Factors Affecting Internet Financial Reporting Disclosure to Provincial Governments In Indonesia

Andi Sayyidatun Ufairah Anto, Hanafi Kartini, Nirwana
Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia
E-mail: sayyidatunufairah@gmail.com, hanafikartini@fe.unhas.ac.id,
nirwana_ni@yahoo.com

*Correspondence: sayyidatunufairah@gmail.com

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
internet; governments; financial reporting	Internet financial reporting is important because people are now geographically spread across different regions and countries. Disclosure with traditional paper-based methods has the disadvantage of limited time for filing. In the current era of globalization, Indonesian people can live in any region or country, so using internet financial reporting methods for information disclosure is available on the official government website and can be done at any time. This study aims to test or measure the impact of specific changes to existing assumptions or hypotheses, in this study are factors that affect the disclosure of internet financial reporting, where the variables used are the size of local government, regional expenditure, local original income and audit opinions on internet financial reporting in Indonesia. The type of research used in this research is quantitative research. Based on the results of research and discussion in this study, the conclusion that can be obtained based on the research variables used is that the size of local government does not affect Internet Financial Reporting which means that the size or size of local government has not been able to encourage local governments to publish financial information on local governments.

Introduction

Internet Financial Reporting is financial reporting carried out by the government to provide information in the form of financial reports via the internet (Oktaviani et al., 2020). The existence of financial reporting through the internet is very useful because it can save the cost of disseminating financial information. The application of Internet Financial Reporting in the government, which includes company financial information via the internet on the official government website, which only supports the provision of relevant information and is the main means of financial reporting that changes the paper-based reporting system to a paper-less reporting system (Dewi, 2019) With the advantages of the internet, the government should create an official website to disclose financial and

non-financial information, the internet changes the presentation of company information traditionally.

Internet financial reporting is important because people are now geographically spread across different regions and countries. Disclosure with traditional paper-based methods has the disadvantage of limited time for filing. In the current era of globalization, Indonesian people can live in any region or country, so using internet financial reporting methods for information disclosure is available on the official government website and can be done at any time.

The Internet is a decentralized global network because it is not "regulated" by any company or country. So anyone can use the service as long as they have access. The Internet can be used as a medium for

Providing important information due to its advantages such as easy distribution, no limits, low costs and high interaction. (Marlim & Panggabean, 2018), then Internet Financial Reporting is very necessary.

Transparency is a principle that ensures that information about the administration of the state is freely accessible to all. One form of government transparency to the public is government openness in communicating public information. Article 2(3) of the FOI Law stipulates that all public information must be available to interested parties in a prompt, timely, inexpensive, and easily accessible manner. One of the easily accessible and cost-effective presentations of information related to the disclosure of regional financial statements is through the Internet.

Based on Article 13 of Government Regulation No. 65 of 2010 concerning regional financial information systems which is an amendment to Government Regulation No. 56 of 2005 concerning Regional Financial Information Systems which states that in utilizing and developing advances in information technology in distributing financial information through official websites has become the obligation of local governments. The obligation of local governments is to convey information, affirmed through Law No. 14 of 2008 concerning public information disclosure which states that public bodies must be open and responsible for every public information.

Along with the issuance of government laws and regulations, related to the delivery of information to the public, local governments should have used the internet as a medium to deliver financial reports (Internet Financial Reporting) to the public.

The Government Regulation that regulates the transparency of government information on the official website is Government Regulation Number 71 of 2019 concerning the Implementation of Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Openness. This regulation regulates the disclosure of public information required by the government and state institutions to the public through the official website. Information disclosure is published by local governments through electronic media, information on the implementation of regional government, and PP No. 13 of 2019. Local governments are required to submit their financial information on their official websites, but each local government has reasons and considerations for publishing or not publishing its financial statements on the Internet.

In today's modern world, institutions or governments need a strong and clean government system, or what is known as a clean form of government or good governance. The demand for transparency in financial reporting has attracted the attention of developing countries such as Indonesia. The goal is that the public can see what is happening and what government agencies will do regarding the use of existing budgets in replicating the prosperity and welfare of the community. in Indonesia is recognized by

the Public Information Disclosure Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 14 of 2008. This law clearly explains that the government has an obligation to provide public information transparently with responsibility and orientation towards public services so that it is easily accessible, fast, efficient and also easily understood by the public (Nosihana & Yaya, 2016) Transparency is one of the hallmarks of financial management and a key component of good governance.

