

Research Statement

Evangelos Constantinou

I am a microeconomist with specialization in political economy and industrial organization. I work on questions on political communication, timing of elections and firm pricing. Methodologically, my research relies on both applied theory and empirical techniques — both reduced-form and structural. In this statement, I summarize my current papers on targeting of political ads and firm pricing, and discuss my ongoing research on free-riding in political advertising, sequential elections, and airline switching costs.

"Messaging the Bases: Tailoring Ads to Audiences" (Job market paper)

In my job market paper, I theoretically and empirically examine how politicians strategically vary ad content and placement to reflect the political makeup of audiences in tv shows to invoke desired electoral reactions. A correctly-placed and designed ad energizes a politician's base and depresses the opponent's. I develop a model of political advertising by extending Adams and Merrill's (2003) model of voter abstention. Politicians can select ads that affect the salience of policy positions or highlight valence (non-policy) attributes via positive ads about themselves or negative ads about the opponent. In turn, the ads a voter consumes affect their choice of preferred candidate, and their decision whether to abstain from voting due to either alienation or indifference. In the former, the cost of voting exceeds the utility the voter derives from voting for their preferred candidate, and in the latter the utility difference between the candidates is less than the cost of voting. I theoretically characterize how the optimal composition of ads varies with audience demographics. This contributes to the political advertising literature by allowing politicians to tailor messages that target specific components of the voters' utility given the latter's ideology and margin of abstention.

I test the predictions of the model using the U.S. gubernatorial and presidential elections in 2008 and 2012. In order to identify the types of ads used on different tv shows, I transcribe the different ads in states with competitive contests, and use the texts to classify each ad as either policy, positive valence or negative valence ad. Specifically, I split each text into individual statements, and assign a subject and tone category to each statement based on its content. Next, I compute the length of each statement, which I use to calculate the total size of each subject and tone category in each ad. Subject categories are classified as either policy or valence, and the total size of the different subject and tone categories determine the type of the ad. I combine these data with viewer demographic and polling data to uncover empirical findings consistent with the theory.

First, I document that politicians simultaneously use policy, positive valence (i.e., emphasize own positive traits), and negative valence ads (i.e., emphasize opponent's negative attributes), which suggests that each type of ad is important for a campaign. Then, I present evidence of significant variation in the demographic makeup of viewers of the different tv shows. Thus, a sorting of viewers into tv shows is present which allows politicians to target demographics and voters with tailored content.

Consistent with the model, I find that opposing candidates target the same voters with different types of ads. Moreover, opposing candidates target different (and more polarized) audiences with policy ads, while positive valence ads are mostly targeted to a candidate's alienated base. In

contrast, the opponent's base is targeted with attacks against their preferred candidate. Finally, I present evidence suggesting that as the ideological difference between opposing candidates widens, candidates increase targeting of policy and positive valence ads to their base.

"The Price-Matching Dilemma" with Dan Bernhardt (*International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 2018)

In this paper, we characterize when strategic considerations of stores to match prices set by rivals on branded goods — common products across rivals — devolve into a prisoner's dilemma. We consider a linear spatial economy with rival stores located at each end of the line. The consumers are located between the two stores and incur a travel cost to visit a location. Stores offer generic products, which creates incentives to raise the prices of branded goods that compete with the store's generics in order to shift consumer purchases toward more profitable generics. We model the store competition as a two-stage game. In the first stage, each store can initiate a price-matching guarantee policy that automatically matches the prices of its branded goods to the rival's price, if the latter is lower. In the second stage, the stores engage in price competition. We demonstrate that price-matching guarantees commit stores not to set high prices for branded goods, thereby attracting more shoppers. We characterize the optimal price-matching policy based on consumers' shopping price-elasticities. The shopping price-elasticities are inversely related to travel cost, and capture the extent to which consumers choose stores based on prices rather than location. When consumer choice of where to shop is sufficiently price elastic, then in the unique equilibrium, a prisoner's dilemma results in which stores have a dominant strategy to price-match. For intermediate shopping elasticities, two equilibria exist—a low profit equilibrium in which all firms price match, and a high profit equilibrium in which no firm does. Only when travel is sufficiently costly is the high profit, no-price matching equilibrium unique.

