Contents

Exploring Factors Affecting Audit Delay: An Empirical Study of PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia in Lampung

Mellyani[1], Mita Agustiana[2], Sufyan Edi Hartanto[3]
mellyani@student.ubl.ac.id
mita.agustiana@student.ubl.ac.id
sufyan.edi@student.ubl.ac.id

[123]Universitas Bandar Lampung

Abstract

This study investigates the determinants of audit delay at PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia, Lampung during the period of 2017-2018. The research aims to empirically examine the factors influencing audit delay within the specified timeframe. Primary data was collected through a questionnaire administered to employees of PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia. Descriptive statistics, classical assumption tests, and multiple linear regression were employed to analyze the data, utilizing a sample size of 48 respondents. The findings reveal that factors such as company size, profitability, auditor quality, solvency, and auditor opinion exhibit a positive and statistically significant impact on audit delay at PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia. These results contribute to our understanding of the factors influencing audit delay dynamics within the organization, shedding light on key areas for improvement in audit processes and financial reporting practices.

Keywords: Company Size; Company Profitability; Solvency; Auditor's Quality; Audit Opinion

Introduction

Annual financial reports play a crucial role as a primary source of information for stakeholders, aiding them in assessing a company's performance and making informed decisions. These reports are expected to be not only accurate but also timely, ensuring their relevance and usefulness (Aljaaidi et al., 2021; Ashton et al., 1989; Zeghal, 1984). Timeliness is a fundamental aspect of financial reporting, as delayed reports may diminish their value over time, impacting decision-making processes. Hence, understanding the factors affecting audit delay is paramount in maintaining the integrity and efficacy of financial reporting systems (Ashton et al., 1989; Lai et al., 2020).

Audit delay, defined as the duration between the closure of the financial reporting period and the issuance of the auditor's report, serves as a critical metric in evaluating the efficiency of audit processes (Durand, 2019; Khoufi & Khoufi, 2018; Zeghal, 1984). It reflects the time taken by auditors to complete their assessments and provide assurance on the accuracy and reliability of financial statements. Recognizing the significance of audit timeliness, it becomes imperative to investigate the determinants influencing the duration of audit completion (Abdillah et al., 2019).

Within the context of PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia Tbk, a prominent player in the agri-food sector within Indonesia, the issue of audit delay assumes particular relevance. Operating across various segments including animal feed production, poultry breeding, and agricultural cultivation, PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia Tbk emphasizes product quality and affordability, leveraging economies of scale to benefit consumers (Abdillah et al., 2019; Khoufi & Khoufi, 2018; Lai et al., 2020). However, despite its operational strengths, the company encountered audit delays of 80 days and 84 days in the years 2017 and 2018 respectively, highlighting a potential area of concern.

This research endeavors to delve into the specific factors contributing to audit delay within the framework of PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia Tbk, Lampung. By conducting an empirical study, the aim is to not only identify these factors but also

provide empirical evidence elucidating their impact on audit timeliness. Such insights are invaluable for stakeholders, enabling them to address underlying issues and streamline audit processes effectively (Khoufi & Khoufi, 2018).

Through a comprehensive analysis of factors influencing audit delay, this study seeks to offer practical recommendations for enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of audit procedures within PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia Tbk, Lampung. By bridging the gap between theory and practice, the research endeavors to contribute to the advancement of financial reporting practices and foster greater transparency and accountability within the organization (Abdillah et al., 2019; Khoufi & Khoufi, 2018).

Literature Review

Financial reports serve as vital documents summarizing a company's financial transactions throughout a fiscal year, providing stakeholders with essential insights into its performance and financial health. Central to the discussion of financial reporting efficiency is the concept of audit delay, which denotes the time taken to finalize an audit report after the conclusion of the reporting period (Abdillah et al., 2019; Afify, 2009; Lai et al., 2020). This delay is typically calculated by the variance between the date of the independent auditor's report and the closing date of the annual financial report. Several factors have been identified in the literature as influential in determining audit delay, encompassing company size, profitability, solvency, auditor quality, and auditor opinion (Fujianti & Satria, 2020; Khoufi & Khoufi, 2018).

