CIPTAAN

Dalam rangka pelindungan ciptaan di bidang ilmu pengetahuan, seni dan sastra berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta, dengan ini menerangkan:

Nomor dan tanggal permohonan	:	EC002026006055, 11 Januari 2026
Pencipta		
Nama	:	**Haryati Indah dan Michelle Kristian, Tjhin**
Alamat	:	Lengkong RT 06 RW 01 Kec. Bojong, Kab. Tegal, Bojong, Kab. Tegal, Jawa Tengah
Kewarganegaraan	:	Indonesia
Pemegang Hak Cipta		
Nama	:	**Haryati Indah**
Alamat	:	Lengkong RT 06 RW 01 Kec. Bojong, Kab. Tegal, Bojong, Kab. Tegal, Jawa Tengah
Kewarganegaraan	:	Indonesia
Jenis Ciptaan	:	**Karya Tulis (Artikel)**
Judul Ciptaan	:	**ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL FACTORS AFFECTING GOING-CONCERN AUDIT OPINIONS IN TEXTILE COMPANIES LISTED ON THE INDONESIA STOCK EXCHANGE FOR THE PERIOD 2022–2024**
Tanggal dan tempat diumumkan untuk pertama kali di wilayah Indonesia atau di luar wilayah Indonesia	:	10 Januari 2026, di Kota Adm. Jakarta Timur
Jangka waktu pelindungan	:	Berlaku selama hidup Pencipta dan terus berlangsung selama 70 (tujuh puluh) tahun setelah Pencipta meninggal dunia, terhitung mulai tanggal 1 Januari tahun berikutnya.
Nomor Pencatatan	:	001077014

adalah benar berdasarkan keterangan yang diberikan oleh Pemohon.
Surat Pencatatan Hak Cipta atau produk Hak terkait ini sesuai dengan Pasal 72 Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta.

a.n. MENTERI HUKUM
DIREKTUR JENDERAL KEKAYAAN INTELEKTUAL
u.b
Direktur Hak Cipta dan Desain Industri

Agung Damarsasongko,SH.,MH.
NIP. 196912261994031001

Balai Besar Sertifikasi Elektronik

Disclaimer:
1. Dalam hal pemohon memberikan keterangan tidak sesuai dengan surat pernyataan, Menteri berwenang untuk mencabut surat pencatatan permohonan.
2. Surat Pencatatan ini telah disegel secara elektronik menggunakan segel elektronik yang ditertibkan oleh Balai Besar Sertifikasi Elektronik, Badan Siber dan Sandi Negara.
3. Surat Pencatatan ini dapat dibuktikan keasliannya dengan memindai kode QR pada dokumen ini dan informasi akan ditampilkan dalam browser.

ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL FACTORS AFFECTING GOING-CONCERN AUDIT OPINIONS IN TEXTILE COMPANIES LISTED ON THE INDONESIA STOCK EXCHANGE FOR THE PERIOD 2022–2024

Haryati Indah[1*] and Michelle Kristian[2]

[1]Professional Accounting Education Program, Universitas Tarumanagara*
Email: Haryati.indah@gmail.com
[2]Universitas Tarumanagara
Email: michellek@fe.untar.ac.id

* Corresponding Author

Submitted: dd-mm-yyyy, Revised: dd-mm-yyyy, Accepted: dd-mm-yyyy

ABSTRACT

This research aims to acquire factual substantiation concerning the influence of profitability, liquidity, solvency, and firm scale on going concern audit assessments. The population in this investigation consists of textile sector enterprises registered on the Indonesia Stock Exchange throughout 2022–2024. The sample comprised 29 entities, determined through the purposive sampling technique. The data category employed is secondary information, derived from corporate financial statements accessed via www.idx.co.id and subsequently analyzed using the Eviews 13 software. The findings of this inquiry indicate that profitability, liquidity, solvency, and firm size exert an influence on going concern audit evaluations.

Keywords: *Going Concern Audit Opinion, Profitability, Liquidity, Solvency, Firm Size*

1. INTRODUCTION

Background

Financial statements constitute a fundamental medium through which stakeholders evaluate a company's performance and financial condition. To ensure their credibility, these statements must undergo independent examination by external auditors, who are responsible for expressing an opinion on whether the financial information is presented fairly. A going-concern audit opinion is particularly critical, as it communicates the auditor's assessment of an entity's ability to continue operating within a reasonable foreseeable period.

