

Financial Disclosure
By Australian Residential Aged Care
Providers: Are They Suffering Dementia?
Dr Erin Poulton, Associate Professor Lisa Barnes & Professor
Frank Clarke
(Newcastle University, Avondale College of Higher Education,
Sydney University)

Abstract

Australia's Residential Aged Care (RAC) Sector is significant in terms of its ageing population, which is consistent with most developed countries. It is therefore vital for stakeholders to have access to RAC providers' financial information to make informed and timely decisions. It is often difficult for stakeholders to accurately compare the financial information of RAC providers due to there being a small timeframe to make decisions with a high emotional content. This research will enable RAC providers and their stakeholders to consider the current level of disclosure required and the level of voluntary disclosures providers in the sector choose to disclose, and whether this level of disclosure is adequate for stakeholders to make informed decisions. Information was gathered from the RAC provider's annual and/or financial reports, to determine their level of financial disclosure, over a three year period. It was found that the RAC providers' level of financial disclosure could be more consistent and adequate by complying with the Australian Financial Reporting Framework, including an independent Audit Report. Hence, this research provides new insights and a basis for further research to determine whether the Australian RAC Sector have improved

their consistency and adequacy of their financial disclosures through the use of the proposed RAC GPFR Framework.

Keywords: RAC Governance, Disclosure, Accountability

1.0 Introduction to the Residential Aged Care (RAC) Sector in Australia

Aged Care, internationally known as elder care, long term care or social care, refers to institutions that provide “care interventions” for the elderly (CEPAR, 2014). The elderly, aged or frail, refers to those aged 65 years and over (ABS, 2006). These institutions assist the elderly in their daily living. This assistance may be required due to a disability, chronic illness, cognitive or physical decline (AIHW, 2012). Much of this care and support is provided informally by family, but there is growing demand for formal aged care (CEPAR, 2014).

Australia’s Aged Care System consists of three core service streams: *residential care*, *community care*, and *flexible care* (AIHW, 2012). Residential Aged Care (RAC) is ‘personal and/or nursing care provided to a person in a residential care service in which the person is also provided with accommodation that includes meals, cleaning services, furniture and equipment’ (AIHW, 2012, p.76). Community care (The Community Aged Care Packages Program) assists older people residing in their own homes, by providing services including home nursing, assistance with meals, shopping, bathing, and transport (ABS, 2010). Flexible care services provide a mixture of residential and community care services (ABS, 2008).

Australian Government–subsidised RAC ‘programs, are available on either a permanent or respite basis’ (AIHW, 2012a, p.4). Permanent RAC is available to people who can no longer be supported living in their community. There are two levels of permanent care, low-care (personal care and accommodation) and high-care (24-hour nursing care), depending on the individual’s assessed needs (DoHA, 2006; 2008). This assessment is based on the person’s cultural, medical, physical, psychological, and social needs (AIHW, 2012). Residents receiving permanent residential low care, require personal care and accommodation. Those receiving permanent residential high care, require twenty-four hour nursing care “in addition to their low care needs” (AIHW, 2012, p.4).

The Australian Government is involved in each aspect of the provision of RAC, to ensure the equitable provision of services. The Government regulates entry into the sector, limits the number and level of places it funds, regulates the standard of care, and provides grants (Hamilton & Menezes, 2011, p.2). For RAC providers to receive government subsidies on their residents' behalf, they must be accredited. For a provider to become accredited, they must receive approval from the Aged Care Standards and Accreditation Agency, and be certified by the DoHA. This process takes into consideration the standard of the provider's buildings, equipment, provision of care and past conduct.

As of 30 June 2011, 169,001 people were living in RAC facilities, nearly all on a permanent basis (98%). Of these 77% were aged eighty and over and 57% were aged eighty-five and over (AIHW, 2012). The majority of people living in Australian RAC facilities are women (70%), aged eighty and over.

This research focuses on the information RAC providers disclose to decision-makers and whether this information meets their needs. Information disclosure is vital for the 'efficient functioning of markets' (Bayoud, 2012, p.76). A lack of information disclosure can result in information asymmetry (IA). IA exists when one group has an information advantage over another. Information plays a vital role in decision-making informed by public (freely available) and private information (that only available, if at all, to limited audiences). Information that managers disclose to the market decreases IA (Lopes and Rodrigues, 2006).

The Australian RAC sector consists of 2,724 facilities of which are operated by 1,069 providers across Australia during the 2011-12 financial year (ABS data collection period). The breakdown for the number of RAC Facilities in the data population, according to their organisational classification, are depicted in Table 1 below. The data population is made up of 2,724 RAC facilities, operated by 1,069 RAC providers. Of the 1,069 RAC providers, 115

(10.8%) are classified as Government, 553 (51.7%) as charitable, community based or religious, and 401 (37.5%) as privately owned or publicly listed.

