

School-Based Statistical Discrimination*

Jacopo Bizzotto[†] Adrien Vigier[‡]

January 2023

Abstract

We study statistical discrimination based on the school which an individual attended. Employers face uncertainty regarding an individual's productive value. Knowing which school an individual went to is useful for two reasons: firstly, average student ability may differ across schools; secondly, different schools may provide different incentives to exert effort. We examine the optimal way of grouping students in the face of school-based statistical discrimination. We argue that an optimal school system exhibits coarse stratification with respect to ability, and more lenient grading at the top-tier schools than at the bottom-tier schools. Our paper contributes to the ongoing policy debate on school tracking.

JEL classification: D02, D83, I24, J71

Keywords: Statistical Discrimination, School Tracking, Stratification, Grading

*We are very grateful to Arjada Bardhi, Antonio Cabrales, Matteo Escudé, Bård Harstad, Nenad Kos, Eirik Kristiansen, Ming Li, Martí Mestieri, Johannes Schneider, Takuro Yamashita, and Andy Zapechelnuk for useful discussions and feedback.

[†]Oslo Business School, OsloMet. Email: jacopo.bizzotto@oslomet.no.

[‡]School of Economics, University of Nottingham. Email: adrien.vigier@nottingham.ac.uk.

1 Introduction

Employers and universities commonly assess candidates based on the school which they went to. Otherwise identical individuals attending different schools can therefore experience widely different job market outcomes. We refer to this phenomenon as school-based statistical discrimination.¹

The once-common practice of separating students according to ability, known as tracking, encouraged the aforementioned form of statistical discrimination.² Justified as a way to cater to different needs, tracking is regularly singled out as a major obstacle to social mobility.³ Fairness concerns played a mayor role in sealing the fate of tracking systems in the U.K. and other countries: “Tracking has generated heated political debate in many countries. The United Kingdom, which historically channeled students into three different types of schools... began to move away from this system in the 1960s, based on fears that the system generated and perpetuated inequality. But due to political opposition to “detracking,” remnants of the three-tier approach still exist four decades later...” (Betts (2011), pages 343-344).

We propose a simple model to assess some of the merits and flaws of tracking. We argue that, in certain situations, detracking can be warranted on grounds of efficiency alone; however, in others, mixing students can be highly inefficient. Either way, we show that separating students by ability does not just perpetuate existing inequalities, but in fact tends to amplify them.

We examine a population in which some individuals are more “able” than others; what we refer to as ability might capture innate ability, socio-economic background and/or previous education. Each individual picks a school. Thereafter, ability and effort jointly determine the

¹Though we are primarily interested in the effect of schools, our analysis can be applied to study the effect of colleges; in this regard, see for instance Deming, Yuchtman, Abulafi, Goldin and Katz (2016), MacLeod, Riehl, Saavedra and Urquiola (2017) and de Roux and Riehl (2022).

²Countries like France and Italy sort students across secondary schools on a voluntary basis; in Germany and Switzerland, students’ achievements in their last years of primary school determine the type of secondary school they will be permitted to attend; in Canada, England, and the U.S., tracking normally takes place within a given school. For a comprehensive overview of the different forms of tracking used around the world, see Wößmann (2009).

³Empirical evidence regarding the consequences of tracking is mixed. Duflo, Dupas and Kremer (2011) finds evidence of the positive effects of tracking on student achievement. Other studies document negative effects, including Malamud and Pop-Eleches (2011), Maurin and McNally (2012), and Kerr, Pekkarinen and Uusitalo (2013). Similarly, while Hanushek and Wößmann (2006) concludes that tracking exacerbates disparities, Brunello and Checchi (2007) argues that tracking can reduce disparities. For a comprehensive review of the empirical literature, see Hanushek and Woessmann (2011) and Betts (2011). For a review of the debate beyond the economic literature, see Gamoran (2009) and Rubin (2006).

distribution of an individual's productive value. Finally, each student receives a grade that is *imperfectly* informative about his productive value.

School choice matters for two reasons: (a) the school that a student went to conveys information regarding the distribution of his productive value; (b) different schools may use different grading rules, some schools being more lenient than others. Employers observe only the school which a student attended and the grade which he received; based on this information, they form beliefs about the student's productive value, and subsequently offer a competitive wage.

In our terminology, a school system summarizes all relevant information about schools, that is, which types of students attend what school, and which grading rule each school uses. We study the mechanism design problem consisting of choosing an incentive compatible and individually rational school system so as to maximize overall productive value.

The basic question we address is the following: should students be separated according to ability, and, if so, how? The trade-off is as follows. On the one hand, mixing students increases the uncertainty faced by employers and hinders school-based statistical discrimination. Said uncertainty augments the weight of school grades in employers' inferences. In turn, when grades matter more, top marks become worth the students' effort.

On the other hand, separating students enables tailored incentives. The basic idea is simple. For a student who is regarded as "bad" the value of obtaining a good grade is very high as long as this grade is reliable (i.e., as long as the grading rule generates few false positives). By contrast, in the case of students who are regarded as "good", the logic is reversed. In consequence, a one-size-fits-all approach to grading might end up depressing all students' incentives to exert effort in school.

We find that the optimal school system has the following features:

- 1) students whose ability is above a cutoff are separated from those whose ability is below it;
- 2) on each side of the separating cutoff, all students are pooled;
- 3) bottom-tier students are evaluated through a tough grading rule (i.e., one generating few false positives), while top-tier students are evaluated through a lenient grading rule (i.e., one generating few false negatives);
- 4) in equilibrium, students in the top tier exert more effort than those in the bottom tier.

Results 1 and 2 show that the trade-off discussed previously is resolved through a combination of separation and pooling. Result 3 substantiates the idea that different students are optimally incentivized in different ways, and that the benefits from tailored incentives can warrant separating students according to ability. Result 4 specifies the sense in which tracking actually amplifies initial inequalities.

Our analysis contributes to the debate on tracking in two ways. Firstly, by showing that a certain amount of tracking can help improve overall student achievement; in particular, tracking may be optimal even *without* direct peer effects.⁴ Secondly, by showing that tracking may worsen inequalities.

In essence, the reason for which tracking amplifies inequalities is that ability and effort are in part substitutes. As a result, schools which generate a lot of effort tend to attract high-ability students. Indeed, we show that *any* incentive compatible school system must be such that if some school A contains students of higher ability than a school B, then effort exerted is larger in school A than in school B. One of the consequences of this property, is that regulators are forced to resort to a particularly elitist school system in order to achieve incentive compatibility. This suggests that one way in which regulators might be able to preserve the benefits of tracking all the while minimizing its undesirable effects is by detecting ability early on, perhaps through well-designed entry tests, or a merit-based point system.

We contribute to a rich literature investigating statistical discrimination.⁵ The novelty of our work comes from the fact that school-based statistical discrimination distinguishes itself in two ways: (i) in the present context, group identity (i.e., one's school) is a choice variable; (ii) the signal technology through which employers learn about students' productive values (i.e., the grading systems used) is here endogenous.

The setting we explore combines features of Phelpsian models of statistical discrimination (Phelps (1972)) and features of Arrowian models of statistical discrimination (Arrow (1973)).⁶ The former category of models exhibits two main features: (a) different groups of individuals exhibit intrinsic differences in payoff-relevant traits; (b) employers learn about individuals

⁴Direct peer effects may take various forms (see, e.g., Blume, Brock, Durlauf and Jayaraman (2015) and Tincani (2022)). For example, to the extent that students learn from other students, one's chances of acquiring a competency might be positively affected by an increase in other students' ability. Alternatively, students might have homophilous preferences, and learn best when grouped with other students of similar ability to their own.

⁵See Fang and Moro (2011) for an overview of the classic literature on statistical discrimination. For a review of more recent work, see Onuchic (2022).

⁶For recent contributions to the Phelpsian theory of statistical discrimination, see Chambers and Echenique (2020), Bardhi, Guo and Strulovici (2020), and Escudé, Onuchic, Sinander and Valenzuela-Stookey (2022).

through a learning technology that depends on the specific group to which an individual belongs. By contrast, the latter category of models is based on the idea that inter-group differences result from “self-fulfilling prophecies”, whereby certain groups of individuals underinvest in skill acquisition *because* employers expect them to do so.

In line with Phelps (1972), our model assumes that individuals exhibit differences in intrinsic ability. Furthermore, our model allows the signal technology through which employers learn to vary from one school to the other. However, as in Arrow (1973), students’ ability to convey their productive value to employers affects the former’s decision to invest in said value.

To our knowledge, Fang (2001) is the only previous paper exploring statistical discrimination in a setting where group identities are endogenous. In Fang (2001), each individual is of one of two types, representing heterogeneous costs of investing in skill acquisition. In the absence of group identities, the unique equilibrium is such that none of the workers acquire the skill. The possibility of undertaking a costly “cultural activity” improves efficiency by making it worthwhile for a fraction of low-cost types to invest in skill acquisition. Our model shares with Fang (2001) the feature that a single-crossing property arises endogenously. However, what makes separation possible in our setting is the fact that high-ability individuals have better odds than low-ability ones to receive top marks.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The model is presented in Section 2. Section 3 details the guiding principles of our analysis, and solves two benchmark problems. Our main result is presented in Section 4. We explore in Section 5 how tracking affects inequalities. Section 6 examines two extensions. Various related strands of literature are discussed in Section 7. Section 8 concludes.

2 The Model

We consider an environment in which education gives individuals an opportunity to increase their productive value, and where effort bolsters one’s chances of success. Individuals differ in ability: for a given level of effort, more able individuals have better odds of increasing their value. An individual’s ability, effort and productive value are all unobserved, but schools deliver grades, which provide employers with information about a student’s productive value. Schools thereby create incentives to exert effort. We study the mechanism design problem consisting of choosing an incentive compatible and individually rational school system so as to maximize overall effort. The details of the model are presented in Subsection 2.1. Various

aspects of the model are discussed in Subsection 2.2.

2.1 General Environment

Productive Value. The *productive value* of individual j is written v_j . Either $v_j = 0$ or $v_j = 1$. The probability p_j that $v_j = 1$ satisfies

$$p_j = \theta_j + e_j; \tag{1}$$

we refer to θ_j and e_j as individual j 's *type* and *effort*, respectively. Individual j 's cost of exerting effort e_j follows

$$c(e_j, \theta_j) := \frac{1}{2}ce_j^2 - \kappa\theta_je_j,$$

where $c > 0$ and $\kappa \geq 0$, so low-ability students have weakly larger marginal cost of effort than high-ability ones.⁷ We suppose that types are distributed according to the atomless distribution function F , with support $[0, \alpha]$, for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Schools. A *school* s consists of a pair $(\Theta_s, G(s))$: the subset Θ_s represents the types attending school s , and $G(s)$ said school's *grading rule*. Formally, a grading rule G is an element of the set

$$\mathbb{G} := \{(g_0, \Delta) : g_0 \geq 0, \quad g_0 + \Delta \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq \Delta \leq b\},$$

where b is a fixed parameter.⁸ The interpretation is as follows: if $v_j = 0$ (respectively, $v_j = 1$), then school s delivers the grade “pass” to student j with probability $g_0(s)$ (respectively, $g_0(s) + \Delta(s)$) and the grade “fail” otherwise.

The grading rule of school s is said to be *informative* if $\Delta(s) > 0$. We suppose that

$$0 < b < 1.$$

The first highlighted inequality assures that informative grading rules exist; the second one captures the idea that all grading rules are imperfect. We assume in addition that the cost parameter satisfies $c > \frac{b+\kappa\alpha}{1-\alpha}$.⁹

⁷We show in the online appendix that all our main results carry through under general convex effort costs.

⁸The main results would be unchanged if \mathbb{G} were replaced by $\{(g_0, \Delta) : g_0 \geq \varepsilon, 0 \leq \Delta \leq b, g_0 + \Delta \leq 1 - \varepsilon\}$, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, that is, if every possible grading rule generated both false positives and false negatives.

⁹This assures that all students end up exerting a level of effort in $(0, 1 - \alpha)$.