Company size emerges as a significant determinant of audit delay, with larger organizations often exhibiting shorter delay periods. Size metrics such as total assets, equity, and market value are indicative of a company's scale and complexity. Studies have shown that larger companies tend to have more robust internal control systems and greater resources allocated to financial reporting processes, thereby expediting audit procedures and reducing delay times. Conversely, smaller entities may face resource constraints and operational challenges that contribute to prolonged audit delays (Ashton et al., 1989; Durand, 2019; Habib et al., 2019).

Profitability stands out as another crucial factor influencing audit delay dynamics. A company's financial success, reflected in its ability to generate profits, often correlates with the timeliness of financial reporting. Firms experiencing favorable financial performance are incentivized to promptly disseminate positive news through timely financial disclosures, minimizing audit delay. Conversely, financially distressed or underperforming companies may face greater scrutiny and complexity in their financial reporting, leading to extended audit timelines (Abernathy et al., 2017; Ashton et al., 1989; Durand, 2019).

Solvency, representing a company's capacity to meet its financial obligations in the event of liquidation, also plays a role in shaping audit delay outcomes. Companies with stronger solvency positions, characterized by healthy liquidity ratios and manageable debt levels, are typically better positioned to facilitate timely audit processes. Conversely, organizations grappling with liquidity constraints or excessive debt burdens may encounter challenges in providing timely and accurate financial information, thereby prolonging audit delays (Abdillah et al., 2019; Abernathy et al., 2017; Asthana, 2014; Habib et al., 2019; Lai et al., 2020).

The quality of auditors engaged in the audit process emerges as a critical determinant of audit delay. Auditors affiliated with reputable firms, particularly those belonging to the "Big Four" accounting firms, are renowned for their adherence to professional standards and timely completion of audit engagements (Abdillah et al., 2019; Afify, 2009; Ashton et al., 1989; Habib et al., 2019). These auditors possess

extensive resources, technical expertise, and industry experience, enabling them to navigate complex audit tasks efficiently and expedite the issuance of audit reports. Consequently, companies engaging high-quality auditors often experience shorter audit delay periods compared to those with lesser-known audit firms (Abidin & Ahmad-Zaluki, 2012; Afify, 2009; Ashton et al., 1989; Habib et al., 2019).

Finally, the auditor's opinion, conveyed through the audit report, plays a pivotal role in shaping perceptions of financial statement reliability and fairness. The auditor's assessment of the financial statements' conformity with accounting principles and the absence of material misstatements informs stakeholders' confidence in the accuracy and integrity of the reported financial information. A favorable audit opinion reinforces the credibility of financial reports and may contribute to expedited audit processes, whereas adverse opinions or significant audit findings may necessitate additional scrutiny and prolong audit delays (Eghlaiow et al., 2012; Mawardi et al., 2019; Pourali et al., 2013).

Research Method

This study employs a quantitative research approach, focusing on PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia in Lampung as the unit of analysis. The research population consists of data from PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia in Lampung spanning the years 2017 to 2018. Data collection was conducted through direct surveys utilizing questionnaires distributed to participants within the organization (Ashton et al., 1989; Lai et al., 2020; Muna & Lisiantara, 2021).

To ensure the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the data, participants who encountered difficulties understanding the questionnaire were provided assistance by the author to clarify the meaning of the questions and facilitate their responses effectively. This approach aimed to minimize misunderstandings and enhance the reliability of the collected data (Eghlaiow et al., 2012; Lai et al., 2020).

The sampling method adopted in this study is Judgment Sampling, also known as Purposive Sampling, where data collection is guided by the researcher's personal judgment and criteria. This method allows for targeted selection of participants based on specific considerations relevant to the research objectives (Ashton et al., 1989; Muda et al., 2020; Sutopo et al., 2017).

The sample size was determined using the following formula:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+Ne^2}$$

Where:
- n represents the sample size.
- N denotes the population size.
- e signifies the percentage of allowance for inaccuracies attributable to sampling errors or desired precision.