A going-concern opinion serves as an informative signal for users—including investors, creditors, and regulatory bodies—because it highlights potential financial distress that may threaten a firm's operational sustainability. In forming this opinion, auditors consider both financial and non-financial indicators, with financial ratios functioning as key metrics of stability and performance.

In recent years, concerns surrounding going-concern issues have intensified in Indonesia, particularly within the manufacturing sector, including textile and garment companies. Despite its significant contribution to national economic growth and employment, the textile industry has faced substantial challenges such as rising production costs, fluctuations in import-based raw material prices, heightened global competition, and weakening domestic demand.

These pressures have constrained profitability and disrupted cash flows. For instance, PT Pan Brothers Tbk received an auditor's emphasis-of-matter paragraph indicating substantial doubt about its ability to continue operations due to liquidity limitations and high leverage. Such cases demonstrate how financial indicators—profitability, liquidity, and solvency—are closely linked to auditors' going-concern judgments.

Beyond financial ratios, firm size also influences auditor evaluations. Larger firms are generally perceived as more resilient to economic shocks because they possess stronger financing capacity, diversified business operations, and more established internal control systems.

Profitability reflects a firm's capability to generate earnings over a particular period, with higher profitability enhancing its ability to meet financial obligations. Liquidity captures the firm's capacity to satisfy short-term commitments through readily available assets. Solvency represents the ability to fulfill long-term obligations; however, previous research (e.g., Bahtiar et al., 2021) suggests that solvency may not exert a significant effect on going-concern opinions.

Existing empirical findings remain inconclusive. Wahyuni, Wijayanti, and Cahyadi (2024) reported that liquidity and solvency positively influence going-concern opinions, whereas profitability exerts a negative effect. Catherine, Tanusdjaja, and Kristian (2025) similarly found a negative impact of profitability and a positive impact of solvency, while liquidity and firm size were insignificant. In contrast, Ferdy and Iskak (2022) found profitability to be negative but statistically insignificant.

Given these inconsistencies, the present study investigates the effects of profitability, liquidity, solvency, and firm size on going-concern audit opinions among textile companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange during 2022–2024. This study contributes to the literature by providing updated evidence on financial and firm-specific determinants that influence auditors' going-concern assessments in the Indonesian context.

Problem Formulation

Based on the background above, the research questions are as follows:

1. Does profitability influence the issuance of going-concern audit opinions?
2. Does liquidity influence the issuance of going-concern audit opinions?
3. Does solvency influence the issuance of going-concern audit opinions?
4. Does firm size influence the issuance of going-concern audit opinions?

Agency Theory

Agency theory explains that within a company's operational activities, a relationship exists between the principal—namely the shareholders—and the agent, who is represented by management. According to Jensen and Meckling (1976), conflicts of interest frequently arise within this agency relationship because each party has different objectives. Owners generally seek to maximize firm value, whereas managers may prioritize their own personal interests. In relation to this study, the principal refers to entities that engage intermediaries, specifically Public Accounting Firms (KAP). KAPs act as agents tasked with auditing financial statements to enhance the confidence of stakeholders such as investors and creditors. The auditor's decision-making role, as the agent, is reflected in the issuance of an audit opinion that assesses whether the company is able to maintain its going-concern status (Ferdy & Iskak, 2022). Within the auditing context, agency theory is relevant because auditors function as neutral parties that bridge the differing objectives of management and owners by providing an independent opinion on the financial statements. A going-concern opinion serves as a monitoring mechanism to mitigate the risk of opportunistic managerial behavior that may obscure the company's true financial condition.

Signaling Theory

Signaling theory, introduced by Spence (1973), posits that firms provide signals to external parties in order to reduce information asymmetry between management and investors. In the context of this study, signaling theory illustrates that audit opinions and financial ratios function as signals regarding a company's financial condition and future prospects. Positive signals are reflected in firms exhibiting strong financial performance, as indicated by high profitability and liquidity ratios, low leverage, and larger firm size. Conversely, when financial ratios show weak performance, the market perceives these as negative signals. Such negative indications increase the likelihood that auditors will issue a going-concern opinion due to heightened doubt about the company's ability to sustain its operations.

Effect of Profitability on Going-Concern Audit Opinions

Profitability provides an indication of an entity's ability to generate earnings from its operational activities. Firms with high profitability generally demonstrate strong financial performance and are better able to meet their financial obligations. Consequently, such firms have a lower likelihood of receiving a going-concern audit opinion. Conversely, firms with low profitability are more vulnerable to financial difficulties, which may raise auditors' doubts regarding the entity's ability to sustain its operations. Therefore, profitability is expected to have a negative effect on the issuance of going-concern audit opinions.