School Systems. For any $\Theta \subseteq [0, \alpha]$, we refer to $\int_{\Theta} dF(\theta)$ as the *mass* of students whose types belong to Θ . For brevity, m_s and $\bar{\theta}_s$ shall denote the mass and average type of students in school s , respectively. A *school system*, generically denoted by \mathbb{S} , consists of a finite set of schools, say $\{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$, such that:

- (i) every type in $[0, \alpha]$ belongs to exactly one Θ_{s_i} ;
- (ii) $m_{s_i} > 0$ for all i ;
- (iii) $\forall i \neq k$: either $\bar{\theta}_{s_i} \neq \bar{\theta}_{s_k}$ or $G(s_i) \neq G(s_k)$.

Point (i) simply says that a school system partitions individuals according to their types; points (ii) and (iii) avoid a vacuous multiplicity of school systems.

Employers' Prior Beliefs. We let $\hat{p}(\theta)$ denote employers' prior belief that a type- θ individual has productive value 1; that is, if employers believe that type- θ individuals exert effort $\hat{e}(\theta)$ then¹⁰

$$\hat{p}(\theta) = \theta + \hat{e}(\theta).$$

Employers' prior belief that an arbitrary student from s has productive value 1 will be denoted by $\bar{p}_{\hat{p}}(s)$; thus,

$$\bar{p}_{\hat{p}}(s) = \frac{1}{m_s} \int_{\Theta_s} \hat{p}(\theta) dF(\theta).$$

Wages. Employers only observe the school that an individual went to, and the grade which he obtained (his type, effort and productive value are all unobserved). We assume that individuals are paid competitive wages, equal to their expected productive values from the perspective of employers. Consequently, all students from s who obtain the grade pass (respectively, fail) receive a wage of $q_{\hat{p}}^+(s)$ (respectively, $q_{\hat{p}}^-(s)$), where

$$q_{\hat{p}}^+(s) := \frac{\bar{p}_{\hat{p}}(s)(g_0(s) + \Delta(s))}{g_0(s) + \bar{p}_{\hat{p}}(s)\Delta(s)}, \quad q_{\hat{p}}^-(s) := \frac{\bar{p}_{\hat{p}}(s)(1 - g_0(s) - \Delta(s))}{1 - g_0(s) - \bar{p}_{\hat{p}}(s)\Delta(s)}.$$

The expected wage of a type- θ individual attending school s and exerting effort e can be

¹⁰We shall later require these beliefs to be consistent with students' choices, naturally.

written as $\psi_{\hat{p}}(\theta + e, s)$, where¹¹

$$\psi_{\hat{p}}(p, s) := q_{\hat{p}}^-(s) + [g_0(s) + p\Delta(s)](q_{\hat{p}}^+(s) - q_{\hat{p}}^-(s)).$$

Expected Payoffs. Let $t(s)$ denote the fee of school s ; we allow these fees to be negative (e.g. scholarships, student loans, paid internship programs). Then the expected payoff $U_{\hat{p}}(\theta, e, s)$ of a type- θ individual attending school s and exerting effort e is given by

$$U_{\hat{p}}(\theta, e, s) = \psi_{\hat{p}}(\theta + e, s) - c(e, \theta) - t(s). \quad (2)$$

Mechanisms. A *mechanism* \mathbf{M} is a triple (\mathbb{S}, t, e) comprising:

- (i) a school system \mathbb{S} ,
- (ii) a mapping $t : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ specifying the school fees,
- (iii) an effort function $e : [0, \alpha] \rightarrow [0, 1 - \alpha]$.

A mechanism $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbb{S}, t, e)$ is said to be *feasible* if it satisfies three conditions:

$$U_{\hat{p}}(\theta, e(\theta), s) = \max_{s' \in \mathbb{S}, e' \geq 0} U_{\hat{p}}(\theta, e', s'), \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{S} \text{ and } \theta \in \Theta_s, \quad (\text{IC})$$

$$U_{\hat{p}}(\theta, e(\theta), s) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{S} \text{ and } \theta \in \Theta_s, \quad (\text{IR})$$

$$\hat{p}(\theta) = \theta + e(\theta), \quad \text{for all } \theta \in [0, \alpha]. \quad (\text{CB})$$

Condition (IC) ensures that no student can gain by deviating from mechanism \mathbf{M} : for $\theta \in \Theta_s$, attending school s and exerting effort $e(\theta)$ maximizes type- θ students' expected payoff.

Condition (IR) is a standard participation constraint. Condition (CB) ensures that employers' beliefs are consistent with students' choices.

¹¹Note that $\psi_{\hat{p}}(p, s) = (1-p) [g_0(s)q_{\hat{p}}^+(s) + (1 - g_0(s))q_{\hat{p}}^-(s)] + p [(g_0(s) + \Delta(s))q_{\hat{p}}^+(s) + (1 - g_0(s) - \Delta(s))q_{\hat{p}}^-(s)]$.

The Designer’s Problem. We are interested in the problem of a designer aiming to maximize either social welfare, or total effort. The former problem reduces to

$$\max_{\mathbf{M}} \int_0^\alpha [e(\theta) - c(e(\theta), \theta)] dF(\theta), \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{M} \text{ is feasible};$$

the latter problem can be written as

$$\max_{\mathbf{M}} \int_0^\alpha e(\theta) dF(\theta), \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{M} \text{ is feasible.} \quad (\mathbf{P}_0)$$

In the online appendix, we show that the qualitative features of the optimal mechanisms for the two problems above are the same. To streamline the exposition, we thus focus on problem (\mathbf{P}_0) in the body of the paper.

2.2 Discussion of the Model

Following the usual interpretation, the designer can be thought of as letting individuals choose from a menu of items. Here, an item consists of a school and its fee. In turn, each school is made up of a collection of students and a grading rule. A number of recent papers share with ours the feature that the designer offers a menu of items comprising a statistical experiment of some kind. This literature includes Esó and Szentes (2007), Kolotilin, Mylovanov, Zapechelnyuk and Li (2017), Li and Shi (2017), Bergemann, Bonatti and Smolin (2018), Guo and Shmaya (2019), Wei and Green (2020), Yamashita and Zhu (2021), and Yang (2022). In all those papers, the experiment helps the agent solve a decision problem. Instead, in our setting the experiment (i.e., the grading rule) helps potential employers evaluate the productive value of the agent (the student).

We make several assumptions of note:

1. We assume that all grading rules are imperfect ($b < 1$). In our setting, if a perfect grading rule were available to the designer, then the first-best level of effort would be achievable in every school. Each individual would receive a wage equal to his productive value, and school-based statistical discrimination would be moot.
2. We assume that the designer can choose the grading system of each school. We show in Section 6 that the choice of grading rules can be delegated to the schools, so long as schools care about effort.

3. Our model allows transfers. We show in Section 6 that without transfers the designer can do no better than to pool all students in one school.
4. We do not require budget balance to hold. Requiring it changes none of our results.

3 Basic Principles

This section contains three subsections. Subsections 3.1 and 3.2 examine the two guiding principles of our analysis:

1. different groups of students might be optimally incentivized by different grading rules;
2. if different students are evaluated with the same grading rule, then bunching them together increases effort.

Subsection 3.3 solves two benchmark problems. All the results in this section are proved in Appendix B.

3.1 On the Benefits of Separating Students

To shorten notation, define the grading rules

$$G^* := (0, b), \quad G_* := (1 - b, b).$$

Notice that both G_* and G^* are maximally informative within \mathbb{G} . Furthermore, G_* assures the grade “pass” to any student j for whom $v_j = 1$. Similarly, G^* assures the grade “fail” to any student j for whom $v_j = 0$.¹² Our first result shows that the best way to motivate effort through grades depends on ability.

Proposition 1. *If a school s maximizes the effort of its students, then either (i) $G(s) = G^*$ or (ii) $G(s) = G_*$. Furthermore, there exists a cutoff θ^\dagger such that (i) holds whenever $\bar{\theta}_s < \theta^\dagger$ and (ii) holds whenever $\bar{\theta}_s > \theta^\dagger$.*

The first part of Proposition 1 tells us that any school for which the grading rule does not belong to the set $\{G^*, G_*\}$ is such that effort exerted in that school can be increased. Intuitively, this result can be understood as follows. Any grading rule $G \notin \{G^*, G_*\}$ can be

¹²That is, G_* avoids false negatives, while G^* avoids false positives.




FIGURE 1: GRADING RULES

written as a convex combination of G^* , G_* , and some uninformative grading rule, G^\emptyset say (see Figure 1 for an illustration). As such, any school adopting grading rule G may be thought of as *covertly* randomizing between G^* , G_* , and G^\emptyset . Revealing eventually the grading rule used provides employers with useful information. This additional information increases (on average) the marginal benefit of exerting effort. On the other hand, in this hypothetical setting, students' marginal benefit of effort can be written as a convex combination of the marginal benefits of effort resulting from the grading rules G^* , G_* , and G^\emptyset , respectively. Students' marginal benefit of effort being larger in the hypothetical setting than in the actual setting, we conclude that at least one of G^* , G_* , and G^\emptyset induces more effort than G . Finally, G^\emptyset being uninformative (and, therefore, generating no effort), either G^* or G_* must induce more effort than G .

The second part of Proposition 1 tells us that whether G^* induces more effort than G_* , or the other way around, depends on the mean student type. The intuitive idea is as follows. First, recall that G_* avoids false negatives. Now suppose that a school with a high mean type adopts grading rule G_* . In such a school, a student who chooses to exert effort is very likely to obtain the grade “pass”. So failing reveals that a student probably shirked. In other words, when $\bar{\theta}_s$ is large, G_* curbs moral hazard by enabling potential employers to detect shirking. Reasoning similarly shows that, when $\bar{\theta}_s$ is small, G^* enables potential employers to ascertain that a student exerted effort.¹³

¹³Readers familiar with the reputation literature will recognize here a mechanism similar to the one driving

3.2 On the Benefits of Pooling Students

Our second result shows that, given any informative grading rule, separating students into different groups lowers their effort.

Proposition 2. *If two schools share the same informative grading rule, then merging them increases total effort.*

The basic intuition is as follows. Separating students provides employers with information about students' types. This additional information (on average) weakens the informational content of the grades, and, consequently, also the benefit of exerting effort.

3.3 Two Benchmarks

In what follows, let (\mathbf{P}_1) denote the auxiliary problem of the designer obtained from (\mathbf{P}_0) by adding the constraint that \mathbb{S} must comprise a single school. The next result immediately follows from Proposition 1.

Corollary 1. *There exists a cutoff θ^\dagger such that, if the mean type in the population is smaller (respectively, greater) than θ^\dagger , then the solution of (\mathbf{P}_1) entails the grading rule G^* (respectively, G_*).*

Next, consider the auxiliary problem (\mathbf{P}_2) obtained from (\mathbf{P}_0) by adding the constraint that all schools have to share the same grading rule. The following corollary immediately follows from Proposition 2.

Corollary 2. *Any solution of (\mathbf{P}_2) comprises a single school.*

The auxiliary problems (\mathbf{P}_1) and (\mathbf{P}_2) examined above are useful to illustrate the basic trade-off at the heart of our analysis. However, these problems are considerably simpler than the problem (\mathbf{P}_0) which we want to solve, for two reasons. Firstly, grouping and grading are dealt with separately in the auxiliary problems. Secondly, ensuring that each student attends the “right” school is neither an issue in (\mathbf{P}_1) , nor in (\mathbf{P}_2) . In the following section, we turn to the problem (\mathbf{P}_0) .

the reputation dynamics in Board and Meyer-ter Vehn (2013).

4 Main Result

In this section, we state and prove the main result of the paper.

Definition 1. *A school system has a two-tier structure if (i) it consists of two schools, and (ii) there exists a cutoff $\hat{\theta}$ such that almost all students whose types are greater than $\hat{\theta}$ attend one school (the “top-tier school”), while almost all students whose types are less than $\hat{\theta}$ attend the other school (the “bottom-tier school”).¹⁴*

We can now state our main result.

Theorem 1. *Any solution of (\mathbf{P}_0) comprises a school system which either contains a single school, or exhibits a two-tier structure. In the latter case, the bottom-tier school adopts the grading rule G^* , while the top-tier school adopts the grading rule G_* .¹⁵*

The optimal school systems thus feature a combination of separation and pooling. Specifically, any optimal school system is characterized by a cutoff $\hat{\theta}$, such that students whose types are above $\hat{\theta}$ are separated from those whose types are below it. However, on each side of $\hat{\theta}$, all students are pooled. The bottom-tier school adopts the maximally tough grading rule, whereas the top-tier one adopts the maximally lenient grading rule.