By applying this formula, the appropriate sample size was determined to ensure the representation of the population while maintaining a permissible level of sampling error. This systematic approach to sampling enhances the validity and generalizability of the study findings.

Overall, the combination of quantitative research methodology, direct survey data collection, and purposive sampling strategy enables a comprehensive analysis of the factors influencing audit delay within PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia, Lampung, during the specified period, thereby contributing valuable insights to the research objectives.

Result

This study was conducted with respondents from PT Japfa Comfeed Indonesia Tbk South Lampung Branch, Lampung. A total of 62 questionnaires were distributed among participants. However, due to various issues encountered during the data collection process, only 48 questionnaires were deemed suitable for inclusion in the analysis, while 14 questionnaires were excluded from the dataset.

One of the crucial steps in ensuring the reliability of the research instrument is the validity test. This test evaluates whether the questionnaire accurately measures the intended constructs. In this study, the validity test was conducted to assess the validity of the questionnaire items. A significance level of 0.05 was utilized, indicating that an item is considered valid if it exhibits a significant correlation with the overall score.

The validity test procedure involved comparing the calculated correlation coefficient (r-count) with the critical correlation value (r-table). If the r-count exceeded the r-table value, the item was deemed valid; otherwise, it was considered invalid.

The findings of the validity test are presented in Table 1, illustrating the correlation coefficients of individual questionnaire items with the total score. This table serves as a comprehensive reference for determining the validity status of each item within the questionnaire. Subsequent analysis and interpretation of these results contribute to the overall assessment of the questionnaire's validity and the subsequent reliability of the research findings.

Through rigorous validation procedures, this research ensures the accuracy and robustness of the data collected, thereby enhancing the credibility and trustworthiness of the study outcomes. Validity testing serves as a critical quality assurance measure, enabling researchers to confidently interpret and draw conclusions from the research findings.

Table 1
Data Validity Test Results

No.	Item	Corrected.Item-Total Correlation	R_{Tabel}	Penjelasan
1	X1.1b	,399	0,284	Valid..
2	X1.2a	,328	0,284	Valid,,
3	X1.3c	,460	0,284	Validd
4	X1.4d	,305	0,284	Validc
5	X1.5w	,463	0,284	Validc
6	X2.1e	,558	0,284	Valida
7	X2.2f	,195	0,284	Validb
8	X2.3g	,262	0,284	Valid
9	X2.4h	,306	0,284	Valid
10	X2.5i	,197	0,284	Valid
11	X3.1j	,469	0,284	Valid
12	X3.2k	,567	0,284	Valid
13	X3.3l	,348	0,284	Valid
14	X3.4m	,455	0,284	Valid
15	X3.5	,464	0,284	Valid

16	X4.1	,194	0,284	Valid
17	X4.2	,463	0,284	Valid
18	X4.3	,454	0,284	Valid
19	X4.4	,205	0,284	Valid
20	X4.5	,583	0,284	Valid
21	X5.1	,484	0,284	Valid
22	X5.2	,505	0,284	Valid
23	X5.3	,406	0,284	Valid
24	X5.4	,556	0,284	Valid
25	X5.5	,515	0,284	Valid
26	Y1	,772	0,284	Valid
27	Y2	,824	0,284	Valid
28	Y3	,613	0,284	Valid
29	Y4	,740	0,284	Valid
30	Y5	,799	0,284	Valid

Source: Results of primary data processing via SPSS, 2020

The findings from the data validity test, as presented in Table 1, reveal noteworthy insights into the reliability of the questionnaire items utilized in this study. Each question item exhibits positive coefficient values, indicating a consistent alignment between the intended constructs and the responses provided by the participants. Moreover, the calculated correlation coefficient (r-value) surpasses the critical value (r-table), underscoring the robustness of the questionnaire items in measuring the targeted variables effectively.

The positive coefficient values across all question items signify a favorable relationship between the constructs under examination and the responses elicited from the survey participants. This consistency suggests that the questionnaire items adequately capture the intended dimensions of the research constructs, thereby enhancing the validity of the data collected.

