

Firda Nur Fauzia¹

State University of Malang, Malang, Indonesia

Sri Pujiningsih²

State University of Malang, Malang, Indonesia

Makaryanawati³

State University of Malang, Malang, Indonesia

Determinants of Fraudulent Tendencies on Public Accountancy in Indonesia

Abstract. Accounting fraud is the intentional manipulation of accounting data to create a false appearance of corporate financial health or obtain personal benefits. If problems like this occur continuously, it will cause fraud that is detrimental to many parties. Therefore, efforts to minimize fraud need to do an in-depth analysis of the causes of fraud. One of them is analyzing the tendency of public accountant fraud through the fraud hexagon perspective. Georgios L. Vousinas developed the fraud hexagon in 2019. The fraud hexagon explains that fraud can occur due to six factors, namely, 1) pressure, 2) opportunity, 3) rationalization, 4) capability, 5) arrogance and 6) collusion. This theoretical concept is the basis of this research. This research aims to obtain empirical evidence regarding the influence of the fraud hexagon factor on the tendency of public accountant fraud accompanied by a moderating variable of professional ethics. The questionnaire method was used to collect data for analysis. The sample in this study is all public accountants working at public accounting firms registered with the Indonesian Ministry of Finance (Kementerian Keuangan) in 2022. The total sample is 107 respondents. To analyze data Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) was used. The results of this study are pressure, rationalization, opportunity, capability, and arrogance do not affect public accountant fraud tendencies. Collusion is a factor that influences the tendency of public accountants to commit fraud. The ethics of the accounting profession do not moderate the hexagon fraud factor's effect on public accountants' tendency to commit fraud. Other related parties can use the results of this study to prevent public accountant fraud through policies related to collusive practices because only collusion increases the desire of public accountants to commit fraud.

Keywords: fraud hexagon, tendency to fraud, ethics for professional accountants, public accountant, collusion.

Suggested Citation

Fauzia, F. N., Pujiningsih, S., Makaryanawati. (2022). Determinants of Fraudulent Tendencies on Public Accountancy in Indonesia. *Oblik i finansii*, 4(98), 13-22. [https://doi.org/10.33146/2307-9878-2022-4\(98\)-13-22](https://doi.org/10.33146/2307-9878-2022-4(98)-13-22)

¹ **Firda Nur Fauzia**, State University of Malang, Malang, Indonesia.

ORCID 0000-0002-9975-9978

E-mail: firdanurfauzia7@gmail.com (*Corresponding author*)

² **Sri Pujiningsih**, State University of Malang, Malang, Indonesia.

ORCID 0000-0002-7726-355X

³ **Makaryanawati**, State University of Malang, Malang, Indonesia

ORCID 0000-0002-6481-2636

Детермінанти шахрайства серед професійних бухгалтерів у публічній практиці в Індонезії

***Анотація.** Бухгалтерське шахрайство – це навмисне маніпулювання бухгалтерськими даними з метою неправдивого представлення фінансового стану компанії у звітності або отримання особистої вигоди бухгалтером чи іншими пов'язаними особами. Якщо випадки такого шахрайства виникають часто, то це завдасть шкоди багатьом сторонам. Зусилля з мінімізації шахрайства потребують проведення глибокого аналізу причин його виникнення. Одним із таких заходів є аналіз схильності бухгалтерів до шахрайства через призму шестикутника шахрайства. Шестикутник шахрайства, розроблений Георгіосом Л. Вузінасом у 2019 році, припускає, що шахрайство може статися через шість факторів, а саме: 1) тиск, 2) можливість, 3) раціоналізацію, 4) здібність, 5) зарозумілість і 6) змову. Ця теоретична концепція є основою даного дослідження, мета якого – отримати емпіричні докази щодо впливу факторів шестикутника шахрайства на схильність бухгалтерів до шахрайства з розглядом професійної етики як модеруючої змінної. Для збору даних для аналізу використовувався метод анкетування. Вибіркою в цьому дослідженні є всі бухгалтери, які працюють у державних бухгалтерських фірмах, зареєстрованих у Міністерстві фінансів Індонезії у 2022 році. Загальна вибірка становить 107 респондентів. Для аналізу даних використовувався модерований регресійний аналіз (MRA). Результати цього дослідження свідчать, що тиск, раціоналізація, можливості, здібності та зарозумілість не впливають на схильність бухгалтерів до шахрайства. Натомість змова є фактором, який суттєво впливає на схильність бухгалтерів до шахрайства. Професійна етика бухгалтера не пом'якшує вплив факторів шестикутника шахрайства на схильність бухгалтерів до шахрайства. Відповідні служби чи особи можуть використовувати результати цього дослідження, щоб запобігти шахрайству публічних бухгалтерів через політику, пов'язану із змовою, оскільки лише змова збільшує бажання бухгалтерів вчиняти шахрайство.*

***Ключові слова:** шестикутник шахрайства, схильність до шахрайства, професійна етика бухгалтера, професійний бухгалтер у публічній практиці, змова.*

INTRODUCTION

In 2018 there was a big case at PT. Garuda, Tbk. This case was caused by a violation by a public accountant who conducted an audit not following Statement of Financial Accounting Standards (*Kementerian Keuangan*, 2018). The public accountant is Kasner Sirumpea from public accounting firm Tanubrata, Susanto, Fahmi, Bambang, and colleagues. This case started when the public accountant did not obtain sufficient audit evidence to evaluate the financial statements of PT. Garuda, Tbk, so that public accountants can not audit financial statements optimally (Akbar, 2018). It is because the 2018 financial statements showed a profit of US\$ 5,018,308, while the 2017 financial statements showed a loss of US\$ 213,389,678. (Christian et al., 2021). According to *Kementerian Keuangan* (2018), the public accountant has violated the Public Accountant Professional Standards.