"When Do Co-Located Firms Selling Identical Products Thrive?" with Dan Bernhardt and Mehdi Shadmehr (Forthcoming at *Journal of Industrial Economics*)

In this paper, we theoretically characterize how price competition between co-located (cluster) firms, which hinges on the share of comparison shoppers that go to the cluster, interacts with the price-elasticity of the consumers' decisions of where to shop to determine the profits of isolated and co-located firms. We consider a linear spatial economy with two stores co-located at zero, and a monopolist located at one. Consumers visit one location; comparison shoppers visit all stores in the location, and non-shoppers visit only one store (Rosenthal (1980), Varian (1980)). We prove that co-located firms thrive when there are some shoppers, but not too many. Without any shoppers, all stores set the monopoly price, consumers visit the closest location and co-located stores earn half the monopolist profit. Introducing shoppers has two effects on cluster store profits. The direct effect is to reduce profit since co-located stores compete on price. The indirect effect is that price competition draws more consumers to the cluster and away from the monopolist. With a few shoppers, distance is the key factor for choosing which location to visit, and the marginal consumer has similar travel costs for the two locations. Thus, the measure of consumers drawn to the cluster by the price competition is initially very elastic, which increases the consumer base of the cluster consumer base by enough to offset for the lower prices and increase profits. If, instead, the number of shoppers is high, then the price competition drives prices to marginal cost, and profits to zero. Finally, we endogeneize location choice on a circle by stores and prove that for moderate travel costs we can derive an equilibrium with two co-located stores and a maximally separated monopolist. For sufficiently low travel costs, all stores co-locate. In contrast, if travel costs are sufficiently high, then all stores maximally separate.

Future research agenda

My future research agenda is in the fields of Political Economy and Industrial Organization. Next, I summarize four of my ongoing projects in the two fields.

In *Candidate Advertising Free Riding and Party Solutions*, I exploit that media markets and station reception cross multiple electoral district boundaries to ask whether neighboring candidates of the same party free ride of each others ads, and whether parties help ameliorate such concerns. For this project, I use the Wisconsin Advertising Project and Wesleyan Media Project data on local tv ads for the 2008, 2010 and 2012 U.S. election cycles. I focus the analysis on federal general elections for the U.S. House and Senate. Treated candidates are identified in two ways. Under the first one, I consider as treated the candidates in media markets which are comprised of counties from more than one state. For the second definition I use a data driven methodology: a candidate is labeled as treated if they advertised in the same station as another candidate of the same party for the same office, but from a different district. In a preliminary analysis, I find that a variation exists between offices and election years, but parties and political action committees (pacs) are 10 – 15 percentage points more likely to sponsor ads for the treated candidates. Some candidates are treated in one media market but not in another. I am currently testing how sponsorship of ads by parties and pacs varies for these candidates between media markets. Moreover, I plan to examine how ideological differences between candidates who advertise in the same space affects the party’s decision, first, whether to sponsor an ad, and second, what type of ad to sponsor. Ideologically similar candidates can either free ride of off each other’s ads, or they might complement each other resulting in more ads sponsored by candidates. Ideologically distant candidates might advertise more to separate themselves, or to avoid advertising expecting the party to step in. With ideologically similar candidates, who free ride, I expect the party to sponsor more policy ads. In contrast, if the party sponsors ads for ideologically distant candidates, I expect those ads to be more generic in an effort to boost both candidates. The candidate ideological scores will come from Bonica’s (2016) Database on Ideology, Money in Politics, and Elections (DIME).

In *Endogenous Order with Sequential Elections* with George Deltas, we investigate the strategic considerations stemming from the timing of primary elections. We consider a framework with aggregate uncertainty about the ideology distribution of voters, and idiosyncratic uncertainty within electoral districts about the ordering of candidates on non-policy dimensions. We consider the effects of idiosyncratic uncertainty on endogenous voting order, and the effect of that order on outcomes. We also characterize conditions such that election outcomes are independent of voting order. We collected data from the US primary elections between 1980-2016, which we will use to test our theory.