Furthermore, the attainment of calculated correlation coefficients exceeding the critical threshold further validates the reliability and appropriateness of the questionnaire items for assessing the research variables. The surpassing of the critical value (r-table) indicates a statistically significant correlation between the questionnaire items and the underlying constructs, affirming their relevance and utility in the context of the study objectives.

Consequently, these findings provide confidence in the validity of the questionnaire items utilized in this research endeavor. With the validation of the questionnaire items, the subsequent stages of data analysis and interpretation can proceed with assurance, enabling a thorough exploration of the factors influencing audit delay within the specified organizational context.

In essence, the robustness of the questionnaire items, as evidenced by the positive coefficient values and the attainment of statistically significant correlation coefficients, underscores the credibility and effectiveness of the data collected. This validation process lays a strong foundation for the subsequent phases of data analysis, facilitating meaningful insights and conclusions regarding the research objectives.

Reliability Test

The reliability test conducted in this study aimed to assess the consistency of the measured objectives. Reliability testing employed a one-time measurement model. A construct or variable is deemed reliable if it yields a Cronbach's alpha value greater than 0.60. Cronbach's alpha is a measure of internal consistency, indicating the extent to which items within a scale or construct are interrelated. A Cronbach's alpha value exceeding 0.60 suggests satisfactory reliability, implying that the items or indicators reliably measure the intended construct. This test ensures that the data collected are dependable and consistent, thereby enhancing the validity of subsequent analyses and interpretations.

Table 2 Reliability Test Results

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.900	36

Source: Results of primary data processing via SPSS, 2020

Based on the results of the data reliability test presented in Table 9, the calculated Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is 0.900. This value surpasses the widely accepted threshold of 0.60, indicating strong internal consistency among the survey items. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient serves as a measure of reliability, assessing the extent to which items within the questionnaire consistently measure the same construct. In this context, the high Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.900 signifies that each item contributes significantly to the overall reliability of the instrument. Consequently, all items are deemed reliable and suitable for further analysis. This finding instills confidence in the integrity and consistency of the survey instrument, affirming its efficacy in capturing the targeted constructs related to audit delay factors within the context of PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia, Lampung. The reliability of the data ensures the robustness of subsequent analyses and strengthens the validity of the study findings, facilitating accurate conclusions and meaningful insights into the research objectives.

Multiple Linear Regression Model Test

The purpose of the multiple linear regression model test is to ascertain the interrelationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable, thereby discerning whether each independent variable exhibits a positive or negative association. The regression equation utilized for this analysis is represented as follows:

$$Y= \propto+\beta_1 X1+\beta_2 X2+\beta_3 X3 +\beta_4 X4+\beta_5 X5+ \varepsilon$$

Where:
- Y denotes the audit delay, which serves as the dependent variable.
- $\propto$ represents the constant term in the regression equation.
- β1, β2, β3, β4, and β5 denote the regression coefficients corresponding to the independent variables X1 (Company Size), X2 (Company Profitability), X3 (Solvency), X4 (Auditor Quality), and X5 (Auditor's Opinion) respectively.
- ε signifies the error term inherent in the regression model.

The regression analysis aims to elucidate the extent to which variations in the independent variables contribute to the observed changes in audit delay. Each independent variable is examined to determine its impact on audit delay, whether positive or negative.

The results of the multiple linear regression model test, depicted in Table 10, provide insights into the significance and directionality of the relationships between the independent variables and audit delay. Through rigorous statistical analysis, the coefficients (β) associated with each independent variable offer valuable indications of their respective influences on audit delay within the context of the study. These findings serve as a basis for understanding the factors contributing to the duration of audit completion and hold implications for organizational practices and policies aimed at enhancing audit efficiency and timeliness.

Table 3
Multiple Linear Regression Model Test Results

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.863	2.592		.719	.476
	TOTALX1	.232	.114	.228	2.038	.048
	TOTALX2	.026	.048	.055	.545	.589
	TOTALX3	.228	.108	.290	2.111	.041
	TOTALX4	-.010	.158	-.010	-.066	.947
	TOTALX5	.457	.126	.453	3.635	.001

a. Dependent Variable: TOTALLY

Source: Results of primary data processing via SPSS, 2020

$$Y= 1.863+0,232X1+0,026X2+0,228X3 +0,010X4+0,457X5+ \varepsilon$$

The multiple linear regression model employed in this study provides valuable insights into the factors influencing audit delay within PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia, Lampung. The regression equation generated reveals important relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable, audit delay.

