

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- ACFE. (2017). *Fraud Tree*. <http://www.acfe.com/fraud-tree.aspx>
- Agusputri, H., & Sofie, S. (2019). Faktor - Faktor Yang Berpengaruh Terhadap Fraudulent Financial Reporting Dengan Menggunakan Analisis Fraud Pentagon. *Jurnal Informasi, Perpajakan, Akuntansi, Dan Keuangan Publik*, 14(2), 105. <https://doi.org/10.25105/jipak.v14i2.5049>
- Alberth, s w, Alberth, C. O., & Zimbelman, M. F. (2011). *Fraud Examination Fourth Edition*. New York: South - Western Cengage Learning.
- Aprilia, A. (2017). Analisis Pengaruh Fraud Pentagon Terhadap Kecurangan Laporan Keuangan Menggunakan Beneish Model Pada Perusahaan Yang Menerapkan Asean Corporate Governance Scorecard. *Jurnal ASET (Akuntansi Riset)*, 9(1), 101. <https://doi.org/10.17509/jaset.v9i1.5259>
- Apriliana, S., & Agustina, L. (2017). The Analysis of Fraudulent Financial Reporting Determinant through Fraud Pentagon Approach. *Jurnal Dinamika Akuntansi*, 9(2), 154–165. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jda.v7i1.4036>
- Aulia Haqq, A. P. N., & Budiwitjaksono, G. S. (2020). Fraud pentagon for detecting financial statement fraud. *Journal of Economics, Business, & Accountancy Ventura*, 22(3), 319–332. <https://doi.org/10.14414/jebav.v22i3.1788.ABSTRACT>
- Avotri, C., & Agbanyo, R. (2021). Determinants of management fraud in the banking sector of Ghana: the perspective of the diamond fraud theory. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 28(1), 142–155. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-06-2020-0102>
- Bawekes, H. F., Simanjuntak, A. M., & Christina Daat, S. (2018). PENGUJIAN TEORI FRAUD PENTAGON TERHADAP FRAUDULENT FINANCIAL REPORTING (Studi Empiris pada Perusahaan yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2011-2015). *Jurnal Akuntansi & Keuangan Daerah*, 13(1), 114–134.
- Christian, N., Basri, Y. Z., & Arafah, W. (2019). *Analysis of Fraud Triangle , Fraud Diamond and Fraud Pentagon Theory to Detecting Corporate Fraud in Indonesia*. 3(4), 73–78.
- Clinard, M. B., & Cressey, D. R. (1954). Other People's Money: A Study in the Social Psychology of Embezzlement. *American Sociological Review*, 19(3), 362. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2087778>
- Danuta, K. S. (2017). Crowe's Fraud Pentagon Theory dalam Pencegahan Fraud pada Proses Pengadaan melalui E-Procurement. *Jurnal Kajian Akuntansi*, 1(2), 161–171. <https://doi.org/10.33603/jka.v1i2.826>
- Devi, P. N. C., Widanaputra, A. A. G. P., Budiasih, I. G. A. N., & Rasmini, N. K. (2021). The Effect of Fraud Pentagon Theory on Financial Statements: Empirical Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(3), 1163–1169. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no3.1163>