Table 1: Population RAC Data Sample by Organisational Classification

RAC Data Sample	RAC Facilities (No.)	RAC Facilities (%)	RAC Providers (No.)	RAC Providers (%)
Government	287	10.5	115	10.8
Community/Religious	1,611	59.2	553	51.7
Private Owned/Publicly Listed	826	30.3	401	37.5
Total	2,724	100	1,069	100

2.0 Theoretical Background

Accountability is ‘the perceived need to justify or defend a decision or action to [a particular] audience which has potential reward or sanction power, and where such rewards and sanctions are perceived as contingent on accountability conditions’ (Frink & Klimoski, 1998, p.9). It involves meeting specified duties, expectations and obligations (Weigold & Doherty, 1991; Schlenker & Werigold, 1989; Schlenker, 1986). When individuals are accountable, they attempt to justify their behaviour (Schlenker et al., 1991), while others judge, scrutinise, sanction and possibly reward their actions (Tetlock, 1992, 1985; Semin & Manstead, 1983). Responsibility ‘is the force that binds individuals to events and to relevant prescriptions that govern their conduct’. It provides a basis for sanctioning and judgement (Schlenker et al., 1994). An audience evaluates the individuals’ accountability for their actions and ‘moves the individual from responsibility to accountability (Royle & Hall, 2012).

In an age where there are rapidly globalising economies and increasing access to available information, ‘it is apparent that high profile lapses of accountability occur frequently’ (e.g. the granting of housing loans in the early part of the global financial crisis). Concern is growing in academic literature and the media about the apparent lack of accountability (Royle & Hall,

2012). Accountability is an essential part of life (both personal and organisational) (Tetlock, 1992; 1985). It is 'instrumental in allowing societies to sustain themselves. In the organisational context, a lack of accountability may undermine firms' internal, legitimate, systems of checks and balances, and adversely affect its performance' (Royle & Hall, 2012). Hence, 'accountability in the community denotes a responsibility on the part of members of the community to participate in a network of interactive relationship with a willingness to share information, discuss and find solutions on issues that affect communal values' (Arunachalam, Lawrence, Kelly & Locke, 2007).

The Australian Financial Reporting Framework (AFRF) sets out the guidelines and requirements for accountability in 'general purpose financial reports' (GPFR) and 'special purpose financial reports' (SPFR):

'GPFRs are those intended to meet the needs of users not in a position to demand reports tailored to meet their particular information needs and include full compliance with all relevant Australian accounting standards. GPFR include those that are presented separately or within another public document such as an annual report or prospectus. The alternative, a SPFR, is prepared to meet the needs of the intended users' (Institute of Chartered Accountants Australia, 2013, pp.33-4).

Thus the GRI guidelines, in conjunction with the Australian Institute of Chartered Accountants' reporting checklist, will be used to determine RAC providers' compliance with current reporting requirements.

The Aged Care Financing Authority (ACFA) was established, in August 2012, to provide the Minister with independent advice on the impact of pricing, funding and financing arrangements on aged care services. ACFA is required to annually report on the impact of funding and financing arrangements in relation to:

- the Sustainability and viability of the aged care sector;
- care recipients access to quality aged care; and
- the aged care workforce (Aged Care Financing Authority (ACFA), 2014).

In its inaugural report, ACFA reported that the quality and resultant usability of providers' current General Purpose Financial Reports (GPFRs), were limited in their value for the purpose of undertaking financial analysis and reporting. Therefore, in January 2014, the Assistant Minister for Social Services requested ACFA provide advice on options to improve the collection of appropriate financial data from aged care providers (ACFA, 2014).

In order to improve the value of reporting: the process, outputs and outcomes of statutory reporting should be consistent with and enhance the broader goals of good corporate management and organisational governance; financial information should inform government policy and allow for the setting of future policy directions; and financial information and evidence-based analysis should inform consultation and partnership arrangements between the Government and aged care sector stakeholders (ACFA, 2014).

This leads to the following Research Question: *“Is the disclosure of financial information and compliance with the Australian Financial Reporting Framework of Australian Residential Aged Care providers consistent and adequate?”*


3.0 Empirical Tests

This study investigates publicly available archival data and disclosures of Australian RAC providers. Annual, and financial reports of this study are examined over the period of three years (2013, 2014 and 2015), using archival data. Quantitative content analysis will be undertaken to examine the annual and/or financial reports. During these three years the Australian Government introduced the Living Longer Living Better reforms which are “aimed

at building a better and fairer aged care system” (Australian Government Department of Social Services, 2014, p.2); and the My Aged Care website, designed to improve the disclosure of aged care facilities by developing a central location for users to more easily access vital information in a timely manner.