Today there are many official government websites that can be accessed with different types of information and displays. However, the use of official local government websites as a medium for reporting financial and non-financial information is still not optimal, resulting in limited availability of some financial and non-financial information. Motivations for voluntarily reporting government information to websites vary according to the urgency of each region. This will result in a lack of information and public services that should be published on the official website of the local government (official website of the local government) but not posted.

The advantages of the Internet over other media with the number of internet users continue to grow exponentially. According to Internet World Stats, the number of Internet users (Netters) worldwide has increased dramatically over the past decade. According to (easydigital.id) Digital User Data in Indonesia in 2022 is 204.7 million internet users in January 2022.Internet penetration in Indonesia will reach 73.7% of the total population at the beginning of 2022. According to Kepios analysis, internet users in Indonesia will grow by 2.1 million (+1.0%) between 2021 and 2022.

Agency theory describes two opposing economic actors: principals and agents. Create a proxy relationship when one or more principals hire others to perform services and make decisions in the principal's best interest. In this case, local government as an agent and client is the community and other stakeholders. The community as a client gives strength and trust to local governments to run the government to maintain transparency in communicating implementation results to the community. Agency relationships can cause problems, one of which is information asymmetry. Information asymmetry has been shown to encourage government fraud and corruption. Efforts are made to reduce the occurrence of information asymmetry. An easy way to obtain information is to publish financial statements on the Internet or on the official website of the local government.

Signalling theory is a theory that explains why governments have the urge to show signals to the public. Improve the internal control system and more detailed disclosure by giving positive signals to the public regarding the disclosure of high-quality reports, reducing the occurrence of information asymmetry and enabling the government to better manage government affairs (Putri & Setiawan, 2022)

Research on Internet Financial Reporing on government measures has been conducted previously by (Azis & Hapsari, 2020), (Hadianto & Murtin, 2020), and (Mutiha, 2017). Which states that the size of local government affects internet financial reporting, the size of government is the amount of assets owned by the government. The greater the number of assets owned by the government, the greater the size of the government (Azis & Hapsari, 2020). Research that examines Internet Financial Reporting on local governments states that there is a relationship between population and Internet Financial Reporting, stating that areas that have a larger population will provide easier access to access financial statement information via the internet (Styles & Tennyson, 2007). So it can be said that the greater the population of a local government, the higher the demand for ease of accessibility to access financial statement information. So that the size of the local government has an influence on the disclosure of Internet Financial

Reporting of regional movers. However, different results are found in research (Moehardiono & Yuliati, 2021), (Masra & Sari, 2020) which states that the size of local governments does not affect Internet Financial Reporting (IFR).

Research on Intenet Financial Reporing on regional spending has been conducted previously by (Putri & Setiawan, 2022), (Alhajjriana et al., 2017), (Masra & Sari, 2020), (Mutiha, 2017). Which states that a high regional expenditure can then reflect a high level of service as well. Regional spending can be a motivating factor for local governments to conduct financial reporting on the internet because the greater regional spending shows that local governments provide good services and quality facilities to the community. As regional expenditure is a regional obligation that is used as a deduction from the value of net worth. However, different results are found in research (Azis et al., 2020) which states that regional spending has no effect on Internet Financial Reporting.

Research on Internet Financial Reporing to Leverage has been conducted previously by (Budi, 2019). High leverage requires the government to provide surveillance media to creditors to monitor the use of borrowed funds and to monitor the government's ability to pay its debts. (Budi, 2019) stated that the internet financial reporting will be the right supervisory medium that can be provided by the government for creditors because it can be accessed anywhere and anytime and is cost-effective. The results of research conducted by (Budi, 2019) who said that Leverage affects Internet Financial Reporting. Leverage indicates the ability of an institution to repay its long-term debts. (Rulitawati et al., 2020) concluded that long-term solvency, including leverage, is the aspect of financial condition considered most important by users of government financial statements. However, different results are found in research (Diptyana, 2018) which states that Leverage has no effect on Internet Financial Reporting.

