

Results from survey of participants at 2014 Annual Cliometric Society Conference held at Clemson University, May 16-17, 2014.

1. How did the presentation at the Conference help your work?

Identify points that needed clarification. Motivation.

Help improve our work and made it ready for submission for publication

I found it useful that the entire audience was filled with quantitative economic historians--as such, the suggestions given were much more relevant, on-topic, and useful than at some other more general conferences. I came away from the conference with specific action items I knew I'd want to address, as well as confirmation on inklings I had had about which parts of the paper to emphasize/deemphasize.

Some very helpful comments. In the process of incorporating them now.

Suggestions from attendees helped me refine my identification strategy and encouraged me to provide more information on the historical context. Both greatly improved the quality of my work.

Excellent feedback. Amazing networking opportunity.

Intense and useful feedback. New ideas for paper improvement. Met new coauthors

It will improve the forthcoming Lindert-Williamson PUP book on American incomes since 1650.

The audience at Clio is quite probing, so it is an opportunity to check for weaknesses in the research.

2. Please describe the current status of the paper that you presented.

Revised	4
Submitted for pub	4
Forthcoming	1
Book, Princeton University Press	1

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

It allowed me to stay on top of current papers on the frontier of the discipline. It also serves to strengthen my professional network.

Clio is one of the very few conferences I would attend without presenting a paper - which is partly because you also receive some feedback on what you write in your "Research summary", partly because of the good networking opportunities (which stem from, I presume, the small conference size, the high quality of participants and the very personal atmosphere)

I am retired, but it was useful to talk to people about my possible future projects.

I found the discussion of econometric techniques used in the papers by conference participants extremely helpful for my own research.

Introducing me to (a) other work going on, and (b) techniques used by others that could prove useful in my future work.

Seeing what young people are working on.

I learned a great deal from the papers presented, made new connections that could be valuable for future research opportunities, and I furthered my understanding of the unique Cliometrics approach to economic history (and the unique Cliometrics community).

I enjoyed meeting and listening to researchers who make it their business to develop historical data and hypotheses very carefully.

The Clio meeting is central to appreciate the current leading ideas in the discipline and more generally to evaluate the state of the art in terms of theory, history and methodology. It is an extraordinary meeting point between the young generation of cliometricians and the senior scholars.

Contacts and discussions of related research are invaluable aids in research and keeping abreast of the field

Meeting researchers working on topics that are very much related to mine

I learn a lot reading papers, hearing other comments - hence getting insights for my future research. It also helps me hugely in being in touch with up-to-date research in economic history.

4. This is the first conference for which we distributed the Conference book electronically – as a PDF. Please provide suggestions for how we can improve the book's formatting or suggest alternative methods of distribution.

None -- I believe it would have worked well if I had been equipped for it! (More space needed on the iPad...)

I think this worked well. Even though I printed out the papers, it seems rather expensive to send material in paper format (especially to non-US based participants).

I did not like it as well as hard copy.

This was fine

The conference should distribute a book that is specifically formatted for tablets/ipads.

You really need to require authors to imbed their figures and tables in the text of the paper. Otherwise, the reader who does not simply print the entire thing out has to go back and forth from the text to the relevant table or figure at the end of the paper.

Very confusing to try to remember what page you were on with the text or where the relevant table or figure might be.

None

I thought it was great to get a pdf booklet in advance, and I especially appreciated the links within the document that made it easy to flip between papers and sessions. That said, I would have really appreciated a hard copy booklet to make it easier to flip through quickly/easily and read/take notes (or at least the main schedule portion, if not the papers), although I completely understand why this may be logistically difficult and cost-prohibitive.

Hyperlinks to each paper in the booklet and back to the main menu would be very helpful

PDF was excellent, ensured searchability and saves trees. A note is that if this pursued in future, it would be valuable to hold the conference in rooms where all participants have access to a power outlet (continuous use through the day will drain even the most robust batteries).

It would be nice to have better search or find options. For example, find a name in the index and be able to jump to their session.

no suggestions

Honestly, this is annoying. I would like to have a paper book in the old style. You want me to read all the papers, so that I am able to offer comments; I want me to read all the papers. Having to print them all out myself (in large format) is much less convenient than having them already bound in a small format. I used to carry the book with me (eg on planes) and read papers as time arose and write comments in the book. This is more difficult with a bulky stack of papers. I know that dropping the book saves money: but I think that it is a false economy, in terms of the quality of participation at the conference.

5. How did you read the Conference papers?

Computer	7
Reader	5
Printed	9

6. Did you find your neighbor's reading on a computer or tablet distracting?

Yes	1
No	20

7. We experimented with a Friday/Saturday format for the Clemson Conference, partly due to its location. We usually use a Friday afternoon/Saturday/Sunday morning conference format. Which do you prefer? Any comments on the two-day format?

