CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS TEST

4.1 Implementation of The Research

This research was conducted with an instrument in the form of a questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed to employees of the Indonesian Supreme Audit Board Representative of Central Java Province who conducted an examination of the LKPD in the districts / cities / provinces in Central Java. The distribution of the questionnaire was carried out once on 26 January 2019 until 27 January 2019.

The data generated from the questionnaire is in the form of interval data. The data is processed using parametric statistics. By using parametric statistics, the results obtained can be applied to the population if the level of significance is met. The level of significance is set at 5%.

The study was conducted at the Indonesian Office of the Supreme Audit Board Representative of Central Java Province having its address at Jalan Perintis Kemerdekaan Number 35, Semarang, Central Java. The questionnaire was printed and reproduced, then distributed manually to the respondent.

4.2 Respondent profiles

The data in this study were collected by distributing questionnaires in January to the Auditors who worked in the Indonesian Supreme Audit Board Representative of the Central Java. There are 97 auditors who worked in BPK but around 22 auditors already conducted audit in several area. So, researcher gave 60 questionnaires

according to the sample set in the study 49 questionnaires were returned and there was 1 questionnaire that was incomplete in filling it. The presentation of descriptive research data aims to be able to see the profile of the research data and the relationships that exist between the variables used in the study. Descriptive data that describes the condition or condition of the respondent is additional information to understand the results of the study. Respondents in this study have characteristics. The research characteristics are:

4.2.1 Gender

The data regarding the gender of respondents of auditors in the office of Indonesian Supreme Audit Board Representative of Central Java Province are as follows:

Table 4.2 **Gender**

No.	Sex	Total	Percentage
1	Men	12	25,00%
2	Women	36	75,00%

Data Source: Primary Data

Based on the information in the table above, it can be seen about the gender of auditors at the Supreme Audit Board Representative Office of Central Java Province who were taken as respondents. The most respondents were male at 75.00% and women at 25.00%. The table above shows that some auditors working in Indonesian Supreme Audit Board Representatives of Central Java Province who were taken as respondents in this study were men.

4.2.2 Education

Data on respondents' education here, researchers grouped into five categories, namely from high school education graduates, diploma (D3), undergraduate (S1), Postgraduate (S2), and Doctoral (S3). The data on the latest education auditors working in the Indonesian Supreme Audit Board of Central Java taken as respondents are as follows:

Table 4.3 **Education**

No.	Education	Total	Percentage
1	Undergraduate (S1)	36	75%
2	Graduate (S2)	12	25%

Data Source: Primary Data

Based on the information in the table above, it can be seen about the last educational background of the auditor at the office of Indonesian Supreme Audit Board Representative of Java Province who was taken as a respondent. Undergraduate graduates (S1) as many as 36 respondents or 75% and those with the latest education postgraduate (S2) as many as 12 respondents or 25% From the information above shows that most auditors who work in the office of Indonesian Supreme Audit Board Representative of Central Java taken as respondents in this study having the last educational background as an undergraduate (S1).

4.2.3 Experience

The researcher grouped respondents' work experience data into four categories, from the first year as auditors to the fourth year, the fourth year up to the eighth year, the eighth year up to the 12th year, and from the 12th year to the 16th year. The data regarding the length of time working as an auditor working at the Indonesian Supreme Audit Board Central Java Provincial Representatives taken as respondents are as follows:

Table 4.4 **Experience**

No.	Auditing Experience	Total	Percentage
1	0 ≤ 4 years	2	4,20%
2	≥4 years ≤ 8 years	8	16,60%
3	≥8 years ≤ 12 years	29	58,40%
4	≥12 years ≤ 16 years	10	20,80%

Data Source: Primary Data

Referring to the results of the table above, it can be seen the work experience of the respondents. The above results show that there are two people who have less than 4 years of working experience, 8 people have more than four years of work experience but less than 8 years, then 29 people who have more than eight years of experience but are still less than 12 years old and the last is 10 respondents who have 12 years of work experience but are still less than 16 years old. Based on the data above, it can be concluded that most respondents in the Indonesian Supreme Audit Board Representative Office of

Central Java Province have work experience for more than eight years but less than 12 years.