If problems like this occur continuously, it will create fraud that is detrimental to many parties. Therefore, efforts to minimize fraud need to do an in-depth analysis of the causes of fraud. One of them is by analyzing the tendency of public accountant fraud through the fraud hexagon perspective. The fraud hexagon is an approach to detect fraud through factors of pressure,

rationalization, opportunity, capability, arrogance, and collusion.

The authors found that the analysis of fraud in public accountants is still rarely carried out in accounting studies. The majority of previous studies have only focused on cases of public sector fraud, such as corruption (Ozcelik, 2020; Prakoso & Setiyorini, 2021), academic cheating (Purwatmiasih et al., 2021; Savilia & Laily, 2020), and cheating on company employees (Sari & Nugroho, 2020; Avortri & Agbanyo, 2020). Therefore, in this research, the accountant's professional ethics variable is used as a moderating variable to create updates from previous studies.

Professional ethics is a moral behavior that is owned by a person in carrying out his profession (Agoes, 2017). This can create professionalism in making a decision, the better the ethics, the better the actions taken (Thomas, 2021). Therefore professional ethics have a role to weaken or increase a person's tendency to commit fraud in carrying out his profession (Sahla & Ardianto, 2022; Wahyuni & Isniawati, 2021). Professional ethics contains controls that are expected to prevent fraud factors (Widiyati, 2021), especially the factors contained in the fraud hexagon. Based on the explanation above, the researcher will formulate a problem regarding the

influence of the fraud hexagon factor which includes pressure, rationalization, opportunity, capability, arrogance, and collusion on the tendency of public accountant fraud accompanied by moderating variables of accounting profession ethics.

This research is expected to provide knowledge and information to future researchers regarding the tendency of fraud to occur in public accountants using the fraud hexagon approach. The practical value of this study is as follows:

1) knowing the factors that cause fraud will help other related parties make policies to discipline and supervise public accountants. Such associations include the Indonesian Institute of Accountants (Ikatan Akuntan Indonesia (IAI), the Financial Profession Development Center (Pusat Pembinaan Profesi Keuangan (PPPK), and others. The aim is to prevent ongoing fraud in public accountants.

2) accountants will be more aware of the factors that lead to fraud in public accountancy.

LITERATURE REVIEW & HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Fraud Hexagon

The fraud hexagon was developed by Georgios L. Voutsinas in 2019. This is a development of the previous fraud theory, namely the fraud triangle (Cressey, 1953), fraud diamond (Wolfe & Hermanson, 2004), and pentagon or star (Marks, 2011). The fraud hexagon explains that fraud can occur due to six factors, namely 1) pressure, 2) opportunity, 3) rationalization, 4) capability, 5) arrogance, and 6) collusion. Hexagon fraud is considered better and more perfect than other frauds (Sagala & Siagian, 2021). Because more complex indicators can analyze the problem comprehensively. Therefore, this theory is expected to be more accurate in detecting fraud in an organization.

Pressure

Pressure is an urge that occurs in a person to do an action or action (Mardiah, 2021). Pressure can create fraud on public accountants due to internal and external motives. Pressure can be financial or non-financial (Tuanakotta, 2013). The greater the pressure faced by a person, the higher someone commits fraud (*fraud*) (Lou & Wang, 2009). This statement is supported by other empirical studies which reveal that pressure has a significant effect on public accountant fraud (Durori & Indradjit, 2020). While research Sahla & Ardianto (2022) explains that pressure does not affect the tendency of public accountant fraud. Every accountant can feel pressure in his work. Therefore, the potential for fraud will always exist.

H₁: pressure affects the tendency of public accountant fraud.

Rationalization

Rationalization is a feeling that arises in a person because he has justified deviant (cheating) actions (Romney & Paul, 2014). This rationalization is one of the factors that triggers someone to commit fraud or fraud (Apriani, 2020). Several other studies have proven that

rationalization has a positive effect on someone in committing fraud (Omukaga, 2019; Putra & Rahayu, 2019; Rustiarini et al., 2019; Fadly et al., 2020). Meanwhile, Sahla & Ardianto's research (2022) shows that rationalization has no effect on the tendency to cheat in public accountants. There is an inconsistency of results that causes rationalization of fraud research that may occur in accountants.

H₂: rationalization affects the tendency of public accountant fraud.

Opportunity

Opportunity is the opportunity for fraud to occur in an organization. Opportunities for fraud occur due to the perception that controls within an organization are weak (Abdullahi et al., 2015). The greater the opportunity that a person feels, the greater the potential for fraud to occur (Suryandari & Valentin, 2020). Several studies have tested that opportunity has a positive influence on fraud, namely (Omukaga, 2019; Rustiarini et al., 2019; Apriani, 2020). But research Sahla & Ardianto (2022) shows that opportunity does not affect the tendency of public accountant fraud. Sometimes public accountants can get opportunities outside their control that can spur fraudulent actions in them.

