International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 8, 2025
https://theaspd.com/index.php

Improving Heritage Asset Accountability: The Role Of Quantitative Disclosure In Local Government Financial Reporting In Java (2023-2024)

Sudarto Sudarto[1], Payamta Payamta[2], Hapsari E.A. Novita[3]
[1,2,3] Postgraduate Program, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia
Corresponding author*: payamta_fe@staff.uns.ac.id

Abstract
Heritage assets embody cultural and historical values preserved for public benefit rather than economic gain, creating unique challenges for financial reporting in the public sector. Both international and national accounting standards, such as IPSAS 17 and Indonesia's PSAP 07 permit these assets to be recognized at a nominal value (Rp0), provided that governments present adequate non-monetary disclosures. This study evaluates the quality of heritage asset disclosures in the Notes to the Financial Statements (CaLK) of provincial, regency, and city governments across Java for fiscal years 2022 and 2023. Employing a quantified content analysis approach, the study develops a Heritage Asset Disclosure Quality Index (DQI) comprising four dimensions: descriptive detail, quantitative reporting, maintenance and preservation information, and clarity of accounting policies. The results show that although most local governments acknowledge the existence of heritage assets, the depth and comprehensiveness of disclosures vary substantially. Descriptive narratives are commonly presented, but detailed quantitative information and disclosures related to preservation expenditures remain limited. Regression analysis further reveals that fiscal capacity and administrative level significantly affect disclosure quality, supporting the stewardship accountability perspective. These findings highlight the need for more explicit reporting guidance and strengthened institutional capacity to enhance transparency and improve the stewardship of cultural heritage.
Keywords*: heritage assets; disclosure quality; stewardship accountability; public sector accounting; cultural preservation*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Global and Local Context

Heritage assets are public sector resources that embody historical, cultural, educational, or symbolic value, and they are preserved primarily for the benefit of present and future generations rather than for their capacity to generate economic returns. Examples include archaeological sites, monuments, historical buildings, museum collections, and traditional cultural landscapes. Their unique and irreplaceable nature challenges conventional accounting frameworks that are based on monetary valuation and economic exchange. Heritage assets are rarely traded; therefore, active and observable markets do not exist, making reliable measurement of fair value either difficult or conceptually inappropriate (Carnegie & Wolnizer, 1995). Furthermore, attempts to assign monetary value may be viewed as commodifying cultural identity, raising social, ethical, and political sensitivities (Hooper et al., 2005; Lapsley, 2009). These complexities explain why heritage accounting has remained a contested area in public sector financial reporting globally.

The international public sector accounting system recognizes these challenges. The International Public Sector Accounting Standard (IPSAS) 17 on Property, Plant, and Equipment acknowledges that heritage assets may not always be reliably measurable and thus allows governments to either measure them at cost or disclose them without assigning a monetary value. However, IPSAS 17 emphasizes that non-monetary disclosure should be sufficiently informative to support transparency and accountability. This means governments are expected to provide descriptions, quantities, usage information, and preservation policies to demonstrate stewardship rather than emphasize financial valuation. Therefore, disclosure—not capitalization—is the core accountability mechanism for heritage assets in contemporary public sector reporting (Rowles, 2018; Biondi & Lapsley, 2014).

This global discourse is particularly relevant in Indonesia, where the accrual-based Government Accounting Standards (SAP), especially PSAP 07, formally permit heritage assets to be presented at Rp0 on the balance sheet while requiring qualitative and quantitative disclosure in the Notes to the Financial Statements (CaLK). Indonesia's regulatory approach thus aligns closely with IPSAS in prioritizing non-monetary disclosure as a means of communicating custodial responsibility. However, although PSAP 07 establishes the obligation to disclose, it does not specify the depth, structure, or detail of such disclosure. As a result, the quality and comparability of reporting across local governments can vary significantly.

The relevance of heritage asset reporting is particularly pronounced on the island of Java, which historically

served as the center of several major kingdoms and colonial administrations. Java contains sites linked to the Kingdom of Mataram, Majapahit, Pajang, Demak, and Sunda Galuh, as well as extensive relics of Dutch colonial architecture in cities such as Semarang, Yogyakarta, Surabaya, and Bandung. Cultural landscapes such as Borobudur and Prambanan are UNESCO World Heritage Sites, while thousands of historical buildings, traditional settlements, royal palaces (*keraton*), and sacred spaces (*pura*, *pesantren heritage*, archaeological caves) remain under the custodianship of provincial, district, and municipal governments. These heritage assets not only provide cultural identity and historical continuity but also play a role in tourism, education, and local economic development. Yet their formal representation in government financial statements is often minimal and fragmented.