In *Name-Change Fees, Scalpers, and Secondary Markets*, I consider a monopolist provider of a service, where consumers enjoy the service only if they have ticket (e.g., concerts, airline flights, and hotel rooms). The monopolist can set a name-change fee to allow holders of tickets to transfer ownership of their tickets to other consumers. I identify the conditions making it optimal to use name-change fees such that the secondary market is active. I show how this reduces demand uncertainty and alleviates price rigidity.

In *Airline Entry and Switching Costs* with George Deltas, we use the Origin and Destination survey (DB1B) to provide a measure of switching costs in US domestic airline markets. We leverage airline entry into new airports that connect them with airports that the airline already has presence. We construct our measure of switching costs by exploiting the relative flow of passengers based on the direction of the route (i.e., new airport as origin vs old airport as origin). Then, we consider a discrete choice model to examine the factors affecting these costs.

Teaching Statement

Evangelos Constantinou

As a first generation college graduate, I know the impact teaching can have on a student's life. My experience has shown me that the best teaching methods facilitate learning, not rote memorization. Effective teaching helps students discover the answer, and sharpens their understanding of key concepts in the process. My goal is for my students to develop a long-lasting interest in economics and politics, and gain insights that will serve them beyond the classroom.

I truly enjoy teaching. It gives me the opportunity to not only share knowledge, but also create it with my students. Teaching always helps me clarify abstract ideas and through teaching I find new ways to present difficult concepts in a relatable and clear manner. This informs how I undertake research, think through my questions, and effectively communicate my goals and findings.

I am fortunate to have taught several exciting courses in my career. During my time at the University of Illinois, I served as a Teaching Assistant, and a Head Teaching Assistant for the introductory microeconomics class by Dr. Isaac DiIanni. Most students were in their first year, working on a wide range of majors from economics and finance to physics and music. Although the material was assigned by Dr. DiIanni, the teaching format was left to me to create and implement. I find it most effective to break the students into smaller groups of four or five members, and ask them to discuss three to four questions I provide relating to the course material. In the meantime, I check with each group and ask them to explain the questions to me, and I try to guide them to critically think about the content of each question. After fifteen minutes, I open the discussion to the whole class. I provide a general argument for each question, and I ask them to challenge my reasoning or defend it using the tools taught in class. Once an idea or theory is developed, I highlight loose ends in the reasoning, and guide the students in crafting a more precise argument. I find that this helps students engage with the material in an accessible way, apply what they have learned to everyday situations, and allows them to think analytically and critically. Being selected by my students as "Teacher Ranked as Excellent" (top 10% in the university) was a true honor and reflects the positive impact my instruction had on students throughout my time at UIUC. As an addendum, feedback forms by the students are attached.

Prior to my studies at the University of Illinois, I served as Special Teaching staff at the University of Cyprus for four semesters. This was a rewarding experience focused exclusively on teaching. Each semester I was assigned 12 to 16 teaching hours for a wide range of classes such as microeconomics, statistics and econometrics, and mathematical economics. The opportunity to teach such a variety of classes and reach hundreds of students in a semester was a truly gratifying experience, despite the significant teaching load. I also independently

expanded my office hours, which gave me the opportunity to interact with my students in smaller groups. Since I was in Cyprus during the financial crisis of 2013, these office hours often applied the material covered in class to explain the real-life phenomena Cyprus was experiencing at the time.

As a professor, I will be delighted to teach at any level, graduate or undergraduate. I bring special knowledge to courses on political economy, industrial organization, American politics, microeconomics, quantitative methods and econometrics, but I would also find it rewarding, and a learning opportunity, to teach outside these areas.



Course Evaluation Results

ECON 102 - Microeconomic Principles

Spring, 2021

Section BDD, Online Discussion (Evangelos Constantinou)

F, 9am

Evaluations were completed by **16** out of **48** students (33.3%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Medium", a course type of "Elective", and an instructor type of "TA".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

Demographic Items

Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
44% (7)	44% (7)	6% (1)	6% (1)	-	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
63% (10)	13% (2)	25% (4)	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
25% (4)	19% (3)	56% (9)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	75% (12)	25% (4)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
6% (1)	63% (10)	31% (5)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
69% (11)	31% (5)	-	-	-	-

Global Items

Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	13% (2)	31% (5)	56% (9)	-	4.44	0.73	76	61