H₃: opportunity affects the tendency of public accountant fraud.

Capability

Capability is an ability possessed by a person to create deviations, such as controlling a situation for his gain (Suryandari & Valentin, 2020). Strategies can be made well because the perpetrators already know the weaknesses of internal control. In research Omukaga (2019); Rustiarini et al (2019); Apriani (2020) state that competence has a positive effect on fraud. Study Sahla & Ardianto (2022) also explains that capability influences the tendency of public accountant fraud. Therefore, a public accountant who has the ability in himself will have the potential to commit fraud in it.

H₄: capability affects the tendency of public accountant fraud.

Arrogance

Arrogance is a feeling in a person who feels superior and feels he has the right to cheat. This is caused by the perception that company or organizational policies are not directed at him (Marks, 2012). According to Marks (2012), There are five factors that a person commits arrogance in an organization, including 1) a large ego, 2) internal control does not apply to the perpetrator, 3) the characteristics of a bully, 4) accustomed to leading authoritarian, and 5) fear of losing one's position, position, or status in an organization. Research by Sahla & Ardianto (2022) explained that arrogance encourages public accountants to commit fraud. Accountants have the possibility of being arrogant because of their position or job. So the accountant may have an arrogant attitude that has the potential to commit fraud.

H₅: arrogance affects the tendency of public accountant fraud.

Collusion

A collusion is an act of hiding between two or more people. This is done so that the fraud that has been committed is not detected by other parties or internal control (Sihombing & Rahardjo, 2014). An example of collusive behavior is co-workers cooperating with fake expenses on financial reports (Suryandari & Valentin, 2020). The aim is to gain profit from the fraudulent act. Several other empirical studies have also tested the effect of collusion on fraud (Susandra & Hartina, 2017; Desviyana et al., 2020), and the results show that there is a positive influence on it. Public accountants may receive offers for collusion so that the potential for fraud can occur. Therefore, the hypothesis made is:

H₆: collusion affects the tendency of public accountant fraud.

Accountant Professional Ethics

Professional ethics is a person's behavior and morals in carrying out his profession (Sukrisno, 2017). Each profession will have its professional ethics, including the accounting profession. Professional accounting ethics is very necessary to prevent public accountants from deviant actions. Therefore, the accounting profession is equipped with a code of ethics to guarantee the quality, quality, and trust of accountants (Wahyuni & Isniawati, 2021). The higher the accountant's understanding of the accountant's code of ethics, the more excellent and reliable the service provided by the accountant to the client will be (Thomas, 2021). Other studies have tested that the professional ethics of accountants can moderate the influence of capability and arrogance on the tendency of public accountants to fraud (Sahla & Ardianto, 2022). Although other studies explain that the ethics of the accounting profession are unable to moderate pressure (Wahyuni & Isniawati, 2021), rationalization, and opportunity (Sahla & Ardianto, 2022). This professional ethics is expected to weaken the factors that can trigger

deviant behavior, such as cheating. Therefore the hypothesis is derived, as follows:

H₇: professional ethics moderates the influence of the hexagon fraud factor on the tendency of public accountant fraud.

Accountants' Fraud Tendency

Tendency to cheat means a person's motive or desire to do things that deviate from the norms or rules that apply. In the business sector, the factor that causes a person to experience fraud tendencies is the lack of strict rules due to the low integrity of related parties in preparing financial reports (Amin, 2013). According to the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE), accounting fraud is divided into three types: 1) intentional or unintentional misstatement of financial reporting; 2) misappropriation of assets; 3) Corruption attempts for personal gain.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research is classified as explanatory research or a type of causal or causal research (Creswell, 2016). In this study, the aim was to obtain empirical evidence regarding the influence of the fraud hexagon factor on the tendency of public accountant fraud accompanied by a moderating variable of professional ethics. This study will use primary data from a survey. This study will collect data directly using online or offline questionnaires. The population of this study is all public accountants in Indonesia who work at Public Accounting Firms registered with the Ministry of Finance (*Kementerian Keuangan*) in 2022. While the sampling is done by accidental sampling or by chance (Creswell, 2016). The minimum sample uses the Lemeshow formula, which is a minimum of 96 samples. The data analysis technique will be tested with Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA). In this research, it is formulated into two equations, as follows:

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6$$

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + Z X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4 X_5 X_6 + e$$

Explanation:

Y	= The tendency of public accountants fraud
$\beta_1 \dots \beta_6$	= Coefficient of regression direction
X_1	= Pressure
X_2	= Rationalization
X_3	= Opportunity
X_4	= Capability
X_5	= Arrogance
X_6	= Collusion
Z	= Professional ethics

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this study is the tendency to fraud in public accountants such as the research of Sahla & Ardianto (2022). The tendency to fraud is the perpetrator's motive for committing fraud, this can be measured through an instrument that contains several questions (Suryandari & Valentin, 2020).

Independent Variables

The independent variables in this study include:

1. Pressure, namely the pressure felt by someone to commit fraud. Pressure can be measured through an instrument consisting of several questions (Suryandari & Valentin, 2020; Desviyana et al., 2020).