Researchers tried to include audit opinion variables which are moderation variables in the research model because good audit opinions can be obtained from good government performance and are a picture of regional financial management that is tipped by the government (Hiola & Rusidi, 2016). According to (Budi, 2019) the community demands that public sector organizations improve the quality, professionalism, and accountability of the public in the delivery of their programs, and can encourage local government compliance in disclosing financial information on websites. Local government financial statements that have been audited by BPK and obtain an unqualified opinion can facilitate compliance when local governments disclose financial information on their websites.

Based on previous research, the researcher wants to test and re-analyze the factors that influence the disclosure of internet financial reporting in Indonesia, Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine the impact of local government size, regional spending, and, leverage on internet financial reporting in Indonesia, and audit opinion as a moderation variable to strengthen the relationship between local government size and leverage, and to explore the impact of local government experiences to support and analyze the impact on internet financial reporting performance of local financial statements on local governments in Indonesia.

This research is a development of research (Alhajjriana et al., 2017) which examines the effect of local original income, regional expenditure, number of legislative members, and population of internet financial reporting on blood government and the effect of local government internet financial reporting on regional financial statement accountability. As for what distinguishes between this study and previous studies, namely the type of variables taken, in this study researchers used 3 independent variables and 1 moderation variable, namely government size, regional spending, and leverage as

independent variables and audit opinions as moderation variables. In this study, the object of research is 34 provincial governments in Indonesia during 2017-2021. While the previous study used 5 types of variables, namely local original income, regional expenditure, number of legislative members, population and accountability of regional financial statements and the object of research was 32 provincial governments in Indonesia during 2012-2014. The reason for taking variables in this study is because there are inconsistencies derived from previous studies that cause asymmetries in these variables.

Research Methods

The type of research used in this research is quantitative research. According to S.Margono 1997: 105 quality research is: "a process of growing knowledge that uses data in the form of numbers as a tool to find information about what we want to know. The quantitative research approach uses more hypothetical verifiative logic".

The research design used in this study is a causality design. Causal research is the investigation of causal relationships. To determine causality, it is important to observe changes in research variables that are thought to cause changes in other variables, and measure changes in other variables.

This study aims to test or measure the impact of specific changes to existing assumptions or hypotheses, in this study are factors that affect the disclosure of internet financial reporting, where the variables used are the size of local government, regional expenditure, local original income and audit opinions on internet financial reporting in Indonesia

Results and Discussions

Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Descriptive analysis is used to analyze data by describing or describing data that has been collected without the intention of making generally accepted conclusions. Descriptive analysis in this study was obtained through secondary data obtained from the official website of local governments in Indonesia to describe and describe the variables studied. Descriptive statistical analysis provides an overview or descriptive of a data seen from the mean value, standard deviation, maximum, minimum and mean of each variable, (Ghozali, 2016). Variables used in this study include local government size, local spending, leverage, audit opinion and Internet Financial Reporting (IFR).

Table 1 Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Local Government Size	65	,002	,340	,04762	,045814
Regional Shopping	65	28,09	31,79	29,4842	1,00890
Leverage	65	,00	,17	,0431	,03606
Opini Audit	65	3	4	3,95	,211
Internet Financial Reporting	65	4	10	7,95	1,849
Valid N (listwise)	65				

Source: Data processed, 2023

The results in table 1 above show a descriptive statistical analysis that describes the description of the variables used in this study. Minimum is the smallest value of a series

of observations, maximum is the largest value of a series of observations, mean is the result of adding values divided by all data divided by the amount of data, while standard deviation is the root of the sum of squares of the difference between data values and the average divided by the amount of data.

It can be seen that in the local government size variable (X1) the minimum value is 0.002, the maximum value is 0.340, the mean is 0.04762 and the standard deviation value is 0.045814. This shows that local government size data is not group or variable data because local government size data has a standard deviation value lower than the mean value.