4.3 Descriptive Statistic

In table 4.5 below it can be seen that the audit quality variable has the lowest value of 4.00 and the highest value of 5.00 with an average value of 4.2740 and the standard deviation (data distribution rate) of 0.34030 Variable competency has the lowest value of 3.43 and the highest value of 5.00 with an average value of 4.1431 and a data distribution rate of 0.43461. Tenure Audit variable has the lowest value of 2.67 and the highest value of 5.00 with an average value of 3.3885 and a data distribution rate of 0.38042. The variable time budget pressure has the lowest value of 3.00 and the highest value of 5.00 with an average value of 3.8296 and the data distribution rate of 0.47698, and the last task complexity variable has the lowest value of 3.00 and the highest value of 4.86 with an average value the value is 3.5679 and the standard deviation.

Table 4.5 **Descriptive Statistics**

	n	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Competency	48	3.43	5.00	4.1431	0.43461
Audit Tenure	48	2.67	5.00	3.3885	0.38042
TimeBudgetPressure	48	3.00	5.00	3.8296	0.47698
Task Complexity	48	3.00	4.86	3.5679	0.43363
Audit Quality	48	4.00	5.00	4.2740	0.34030

4.4 Test Quality of Data

4.4.1 Validity Test

Validity is the accuracy or accuracy of an instrument in measuring what you want to measure. Validity tests are often used to measure the accuracy of an item in a questionnaire or scale. The validity test done is the validity of the item. The validity of the item is done by correlating each instrument item with the total item score. In order to find out the validity test, a correlation coefficient can be used whose significant value is smaller than 5% (level of significance) indicating that these statements are valid as indicators. Which is where the correlation result (r_{count}) is then compared with (r_{table}). If (r_{count}) is greater than rtable, the item statement is considered valid. With the number n of 48 (rtabel), it is 0.285.

Table 4.6 **Validity Test of Competency**

Item	r Score	r Table	Results
1	0,819	0,285	**Valid**
2	0,704	0,285	**Valid**
3	0,751	0,285	**Valid**
4	0,816	0,285	**Valid**
5	0,753	0,285	**Valid**
6	0,868	0,285	**Valid**
7	0,779	0,285	**Valid**

Data Source: Process Data

Table 4.6 shows that the statement used to test the competency variables from number 1 to number 7 has a higher calculated value than rtable ($r_{count} > r_{table}$) so that the statements are considered valid for use in measuring competency variables.

Table 4.7 **Validity Test of Audit Tenure**

Item	r Score	r Table	Results
1	0,375	0,285	**Valid**
2	0,587	0,285	**Valid**
3	0,583	0,285	**Valid**
4	0,655	0,285	**Valid**
5	0,709	0,285	**Valid**
6	0,623	0,285	**Valid**

Data Source: Primary Data

Table 4.7 indicates that the statements submitted to test the tenure audit variable have an r_{value} greater than the r_{table} value, which means the statements are valid.

Table 4.8 **Validity Test of Time Budget Pressure**

Item	r Score	r Table	Results
1	0,614	0,285	**Valid**
2	0,687	0,285	**Valid**
3	0,622	0,285	**Valid**
4	0,693	0,285	**Valid**
5	0,678	0,285	**Valid**
6	0,533	0,285	**Valid**

Data Source: Process Data

The statements used to test the variable time budget pressure. Table 4.8 has an r value higher than r_{table}. This shows that the instrument used to measure the time budget pressure variable is valid.