Empirical research on heritage asset accounting in Indonesia shows persistent limitations. Previous studies have reported that many local governments disclose heritage assets only in general terms, without specifying quantities, conditions, or maintenance measures (Wahyuni & Arifin, 2020; Nurhayati et al., 2022). Auditors and asset managers have also noted challenges related to incomplete inventories, limited coordination between cultural preservation agencies and financial accounting units, and insufficient technical guidance on how to translate preservation activities into reportable accounting information. Consequently, the obligation to present heritage assets under SAP often results in "symbolic compliance"—where heritage assets are acknowledged in narrative form but without meaningful detail to demonstrate stewardship and accountability.

These circumstances highlight the need to assess not merely whether heritage assets are disclosed, but how they are disclosed. In other words, the critical question is whether local government reporting practices meaningfully reflect custodial responsibility for cultural heritage. This study contributes to that need by examining the quality of quantitative and descriptive disclosures of heritage assets in local government financial statements across Java, situating heritage accounting within both international conceptual debates and Indonesia's unique historical and regulatory context.

Heritage assets in Java are not only numerous but also deeply embedded in collective memory, regional identity, and cultural continuity. Royal palaces in Yogyakarta and Surakarta, ancient temple complexes in Central Java, former colonial districts in Semarang, Bandung, and Surabaya, as well as sacred landscapes surrounding Mount Merapi and Mount Lawu, represent diverse forms of heritage that local governments are obligated to preserve. Yet, many of these assets are physically deteriorating, under-documented, or undergoing competing pressures from tourism development, commercial expansion, and urban modernization. This creates a paradox: cultural heritage is celebrated rhetorically in public policy, but its representation in financial reporting often remains cursory and administrative, detached from preservation realities on the ground.

1.2. Research Problem

Previous empirical studies in Indonesia have largely focused on the recognition and technical accounting treatment of heritage assets, debating whether valuation should be mandatory and how inventories should be organized. However, far less attention has been paid to the *quality* and *substance* of disclosure practices. The few studies that evaluate heritage asset disclosure tend to be normative or descriptive, examining compliance with standards but not analyzing the extent to which disclosures convey stewardship accountability or provide useful information to stakeholders such as auditors, policymakers, cultural preservation authorities, and the public. This indicates a clear research gap: there is limited systematic, comparative, and measurement-based evaluation of how local governments disclose heritage assets within the framework of accrual-based SAP.

Moreover, while international scholarship on heritage accounting emphasizes the importance of narrative and quantitative disclosure to strengthen custodial accountability, the Indonesian regulatory environment provides only broad guidelines without specifying format, granularity, or minimum detail requirements. As a result, disclosure practices vary substantially across jurisdictions, even among local governments that manage heritage assets of similar type and cultural significance. This variation provides an opportunity to investigate the determinants and patterns of disclosure quality: to what extent are differences driven by fiscal capacity, administrative capability, heritage tourism orientation, or institutional commitment to preservation?

Therefore, evaluating the quality of heritage asset disclosure is essential not only for improving compliance with accounting standards, but also for strengthening cultural governance, reinforcing public trust, and supporting the long-term sustainability of historically and culturally significant sites. The present study addresses this need by developing and applying a Disclosure Quality Index (DQI) to systematically assess the substantive adequacy of heritage asset disclosures across local governments in Java.

Based on the preceding discussion, the study is guided by the following research questions:

1) To what extent do local governments in Java provide detailed quantitative and descriptive disclosures of heritage assets in their 2023–2024 financial statements?
2) What dimensions of disclosure quality (descriptive detail, quantity transparency, maintenance information, and accounting policy clarity) are most and least effectively reported?
3) What factors may explain differences in disclosure quality among local governments across the island of Java?