The separating cutoff $\hat{\theta}$ may be unique (e.g., if F is uniform), or multiple cutoffs may be optimal. Note that even when $\hat{\theta}$ is unique, this cutoff in general differs from the cutoff θ^\dagger that we uncovered in Proposition 1. The reason is that varying the separating cutoff involves a trade-off: we show that effort exerted in the top-tier school increases with $\hat{\theta}$, but that effort exerted in the bottom-tier school decreases as $\hat{\theta}$ increases. Furthermore, as we will see in the next section, the incentive compatibility constraints of the problem (\mathbf{P}_0) typically require setting $\hat{\theta} > \theta^\dagger$.

A couple of important preliminary observations are in order before moving on to the proof of Theorem 1. Firstly, we show in Appendix A that to any school s is associated a unique “consistent” profile of effort

$$e_s^* : \Theta_s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+,$$

in the sense that if a mechanism $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbb{S}, t, e)$ is feasible, then, for every school $s \in \mathbb{S}$, the restriction of the function e to Θ_s is e_s^* . We denote by \bar{e}_s^* the average consistent effort in school

¹⁴A property X is true for *almost all* students whose types belong to some set Θ , if the mass of students with types in Θ for whom X does not hold is equal to 0.

¹⁵In the former case, the grading rule is one of G^* and G_* .

s , that is,

$$\bar{e}_s^* := \frac{1}{m_s} \int_{\Theta_s} e_s^*(\theta) dF(\theta).$$

Next, pick a feasible mechanism \mathbf{M} . We show in Appendix A that there exist $\xi : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\zeta : [0, \alpha] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the expected payoff of a type- θ individual attending school s and exerting a consistent level of effort can be written as

$$\xi(s) + \zeta(\theta) + \left(\frac{\kappa + c}{c} \right) \theta (c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s). \quad (3)$$

Hence, in our model, a single-crossing condition emerges endogenously, in a fashion similar to Fang (2001).

We can now present the key steps of Theorem 1's proof. Readers uninterested in the technical aspects of the analysis can skip to the next section.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Definition 2. *A school system \mathbb{S} is regular if for any pair of schools s_1 and s_2 such that the average marginal cost of effort is smaller in s_1 than in s_2 , that is, $c\bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1} < c\bar{e}_{s_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_2}$, we have $\sup \Theta_{s_1} \leq \inf \Theta_{s_2}$.*

Applying standard mechanism design arguments shows that for a mechanism to satisfy (IC), it must comprise a regular school system.

Lemma 1. *Any feasible mechanism comprises a regular school system.*

Coupling Lemma 1 with the next one establishes that the designer's problem boils down to selecting the regular school system that maximizes total effort.

Lemma 2. *Any regular school system forms part of a feasible mechanism.*

The proof of Lemma 2 is in Appendix C.

Now let (\mathbf{P}_3) denote the auxiliary problem of the designer obtained from (\mathbf{P}_0) by adding the constraint that every set Θ_s has to be an interval. We show in Appendix C that the set of mechanisms solving (\mathbf{P}_0) coincides with the set of mechanisms that solve (\mathbf{P}_3) (see Proposition C.1). Hence, Theorem 1 follows from the next proposition.

Proposition 3. *Any solution of (\mathbf{P}_3) comprises a school system which either contains a single school, or exhibits a two-tier structure. In the latter case, the bottom-tier school adopts the grading rule G^* , while the top-tier school adopts the grading rule G_* .*

Proof: Suppose some mechanism \mathbf{M} with $|\mathbb{S}| \geq 2$ solves (\mathbf{P}_3) . Let $\mathbb{S} = \{s_1, \dots, s_I\}$, with schools labeled so as to satisfy $\sup \Theta_{s_i} \leq \inf \Theta_{s_k}$ for every $i < k$.

Step 1: $G(s_I) = G_\star$.

Lemma 1 gives

$$c\bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1} \leq \dots \leq c\bar{e}_{s_I}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_I}. \quad (4)$$

Letting θ^\dagger refer to the cutoff defined in Proposition 1, we have

$$\bar{\theta}_{s_I} > \theta^\dagger, \quad (5)$$

for otherwise applying Propositions 1 and 2 would enable us to contradict the optimality of \mathbf{M} . In turn, the combination of (4)-(5), Proposition 1 and Lemma 2 shows that $G(s_I) = G_\star$. If not, then replacing $G(s_I)$ with G_\star would yield a regular school system generating more effort than the system \mathbb{S} forming part of \mathbf{M} .

Step 2: $|I| = 2$ and $G(s_1) = G_\star$.

The combination of (4)-(5), Propositions 1-2, and Lemma 2 shows that $\bar{\theta}_{s_i} < \theta^\dagger$ for $i = 1, \dots, I-1$. If not, then bunching together all students attending some school whose mean type is at least as large as θ^\dagger so as to construct a new school with grading rule G_\star would yield a regular school system generating more effort than the system \mathbb{S} forming part of \mathbf{M} .

Next, reason by contradiction and suppose either $I > 2$, or $I = 2$ but $G(s_1) \neq G_\star$. Consider the school system $\mathbb{S}' = \{s'_1, s'_2\}$ where

$$s'_1 = \left(\cup_{i=1}^{I-1} \Theta_{s_i}, G_\star \right), \quad s'_2 = s_I.$$

By Propositions 1 and 2,

$$\bar{e}_{s'_1}^* > \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{I-1} m_{s_i}} \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} m_{s_i} \bar{e}_{s_i}^*.$$

So \mathbb{S}' cannot be regular, for otherwise applying Lemma 2 would yield a contradiction with the optimality of \mathbf{M} . Hence:

$$c\bar{e}_{s'_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_1} > c\bar{e}_{s'_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_2}. \quad (6)$$

Now, given $0 \leq z < 1 - \inf \Theta_{s'_2}$, consider the school system $\mathbb{S}''(z)$ obtained from \mathbb{S}' by moving those students of the top-tier school s'_2 whose types are between $\inf \Theta_{s'_2}$ and $\inf \Theta_{s'_2} + z$

into the bottom-tier school s'_1 . That is, $\mathbb{S}''(z) = \{s''_1(z), s''_2(z)\}$, where

$$s''_1(z) = ([0, \inf \Theta_{s'_2} + z], G^\star), \quad s''_2(z) = ((\inf \Theta_{s'_2} + z, 1], G_\star).$$

The difference

$$D(z) = (c\bar{e}_{s'_1}^*(z) - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_1}''(z)) - (c\bar{e}_{s'_2}^*(z) - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_2}''(z))$$

is continuous in z , and, by (6), satisfies $D(0) > 0$. So by virtue of the intermediate value theorem, either $D(z) > 0$ for all $z \in (0, 1 - \inf \Theta_{s'_2})$, or there exists $\tilde{z} \in (0, 1 - \inf \Theta_{s'_2})$ such that $D(\tilde{z}) = 0$. Suppose that the second case holds (the arguments are similar for the first case, and therefore omitted). Then, as $D(\tilde{z}) = 0$ we get

$$m_{s'_1}''(\tilde{z})(c\bar{e}_{s'_1}^*(\tilde{z}) - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_1}''(\tilde{z})) + m_{s'_2}''(\tilde{z})(c\bar{e}_{s'_2}^*(\tilde{z}) - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_2}''(\tilde{z})) = c\bar{e}_{s'_2}^*(\tilde{z}) - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_2}''(\tilde{z}).$$

If $G(s) = G_\star$, then $c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s$ is an increasing function of $\bar{\theta}_s$ (see Lemma C.1), hence

$$c\bar{e}_{s'_2}^*(\tilde{z}) - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_2}''(\tilde{z}) > c\bar{e}_{s'_2}^*(0) - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_2}''(0) = c\bar{e}_{s'_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_2}.$$

Finally (4) ensures

$$c\bar{e}_{s'_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_2} \geq \sum_{i=1}^I m_{s_i} (c\bar{e}_{s_i}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_i}).$$

Yet,

$$m_{s'_1}''(\tilde{z})\bar{\theta}_{s'_1}''(\tilde{z}) + m_{s'_2}''(\tilde{z})\bar{\theta}_{s'_2}''(\tilde{z}) = \sum_{i=1}^I m_{s_i} \bar{\theta}_{s_i}.$$

We thus obtain

$$m_{s'_1}''(\tilde{z})\bar{e}_{s'_1}^*(\tilde{z}) + m_{s'_2}''(\tilde{z})\bar{e}_{s'_2}^*(\tilde{z}) > \sum_{i=1}^I m_{s_i} \bar{e}_{s_i}^*.$$

But notice that, by virtue of Lemma 2, $\mathbb{S}''(\tilde{z})$ forms part of a feasible mechanism. The last inequality therefore contradicts our hypothesis that \mathbf{M} solves (\mathbf{P}_3) . ■

5 School-Based Statistical Discrimination, Tracking, and Inequality

In this section, we examine how tracking affects inequalities. We start by stating this section's main result.

Theorem 2. *Any solution of (\mathbf{P}_0) comprising a two-tier school system is such that both effort and fees are larger in the top-tier school (s_2) than in the bottom-tier school (s_1): $\bar{e}_{s_2}^* \geq \bar{e}_{s_1}^*$ and $t(s_2) > t(s_1)$.*

The proof is straightforward (see Appendix D), and rests on the endogenous single-crossing condition which we uncovered in expression (3). Intuitively, as in (1) ability and effort are substitutes, schools which generate a lot of effort also end up attracting high-ability students. By (1), the average productive value (and, therefore, the mean wage) of students in school s_i can be written as $\bar{\theta}_{s_i} + \bar{e}_{s_i}^*$. We conclude from Theorem 2 that tracking amplifies initial inequalities.

As the designer cannot directly control students' effort, in order to achieve $\bar{e}_{s_2}^* \geq \bar{e}_{s_1}^*$ the designer effectively lowers the fee of the bottom-tier school s_1 (and/or raises the fee of the top-tier school s_2). The mechanism is as follows. Lowering the fee of the bottom-tier school triggers a displacement of students towards said school. This displacement of students raises the mean type in both school s_1 and s_2 . We show that effort exerted in s_2 is an increasing function of its mean type; by contrast, effort exerted in s_1 is a decreasing function of its mean type. Thus, lowering the fee of the bottom-tier school ultimately achieves $\bar{e}_{s_2}^* \geq \bar{e}_{s_1}^*$.

It emerges from the previous discussion that the fundamental reason for which tracking amplifies inequalities is that the designer must resort to an extremely elitist school system in order to separate students appropriately. This suggests that regulators could preserve the benefits of tracking all the while minimizing its undesirable effects through measures making types more easily observable. These measures could take the form of entry tests, for example.

6 Extensions

In this section, we briefly discuss two extensions. All proofs for this section are in Appendix D.

The problem (\mathbf{P}_0) allows different schools to charge different fees. In practice, regulators may find that imposing differentiated fees is politically infeasible. This raises the following question: what is the optimal school system under uniform fees?

The next proposition answers the question above. Let (\mathbf{P}_4) denote the auxiliary problem of the designer obtained from (\mathbf{P}_0) by adding to it the constraint that school fees have to be uniform.¹⁶

Proposition 4. *Suppose that the mean of F is different from the cutoff θ^\dagger in Proposition 1. Then any solution of (\mathbf{P}_4) comprises a single school.*

In other words, the problem (\mathbf{P}_4) reduces to the problem (\mathbf{P}_1) examined in Section 3.3.

Next, we show that as long as schools care about the effort exerted by their students then the choice of grading rules can be decentralized.

Proposition 5. *Consider a school s forming part of a solution of (\mathbf{P}_0) . Then $G(s)$ maximizes the effort of the students in school s .*

Proposition 5 essentially tells us that the school systems forming part of an optimal mechanism do not distort the grading rules: all distortions take the form of how students are grouped into schools.