The sampling frame for this research was taken from the sector-wide statistical data for 2012. Of the 4,586 Aged Care facilities operating across Australia, 2,724 were RAC facilities. A comprehensive electronic search was undertaken to determine the number of Australian RAC facilities that provide public access to their annual report. This resulted in the formation of the 752 sample. Within this sampling frame of 752 RAC facilities, 105 were classified as community based; 200 as charitable; 170 as religious; 220 as Government; 56 as publicly incorporated bodies; and 1 as a publicly listed company. For analysis purposes these RAC facilities were categorised into three groups (Government, community/religious and privately owned/publicly listed), according to their organisational classification. Figure 1 illustrates the distribution of the RAC Facilities for this study.

Figure 1: Australian RAC Facilities Sample Data Set



If any financial data was found, it was analysed for the following information:

- Comprehensive Statement of Income (if this was found, then the following data was gathered according to Pro-forma disclosure)

Table 2: Statement of Comprehensive Income Data Collection

Category	Data Analysis	Description of Process
Revenue/Income	Yes, no or partial information	Search for the word “revenue”, “income” or equivalents
Operating Revenue	Yes, no or partial information	Search for the word “operating revenue”
Specific Revenue	Yes, no or partial information	Search whether the Statement of Comprehensive Income listed the names of the revenue sources
Non-operating Revenue/Other	Yes, no or partial information	Search for the word “non-operating revenue” or “other”
Total Revenue	Yes, no or partial information	Search for the word “total revenue” or a total revenue figure
Net Profit/Surplus	Yes, no or partial information	Search for the word “net profit”, “surplus” or “deficit”
Expenses	Yes, no or partial information	Search for the word “expenses”
Specific Expenses	Yes, no or partial information	Search whether the Statement of Comprehensive Income listed the names of the expense sources
Total Expenses	Yes, no or partial information	Search for the word “total expenses” or a total expenses figure
Comparison to prior year	Yes, no or partial information	Search whether the Statement of Comprehensive Income provides the figures for the previous year to compare results

- Statement of Financial Position (if this was found, then the following data was gathered according to Pro-forma disclosure)

Table 3: Statement of Financial Position Data Collection

Category	Data Analysis	Description of Process
Current Assets (CA)	Yes, no or partial information	Type of asset described (i.e. bank account); order listed to determine if CA; represented as number, %, or as an image (graph or pie chart)
Non-current Assets (NCA)	Yes, no or partial information	Type of asset described (i.e. building); order listed to determine if NCA; represented as number, %, or as an image (graph or pie chart)
Total Assets	Yes, no or partial information	Total figure provided for assets, represented as number, %, or as an image (graph or pie chart)
Current Liabilities (CL)	Yes, no or partial information	Type of liability described (i.e. accounts payable); order listed to determine if CL; represented as number, %, or as an image (graph or pie chart)
Non-current Liabilities (NCL)	Yes, no or partial information	Type of liability described (i.e. bank loan); order listed to determine if NCL; represented as number, %, or as an image (graph or pie chart)
Total Liabilities	Yes, no or partial information	Total figure provided for liabilities, represented as number, %, or as an image (graph or pie chart)
Net Assets	Yes, no or partial information	Figure provided for net assets, represented as number, %, or as an image (graph or pie chart)
Comparison to prior year	Yes, no or partial information	Search whether the Statement of Comprehensive Income provides the figures for the previous year to compare results

At times RAC providers only provided partial information; data was gathered using yes/no or partial (if information was disclosed or available). Other Financial data collected included are shown in the table below:

Table 4: Other Financial Data Collection

Category	Data Analysis	Description of Process
Cash flow Statement	Yes, no or partial information	Operating, financial and investing or partial
Statement of Changes in Equity	Yes, no or partial information	If not-for-profit this may not be applicable
Notes to Financial Statements	Yes, no or partial information	Either present or not
Compliance with GPFR	Yes or no	If the RAC provider has an audit report who's opinion is found to be compliant then the Annual or Financial report is identified as being compliant, otherwise the researcher will determine this based on the presence of the above statements in accordance with GPFR framework

4.0 Results

Financial data were collected in relation to the number and percentage of RAC providers that included their Statement of Comprehensive Income, Statement of Financial Position, Cash Flow Statement, Statement of Changes in Equity, Notes to Financial Statements and their compliance with GPFR. This information was gathered from the RAC providers' annual and/or financial reports, from the period of 2013 through to 2015.

4.0.1 Statement of Comprehensive Income

The inclusion of their Statement of Comprehensive Income increased from 74.1% (146) in 2013 to 78.7% (155) in 2014, but then slightly decreased in their 2015 annual disclosure to 73.1% (144). The partial disclosure remained stagnant from the period of 2013 to 2014 with only 7.6% (15) choosing to account for their annual income and expenses in this form. However, 2015 saw a 1% increase to 16%. Those providers that chose not to include any financial information increased by approximately 5% from the period of 2014 (13.7%) to 2015 (18.8%). When the number of RAC Providers that did not provide a comprehensive Statement of Comprehensive Income are combined with those that only provided partial financial

information, these providers accounted for approximately a quarter (25.9% (51) in 2013, 21.3% (42) in 2014, and 26.9% (53) in 2015) of the sample.