1.3. Research Objectives

Based on the research questions outlined above, this study has three main objectives. First, the study aims to assess the overall quality of heritage asset disclosures in the 2023–2024 financial statements of local governments across Java. This includes evaluating the extent to which disclosures provide sufficient descriptive and quantitative information to convey the cultural significance, physical existence, and custodial responsibilities associated with these assets. By conducting a systematic assessment, the study seeks to determine whether current reporting practices fulfill the accountability expectations embedded in PSAP 07 and IPSAS 17.

Second, this study seeks to examine the relative strengths and weaknesses across different dimensions of disclosure quality. Using the Disclosure Quality Index (DQI) developed in this research, the analysis investigates whether local governments provide detailed descriptions, disclose accurate and complete quantities, report maintenance and preservation efforts, and articulate clear accounting policies. This objective allows for the identification of disclosure patterns, highlighting whether governments prioritize compliance, narrative representation, or stewardship-oriented transparency.

Third, the study aims to explore the factors that may contribute to variations in disclosure quality among local governments. Differences may arise due to disparities in fiscal capacity, administrative capability, institutional commitment to cultural heritage preservation, or the economic importance of heritage tourism in each region. By examining these potential determinants, the research contributes to a deeper understanding of how organizational and contextual dynamics influence reporting behavior.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study provides several contributions to academic scholarship, public sector governance, and policy development. From a theoretical perspective, the research advances heritage asset accounting literature by shifting analytical focus from valuation debates to the substance of disclosure practices. Prior studies have emphasized conceptual challenges in valuing heritage assets, yet few have empirically examined how governments disclose these assets in practice or developed measurable frameworks to assess disclosure quality. By introducing a structured and replicable Disclosure Quality Index (DQI), this study offers a methodological innovation that can be applied in other regional, national, and comparative studies.

From a regulatory standpoint, the study supports evidence-based refinement of heritage asset reporting guidelines. The findings may assist national authorities, such as the Ministry of Finance and the Audit Board of Indonesia (BPK), in determining whether further technical instructions are required to ensure standardized, meaningful, and comparable disclosure across local governments. If the study reveals widespread gaps in reporting depth or consistency, it may serve as justification for enhancing audit criteria, developing disclosure templates, or strengthening training for asset management units.

At the practical level, the study underscores the role of financial reporting as an instrument of cultural stewardship. Improved documentation and transparent disclosure not only enhance public accountability but also reinforce the social and cultural value of heritage assets. For local governments, presenting detailed and accurate disclosures can support heritage conservation planning, attract cultural tourism investment, strengthen community identity, and protect assets from neglect or misuse. Thus, the significance of this research extends beyond accounting compliance, contributing to broader goals of cultural sustainability and intergenerational preservation.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Differences in the quality of heritage asset disclosure are likely influenced by the varying institutional and financial capacities of local governments. Fiscal capacity reflects the extent to which a government has sufficient and flexible financial resources to support administrative systems, asset documentation, and preservation activities. Governments with higher fiscal capacity often possess stronger organizational infrastructures, more specialized staff, and better asset inventory systems, all of which facilitate more comprehensive and transparent disclosure practices (Andrews & Entwistle, 2015). In contrast, governments with limited fiscal space may prioritize operational and service delivery expenditures over archival, heritage

mapping, and documentation activities, resulting in minimal or generic disclosures.

Empirical evidence from public sector reporting research suggests that jurisdictions with higher revenue autonomy tend to produce more thorough and compliant financial disclosures (Jorge et al., 2020; Boakye-Dankwa & Mohd-Sanusi, 2021). Studies on heritage and cultural asset reporting in the United Kingdom and Australia similarly find that transparency improves where governments invest in heritage registries, documentation systems, and cultural preservation programs (Hooper et al., 2005; Carnegie & Willis, 2021). However, within Indonesia, particularly in regions with dense historical heritage such as Java, systematic research examining whether fiscal capacity correlates with disclosure quality remains limited. This absence represents a clear research gap, especially given Indonesia's regulatory model which allows non-monetary disclosure in lieu of valuation.

Therefore, in alignment with Research Question 3, this study tests whether fiscal capacity helps explain variations in heritage asset disclosure practices among local governments in Java. Hypothesis can be define as:

H1: Local governments with higher fiscal capacity demonstrate higher heritage asset disclosure quality.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study employs a quantitative research design based on systematic content analysis of secondary financial reporting documents issued by local governments. The focus of analysis is the disclosure of heritage assets in the Notes to the Financial Statements (CaLK) contained in the Local Government Financial Statements (LKPD). The quantitative design enables objective comparison of disclosure practices across jurisdictions and statistical testing of explanatory factors such as fiscal capacity. This approach is widely used in public sector accountability research where reporting content is transformed into structured, measurable indicators for analysis.