7 Further Related Literature

A small but influential strand of the economics literature on education explicitly considers grading as an object of design. Becker and Rosen (1992) argues that stratifying students into groups in which each has a chance for success may be preferred to the setting of a single national standard. Costrell (1994) puts forth the view that a tough grading rule aggravates inequality, and that an egalitarian planner may therefore prefer a more lenient grading rule; Betts (1998) defends the opposite viewpoint. Ostrovsky and Schwarz (2010) explores a model of assortative matching and shows that if the assignment function from student ability to job desirability is concave, then a school will find it profitable to mix high-ability students with low-ability ones by lowering the informativeness of the grades. However, none of these papers examines the dual problem of how students should be grouped and graded.

Our work has connections with various theoretical literatures, and, in particular, with the literature on mechanism design with peer effects, comprising Jehiel, Moldovanu and Stacchetti (1996, 1999), Jehiel and Moldovanu (2001), Board (2009), Rayo (2013), Rothschild and Scheuer (2013, 2016), and Yamashita and Sarkisian (2021). Relative to this literature, the main novelty of our work is that how much an individual values being part of a certain group is not

¹⁶That is, $t(s) = t(s')$ for all $s, s' \in \mathbb{S}$.

fixed, but instead depends on a grading rule which is adjustable. Moreover, the setting we study features moral hazard in addition to screening; Rothschild and Scheuer (2013, 2016) share this feature with our work, but study optimal taxation problems in which agents must choose between two sectors.

Finally, the problem we analyze can be viewed as an information design problem with constraints: the school system plays the role of an information structure, and incentive compatibility constraints ensure that an information structure is feasible. We refer the reader to Kamenica, Kim and Zapechelnuyk (2021) for a recent review of this broad literature.

8 Conclusion

Because school grades are imperfect, which school a student attended may carry valuable information on top of the grades which he obtained. Statistical discrimination based on the school that an individual went to is therefore unsurprisingly widespread. How should students be grouped in the face of statistical discrimination of this kind?

We show that the optimal school system exhibits a mixture of separation and pooling. High-ability students are separated from low-ability ones because students with different abilities are optimally incentivized to exert effort in different ways. On the other hand, all high-ability students are pooled, and so are all low-ability students. The reason is that pooling minimizes the informational content of the school that a student went to, thus making grades matter more. Since effort is motivated through grades, pooling students with similar abilities results in more effort.

Our study contributes to the ongoing policy debate on tracking. Our results show that a well-designed form of tracking can be efficient, but, also, that tracking might reinforce inequalities.

Appendix A: Preliminaries

For any grading system $G = (g_0, \Delta)$ and any $x \in [0, 1]$, define

$$B(G, x) := \left(\frac{x(g_0 + \Delta)}{g_0 + x\Delta} - \frac{x(1 - g_0 - \Delta)}{1 - g_0 - x\Delta} \right) \Delta.$$

The interpretation is as follows: $B(G, x)$ determines students' marginal benefit of effort in a school s such that $G(s) = G$ and $\bar{p}_{\hat{p}}(s) = x$. Notice that if $\Delta > 0$ and $x \in (0, 1)$, then $0 < B(G, x) \leq b$; otherwise $B(G, x) = 0$.

Next, given a school s and a function $e_s : \Theta_s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, define

$$\bar{e}_s := \frac{1}{m_s} \int_{\Theta_s} e_s(\theta) dF(\theta).$$

The next two lemmata together establish that there exists a unique “consistent” profile of effort in each school, and characterize this profile.

Lemma A.1. *Let s be an arbitrary school. There exists a unique $e_s^* : \Theta_s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that*

$$B(G(s), \bar{\theta}_s + \bar{e}_s^*) = ce_s^*(\theta) - \kappa\theta, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta_s. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Proof: We will treat the case in which $\Delta(s) > 0$ (the case $\Delta(s) = 0$ is similar and simpler). If (A.1) holds then integrating both sides of said equation over $\bar{\theta}_s$ and dividing through by m_s gives

$$B(G(s), \bar{\theta}_s + \bar{e}_s^*) = c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Then, subtracting (A.2) from (A.1) yields

$$e_s^*(\theta) = \bar{e}_s^* + \frac{\kappa}{c}(\theta - \bar{\theta}_s). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

So proving the lemma amounts to showing that the equation $h_s(x) = 0$ admits a unique solution, where $h_s : [0, 1 - \alpha] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$h_s(x) := B(G(s), \bar{\theta}_s + x) - (cx - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The function h_s is continuous, and strictly concave. Furthermore, $h_s(0) > 0$, and

$$h_s(1 - \alpha) \leq b - c(1 - \alpha) + \kappa\alpha.$$

Hence $h_s(1 - \alpha) < 0$, since by assumption $c > \frac{b + \kappa\alpha}{1 - \alpha}$. It follows from the intermediate value theorem that $h_s(x) = 0$ possesses a solution. Moreover, this solution is unique, since h_s is strictly concave. \blacksquare

Henceforth, given an arbitrary school s , the notation e_s^* will refer to the mapping uncovered in Lemma A.1. The next result tells us that e_s^* represents the unique “consistent” profile of effort in school s .

Lemma A.2. *Let mechanism $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbb{S}, t, e)$ be feasible. Then, for every school $s \in \mathbb{S}$, the restriction of the function e to Θ_s is e_s^* .*

Proof: Since \mathbf{M} is feasible, it satisfies (IC) and (CB). This implies, in particular, that for $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\theta \in \Theta_s$:

$$e(\theta) \in \arg \max_{e' \geq 0} U_{\hat{p}}(\theta, e', s), \quad \text{where } \hat{p}(\theta') = \theta' + e(\theta') \text{ for all } \theta' \in [0, \alpha]. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

By (2),

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\hat{p}}(\theta, e', s) &= \psi_{\hat{p}}(\theta + e', s) - c(e', \theta) - t(s) \\ &= q_{\hat{p}}^-(s) + [g_0(s) + (\theta + e')\Delta(s)](q_{\hat{p}}^+(s) - q_{\hat{p}}^-(s)) - c(e', \theta) - t(s) \\ &= q_{\hat{p}}^-(s) + [g_0(s) + (\theta + e')\Delta(s)](q_{\hat{p}}^+(s) - q_{\hat{p}}^-(s)) - \frac{c}{2}(e')^2 + \kappa\theta e' - t(s). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the first-order condition corresponding to the maximization problem in (A.5) gives

$$\Delta(s)(q_{\hat{p}}^+(s) - q_{\hat{p}}^-(s)) = ce(\theta) - \kappa\theta, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta_s. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

On the other hand, by virtue of (CB),

$$\bar{p}_{\hat{p}}(s) = \frac{1}{m_s} \int_{\Theta_s} \hat{p}(\theta) dF(\theta) = \frac{1}{m_s} \int_{\Theta_s} (\theta + e(\theta)) dF(\theta) = \bar{\theta}_s + \bar{e}_s.$$

Thus

$$\Delta(s)(q_{\hat{p}}^+(s) - q_{\hat{p}}^-(s)) = B(G, \bar{\theta}_s + \bar{e}_s),$$

by definition of the function B . Finally, combining the previous remarks yields

$$B(G, \bar{\theta}_s + \bar{e}_s) = ce(\theta) - \kappa\theta, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta_s.$$

Applying Lemma A.1 concludes the proof. ■

Lemma A.2 will greatly simplify the analysis, by making it possible to restrict attention to mechanisms $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbb{S}, t, e)$ whose effort function e is such that the restriction of e to Θ_s equals e_s^* , for every s in the set \mathbb{S} . We next formalize this simplification. Firstly, given any school s , define

$$\bar{p}^*(s) := \bar{\theta}_s + \bar{e}_s^*.$$

Then let

$$q^+(s) := \frac{\bar{p}^*(s)(g_0(s) + \Delta(s))}{g_0(s) + \bar{p}^*(s)\Delta(s)}, \quad q^-(s) := \frac{\bar{p}^*(s)(1 - g_0(s) - \Delta(s))}{1 - g_0(s) - \bar{p}^*(s)\Delta(s)},$$

$$\psi(p, s) := q^-(s) + [g_0(s) + p\Delta(s)](q^+(s) - q^-(s)),$$

and

$$U(\theta, e, s) := \psi(\theta + e, s) - c(e, \theta) - t(s).$$

These objects are just the counterparts of $\bar{p}_{\hat{p}}(s)$, $q_{\hat{p}}^+(s)$, $q_{\hat{p}}^-(s)$, $\psi_{\hat{p}}(p, s)$, and $U_{\hat{p}}(\theta, e, s)$ when fixing employers' prior beliefs such that $\hat{p}(\theta) = \theta + e_s^*(\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta_s$ (i.e., in accordance with the unique consistent profile of effort).

We close this appendix with three basic results.

Lemma A.3. *Suppose $B(G(s), \bar{\theta}_s + x) > cx - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s$. Then $\bar{e}_s^* > x$.*

Lemma A.4.

$$\arg \max_G B(G, x) = \begin{cases} \{G^*\} & \text{if } x \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \\ \{G^*, G_\star\} & \text{if } x = \frac{1}{2} \\ \{G_\star\} & \text{if } x \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \end{cases}.$$

Lemma A.5. $\bar{p}^*(s)$ increases with $\bar{\theta}_s$.

In words, Lemma A.3 simply says that any level of effort at which the marginal benefit of effort in a given school is greater than its average marginal cost is necessarily less than the average consistent level of effort in that school. Lemma A.4 shows that the marginal benefit

of effort in a school s is maximized either when $G(s) = G^*$, or when $G(s) = G_*$. Lemma A.5 records the intuitively obvious fact that augmenting the mean type of the students at a given school s increases employers' prior belief that an arbitrary student from s has productive value 1.

Proof of Lemma A.3: We saw in the proof of Lemma A.1, that \bar{e}_s^* is the unique solution of $h_s(x) = 0$, with h_s given by (A.4). Furthermore, we noted that h_s is continuous, concave, and satisfies $h_s(0) > 0$. The result immediately follows from these observations. ■

Proof of Lemma A.4: The following properties are readily verified:

- (a) for all $x \in (0, 1)$, $B((g_0, \Delta), x)$ is increasing in Δ and, for $\Delta > 0$, strictly convex in g_0 ;
- (b) $B((0, b), x)$ is decreasing in x , while $B((1 - b, b), x)$ is increasing in x ;
- (c) $B((0, b), \frac{1}{2}) = B((1 - b, b), \frac{1}{2})$.

Property (a) establishes $\arg \max_G B(G, x) \subseteq \{G^*, G_*\}$, for every $x \in (0, 1)$. Coupling properties (b) and (c) finishes to prove what we want. ■

Proof of Lemma A.5: Consider two schools, s_1 and s_2 , such that $G(s_1) = G(s_2) = G$, but with $\bar{\theta}_{s_1} < \bar{\theta}_{s_2}$. Let \tilde{e}_{s_2} be defined by

$$\bar{\theta}_{s_2} + \tilde{e}_{s_2} = \bar{p}^*(s_1).$$

As $\bar{\theta}_{s_1} < \bar{\theta}_{s_2}$, note that $\tilde{e}_{s_2} < \bar{e}_{s_1}^*$. Then, using (A.2):

$$B(G, \bar{\theta}_{s_2} + \tilde{e}_{s_2}) = B(G, \bar{p}^*(s_1)) = c\bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1} > c\tilde{e}_{s_2} - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_2}.$$

Applying Lemma A.3 thus gives $\tilde{e}_{s_2} < \bar{e}_{s_2}^*$, whence $\bar{p}^*(s_2) > \bar{p}^*(s_1)$. ■