The negative effect of profitability on going-concern audit opinions is supported by the findings of Irawanto and Tanusdjaja (2020). Similar results were reported by Wahyuni, Wijayanti, and Cahyadi (2024), as well as Catherine, Tanusdjaja, and Kristian (2025), who concluded that higher profitability reduces the likelihood of auditors issuing a going-concern opinion.

H1: Profitability has a negative effect on going-concern audit opinions.

The Effect of Liquidity on Going-Concern Audit Opinions

Liquidity represents a firm's capacity to meet its short-term obligations using its current assets. A high level of liquidity indicates strong financial health and the ability to settle short-term liabilities, thereby reducing the likelihood of financial distress. Conversely, firms with low liquidity are more prone to cash flow difficulties, which may threaten their operational continuity. Therefore, higher liquidity is expected to decrease the probability that auditors will issue a going-concern audit opinion. Empirical findings support this relationship. Dewi and Rismawandi (2025) reported that liquidity has a negative effect on going-concern audit opinions, indicating that firms with stronger liquidity positions are less likely to receive such opinions.

H2: Liquidity has a negative effect on going-concern audit opinions.

The Effect of Solvency on Going-Concern Audit Opinions

Solvency, often measured through leverage ratios, reflects the extent to which a firm is financed by debt. As interest and principal repayment obligations increase, high leverage indicates a greater level of financial risk for the company. Such conditions may raise auditors' doubts regarding the entity's ability to sustain its operations. Consequently, firms with high leverage are more likely to receive a going-concern audit opinion because their financial structure signals heightened vulnerability. This reasoning is supported by prior empirical findings. Irwanto and

Tanusdjaja (2020) report that solvency has a positive influence on going-concern audit opinions. Similarly, studies by Wahyuni, Wijayanti, and Cahyadi (2024), as well as Catherine, Tanusdjaja, and Kristian (2025), find that higher levels of leverage increase the likelihood of auditors issuing a going-concern opinion. These results align with the expectations of the present study.
H3: Solvency has a positive effect on going-concern audit opinions.

The Effect of Firm Size on Going-Concern Audit Opinions
Firm size reflects a company's financial strength, resilience, and access to external funding sources. Larger firms generally possess more robust risk management systems and more stable resources compared to smaller entities. Because of their stronger capacity to withstand economic pressures, auditors tend to have greater confidence in the continuity of large firms. As a result, auditors are less likely to issue going-concern audit opinions for firms of larger size.
Empirical evidence supports this view. Amami and Triani, as cited in Catherine, Tanusdjaja, and Kristian (2025), report that firm size has a significant influence on going-concern audit opinions.
H4: Firm size has a negative effect on going-concern audit opinions.

2. RESEARCH METHOD
The object of this study consists of textile companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) during the period 2022–2024, selected using the purposive sampling method. The sampling criteria include: (1) companies consistently listed on the IDX from 2022 to 2024; (2) companies that did not undergo an Initial Public Offering (IPO), delisting, suspension, or sector reclassification during the observation period; and (3) companies that prepared their financial statements in Indonesian Rupiah (IDR) for the years 2022–2024. Based on these criteria, a total of 29 firm-year observations were obtained for analysis.

The data collection technique employed in this study is documentation, using secondary data in the form of annual financial statements and independent audit reports obtained from the official IDX website. The data were processed using EViews 13.0. The analytical methods utilized include descriptive statistical analysis and inferential analysis, consisting of panel regression model estimation, model selection procedures, classical assumption testing, and model feasibility testing. Model evaluation was conducted using the coefficient of determination (R^2), the F-test (simultaneous testing), and the t-test (partial testing) at a significance level of 0.05, corresponding to a confidence level of 95%.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
This study measures the dependent variable, going-concern audit opinion, using the number of days between the company's fiscal year-end (31 December) and the issuance date of the independent auditor's report. For the independent variables, profitability is measured using the Return on Assets (ROA), calculated by dividing net income after tax by total assets. Liquidity is measured using the Current Ratio (CR), which compares current assets to current liabilities. Solvency is measured using the Debt to Assets Ratio (DAR), calculated by dividing total liabilities by total assets. Firm size is measured as the natural logarithm of total assets. The sample selection process begins with 55 textile companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) during the 2022–2024 period. From this initial population, 24 companies were excluded because they did not prepare their financial statements in Indonesian Rupiah (IDR) during the observation period. In addition, 2 companies were removed from the sample due to delisting in 2024. After applying all criteria, a total of **29 companies** met the sample requirements and were included in the analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

