

3) If you participated at the conference without presenting, how was your participation beneficial to your research and professional activity?

I was especially impressed & enthusiastic about the Tucson papers & discussion. Will be/has been very helpful in identifying referees and scouting for papers (though, by tradition, we do not solicit contributions)

I find attendance at Clio conferences beneficial because it puts me in touch with the young scholars invited to attend. I also like that invitations are extended internationally. At the last two conferences, I interacted with many people I had never met before. It was good to have an opportunity to engage in extended discussions with them. I also had several conversations about potential collaborations. None have come to anything yet, but the wheels were put in motion.

Clio is uniquely stimulating. There's no other conference experience like it. Even if one doesn't present a paper, it is stimulating to spend two days of intensive discussion about economic history broadly with other colleagues. What are the most compelling questions? Where is the discipline methodologically and where is it headed? Also there are few alternative venues for getting to know the work of graduate students and giving them a chance to get to know people in the profession they might not otherwise meet.

It was a great opportunity to meet people working in economic history, and hear their views on the papers presented. While I didn't get a lot out of the papers on the program, talking to presenters and non-participants outside of the sessions has been valuable for my own research. In particular, the opportunity to talk to scholars like Price Fishback, George Boyer, Ann Carlos, Jeremy Atack, Michael Haines, Karen Clay and others was invaluable.

Even paper-presenters benefit from the discussion of the other papers. One gets a solid introduction to the frontiers of research on other topics, new methods, etc.

The format where the discussion of the paper takes up most of the time was particularly useful. As a participant, intensively reading and discussing papers on topics not necessarily closely related to my own area was interesting and stimulating. For the paper presenters also I think it was useful to get many perspectives. I also got to meet people working on similar issues. Since it was a small group I was able to discuss my work with them in depth, which was very useful. It was also a good way to meet the future co-authors.

My participation was beneficial to my research in stimulating discussion on a paper I was writing with Carol Leonard who also attended and discussing it with other participants. I also enjoyed being able to discuss the other papers in such a stimulating and collegial environment.

The conference was great for its small scale and intimate setting with lots of interaction with paper givers and other attendees. The www and working paper distribution services allow broad access to new unpublished work, but the conference permits personal interaction which is especially valuable for someone like me since I teach at a small liberal arts institution without a seminar series.

I always enjoy seeing what my colleagues are doing in terms of research. I particularly appreciate learning about the work of my younger colleagues.

3) If you participated at the conference without presenting, how was your participation beneficial to your research and professional activity?

Great overview of current cutting-edge research in economic history

The first benefit, of course, was in the contacts made. This is an amazing way for graduate students to be introduced to the profession. It is a much less overwhelming setting than the EHA meetings, and it made my EHA experience that much richer as I already knew several people from my Clio experience. Keep bringing grad students into the fold! The second benefit was in motivation and inspiration. The papers and comments made me want to be a better cliometrician and gave me new motivation for my own research in the hopes that it will eventually be worthy of a Clio spot.

I met valuable contacts undertaking complementary research to my own. With one, I am now discussing collaboration and future research plans. I also continued to develop work relationships with colleagues I greatly respect.

I and my co-author attended, and it was very helpful. Because she is not a historian, but rather, a macroeconomist and econometrician, the meeting allowed her to discuss economic history in some depth perhaps for the first time she has done so. It was also helpful in giving a survey of current work and current thinking. It was invaluable.

Unusually intense discussions, as participants had read the papers very carefully. Very good networking opportunity due to the small number of participants

Learned about latest research, especially from younger Cliometricians.

It was very useful to meet and talk to the relevant people on the field. I had never been in a conference with such a format, so I learned a lot with the type of interaction between speakers and audience, which is quite different from the regular conference format.

Yes, I gained several new insights and citations to sources.

I chaired a session and participated in discussions. I also struck up a friendship with Prof Careras from Spain, and he sent me his compilation of Spanish historical statistics. I enjoyed all of the papers and the discussions of them, and several were relevant to my own research.

It helped me renew professional contacts. It also helped me to become more familiar with the latest work in economic history.

It is very useful to see work in progress to know what topics are currently of interest & how colleagues react to them.

3) If you participated at the conference without presenting, how was your participation beneficial to your research and professional activity?

Very beneficial, mostly through discussions with other participants that related directly to my own research, as well as learning from reading the conference papers and hearing the discussions.

I was especially impressed & enthusiastic about the Tucson papers & discussion. Will be/has been very helpful in identifying referees and scouting for papers (though, by tradition, we do not solicit contributions)

None of the papers were on my specific field of study, so the conferences benefited me in these ways:
1. Keeping me up to date with the field.
2. Helping me to keep in touch with colleagues in the field.
3. I will suggest that my department use one of the paper presented at the conference for next year's comprehensive exam.

Although there was little directly related to my current research, I always find the conference to be stimulating and to benefit my research through the opportunity to talk with people who I know to be doing similar things. I return with many new ideas.

I found it very helpful to hear presentations from young people in our field, since we run a workshop at my institution with outside speakers and it was useful to learn who would be a stimulating presenter for our series. Also I was able to talk to a researcher from across the country and formulate an idea for a joint paper, which we are now working on.