Rate the overall quality of this course. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	13% (2)	31% (5)	56% (9)	-	4.44	0.73	80	62

How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little ... A Great Deal]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	6% (1)	6% (1)	25% (4)	63% (10)	-	4.44	0.89	79	66

Departmental Core Items**ECON - TA****The T.A. was conscientious about their instructional responsibilities. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	6% (1)	31% (5)	63% (10)	-	4.56	0.63	69

The grading procedures for the course were: [Very Unfair ... Very Fair]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	6% (1)	6% (1)	19% (3)	69% (11)	-	4.50	0.89	70

How well did the examination questions reflect the content and emphasis of the course? [Poorly Related ... Well Related]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	6% (1)	25% (4)	63% (10)	6% (1)	4.60	0.63	74

Was the progression of the course logical and coherent from beginning to end? [No, Seldom ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	6% (1)	19% (3)	75% (12)	-	4.69	0.60	83

How would you characterize the T.A.'s ability to explain? [Poor ... Excellent]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	13% (2)	25% (4)	63% (10)	-	4.50	0.73	74

The T.A. motivated me to do my best work. [Almost Never ... Almost Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	13% (2)	19% (3)	69% (11)	-	4.56	0.73	85

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter? [No, Not Much ... Yes, Greatly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	13% (2)	25% (4)	63% (10)	-	4.50	0.73	89

Did this course improve your understanding of concepts and principles in this field? [No, Not Much ... Yes, Significantly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	6% (1)	13% (2)	81% (13)	-	4.75	0.58	94

The T.A.'s lack of facility with English hindered communication of ideas. [Strongly Agree ... Strongly Disagree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	19% (3)	25% (4)	56% (9)	-	4.38	0.81	61

The T.A. seemed well prepared for class. [No, Seldom ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	13% (2)	19% (3)	69% (11)	-	4.56	0.73	64

What was the T.A.'s attitude; how did he deal with you? [Unfair, Disdainful ... Fair And Impartial]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	13% (2)	13% (2)	75% (12)	-	4.63	0.72	62

How accessible was the T.A. for student conferences about the course? [Never Available ... Available Regularly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	13% (2)	13% (2)	75% (12)	-	4.63	0.72	80

Was the T.A.'s use of blackboard and other materials (handouts, etc.) effective? [Confusing, Inadequate ... Very Helpful]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	19% (3)	25% (4)	56% (9)	-	4.38	0.81	60

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					4.44
Rate the overall quality of this course.					4.44
How much have you learned in this course?					4.44
The T.A. was conscientious about their instructional responsibilities.					4.56
The grading procedures for the course were:					4.50
How well did the examination questions reflect the content and emphasis of the course?					4.60
Was the progression of the course logical and coherent from beginning to end?					4.69
How would you characterize the T.A.'s ability to explain?					4.50
The T.A. motivated me to do my best work.					4.56
Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?					4.50
Did this course improve your understanding of concepts and principles in this field?					4.75
The T.A.'s lack of facility with English hindered communication of ideas.					4.38
The T.A. seemed well prepared for class.					4.56
What was the T.A.'s attitude; how did he deal with you?					4.63
How accessible was the T.A. for student conferences about the course?					4.63
Was the T.A.'s use of blackboard and other materials (handouts, etc.) effective?					4.38

= below 3.0 / = 3.0 - 4.0 / = above 4.0

ICES Open-Ended Items**What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?**

- Evangelos helped to add depth and clarity to the material, and was very good at providing examples and explanations that help to solidify understanding.
- The instructor was always excited about class and the subject.
- .
- The instructor is kind, and the meeting is really helpful in reviewing materials.
- This course was to the point and clear.
- It was helpful ahead of doing homework and quiz assignments
- na
- I think the course of ECON102 overall is great , and it is a great start for student to learn Econ.
- Very understanding and kind towards all
- Excellent no complaints.

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- I cannot think of any specific thing to improve the course.
- More videos
- .
- The accents of the instructor is a little bit hard to understand, but overall he's really a good guy.
- n/a
- None
- na
- I think it might be better for instructor to provide some instruction video instead of merely put the PDF in the platform.
- N/a

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- The grading is clearly laid out and consistent. Overall it seems very fair.
- very good
- .
- Great
- You should get the second grade on the quiz, not the average
- They were fair and easy to understand
- na
- I think the grading procedure is fair in this course.
- They were fair.