The results of the descriptive statistical analysis conducted in this study are presented in the following table:

Table 3.1 Descriptive Statistics Test

Variabel	n	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
GCO	29	0.000000	1.000000	0.517241	0.508548
ROA	29	-0.517379	0.111910	-0.047647	0.120605
CR	29	0.017475	2.739267	1.206888	0.812615
DAR	29	0.360906	2.471253	0.879837	0.587476

Source: Processed Data Using EViews 13.0

Panel Data Regression Model Estimation Analysis

a. Chow Test or Likelihood Test

The Chow Test is used to determine whether the Common Effect Model (CEM) or the Fixed Effect Model (FEM) is more appropriate. The rejection of the null hypothesis is based on comparing the calculated F-statistic with the critical F-table value. If the calculated F-statistic is greater than (>) the F-table value, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating that the FEM is the more suitable model. Conversely, if the calculated F-statistic is smaller than (<) the F-table value, the null hypothesis is accepted and the CEM should be used (Widarjono, 2009). Additionally, if the resulting probability value is smaller than the significance level of 0.05, the Fixed Effect Model (FEM) is considered the most appropriate (alternative hypothesis accepted), and vice versa. The results of the Chow Test in this study are presented in the following table:

Table 3.2 Chow Test Results

Redundant Fixed Effects Tests
Equation: Untitled
Test cross-section fixed effects

Effects Test	Statistic	d.f.	Prob.
Cross-section F	8.696367	(9,15)	0.0002
Cross-section Chi-square	52.995163	9	0.0000

Source: Processed Data Using EViews 13.0

Based on the results of the Chow Test conducted through the Redundant Fixed Effects Test, the cross-section chi-square value obtained was 52.995163 with a probability of 0.0000, which is lower than the 5% significance level. Since all test indicators show that the probability of the F-statistic is below the α level of 0.05, the appropriate model to be applied is the Fixed Effect Model (FEM).

Following this result, it is necessary to determine whether the fixed effect or random effect model should ultimately be used. Therefore, the Random Effect Model will be estimated and subsequently compared with the Fixed Effect Model using the Hausman Test.

b. Hausman Test

The Hausman Test is applied to identify the most appropriate estimation approach between the Fixed Effect Model (FEM) and the Random Effect Model (REM). The test is conducted under the following hypotheses:

H_0**:** The Random Effect Model is the appropriate specification (probability value > 0.05).

H_1**:** The Fixed Effect Model is the appropriate specification (probability value < 0.05).

Model selection is determined by examining the p-value obtained from the test. When the p-value is lower than the 5% significance threshold ($\alpha = 0.05$), H_0 is rejected, indicating that the Fixed Effect Model should be employed. Conversely, if the p-value exceeds 0.05, H_0 is accepted, and the Random Effect Model is considered more suitable. The results of the Hausman Test are presented in the following table:

Table 3.3 Hausman Test Results

Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test
Equation: Untitled
Test cross-section random effects

Test Summary	Chi-Sq. Statistic	Chi-Sq. d.f.	Prob.
Cross-section random	19.563438	4	0.0006

Source: Processed Data Using EViews 13.0

Based on Table 3.3, the chi-square statistic is 19.563438 with a chi-square probability of 0.0006, which is below the 0.05 significance level (0.0006 < 0.05). Therefore, the appropriate estimation approach is the Fixed Effect Model (FEM). Consequently, referring to the Hausman Test results, the Fixed Effect Model is deemed more suitable for processing the data compared to the Random Effect Model.

c. Lagrange Multiplier Test

The Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test is used to determine whether the Common Effect Model or the Random Effect Model is more appropriate. This test is conducted by referring to the following hypotheses:

H_0: The Common Effect Model is appropriate.

H_1: The Random Effect Model is appropriate.

The LM test relies on the Breusch–Pagan probability value. If the Breusch–Pagan probability is below the significance level α, then H0 is rejected, indicating that the Random Effect Model is the appropriate estimation approach for the panel regression. Conversely, if the probability exceeds α, H0 is accepted and the Common Effect Model is selected.

