

Course: ECON3220/422022H: ECON3220/4220 22H Microeconomics 3-ECON4220 22H Undervisning - alle

Response Rate: 16/77 (20.78 %)

1 - Which study programme are you enrolled in?					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
1 year programme in economics	(1)	0	0,00%		6,00
Bachelor programme in economics	(2)	0	0,00%		
5 year master programme in economic analysis	(3)	0	0,00%		
Other study programme at UiO	(4)	0	0,00%		
Single course student	(5)	0	0,00%		
2 year master programme in economics	(6)	16	100,00%	██████████	
Other	(0)	0	0,00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)		6,00		0,00	6,00

2 - How many hours a week do you spend on your studies in total?					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Under 10 hours	(1)	0	0,00%		3,44
10-20 hours	(2)	5	31,25%	████	
20-30 hours	(3)	3	18,75%	███	
30-40 hours	(4)	4	25,00%	████	
More than 40 hours	(5)	4	25,00%	████	
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)		3,44		1,21	3,50

3 - I am, all in all, satisfied with the course.From "do not agree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5).					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
2	(2)	4	25,00%	███	3,38
3	(3)	5	31,25%	████	
4	(4)	4	25,00%	████	
5	(5)	3	18,75%	███	
				0 25 50 100	
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)		3,38		1,09	3,00

4 - I think the course is interesting.From "do not agree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5).					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
2	(2)	4	25,00%	███	3,75
3	(3)	2	12,50%	██	
4	(4)	4	25,00%	████	
5	(5)	6	37,50%	██████	
				0 25 50 100	
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)		3,75		1,24	4,00

University of Oslo
 Course evaluation ECON3220/ECON4220 - autumn 2022

Course: ECON3220/422022H: ECON3220/4220 22H Microeconomics 3-ECON4220 22H Undervisning - alle
 Response Rate: 16/77 (20.78 %)

5 - How difficult / demanding do you think the course is? From "very easy" (1) to "moderately demanding" (3) to "very demanding" (5).					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	
2	(2)	1	6,25%		<p>3,88</p>
3	(3)	5	31,25%		
4	(4)	5	31,25%		
5	(5)	5	31,25%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)		3,88		0,96	4,00

6 - Here are some questions about the lectures. Please rate from "very bad" (1) to "very good" (5). If you do not follow the lectures, select "Not relevant".					
What do you think of the quality of the physical lectures?					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Very bad	(1)	1	6,25%		<p>3,50</p>
Bad	(2)	0	0,00%		
OK	(3)	7	43,75%		
Good	(4)	6	37,50%		
Very good	(5)	2	12,50%		
Not relevant	(0)	0	0,00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)		3,50		0,97	3,50

6 - Here are some questions about the lectures. Please rate from "very bad" (1) to "very good" (5). If you do not follow the lectures, select "Not relevant".					
What do you think of the quality of the digital lectures?					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Very bad	(1)	3	18,75%		<p>3,00</p>
Bad	(2)	1	6,25%		
OK	(3)	0	0,00%		
Good	(4)	3	18,75%		
Very good	(5)	2	12,50%		
Not relevant	(0)	7	43,75%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)		3,00		1,73	4,00

6 - Here are some questions about the lectures. Please rate from "very bad" (1) to "very good" (5). If you do not follow the lectures, select "Not relevant".					
What do you think of the lecture resources that are made available?					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Very bad	(1)	0	0,00%		<p>3,88</p>
Bad	(2)	3	18,75%		
OK	(3)	3	18,75%		
Good	(4)	3	18,75%		
Very good	(5)	7	43,75%		
Not relevant	(0)	0	0,00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)		3,88		1,20	4,00

Course: ECON3220/422022H: ECON3220/4220 22H Microeconomics 3-ECON4220 22H Undervisning - alle

Response Rate: 16/77 (20.78 %)

6 - Here are some questions about the lectures. Please rate from "very bad" (1) to "very good" (5). If you do not follow the lectures, select "Not relevant".

What do you think about the lecturers' use of Canvas?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means		
Very bad	(1)	0	0,00%		4,19		
Bad	(2)	1	6,25%	█			
OK	(3)	3	18,75%	██			
Good	(4)	4	25,00%	███			
Very good	(5)	8	50,00%	██████			
Not relevant	(0)	0	0,00%				
				0 25 50 100	Question		
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median	
16/77 (20,78%)				4,19	0,98	4,50	

6 - Here are some questions about the lectures. Please rate from "very bad" (1) to "very good" (5). If you do not follow the lectures, select "Not relevant".