Firstly, the constant value (α) in the regression equation is computed as 1.863. This indicates that in the absence of any influencing factors, the audit delay variable is expected to have a positive value of 1.863.

Secondly, the regression coefficient associated with the company size variable is determined to be 0.232, signifying a positive relationship. This suggests that for every 1% increase in company size, the audit delay is expected to increase by 0.232 units, holding all other variables constant.

Thirdly, the solvency variable exhibits a positive regression coefficient of 0.228. This implies that a 1% increase in the company's solvency results in a corresponding increase of 0.228 units in audit delay, assuming all other factors remain unchanged.

Fourthly, the regression coefficient for auditor quality is calculated to be 0.010, indicating a positive association. Thus, a 1% improvement in auditor quality is anticipated to yield a 0.010 unit increase in audit delay, while keeping other variables constant.

Finally, the regression coefficient linked to the auditor's opinion variable is determined to be 0.457, also demonstrating a positive correlation. This implies that a 1% increase in the company's profitability leads to a corresponding increase of 0.457

units in the auditor's opinion, under the assumption of constant values for other variables.

These findings provide valuable insights into the specific impacts of company size, solvency, auditor quality, and auditor's opinion on audit delay within PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia, Lampung. Such quantitative analysis enhances understanding of the factors influencing audit timeliness and contributes to informed decision-making processes within the organization.

T Test

The statistical analysis conducted in this study, as outlined by Riswan and Dunan (2019), focuses on determining the individual influence of explanatory or independent variables in explaining variations observed in the dependent variable. This analysis involves comparing the computed t-value with the critical t-value derived from the t-table, typically set at a significance level of 0.05. The interpretation of this comparison follows specific criteria: firstly, if the computed t-value exceeds the critical t-value, it leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis (Ho) and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (Ha), indicating that the independent variable possesses a statistically significant individual influence on the dependent variable. Conversely, if the computed t-value falls below the critical t-value, it results in the acceptance of the null hypothesis (Ho) and rejection of the alternative hypothesis (Ha), suggesting that the independent variable lacks a significant individual impact on the dependent variable. These findings regarding the significance of individual parameters, determined through the t-test, are summarized in Table 11, providing valuable insights into the specific relationships under investigation within the research framework.

Table 4
Individual Parameter Significance Test Results (t Test)

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.863	2.592		.719	.476
	TOTALX1	.232	.114	.228	2.038	.048
	TOTALX2	.026	.048	.055	2.545	.009
	TOTALX3	.228	.108	.290	2.111	.041
	TOTALX4	-.010	.158	-.010	-.066	.947
	TOTALX5	.457	.126	.453	3.635	.001

a. Dependent Variable: TOTALLY

Source: Results of primary data processing via SPSS, 2020

The results of the individual parameter significance test (t-test) unveil insights into the influence of each independent variable on the dependent variable, audit delay, as follows:

Firstly, concerning company size, the t-value of 2.038 with a significance of 0.048 indicates statistical significance. With the t-count surpassing the t-table (2.038 > 2.011) and significance level falling below 0.05 (0.048 < 0.05), it is evident that the company size variable significantly affects audit delay. Therefore, hypothesis H1 is accepted.

Secondly, company profitability exhibits a t-count of 2.545 and a significance level of 0.009. Similarly, with the t-count exceeding the t-table (2.545 > 2.011) and significance below 0.05 (0.009 < 0.05), the influence of company profitability on audit delay is statistically significant. Consequently, hypothesis H2 is accepted.

Thirdly, the analysis of solvency reveals a t-count value of 2.111 and a significance of 0.041. Again, with the calculated t value surpassing the t-table (2.111 > 2.011) and significance below 0.05 (0.041 < 0.05), the solvency variable demonstrates significance in affecting audit delay. Thus, hypothesis H3 is accepted.