Individual Evaluation Results

[Course Results](#)

ECON 102 - Microeconomic Principles

Spring, 2020

Section BDE, Discussion (Evangelos Constantinou)
F, 3pm, 206 David Kinley Hall

[<< Previous](#)

 Student of 7
[Next >>](#)

Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.

Exceptionally Low	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Exceptionally High
-------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------

Rate the overall quality of this course.

Exceptionally Low	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Exceptionally High
-------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------

How much have you learned in this course?

Very Little	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	A Great Deal
-------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------

The T.A. was conscientious about their instructional responsibilities.

Strongly Disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Strongly Agree
-------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------

The grading procedures for the course were:

Very Unfair	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Very Fair
-------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------

How well did the examination questions reflect the content and emphasis of the course?

Poorly Related	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Well Related
----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------

Was the progression of the course logical and coherent from beginning to end?

No, Seldom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Yes, Always
------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-------------

How would you characterize the T.A.'s ability to explain?

Poor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Excellent
------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------

The T.A. motivated me to do my best work.

Almost Never	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Almost Always
--------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	---------------

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?

No, Not Much	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Yes, Greatly
--------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	--------------

Did this course improve your understanding of concepts and principles in this field?

No, Not Much	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Yes, Significantly
--------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------

The T.A.'s lack of facility with English hindered communication of ideas.

Strongly Agree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------

The T.A. seemed well prepared for class.

No, Seldom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Yes, Always
------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-------------

What was the T.A.'s attitude; how did he deal with you?

Unfair, Disdainful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Fair And Impartial
--------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------

How accessible was the T.A. for student conferences about the course?

Never Available	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Available Regularly
-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------

Was the T.A.'s use of blackboard and other materials (handouts, etc.) effective?

Confusing, Inadequate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Very Helpful
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------

What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?

The instructor was very considerate of how COVID impacted all of our lives. I am truly grateful for the mindfulness. The course itself was only interesting because of his delivery. Awesome job.

What do you suggest to improve the course?

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

Click [Next](#) to view the next student's evaluation.

Click [Previous](#) to view the previous student's evaluation.

Click [Return](#) to return to the course results page.

Feedback

Log Out: Evangelos Constantinou



Individual Evaluation Results

[Course Results](#)

ECON 102 - Microeconomic Principles

Spring, 2020

Section BDE, Discussion (Evangelos Constantinou)
F, 3pm, 206 David Kinley Hall

[<< Previous](#)

 Student 3 of 7 [Go](#)
[Next >>](#)

Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.

Exceptionally Low	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Exceptionally High
-------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

Rate the overall quality of this course.

Exceptionally Low	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Exceptionally High
-------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

How much have you learned in this course?

Very Little	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	A Great Deal
-------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------

The T.A. was conscientious about their instructional responsibilities.

Strongly Disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Strongly Agree
-------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------

The grading procedures for the course were:

Very Unfair	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Very Fair
-------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------

How well did the examination questions reflect the content and emphasis of the course?

Poorly Related	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Well Related
----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------

Was the progression of the course logical and coherent from beginning to end?

No, Seldom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Yes, Always
------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------

How would you characterize the T.A.'s ability to explain?

Poor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Excellent
------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------

The T.A. motivated me to do my best work.

Almost Never	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Almost Always
--------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?

No, Not Much	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Yes, Greatly
--------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------

Did this course improve your understanding of concepts and principles in this field?

No, Not Much	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Yes, Significantly
--------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

The T.A.'s lack of facility with English hindered communication of ideas.

Strongly Agree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

The T.A. seemed well prepared for class.

No, Seldom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Yes, Always
------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------

What was the T.A.'s attitude; how did he deal with you?

Unfair, Disdainful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Fair And Impartial
--------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------

How accessible was the T.A. for student conferences about the course?

Never Available	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Available Regularly
-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------

Was the T.A.'s use of blackboard and other materials (handouts, etc.) effective?