Table 3.4 presents the results of the Lagrange Multiplier Test

Lagrange Multiplier Tests for Random Effects
Null hypotheses: No effects
Alternative hypotheses: Two-sided (Breusch-Pagan) and one-sided (all others) alternatives

	Test Hypothesis		
	Cross-section	Time	Both
Breusch-Pagan	3.908572	0.126862	4.035434
	(0.0480)	(0.7217)	(0.0446)

Source: Processed Data Using EViews 13.0

Based on the results of the analysis, the cross-section value obtained is 3.908572 with a probability of 0.0480, which is lower than the 5% significance threshold. Since the test results indicate that the Breusch–Pagan probability is below the significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected, and thus the Random Effect Model (REM) is deemed the more appropriate approach. However, when considering the overall model selection process—including the results of the Chow Test and the Hausman Test—the Fixed Effect Model (FEM) remains the most suitable specification for the regression analysis in this study.

Model Selection

Based on the results of the Chow Test conducted earlier, the Fixed Effect Model (FEM) was identified as the appropriate model. Subsequently, a Hausman Test was performed to determine whether the FEM or the Random Effect Model (REM) should be applied. The results of the Hausman Test further confirmed that the FEM is the most suitable specification for this study. The estimation results of the Fixed Effect Model are presented in the following table:

Table 3.5 Fixed Effect Model (FEM) Results

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
GCO	-0.034078	0.036359	-0.937285	0.3635
ROA	-0.250152	0.044822	-5.580966	0.0001
CR	-0.226847	0.046442	-4.884530	0.0002
DAR	0.296625	0.091185	3.252996	0.0054
TA	-0.334426	0.043556	-7.678031	0.0000
	Effects Specification			
Cross-section fixed (dummy variables)				
R-squared	0.973487	Mean dependent var		0.071379
Adjusted R-squared	0.950510	S.D. dependent var		0.743883
S.E. of regression	0.165487	Akaike info criterion		-0.453572
Sum squared resid	0.410791	Schwarz criterion		0.206502
Log likelihood	20.57679	Hannan-Quinn criter.		-0.246845
F-statistic	42.36671	Durbin-Watson stat		2.340144
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Source: Processed Data Using EViews 13.0

Model Feasibility Test

a. F-Statistic Test (ANOVA)

The F-test is conducted to determine whether all independent variables in the research model collectively exert a significant influence on the dependent variable. As presented in Table 4.4, which reports the FEM results, the F-statistic value is 42.3667 with a Prob(F-statistic) of 0.000000. This probability value is considerably lower than the 0.05 significance threshold, indicating that all independent variables jointly have a statistically significant effect on the Going Concern Audit Opinion. Thus, the panel regression model used in this study is deemed appropriate and capable of explaining the overall variation in the Going Concern Audit Opinion.

b. Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

The R^2 test is used to evaluate the extent to which variations in the dependent variable can be explained by all independent variables in the model. Based on the FEM results presented in Table 4.4, the coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.973487, indicating that 97.35% of the variation in the Going Concern Audit Opinion can be explained by the independent variables. Meanwhile, the adjusted R^2 value of 0.950510 shows that, after adjusting for the number of predictors, the model still explains 95.05% of the variation in the dependent variable. These findings indicate that the model possesses strong predictive capability and is highly suitable for analytical purposes.

c. F-Test (Simultaneous)

This test assesses whether the independent variables collectively have a substantial effect on the dependent variable, as reflected in the probability value of the F-statistic. The probability value reported in Table 3.5 is 0.065147 (> 0.05), indicating that the independent variables, when considered together, do not have a statistically significant effect on the dependent variable in this study.

d. t-Test (Partial/Hypothesis Testing)

The t-test is employed to examine the individual effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable, determining whether each predictor in the model has a statistically significant influence. Based on the results of the statistical analysis, the relationship between each independent variable and the dependent variable can be interpreted as follows:

1) Effect of Profitability on Going Concern Audit Opinion
   The FEM results (Table 3.5) show that the profitability variable (ROA) has a negative coefficient of –0.250152 with a probability value of 0.0001. This indicates that higher profitability leads to a lower likelihood of receiving a Going Concern Opinion (GCO). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 (H1) is accepted.

2) Effect of Liquidity on Going Concern Audit Opinion
   The FEM results presented in Table 3.5 reveal that liquidity (CR) has a significant negative effect, with a coefficient of –0.226847 and a probability value of 0.0002. This suggests that an increase in liquidity reduces the likelihood of receiving a GCO. Thus, Hypothesis 2 (H2) is accepted.

3) Effect of Solvency on Going Concern Audit Opinion
   The FEM results (Table 3.5) indicate that solvency (DAR) has a positive coefficient of 0.296625 with a probability value of 0.0054. This finding shows that higher leverage increases the likelihood of receiving a GCO. Accordingly, Hypothesis 3 (H3) is accepted.

