

# Robust

## Research Business and Economics Studies

journal homepage: <http://ejournal.iainkendari.ac.id/robust>

---

### Literature Study of Factors Causing Fraud in Public & Private Sector Companies

**Amir Nur Hidayat**<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Economics and Business, UPN Veteran Jawa Timur

Email:

---

ARTICLE INFO	A B S T R A C T
<p><b>Article History:</b> <i>Received 11 Juli 2021</i></p> <p><i>1st Received in revised form 12 Agustus 2022</i> <i>2st Received in revised form 05 September 2022</i> <i>3nd Received in revised form 17 Oktober 2022</i> <i>Available online 31 Oktober 2022</i></p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> <i>Fraud, Financial Statements, Behavioral Accounting, Public Sector Accounting.</i></p>	<p>This study aims to describe the factors that cause fraud in Indonesia, both from public sector organizations and non-public sector organizations. The research carried out is a literature review research sourced from articles that are in accordance with the research topic for further analysis. The research method used is descriptive qualitative method by taking data from literacy studies on research on fraud in various entities in Indonesia. The results of this study are expected to be used as an initial method of fraud detection and provide input and additional insight to all parties including company management, auditors, and users of financial statements about the factors that cause fraud in public and private sector companies.</p>

---

### 1. Introduction

Cheating is an act that is very detrimental to companies and organizations, both private and public organizations Kusuma & Sukirman (2017), Lokanan (2019) and Ataman & Aydin (2017). Therefore, acts of fraud will always be fought by private organizations to public organizations. Likewise in Indonesia, there are many cases of fraud that occur in public organizations, namely government organizations (Kiswanto & Maulana, 2019). This shows that fraud must be handled immediately (Hardinto, 2018), therefore every company or government agency requires an auditor to examine financial statements.

The government as the bearer of trust from the community has an obligation to carry out its duties effectively and efficiently, one of which is to ensure that state finances are well managed and accountable. However, in practice there are many fraudulent practices that can directly harm the state and indirectly harm the community. The widespread disclosure of fraudulent practices, especially corruption in the government, shows two sides of the reality of government implementation. This shows how rampant fraud is at every level of government,

but on the other hand there is hope that the disclosure shows the government's willingness and determination to improve itself. However, there is hope that fraud can be prevented so that state losses and public losses can be avoided.

The ratification of Law Number 17 of 2003 concerning State Finance which requires central and regional government agencies to make financial reports in every accountability for the implementation of the APBN/D to the DPR/D gives hope that the government can become more accountable. The preparation of these financial reports is expected to be able to present information on the management of state finances in a higher quality and ultimately can encourage better decision making. The financial statements also provide opportunities for financial supervisors, internal auditors, and government external auditors to assess and identify fraud. The issuance of standardized and regulated financial statements also provides an opportunity to develop systems and procedures that do not provide opportunities for fraud to occur (Soepardi, 2013).

Fraud in government agencies does not only involve people who have high positions but also people who are under them, and does not only occur within the central government (Malau, Ohalehi, Badr, Yejini, 2018) but can also occur within the local government environment. (Evenri, 2019). In order for fraud to be minimized, the government of course needs to take action to improve its internal control. These attitudes are contained in the general auditing standards contained in the SPKN (State Financial Audit Standards). In the SPKN it is stated that the general attitude of an auditor related to his personality is competence (technical expertise and training), independence, and professionalism (careful use of the auditor's professional skills).

In fact, fraud can harm the company's finances and state finances. Fraud perpetrators are usually carried out by leaders and employees who work in an organization or company where he works, and even the perpetrators are people whose job duties are to operate the agency/company operating system and also run the internal control system. Fraud will be more difficult to detect, if it is carried out by the leadership/management compared to that carried out by employees.

The question that often arises is, why do certain elements commit fraud?, why do high-ranking officials with high positions and incomes, such as politicians who make decisions, and even judicial institutions as the front line in eradicating corruption, as well as NGO leaders whose mission is to eradicate corruption. involved in corruption? Simple answers explain "need", "greed", and "opportunity", are the main root causes of corruption, as stated by Tuanakotta (2010) "corruption (read: fraud) by need, by greed and by opportunity".

Based on observations, several possible causes for the involvement of officials in fraudulent acts are an uncomfortable and unpleasant work environment, for example treating employees unfairly, communicating in a closed manner and the absence of a mechanism for submitting any complaints, performance measurement systems and rewards, which are not reasonable so that employees feel they are not being treated fairly, there is no employee consultation assistance, to find out problems early, the hiring process is unfair and careless or careless, considering that a person's motivation cannot be observed with the naked eye, on the other hand, the motivational product cannot be hidden.