For the regional expenditure variable (X2), the minimum value is known to be 28.09359, the maximum value is 31.79145, the mean is 29.4842105 and the standard deviation value is 1.00890076. This shows that regional spending data is not group or variable data because regional shopping data has a standard deviation value lower than the mean value.

For variable leverage (X3), the minimum value is 0.0003, the maximum value is 1.667, the mean is 0.043146 and the standard deviation value is 0.0360630. This shows that leverage data is not group or variable data because leverage data has a standard deviation value lower than the mean value.

For the audit opinion variable (Z), the minimum value is 3, the maximum value is 4, the mean is 3.95 and the standard deviation value is 0.211. This shows that audit opinion data is not group or variable data because audit opinion data has a standard deviation value lower than the mean value.

For the Internet Financial Reporting (Y) variable, the minimum value is 4, the maximum is 10, the mean is 7.95 and the standard deviation is 1.849. This shows that Internet Financial Reporting data is not group or variable data because Internet Financial Reporting data has a standard deviation value lower than the mean value.

Classical Assumption Test

The classical assumption test in this study was carried out with the aim of ensuring the results obtained met the basic assumptions in regression analysis. The results of the classical assumption test conducted in this study are through normality tests, multicollinearity tests and heteroscedasticity tests and autocorrelation tests. The results of the classical assumption test processed with the help of SPSS software Version 26.0 and researchers present as follows:

Normality Test

This test aims to determine whether the residuals from the regression model made are normally distributed or not. To test whether the data used is normal or not can be done using the Kolmogorov Smirnov test. When the coefficient Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) is greater than 0.05 hence the data is said to be normally distributed. The results of the normality test can be seen as follows:

Table 2 Normality Test Results

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		65
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	,0000000
	Std. Deviation	1,77763775
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,140
	Positive	,087

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

Negative		-,140
Test Statistic		,140
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,003[c]
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

Source: Data processed, 2023

Based on the results in the table above regarding the normality test using the Kolmogorov Smirnov method, it can be seen that the value of Asymp. Sig (2-tailed) is 0.003. These results do not meet the basis for decision making because they have values smaller than 0.05 or 0.003 < 0.05 so that the data used in this study is declared not normally distributed and the regression model is not suitable for further analysis. To make the data become normally distributed, it is necessary to delete the outlier data. Outlier data is data that has unique characteristics and is very visible, far different from other observations that appear in the form of extreme values.

After the experiment, 23 samples of extreme data were obtained that needed to be eliminated, bringing the samples used to 42 samples. The results of Kolmogorov Smirnov's normality test after outliers are as follows:

Table 3 Normality Test Results After Outliers
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		42
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	,0000000
	Std. Deviation	1,43826924
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,135
	Positive	,135
	Negative	-,134
Test Statistic		,135
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,052[c]

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

Source: Data processed, 2023

Based on the results in table 3 above, it can be seen that the value of Kolmogorov Smirnov (K-S) is 0.135, then the value of Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.052. These results indicate that the regression equation model is normally distributed because of the Asymp value. Sig. (2-tailed) 0.052 is greater than the alpha value of 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that the data used in this study is declared to be normally distributed.

Multicollinearity Test

Regression models can be said to be good if there is no correlation between independent variables (multicollinearity does not occur). The multicollinearity test aims to test whether in the regression model there is a correlation between independent variables where a good regression model should not have a correlation between independent variables. To determine the presence or absence of multicollinearity in the regression model is carried out by analyzing the value of Variance Influence Factor (VIF) and Tolerance with the following criteria:

Andi Sayyidatun Ufairah Anto, Hanafi Kartini, Nirwana

If the VIF value < 10.00 then it means that there is no multicollinearity in the regression model
If the VIF value > 10.00, it means that there is multicollinearity in the regression model
While the criteria based on the tolerance value are:
    If the tolerance value is > 0.10 then it can be concluded that in the regression model there is no multicollinearity
    If the tolerance value is < 0.10 then it can be concluded that in the regression model there is multicollinearity.
    The results for the multicollinearity test in this study are as follows:

Table 4 Multicollinearity Test Results

Variabel	Collinearity Statictics	
	Tolerance	VIF
Local Government Size	0,917	1,091
Regional Shopping	0,800	1,250
Leverage	0,889	1,124
Opini Audit	0,924	1,082
a. Dependent Vaiable: Internet Financial Reporting (Y)		

Source: Data processed, 2023

Based on the results of the multicollinearity test in table 5.4 above, it can be seen that the tolerance and VIF values of the variables of local government size, regional expenditure, leverage and audit opinion have values greater than 0.10 and VIF values smaller than 10.00 which means that the regression equation model is free from multicollinearity symptoms.