What do you think of lecturers' preparations for lectures?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means		
Very bad	(1)	0	0,00%		4,36		
Bad	(2)	0	0,00%				
OK	(3)	2	12,50%	█			
Good	(4)	5	31,25%	████			
Very good	(5)	7	43,75%	██████			
Not relevant	(0)	2	12,50%	█			
				0 25 50 100	Question		
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median	
16/77 (20,78%)				4,36	0,74	4,50	

7 - I actively participate in lectures.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means		
Yes	(1)	6	37,50%	████	1,88		
To a certain extent	(2)	6	37,50%	████			
No	(3)	4	25,00%	███			
Not relevant	(0)	0	0,00%				
				0 25 50 100	Question		
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median	
16/77 (20,78%)				1,88	0,81	2,00	

8 - I am prepared when I attend the lecture.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means		
Yes	(1)	5	31,25%	████	1,81		
To a certain extent	(2)	9	56,25%	██████			
No	(3)	2	12,50%	██			
Not relevant	(0)	0	0,00%				
				0 25 50 100	Question		
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median	
16/77 (20,78%)				1,81	0,66	2,00	

Course: ECON3220/422022H: ECON3220/4220 22H Microeconomics 3-ECON4220 22H Undervisning - alle

Response Rate: 16/77 (20.78 %)

9 - Supplementary comments (positive and constructive) about the lectures.

Response Rate 3/77 (3,9%)

- I liked the first part (with von der Fehr). I learnt a lot, lectures were easier to follow due to the use of the blackboard. Structured lectures and although technically challenging, I felt like the lectures provided some "order to the madness". But I have found the second part, game theory+economics of information, very hard to follow. Don't deal like i've learnt anything, if anything I am more confused now than what I was before we started. Difficult to follow the lecturer when he doesn't even present the topic of the lecture, provides very little intuition and just "dumps" 20 powerpoint slides with calculations on us without explaining. I don't understand the games we play and they provide no learning outcome for me. Lectures are not interactive.
- The first part of the course was good, but the second part (game theory) has been very frustrating to follow. The lecturer goes way too fast and the explanations are not thorough enough. My advice for him is to skip the slides and write on the blackboard. This would force him to go at a slower pace and make it easier to follow. Also, we get to see how things are derived, in comparison to the concepts being revealed on a slide. The other tip I have is for him to make his language "dumber" and define important terms clearly and as simply as possible.
- Geir has such good structure on Canvas! The videos are also very nice to review the harder topics. However, the game theory part is a lot of information, feels like a 7.5 subject. Nils is very good and his lecture notes are very nice.

10 - Please write the name of your seminar teacher.

Response Rate 10/77 (12,99%)

- Nils-Henrik von der Fehr
- Jarle Kvile
- Nils von der Fehr
- Mihai Pasnicu,Tore Adam Reiremo
- Oliver Groth Pettersen
- Oliver and Nils Henrik
- Nils Henrik M. von der Fehr
- Jarle Kvile
- Nils Henrik
- Jarle Kvile

11 - Here are some questions about the seminar teaching. Rate them from "very bad" (1) to "very good" (5). If you do not follow the seminar teaching, select "Not relevant".

What do you think about the quality of the physical seminars?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Very bad	(1)	0	0,00%			
Bad	(2)	0	0,00%			
OK	(3)	3	18,75%	■		
Good	(4)	4	25,00%	■		
Very good	(5)	9	56,25%	■		
Not relevant	(0)	0	0,00%			
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)				4,38	0,81	5,00

11 - Here are some questions about the seminar teaching. Rate them from "very bad" (1) to "very good" (5). If you do not follow the seminar teaching, select "Not relevant".

What do you think about the quality of the digital seminars?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Very bad	(1)	0	0,00%			
Bad	(2)	0	0,00%			
OK	(3)	1	6,25%	■		
Good	(4)	1	6,25%	■		
Very good	(5)	3	18,75%	■		
Not relevant	(0)	11	68,75%	■		
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)				4,40	0,89	5,00

Course: ECON3220/422022H: ECON3220/4220 22H Microeconomics 3-ECON4220 22H Undervisning - alle

Response Rate: 16/77 (20.78 %)

11 - Here are some questions about the seminar teaching. Rate them from "very bad" (1) to "very good" (5). If you do not follow the seminar teaching, select "Not relevant".