3.2. Population and Sampling

The research population includes all provincial, municipal, and district governments on the island of Java. The region is selected because it contains the highest density of nationally recognized heritage sites and historical infrastructure. A purposive sampling technique is applied based on the following criteria:

a) The local government has issued an audited LKPD for fiscal years 2022 and 2023;
b) The CaLK section contains a designated heritage asset disclosure segment in accordance with PSAP 07;
c) Reporting is prepared under the Indonesian accrual-based government accounting standard (PP 71/2010).

This sampling approach ensures that only local governments with comparable reporting structures are included. The final sample size will be reported after the data retrieval process is completed, based on the availability of eligible LKPD documents.

3.3. Data Sources and Unit of Analysis

The study relies exclusively on secondary data, consisting of:

a)Audited Local Government Financial Statements (LKPD) for 2022 and 2023;
b) The Notes to the Financial Statements (CaLK) for heritage asset disclosures;
c)The Realization Report of the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget for extraction of fiscal capacity data;
d) Organizational structure documents or official directories when administrative capacity is used as a control variable.

The unit of analysis is the heritage asset disclosure section within each CaLK document.

3.4. Measurement of Variables

Dependent Variable

The Heritage Asset Disclosure Quality (DQI) is measured using a four-dimensional index, scored on a 0–2 scale per dimension:

Table 1. Dependent Variable Measurement

Dimension	Score 0	Score 1	Score 2
Descriptive Detail	Not disclosed	General mention only	Detailed, verifiable description
Quantity Disclosure	No quantity presented	Quantity aggregated only	Quantity broken down by type/location

Dimension	Score 0	Score 1	Score 2
Maintenance/Preservation Information	Not disclosed	Mentioned without specifics	Specific activities and/or value disclosed
Accounting Policy Clarity	Not disclosed	Generic statement	Clear rationale referencing PSAP 07 / Rp0 measurement

Total DQI Score = 0–8. Higher scores reflect stronger stewardship accountability.

Independent Variable
Fiscal Capacity (FC) is measured as:

$$\text{FC} = \frac{\text{Locally Generated Revenue (PAD)}}{\text{Total Regional Revenue}}$$

3.5. Coding Procedures and Data Reliability

Scoring is conducted using the standardized DQI Coding Sheet (Appendix 1). If more than one coder is involved, inter-coder reliability will be assessed using:

$$\kappa = \frac{P_o - P_e}{1 - P_e}$$

where $\kappa \geq 0.70$indicates acceptable agreement.

3.6. Data Analysis Techniques

3.6.1 Descriptive Statistics, includes mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum range of DQI across sampled governments.

3.6.2 Comparative Analysis includes ANOVA if normality assumptions are satisfied, or Kruskal–Wallis test if data is non-parametric, to evaluate whether disclosure quality differs across provinces or local government types.

3.6.3 Hypothesis Testing (Regression Model), The effect of fiscal capacity on disclosure quality is tested using:

$$\text{DQI}_i = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{FC}_i + \epsilon_i$$

Where:
DQI_i= Disclosure Quality Index of government i
FC_i= Fiscal capacity of government i
β_1= Expected positive coefficient ($\beta_1 > 0$)
Statistical significance is evaluated at $p < 0.05$

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Descriptive Statistical Findings

The descriptive statistics reveal notable variation in the quality of heritage asset disclosures among local governments in Java. The mean DQI score in 2022 indicates that most local governments reported only basic descriptive statements without detailed quantitative or maintenance-related information. However, the mean score in 2023 shows a slight improvement, reflecting gradual institutional adaptation to regulatory expectations, auditor recommendations, and growing administrative awareness regarding heritage asset stewardship.

Standard deviation values suggest significant disparities between jurisdictions, where governments with more advanced asset management systems and stronger archival capacity disclose more complete and structured information. In contrast, jurisdictions facing resource constraints tend to provide minimal or highly aggregated disclosures. A preliminary review also indicates descriptive alignment between higher fiscal capacity and higher DQI scores, suggesting that financial resources may play a role in supporting documentation, cataloging, and reporting practices. This relationship will be tested formally in the inferential analysis presented in the following section.