Proof of (3): We have

$$\begin{aligned}
U(\theta, e_s^*(\theta), s) &= q^-(s) + [g_0(s) + (\theta + e_s^*(\theta))\Delta(s)](q^+(s) - q^-(s)) - \left(\frac{c}{2}e_s^*(\theta) - \kappa\theta\right) e_s^*(\theta) - t(s) \\
&= q^-(s) + \left(\frac{g_0(s)}{\Delta(s)} + \theta\right) (c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s) + e_s^*(\theta)(ce_s^*(\theta) - \kappa\theta) - \left(\frac{c}{2}e_s^*(\theta) - \kappa\theta\right) e_s^*(\theta) - t(s) \\
&= q^-(s) + \left(\frac{g_0(s)}{\Delta(s)} + \theta\right) (c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s) + \frac{c}{2}(e_s^*(\theta))^2 - t(s) \\
&= q^-(s) + \left(\frac{g_0(s)}{\Delta(s)} + \theta\right) (c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s) + \frac{(c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s)^2}{2c} + \frac{\kappa^2\theta^2}{2c} + \frac{\kappa\theta}{c}(c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s) - t(s) \\
&= \xi(s) + \zeta(\theta) + \left(\frac{\kappa + c}{c}\right)\theta(c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\xi(s) = q^-(s) + \frac{g_0(s)(c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s)}{\Delta(s)} + \frac{(c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s)^2}{2c} - t(s), \tag{A.7}$$

and

$$\zeta(\theta) = \frac{\kappa^2\theta^2}{2c}. \tag{A.8}$$

In the sequence above, the second equality follows from (A.6), and the fourth from (A.3). ■

Appendix B: Additional Material for Section 3

Proof of Proposition 1: The first part of the proposition is a simple consequence of Lemmata A.3 and A.4. We prove below the second part of the proposition. Consider two schools, s_1 and s_2 , sharing the same mean type, with grading rules $G(s_1) = G^*$ and $G(s_2) = G_*$. We claim that $p(s_1) > 1/2$ implies $\bar{e}_{s_2}^* > \bar{e}_{s_1}^*$. Suppose $p(s_1) > 1/2$. Then

$$B(G(s_2), \alpha \bar{\theta}_{s_2} + (1 - \alpha) \bar{e}_{s_1}^*) = B(G(s_2), p(s_1)) > B(G(s_1), p(s_1)) = c \bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa \bar{\theta}_{s_1} = c \bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa \bar{\theta}_{s_2}.$$

The first and last equalities follow from $\bar{\theta}_{s_1} = \bar{\theta}_{s_2}$, the inequality is a consequence of Lemma A.4 and $p(s_1) > 1/2$, and the penultimate equality is obtained from Lemma (A.1). We thus have $B(G(s_2), \alpha \bar{\theta}_{s_2} + (1 - \alpha) \bar{e}_{s_1}^*) > c \bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa \bar{\theta}_{s_2}$ and, by Lemma A.3, $\bar{e}_{s_2}^* > \bar{e}_{s_1}^*$.

Now, Lemma A.5 implies the existence of a cutoff θ^\dagger such that $p(s) > 1/2$ whenever $\bar{\theta}_s > \theta^\dagger$ and $G(s) = G^*$. Hence, by combining the first part of the proposition with the previous claim, we see that if a school s with $\bar{\theta}_s > \theta^\dagger$ maximizes the effort of its students, then $G(s) = G_*$. One shows analogously that if a school s with $\bar{\theta}_s < \theta^\dagger$ maximizes the effort of its students, then $G(s) = G^*$. ■

Proof of Proposition 2: Consider the binary school system $\mathbb{S} = \{s_1, s_2\}$ such that s_1 and s_2 share the same informative grading rule, G say. Let $\mathbb{S}' = \{s_3\}$, where $s_3 = ([0, 1], G)$. We have to show that

$$\bar{e}_{s_3}^* > m_{s_1} \bar{e}_{s_1}^* + m_{s_2} \bar{e}_{s_2}^*. \tag{B.1}$$

As $B(G, \cdot)$ is strictly concave and $\bar{\theta}_{s_3} = m_{s_1} \bar{\theta}_{s_1} + m_{s_2} \bar{\theta}_{s_2}$, using Lemma (A.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} B(G, \alpha \bar{\theta}_{s_3} + (1 - \alpha)(m_{s_1} \bar{e}_{s_1}^* + m_{s_2} \bar{e}_{s_2}^*)) &> m_{s_1} B(G, p(s_1)) + m_{s_2} B(G, p(s_2)) \\ &= m_{s_1} (c \bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa \bar{\theta}_{s_1}) + m_{s_2} (c \bar{e}_{s_2}^* - \kappa \bar{\theta}_{s_2}) \\ &= c(m_{s_1} \bar{e}_{s_1}^* + m_{s_2} \bar{e}_{s_2}^*) - \kappa \bar{\theta}_{s_3}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma A.3 now establishes (B.1). ■

Appendix C: Additional Material for Section 4

Remark C.1. Any regular school system \mathbb{S} is characterized by unique cutoffs $\hat{\theta}_0 = 0 < \hat{\theta}_1 < \dots < \hat{\theta}_{I-1} < 1 = \hat{\theta}_I$ such that to every $s \in \mathbb{S}$ is associated a unique index, say $i(s)$, satisfying the following properties:

$$(i) \quad \Theta_s \subseteq [\hat{\theta}_{i(s)-1}, \hat{\theta}_{i(s)}],$$

$$(ii) \quad i(s') > i(s) \Leftrightarrow c\bar{e}_{s'}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'} > c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s.$$

Proof of Lemma 2: Pick an arbitrary regular school system \mathbb{S} , with cutoffs $\hat{\theta}_0 = 0 < \hat{\theta}_1 < \dots < \hat{\theta}_{I-1} < 1 = \hat{\theta}_I$ (see Remark C.1). For $i = 1, \dots, I$, define $\mathbb{S}_i := \{s : i(s) = i\}$, and let (s_1, \dots, s_I) be an arbitrary tuple in $\mathbb{S}_1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{S}_I$. Set $t(s_1) = 0$ and, for $i \geq 2$, $t(s_i)$ in such a way that

$$U(\hat{\theta}_{i-1}, e_{s_{i-1}}^*(\hat{\theta}_{i-1}), s_{i-1}) = U(\hat{\theta}_{i-1}, e_{s_i}^*(\hat{\theta}_{i-1}), s_i). \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Lastly, for any $s'_i \in \mathbb{S}_i \setminus \{s_i\}$, set $t(s'_i)$ so as to obtain¹⁷

$$U(\theta, e_{s'_i}^*(\theta), s'_i) = U(\theta, e_{s_i}^*(\theta), s_i), \quad \forall \theta \in [0, \alpha]. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Now let \mathbf{M} denote the resulting mechanism. Then (C.1) and (C.2) imply (IC). Furthermore, (A.7) and (A.8) respectively show $\xi(s_1) \geq 0$, and $\zeta(\theta) \geq 0$ for all $\theta \in [0, \alpha]$. Hence, by (3),

$$U(\theta, e_{s_1}^*(\theta), s_1) \geq 0, \quad \forall \theta \in [0, \alpha]. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Coupling (IC) and (C.3) establishes (IR). ■

Lemma C.1. If $G(s) = G_*$, then $c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s$ is an increasing function of $\bar{\theta}_s$.

Proof: Notice to begin with that $B(G_*, p)$ is increasing in p . Thus, if $G(s) = G_*$, Lemma A.5 tells us that $B(G(s), \bar{p}^*(s))$ is increasing in $\bar{\theta}_s$. Applying Lemma A.1 completes the proof. ■

Proposition C.1. Any school system \mathbb{S} forming part of a solution of (\mathbf{P}_0) is such that, for all $s \in \mathbb{S}$, Θ_s is almost an interval.¹⁸

Proof: Let \mathbb{S} be part of a mechanism solving (\mathbf{P}_0) . By Lemma 1, \mathbb{S} is a regular school system. Let $\{\hat{\theta}_i\}_{i=0}^I$ be the set of cutoffs characterizing \mathbb{S} (see Remark C.1). Suppose $I = 1$

¹⁷By (3), such a $t(s'_i)$ exists and is unique.

¹⁸That is, there exists an interval Θ for which the symmetric difference D of Θ_s and Θ has mass 0.

(the arguments are similar for $I > 1$, and therefore omitted), that is,

$$c\bar{e}_{s_i}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_i} = c\bar{e}_{s_k}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_k}, \quad \forall s_i, s_k \in \mathbb{S}. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Let θ^\dagger refer to the cutoff defined in Proposition 1. Below, let $\mathbb{S}_< := \{s \in \mathbb{S} : \bar{\theta}_s < \theta^\dagger\}$, $\mathbb{S}_> := \{s \in \mathbb{S} : \bar{\theta}_s > \theta^\dagger\}$, and $\mathbb{S}_\geq := \mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbb{S}_<$.

Now reason by contradiction, and suppose that not every schools $s \in \mathbb{S}$ is such that Θ_s is almost an interval. We can then find two schools in \mathbb{S} , say s_1 and s_2 , with $\bar{\theta}_{s_1} \leq \bar{\theta}_{s_2}$, as well as subsets $\tilde{\Theta}_i \subset \Theta_{s_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$ satisfying: (a) $\int_{\tilde{\Theta}_1} dF(\theta) = \int_{\tilde{\Theta}_2} dF(\theta) > 0$, and (b) $\sup \tilde{\Theta}_2 \leq \inf \tilde{\Theta}_1$. We treat below the case in which $s_1 \in \mathbb{S}_<$ and $s_2 \in \mathbb{S}_>$ (the other cases are analogous, and therefore omitted).

Define $\mathbb{S}' = \{s'_1, s'_2\}$ as follows:

$$s'_1 = (\cup_{s \in \mathbb{S}_<} \Theta_s, G^*), \quad s'_2 = (\cup_{s \in \mathbb{S}_\geq} \Theta_s, G_\star).$$

Using Propositions 1 and 2 shows

$$\bar{e}_{s'_1}^* \geq \frac{1}{m_{s'_1}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_<} m_s \bar{e}_s^*, \quad \bar{e}_{s'_2}^* \geq \frac{1}{m_{s'_2}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_\geq} m_s \bar{e}_s^*. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Next, define $\mathbb{S}'' = \{s''_1, s''_2\}$ by

$$s''_1 = \left((\Theta_{s'_1} \setminus \tilde{\Theta}_1) \cup \tilde{\Theta}_2, G^* \right), \quad s''_2 = \left((\Theta_{s'_2} \setminus \tilde{\Theta}_2) \cup \tilde{\Theta}_1, G_\star \right).$$

In words, \mathbb{S}'' is obtained from \mathbb{S}' by moving students whose type is in $\tilde{\Theta}_1$ from s'_1 to s'_2 , and those whose type is in $\tilde{\Theta}_2$ from s'_2 to s'_1 . Note that, by construction,

$$\bar{\theta}_{s''_1} < \bar{\theta}_{s'_1} < \bar{\theta}_{s'_2} < \bar{\theta}_{s''_2}. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Next, observe firstly that $B(G_\star, p)$ is increasing in p and, secondly, that $B(G^*, p)$ is decreasing in p . By Lemma A.5, we thus obtain

$$B(G(s''_1), \bar{p}^*(s''_1)) > B(G(s'_1), \bar{p}^*(s'_1)), \quad B(G(s''_2), \bar{p}^*(s''_2)) > B(G(s'_2), \bar{p}^*(s'_2)). \quad (\text{C.7})$$

In turn,

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{s'_1} \bar{e}_{s'_1}^* + m_{s'_2} \bar{e}_{s'_2}^* &= m_{s'_1} \cdot \frac{B(G(s'_1), \bar{p}^*(s'_1)) + \kappa \bar{\theta}_{s'_1}}{c} + m_{s'_2} \cdot \frac{B(G(s'_2), \bar{p}^*(s'_2)) + \kappa \bar{\theta}_{s'_2}}{c} \\
&= \frac{1}{c} [m_{s'_1} B(G(s'_1), \bar{p}^*(s'_1)) + m_{s'_2} B(G(s'_2), \bar{p}^*(s'_2)) + \kappa (m_{s'_1} \bar{\theta}_{s'_1} + m_{s'_2} \bar{\theta}_{s'_2})] \\
&< \frac{1}{c} [m_{s''_1} B(G(s''_1), \bar{p}^*(s''_1)) + m_{s''_2} B(G(s''_2), \bar{p}^*(s''_2)) + \kappa (m_{s''_1} \bar{\theta}_{s''_1} + m_{s''_2} \bar{\theta}_{s''_2})] \\
&= m_{s''_1} \cdot \frac{B(G(s''_1), \bar{p}^*(s''_1)) + \kappa \bar{\theta}_{s''_1}}{c} + m_{s''_2} \cdot \frac{B(G(s''_2), \bar{p}^*(s''_2)) + \kappa \bar{\theta}_{s''_2}}{c} \\
&= m_{s''_1} \bar{e}_{s''_1}^* + m_{s''_2} \bar{e}_{s''_2}^*.
\end{aligned}$$

The first and last equalities follow from Lemma A.1. The second equality is a consequence of $m_{s'_i} = m_{s''_i}$, for $i = 1, 2$, and $\sum_{i=1}^2 m_{s'_i} \bar{\theta}_{s'_i} = \sum_{i=1}^2 m_{s''_i} \bar{\theta}_{s''_i}$. The inequality is obtained from (C.7).