Table 5: Level of Financial Disclosure of Statement of Comprehensive Income

Statement of Comprehensive Income	Number				Percentage (%)			
	Yes	Partial	No	Total	Yes	Partial	No	Total
2015	144	16	37	197	73.1	8.1	18.8	100
2014	155	15	27	197	78.7	7.6	13.7	100
2013	146	15	36	197	74.1	7.6	18.3	100

4.0.2 Statement of Financial Position

The inclusion of their Statement of Financial Position increased from 73.1% (144) in 2013 to 79.2% (156) in 2014, but then slightly decreased in their 2015 annual disclosure to 73.6% (145). The partial disclosure declined slightly from 6.6% (13) in 2013 to 6.1% (12) in 2014. However, 2015 saw a 3% increase to 15% (15), in the number of RAC Providers choosing to report on their financial position in this form. Those providers that chose not to include any financial information increased by approximately 4% from the period of 2014 (14.7%) to 2015 (18.8%). When the number of RAC Providers that did not provide a Statement of Financial Position are combined with those that only provided partial financial information, these providers accounted for approximately a quarter (26.9% (53) in 2013, 20.8% (41) in 2014, and 26.4% (52) in 2015) of the sample.

Table 6: Level of Financial Disclosure of Statement of Financial Position

Statement of Financial Position	Number				Percentage (%)			
	Yes	Partial	No	Total	Yes	Partial	No	Total
2015	145	15	37	197	73.6	7.6	18.8	100
2014	156	12	29	197	79.2	6.1	14.7	100
2013	144	13	40	197	73.1	6.6	20.3	100

4.0.3 Cash Flow Statement

The inclusion of their cash flow statement increased from 68.5% (135) in 2013 to 74.1% (146) in 2014, but then slightly decreased in their 2015 annual disclosure to 67.5% (133). The partial disclosure remained stagnant from the period of 2013 to 2014 with only 0.5% (1) choosing to account for their annual income and expenses in this form. However, 2015 saw no provision of partial information. Those providers that chose not to include any financial information increased by approximately 5.5% from the period of 2014 (25.4%) to 2015 (32.5%). When the number of RAC Providers that did not provide a Statement of Financial Position are combined with those that only provided partial financial information, these providers accounted for an average of 30% (31.5% (62) in 2013, 25.9% (51) in 2014, and 32.5% (64) in 2015) of the sample.

Table 7: Level of Financial Disclosure of Cash Flow Statement

Cash Flow Statement	Number				Percentage (%)			
	Yes	Partial	No	Total	Yes	Partial	No	Total
2015	133	0	64	197	67.5	0	32.5	100
2014	146	1	50	197	74.1	0.5	25.4	100
2013	135	1	61	197	68.5	0.5	31.0	100

4.0.4 Statement of Changes in Equity

The inclusion of their Statement of Changes in Equity increased from 65.0% (128) in 2013 to 70.1% (138) in 2014, but then decreased in their 2015 annual disclosure back down to 65.0% (128). The partial disclosure remained stagnant from the period of 2014 to 2015 with no RAC Facility choosing to account for their annual income and expenses in this form. However, 2013 saw 1 (0.5%) RAC Facility provide a partial statement of equity. Those providers that chose not to include any financial information increased by approximately 5% from the period of 2014 (29.9%) to 2015 (35.0%). When the number of RAC Providers that did not provide a Statement of Financial Position are combined with those that only provided partial financial

information, these providers accounted for an average of 33% (35% (129) in 2013, 29.9% (138) in 2014, and 35.0% (128) in 2015) of the sample.

Table 8: Level of Financial Disclosure of Statement of Equity

Statement of Changes in Equity	Number				Percentage (%)			
	Yes	Partial	No	Total	Yes	Partial	No	Total
2015	128	0	69	197	65.0	0	35.0	100
2014	138	0	59	197	70.1	0	29.9	100
2013	128	1	68	197	65.0	0.5	34.5	100

4.0.5 Notes to Financial Statements

The inclusion of their notes to financial statements increased from 66.0% (130) in 2013 to 69.5% (137) in 2014, but then decreased in their 2015 annual disclosure back down to 64.5% (127). There was no partial disclosure of the notes to financial statements, the RAC Providers either included the financial notes to their accounts or did not. Those providers that chose not to include any financial information increased by 5% from the period of 2014 (30.5%) to 2015 (35.5%). Overall, an average of 66% disclosed their notes to their financial statements in their annual and/or financial reports, throughout the three-year time period.