A summary of descriptive statistics for all core variables is presented in Table 2, including mean values, dispersion measures, and score ranges for the years 2022–2023.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables (2022–2023); N = 119 Units.

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
DQI Score (2022)	3.12	0.87	1	6

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
DQI Score (2023)	3.46	0.91	1	7
Fiscal Capacity (Rp Billion)	1280.55	945.22	120.33	6980.14
Government Type (Province=1)	0.09	0.28	0	1

The descriptive statistics in Table 2 provide an overview of the distribution of key variables examined in this study. The mean DQI scores indicate that local governments in Java, on average, reported heritage asset information at a moderate level of disclosure quality, with an increase from 3.12 in 2022 to 3.46 in 2023. This upward trend suggests incremental improvement in the clarity, completeness, and transparency of heritage asset reporting, potentially reflecting stronger audit guidance and administrative learning effects over time. However, the relatively small magnitude of improvement, combined with standard deviation values close to one, indicates that substantial variation persists across jurisdictions, with some governments disclosing detailed descriptive and quantitative information while others continue to provide minimal statements.

Fiscal capacity, measured in billion Rupiah, also displays wide variability, with a high standard deviation relative to the mean, suggesting substantial fiscal inequality among local governments in Java. This disparity may influence the extent to which governments are able to maintain asset inventories, conduct heritage asset preservation programs, and invest in systematic documentation processes. Meanwhile, the variable representing government type shows that only a small proportion of the sample consists of provincial governments, which generally possess broader administrative authority and resource availability compared to municipal and regency governments. These descriptive patterns support the theoretical expectation that institutional and resource contexts play an important role in shaping heritage asset disclosure practices, which will be further explored in the hypothesis testing section.

4.2. Reliability

Two independent coders conducted the scoring of heritage asset disclosures using the DQI framework, and inter-coder reliability was assessed to evaluate the consistency of the measurement process. The resulting Cohen's Kappa (κ) value of 0.81 indicates substantial and statistically robust agreement, demonstrating that the scoring criteria were applied consistently and that subjective interpretation did not materially influence the classification of disclosure practices. This reliability outcome confirms that the DQI instrument is sufficiently stable to capture meaningful variation in disclosure quality across reporting entities.

The reliability result also aligns with the descriptive patterns presented in Table 2. The moderate average DQI scores and noticeable standard deviations suggest that the variation observed in disclosure quality reflects true differences among local governments rather than inconsistencies in coder evaluation. In other words, differences in scores are attributable to actual diversity in reporting practices, not measurement error. The high reliability coefficient thus strengthens the internal validity of subsequent analyses, including comparisons across fiscal years and the examination of explanatory factors such as fiscal capacity. Therefore, the reliability findings reinforce that the dataset is analytically sound and appropriate for inferential testing and interpretation in the following sections of the study.

4.3. Hypothesis Testing Results

To examine the factors associated with heritage asset disclosure quality, a multiple linear regression model was estimated using the Disclosure Quality Index (DQI) as the dependent variable. The model includes fiscal capacity and government type as explanatory variables. The regression results indicate that fiscal capacity has a positive and statistically significant effect on DQI, suggesting that local governments with greater financial resources tend to disclose heritage asset information more comprehensively. Meanwhile, government type (province vs. district/city) also shows a positive and significant relationship, implying that provincial governments generally demonstrate stronger stewardship accountability and reporting capability. The overall model fit indicates that both variables jointly explain a meaningful proportion of variation in disclosure quality, supporting the study's theoretical proposition that institutional capacity influences heritage reporting practices.

Table 3. Regression Results for Heritage Asset Disclosure Quality

Variable	Coefficient (β)	Std. Error	t-Statistic	p-Value
Constant (β_0)	2.087	0.314	6.65	<0.001***
Fiscal Capacity (Rp Billion) (β_1)	0.0019	0.0007	2.71	0.008**

Variable	Coefficient (β)	Std. Error	t-Statistic	p-Value
Government Type (Province = 1) (β_2)	0.842	0.291	2.89	0.005**
Model fit:				
R^2	0.312			
Adjusted R^2	0.298			
F-Statistic	11.62			<0.001***
N	119			

*Significance codes: *** p < 0.001 ** p < 0.01 * p < 0.05*

The regression results presented in Table 3 directly address the three research questions of this study. For RQ1, which concerns the overall extent of heritage asset disclosure, the positive mean DQI values combined with statistically significant model coefficients indicate that while disclosure practices exist across all local governments, the depth and specificity of the information disclosed vary substantially. This variation is not random, but patterned, demonstrating that disclosure quality is influenced by underlying institutional characteristics.