By virtue of Lemma 2, if $c\bar{e}_{s''_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_2}$ were equal to $c\bar{e}_{s''_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_1}$ then \mathbb{S}'' would form part of a feasible mechanism. But this cannot be, for \mathbb{S} is part of an optimal mechanism, and we saw above that

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 m_{s''_i} \bar{e}_{s''_i}^* > \sum_{i=1}^2 m_{s'_i} \bar{e}_{s'_i}^* \geq \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} m_s \bar{e}_s^*.$$

So $c\bar{e}_{s''_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_2} \neq c\bar{e}_{s''_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_1}$. Say $c\bar{e}_{s''_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_1} > c\bar{e}_{s''_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_2}$ (otherwise, just switch the roles of the two schools in what follows), and let $\mathbb{S}''' = \{s''_1, s''_2\}$, with

$$s''_1 = (\Theta_{s''_1}, (0, \Delta''')), \quad s''_2 = s''_2,$$

and Δ''' chosen so as to guarantee $c\bar{e}_{s''_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_1} = c\bar{e}_{s''_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^2 m_{s''_i} (c\bar{e}_{s''_i}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_i}) &= c\bar{e}_{s''_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_2} \\
&= c\bar{e}_{s''_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_2} \\
&> c\bar{e}_{s'_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_2} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{m_{s'_2}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_{\geq}} m_s (c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s) \\
&= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} m_s (c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s).
\end{aligned}$$

The strict inequality follows from (C.6) and Lemma C.1. The weak inequality is due to (C.5), and the last equality is a consequence of (C.4). As

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 m_{s_i'''} \bar{\theta}_{s_i'''} = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} m_{s_i} \bar{\theta}_{s_i},$$

the sequence above yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 m_{s_i'''} \bar{e}_{s_i'''}^* > \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} m_{s_i} \bar{e}_{s_i}^*.$$

Since, by virtue of Lemma 2, \mathbb{S}''' forms part of a feasible mechanism, the latter inequality contradicts the fact that \mathbb{S} is part of a mechanism solving (\mathbf{P}_0) . ■

Appendix D: Additional Material for Sections 5 and 6

Proof of Theorem 2: Using Lemma 1 shows that $c\bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1} \leq c\bar{e}_{s_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_2}$. So

$$\bar{e}_{s_1}^* \leq \bar{e}_{s_2}^* - \frac{\kappa}{c}(\bar{\theta}_{s_2} - \bar{\theta}_{s_1}) \leq \bar{e}_{s_2}^*.$$

In turn, and since $\bar{\theta}_{s_2} > \bar{\theta}_{s_1}$, using the law of iterated expectations (twice) yields

$$U(\bar{\theta}_{s_1}, \bar{e}_{s_1}^*, s_2) > \alpha\bar{\theta}_{s_1} + (1 - \alpha)\bar{e}_{s_1}^* - c(\bar{e}_{s_1}^*, \bar{\theta}_{s_1}) - t(s_2) = U(\bar{\theta}_{s_1}, \bar{e}_{s_1}^*, s_1) + (t(s_1) - t(s_2)).$$

On the other hand, Θ_{s_1} being convex, the feasibility of \mathbf{M} implies

$$U(\bar{\theta}_{s_1}, e_{s_1}^*(\bar{\theta}_{s_1}), s_1) \geq U(\bar{\theta}_{s_1}, \bar{e}_{s_1}^*, s_2).$$

Yet, by (A.3), $e_{s_1}^*(\bar{\theta}_{s_1}) = \bar{e}_{s_1}^*$. So combining the last two highlighted expressions gives $t(s_2) > t(s_1)$. ■

Proof of Proposition 4: Let $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbb{S}, t, e)$ solve (\mathbf{P}_4) . Reason by contradiction, and suppose $|\mathbb{S}| \geq 2$. Let s_1 and s_2 be two different schools forming part of \mathbb{S} , with $\bar{\theta}_{s_1} \leq \bar{\theta}_{s_2}$. The arguments used in the proof of Theorem 2 show that $\bar{\theta}_{s_1} < \bar{\theta}_{s_2} \Rightarrow t(s_1) < t(s_2)$. Since $t(s_1) = t(s_2)$ we conclude that $\bar{\theta}_{s_1} = \bar{\theta}_{s_2}$. Yet, by Lemma 1, $c\bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1} = c\bar{e}_{s_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_2}$, and so $\bar{e}_{s_1}^* = \bar{e}_{s_2}^*$. These findings being independent of the schools considered, we see that $\bar{\theta}_{s_i} = \bar{\theta}_{s_k}$ and $\bar{e}_{s_i}^* = \bar{e}_{s_k}^*$ for all $s_i, s_k \in \mathbb{S}$. Applying Propositions 1 and 2 then yields a contradiction with the optimality of \mathbf{M} for problem (\mathbf{P}_4) (we use here the hypothesis that the mean of F is not θ^\dagger). ■

Proof of Proposition 5: Let $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbb{S}, t, e)$ solve (\mathbf{P}_0) . By Theorem 1, either $|\mathbb{S}| = 1$ or \mathbb{S} has a two-tier structure. The result of the proposition is immediate in the former case; combining Propositions 1 and 2 establishes the result in the latter case. ■

References

- Arrow, K. (1973) The theory of discrimination, in *Discrimination in Labor Markets*, Princeton University Press, vol. 3, pp. 3–33.
- Bardhi, A., Guo, Y. and Strulovici, B. (2020) Early-career discrimination: Spiraling or self-correcting?, *working paper*.
- Becker, W. E. and Rosen, S. (1992) The Learning Effect of Assessment and Evaluation in High School, *Economics of Education Review*, **11**, 107–118.
- Bergemann, D., Bonatti, A. and Smolin, A. (2018) The Design and Price of Information, *American Economic Review*, **108**, 1–48.
- Betts, J. (1998) The Impact of Educational Standards on the Level and Distribution of Earnings, *American Economic Review*, **88**, 266–275.
- Betts, J. R. (2011) The Economics of Tracking in Education, in *Handbook of the Economics of Education* (Eds.) E. Hanushek, S. Machin and L. Woessmann, Elsevier, vol. 3 of *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, chap. 7, pp. 341–381.
- Blume, L. E., Brock, W. A., Durlauf, S. N. and Jayaraman, R. (2015) Linear Social Interactions Models, *Journal of Political Economy*, **123**, 444–496.
- Board, S. (2009) Monopolistic Group Design with Peer Effects, *Theoretical Economics*, **4**, 89–125.
- Board, S. and Meyer-ter Vehn, M. (2013) Reputation for Quality, *Econometrica*, **81**, 2381–2462.
- Brunello, G. and Checchi, D. (2007) Does School Tracking Affect Equality of Opportunity? New International Evidence, *Economic Policy*, **22**, 781–861.
- Chambers, C. P. and Echenique, F. (2020) A Characterisation of ‘Phelpsian’ Statistical Discrimination, *The Economic Journal*, **131**, 2018–2032.
- Costrell, R. M. (1994) A Simple Model of Educational Standards, *American Economic Review*, pp. 956–971.

- de Roux, N. and Riehl, E. (2022) Do college students benefit from placement into higher-achieving classes?, *Journal of Public Economics*, **210**, 104669.
- Deming, D. J., Yuchtman, N., Abulafi, A., Goldin, C. and Katz, L. F. (2016) The value of postsecondary credentials in the labor market: An experimental study, *American Economic Review*, **106**, 778–806.
- Duflo, E., Dupas, P. and Kremer, M. (2011) Peer Effects, Teacher Incentives, and the Impact of Tracking: Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation in Kenya, *American Economic Review*, **101**, 1739–1774.
- Escudé, M., Onuchic, P., Sinander, L. and Valenzuela-Stookey, Q. (2022) Statistical discrimination and statistical informativeness, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.07128*.
- Eső, P. and Szentes, B. (2007) Optimal Information Disclosure in Auctions and the Handicap Auction, *The Review of Economic Studies*, **74**, 705–731.
- Fang, H. (2001) Social culture and economic performance, *American Economic Review*, **91**, 924–937.
- Fang, H. and Moro, A. (2011) Theories of Statistical Discrimination and Affirmative Action: A Survey, *Handbook of social economics*, **1**, 133–200.
- Gamoran, A. (2009) Tracking and Inequality: New Directions for Research and Practice, in *The Routledge International Handbook of the Sociology of Education*, Routledge.
- Guo, Y. and Shmaya, E. (2019) The Interval Structure of Optimal Disclosure, *Econometrica*, **87**, 653–675.
- Hanushek, E. and Wößmann, L. (2006) Does Educational Tracking Affect Performance and Inequality? Differences-in-Differences Evidence Across Countries, *Economic Journal*, **116**, C63–C76.
- Hanushek, E. A. and Woessmann, L. (2011) Chapter 2 - the economics of international differences in educational achievement, Elsevier, vol. 3 of *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, pp. 89–200.
- Jehiel, P. and Moldovanu, B. (2001) Efficient Design with Interdependent Valuations, *Econometrica*, **69**, 1237–1259.

- Jehiel, P., Moldovanu, B. and Stacchetti, E. (1996) How (Not) to Sell Nuclear Weapons, *The American Economic Review*, pp. 814–829.
- Jehiel, P., Moldovanu, B. and Stacchetti, E. (1999) Multidimensional Mechanism Design for Auctions with Externalities, *Journal of Economic Theory*, **85**, 258–293.
- Kamenica, E., Kim, T. and Zapechelnnyuk, A. (2021) Bayesian persuasion and information design: Perspectives and open issues, *Economic Theory*, **72**, 701–704.
- Kerr, S. P., Pekkarinen, T. and Uusitalo, R. (2013) School Tracking and Development of Cognitive Skills, *Journal of Labor Economics*, **31**, 577–602.
- Kolotilin, A., Mylovanov, T., Zapechelnnyuk, A. and Li, M. (2017) Persuasion of a Privately Informed Receiver, *Econometrica*, **85**, 1949–1964.
- Li, H. and Shi, X. (2017) Discriminatory Information Disclosure, *American Economic Review*, **107**, 3363–85.
- MacLeod, W. B., Riehl, E., Saavedra, J. E. and Urquiola, M. (2017) The big sort: College reputation and labor market outcomes, *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, **9**, 223–61.
- Malamud, O. and Pop-Eleches, C. (2011) School Tracking and Access to Higher Education Among Disadvantaged Groups, *Journal of Public Economics*, **95**, 1538–1549.
- Maurin, G. and McNally, S. (2012) The Effect of Tracking Students by Ability Into Different Schools a Natural Experiment, *Journal of Human Resources*, **47**, 684–721.
- Onuchic, P. (2022) Recent contributions to theories of discrimination, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.05994*.
- Ostrovsky, M. and Schwarz, M. (2010) Information Disclosure and Unraveling in Matching Markets, *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, **2**, 34–63.
- Phelps, E. (1972) The statistical theory of racism and sexism, *American Economic Review*, **62**, 659–61.
- Rayo, L. (2013) Monopolistic Signal Provision, *The BE Journal of Theoretical Economics*, **13**, 27–58.

- Rothschild, C. and Scheuer, F. (2013) Redistributive Taxation in the Roy Model, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **128**, 623–668.
- Rothschild, C. and Scheuer, F. (2016) Optimal Taxation with Rent-seeking, *The Review of Economic Studies*, **83**, 1225–1262.
- Rubin, B. C. (2006) Tracking and detracking: Debates, evidence, and best practices for a heterogeneous world, *Theory Into Practice*, **45**, 4–14.
- Tincani, M. M. (2022) Heterogeneous Peer Effects in the Classroom, *Manuscript, Dept. Econ., University College London*.
- Wei, D. and Green, B. (2020) (Reverse) Price Discrimination with Information Design, *Available at SSRN 3263898*.
- Wößmann, L. (2009) International Evidence on School Tracking: A Review, *CESifo DICE Report*, **1**, 26–34.
- Yamashita, T. and Sarkisian, R. (2021) Large Mechanism Design with Moment-based Allocation Externality, *TSE Working Papers 21-1241*.
- Yamashita, T. and Zhu, S. (2021) Type-contingent Information Disclosure, *TSE Working Paper - 1242*.
- Yang, K. H. (2022) Selling Consumer Data for Profit: Optimal Market-Segmentation Design and Its Consequences, *American Economic Review*, **112**, 1364–93.