Heteroscedasticity Test

This heteroscedasticity test has the aim of knowing whether in the regression model there is an inequality of variance from the residual of one observation to another observation made with the Glejser test. If there is no independent variable that has a significant effect on the absolute residual value or its significance value is above 0.05, it does not contain symptoms of heteroscedasticity. The results of the heteroscedasticity test in this study can be seen as follows:

Table 5 Heteroscedasticity Test Results
Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	-,551	1,009		-,546	,588
Local Government Size (X1)	-,008	,011	-,124	-,735	,467
Regional Shopping (X2)	,135	,288	,084	,469	,642
Leverage (X3)	-,003	,008	-,062	-,364	,718
Opini Audit (Z)	,027	,034	,133	,795	,432
a. Dependent Variable: ABS_RES					

Source: Data processed, 2023

Based on the results in table 5 above regarding the heteroscedasticity test, it can be seen that the significance value of the local government size variable is 0.467, regional expenditure is 0.642, leverage is 0.718 and audit opinion is 0.432. The significance value

of all variables is greater than 0.05 which means that there is no influence between the independent variable and the absolute residual. Thus, the created model does not experience symptoms of heteroscedasticity.

Autocorrelation Test

An autocorrelation test is performed to test whether in a linear regression model there is a correlation between user error in period t and error in period t-1. A good regression model is one that is free from autocorrelation. Autocorrelation can be detected one of them through the Durbin - Watson test (DW test), namely by comparing the calculated DW value with the DW table.

Autocorrelation testing in a model aims to determine whether there is a correlation between confounding variables in a certain period with previous variables. A good model is a model that does not have autocorrelation symptoms, where autocorrelation problems often occur in time series data. The hypotheses to be tested are:

H0: no autocorrelation ($\rho = 0$)

Ha: there is an autocorrelation ($\rho \neq 0$)

To detect the presence or absence of autocorrelation using the Durbin Watson test (DW-Test) there are the following conditions::

Table 6 Basic Autocorrelation Decision Making

Nol hypothesis	Results	If
No positive autocorrelation	Less	$0 < d < d_L$
No positive autocorrelation	No decision	$d_L \leq d \leq d_U$
No negative autocorrelation	Less	$4 - d_L < d < 4$
No negative autocorrelation	No decision	$4 - dU \leq d \leq 4 - dL$
No positive or negative autocorrelation	Not rejected	$dU < d < 4 - dU$

Source: Ghozali and Ratmono, 2013

Ket: dU : durbin watson upper, dL : durbin watson lower

The results of the autocorrelation test through the Durbin - Watson test (DW test) are as follows:

Table 7 Autocorrelation Test Results

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	,534[a]	,285	,208	,06833	1,094

a. Predictors: (Constant), Audit Opinion (Z), Leverage (X3), Local Government Size (X1), Local Expenditure (X2)

b. Dependent Variable: Internet Financial Reporting (Y)

Source: Data processed, 2023

Based on the results in the table above, it can be seen that the value of Durbin-Watson (DW) is 1.094. With the amount of data (n) = 42, it is known that the dL value is 1.357, the dU value is 1.661 and 4 – dU = 2.339. With these results showing that the DW value is not located between dU < DW< 4 – dU because dU > DW (2.339 > DW) so it can be concluded that the regression model used is a symptom of autocorrelation.