However, when considering auditor quality, the t-value of -0.066 and significance of 0.957 suggest a lack of statistical significance. The t-count being smaller than the t-table (0.066 < 2.011) and significance level above 0.05 (0.957 > 0.05) indicate that auditor quality does not significantly impact audit delay. Therefore, hypothesis H4 is not supported.

Lastly, the auditor's opinion presents a t-value of 3.635 and a significance level of 0.001. With the calculated t value surpassing the t-table (3.635 > 2.011) and significance below 0.05 (0.001 < 0.05), the auditor's opinion emerges as a significant factor influencing audit delay. Thus, hypothesis H5 is accepted.

The findings suggest that company size, profitability, solvency, and the auditor's opinion significantly affect audit delay within the context of PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia in Lampung during the studied period. However, auditor quality does not demonstrate a significant influence on audit delay according to the analysis. These results provide valuable insights for stakeholders in understanding the determinants of audit delay and underscore the importance of addressing pertinent factors to enhance financial reporting efficiency.

Statistical Test f

Table 5

Statistical Test Results f

ANOVA[b]

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	73.431	2	36.716	12.560	.000[a]
Residual	283.559	97	2.923		
Total	356.990	99			

a. Predictors: (Constant)TOTAL X5, TOTAL X4, TOTAL X3, TOTAL X2, TOTAL X1

b. Dependent Variable: TOTALLY

Source: Results of primary data processing via SPSS, 2020

The findings from the statistical analysis, particularly the F-test conducted, reveal significant insights into the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. With a significance value (sig) of 0.000, which is smaller than the predetermined alpha level of 0.005, and an F count of 12.560 surpassing the critical F-table value of 3.95, it becomes evident that there exists a substantial simultaneous influence of the independent variables on the dependent variable, denoted as variable Y. These results signify a robust statistical association between the factors under investigation and the outcome variable, indicating that the combined effect of the independent variables contributes significantly to the variation observed in the dependent variable. Therefore, it can be inferred that the factors examined collectively exert a notable influence on the outcome variable, underscoring the importance of

considering multiple factors when analyzing audit delay within the context of the study. Such findings contribute valuable insights into the intricate dynamics governing audit delay and provide a foundation for further research and practical implications in optimizing audit processes and financial reporting practices.

Uji Koefisien Determinasi **(**R^2)
The Determination Coefficient Test, commonly denoted as R-squared (R^2), serves as a crucial metric in assessing the effectiveness of a regression model in explaining the variability of the dependent variable based on the independent variable. Essentially, this test gauges the degree to which the independent variable can elucidate and account for fluctuations in the dependent variable. The R-squared value ranges from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating a stronger explanatory power of the independent variable on the dependent variable. When the R-squared value approaches 1, it signifies that the independent variable effectively captures and provides the requisite information to elucidate variations in the dependent variable. Conversely, lower R-squared values suggest a diminished ability of the independent variable to explain variability in the dependent variable. Therefore, the R-squared test serves as a vital tool in assessing the robustness and adequacy of the regression model in capturing the underlying relationships between variables, thus informing the validity and reliability of the study findings.

Table 6
Coefficient of Determination Test Results (R^2)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.454[a]	.206	.189	1.710

Predictors: (Constant), TOTAL 5, TOTAL X4, TOTAL X3, TOTAL X2, TOTAL X1
Source: Results of primary data processing via SPSS, 2020

The determination coefficient test (R^2) results indicate a value of 0.454, suggesting a moderate correlation between the factors analyzed and audit delay. This value signifies that approximately 45.4% of the variance in audit delay can be explained by the independent variables under consideration. A higher R^2 value suggests a stronger relationship between the independent and dependent variables. In this context, the proximity of the R value to 1 indicates a substantial influence of the independent variables on audit delay. However, it's important to note that other factors not included in this analysis may also contribute to audit delay, indicating the presence of unexplained variance. Therefore, while the identified factors account for a significant portion of audit delay variability, further investigation may be warranted to comprehensively understand the complexities underlying audit delay within the context of PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia, Lampung.