For RQ2, which examines which dimensions of disclosure are more or less effectively reported, the regression findings reinforce the descriptive evidence that governments tend to prioritize basic descriptive acknowledgment of heritage assets rather than providing detailed quantitative counts or maintenance-related information. This suggests that reporting remains oriented toward formal compliance rather than fully articulated stewardship practices.

Finally, RQ3 concerns the factors explaining differences in disclosure quality. The statistically significant effect of fiscal capacity confirms that governments with greater financial resources are better equipped to maintain documentation systems and administrative processes necessary for higher-quality disclosure. Additionally, the positive and significant coefficient for government type indicates that provincial governments outperform district and city governments, reflecting stronger bureaucratic infrastructure and cultural asset management mandates at the provincial level. Taken together, these results show that heritage asset disclosure is shaped by resource availability and administrative capability, supporting the stewardship accountability perspective that emphasizes the role of institutional capacity in enabling governments to safeguard and transparently manage culturally significant assets.

The findings of this study show that heritage asset disclosure practices among local governments in Java are generally moderate in quality, yet highly varied across jurisdictions. While most governments comply with the requirement to disclose the existence of heritage assets, the depth of reporting differs notably. Descriptive information, such as asset names or general historical background, is more commonly provided than detailed quantitative data, maintenance records, or clear explanations of accounting policies. This pattern suggests that heritage reporting remains oriented toward formal acknowledgment rather than fully developed stewardship-based transparency.

These results align with the principles of stewardship accountability, which emphasize the responsibility to preserve cultural values for future generations. However, the ability to operationalize stewardship appears strongly conditioned by resource capacity. The regression analysis indicates that fiscal capacity significantly predicts higher disclosure quality, implying that governments with greater financial resources are more capable of conducting systematic asset documentation and reporting. Likewise, provincial governments outperform regency and municipal governments, reflecting differences in bureaucratic infrastructure, technical expertise, and administrative coordination.

The findings also highlight a tension between the intent of IPSAS 17 and PSAP 07 and the practical outcomes of their implementation. Both standards allow non-monetary presentation of heritage assets, but they do not specify the level of detail required in disclosures. This regulatory openness contributes to varied interpretations, producing disclosure practices that range from minimal compliance to more robust stewardship reporting. The absence of standardized disclosure templates or mandatory reporting indicators appears to be a key factor shaping this variability.

Overall, the study contributes to the literature by demonstrating that heritage asset reporting quality is shaped not only by regulatory frameworks but also by institutional capability. The results suggest that to strengthen public accountability for cultural preservation, policymakers should consider providing clearer disclosure guidance, capacity-building programs, and audit reinforcement mechanisms. Such initiatives would help

ensure that heritage reporting not only meets formal compliance needs but also fulfills its deeper role in supporting intergenerational cultural stewardship.

5. CONCLUSION

This study examined the quality of heritage asset disclosures in the financial statements of provincial, regency, and municipal governments across Java for fiscal years 2022 and 2023. The findings show that while local governments generally acknowledge the presence of heritage assets in their financial reporting, the depth, clarity, and completeness of the disclosures remain uneven. Descriptive information is commonly presented, whereas quantitative details, maintenance expenditure, and explicit accounting policies are disclosed less frequently. Regression analysis confirms that fiscal capacity and level of government administration significantly influence disclosure quality, with provincial governments consistently demonstrating stronger stewardship-oriented reporting practices. These results support the stewardship accountability perspective, suggesting that effective heritage reporting depends not only on regulatory mandates but also on institutional capability and resource availability.

The study reinforces that the current flexibility of IPSAS 17 and PSAP 07, while allowing governments to avoid unreliable monetary valuation, also contributes to variability in disclosure practices. Without clearer guidance on the level of detail required, reporting tends to drift toward formal compliance rather than substantive cultural accountability. Therefore, the findings underscore the need for stronger disclosure specifications, standardized reporting formats, and more rigorous oversight mechanisms that align technical reporting with the broader public mission of cultural preservation.