Thus, it can be retested through a different method, namely the Cochrane Orcutt test which is used to overcome autocorrelation symptoms. The results of the autocorrelation test through the Cochrane Orcutt test are as follows:

Table 8 Cochrane Orcutt Autocorrelation Test Results
Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	,475[a]	,226	,140	,05946	1,753

a. Predictors: (Constant), LagZ, LagX2, LagX3, LagX1
b. Dependent Variable: LagY

Source: Data processed, 2023

After the Cochrane Orcutt test, it can be found that the Durbin-Watson (DW) value is 1.753. With these results, it shows that the DW value lies between dU < DW < 4 – dU, which is 1.661 < 1.753 < 2.339, so it can be concluded that the regression model used does not occur autocorrelation symptoms.

Double Linear Regression Analysis Results

After all classical assumption tests are met, then next describe the results of multiple linear regression analysis. The calculation of multiple linear regression coefficients is carried out by regression analysis through SPSS software Version 26.0 for Windows can be seen as follows:

Table 9 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results
Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	-,270	1,463		-,185	,855
	Local Government Size (X1)	,004	,017	,033	,227	,821
	Regional Shopping (X2)	,357	,433	,125	,825	,415
	Leverage (X3)	,043	,012	,542	3,687	,001

Dependent Variable: Internet Financial Reporting (Y)

R Square	: 0,266
F count	: 4,590
Significance F	: 0,008

Source: Data processed, 2023

Based on the results of multiple linear regression analysis as presented in table 9 above, the regression equation can be made as follows:

$$Y = -0{,}270 + 0{,}004X1 + 0{,}357X2 + 0{,}043X3$$

Based on the regression equation above, for all variables can be interpreted as follows:

A constant value of -0.270 means that if the variables of local government size (X 1), regional expenditure (X2) and leverage (X3) have a value of 0 or fixed (no increase), then Internet Financial Reporting (Y) will be -0.270 units.

The value of the regression coefficient of the local government size variable (X 1) is 0.004 with a positive value indicating that for every 1 unit increase in local government size (X 1), the Internet Financial Reporting (Y) will increase by 0.004 assuming other variables are constant. With these results, it can be interpreted that the size of local government (X_1) contributes 0.004 to Internet Financial Reporting (Y).

The regression coefficient value of the regional expenditure variable (X 2) is 0.357 with a positive value indicating that for every 1 unit increase in regional expenditure (X2),

the Internet Financial Reporting (Y) will increase by 0.357 assuming other variables are constant. With these results, it can be interpreted that regional expenditure (X$_2$) contributes 0.357 to Internet Financial Reporting (Y).

The regression coefficient value of the leverage variable (X3) is 0.043 with a positive value indicating that for every 1 unit increase in leverage (X3), Internet Financial Reporting (Y) will increase by 0.043 assuming the other variables are constant. With these results, it can be interpreted that leverage (X3) contributes 0.043 to Internet Financial Reporting (Y).

The following is an explanation of the results of multiple regression analysis consisting of hypothesis tests (t tests), coefficient of determination analysis (R2) and model feasibility tests (F tests).

Conclusion

Based on the results of research and discussion in this study, the conclusion that can be obtained based on the research variables used is that the size of local government does not affect Internet Financial Reporting which means that the size or size of local government has not been able to encourage local governments to publish financial information on local governments. This is indicated because there are still many local governments in Indonesia that have less total assets so that local governments have not published their financial statements on local government websites.

Regional spending has no effect on Internet Financial Reporting which means that local governments have not been able to provide signals in the competence of providing good public services. The high or low level of regional spending does not influence local governments to disclose or publish their financial statements on local government websites.

Leverage affects Internet Financial Reporting which means that local governments have been able to provide Internet Financial Reporting as a monitoring tool provided to creditors with the aim of monitoring the use of funds and monitoring the government's ability to pay its debts. In this case, the government has been able to provide signals related to the ability to refund funds by disclosing financial information through its website.

Audit opinions cannot moderate local governments' measures of Internet Financial Reporting, suggesting that positive audit results do not affect local governments' measures of Internet Financial Reporting.

Audit opinions cannot moderate regional spending on Internet Financial Reporting, it shows that good audit results do not affect regional spending on Internet Financial Reporting.

Audit opinions cannot moderate leverage on Internet Financial Reporting, it shows that while local governments can guarantee loan funds and governments that receive good audit opinions such as Reasonable Without Exception (WTP) do not affect local spending on Internet Financial Reporting.