- Elviani, D., Ali, S., & Kurniawan, R. (2020). Pengaruh Kecurangan Laporan Keuangan terhadap Nilai Perusahaan: Ditinjau dari Perspektif Fraud Pentagon (Kasus di Indonesia). *Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Batanghari Jambi*, 20(1), 121. <https://doi.org/10.33087/jiubj.v20i1.828>
- Evana, E., Metalia, M., Mirfazli, E., Georgieva, D. V., & Sastrodiharjo, I. (2019). Business Ethics in Providing Financial Statements: The Testing of Fraud Pentagon Theory on the Manufacturing Sector in Indonesia. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 3(3), 68–77. [https://doi.org/10.21272/bel.3\(3\).68-77.2019](https://doi.org/10.21272/bel.3(3).68-77.2019)
- Faradiza, S. A. (2019). Fraud Pentagon Dan Kecurangan Laporan Keuangan. *EkBis: Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 2(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.14421/ekbis.2018.2.1.1060>
- Free, C. (2015). Looking through the fraud triangle: A review and call for new directions. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 23(2), 175–196. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MEDAR-02-2015-0009>
- Ghozali, I. H. (2016). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariat dengan Program IBM SPSS 23. edisi 8 Semarang Universitas Diponegoro*. 22, 1.
- Horwarth, C. (2010). *IIA Practice Guide: Fraud and Internal Audit*.
- Horwarth, C. (2012). *The Mind Behind The Fraudsters Crime : Key Behavior Enviromental Element*.
- Juananda, M., Tian, C., Edita, K., & Vivien. (2020). Analisis Pengaruh Fraud Pentagon Terhadap Fraudulent Financial Reporting Menggunakan Beneish Model. *Jurnal Penelitian Akuntansi*, 1(1), 80–98.
- Muhsin, Kardoyo, & Nurkhin, A. (2018). What Determinants of Academic Fraud Behavior? From Fraud Triangle to Fraud Pentagon Perspective. *KnE Social Sciences*, 3(10), 154. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i10.3126>
- 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*. 102, 131–153. <https://doi.org/10.1108/s1569-375920200000102012>
- Sakaran, U. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Untuk Bisnis*.
- Septriyani, Y., & Handayani, D. (2018). Mendeteksi Kecurangan Laporan Keuangan dengan Analisis Fraud Pentagon. *Jurnal Akuntansi, Keuangan Dan Bisnis*, 11(1), 11–23. <http://jurnal.pcr.ac.id>
- Skousen, & Smith. (2009). Detecting and Predecting Financial Statment Fraud: The Effectiveness of the Fraud Triangle and SAS No 99. *Corporate Governance and Firm Performance Advance in Financial Economics*, 13, 53–81.
- Sugiyono. (2015). *Memahami Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Bandung CV. Alfabeta.

- tambang.co.id.* (2021). <https://www.tambang.co.id/pt-timah-diduga-membuat-laporan-keuangan-fiktif-9640/>
- Ulfah, M., Nuraina, E., & Wijaya, A. L. (2017). Pengaruh Fraud Pentagon Dalam Mendeteksi Fraudulent Financial Reporting (Studi Empiris Pada Perbankan Di Indonesia Yang Terdaftar Di Bei. *Forum Ilmiah Pendidikan Akuntansi*, 5(1), 399–418. Fraud, Fraud Pentagon, Fraudulent Financial Reporting
- Vousinas, G. L. (2019). Fraud-The human face of fraud: Understanding the suspect is vital to any investigation. *CA Magazine-Chartered Accountant*, 136(4), 39–40.
- Wells, & Joseph, T. (2011). *Fraud Handbook Prevention and Detection Third Edition*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Wolfe, D. T., & Hermanson, D. R. (2004). The Fraud Diamond Considering the four elements of fraud. *The CPA Journal*, 74(12), 38.
- Wolfe, T. D., & R, H. (2004). the fraud diamond : considering the four element of fraud. *The CPA Journal*, 38–42.
- ww.idx.co.id.* (2021). <https://www.idx.co.id/perusahaan-tercatat/laporan-keuangan- dan-tahunan/>
- www.bps.go.id.* (n.d.). <https://www.bps.go.id/>
- Yusof, Mohamed, & Khair, A. (2014). Fraudulent Listed Companies. *The Macrotheme Review*, 4.