Fri/Sat	13
Fri/Sat/Sun	5

I can only have an opinion for the Europe-based participants who probably prefer the Fr/Sa arrangement given the typical flight schedule Europe-US.

It worked.

first-time attendee - can't really choose

Fri/Sat format eliminated late arrivals and early departures

I have not attended the 3-day version of the conference, but I thought the 2-day version, while intense and a little exhausting, allowed for greater ease of travel/budget management

Everyone was able to relax Saturday evening and enjoy the dinner and post-dinner festivities.

Two days seemed quite sufficient.

There was no Sunday letdown and no early departures

I had to travel on Thursday afternoon; so the conference eats up a chunk of Thursday (as well as Fri-Sat-Sun). The old format took up only Fri-Sat-Sun, so was better.

8. Please make suggestions for improving the conference.

(1) a round table (or a U-shaped) seating arrangement might stimulate discussion (even more) and be perhaps slightly less intimidating for PhD students - we opted for this at the recent EHES Summer School in Berlin (roughly same number of participants) and thought it worked well (2) I thought the invitation on Friday evening to the house of Howard and Pamela Bodenhorn greatly added to the personal character of the conference and it would be nice if this feature could be maintained in future (though I know all this depends on circumstances)

I think I would have benefited from a slightly longer time to present up front, along with a couple slides--I felt that with the 5-min limit at the beginning, I was not able to adequately tee up the paper (particularly its more confusing or methodologically problematic/controversial parts, such as empirical design and robustness) for those that may not have read it/may have forgotten many of the pertinent details since reading it, and thus spent a good amount of time during the questions reiterating things that had been extensively covered in the paper and which usually get a reasonable amount of airtime during my longer conference presentations. I think some of this could have been avoided just by allowing speakers to kick off each session with a 10-15 min talk that allows them to give a brief outline, recap the paper (especially if the paper has been significantly changed or revised since its submission to the booklet), and better set the parameters of discussion, all with the aid of, say, an optional 3 slides max to help organize the key points. This would still leave ample time for questions and discussion, and I suspect discussion might be a bit more productive this way. That said, I understand why the format currently in place has its own advantages and felt it went quite well as it was.

Continue the two day format

The room was too big/the wrong shape (a lecture theater). Clio works best when people are packed into an uncomfortably small room! Then it has a real buzz.

9. What was your overall impression of the conference?

Excellent! Would definitely recommend to others, and hope to participate again in the future.

Great -- good mix of scholar (junior/senior faculty, grad students, etc).

This was a fabulous conference which I greatly enjoyed. The Clio conferences breathe a certain esprit de corps and give participants, by means of a small number of carefully selected papers, a good idea where economic history currently stands. I would like to thank everyone involved in organising this event.

Well run as always.

Very well organised and very beneficial

This conference does an amazing job of creating a network of new phds, rising stars, and big names in the profession. The papers presented are at the frontier of economic history and paper presenters receive incredible feedback from participants.

Very positive. Met a lot of people and got introduced to a wide body of research.

Very good.

I found it a great opportunity to meet a number of other economic historians, especially those that are grad students, and to engage with them and their ideas more deeply than is typically possible in the usual conference. As such, it was a particularly helpful network-building activity--I now know people I can reach out to with questions about very specific methodological issues or a given historical context, and given the small and intense nature of the conference, I know them well enough to feel comfortable reaching out to them in the future. I found the conference useful in obtaining feedback that will improve my paper, and I hope to attend again in the future. Thanks for a great conference!

It was a really great experience. Clio is quite unique in that all attendees have read the presenters' papers and actively engage them in dialog. It is wonderfully helpful for researchers to get in depth feedback from their peers. This forum does an excellent job of facilitating that.

Probably the most useful and productive conference I've attended.

A very interesting conference and valuable feedbacks

Excellent conference, probably the best I attended this year (and that was just as a participant, not as a presenter).

I think it was a spectacular conference for cliometricians.

A great moment!!! A real discussion of the papers. Enough time to have scientific exchanges with all participants.

Excellent experience

Clio has been a spectacular success for decades, and Clemson was no exception. The large share of young scholars really matters (to them, and to the novelty of the arguments from the floor). However, I already expressed my disappointment in their papers: very little historical context, no BIG questions, and an obsession with micro econometrics. Clio needs to recruit more senior people to present work on BIG questions for balance.

I particularly appreciate the format of the conference

I feel that the audience was not as lively as previous years. One issue is that Europeans seem to be more highly represented than in years gone by; the Europeans tend not to ask many questions (I am European, but try not to fall into that category!). My impression is also that fewer senior US researchers come to Clio nowadays - although it may just be that I am getting older, so don't realize how senior they are! If I look at the questions per presentation coefficient of Jeff Williamson, then he was clearly way out in front - it would be good to attract more people like him more regularly (I am thinking of the Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, Greg Clarks, Lee Alstons, Bob Margos of the world).

It was a very good conference, very friendly and that make me want to help to develop the community;