Table 4.9 **Validity Test of Task Complexity**

Item	r Score	r Table	Results
1	0,846	0,285	**Valid**
2	0,869	0,285	**Valid**
3	0,813	0,285	**Valid**
4	0,704	0,285	**Valid**
5	0,571	0,285	**Valid**
6	0,491	0,285	**Valid**
7	0,628	0,285	**Valid**

Data Source: Process Data

Table 4.9 shows that the statement used to test the task complexity variable from number 1 to number 7 has a higher calculated value than r_{table} ($r_{count} > r_{table}$) so that these statements are considered valid for use in measuring task complexity variables.

Table 4.10 **Validity Test of Audit Quality**

Item	r Score	r Table	Results
1	0,417	0,285	**Valid**
2	0,788	0,285	**Valid**
3	0,852	0,285	**Valid**
4	0,821	0,285	**Valid**
5	0,737	0,285	**Valid**
6	0,387	0,285	**Valid**
7	0,763	0,285	**Valid**

Data Source: Process Data

Table 4.10 give the calculation results that the statement used to test the audit quality variable from number 1 to number 7 has an r_{value} that is higher than rtable ($r_{count} > r_{table}$) so that the statements are considered valid for use in measuring audit quality variables.

4.4.2 Reliability Test

Reliability test is used to determine the consistency of a measuring instrument, whether the measuring instrument used is reliable and remains consistent if the measurement is repeated, in this case the questionnaire, can be used more than once and may not be used on the same respondent. Testing is done by testing the instrument and then analyzing the technique using the Cronbach's Alpha test, whose value will be compared with the acceptable minimum reliability coefficient value. According to Ghozali (2016), if the value of Cronbach's Alpha> 0.6, then the research instrument is reliable. If the Cronbach's Alpha value is <0.6, the research instrument is not reliable.

Table 11 **Reliability Test of Competency**

Cronbach Alpha	**N of Items**
.879	7

Data Source: Process Data

Table 4.11 shows that the Cronbach alpha value possessed by the competency variable is 0.879, where the number is greater than the minimum value of Cronbach alpha in the reliability test which is> 0.60. Based on these

results it means that the data on this competency variable has met the reliability requirements.

Table 4.12 **Reliability Test of Audit Tenure**

Cronbach Alpha	N of Items
.610	6

Data Source: Process Data

Table 4.12 shows the results of the reliability test for tenure audit variables. The table shows the Cronbach alpha which has an audit tenure variable of 0.610. This number shows a higher value than the Cronbach alpha value > 0.60. The results above that in the tenure audit variable the reliability test is done successfully.

Table 4.13 **Reliability Test Time Budget Pressure**

Cronbach Alpha	N of Items
.679	6

Data Source: Process Data

The reliability test results on variable time budget pressure show a Cronbach alpha value of 0.679, which indicates a higher Cronbach alpha value than > 0.60. These results prove that the data contained in the tenure audit variable is reliable.

Table 4.14 **Reliability Test of Task Complexity**

Cronbach Alpha	N of Items
.817	7

Data Source: Process Data

The results of the reliability tests conducted on task complexity variables showed that Cronbach alpha obtained was 0.817 which means that the number had exceeded the predetermined standard Cronbach alpha value of > 0.60. These results indicate the variable task complexity has passed the reliability test.`

Table 15 **Reliability Test of Audit Quality**

Cronbach Alpha	N of Items
.774	7

Data Source: Process Data

Table 4.15 referring to the results of the reliability test that has been carried out on the dependent variable, namely audit quality, obtaining the Cronbach alpha value of 0.774, where the data is very reliable because it has exceeded the determined Cronbach alpha value which is> 0.60. Therefore, the reliability of the tests performed on the audit quality variable has met the requirements of reality.