THE CONFERENCE WAS BENEFICIAL IN THREE WAYS. FIRST, I WAS ABLE TO SEE CUTTING-EDGE RESEARCH, IN ITS EARLIEST STAGES, ACROSS A LARGE SET OF ECONOMIC HISTORY TOPICS. SECONDLY, I WAS ABLE TO HEAR THE QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE OTHER PARTICIPANTS, WHICH ALLOWED ME CONTRIBUTED TO MY KNOWLEDGE IN THE SEVERAL AREAS IN WHICH I AM NOT AN EXPERT. FINALLY, THE ASSOCIATION WITH OTHER SCHOLARS DURING BREAKS, MEALS, AND RECEPTIONS ALLOWED ME TO FURTHER EXPAND ON THE FIRST TWO ITEMS ABOVE AND TO MAKE SCHOLARLY CONTACTS THAT WILL, HOPEFULLY, EXTEND BEYOND THE CONFERENCE.

Two of the early-stage research projects presented at the conference are very much related to my research. I did not have any prior knowledge of them. The work of one of the presenters will be very useful in an upcoming book chapter of mine.

Even though I was not presenting a paper, my participation at the conference was highly beneficial. It introduced me to the academic circle of the Cliometric Society. This allowed me to get to know current research on my area of expertise and related areas, as well as to get in touch with future employers.

First of all, I had the opportunity to meet a person who has been doing research on the same subject I am, and our conversations have been developing to a new joint paper. Secondly, I had the opportunity to advertise my research to many scholars who attended the conference, receiving valuable comments. Thirdly, even though the papers presented did not directly relate to my research topic, some of the papers showed quantitative approach that I might be able to apply to my own research.

3) If you participated at the conference without presenting, how was your participation beneficial to your research and professional activity?

I have learned a great deal about the many different topics from listening to and discussing the other 11 papers at the conference.

As a senior member of the Cliometrics Profession it was very satisfying to meet talented young people. At this particular Conference I learned of some new technical literature on finance that I am going to use in my next work.

It is most useful to keep abreast of the new research and techniques being employed in economic history. I always enjoy Clio because everyone attends and participates in the discussion. Oftentimes the most useful comments come from participants who might not have otherwise been present.

I discussed my current research with several people who gave me valuable advice and leads for further information.

It was great to see current issues in economic history. Also, I had a great time to share research ideas with other researchers. The conference would definitely stimulate my research.

I heard excellent discussions of state-of-the-art econometric methods and research techniques, in particular methods for analyzing panel data. Some of the papers--in particular the papers on German trade and on infant mortality--represented break through in their respective areas and contributed substantially to my general knowledge of economic history. The networking with both younger and older scholars alerted me to interesting ongoing projects (that I had not previously been aware of) and to potential opportunities to engage in collaborative research.

It was extremely helpful. Not only did I learn how to structure papers and improve the statistical work of my own papers from reading what was presented, but I also learned a lot from the discussions. The sessions were like taking a methods class for economic history. The meeting was very instructive and the discussions after the meeting were also incredibly helpful and interesting.

Because I am at a small public liberal arts college that focuses on teaching, Clio helps me stay connected to current work in the field. It is the most intellectually stimulating conference I attend. Its most direct pay off is in my classrooms--I nearly always find that I either use some of the information as examples of basic economic principles or to illuminate how economic history is written. My own scholarship is enriched by being able to run new ideas by others who are more actively involved in research and I never come away without a list of suggestions for more quantitative approaches or recent work I might have overlooked.

was very beneficial. I got a good look at the work of many young scholars and a sense of their ability to think on their feet. I got some ideas of how to better package my research.

Am not a cliometrician, so it was a good opportunity to learn about the field and the state of research in the area.

3) If you participated at the conference without presenting, how was your participation beneficial to your research and professional activity?

A.) I gained specific knowledge that I will use in my research; specifically the paper presented by Joe Mason used a new (to me) empirical methodology to look at the impact of bank failures in the Depression, and I may use this methodology in my work; Also Regina Grafe's study of commercial institutions in pre-modern Europe both suggested a methodology and also documented facts that I didn't know. B.) I gained general back ground knowledge in economic history that will be likely to improve my teaching in economic history, and my general professional knowledge (useful for example in refereeing, editing, grant reviewing). C.) I met exciting younger economic historians and so now when I have a question I can't answer I know where to turn.

Yes, I gained several new insights and citations to sources.

The major benefits to my research came from the opportunity to meet many new members of the profession and learn about their research interests. Hearing the research presentations was also helpful both for exposure to topics and techniques that are in the cutting edge of the field. Finally the opportunity for informal interaction with other cliometricians was valuable.

I learned about some of the latest research in fields outside my own detailed area. This will definitely be useful in teaching, possibly helpful in thinking about future research projects, and advising students about their dissertations.

I got an overview about current US topics in economic history. As a European PhD student this was very valuable for me. I got to know the relevant people in the US market, and extremely enjoyed the discussions. The rather informal and yet intensive atmosphere was the best environment for scientific exchange I ever was exposed to, and met my high expectations.

It is very useful to see work in progress to know what topics are currently of interest & how colleagues react to them.

I really enjoyed the conference. There are several papers that directly relate to my research. For others, the discussion has brought forth quite a lot of research ideas for my future papers.