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In 1974, The Academy of Accounting Historians established the Working Paper Series to provide Academy members a means of exposing historical research to a wider audience, exchanging of ideas, and providing feedback from other qualified persons interested in research.

As of December 1988, 76 working papers have been published. Working Papers Numbers 1 through 60 have been bound in three volumes. Volume 1 contains Working Papers Numbers 1-20, Volume 2 contains Working Papers Numbers 21-40, and Volume 3 contains Working Papers Numbers 41-60. The titles of papers appearing in Volumes 1-3 and information for ordering these volumes are presented in an appendix to this article. A thousand copies of each volume were initially published; however, only a small inventory of each volume remains. It is anticipated that a fourth volume containing Working Papers Numbers 61-80 will be published in 1989.

It is estimated that since the Series started, 16,000 copies of individual working papers have been distributed and 800 copies of each of the Volumes 1-3 have been sold. Working papers are published on an irregular basis and are distributed to those whose names appear on a compiled mailing list that includes a broad readership including officers of leading professional accounting associations, members of accounting standard-setting bodies, editors of academic and professional accounting journals, and historian and nonhistorian scholars. In 1982, a Review Board was established as part of the review process of the Working Paper Series. Currently, manuscripts submitted for publication as working papers are reviewed by at least two of the following members of the Review Board: Edward A. Becker (Nova University), Doris M. Cook (University of Arkansas), Hans J. Dykxhoorn (Western Michigan University), O. Finley Graves (University of Mississippi), Dahlia Gray (American University), Harvey Mann (Brock University), Patti Mills (Indiana State University), or Owen B. Moseley (Arkansas State University).

Since it has been fifteen years from the time the Working Papers Series was established, it seemed appropriate to undertake a study to evaluate the Series and the extent to which its objectives have been achieved. To obtain information about the Working Paper Series, a questionnaire containing nine questions was designed and mailed to authors of the seventy-six published working papers. In cases of coauthored working papers, the questionnaire was sent only to the author that was listed first. Responses were received from 55 authors representing a 72 percent response rate.

Question one was concerned with determining whether the manuscripts submitted for publication as working papers were considered by the authors as completed papers or as incomplete research papers on which feedback was desired for further refinement and publication elsewhere.
Approximately 74 percent of the authors considered the papers they submitted as completed research. About 24 percent of the authors desired feedback on their research in order to further refine their papers.

Questions two and three were concerned with determining whether the authors had published their research papers prior to their publication as working papers. Approximately 10 percent of the authors had published their research papers prior to submitting them for publication as working papers; a majority of these authors had published an abstract or part of their papers in the Proceedings of an American Accounting Association meeting.

Questions four and five were concerned with determining whether the working papers were subsequently reprinted or published. Results indicate that 12 working papers (22 percent) were subsequently reprinted or published in other outlets. Reprinted working papers were defined as those working papers that were reprinted substantially in their original form, whereas published working papers were defined as those working papers that were published after having been expanded or revised from their original form. It is interesting to note, that eleven of the twelve authors that subsequently had their working papers reprinted or published considered their manuscripts incomplete research at the time they were submitted as working papers. See information in Table 1 concerning where working papers have subsequently appeared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Reprint or Publication</th>
<th>No. of Working Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Accountancy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Historians Journal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Accounting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting History (England)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeding of AAA Regional Meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Chapter in a Book or Monograph</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Question six, the authors were asked how their published working papers were viewed in their annual evaluation at their universities. Eighteen percent of the authors indicated that their published working papers were valued equally with published articles in their annual evaluations. Approximately 55 percent of the authors indicated that their working papers were valued but not equally with published articles. Fifteen percent of the authors indicated that their working papers did not count in their annual evaluations. The remainder of the authors qualified their responses to this question.