4.5 Classic Test

4.5.1 Normality Test

The purpose of the normality test is to test whether, in the regression model, the residual confounding variable has a normal distribution or not. Data normality testing is done using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, looking at a significance level of 5%. In the normality test table, the results of

normality test data are presented using the Kolmogorov - Smirnov test as follows:

Table 4.16 **Normality Test**

Variable	Kolmogorov-Sminov Z	Asymp. Sig (2 -Tailed)	Results
Unstandardized Residual	1.155	0.139	Normal

Data Source: Process Data

From the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test above, the Asymp value is generated. Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.139. These results can be concluded that the residual data in this regression model is normally distributed because of the value of Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) above 0.05. This result is in accordance with the stipulated provisions so that it can be concluded that the data is normally distributed and can be used in research.

4.5.2 Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity test aims to find out whether the regression model found a correlation between independent variables. In a good regression model, there should be no correlation between the independent variables. To detect the presence or absence of multicollinearity in the regression model, it can be seen from the tolerance value and the opposite of the variance inflation factor (VIF).

Multicollinearity can be seen from the tolerance value >0.10 or VIF <10. Both measurements indicate which independent variables are explained by other independent variables. The results of the multicollinearity test are as follows;

Table 4.17 **Multicollinearity Test**

Model	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	**VIF**
(Constant)		
Competency	0.637	1.569
Audit Tenure	0.951	1.052
Time Budget Pressure	0.898	1.114
Task Complexity	0.653	1.532

Data Source: Process Data

Based on the Multicollinearity Test conducted, the calculation of the Tolerance value is more than 0.10, which means there is no correlation between the independent variables whose value is more than 95%. The calculation of the VIF value also shows the same thing, that there is not one independent variable that has a VIF value than 10. Based on these results, there is no correlation between the independent variables in the regression equation or it can be called freely from Multicollinearity.

4.5.3 Heteroscedasticity Test

This research used glejser test for heteroscedasticity. According to Ghozali (2013:139) glejser test aims to non-weather in the regression model there is an inequality of variance from the residual one observation to another observation. The results of the heteroscedasticity test are as follows:

Table 4.18 **Heteroscedasticity**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	0.523	0.533		0.981	0.332
Competency	-0.020	0.064	-0.059	-0.315	0.754
Audit Tenure	- 0.091	0.060	-0.230	-1.510	0.138
Time Budget Pressure	0.002	0.049	0.007	0.046	0.963
Task Complexity	0.010	0.064	0.028	0.153	0.879

Data Source: Process Data

From the results of the heteroscedasticity test above, shows that all independent variables have a significance probability value greater than 0.05. These results can be concluded that did not occur heteroscedasticity in the regression model.

4.6 Hypothesis Test

4.6.1 Linear Regression Analysis

Data analysis in this study used multiple linear regression models. This analysis is used to determine the relationship between discretionary accruals and independent variables. The results of the regression analysis are as follows:

Table 19 **Linear Regression Analysis**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	3.990	0.844		4.726	0.000
Competency	0.256	0.102	0.327	2.513	0.016
Audit Tenure	-0.199	0.095	-0.222	-2.086	0.043
Time Budget Pressure	0.175	0.078	0.245	2.235	0.031
Task Complexity	-0.216	0.101	-0.276	-2.146	0.038

Data Source: Process Data

Based on the table above, the regression models obtained are as follows:

Y = 3.990 + 0.256X1- 0,199X2 + 0,175X3 - 216X4

From the results of the regression equation model above, the conclusions that can be taken are as follows:

1. If all the independent variable values have a value (0), the value of the dependent audit quality variable is 3.990.
2. The competency coefficient value for the X1 variable is 0.256. This implies that every increase in the competency of one unit then the audit quality variable will increase by 0.256 if the other independent variables remain.
3. The audit tenure coefficient value for X2 variable is -0.199, this means that every increase in one unit's tenure audit then the audit quality variable will decrease by -0.199 if the other independent variables are fixed.

4. Time budget pressure coefficient for X3 variable is 0.175, This means that every increase in one-unit time budget pressure then the audit quality variable will increase by 0.175 if the other independent variables are fixed.
5. The task complexity coefficient for X4 variables is -0.216. This means that after increasing the task complexity of one unit, the audit quality variable will experience a descent of -0,216 if the other independent variables are fixed.