Confusing, Inadequate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Very Helpful
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------

What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?

Discussion is not stressful.
I made some friends with my group
T.A knows how to run discussion

What do you suggest to improve the course?

None

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

Fair

Click [Next](#) to view the next student's evaluation.

Click [Previous](#) to view the previous student's evaluation.

Click [Return](#) to return to the course results page.

Feedback

Log Out: Evangelos Constantinou



Individual Evaluation Results

[Course Results](#)

ECON 102 - Microeconomic Principles

Spring, 2020

Section BDE, Discussion (Evangelos Constantinou)
F, 3pm, 206 David Kinley Hall

[<< Previous](#)

 Student 6 of 7 [Go](#)
[Next >>](#)

Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.

Exceptionally Low	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Exceptionally High
-------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------

Rate the overall quality of this course.

Exceptionally Low	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Exceptionally High
-------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------

How much have you learned in this course?

Very Little	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	A Great Deal
-------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	--------------

The T.A. was conscientious about their instructional responsibilities.

Strongly Disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Strongly Agree
-------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------

The grading procedures for the course were:

Very Unfair	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Very Fair
-------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------

How well did the examination questions reflect the content and emphasis of the course?

Poorly Related	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Well Related
----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	--------------

Was the progression of the course logical and coherent from beginning to end?

No, Seldom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Yes, Always
------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-------------

How would you characterize the T.A.'s ability to explain?

Poor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Excellent
------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------

The T.A. motivated me to do my best work.

Almost Never	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Almost Always
--------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	---------------

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?

No, Not Much	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Yes, Greatly
--------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	--------------

Did this course improve your understanding of concepts and principles in this field?

No, Not Much	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Yes, Significantly
--------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

The T.A.'s lack of facility with English hindered communication of ideas.

Strongly Agree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------

The T.A. seemed well prepared for class.

No, Seldom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Yes, Always
------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-------------

What was the T.A.'s attitude; how did he deal with you?

Unfair, Disdainful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Fair And Impartial
--------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------

How accessible was the T.A. for student conferences about the course?

Never Available	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Available Regularly
-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------

Was the T.A.'s use of blackboard and other materials (handouts, etc.) effective?

Confusing, Inadequate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Very Helpful
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------

What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?

Great understanding of the course material.

What do you suggest to improve the course?

N/A

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

Fair

Click [Next](#) to view the next student's evaluation.

Click [Previous](#) to view the previous student's evaluation.

Click [Return](#) to return to the course results page.

[Feedback](#)

[Log Out](#): Evangelos Constantinou

Instructor name: EVANGELOS CONSTANTINOU

Department name: ECONOMICS

Instructor GLOBAL ITEM 1: Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness

Course GLOBAL ITEM 2: Rate the overall quality of this course

NOTE: Sections with fewer than 5 forms are least reliable data

1987 to Present (Rating Range 1-5):

Semester	Course No.	No. of Forms	Elective Mixed Required	Mean Item 1	Mean Item 2	Norm Group Item 1	Norm Group Item 2
FALL2015	102	29	R	3.9	4.3	LO AVG	HI AVG
FALL2015	102	22	M	4.5	4.5	AVG	HI AVG
SPNG2016	102	22	M	3.9	4.1	LO AVG	AVG
SPNG2016	102	26	M	4.2	4.1	AVG	AVG
FALL2016	102	31	M	4.3	4.3	AVG	HI AVG
SPNG2017	102	6	M	4.5	4.5	HI AVG	HI AVG
FALL2017	102	31	R	4.1	4.0	AVG	AVG
SPNG2018	102	14	M	4.1	4.1	AVG	AVG
FALL2018	102	26	M	4.2	4.3	AVG	HI AVG
SPNG2019	102	16	M	4.2	4.1	AVG	AVG
FALL2019	102	24	R	3.9	4.1	AVG	AVG
FALL2019	102	26	R	3.7	3.6	LO AVG	AVG
SPNG2020	102	7	M	4.3	4.3	AVG*	AVG*
SPNG2020	102	1	E	5.0	5.0	HIGH*	HIGH*
SPNG2021	102	16	E	4.4	4.4	AVG*	AVG*

*This section's evaluations were collected with ICES Online.