Table 9: Level of Financial Disclosure of Notes to financial statements

Notes to financial statements	Number				Percentage (%)			
	Yes	Partial	No	Total	Yes	Partial	No	Total
2015	127	0	70	197	64.5	0	35.5	100
2014	137	0	60	197	69.5	0	30.5	100
2013	130	0	67	197	66.0	0	34.0	100

4.0.6 Compliance with GPFR

The level of compliance with GPFR increased from 65.0% (128) in 2013 to 69.5% (137) in 2014, but then decreased in their 2015 annual disclosure back down to 65.0% (128). The partial compliance remained stagnant from the period of 2013 to 2014 with 16.8% (33) of the RAC Providers meeting part of the requirements. However, 2015 saw a decline of 0.6% (1) only partially meeting the GPFR requirements. Those providers that were not compliant (hence did

not disclose any financial information) increased by approximately 5% from the period of 2014 (13.7%) to 2015 (18.8%). When the number of RAC Providers that did not meet the GPFR compliance requirements are combined with those that only partially complied, these providers accounted for an average of 33.5% (35.0% (128) in 2013, 30.5% (137) in 2014, and 35.0% (128) in 2015) of the sample. Therefore, overall, an average of 66.5% complied with the GPFR framework throughout the three-year timeframe.

Table 10: Level of Compliance with GPFR

Compliance with GPFR	Number				Percentage (%)			
	Yes	Partial	No	Total	Yes	Partial	No	Total
2015	128	32	37	197	65.0	16.2	18.8	100
2014	137	33	27	197	69.5	16.8	13.7	100
2013	128	33	36	197	65.0	16.8	18.2	100

4.1 Further Financial Analysis

Further financial analysis was undertaken on the RAC providers' Statement of Comprehensive Income and Statement of Financial Position, across the three-year period (2013-2015). Table 11 provides additional analysis for the Statement of Comprehensive Income. Of the 197 RAC Providers, 74.1% (146) include a Statement of Comprehensive Income in either their annual report and/or financial report. 7.6% (15) provide partial statements, this means they either provide a summarised version, provide a description (usually in the form of a Treasurer's report or a report from the Chief Financial Officer), or provide a pie chart depicting either percentages, total figures (total income, total expenses and net profit) or only a description (no figures). 18.3% (36) of the RAC providers did not provide any financial information in their annual report.

Table 11: 2013 Statement of Comprehensive Income or Statement of Profit and Loss

2013	Number				Percentage (%)			
	Yes	Partial	No	Total	Yes	Partial	No	Total
Statement of Comprehensive Income	146	15	36	197	74.1	7.6	18.3	100
Revenue	155	3	39	197	78.7	1.5	19.8	100
Operating Revenue	139	4	54	197	70.6	2.0	27.4	100
Specific Revenue	64	11	122	197	32.5	5.6	61.9	100
Non-operating Revenue (Other)	132	3	62	197	67.0	1.5	31.5	100
Total Revenue	155	0	42	197	78.7	0	21.3	100
Expenses	153	3	41	197	77.7	1.5	20.8	100
Specific Expenses	147	3	47	197	74.6	1.5	23.9	100
Total Expenses	152	0	45	197	77.2	0	22.8	100
Net Profit	158	0	39	197	80.2	0	19.8	100
Comparison to prior year	154	0	43	197	78.1	0	21.9	100

Table 12 provides additional analysis for the 2014 Statement of Comprehensive Income. Of the 197 RAC Providers, 84.8% (167) include a Statement of Comprehensive Income in either their annual report and/or financial report. 11.1% (22) provide partial statements, this means they either provided a summarised version, a description (usually in the form of a Treasurer's report or Chief Financial Officer's report), or a pie chart depicting either percentages, total figures (total income, total expenses and net profit) or only a description (no figures). 4.1% (4) of the RAC providers did not provide any financial information in their annual report.

Table 12: 2014 Statement of Comprehensive Income or Statement of Profit and Loss

2014	Number				Percentage (%)			
	Yes	Partial	No	Total	Yes	Partial	No	Total
Statement of Comprehensive Income	167	22	8	197	84.8	11.1	4.1	100
Revenue	167	17	13	197	84.8	8.6	6.6	100
Operating Revenue	167	4	26	197	84.8	2.0	13.2	100
Specific Revenue	166	1	30	197	84.3	0.5	15.2	100
Non-operating Revenue (Other)	167	5	25	197	84.8	2.5	12.7	100
Total Revenue	167	8	22	197	84.8	4.0	11.2	100
Expenses	167	17	13	197	84.8	8.6	6.6	100
Specific Expenses	167	8	22	197	84.8	4.0	11.2	100
Total Expenses	167	1	29	197	84.8	0.5	14.7	100
Net Profit	167	10	20	197	84.8	5.0	10.2	100
Comparison to prior year	167	8	22	197	84.8	4.0	11.2	100

Table 13 provides additional analysis for the 2015 Statement of Comprehensive Income. Of the 197 RAC Providers, 73.1% (144) include a Statement of Comprehensive Income in either their annual report and/or financial report. 8.1% (16) provided partial statements, this means they either provide a summarised version, a description (usually in the form of a Treasurer's report or Chief Financial Officer's report), or a pie chart depicting either percentages, total figures (total income, total expenses and net profit) or only a description (no figures). 18.8% (37) of the RAC providers did not provide any financial information in their annual report.