4.6.2 Determination Analysis (R2)

Determination analysis is used to determine the percentage of how much variation in the independent variable can explain variations in the dependent variable. If the R2 coefficient is equal to 0, then there is not the slightest percentage of the contribution of the influence given to the dependent variable or the variation of the independent variable used does not explain the slightest variation in the dependent variable and vice versa. Santoso (2001) stated that for regression with more than two independent variables used Adjusted R Square as the coefficient of determination. Adjusted R Square is the adjusted R Square value. In the table below presents the Adjusted R Square value of 0.493.

Table 4.20 **Determination Analysis R2**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of The Estimate
1	0.733a	0.537	0.493	0.24219

a. Predictors: (Constant), Task Complexity, Audit Tenure, Time Budget Pressure, Competency

Data Source: Process Data

The value of 0.493 means that the percentage contribution of variable competency, audit tenure, time budget pressure, and task complexity simultaneously to the audit quality is 49.3%. This shows that audit quality variations can be explained by independent variables, namely competency, audit tenure, time budget pressure, and task complexity by 49.3% While the remaining 53.7% is influenced by other factors.

4.6.3 Hypothesis Test Results

Testing the hypothesis in this study uses the T-test. The results of hypothesis testing in this study are as follows**:**

1. Hypothesis Competency Test

The first hypothesis in this study is that competence has a positive effect on audit quality. From table 4.19 the parameter of the relationship of the competency variable to audit quality is 0.256 and the significance value is 0.016. At the level of significance $\alpha = 5\%$; then the regression coefficient is significant because $\rho = 0.016 < 0.05$. Based on the test results above, it can be concluded that competence has a significant positive effect on audit quality so that the first hypothesis in this study is acceptable.

2. Tenure Audit Hypothesis Test

The second hypothesis in this study is that audit tenure has a negative effect on audit quality. From table 4.19 the parameters of the audit tenure relationship to audit quality are equal to -0,199 and a significance value of

0.043. At the level of significance α = 5%; then the regression coefficient has a significant effect because ρ = 0.043 <0.05. Based on the results of testing the hypothesis above, it can be concluded that, audit tenure has a significant negative effect on audit quality so that the second hypothesis of this study is acceptable.

3. Time Budget pressure hypothesis testing

The third hypothesis in this study is time budget pressure influences audit quality. From table 4.19 the parameter of the time budget pressure relationship to audit quality is 0.175 and the significance value is 0.031. At the level of significance α = 5%; then the regression coefficient has a significant effect because ρ = 0.031 <0.05. Based on the results of testing the hypothesis above, it can be concluded that, time budget pressure has a significant positive effect on audit quality so that the third hypothesis of this study is acceptable.

4. Task Complexity Hypothesis Test

The fourth hypothesis in this study is task complexity has a negative effect on audit quality. From table 4.19 the parameter of task complexity relation to audit quality is -0.216 and significance value of 0.038. At the level of significance α = 5%; then the regression coefficient has a significant effect because ρ = 0.038 <0.05. Based on the results of testing the hypothesis above, it can be concluded that task complexity has a significant negative effect on audit quality so that the fourth hypothesis in this study is acceptable.

4.7 Discussion

4.7.1 The Effect of Auditor Competence on Audit Quality

Based on the results of the t-test (partial) in the regression model, the significance value of the auditor competency variable is 0.016 <0.05 (significant level of significance in the study). Then it can be concluded that H1 is accepted which means that partially the auditor competency variable significantly influences the audit quality variable. The results of this study are supported by the results of previous studies, namely research conducted by Kurnia, Khomsiyah and Sofie (2014) which shows the results that auditor competence affects audit quality.