It is important to examine the root causes of fraud, firstly because of the many cases of corruption that ultimately hinder the running of the government, so that the goal of development itself, namely the welfare of society, will never be achieved. For example, it was found that development funds intended for basic infrastructure and public services were neglected because these funds were misused by the officials concerned. Finally, the service to the community is not optimal. This also tarnishes the community's sense of justice and therefore anyone who is proven to have violated it must be dealt with as a lesson to the person concerned and other officials (progressive approach). The second thing is how to make efforts so that any official as early as possible does not make the same mistake (preventive approach).

From various theories, there are several factors that cause fraud, including the Fraud Theory developed by Bologna (1993). This theory explains the causes of fraud or also known as GONE Theory, consisting of four factors that encourage someone to behave deviantly (Fraud). The four factors are: (1) Greed or greed, (2) Opportunity or opportunity, (3) Needs or needs, (4) Exposure or disclosure.

While the Fraud Triangle theory developed by Cressey (1953), says that fraud is caused by three factors, namely: (1) Pressure, (2) Opportunity or opportunity, (3) Rationalization or justification. Pressure is pressure that causes someone to commit fraud. Situational pressure is a condition caused by financial and/or non-financial factors faced by employees/management that are difficult to solve in a legal or ethical manner. Moeller (2004:222) suggests that the situational pressure has the potential to arise due to financial obligations that exceed the ability limit that must be completed by employees/management, and the failure of working relationships between the company and its employees both with regard to access to/use of company assets, compensation that are not in line with expectations, as well as career/promotion levels including the unclear future of employees in the company.

The Committee of Sponsoring Organization of the Treadway Commission (COSO) said that an in-depth analysis of fraud research on the nature, extent, and characteristics of fraudulent financial reporting provides a very helpful understanding of new and ongoing issues that need to be urgently addressed. All parties involved in the financial reporting process must continue to focus on ways to prevent, deter, and detect fraudulent financial reporting. COSO also revealed that further development of internal control guidelines could assist parties involved in the financial reporting process.

Based on the background of the problem, this research is interesting to study. So the author gave the title of this research "Factors Causes the Emergence of Fraud in Public & Private Sector Companies".

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Teori Atribusi**

The theory developed by Fritz Heider studies the process of how a person interprets an event, reason, or cause of his behavior. A person's behavior by a combination of internal and external forces. In making judgments about others, perception will be associated with attribution theory. The same thing is stated by Robbins (2003) that attribution theory is an explanation of the ways in which humans judge people differently, depending on what meaning is associated with a particular behavior. Basically this theory suggests that if one observes the behavior of an individual, the person tries to determine whether the behavior is caused by internal or external factors.

The behavior of a person in the organization such as the behavior of the leader and the behavior of subordinates cannot be separated from this theory. Actions or decisions taken by leaders or people who are given authority are caused by causal attributes. Factors such as internal control and compensation are some of the factors that cause the fraud to occur.

### **2.2 Fraud Triangle Teory**

The concept of fraud triangle was first proposed by Donald Cressey. Fraud triangle theory as the main theoretical basis in this research. The theory of Fraud Triangle Cressey (1953) in Tuanakotta (2007), fraud is caused by 3 factors, namely (1) Pressure is the motivation of individual employees to act fraud due to pressure, both financial and non-financial from personal and personal pressure. from the organization, (2) Opportunity is the opportunity for fraud to occur due to weak or ineffective control effectiveness so that it opens up opportunities for fraud to occur. Factors causing fraud due to weaknesses in the system where an employee has the power or ability to take advantage of so that fraudulent acts can be carried out, (3) Rationalization is fraud that occurs due to conditions of local ethical values that encourage (allow) fraud to occur. Consideration of fraudulent behavior as a consequence of employee

personal integrity gaps or other moral reasoning. Rationalization occurs when a person or group of people build justifications for the fraud committed. Fraud perpetrators usually look for justifications that what they do is not theft or fraud.

### **2.3 Fraud**

According to the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE) in Najahningrum (2013), fraud is unlawful acts carried out intentionally for certain purposes (manipulation or giving false reports to other parties) carried out by people from within or outside the organization. to obtain personal or group benefits that directly or indirectly harm other parties. The AICPA and IAI do not clearly distinguish whether the fraud is a material misstatement if it is intentional. Therefore, incompetence and poor management do not constitute fraud. The desire to deceive for personal gain and loss to the relying party is an error that results in material misstatement or not, what needs to be considered is the factor underlying the reason for fraud, namely the action that underlies the truth of the real evidence of the transaction is the most important element of fraud.