LAMPIRAN

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Tekanan	114	.0880	1.3254	.556817	.2842415
Kesempatan	114	.2000	.6667	.423350	.1102664
Rasionalisasi	114	.00	1.00	.3772	.48682
Kemampuan	114	.00	1.00	.1228	.32966
Arogansi	114	1.00	4.00	2.4123	.72639
Kecurangan_Pelaporan_Keuangan	114	.00	1.00	.0702	.25657
Valid N (listwise)	114				

Iteration History^{a,b,c}

Iteration	-2 Log likelihood	Coefficients
		Constant
Step 0	1	65.090
	2	58.354
	3	57.936
	4	57.933
	5	57.933

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. Initial -2 Log Likelihood: 57,933

c. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Variables not in the Equation

			Score	df	Sig.
Step 0	Variables	Tekanan	7.088	1	.008
		Kesempatan	6.784	1	.009
		Rasionalisasi	.593	1	.441
		Kemampuan	1.205	1	.272
		Arogansi	.744	1	.388
	Overall Statistics		16.316	5	.006

Iteration History^{a,b,c,d}

Iteration	-2 Log likelihood	Coefficients					
		Constant	Tekanan	Kesempatan	Rasionalisasi	Kemampuan	Arogansi
Step 1 1	58.856	-3.674	.853	2.193	-.182	-.162	.265
2	45.725	-6.817	1.904	4.945	-.456	-.480	.568
3	41.893	-9.524	2.857	7.512	-.774	-1.077	.827
4	41.090	-11.034	3.363	8.959	-.979	-1.928	.972
5	40.949	-11.410	3.479	9.323	-1.034	-2.913	1.010
6	40.905	-11.432	3.484	9.346	-1.038	-3.920	1.013
7	40.889	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-4.923	1.013
8	40.883	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-5.924	1.013
9	40.881	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-6.925	1.013
10	40.880	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-7.925	1.013
11	40.880	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-8.925	1.013
12	40.880	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-9.925	1.013
13	40.880	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-10.925	1.013
14	40.880	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-11.925	1.013
15	40.880	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-12.925	1.013
16	40.880	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-13.925	1.013
17	40.880	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-14.925	1.013
18	40.880	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-15.925	1.013
19	40.880	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-16.925	1.013
20	40.880	-11.432	3.484	9.347	-1.038	-17.925	1.013

a. Method: Enter

b. Constant is included in the model.

c. Initial -2 Log Likelihood: 57,933

d. Estimation terminated at iteration number 20 because maximum iterations has been reached. Final solution cannot be found.

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	17.054	5	.004
	Block	17.054	5	.004
	Model	17.054	5	.004

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	40.880 ^a	.139	.349

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 20 because maximum iterations has been reached. Final solution cannot be found.

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	2.701	8	.952

Classification Table^a

Observed		Predicted		
		Kecurangan_Pelaporan_Keuangan		Percentage Correct
		.00	1.00	
Step 1	Kecurangan_Pelaporan_Keuangan	.00	1.00	99.1
		105	1	
		8	0	.0
	Overall Percentage			92.1

a. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)		
							Lower	Upper	
Step 1 ^a	Tekanan	3.484	1.521	5.246	1	.022	32.602	1.653	643.002
	Kesempatan	9.347	3.785	6.098	1	.014	11460.543	6.877	1.910E7
	Rasionalisasi	-1.038	.968	1.149	1	.284	.354	.053	2.362
	Kemampuan	-17.925	9752.034	.000	1	.999	.000	.000	.
	Arogansi	1.013	.616	2.705	1	.100	2.753	.824	9.205
	Constant	-11.432	3.289	12.080	1	.001	.000		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Tekanan, Kesempatan, Rasionalisasi, Kemampuan, Arogansi.

Correlation Matrix

	Constant	Tekanan	Kesempatan	Rasionalisasi	Kemampuan	Arogansi
Step 1 Constant	1.000	-.653	-.739	.143	.000	-.695
Tekanan	-.653	1.000	.258	-.028	.000	.318
Kesempatan	-.739	.258	1.000	-.207	.000	.185
Rasionalisasi	.143	-.028	-.207	1.000	.000	-.192
Kemampuan	.000	.000	.000	.000	1.000	.000
Arogansi	-.695	.318	.185	-.192	.000	1.000