Table 13: 2015 Statement of Comprehensive Income or Statement of Profit and Loss

2015	Number				Percentage (%)			
	Yes	Partial	No	Total	Yes	Partial	No	Total
Statement of Comprehensive Income	144	16	37	197	73.1	8.1	18.8	100
Revenue	153	5	39	197	77.7	2.5	19.8	100
Operating Revenue	136	6	55	197	69.0	3.0	28.0	100
Specific Revenue	68	15	114	197	34.5	7.6	57.9	100
Non-operating Revenue (Other)	133	3	61	197	67.5	1.5	31.0	100
Total Revenue	159	0	38	197	80.7	0	19.3	100
Expenses	152	4	41	197	77.2	2.0	20.8	100
Specific Expenses	149	5	43	197	75.6	2.5	21.9	100
Total Expenses	155	0	42	197	78.7	0	21.3	100
Net Profit	155	0	42	197	78.7	0	21.3	100
Comparison to prior year	149	0	48	197	75.6	0	24.4	100

Table 14 provides additional analysis for the 2013 Statement of Financial Position. Of the 197 RAC Providers, 72.6% (143) include a Statement of Financial Position in either their annual report and/or financial report. 7.1% (14) provided partial statements, this means they either provided a summarised version, a description (usually in the form of a Treasurer's report or Chief Financial Officer's report), or provided a pie chart depicting either percentages, total figures (total assets, total liabilities and net assets) or only a description (no figures). 20.3% (40) of the RAC providers did not provide any financial information in their annual report. Out of the 143 RAC Providers that provided a Statement of Financial Position 5 did not disclose their current assets (CA), non-current assets (NCA), current liabilities (CL), or non-current liabilities (NCL). These figures indicate that the Majority of RAC Providers provided a Statement of Financial Position in their annual and/or financial report. They also indicate that the number of RAC Providers that provided a Statement of Comprehensive Income also provided a Statement of Financial Position, with the exception of 3 RAC providers, whom

disclosed their Statement of Comprehensive Income but not their Statement of Financial Position.

Table 14: 2013 Statement of Financial Position

2013	Number				Percentage (%)			
	Yes	Partial	No	Total	Yes	Partial	No	Total
Statement of Financial Position	143	14	40	197	72.6	7.1	20.3	100
Current Assets	147	5	45	197	74.6	2.5	22.9	100
Non-current Assets	145	5	47	197	73.6	2.5	23.9	100
Total Assets	155	1	41	197	78.7	0.5	20.8	100
Current Liabilities	147	5	45	197	74.6	2.5	22.9	100
Non-current Liabilities	145	5	47	197	73.6	2.5	23.9	100
Total Liabilities	153	1	43	197	77.7	0.5	21.8	100
Net Assets	152	0	45	197	77.2	0	22.9	100

Table 15 provides additional analysis for the Statement of Financial Position. Of the 197 RAC Providers, 84.8% (167) include a Statement of Financial Position in either their annual report and/or financial report. 9.6% (19) provide partial statements, this means they either provide a summarised version, provide a description (usually in the form of a Treasurer's report or Chief Financial Officer's report), or provide a pie chart depicting either percentages, total figures (total assets, total liabilities and net assets) or only a description (no figures). 5.6% (11) of the RAC providers did not provide any financial information in their annual report. Out of the 167 RAC Providers that provided a Statement of Financial Position 2 did not disclose their non-current assets (NCA) or non-current liabilities (NCL) as they did not have any to disclose. These figures indicate that the Majority of RAC Providers provide a Statement of Financial Position in their annual and/or financial report. They also indicate that the number of RAC Providers that provided a Statement of Comprehensive Income also provided a Statement of Financial Position.