2. Rationalization, namely the justification of a fraud committed by someone. Rationalization can be measured through an instrument consisting of several questions adopted from the research of Suryandari & Valentin (2020), and Desviyana et al., (2020).

3. Opportunity, namely the opportunity for someone to cheat. Opportunity can be measured through an instrument consisting of several questions adopted from the research of Suryandari & Valentin (2020), and Desviyana et al., (2020).

4. Capability, namely the ability of a person to cheat. Capability can be measured through an instrument which consists of several questions adopted from the research of Suryandari & Valentin (2020), and Desviyana et al., (2020).

5. Arrogance, namely the arrogant attitude possessed by someone to support the motive of cheating. Arrogance can be measured through an instrument which consists of several questions adopted from the research of Suryandari & Valentin (2020), and Desviyana et al., (2020).

6. Collusion, namely the conspiracy of two or more parties in committing fraud. Collusion can be measured through an instrument consisting of several questions adopted from the research of Suryandari & Valentin (2020), and Desviyana et al., (2020).

Moderating Variable

The moderating variable in this study is the ethics of the accounting profession, as was done in Sahla & Ardianto's research (2022). The ethics of the accounting profession have an influence on weakening or strengthening the motives of fraudulent public accountants. The ethics of the public accounting

profession will be measured through an instrument consisting of several question items adopted from Wahyuni & Isnawati's research (2021).

RESULTS

Respondent Profile

This study got 107 responses from public accountants as respondents. The results showed that the composition of the respondents varied. The percentage of respondents' gender shows the results of 53% women with a total of 57 people. While men as much as 47% with a total of 50 people. The percentage of age 20-30 years were 91 respondents, age 30-40 years were 11 respondents, and 40-50 years were 5 respondents. The percentage of Senior High School/Vocational High School education level is 7 respondents, Associate's degree is 8 respondents, Bachelor degree is 82 respondents, and postgraduate is 10 respondents. Finally, the percentage of work experience <1 year is 34 respondents, 1-5 years is 50 respondents, and >5 years is 23 respondents.

Descriptive Statistics Results

Descriptive statistics show the minimum, maximum, average, and variance of the dependent, moderating, and independent variables. The average respondent's answers regarding the tendency to fraud agree with 30,000 (30%) and disagree (minimum) with 16,000 (16%), the average is 24,971 (24.9%). This shows that the majority of respondents agree that accountants have the potential for fraud. This is because there are still frequent cases of fraud that occur in certain companies that are closely related to public accountants, such as the case of PT. Garuda, Tbk (Natalis Christian et al., 2021).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Tendency to Fraud	16,000	30,000	24,97196	3,292238	10,839
Pressure	7,000	57,000	33,98131	6,477801	41,962
Rationalization	16,000	30,000	23,99065	2,918695	8,519
Opportunity	18,000	30,000	24,55140	2,825870	7,986
Capability	18,000	30,000	24,28037	2,520835	6,355
Arrogance	18,000	30,000	25,53271	2,882340	8,308
Collusion	18,000	30,000	25,30841	3,432396	11,781
Professional ethics	16,000	30,000	24,49533	3,172327	10,064

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of each variable showing almost the same average value. While the highest average value is in the pressure variable, which is 33,981 or 33.9%. This means that the ratio between the maximum and minimum values is 33.9%. The maximum value of 57% and the minimum is 7%.

Pearson Correlation Test

The results of the Pearson correlation between variables show that pressure, rationalization, opportunity, capability, arrogance, and collusion have a significant positive relationship with the tendency of public accountant fraud. The moderating variable is professional ethics related to the tendency of public accountant fraud.

Table 2. Pearson Correlation

Explanation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Tendency to Fraud	1,000							
Pressure	,258**	1,000						
Rationalization	,089	,037	1,000					
Opportunity	,287**	,124	,296**	1,000				
Capability	,248*	,143	,257**	,260**	1,000			
Arrogance	,479**	,155	,335**	,552**	,286**	1,000		
Collusion	,376**	,147	,356**	,454**	,325**	,612**	1,000	
Professional ethics	,655**	,242*	,287**	,426**	,445**	,523**	,579**	1,000

** Significant correlation on 0.001

* Significant correlation on 0.05

Regression Test Results

Before carrying out the Multiple Linear Regression test, researchers must carry out the Classical Assumption test, including 1) The normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov one sample shows that the research data is normally distributed because the sig value shows a value of 0.200. This value is > 0.05 . 2) For the multicollinearity test in this study, the VIF value as a

whole has shown < 10 . This shows that the data in this study did not have multicollinearity in it. 3) The heteroscedasticity test in this study used the Glejser test. All variables show sig values > 0.05 . Overall the variables are free from interference or heteroscedasticity. In connection with research data that does not use time series data, the autocorrelation test is not necessary for this study.