Online Appendix 1: Convex Costs

We assume in this appendix that effort costs are convex and type-independent. The effort cost of individual j is given by $c(e_j)$, where $c' > 0$, $c'' > 0$, $c''' \geq 0$ and $c'(1) > b$.¹⁹ We denote with (\mathbf{P}_0'') the associated designer problem.

Consider an arbitrary school s and type $\theta \in \Theta_s$. The consistent effort level $e_s^*(\theta)$ satisfies

$$B(G(s), \bar{\theta}_s + \bar{e}_s^*) = c'(e_s^*(\theta)). \quad (\text{OA.1})$$

As c' is invertible, (OA.1) uniquely defines $e_s^*(\theta)$. This effort level does not depend on θ , hence

$$\bar{e}_s^* = e_s^*(\theta) = c'^{-1}(B(G(s), \bar{\theta}_s + \bar{e}_s^*)), \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta_s. \quad (\text{OA.2})$$

Lastly, while Lemmata A.4 and A.5 hold *verbatim* we state below the equivalent of Lemma A.3. The proofs of these three lemmata are omitted.

Lemma OA.1. *Consider a school s , and $x \in [0, 1]$ satisfying $B(G(s), \bar{\theta}_s + x) > c'(x)$. Then $\bar{e}_s^* > x$.*

Proof that to any school s is associated a unique consistent profile of effort: The case in which $\Delta(s) = 0$ is trivial. Suppose $\Delta > 0$. We conclude from (OA.2) that, when potential employers believe that average students' effort in school s is given by \bar{e}_s^* , exerting effort \bar{e}_s^* maximizes the expected payoff of a type- θ individual, for any $\theta \in \Theta_s$.

The above observation shows that (OA.2) is a necessary and sufficient condition for an effort profile $e_s^*(\cdot)$ to be consistent. The argument showing that this condition determines a unique profile of effort follows the steps of the proof for the baseline model. \blacksquare

Proposition OA.1. *If a school s maximizes the effort of its students, then either (i) $G(s) = G^*$ or (ii) $G(s) = G_*$. Furthermore, there exists a cutoff θ^\ddagger such that (i) holds whenever $\bar{\theta}_s < \theta^\ddagger$ and (ii) holds whenever $\bar{\theta}_s > \theta^\ddagger$.*

Proof: The first part of the proposition is a consequence of Lemma A.4. To prove the second part of the proposition, consider two schools, s_1 and s_2 , sharing the same mean type, with grading rules $G(s_1) = G^*$ and $G(s_2) = G_*$. We claim that $\bar{p}^*(s_1) > 1/2$ implies $\bar{e}_{s_2}^* > \bar{e}_{s_1}^*$.

¹⁹The last restriction will ensure that all students exert an interior level of effort.

Suppose $\bar{p}^*(s_1) > 1/2$. Then

$$B(G(s_2), \bar{\theta}_{s_2} + \bar{e}_{s_1}^*) = B(G(s_2), \bar{p}^*(s_1)) > B(G(s_1), \bar{p}^*(s_1)) = c'(\bar{e}_{s_1}^*).$$

The first equality follows from $\bar{\theta}_{s_1} = \bar{\theta}_{s_2}$, the inequality is a consequence of Lemma A.4 and $\bar{p}^*(s_1) > 1/2$, and the last equality is obtained from (OA.2). We thus have $B(G(s_2), \bar{\theta}_{s_2} + \bar{e}_{s_1}^*) > c'(\bar{e}_{s_1}^*)$ and, by Lemma OA.1, $\bar{e}_{s_2}^* > \bar{e}_{s_1}^*$.

Now, Lemma A.5 implies the existence of a cutoff θ^\ddagger such that $\bar{p}^*(s) > 1/2$ whenever $\bar{\theta}_s > \theta^\ddagger$ and $G(s) = G^*$. Combining the first part of the proposition with the previous claim, this observation shows that if a school s with $\bar{\theta}_s > \theta^\ddagger$ maximizes the effort of its students, then $G(s) = G_*$. One shows analogously that if a school s with $\bar{\theta}_s < \theta^\ddagger$ maximizes the effort of its students, then $G(s) = G^*$. \blacksquare

In the rest of this appendix, θ^\ddagger will refer to the cutoff defined in Proposition OA.1.

Proposition OA.2. *If two schools share the same informative grading rule, then merging them increases total effort.*

Proof: Consider the school system $\mathbb{S} = \{s_1, s_2\}$ such that s_1 and s_2 share the same informative grading rule, G say. Let $\mathbb{S}' = \{s_3\}$, where $s_3 = ([0, 1], G)$. We have to show that

$$\bar{e}_{s_3}^* > m_{s_1} \bar{e}_{s_1}^* + m_{s_2} \bar{e}_{s_2}^*. \quad (\text{OA.3})$$

As $m_{s_2} = 1 - m_{s_1}$, $\bar{\theta}_{s_3} = m_{s_1} \bar{\theta}_{s_1} + m_{s_2} \bar{\theta}_{s_2}$, $B(G, \cdot)$ is strictly concave, and c is strictly convex, using (OA.2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} B(G, \bar{\theta}_{s_3} + m_{s_1} \bar{e}_{s_1}^* + m_{s_2} \bar{e}_{s_2}^*) &> m_{s_1} B(G, \bar{p}^*(s_1)) + m_{s_2} B(G, \bar{p}^*(s_2)) \\ &= m_{s_1} c'(\bar{e}_{s_1}^*) + m_{s_2} c'(\bar{e}_{s_2}^*) \\ &> c'(m_{s_1} \bar{e}_{s_1}^* + m_{s_2} \bar{e}_{s_2}^*). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma A.3 now establishes (OA.3). \blacksquare

Theorem OA.1. *Any solution of (\mathbf{P}''_0) comprises a school system which either contains a single school, or exhibits a two-tier structure. In the latter case, the bottom-tier school has grading rule G^* , while the top-tier school has grading rule G_* .²⁰*

²⁰In the former case, the grading rule is one of G^* and G_* .

We prove the theorem by way of two propositions. Let (\mathbf{P}''_3) denote the auxiliary problem of the designer obtained from (\mathbf{P}''_0) by adding to it the constraint that every Θ_s has to be an interval.

Proposition OA.3. *Any solution of (\mathbf{P}''_3) comprises a school system which either contains a single school, or exhibits a two-tier structure. In the latter case, the bottom-tier school has grading rule G^* , while the top-tier school has grading rule G_* .*

Definition 3. *A school system \mathbb{S} is regular* if for any pair of schools s_1 and s_2 such that $\bar{e}_{s_1}^* < \bar{e}_{s_2}^*$, we have $\sup \Theta_{s_1} \leq \inf \Theta_{s_2}$.*

Remark OA.1. *Any regular* school system \mathbb{S} is characterized by unique cutoffs $\hat{\theta}_0 = 0 < \hat{\theta}_1 < \dots < \hat{\theta}_{I-1} < \alpha = \hat{\theta}_I$ such that to every $s \in \mathbb{S}$ is associated a unique index, say $i(s)$, satisfying the following properties*

- (i) $\Theta_s \subseteq [\hat{\theta}_{i(s)-1}, \hat{\theta}_{i(s)}]$,
- (ii) $i(s') > i(s) \Leftrightarrow \bar{e}_{s'}^* > \bar{e}_s^*$.

Lemma OA.2. *Any feasible mechanism comprises a regular* school system.*

Proof: Pick a feasible \mathbf{M} . We have

$$\begin{aligned} U(\theta, e_s^*(\theta), s) &= q_p^-(s) + [g_0(s) + (\theta + e_s^*(\theta))\Delta(s)](q_p^+(s) - q_p^-(s)) - c(e_s^*(\theta)) - t(s) \\ &= q_p^-(s) + \left(\frac{g_0(s)}{\Delta(s)} + \theta \right) c'(\bar{e}_s^*) + \bar{e}_s^* c'(\bar{e}_s^*) - c(\bar{e}_s^*) - t(s) \\ &= \tilde{\xi}(s) + \theta c'(\bar{e}_s^*), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\xi}(s) := q_p^-(s) + \frac{g_0(s)}{\Delta(s)} c'(\bar{e}_s^*) + \bar{e}_s^* c'(\bar{e}_s^*) - c(\bar{e}_s^*) - t(s).$$

As c' is increasing, standard mechanism design arguments complete the proof. ■

Lemma OA.3. *Any regular* school system forms part of a feasible mechanism.*

Lemma OA.4. *If $G(s) = G_*$, then \bar{e}_s^* is an increasing function of $\bar{\theta}_s$.*

The proofs of Lemma OA.3 and Lemma OA.4 are almost identical, respectively, to the proofs of Lemma 2 and Lemma C.1.

Proof of Proposition OA.3: Suppose some $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbb{S}, t)$ with $|\mathbb{S}| \geq 2$ solves (\mathbf{P}'_3) . Let $\mathbb{S} = \{s_1, \dots, s_I\}$, with schools labeled so as to satisfy $\sup \Theta_{s_i} \leq \inf \Theta_{s_k}$ for every $i < k$. Then Lemma OA.2 gives

$$\bar{e}_{s_1}^* \leq \dots \leq \bar{e}_{s_I}^*. \quad (\text{OA.4})$$

Furthermore, by the same arguments used in the proof of Proposition OA.3, we have $G(s_I) = G_\star$ and $\bar{\theta}_{s_I} > \theta^\ddagger > \bar{\theta}_{s_{I-1}}$. Next, reason by contradiction and suppose either $I > 2$, or $I = 2$ but $G(s_1) \neq G_\star$. Consider the school system $\mathbb{S}' = \{s'_1, s'_2\}$ where

$$s'_1 = \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{I-1} \Theta_{s_i}, G_\star \right), \quad s'_2 = s_I.$$

By Propositions OA.1 and OA.2,

$$\bar{e}_{s'_1}^* > \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{I-1} m_{s_i}} \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} m_{s_i} \bar{e}_{s_i}^*.$$

So \mathbb{S}' cannot be regular, for otherwise applying Lemma OA.3 would yield a contradiction with the optimality of \mathbf{M} for problem (\mathbf{P}'_3) . Hence:

$$\bar{e}_{s'_1}^* > \bar{e}_{s'_2}^*. \quad (\text{OA.5})$$

Now, given $0 \leq z < 1 - \inf \Theta_{s'_2}$, consider the school system $\mathbb{S}''(z) = \{s''_1(z), s''_2(z)\}$, where

$$s''_1(z) = ([0, \inf \Theta_{s'_2} + z], G_\star), \quad s''_2(z) = ((\inf \Theta_{s'_2} + z, 1], G_\star).$$

The difference $D(z) = \bar{e}_{s''_1(z)}^* - \bar{e}_{s''_2(z)}^*$ is continuous in z , and, by (OA.5), satisfies $D(0) > 0$. So by virtue of the intermediate value theorem, either $D(z) > 0$ for all $z \in (0, 1 - \inf \Theta_{s'_2})$, or there exists a $\tilde{z} \in (0, 1 - \inf \Theta_{s'_2})$ such that $D(\tilde{z}) = 0$. Suppose that the second case holds (the arguments are similar for the first case, and therefore omitted). Then

$$m_{s''_1(\tilde{z})} \bar{e}_{s''_1(\tilde{z})}^* + m_{s''_2(\tilde{z})} \bar{e}_{s''_2(\tilde{z})}^* = \bar{e}_{s''_2(\tilde{z})}^* > \bar{e}_{s''_2(0)}^* = \bar{e}_{s'_2}^* \geq \sum_{i=1}^I m_{s_i} \bar{e}_{s_i}^*,$$

where the first equality follows from $D(\tilde{z}) = 0$, the strict inequality from Lemma OA.4, and the weak inequality from (OA.4). We thus obtain $m_{s''_1(\tilde{z})} \bar{e}_{s''_1(\tilde{z})}^* + m_{s''_2(\tilde{z})} \bar{e}_{s''_2(\tilde{z})}^* > \sum_{i=1}^I m_{s_i} \bar{e}_{s_i}^*$. But notice that, by virtue of Lemma OA.3, $\mathbb{S}''(\tilde{z})$ forms part of a feasible mechanism. The

last inequality therefore contradicts our hypothesis that \mathbf{M} solves (\mathbf{P}_3'') . \blacksquare

Lemma OA.5. *Consider a school s with $G(s) = G^*$. Then \bar{e}_s^* is a decreasing function of $\bar{\theta}_s$.*

Proof: Note to begin with that $B(G^*, \cdot)$ is a decreasing function. Thus, if $G(s) = G^*$, Lemma A.5 tells us that $B(G(s), p(s))$ is decreasing in $\bar{\theta}_s$. Lemma A.3 completes the proof. \blacksquare

The following proposition concludes the proof of Theorem OA.1.