Contained aspects of fraud are deception (deception), dishonesty (dishonest) and intention (intent). Fraud concerns the ways produced by human reason that are chosen by one person to get an advantage from another party by presenting a false/false representation. Cheating includes surprises, deceit, cunning and dishonest ways that are used to deceive others (Zulkarnain 2013). This is in line with the opinion of Singleton (2006), which suggests that fraud, theft, defalcation, irregularities, white collar crime, and embezzlement are terms that are often used interchangeably.

From several understandings of fraud, fraud can be interpreted simply as intentional fraud, including lying, stealing, engineering, and embezzling (unnaturally changing company assets for their own interests). Fraud itself is generally an unlawful act carried out by people from within and or outside the organization, with the intention of obtaining personal or group benefits that directly harm other parties.

### **2.4 Fraud Classification**

The Association of Certified Fraud Examinations (ACFE), one of the associations in the USA that has main activities in the prevention and eradication of fraud, categorizes fraud into three groups as follows:

- 1) Financial Statement Fraud Financial Statement Fraud can be defined as fraud committed by management in the form of a material misstatement of Financial Statements that is detrimental to investors and creditors. This fraud can be financial or non-financial fraud.
- 2) Asset Misappropriation Asset misappropriation can be classified into Cash Fraud<sup>c</sup> and Fraudulent disbursement.
- 3) Corruption in the context of this discussion is corruption according to ACFE, not the definition of corruption according to the Law on the Eradication of TPK in Indonesia. According to ACFE, corruption is divided into conflict of interest, bribery, illegal gratuity, and economic extortion.

### **2.5 Factors Causing Fraud**

According to Cressey's (1953) Fraud Triangle theory, through his research, he states that a person commits fraud due to 3 factors, namely:

- 1) Pressure is the motivation of individual employees to act fraud due to both financial and non-financial pressures from personal and organizational pressures (leadership, tasks that are too heavy and others). Pressure is proxied by the influence of compensation suitability variables, distributive justice, and procedural justice. In SAS No. 99, there are four types of conditions that commonly occur in pressure that can lead to fraud. These conditions are financial stability (financial stability), external pressure (external pressure), personal needs (personal financial need), and financial targets (financial targets).

- 2) Opportunity, according to Montgomery (2002) in Rukmawati (2011) opportunity is an opportunity that causes actors to freely carry out their actions caused by weak internal controls, indiscipline, weakness in accessing information, no audit mechanism, and attitude. apathetic. The thing that stands out the most here is in terms of internal control and enforcement of regulations. Poor internal control and enforcement of regulations will give people the opportunity to commit fraud. SAS No. 99 states that opportunities in financial statement fraud can occur in three categories. These conditions are the nature of industry, ineffective monitoring, and organizational structure.
- 3) Justification (Rationalization) is an attitude or process of thinking with moral considerations of individual employees to rationalize fraudulent actions. (Rae, 2008). To proxy rationalization, the variables of organizational culture and organizational commitment are used.

According to research conducted by Bologna (1993) there are four factors that drive a person to commit fraud, which is also known as the GONE theory, namely:

- a) Greed
- b) Opportunity
- c) Need
- d) Exposure (disclosure).

Greed and Need factors are factors related to individual fraud perpetrators (also called individual factors). While the Opportunity and Exposure factors are factors related to the organization as a victim of fraud (also called generic/general factors).

### 3. Research Method

This research approach is a qualitative research with a library research approach where the method in this research uses theories taken from literature books, papers, papers and research that support and are relevant to the topic of discussion.

According to Neong Muhadjir, literature study includes a theoretical study of a scientific discipline that needs to be continued empirically or obtain empirical truth. Where this study seeks to examine the causes or factors that cause fraud. The sources and types of data used are secondary data in the form of books, review of articles and previous research.

### 4. Result

In this section, 3 (three) indicators will be discussed in the previous section related to the factors that cause fraud.

#### Indicator 1: Pressure Aspects Cause of Fraud

Officials who get certain pressure while serving a certain position or while working in a certain job have a tendency to commit fraud. Various pressures that can affect officials when they work, including pressure triggered by financial problems, work environment, and pressure from a bad personality. Financial problems can be caused by the greed or greed of officials who are never satisfied in material terms. The current salary, including performance allowances, is still considered insufficient, so they commit various frauds in financial management based on the position they hold.

According to research from Zahara, A. (2017) the higher the pressure felt by a person such as economic pressure, the higher the desire to commit fraud. The results of Binde's research (2016), someone who already has a gambling addiction is difficult to stop. When they lose, they are motivated to participate in gambling again to cover the results of the defeat that has cost them. When privately owned funding sources have been exhausted, they will be motivated to use office money under their control.

The luxurious lifestyle triggers an official to commit fraud. Luxury, debauchery, rah-rah of course will require some funds for these activities. Meanwhile, the salary and various

benefits he received were insufficient, causing financial problems for himself and his family, which in turn allowed officials to commit fraud. Other conditions, such as various unexpected needs.