Table 3. Regression Test Results

	Model I	Model II
Constant	7,196	0,418
Pressure (X ₁)	0,572	,297
Rationalization (X ₂)	0,677	,962
Opportunity (X ₃)	0,158	,293
Capability (X ₄)	0,451	,950
Arrogance (X ₅)	0,468	,439
Collusion (X ₆)	0,006	,635
Professional ethics		,637
Professional ethics (Z)*X ₁		,353
Professional ethics (Z)*X ₂		,976
Professional ethics (Z)*X ₃		,377
Professional ethics (Z)*X ₄		,896
Professional ethics (Z)*X ₅		,422
Professional ethics (Z)*X ₆		,404
Simutan test (Uji F)	0,000	0,000
Coefficient of Determination (R ²)	0,276	0,405

Significant value when the value of sig $< 0,05$

Based on table 3 partial test results (t-test) with multiple linear regression in model I, the variable pressure to arrogance has a sig value > 0.05 , so the related variables do not influence the tendency of public accountant fraud. Therefore the hypotheses H₁ to H₅ are rejected or not proven. It can be concluded that the higher the pressure, rationalization, opportunity, capability, and arrogance experienced by public accountants. Then it will not affect his desire to commit fraud. Meanwhile, collusion (X₆) has a positive and significant effect on fraud tendencies (Y), so hypotheses H₆ is accepted. Because the sig value shows the number 0.006. This value is < 0.05 . This shows that the higher the collusive practices that exist within the public accounting environment, the more it will affect the motives for committing fraud. Simultaneously, pressure, rationalization, opportunity, capability, arrogance, and

collusion affect the tendency of public accountants to commit fraud. The coefficient of determination (R₂) shows a value of 0.276. This means that the ability of the independent variables namely pressure (X₁), rationalization (X₂), opportunity (X₃), capability (X₄), arrogance (X₅), and collusion (X₆) in explaining the dependent variable namely the tendency to cheat (Y) is 0.276 or 27.6 %. While the residual value of 73.4% is influenced by other variables not examined in this study.

Based on table 3 results of the partial test (t-test) with Moderated Regression Analysis in model II, the results show that the ethics of the accounting profession are not able to moderate the influence of pressure, rationalization, opportunity, capability, arrogance, and collusion on fraud tendencies. Because the sig value shows a number > 0.05 . So that the H₇ hypothesis is rejected or not proven. Therefore, even though there are

fraud hexagon factors that are perceived by public accountants. The level of professional ethics in accountants cannot weaken or increase the desire to commit fraud. The simultaneous test (F) shows that the sig value is 0.000, this value is <0.05 . So it can be concluded that simultaneously or simultaneously, the variables of pressure (X_1), rationalization (X_2), opportunity (X_3), capability (X_4), arrogance (X_5), and collusion (X_6) moderated by accounting professional ethics (Z) influence the tendency of public accounting fraud (Y). Test the coefficient of determination on the value of R square is 0.405 or in percentage is 40.5%. This shows that the tendency to fraud (Y) of public accountants can be explained by the variables of pressure (X_1), rationalization (X_2), opportunity (X_3), capability (X_4), arrogance (X_5), and collusion (X_6) which are moderated by the ethics of the accounting profession by 40.5%. While the remaining 59.5% is influenced by other variables not examined in this study.

DISCUSSION

The Influence of Hexagon Fraud Factors on Public Accountants' Fraud Tendency

For public accountants, internal or external pressure will not cause them to commit fraud. In the fraud hexagon theory, the pressure that comes from within can appear in the form of financial difficulties or several cases related to greed, such as the desire to live in luxury, an elite lifestyle, and so on. (Sriyana et al., 2014). Despite financial pressure, accountants choose not to commit fraud. Meanwhile, external pressure can also take the form of pressure from third parties, clients, family problems, and others (Pradipta & Bernawati, 2019). Even if the accountant has family problems or other problems that come from a third party, this still will not increase his desire to commit fraud for personal gain. Even if pressure from external parties deviates from the rules, it must be rejected to uphold professionalism. This is also in line with the research Sahla & Ardianto (2022) which explains that pressure does not affect the tendency of fraud in public accountants.

In this study, rationalization of fraud can take the form of justification for an error or fraud (Suryandari & Valentin, 2020). This can occur as a result of individuals or groups often making up a small problem (Wahyuni & Isnawati, 2021). However, the facts on the ground show that public accountants do not justify an error in the Public Accounting Firm. Even accountants will always reprimand other accountants if they make mistakes or violate the rules. So it can be concluded that fraud is not a natural thing, and cannot happen to everyone, especially public accountants. Public accountants know what is right or wrong, therefore this rationalization of fraud will not influence accountants to want to commit fraud. This research is in line with research Sahla & Ardianto (2022) that the rationalization of fraud has no effect on fraud by public accountants, or accountants in a company (Hasuti & Wiratno, 2020).

Opportunities are often linked by weak internal controls. Weak internal controls can lead to accounting fraud in an organization (Fernandhytia & Muslichah,

2020). However, in the results of this study, the opportunity to commit fraud due to internal control will always exist. But the public accountants will not intend to take this opportunity. Even accountants always communicate with clients, and other related parties to avoid any opportunity for fraud. Accountants will carry out their performance following professionalism. This causes fraud not to occur in Public Accounting Firms. This research is in line with Sahla & Ardianto (2022) that opportunity does not affect the tendency of public accountant fraud.

Capabilities are closely related to the competence or skills possessed by a person (Wahyuni & Isnawati, 2021). In this study, the meaning of competence is the ability of public accountants to control situations so they can act fraudulently. The results of the study show that public accountants can control social situations. But this does not create a desire for accountants to cheat. Generally, someone with a high position and power can control the situation to cheat (Nindito, 2019). In this study, a high position does not necessarily create fraud. Even many accountants with high positions, but do not commit fraud. Accountants with high positions will always do their jobs well and according to the code of ethics. Therefore position and power do not always lead to fraud.