In Questions seven and eight, and nine the authors were asked to evaluate the working papers. More specifically, in Question seven the authors were asked to identify the benefits to them of having published their papers in the Working Papers Series. A majority of the authors made favorable comments concerning the Series and they indicated that they had benefited in various ways from having published their papers in the Working Papers Series. Some of the typical favorable comments were as follows:

- **Personal satisfaction.**
- [Working Paper] has received many citations.
- Impetus to start and finish a book [on the topic].
- Have received some feedback [for further research].
- Exposure of research which would not have been made available.
- Provided my students with a formal...
reference to some of my works. Because I had to revise my paper twice before it was finally accepted, I learned a great deal about editing and editors. Assisted in tenure and promotion. [Provided] the networking and resultant co-authorship of other historical publications.

In addition to the above favorable comments, one author commented unfavorably by indicating that he had "received no feedback whatsoever on the working paper." The particular working paper being referred to here was published prior to the establishment of the Review Board in 1982. As indicated earlier, currently papers submitted for publication as working papers are reviewed by at least two reviewers and the authors receive feedback from the reviewers.

In Question eight the authors were asked to comment on their overall evaluation of the Working Papers Series. Once again, responses were overwhelmingly favorable. A sample of the typical comments were as follows:

An interesting mixture of topics & authors. The Working Paper Series fills a role by presenting material that for various reasons may not be found in journals, but yet should be available to researchers.

Good. I have used several of them in my own research and have also used material from others for lectures in other courses.

I think that the Working Paper Series is a very useful forum. The wide range of articles covered . . .provided meaningful areas of interest for accounting scholars.

Very good and informative. Most appear to be high quality research.

They vary significantly in quality, which is as it should be.

There was only one unfavorable comment. This author stated that "It [Working Paper Series] is a waste of time, money, and effort. It should be discontinued." It is interesting to note that this comment was made by the same author that made the unfavorable comment referred to in Question seven above.

Finally, in Question nine the authors were asked for any additional comments that they might have concerning the Working Papers Series. The responses to this question were varied in nature and some typical comments were as follows:

The Working Paper Series should continue.

Please continue to encourage new authors.

Maintain refereeing process.

Hope that revisions are still required.

Keep the Series—don’t let evaluation process kill it.

The Working Paper Series should be expanded to include transcripts of oral histories.

An index of key ideas, issues, etc. may be a useful addition to this publication.

These suggestions provide the editor of the Working Paper Series some input into establishing future direction and policies of the Series.

Summary and Conclusion

The analysis of the responses received in this survey indicated that the Working Papers Series is perceived by the authors as a valuable means of exposing their historical research to a wider audience, exchanging of ideas, and providing feedback from other qualified persons interested in research. In this regard, it appears that the Working Paper Series is accomplishing the
objectives established in 1974. Additionally, the subsequent reprint and publication of some working papers, the large number of individual working papers distributed, and the significant number of bound Volumes 1-3 sold indicate that the Series has been received well.

APPENDIX

The titles of the first 60 working papers and the respective volume in which they appear are listed below:

Working Papers 1-20 Volume 1

Working Paper Number

Working Papers 21-40 Volume 2

Working Paper Number
35. “Sombart on Accounting History,” by Kenneth S. Most.
37. “Historical Overview of Developments in Cost and Managerial Accounting,” by M. Zafer Iqbal.
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tion,” by Stanley C.W. Salvary.

Working Papers 41-60 Volume 3

Working Paper Number


44. “Philosophies of History—Their Basic Tenants,” by Owen B. Moseley and Milton F. Usty.


60. “The Development of Accounting in the West, China and Japan,” by Robert Gardella.

The cost of each volume is $7.50 (U.S.) to members and $15.00 (U.S.) to nonmembers. To order these volumes, please photocopy this section, complete the information required, and along with a check payable to the Academy of Accounting Historians, mail to:

The Academy of Accounting Historians
School of Accounting
James Madison University
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22807

No. of Copies

Volume 1

Volume 2

Volume 3

Name

(Please print or type)

Address


NOTABLE ACCOUNTANTS

Copies of Biographies of Notable Accountants can be obtained free of charge from Random House (newly acquired by McGraw-Hill) for class use. To date there are two editions; the first is edited by Horace Givens and the second by Abdel Agami. If you need copies for your classes write to:

Ms. Katherine Woods,
Developmental Editor
Business Group
McGraw-Hill Book Company
College Division
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020
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