4) Effect of Firm Size on Going Concern Audit Opinion
   The FEM output demonstrates that firm size (TA) has a significant negative effect, with a coefficient of –0.334426 and a probability value of 0.0000. This implies that larger firms are less likely to receive a GCO. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 (H4) is accepted.

Furthermore, the simultaneous F-test results indicate that the variables ROA, CR, DAR, and TA collectively have a significant effect on GCO, as shown by a Prob(F-statistic) value of 0.000000, which is far below the 0.05 significance level. Thus, the overall Fixed Effect panel regression model used in this study is deemed appropriate and capable of explaining the variation in Going Concern Audit Opinions.

DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

Effect of Profitability on Going Concern Audit Opinion

This study demonstrates that profitability, measured using Return on Assets (ROA), has a negative and significant effect on the going concern audit opinion. The negative coefficient and probability value below 0.05 indicate that higher profitability reduces the likelihood of auditors issuing a going concern opinion. This suggests that companies with stronger earnings performance are perceived to have better financial health, thereby lowering auditor concerns regarding their business continuity. The findings of this study are consistent with prior research, which also confirmed that profitability negatively influences going concern audit opinions (Irwanto & Tanusdjaja, 2020). Similarly, research by Wahyuni, Wijayanti, and Cahyadi (2024), and Catherine, Tanusdjaja, and Kristian (2025) supports the conclusion that higher profitability reduces the likelihood of receiving a going concern audit opinion.

Effect of Liquidity on Going Concern Audit Opinion

The results indicate that liquidity, measured by the Current Ratio (CR), has a significant negative effect on the going concern audit opinion. The negative coefficient and probability value below 0.05 show that higher liquidity decreases the probability of auditors issuing a going concern opinion. A strong liquidity position reflects a company's ability to meet its short-term obligations, which signals financial stability and reduces auditors' concerns about potential liquidity problems. When firms demonstrate sufficient liquid resources, auditors perceive them as having lower risk of financial distress, thereby reducing the need to issue a going concern opinion. This study's findings are in line with Dewi and Rismawandi (2025), who also reported that liquidity negatively affects the issuance of going concern audit opinions.

Effect of Solvency on Going Concern Audit Opinion

This study finds that solvency, measured by the Debt to Asset Ratio (DAR), has a positive and significant effect on the going concern audit opinion. The positive coefficient and probability value below 0.05 indicate that higher leverage increases the likelihood of auditors expressing doubt about a company's ability to continue as a going concern. A high DAR suggests greater dependence on debt financing, which in turn heightens the risk of default and financial pressure.

High leverage is often perceived by auditors as a sign of potential difficulty in meeting both short-term and long-term obligations. Firms with substantial debt burdens generally possess lower financial flexibility and are more vulnerable to disruptions in cash flow and operational stability. Consequently, auditors have stronger justification to question the company's ability to sustain operations. Overall, solvency is proven to be an important factor in auditors' evaluations. Greater financial obligations increase the risk of going concern issues. These findings are consistent with those of Irwanto and Tanusdjaja (2020), as well as Wahyuni, Wijayanti, and Cahyadi (2024), and Catherine, Tanusdjaja, and Kristian (2025), all of whom found that higher solvency risk positively influences the likelihood of receiving a going concern audit opinion.

Effect of Firm Size on Going Concern Audit Opinion

The results further indicate that firm size, represented by Total Assets (TA), has a negative and significant effect on the going concern audit opinion. The negative coefficient and probability value below 0.05 suggest that larger firms are less likely to receive a going concern opinion. Larger firms typically possess stronger operational capabilities, greater resource availability, and wider access to financing, all of which contribute to improved financial resilience. Auditors generally have greater confidence in the continuity of larger firms due to their ability to withstand economic fluctuations and financial pressures. In contrast, smaller firms are often perceived as more vulnerable to economic uncertainty and financial instability, increasing the likelihood of being assessed as having going concern risks.

Thus, firm size is an important determinant in auditors' evaluations: the larger the company's total assets, the lower the risk of a going concern audit opinion. These findings differ from those of Amami and Triani (as cited in Catherine, Tanusdjaja, & Kristian, 2025), who found a significant influence of firm size on going concern opinions in the opposite direction.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

Based on the results of this study, several conclusions can be drawn. Profitability is found to have a negative and significant effect on the issuance of going concern audit opinions. This indicates that higher profitability reduces the likelihood that auditors will express doubt about the company's ability to continue as a going concern. This finding is consistent with prior studies conducted by Irwanto and Tanusdjaja (2020), Wahyuni, Wijayanti, and Cahyadi (2024), as well as Catherine, Tanusdjaja, and Kristian (2025).