Arrogance is an attitude of arrogance and feeling capable of committing fraud in an organization (Faradiza, 2019). Arrogance also includes a situation where it is difficult to accept input or criticism from other people because they feel that they are the best. In this study, the attitude of arrogance towards public accountants may occur in some public accountants. Just like research Sahla & Ardianto (2022) states that arrogance has an influence on the motives for fraud in public accountants. However, in this study, on the contrary, accountants will continue to carry out their duties properly even though they have an arrogant or arrogant attitude. This proves that arrogance does not affect the accountant's desire to commit fraud at the Public Accounting Firm.

Collusion is a cooperative effort between two or more people, the aim of which is to benefit from fraud (Vousinas, 2019). Collusion can be an attempt to cover up existing fraud. In this study, collusion can be done by giving gifts, bribing, or giving temporary hope so that other parties can cooperate. In addition, public accountant collusion efforts can be carried out by providing services and facilities to their clients. Therefore, collusion can create an intense relationship between the public accountant and the client. Even public accountants may audit financial statements improperly. In a similar study, namely research Sagala & Siagian (2021) explains that collusion influences financial fraud. Because there is a political connection between the company's financial staff and the government, financial fraud can occur smoothly.

Professional Ethics Moderates the Hexagon Fraud Factors' Influence on Public Accountants' Fraud Tendency

Professional ethics are unable to moderate the influence of the fraud hexagon factors which include

pressure, rationalization, opportunity, capability, arrogance, and collusion on the tendency of public accountant fraud. This shows that a higher level of understanding and implementation of accounting professional ethics does not necessarily reduce or increase the motivation of accountants to commit fraud. This is in line with the research Sahla & Ardianto (2022) which explains that ethics is not able to moderate pressure, rationalization, and opportunities for public accountant fraud. A study (Situmorang et al., 2020) explains that competence or ability is not able to moderate the tendency to cheat. In this study, public accountants should carry out their professional ethics. Even though there are various problems, such as pressure, weak internal control, information asymmetry, and so on. So, this will not cause the accountant to act fraudulently. Therefore, the ethics of the accounting profession does not play a role in increasing or weakening the desire of public accountants to commit fraud.

CONCLUSIONS

This study found that the factors of pressure, rationalization, opportunity, capability, and arrogance did not affect the tendency of public accountant fraud. Therefore, hypotheses H1 to H5 are rejected. Collusion is the only factor that influences public accountants to commit fraud at the Public Accounting Firm (*Kantor Akuntan Publik, KAP*), so hypothesis H6 is proven and accepted. This means that the higher the collusive practices that occur in public accountants, the higher the desire of accountants to commit fraud. Professional ethics are not able to moderate the influence of pressure, rationalization, opportunity, capability, arrogance, and collusion on the tendency of public accountant fraud. This shows that Hypothesis H7 is rejected. Therefore, professional ethics is not able to weaken or increase the

motivation of public accountants to commit fraud. All the results of this study indicate that not all factors in the fraud hexagon theory influence public accountants to commit fraud. But only a small part, namely collusion can increase public accountants' committing fraud.

Practically, this research can be used as consideration and input to assist other related parties in making better policies, guidance, and supervision. Other related parties, such as the Indonesian Institute of Accountants (*Ikatan Akuntan Indonesia, IAI*), the Financial Professional Development Center (*Pembinaan Profesi Keuangan, PPPK*), and others. This is done by focusing the study on preventing collusive practices in public accounting circles. Because research shows collusive practices can increase the desire of public accountants to commit fraud. The goal is to prevent ongoing fraud in public accountants.

This research has limitations, namely, the implementation of the survey does not deal with respondents directly. Therefore the results of this study could be biased to the actual conditions. In distributing online questionnaires, researchers were constrained by work e-mails that could not receive new e-mails because the e-mail was full, the researcher's e-mail entered KAP spam, or there was an e-mail address that could not be found. Finally, this study cannot be generalized to all auditors, because the treatment of the questionnaires is different. Some offices do not accept research questionnaires because of busy schedules, or for other reasons.

Suggestions for future researchers should add other factors that are more relevant and accurate because the factors studied by researchers have not been able to explain the information needed by the dependent variable as a whole. In addition, further research can contribute by making models or efforts to prevent fraud in public accountants.