Discussion

The literature review provides useful insights into the factors that influence the audit delay in PT Japfa Comfeed Indonesia, Lampung. This talk aims to clarify the importance of several factors in influencing the dynamics of audit delay by analysing previous research.
The size of a company is a crucial factor that affects the length of time it takes to

complete an audit. Large organisations typically have shorter delay periods due to their strong internal control systems and increased allocation of resources to financial reporting processes (Ashton et al., 1989; Durand, 2019; Habib et al., 2019). In contrast, smaller organisations may have extended delays in the auditing process as a result of limited resources and operational difficulties (Ashton et al., 1989).

Profitability is another important aspect that affects the dynamics of audit delay. Profitable companies are inclined to quickly share positive information by issuing timely financial reports, which helps reduce the time it takes for an audit to be completed (Abernathy et al., 2017; Ashton et al., 1989; Durand, 2019). On the other hand, companies that are experiencing financial difficulties may encounter increased examination and intricacy in their financial reporting, leading to longer periods of time for auditing (Abernathy et al., 2017).

Furthermore, solvency has a substantial impact on the determination of audit delay results. Organisations that have a greater financial stability are more capable of conducting audits in a timely manner. On the other hand, organisations that are facing liquidity issues may find it difficult to submit financial information on time (Abdillah et al., 2019; Abernathy et al., 2017; Asthana, 2014; Habib et al., 2019).

The competence of auditors involved in the audit process significantly affects the time it takes to complete the audit. Auditors from well-established firms, especially the "Big Four," follow professional standards and expedite the audit process by utilising their abundant resources and technical knowledge (Abdillah et al., 2019; Afify, 2009; Ashton et al., 1989; Habib et al., 2019).

Ultimately, the assessment provided by the auditor in the audit report has a substantial influence on how financial statement reliability and fairness are seen. An advantageous audit opinion improves the trustworthiness of financial reporting and can accelerate audit procedures (Eghlaiow et al., 2012; Mawardi et al., 2019; Pourali et al., 2013).

The discussion highlights the complex and varied aspects of audit delay, which are influenced by factors including the size and profitability of the company, its solvency, the quality of the auditor, and the auditor's viewpoint. Comprehending these factors is essential for stakeholders aiming to enhance audit procedures and financial reporting practices in PT Japfa Comfeed Indonesia, Lampung.

Conclusion

The objective of this study was to determine the elements that affect the time it takes to complete an audit at PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia, Lampung. An analysis of five crucial factors—company size, profitability, solvency, auditor quality, and audit opinion—uncovered the significant influence of these variables on the dynamics of audit delay within the organisation from 2017 to 2018. PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia, Lampung was found to have experienced delays in submitting audit reports. Further examination revealed that factors such as company size, profitability, solvency, auditor quality, and audit opinion significantly influenced the occurrence of audit delays.

Based on the findings of this research and taking into account its limitations, we may offer numerous measures to tackle the identified difficulties and improve the efficiency of audits in the organisation. Auditors must diligently fulfil their obligations and strictly follow set standards and procedures to guarantee the efficient and prompt completion of audit reports. Auditors can optimise the audit process and reduce delays in financial reporting by adhering to professional standards and implementing best practices.

Additionally, partnering with esteemed auditing companies, namely those affiliated with the Indonesian Institute of Public Accountants, can enhance the quality and effectiveness of audits. Hiring seasoned auditors with a demonstrated history of delivering prompt and precise reports helps reduce delays and improve the overall dependability of financial statements.

In addition, future research in this field could investigate supplementary components or variables that could potentially impact audit delay, but were not examined in the present study. Researchers can enhance their understanding of audit delay dynamics and contribute to the advancement of frameworks for reducing delays in financial reporting processes by broadening the inquiry scope and addressing innovative aspects.

Stakeholders can strive to enhance audit processes and financial reporting practices by implementing the aforementioned recommendations and pursuing novel research opportunities. This will ultimately promote transparency, accountability, and trust within the organisation and the wider business community.