Liquidity also shows a negative and significant influence on going concern audit opinions. Companies with stronger liquidity positions are perceived to have a lower risk of financial distress, leading auditors to be less inclined to issue going concern opinions. This result aligns with the findings of Dewi and Rismawandi (2025).

Solvency demonstrates a positive and significant impact on going concern audit opinions. Higher leverage increases the probability that auditors will express concern regarding the company's ability to sustain its operations. This conclusion supports the studies of Irwanto and Tanusdjaja (2020), Wahyuni, Wijayanti, and Cahyadi (2024), and Catherine, Tanusdjaja, and Kristian (2025).

Firm size is shown to have a negative and significant effect on going concern audit opinions. Larger firms generally possess stronger operational capacity, broader access to financing, and higher resilience to financial pressure, leading auditors to view them as less likely to face going concern issues. This finding is consistent with the results reported by Amami and Triani (as cited in Catherine, Tanusdjaja, and Kristian, 2025).

Recommendations

Future studies are encouraged to extend the research period to obtain a larger sample size, which would allow for more representative and long-term insights. Researchers are also advised to expand the scope of the research sample beyond textile companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange, incorporating firms from other industries to enhance generalizability. Additionally, subsequent research may consider adding or substituting other independent variables that may influence going concern audit opinions, such as financial distress indicators or alternative financial measurement approaches for the variables examined in this study.

Acknowledgements

The author expresses sincere gratitude to Allah Subhanahu Wa Ta'ala, whose blessings and guidance enabled the completion of this study. Appreciation is extended to Ms. Michelle Kristian, S.E., M.M., CPA., Ak., CA., ASEAN CPA, for her continuous guidance and support throughout the research process. The author also conveys heartfelt thanks to family members for their unwavering encouragement, as well as to fellow students who provided motivation and companionship during the preparation of this research.

REFERENCE

Adang, Fery. & Amin Wijoyo. (2023). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi Audit Report Lag Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Di Indonesia. Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi Peradaban, Vol. 9 No. 1, (118-134). https://doi.org/10.24252/jiap.v9i1.38919.

Amanda, Gabriella,. Susanto Salim, Susanto. (2025). *Several Factors Affecting Auditor's Going Concern Opinion on Apparel and Luxury Companies Listed on IDX During The Covid-19 Pandemic*. International Journal of Application on Economics and Business (IJAEB) Volume 3, Issue 1, 2025. ISSN: 2987-1972.https://doi.org/10.24912/ijaeb.v3i1.203-211.

Bahtiar, A., Meidawati, N., Setyono, P., Putri, N. R., & Hamdani, R. (2021). *Determinants of going concern audit opinion: An empirical study in Indonesia*. Jurnal Akuntansi & Auditing Indonesia, 25(2), 183–193. https://doi.org/10.20885/jaai.vol25.iss2.art8.

Catherine, Tanusdjaja, T., Kristian, M. (2025). Faktor-faktor yang Memengaruhi Opini Audit terkait *Going Concern*. Jurnal Multiparadigma Akuntansi, Volume VII No.1/2025 Edisi Januari Hal: 241-250.

Dewi, G, K., dan Rismawandi. (2025). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Likuiditas, *Audit Tenure*, dan Reputasi Auditor Terhadap Opini Audit *Going Concern*. Jurnal Manajemen Dan Akuntansi Vol. 2, No. 3 April 2025, Hal. 22-37 DOI: https://doi.org/10.62017/wanargi.

Elsani, D., Fitrialis, R., Rahmadani, T., Vania, N. R., & Fitriana, N. (2025). Analisis Rasio Keuangan dalam Menilai Kinerja Profitabilitas dan Likuiditas Perusahaan pada PT. Matahari Departement Store Periode 2023-2024. Menawan: Jurnal Riset dan Publikasi Ilmu Ekonomi Volume. 3, Nomor. 4 Juli 2025. e-ISSN: 3025-4728, p-ISSN: 3025-5899, Hal 259-269. https://journal.areai.or.id/index.php/MENAWAN .