4 References

- Abdullahi, R., & Mansor, N. (2018). Fraud Prevention Initiatives in the Nigerian Public Sector: Understanding the Relationship of Fraud Incidences and the Elements of Fraud Triangle Theory. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 25(2), 527–544.
- Abdullahi, S., Pradhana, B., Mansor, S., & Shariff, A. R. M. (2015). GIS-Based Modeling for the Spatial Measurement and Evaluation of Mixed Land Use Development for a Compact City. *GI Science & Remote Sensing*, 52(1), 18–39.
- Agoes, S. (2017). *Auditing : Petunjuk Praktis Pemeriksaan Akuntan Oleh Akuntan Publik* (Salemba Empat (ed.); 5th ed.).
- Aini, N., Prayudi, M. A., & Diatmika, I. P. G. (2017). Pengaruh Perspektif Fraud Diamond Terhadap Kecenderungan Terjadinya Kecurangan (Fraud) Dalam Pengelolaan Keuangan Desa. *E-Journal SI Ak Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha*, 8(2), 1–13.
- Akbar, C. (2018). Adakah Unsur Kesengajaan dalam Pelanggaran Laporan Keuangan Garuda? Retrieved from <https://bisnis.tempo.co/read/1219268/adakah-unsur-kesengajaan-dalam-pelanggaran-laporan-keuangan-garuda>
- Amin, W. T. (2013). *The Fraud Audit: Mencegah Dan Mendeteksi Kecurangan Akuntansi*. Harvarindo.
- Apriani. (2020). Pengaruh komponen-komponen fraud star terhadap korupsi dengan Sistem Pengendalian Intern Pemerintah (SPIP) sebagai variabel moderasi (Studi kasus pada Mahkamah Agung RI). *Jurnal Magister Akuntansi Trisakti*, 7(1), 1–24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25105/jmat.v7i1.6311>
- Avotri, C., & Agbanyo, R. (2020). Determinants of Management Fraud in the Banking Sector of Ghana: The Perspective of the Diamond Fraud Theory. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 28(1).
- Cressey, D. R. (1953). *Other people's money. A study of the social psychology of embezzlement*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Desviyana, D., Basri, Y. M., & Nasrizal, N. (2020). Analisis Kecurangan Pada Pengelolaan Dana Desa Dalam Perspektif Fraud Hexagon. *Saki (Studi Akuntansi & Keuangan Indonesia)*, 3(1), 50–73.
- Durori, R., & Indradjit, H. (2020). Pengaruh Tekanan Peran, Tekanan Waktu, dan Kontrol Kualitas Terhadap Penghentian Prematur Atas Prosedur Audit pada Sektor Publik. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Manajemen*, 17(2).

- Fadly, A., Wahyudi, I., & Yetti, S. (2020). Pengaruh Fraud Diamond Terhadap Kecurangan Laporan Keuangan Pada Kabupaten Dan Kota Di Provinsi Jambi Periode 2014-2018. *Jambi Accounting Review (JAR)*, 1(2), 139–151.
- Faradiza, S. A. (2019). Fraud Pentagon Dan Kecurangan Laporan Keuangan. *Ekbis: Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 2(1), 1–22.
- Fernandhytia, F., & Muslichah, M. (2020). The Effect of Internal Control, Individual Morality and Ethical Value on Accounting Fraud Tendency. *Media Ekonomi Dan Manajemen*, 35(1).
- Hasuti, A. T. A., & Wiratno, A. (2020). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi, Tekanan, Kesempatan, Dan Rasionalisasi Terhadap Perilaku Korupsi. *Jurnal Ekonomi, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi (JEBA)*, 22(2).
- Huefner, R. J. (2010). Local Government Fraud: The Roslyn School District Case. *Management Research Review*, 33(3), 198–209. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409171011030363>
- Kementerian Keuangan. (2018). *Ini Putusan Kasus Laporan Keuangan Tahunan PT Garuda Indonesia 2018*. Kementerian Keuangan Republik Indonesia. Retrieved from <https://www.kemenkeu.go.id/publikasi/berita/ini-putusan-kasus-laporan-keuangan-tahunan-pt-garuda-indonesia-2018/>
- Lou, Y.I., & Wang, M.L. (2009). Fraud Risk Factor of the Fraud Triangle Assessing the Likeli-Hood of Fraudulent Financial Reporting. *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, 7(2).
- Mardiah, S. J. (2021). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Penyalahgunaan Aset. *Jurnal Krisna:Kumpulan Riset Akuntansi*, 13(1).
- Maria, E., & Gudono. (2017). Empirical Test of Fraud Triangle Theory on Local Government (Evidence from Indonesia). *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, 15(4), 233–248.
- Marks, J. (2011). *Why the Fraud Triangle is no Longer Enough*. Horwath, In.
- Marks, J. (2012). *The Mind Behind the Fraudsters Crime: Key Behavioral and Environmental Elements*. Horwath, In.
- Christian, N., Jessica, & Leondy, R. (2021). Pendeteksian Financial Shenanigans Pada Laporan Keuangan PT Garuda Indonesia Tbk. *JURNAL MANEKSI*, 10(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31959/jm.v10i1.644>
- Nindito, M. (2019). Financial statement fraud: Perspective of the Pentagon Fraud model in Indonesia. *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal*, 22(3), 1–9.
- Omukaga, K. O. (2019). Is the Fraud Diamond Perspective Valid in Kenya? *Journal of Financial Crime*, 28(3), 810–840.
- Ozcelik, H. (2020). An Analysis of Fraudulent Financial Reporting Using the Fraud Diamond Theory Perspective: An Empirical Study on the Manufacturing Sector Companies Listed on the Borsa Istanbul. *Contemporary Issues in Audit Management and Forensic Accounting*, 102, 131–153.
- Pradipta, A., & Bernawati, Y. (2019). The Influence of Pressure, Opportunity, Rationalization and Ethical Value on the Accounting Fraud Tendency. *Sustainable Business Accounting and Management Review*, 1(2).
- Prakoso, D. B., & Setiyorini, W. (2021). Pengaruh Fraud Diamond Terhadap Indikasi Kecurangan Laporan Keuangan. *Jurnal Akuntansi Perpajakan*, 7(1).
- Purwatmiasih, F., Sudrajat, & Oktavia, R. (2021). Academic Fraud in Online System During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Evidence from Lampung- Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*, 21(2).
- Putra, M. A., & Rahayu, N. T. (2019). Analisis Fraud Diamond Theory Dalam Pengelolaan Dana Desa Di Kecamatan Guntur Kabupaten Demak. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Unimus*.
- Rahayu, D., Rahmayati, A., & Narulitasari, D. (2018). Determinan Pencegahan Fraud Pengelolaan Keuangan Desa. *Among Makarti*, 11(22).
- Romney, M. B., & Paul, J. S. (2014). *Sistem Informasi Akuntansi: Accounting Information Systems* (13th ed.).
- Rustiarini, N. W., Sutrisno, Nurkholis, & Andayani, W. (2019). Why people commit public procurement fraud? The fraud diamond view. *Journal of Public Procurement*, 19(4), 345–362.
- Sagala, S. G., & Siagian, V. (2021). Pengaruh Fraud Hexagon Model Terhadap Fraudulent Laporan Keuangan pada Perusahaan Sub Sektor Makanan dan Minuman yang Terdaftar di BEI Tahun 2016-2019. *Jurnal Akuntansi, Program Studi Akuntansi, Fakultas Bisnis, Universitas Kristen Maranatha*, 13(2), 245–259.
- Sahla, W. A., & Ardianto, A. (2022). Ethical Values and Auditors Fraud Tendency Perception: Testing of Fraud Pentagon Theory. *Journal of Financial Crime*.
- Said, J., Alam, M. M., Karim, Z. A., & Johari, R. J. (2018). Integrating Religiosity into Fraud Triangle Theory: Findings on Malaysian Police Officers. *Journal of Criminological Research, Policy and Practice*, 4(2), 111–123. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jcrpp-09-2017-0027>
- Sari, S. P., & Nugroho, N. K. (2020). Financial Statements Fraud dengan Pendekatan Vouisnas Fraud Hexagon Model: Tinjauan pada Perusahaan Terbuka di Indonesia. *IHTIFAZ: Islamic Economic, Finance and Banking(ACI-IJIEFB)*, 409–430.
- Savilia, L., & Laily, N. (2020). Accounting Students' Academic Fraud: Empirical Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Accounting and Business Education*, 5(1).
- Sihombing, S. K., & Rahardjo, N. S. (2014). Analisis Fraud Diamond Dalam Mendeteksi Financial Statement Fraud: Studi Empiris Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Yang Terdaftar Di Bursa Efek Indonesia (BEI) Tahun 2010-2012. *Diponegoro Journal of Accounting*, 3(2).
- Situmorang, D. M., Erlina, & Satriawan, B. (2020). Pengaruh Kompetensi Dan Independensi Auditor Terhadap Kualitas Audit Dengan Etika Auditor Sebagai Variabel Moderating Pada Kantor Akuntan Publik Di Kota Medan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi Dan Finansial Indonesia*, 3(2).