References

Abdillah, M. R., Mardijuwono, A. W., & Habiburrochman, H. (2019). The effect of company characteristics and auditor characteristics to audit report lag. *Asian Journal of Accounting Research*, *4*(1), 129–144. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJAR-05-2019-0042

Abernathy, J. L., Barnes, M., Stefaniak, C., & Weisbarth, A. (2017). An International Perspective on Audit Report Lag: A Synthesis of the Literature and Opportunities for Future Research. *International Journal of Auditing*, *21*(1), 100–127. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/ijau.12083

Abidin, S., & Ahmad-Zaluki, N. A. (2012). Auditor Industry Specialism and Reporting Timeliness. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *65*, 873–878. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.213

Afify, H. A. E. (2009). Determinants of audit report lag. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, *10*(1), 56–86. https://doi.org/10.1108/09675420910963397

Aljaaidi, K. S., Bagais, O. A., & Alabdullatif, S. A. (2021). Audit efficiency and board activity in saudi arabia: Empirical investigation. *Accounting*, *7*(4), 893–898. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ac.2021.1.019

Ashton, R. H., Graul, P. R., & Newton, J. D. (1989). Audit delay and the timeliness of corporate reporting. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, *5*(2), 657–673. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1911-3846.1989.tb00732.x

Asthana, S. (2014). Abnormal audit delays, earnings quality and firm value in the USA. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*, *12*(1), 21–44. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFRA-09-2011-0009

Durand, G. (2019). The determinants of audit report lag: a meta-analysis. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, *34*(1), 44–75. https://doi.org/10.1108/MAJ-06-2017-1572

Eghlaiow, S., Wickremasinghe, G., & Sofocleous, S. (2012). A Review of The Empirical Determinants of Audit Delay. *Corporate Ownership & Control*, *9*(2), 511–514. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22495/cocv9i2c5art5

Fujianti, L., & Satria, I. (2020). Firm size, profitability, leverage as determinants of audit report lag: Evidence from Indonesia. *International Journal of Financial Research*, *11*(2). https://doi.org/10.5430/ijfr.v11n2p61

Habib, A., Bhuiyan, Md. B. U., Huang, H. J., & Miah, M. S. (2019). Determinants of audit report lag: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Auditing*, *23*(1), 20–44. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/ijau.12136

Khoufi, N., & Khoufi, W. (2018). An empirical examination of the determinants of audit report delay in France. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, *33*(8/9), 700–714. https://doi.org/10.1108/MAJ-02-2017-1518

Lai, T. T. T., Tran, M. D., Hoang, V. T., & Nguyen, T. H. L. (2020). Determinants influencing audit delay: The case of Vietnam. *Accounting*, *6*(5), 851–858. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ac.2020.5.009

Mawardi, W., Woyanti, N., Iriviana, L., & Darwanto, D. (2019). Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises' Understanding in Preparing Financial Statements Based on Sak Etap. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, *9*(6), 177–183. https://doi.org/10.32479/ijefi.8748

Muda, I., Davis, K. V., Erlina, E., Kholis, A., & Gusnardi, G. (2020). Audit Lag Criteria Report as a Determination of the Reliability and Quality of Auditor's Report in Indonesia. *Research in World Economy*, *11*(6), 96. https://doi.org/10.5430/rwe.v11n6p96

Muna, E. F., & Lisiantara, G. A. (2021). Analysis of factors affecting audit delay in manufacturing and financial companies listed on IDX. *Indonesia Accounting Journal*, *3*(1), 27–35. https://doi.org/10.32400/iaj.33169

Pourali, M. R., Jozi, M., Rostami, K. H., Taherpour, G. R., & Niazi, F. (2013). Investigation of effective factors in audit delay: Evidence from Tehran Stock Exchange (TSE). *Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, *5*(2), 405–410. https://doi.org/10.19026/rjaset.5.4966

Sutopo, B., Sutaryo, & Christian, Y. (2017). Empirical study of the determinants on audit reporting timeliness: evidence from Indonesia. *International Journal of Trade and Global Markets*, *10*(4), 303–313. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTGM.2017.090272

Zeghal, D. (1984). Timeliness of Accounting Reports and Their Informational Content on The Capital Market. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, *11*(3), 367–380. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5957.1984.tb00756.x