Fauzan, Y. M., Tugiman, Hiro. (2020). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, *Leverage*, Dan Pertumbuhan Perusahaan Terhadap Opini Audit *Going Concern* (Studi Empiris Pada Perusahaan Sektor Pertambangan yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Periode 2014-2018). e-Proceeding of Management : Vol.7, No.2 Agustus 2020 | Page 3160. ISSN : 2355-9357.

Ferdy, Stella., Iskak, Jamaludin. (2022). Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Opini Audit *Going Concern* pada Perusahaan Manufaktur. Jurnal Multiparadigma Akuntansi, Volume IV No. 1/2022 Edisi Januari Hal: 454-461.

Glejser, H. (1969). *A new test for heteroskedasticity*. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 64(325), 316–323. https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1969.10500976.

Gujarati, D. N., & Porter, D. C. (2009). *Basic Econometrics* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Harahap, S. S. (2015). Analisis Kritis atas Laporan Keuangan (Edisi ke-12). Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.

(IAPI), I. A. P. I. (2021). Standar Audit ("SA") 570 (Revisi 2021) Kelangsungan Usaha (hal. 8–9).

Irwanto, Felix., Tanusdjaja, Hendang. (2020). Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Likuiditas, dan Solvabilitas Terhadap Opini Audit Terkait *Going Concern* (Studi dada Perusahaan Manufaktur yang Terdaftar di BEI Periode 2015 – 2017). Jurnal Multiparadigma Akuntansi Tarumanagara / Vol.2 , No.1 , Januari 2020 : 298 – 307.

Kasmir. (2019). *Analisis Laporan Keuangan* (Edisi ke-11). Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Persada.

Mutchler, J. F. (1985). *A Multivariate Analysis of the Auditor's Going Concern Opinion Decision*. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 23(2), 668–682.

Nababan, M, C., Damanik, O, R, S., Maghfirah, M., Hayati, K. (2021). Pengaruh Ukuran Perusahaan, Likuiditas, Profitabilitas, dan Solvabilitas Terhadap Opini Audit *Going Concern* pada Perusahaan Manufaktur yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2018-2020. Owner: Riset & Jurnal Akuntansie –ISSN : 2548-9224| p–ISSN : 2548-7507Volume 5Nomor 2, Agustus 2021. https://owner.polgan.ac.id/index.php/owner/article/view/573.

Nugroho, L., Nurrohmah S., Anasta, L. (2018). Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Opini Audit *Going Concern*. SIKAP, Vol 2 (No. 2), 2018, Hal 96-111. p-ISSN: 2541-1691 e-ISSN: 2599-1876. http://jurnal.usbypkp.ac.id/index.php/sikap.

Prabowo, Pramudia., & Zulfikar. (2024). Pengaruh Faktor-faktor Keuangan Terhadap *Audit Report Lag* Pada Perushaaan Manufaktur Yang Terdaftar Di Bursa Efek Indonesia Periode Tahun 2020-2022. Jurnal Revenue, Vol. 5 (1): 181-199.

Rahmadona, S., Sukartini, & Djefris, D. (2019). Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Opini Audit *Going Concern* (Studi Empiris pada Perusahaan Pertambangan yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Periode 2015-2017). Akuntansi dan Manajemen Vol.14, No.1, 2019, Hal. 15-42. ISSN 2657-1080, ISSN 1858-3687.

Sugiyono. (2008). Metode Penelitian Bisnis. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Wahyuni, R. K., Wijayanti, D., & Cahyadi, R. T. (2024). Analisis Pengaruh Faktor Keuangan Terhadap Opini Audit *Going Concern* pada Perusahaan Tercatat di Bursa Efek Indonesia Periode 2017-2021. Substansi: Sumber Artikel Akuntansi Auditing dan Keuangan Vokasi. https://doi.org/10.31092/subs.v8i1.2319.

Widarjono, A. (2016). Ekonometrika: Teori dan Aplikasi untuk Ekonomi dan Bisnis (4th ed.). Yogyakarta: UPP STIM YKPN.

Zdolsek, D., Jagric, T., & Kolar, I. (2022). *Auditor's going-concern opinion prediction: the case of Slovenia*. Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazivanja, 35(1), 106-121.

Zendrato, Sisobadodo & Siagian, H, L. (2020). Pengaruh Profitabilitas dan Likuiditas Terhadap Opini Audit *Going Concern* Pada Sub Sektor Makanan dan Minuman yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2014-2018. Jurnal Ekonomis Vol. 13, No. 4A : Ekonomis : Desember 2020. https://doi.org/10.58303/jeko.v13i4a.2415.