Table 15: 2014 Statement of Financial Position

2014	Number				Percentage (%)			
	Yes	Partial	No	Total	Yes	Partial	No	Total
Statement of Financial Position	167	19	11	197	84.8	9.6	5.6	100
Current Assets	167	0	30	197	84.8	0.0	15.2	100
Non-current Assets	165	0	32	197	83.8	0.0	16.2	100
Total Assets	167	17	13	197	84.8	8.6	6.6	100
Current Liabilities	167	0	30	197	84.8	0.0	15.2	100
Non-current Liabilities	163	0	34	197	82.7	0.0	17.3	100
Total Liabilities	167	15	15	197	84.8	7.6	7.6	100
Net Assets	167	9	21	197	84.8	4.5	10.7	100

Table 16 provides additional analysis for the 2015 Statement of Financial Position. Of the 197 RAC Providers, 74.1% (146) included a Statement of Financial Position in either their annual report and/or financial report. 7.1% (14) provided partial statements, this means they either provide a summarised version, a description (usually in the form of a Treasurer's report or Chief Financial Officer's report), or a pie chart depicting either percentages, total figures (total assets, total liabilities and net assets) or only a description (no figures). 18.8% (37) of the RAC providers did not provide any financial information in their annual report. Out of the 146 RAC Providers that provided a Statement of Financial Position 9 did not disclose their current assets (CA) or current liabilities (CL), and 10 did not disclose their non-current assets or non-current liabilities (NCL). These figures indicate that the Majority of RAC Providers provide a Statement of Financial Position in their annual and/or financial report. They also indicate that the number of RAC Providers that provided a Statement of Comprehensive Income also provided a Statement of Financial Position, with the exception of 2 RAC providers that disclosed their Statement of Financial Position but not their Statement of Comprehensive Income.

Table 16: 2015 Statement of Financial Position

2015	Number				Percentage (%)			
	Yes	Partial	No	Total	Yes	Partial	No	Total
Statement of Financial Position	146	14	37	197	74.1	7.1	18.8	100
Current Assets	147	9	41	197	74.6	4.6	20.8	100
Non-current Assets	146	10	41	197	74.1	5.1	20.8	100
Total Assets	160	0	37	197	81.2	0	18.8	100
Current Liabilities	147	9	41	197	74.6	4.6	20.8	100
Non-current Liabilities	143	10	44	197	72.6	5.1	22.3	100
Total Liabilities	158	0	39	197	80.2	0	19.8	100
Net Assets	154	0	43	197	78.1	0	21.9	100

Table 17 presents a summary of the comparative statistical analysis of the RAC Providers' non-financial, financial and social (governance and sustainability) disclosure, averaged over the three-year period (2013-2015).

Table 17: Summary of the Financial Statistical Analysis

Financial	Government	Privately Owned /Publicly Listed	Community /Religious
Comprehensive Income Statement	95.0%	60.0%	63.5%
Statement of Financial Position	95.0%	60.0%	64.0%
Cash Flow Statement	94.0%	60.0%	51.0%
Statement of Changes in Equity	94.0%	60.0%	44.4%
Notes to Financial Statements	93.1%	60.0%	45.1%
Compliance with GPFR	93.1%	60.0%	44.8%


5.0 Summary and Conclusions

The results indicated a significant association between each of the financial variables and their level of disclosure. There was a strong positive relationship between the RAC providers' level of financial disclosure. The RAC providers' that chose to disclose their Statement of Comprehensive Income also tended to disclose their Statement of Financial Position, Cash Flow Statement and Statement of Changes in Equity. The same relationship was present between each of the combinations of the Statement of Financial Position, Cash Flow Statement and Statement of Changes in Equity.

The Financial disclosure results indicated a significant positive relationship between the RAC provider's organisational classification and their disclosure of their Statement of Comprehensive Income, Statement of Financial Position, Cash Flow statement, Statement of changes in Equity, notes to financial statements. Hence, as the level of financial disclosure increases, the RAC provider's disclosure of their financial statements and notes also increase.

The RAC GPFR Framework (Figure 2) illustrates the essential components that the RAC Sector should be disclosing in relation to their financial disclosure. The inner most circle labelled "GPFR" (General Purpose Financial Reporting) refers to the guidelines and requirements set out by the Australian Financial Reporting Framework. The GPFR is comprised of four financial statements (Comprehensive Statement of Comprehensive Income, Statement of Financial Position, Cash Flow Statement, and Statement of Changes in Equity [where applicable]) and the Notes to the financial statements. GPFR requires full compliance with the relevant AASB (Australian Accounting Standards Board) and the 2001 Corporations Act. The final component includes an external Audit of the financial statements to ensure compliance with AASB and the Corporations Act 2001. The Audit report and the auditor's statement of independence should form part of the RAC Sectors annual financial disclosure.

Figure 2: RAC GPFR Framework



This research answers the following research question **RQ**: Is the disclosure of financial information and compliance with the Australian Financial Reporting Framework of Australian Residential Aged Care providers adequate? This leads to the following conclusion: *Conclusion the level of financial disclosure could be more consistent and adequate by complying with the Australian Financial Reporting Framework, including an independent Audit Report.*

Australia's Residential Aged Care (RAC) Sector is significant in terms of its ageing population, which is consistent with most developed countries. It is therefore vital for stakeholders to have access to RAC providers' financial information to make informed and timely decisions. It is often difficult for stakeholders to accurately compare the financial information of RAC providers due to there being a small timeframe to make decisions with a high emotional content. Therefore, the RAC GPFR Framework was developed to address this lack of adequate and consistent disclosure in the Australian RAC Sector.