What do you think of the seminar resources?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Very bad	(1)	0	0,00%			
Bad	(2)	2	12,50%	█		
OK	(3)	6	37,50%	████		
Good	(4)	4	25,00%	███		
Very good	(5)	4	25,00%	███		
Not relevant	(0)	0	0,00%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)				3,63	1,02	3,50

11 - Here are some questions about the seminar teaching. Rate them from "very bad" (1) to "very good" (5). If you do not follow the seminar teaching, select "Not relevant".

What do you think of the seminar leader's preparations for the seminars?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Very bad	(1)	0	0,00%			
Bad	(2)	0	0,00%			
OK	(3)	2	12,50%	█		
Good	(4)	4	25,00%	██		
Very good	(5)	10	62,50%	██████		
Not relevant	(0)	0	0,00%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)				4,50	0,73	5,00

11 - Here are some questions about the seminar teaching. Rate them from "very bad" (1) to "very good" (5). If you do not follow the seminar teaching, select "Not relevant".

What do you think about the use of Canvas?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Very bad	(1)	0	0,00%			
Bad	(2)	0	0,00%			
OK	(3)	6	37,50%	████		
Good	(4)	5	31,25%	████		
Very good	(5)	5	31,25%	████		
Not relevant	(0)	0	0,00%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)				3,94	0,85	4,00





12 -

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Yes	(1)	11	68,75%	██████████		
To a certain extent	(2)	4	25,00%	███		
No	(3)	1	6,25%	█		
Not relevant	(0)	0	0,00%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)				1,38	0,62	1,00

University of Oslo
 Course evaluation ECON3220/ECON4220 - autumn 2022

Course: ECON3220/422022H: ECON3220/4220 22H Microeconomics 3-ECON4220 22H Undervisning - alle
 Response Rate: 16/77 (20.78 %)

13 - I am prepared when I attend the seminars.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Yes	(1)	5	31,25%		 1.81	
To a certain extent	(2)	9	56,25%			
No	(3)	2	12,50%			
Not relevant	(0)	0	0,00%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
16/77 (20,78%)			1,81		0,66	2,00

14 - Supplementary comments (positive and constructive) about the seminar teaching.

Response Rate 2/77 (2,6%)

- In my opinion, the problem sets are unnecessarily difficult. I am never able to complete them on my own, which is very discouraging considering the exam. In the game theory questions I often don't even know where to start, even if I attend all lectures.
- Jarle is the best. He makes us feel not stupid. He knows our names and creates a very safe learning environment. He's also young and funny and makes the seminar worthwhile

15 - Do you have any other comments regarding the teaching in this course?

Response Rate 4/77 (5,19%)

- I wish game theory teacher could present in a better way. I am honestly worried about failing the exam, even though I dedicate a substantial amount of time to working with the course.
- Alt pensumet som undervises i mikroteori i Mikro 3 kunne vært gjennomgått i Mikro 2. Det matematiske nivået svarer til matte 1. Det at matematikken som læres i første semesteret på samføk ikke anvendes ordentlig før på det som for mange er masternivå er ikke godt nok. Mikro 2 er et veldig lett og reduktivt fag. Vi trenger mye mer matematikk på bachelornivå i mikro, og deretter et mer avansert mikrofag som tar for seg mer anvendt mikro og matematiske fundament på masternivå. Dette handler kun om at mikro 2 er alt for lett! Og vær så snill få inn et mattekrav på bachelor i samfunnsøkonomi, det er ikke noe gøy å tegne modeller i tre år før man begynner med ordentlig samfunnsøkonomi med kalkulus osv.
- The digital lectures in game theory are very helpful. Personally, I need some time to think about the logic behind the players choices and the rules of the game. In a physical lecture, it is difficult to keep up with Geir Analyzing a game. Preparation might improve my understanding of the physical lectures, but I don't believe that game theory can be taught better physically than digitally. Therefore, I have watched the digital lectures instead of attending physically this semester. I like that Niels Henrik proves or sketches the proof during lectures. It has enabled me to understand more of the book.
- Nils Henrik should have recorded his lectures. Very sad to lose a lecture with him if you get sick.