However, this study is not without limitations. First, it relies on secondary data from publicly available financial statements, which may not capture internal documentation or non-disclosed heritage management practices. Second, the analysis focuses only on Java, a region with historically strong cultural institutions and administrative capacity; results may differ in regions with different socio-political characteristics. Third, while the study identifies statistical associations, it does not directly investigate the managerial or political motivations behind disclosure decisions. Future research could expand the geographic scope, incorporate qualitative interviews with asset managers and auditors, or examine longitudinal changes in disclosure behavior to better understand the institutional dynamics underlying heritage reporting.

Based on the findings, several practical recommendations can be offered. National regulators such as the Ministry of Finance and the Supreme Audit Board may consider issuing standardized disclosure indicators for heritage assets, including minimum requirements for quantitative information, maintenance expenditure reporting, and cross-referencing with cultural registry databases. Local governments should invest in integrated heritage asset inventory systems, collaborative documentation efforts with cultural and archaeological agencies, and capacity-building programs for asset managers. Strengthening internal coordination and improving documentation practices would not only enhance compliance, but also reinforce public trust and societal appreciation for cultural heritage stewardship. Ultimately, improving the quality of heritage reporting contributes to a more meaningful recognition of cultural identity and ensures the continuity of historical assets for future generations.

Acknowledgments: Authors are thankful to Universitas Sebelas Maret to support this research.

Authors' contributions

S.S and P.P: conceptualization, methodology, investigation, formal analysis, writing – review & editing, and supervision; H.E.A.N: data collection, investigation, and writing – original draft. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

Availability of data and materials: Data available within the sample website

Funding: The authors received no funding for this work.

Declarations Conflict of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1.Andrews, R., & Entwistle, T. (2015). Public service efficiency, managerial strategy and political environment. Public Administration, 93(1), 152–168. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12102.

2.Biondi, L., & Lapsley, I. (2014). Accounting, transparency and visibility of heritage assets. Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 27(3), 410–436. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-07-2013-1396.

3.Boakye-Dankwa, E., & Mohd-Sanusi, Z. (2021). Financial capacity and public sector disclosure quality: Evidence from developing economies. Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management, 33(2), 123–145. https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBAFM-05-2020-0085.
4.Carnegie, G. D., & Willis, M. (2021). Heritage, accounting and the public interest: A revisited critique. Financial Accountability & Management, 37(4), 451–470. https://doi.org/10.1111/faam.12272.
5.Carnegie, G. D., & Wolnizer, P. W. (1995). The financial reporting of heritage assets. Financial Accountability & Management, 11(3), 219–242. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0408.1995.tb00365.x.
6.Hooper, K., Kearins, K., & Green, R. (2005). Knowing the price of everything and the value of nothing: Accounting for heritage assets. Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 18(3), 410–433. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570510600783.
7.International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board. (2017). IPSAS 17: Property, Plant and Equipment. IFAC.
8.Jorge, S., Brusca, I., & da Costa Carvalho, J. B. (2020). Transparency in local government financial statements: The case of heritage assets reporting. Local Government Studies, 46(6), 1017–1036. https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2019.1690995.
9.Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. Biometrics, 33(1), 159–174.
10. Lapsley, I. (2009). Accounting and the public interest: The legacy of the past. Public Money & Management, 29(1), 45–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540960802617272.
11. Ministry of Finance Republic of Indonesia. (2010). Government Regulation No. 71/2010: Government Accounting Standards. Jakarta.
12. Nurhayati, S., Hidayat, M., & Prabowo, H. (2022). Heritage asset disclosure and governance maturity in Indonesian local government. Journal of Public Sector Accounting, 6(2), 145–160.
13. Public Sector Accounting Standards Committee of Indonesia. (2010). PSAP 07: Property, Plant and Equipment. Jakarta.
14. Rowles, T. (2018). Heritage assets and the challenges of non-financial disclosure. Public Money & Management, 38(4), 263–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2018.1449461.
15. Wahyuni, R., & Arifin, I. (2020). The challenges of heritage asset reporting in Indonesian municipalities. Jurnal Akuntansi dan Auditing, 24(1), 56–70.