References

Aged Care Financing Authority (ACFA). (2014). Report on the Funding and Financing of the Aged Care Industry. Retrieved from <https://agedcare.health.gov.au/aged-care-reform/reforms-by-topic/aged-care-financing-authority/2014-report-on-the-funding-and-financing-of-the-aged-care-industry>

Arunachalam, M., Lawrence, S., Kelly, M., & Locke, J. (2007). A communitarian approach to constructing accountability and strategies for sustainable abstract development. *Issues in Social and Environmental Accounting*, 1(2), 217-242.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). (2006). Managing Care and Work, New South Wales (March 20, 2013). Retrieved from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/dossbytitle/2E7B17F7B150B652CA2572960074AB4F?OpenDocument>

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). (2008). The Health and Welfare of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples (April 2008 #4704.0). Retrieved from <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/39433889d406eeb9ca2570610019e9a5/4C2FC9349E39F808CA2574390014D20B?opendocument>

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). (2010). Population by Age and Sex, Australian States and Territories (Jun 2010 #3201.0). Retrieved from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/3201.0>

Australian Government Department of Social Services. (2014). Publishing accommodation pricing and key features information: Best Practice Guide. Retrieved from https://agedcare.health.gov.au/sites/g/files/net1426/f/documents/10_2014/publishing_accomm_prices_best_practice_guide_-_web_accessible.docx

Australian Institute of Company Directors. (2011). Organisation Definitions. Retrieved from <http://www.companydirectors.com.au/Director-Resource-Centre/Organisation-Type/Organisation-definitions>

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). (2012). Residential Aged Care in Australia 2010-11: A Statistical Overview (no. 36. cat no. 68). Retrieved from <http://www.aihw.gov.au/publication-detail/?id=10737422821>

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). (2012a). Residential aged care and aged care packages in the community 2011-12. Retrieved from <http://www.aihw.gov.au/aged-care/residential-and-community-2011-12/>

Bayoud, N. S. M. (2012). Corporate social responsibility disclosure and organisational performance: The case of Libya, a mixed methods study (PhD thesis, University of Southern Queensland). Retrieved from <http://trove.nla.gov.au/version/196982501>

CEPAR (Centre of Excellence in Population Ageing Research). (2014). Aged Care in Australia: Part 1 – Policy, demand and funding. Retrieved from http://www.cepar.edu.au/media/127442/aged_care_in_australia_-_part_i_-_web_version_fin.pdf

Department of Health and Ageing (DoHA). (2006). Aged care assessment and approval guidelines 2006. Canberra.

Department of Health and Ageing (DoHA). (2008). Ageing and aged care in Australia. Canberra.Eng, L. L., & Mak, Y.T. (2003). Corporate governance and voluntary disclosure. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 22, 325–345.

Frink, D. D., & Klimoski, R. J. (1998). *Toward a theory of accountability in organizations and human resource management*. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Hamilton, S. D., & Menezes, F. M. (2011). Embedded incentives in the funding arrangements for residential aged care in Australia. *Economic Papers: A Journal of Applied Economics and Policy*, 30(3), 326-340.

Institute of Chartered Accountants Australia. (2013). Enhancing Not-for-Profit Annual and Financial Reporting. Retrieved from <http://www.charteredaccountants.com.au/NFP>

Lopes, P. T., & Rodrigues, L. L. (2006). Accounting for financial instruments: An analysis if the determinants of disclosure in the Portuguese stock exchange, FEP Working Papers, Research Paper Series, (106).

Royle, M. T., & Hall, A. T. (2012). The relationship between McClelland's theory of needs, feeling individually accountable, and informal accountability for others. *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 5(1), 21-43.

Schlenker, B. R. (1986). *Personal accountability: Challenges and impediments in the quest for excellence*. Technical report prepared for the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, CA.

Schlenker, B. R., & Weigold, M. F. (1989). Self-identification and accountability. In R. A. Giacalone, & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Impression management in the organization* (21-43). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schlenker, B. R., Weigold, M. F., & Doherty, K. (1991). Coping with accountability: Self-identification and evaluative reckonings. In C. R. Snyder, & D. R. Forsyth (Eds.), *Handbook of social and clinical psychology* (pp. 96-115). New York: Free Press.

Schlenker, B. R., Britt, T. W., Pennington, J., Murphy, R., & Doherty, K. (1994). The triangle model of responsibility. *Psychological Review*, 77, 419-426.

Semin, G. R., & Manstead, A. (1983). *The accountability of conduct: A social psychological analysis*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Tetlock, P. E. (1985). Accountability: The neglected social context of judgement and choice. In L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (7, 297-332). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Tetlock, P. E. (1992). The impact of accountability on judgement and choice: Toward a social contingency model. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 331-77). New York: Academic Press.