This research shows the results that there is significant influence between auditor competency variables on audit quality. Auditor competence is one that must be owned by an auditor because competence is closely related to audit quality. With the existence of competence, the auditor is deemed to have enough knowledge and experience regarding the audit field. The knowledge that is already owned must be explored even more so that it can facilitate the auditor in solving problems faced while carrying out the audit process and can keep abreast of developments that occur at this time. Previous experiences must be re-poured when conducting the audit process so that in completing the audit process it will be better and faster because it has had prior experience. With knowledge and experience in the field of auditing, the auditor will be able to complete the audit properly to produce good and adequate audit.

4.7.2 The Effect of Tenure Audit on Audit Quality

Based on the results of the t-test (partial) in the regression model, the significance value of the auditor competency variable is 0.043 <0.05 (significant level of significance in the study). Then it can be concluded that H2 is accepted, meaning that partially the audit tenure variable has a significant effect on the audit quality variable. The results of this study are in line with the research of Pramaswaradana (2017), which states that audit tenure has a negative effect on audit quality. Audit tenure is the length of time or the audit process of the client's financial statements conducted by the auditor.

The long relationship between the auditor and the client has the potential to make the auditor not independent in carrying out his duties because he already has a good relationship with the client, so that there is no courage to disclose the actual situation in the client organization and always depend on the management statement. So, the longer the auditor's relationship with the client, the lower the audit quality produced.

Regarding audit tenure issue, Supreme Audit Board must conduct auditor switching so that no auditor does audit in the same area repeatedly. This is done to minimize the possibility of deviant actions and can improve the integrity of the institution.

4.7.3 The Effect of Time Budget Pressure on Audit Quality

Based on the results of the t-test (partial) in the regression model, the significance value of the auditor competency variable is 0.031 <0.05 (significant level of significance in the study). Then it can be concluded that H3 is accepted, meaning that partially the audit tenure variable has a significant effect on the audit quality variable. The results of this study are in line with the research Shintya, Nuryatno, & Oktaviani (2016) when the time budget given is getting tighter it encourages the auditor to be more enthusiastic in completing his audit tasks and would improve audit quality. Although the time budget pressure is quite high it does not cause a decrease in audit quality, because time budget is the time given to complete the audit assignments and even though auditors are under pressure, they must maintain their audit quality because time budget pressures are things that cannot be avoided and become an obligation in conducting audits.

4.7.4 The Effect of Task Complexity on Audit Quality

The results of testing this study also support the fourth hypothesis that task complexity has a negative effect on audit quality. The calculation results show a significance level of 0.038 <0.05. Then it can be concluded that H3 can be accepted, meaning that partially task complexity variable has a negative effect on audit quality variables. These results indicate that the complexity of the task has a negative influence on audit quality. The complexity of the tasks faced by the auditor, the auditor is more difficult to complete the tasks that must

be completed and will reduce audit quality. Task complexity consists of two components namely task difficulties and task structure (Artha et al. 2014). The level of difficulty of the task is always associated with a lot of information about the task, while the structure of tasks is related to information clarity. Difficult tasks require more individual abilities to solve them. If the difficulty of the task is greater than the ability of the individual, it will trigger a concern that there will be a failure in completing the task, it will result in a decrease in motivation and effort to complete the task so that performance decreases. This decrease in performance will also have an impact on the quality of the audit produced.

The results of this study are consistent with the results of research conducted by Ayuni and Suprasto (2016) which found that task complexity has a negative and significant effect on audit quality. Negative influences in this case indicate that task complexity has an influence that is not in line with audit quality. This means that the higher the complexity of the tasks carried out by the auditor, the lower the quality of the audit produced.

Supreme Audit Board Office Representative of Central Java Province must always make improvements to audit procedures so that it can have a better audit procedure. In addition, Supreme Audit Board must have several anticipatory steps to minimize the negative impact of audits with high complexity through appropriate, concise and clear procedures, placing credible auditors, and providing education and training on audits that will be conducted to the team.