#### Indicator 2: There is an opportunity Cause of fraud

The existence of opportunities can lead to fraudulent actions, whether caused by systems, rules and law enforcement. Officials who hold power will have discretionary behavior or behavior that benefits themselves or a certain group of people. Officials will have a certain desire to equip themselves with various facilities that exceed existing standards, such as cars, office equipment and so on.

According to research from Angela. F (2016) states that not a few officials in several SKPD are only accepting of the results of an activity, both physical and non-physical. Other aspects that can lead to fraud, including lack of or no access to information so that they do not understand the actual situation, fail to discipline or impose sanctions on fraud perpetrators, are negligent, apathetic, indifferent, lack or no audit trail. audit), so that data cannot be traced, all of which can lead to fraud.

According to research from Dewi, N (2018) that the cause of fraud in the government environment is due to the lack of supervision carried out, so that opportunities arise for these fraudulent acts which result in state/government losses. So in theory that says the factor of fraud is the opportunity for the perpetrators.

#### Indicator 3: Reasons for justification Causes of fraud

In some cases, fraud is encountered as a result of imitating a superior or co-worker, feeling that they have done a lot, assuming that what was taken is not much, or is considered to be just a loan, in due course it will be returned. Feeling that he has done a lot is justification for an official to commit fraud.

According to research from Ristianingsih, I. (2017) that rationalization is a thought that justifies his actions as a natural behavior, which is morally acceptable in a normal society. Fraud perpetrators always try to legitimize their actions by trying to find excuses. This is done to calm the feelings concerned so that if done does not cause fear in him. A good organizational culture will not open the slightest opportunity for individuals to commit corruption because a good organizational culture will form organizational actors to have a sense of belonging (a sense of belonging) and a sense of identity (a sense of pride as part of an organization.

## 5. Conclusion

That in knowing the factors of fraud, the public sector and non-public sector governments need to provide additional regulations and supervision of every transaction that exists within the company for the non-public sector and for the government of the public sector. In various literatures that researchers have analyzed that the factors of pressure, opportunity and justification are found as factors for the emergence of fraud.

#### Suggestion

Based on research on what factors cause fraud in government and non-government environments, it is necessary to pay attention to the factors that cause it to happen. It is hoped that further research needs to be improved and added to the analysis of these factors so that the accuracy of the results obtained is more specific, so that fraud that occurs can be anticipated in advance.

## References

- Angela F., Simbala, H. E. L., & Saroyo. (2016). Provinsi Sulawesi Utara. *Jurnal EMBA*, 4(1), 484–495. <http://kkji.kp3k.kkp.go.id/index.php/dokumen/finish/98-buku-cetakan-2015/906>
- Binde, Per. 2016. Gambling-related Embezzlement in The Workplace: A Qualitative Study. *International Gambling Studies*, 2016.
- Dewi, N. L. P. I. T., Anggaryani, M. P., Septyastini, I. D. A. E., Gayatri, N. M. S., Sudiari, K. D., & Andika, K. D. (2019). Fraud Triangle Di Sektor Pemerintahan (Studi Kasus Pada Dinas Kabupaten Buleleng). *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi Dan Humanika*, 8(2), 157–162. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jinah.v8i2.19877>
- Kiswanto dan Panji Aziz Maulana. (2019). Pengalaman memoderasi penilaian risiko kecurangan, skeptisisme, beban kerja pada kemampuan mendeteksi kecurangan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi dan Bisnis*, 14(2), 183-195.
- Kusuma Satria Panji & Sukirman (2017). The Effect of Emotional Intelligence and Auditor's Experience on Audit Quality with Independence as A Moderating Variable. *Accounting Analysis Journal AAJ* 6 (3) 2017. 370-379.
- Republik Indonesia. 2003. Undang-undang No 17 Tahun 2003 tentang Keuangan Negara. Jakarta: Legalitas.
- Ristianingsih, I. (2017). Telaah konsep fraud diamond theory dalam mendeteksi perilaku fraud di perguruan tinggi. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Dan Call For Paper Ekonomi Dan Bisnis, 2017*, 131.
- Walter Cameron Malau, Paschal Ohalehi, Eldin Soha Badr, Kemi Yekini, 2018. Fraud interpretation and disclaimer audit opinion Evidence from the Solomon Islands public sector (SIPS). *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 11 November 2018
- Zahara, A. (2017). Pengaruh Tekanan, Kesempatan dan Rasionalisasi Terhadap Tindakan Kecurangan (Survei pada Narapidana Tipikor di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Kelas II A Kota Pekanbaru). *Jurnal Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Negeri Padang*, 1–19.