References

Alhajjriana, G. I., Nor, W., & Wijaya, R. (2017). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi internet financial reporting pemerintah daerah dan implikasinya terhadap akuntabilitas laporan keuangan daerah. Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Bisnis, 17(2), 100–109.

Azis, I., & Hapsari, D. W. (2020). Pengaruh Ukuran Pemerintah Daerah, Pendapatan Asli Daerah, Belanja Daerah Terhadap Internet Financial Reporting (Studi Pemerintah Kabupaten/Kota Provinsi Jawa Timur Periode 2015-2018). eProceedings of Management, 7(2).

Budi, S. (2019). Pengaruh Ukuran Pemda, Leverage dan Kinerja Keuangan terhadap IFR pada Pemda dengan Dimoderasi Opini Audit. Pengaruh Ukuran Pemda, Leverage dan Kinerja Keuangan Terhadap IFR pada Pemda dengan Dimoderasi Opini Audit, 29(3), 1012–1025.

Dewi, M. (2019). Analisis Internet Financial Reporting (Ifr) Pada Penyajian Laporan Keuangan Badan Usaha Milik Negara (Bumn) Di Indonesia. STIEP Perbanas Surabaya.

Diptyana, P. (2018). Exploring government internet financial reporting in Indonesia. Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis, 21(1), 115–138.

Ghozali, I. (2016). Desain penelitian kuantitatif dan kualitatif: untuk akuntansi, bisnis, dan ilmu sosial lainnya.

Hadianto, D., & Murtin, A. (2020). Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Pengungkapan Internet Financial Reporting (IFR) di Indonesia. Reviu Akuntansi dan Bisnis Indonesia, 4 (2), 33–45.

Hiola, Y., & Rusidi, A. D. M. (2016). Political environment in the effect of the regional government financial performance on disclosure of financial information on website. Journal of Economics, Business, and Accountancy Ventura, 19(1), 27–36.

Marlim, E., & Panggabean, R. R. (2018). Factors Affecting the Internet Financial Reporting (IFR) at Manufacturing Industry in Indonesia. The International Conference on Accounting and Management Science.

Masra, E. A., & Sari, V. F. (2020). Faktor yang mempengaruhi internet financial reporting (ifr) pada pemerintah kabupaten/kota di Sumatera Barat. Jurnal Eksplorasi Akuntansi, 2(2), 2757–2771.

Moehardiono, I. A., & Yuliati, A. (2021). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah, Ukuran Pemerintah Daerah, Opini Audit Terhadap Internet Financial Reporting Pemerintah Kota/Kabupaten Jawa Timur. JIMAT (Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Akuntansi) Undiksha, 12(3), 717–727.

Mutiha, A. H. (2017). Faktor penentu aksesibilitas internet financial reporting pada e-government pemerintah kota/kabupaten di Jawa Barat.

Nosihana, A., & Yaya, R. (2016). Internet financial reporting dan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhinya pada pemerintah kota dan kabupaten di Indonesia. Jurnal Dinamika Akuntansi dan Bisnis, 3(2), 89–104.

Oktaviani, A. D., Andriati, H. N., & Larasati, R. (2020). Analisis Pengungkapan Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Penerapan Internet Financial Reporting (IFR) Sebagai Voluntary Disclosure Pada Tahun 2014-2018. Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Keuangan Daerah, 15(2), 87–97.

Putri, W., & Setiawan, M. A. (2022). Pengaruh Kekayaan Daerah dan Belanja Daerah terhadap Pengungkapan Internet Financial Reporting (IFR) pada Pemerintah Daerah. JURNAL EKSPLORASI AKUNTANSI, 4(2), 438–448.

Factors Affecting Internet Financial Reporting Disclosure to Provincial Governments in Indonesia

Rulitawati, M. P. I., Ritonga, H. A. H., & Hasibuan, L. (2020). Model Pengelolaan Kinerja Guru. Tunas Gemilang Press.

Styles, A. K., & Tennyson, M. (2007). The accessibility of financial reporting of US municipalities on the Internet. Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management, 19(1), 56–92.