- Skousen, C. J., Smith, K. R., & Wright, C. J. (2009). Detecting and predicting financial statement fraud: The effectiveness of the fraud triangle and SAS No. 99. In *Corporate governance and firm performance*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. DOI:10.1108/S1569-3732(2009)0000013005
- Sriyana, J., Prabowo, Y., & Syamsudin, M. (2014). The Budget Misallocation Mechanism in Indonesia's Bureaucracy. *International Journal of Business and Management Study (IJBM)*, 1(2).
- Sukrisno. (2017). *Auditing: Petunjuk Praktis Pemeriksaan Akuntan oleh Akuntan Publik*. Salemba Empat.
- Suryandari, E., & Valentin, L. (2020). Determinan Fraud Dana Desa: Pengujian Elemen Fraud Hexagon, Machiavellian, Dan Love of Money. *Reviu Akuntansi Dan Bisnis Indonesia*, 5(1), 55–78.
- Susandra, F., & Hartina, S. (2017). Analisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kecenderungan fraud pada satuan kerja perangkat daerah (SKPD) di kota Bogor. *Jurnal Akunida*, 3(2).
- Thomas, A. (2021). Pengaruh Sikap, Tekanan Dan Kesempatan Karyawan Terhadap Kecurangan. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Sosial Humaniora*, 3(2), 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.51454/jimsh.v3i2.84>
- Tuanakotta, T. M. (2013). *Audit Berbasis ISA (International Standar Auditing)*. Salemba Empat.
- Vousinas, G. L. (2019). Advancing Theory of Fraud: The S.C.O.R.E. Model. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 26(1).
- W.Creswell, J. (2016). *Research Design, Pendekatan Metode Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, Dan Campuran* (4th ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Wahyuni, N., & Isnawati, A. (2021). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Kemampuan Auditor Mendeteksi Kecurangan Dengan Moderasi Etika Profesi. *Journal of Business and Information Systems*, 3(2).
- Widiyati, D. (2021). Pengendalian Kecurangan Dan Pengembangan Etika Profesi Pada Industri Perbankan Di Indonesia. *Conference on Economic and Business Innovation*, 1(1).
- Wolfe, D. T., & Hermanson, D. R. (2004). The Fraud Diamond: Considering the Four Elements of Fraud. *The CPA Journal, New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants*, 74(12), 38.