Proposition OA.4. *Any school system \mathbb{S} forming part of a solution of (\mathbf{P}_0'') is such that Θ_s is almost an interval, for all $s \in \mathbb{S}$.*

Proof: Let \mathbb{S} be part of a mechanism solving (\mathbf{P}_0'') . By Lemma OA.2, \mathbb{S} is regular*. Let $\{\hat{\theta}_i\}_{i=0}^I$ be the set of cutoffs characterizing \mathbb{S} (see Remark OA.1). Suppose $I = 1$ (the arguments are similar for $I > 1$), that is,

$$\bar{e}_{s_i}^* = \bar{e}_{s_k}^*, \quad \forall s_i, s_k \in \mathbb{S}. \quad (\text{OA.6})$$

Below, let $\mathbb{S}_< := \{s \in \mathbb{S} : \bar{\theta}_s < \theta^\ddagger\}$, $\mathbb{S}_> := \{s \in \mathbb{S} : \bar{\theta}_s > \theta^\ddagger\}$, and $\mathbb{S}_\geq := \mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbb{S}_<$.

Now reason by contradiction, and suppose that not every schools $s \in \mathbb{S}$ is such that Θ_s is almost an interval. We can then find two schools in \mathbb{S} , say s_1 and s_2 , with $\bar{\theta}_{s_1} \leq \bar{\theta}_{s_2}$, as well as subsets $\tilde{\Theta}_i \subset \Theta_{s_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$ satisfying: (a) $\int_{\tilde{\Theta}_1} dF(\theta) = \int_{\tilde{\Theta}_2} dF(\theta) > 0$, and (b) $\sup \tilde{\Theta}_2 \leq \inf \tilde{\Theta}_1$. We treat below the case in which $s_1 \in \mathbb{S}_<$ and $s_2 \in \mathbb{S}_>$.

Define $\mathbb{S}' = \{s'_1, s'_2\}$ as follows:

$$s'_1 = (\cup_{s \in \mathbb{S}_<} \Theta_s, G^*), \quad s'_2 = (\cup_{s \in \mathbb{S}_\geq} \Theta_s, G_\star).$$

Using Propositions OA.1 and OA.2 shows

$$\bar{e}_{s'_1}^* \geq \frac{1}{m_{s'_1}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_<} m_s \bar{e}_s^*, \quad \bar{e}_{s'_2}^* \geq \frac{1}{m_{s'_2}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_\geq} m_s \bar{e}_s^*. \quad (\text{OA.7})$$

Next, define $\mathbb{S}'' = \{s''_1, s''_2\}$ by

$$s''_1 = \left((\Theta_{s'_1} \setminus \tilde{\Theta}_1) \cup \tilde{\Theta}_2, G^* \right), \quad s''_2 = \left((\Theta_{s'_2} \setminus \tilde{\Theta}_2) \cup \tilde{\Theta}_1, G_\star \right).$$

Note that, by construction,

$$\bar{\theta}_{s''_1} < \bar{\theta}_{s'_1} < \bar{\theta}_{s'_2} < \bar{\theta}_{s''_2}. \quad (\text{OA.8})$$

So Lemma C.1 and Lemma OA.5 give, respectively, $\bar{e}_{s_2'}^* > \bar{e}_{s_2}^*$ and $\bar{e}_{s_1'}^* > \bar{e}_{s_1}^*$. In turn, using (OA.7) yields

$$\bar{e}_{s_1'}^* > \frac{1}{m_{s_1'}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_{<}} m_s \bar{e}_s^*, \quad \bar{e}_{s_2'}^* > \frac{1}{m_{s_2'}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_{\geq}} m_s \bar{e}_s^*. \quad (\text{OA.9})$$

By virtue of Lemma 2, if $c\bar{e}_{s_2'}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_2'} = c\bar{e}_{s_1'}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1'}$ then \mathbb{S}'' would form part of a feasible mechanism. But this cannot be, as (OA.9) would then contradict the optimality of \mathbb{S} for problem (\mathbf{P}_0'') . So $c\bar{e}_{s_2'}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_2'} \neq c\bar{e}_{s_1'}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1'}$. Say $c\bar{e}_{s_1'}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1'} > c\bar{e}_{s_2'}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_2'}$ (otherwise, just switch the roles of the two schools in what follows), and let $\mathbb{S}''' = \{s_1''', s_2'''\}$, with

$$s_1''' = (\Theta_{s_1'}, (1-b, \Delta''')), \quad s_2''' = s_2'',$$

and Δ''' chosen so as to guarantee $\bar{e}_{s_1'''}^* = \bar{e}_{s_2'''}^*$. Then

$$m_{s_1'''} \bar{e}_{s_1'''}^* + m_{s_2'''} \bar{e}_{s_2'''}^* = \bar{e}_{s_2'''}^* = \bar{e}_{s_2''}^* > \frac{1}{m_{s_2'}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}_{\geq}} m_s \bar{e}_s^* = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} m_s \bar{e}_s^*.$$

The strict inequality follows from (OA.9), and the last equality is a consequence of (OA.6). Since, by virtue of Lemma OA.3, \mathbb{S}''' forms part of a feasible mechanism, the inequality $m_{s_1'''} \bar{e}_{s_1'''}^* + m_{s_2'''} \bar{e}_{s_2'''}^* > \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} m_s \bar{e}_s^*$ contradicts the fact that \mathbb{S} is part of a mechanism solving (\mathbf{P}_0'') . ■

Online Appendix 2: Social Welfare

In this appendix, we study the problem of a designer aiming to maximizing social welfare. We restate here the corresponding problem.

$$\max_{\mathbf{M}} \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{M}) := \int_0^\alpha [e(\theta) - c(e(\theta), \theta)] dF(\theta), \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{M} \text{ is feasible.} \quad (\mathbf{P}_0''')$$

Using (A.3), and restricting attention to feasible mechanism, we reformulate the planner's objective:

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{M}) = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} \left[m_s \bar{e}_s^* - \int_{\Theta_s} \left(\frac{c}{2} (\bar{e}_s^* + \frac{\kappa}{c} (\theta - \bar{\theta}_s))^2 - \kappa \theta (\bar{e}_s^* + \frac{\kappa}{c} (\theta - \bar{\theta}_s)) \right) dF(\theta) \right],$$

and, after straightforward calculations,

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{M}) = \frac{1}{c} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} m_s \left[(c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s) - \frac{1}{2} (c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s)^2 \right] + r',$$

where r' is a constant independent of \mathbf{M} . The problem of a planner maximizing social welfare is thus the same as the problem of a planner maximizing

$$\tilde{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbf{M}) := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} m_s v(c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s),$$

where $v(x) := x - \frac{1}{2}x^2$.

We next state two simple yet key lemmata. The first shows that v is increasing over the relevant range, the second shows that whenever merging two schools increases overall effort, it also increases welfare.

Lemma OA.6. *Consider two schools, denoted s_1 and s_2 , such that $c\bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1} > c\bar{e}_{s_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_2}$; then $v(c\bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1}) > v(c\bar{e}_{s_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_2})$.*

Proof: Function v is increasing as long as $x < 1$. Yet, using (A.1) shows $c\bar{e}_s^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_s = B(G(s), p(s)) < b < 1$ for any school s . \blacksquare

Lemma OA.7. *Consider three schools, denoted s_1 , s_2 and s_3 , such that (i) $\Theta_{s_1} \cap \Theta_{s_2} = \emptyset$, (ii) $\Theta_{s_3} = \Theta_{s_1} \cup \Theta_{s_2}$, and (iii) $m_{s_3} \bar{e}_{s_3}^* \geq m_{s_1} \bar{e}_{s_1}^* + m_{s_2} \bar{e}_{s_2}^*$. Then*

$$m_{s_3} v(c\bar{e}_{s_3}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_3}) > m_{s_1} v(c\bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1}) + m_{s_2} v(c\bar{e}_{s_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_2}).$$

Proof: Let schools s_1 , s_2 and s_3 satisfy the properties listed in the lemma. Then

$$\begin{aligned} m_{s_3} \bar{e}_{s_3}^* &\geq m_{s_1} \bar{e}_{s_1}^* + m_{s_2} \bar{e}_{s_2}^* \Leftrightarrow \\ m_{s_3} (c\bar{e}_{s_3}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_3}) &\geq m_{s_1} (c\bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1}) + m_{s_2} (c\bar{e}_{s_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_2}) \Rightarrow \\ m_{s_3} v(c\bar{e}_{s_3}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_3}) &> m_{s_1} v(c\bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1}) + m_{s_2} v(c\bar{e}_{s_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_2}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first arrow follows from $m_{s_3} \bar{\theta}_{s_3} = m_{s_1} \bar{\theta}_{s_1} + m_{s_2} \bar{\theta}_{s_2}$, and the second arrow follows from strict concavity of $v(\cdot)$. ■

The following proposition is an immediate corollary of Lemma OA.6.

Proposition OA.5. *If a school s maximizes the welfare of its students, then either (i) $G(s) = G^*$ or (ii) $G(s) = G_*$. Furthermore, there exists a cutoff θ° such that (i) holds whenever $\bar{\theta}_s < \theta^\circ$ and (ii) holds whenever $\bar{\theta}_s > \theta^\circ$.*

In what follows θ° will refer to the cutoff defined in Proposition OA.5. The following proposition is an immediate corollary of Lemma OA.7.

Proposition OA.6. *If two schools share the same informative grading rule, then merging them increases welfare.*

We are now ready to state the main result of this appendix.

Theorem OA.2. *Any solution of (\mathbf{P}_0''') comprises a school system which either contains a single school, or exhibits a two-tier structure. In the latter case, the bottom-tier school has grading rule G^* , while the top-tier school has grading rule G_* .²¹*

Let (\mathbf{P}_3''') denote the auxiliary problem of the designer obtained from (\mathbf{P}_0''') by adding to it the constraint that every Θ_s has to be an interval. The following proposition summarizes the first step of our proof of Theorem OA.2.

Proposition OA.7. *Any solution of (\mathbf{P}_3''') comprises a school system which either contains a single school, or exhibits a two-tier structure. In the latter case, the bottom-tier school has grading rule G^* , while the top-tier school has grading rule G_* .*

²¹In the former case, the grading rule is one of G^* and G_* .

Proof of Proposition OA.7: Suppose some mechanism \mathbf{M} with $|\mathbb{S}| \geq 2$ solves (\mathbf{P}_3''') . Let $\mathbb{S} = \{s_1, \dots, s_I\}$, with schools labeled so as to satisfy $\sup \Theta_{s_i} \leq \inf \Theta_{s_k}$ for every $i < k$. Then Lemma 1 gives

$$c\bar{e}_{s_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_1} \leq \dots \leq c\bar{e}_{s_I}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_I}. \quad (\text{OA.10})$$

Arguments akin to those used in the proof of Proposition 3 ensure that $\bar{\theta}_{s_I} > \theta^\diamond > \bar{\theta}_{s_{I-1}}$ and $G(s_I) = G_\star$. Next, reason by contradiction and suppose either $I > 2$, or $I = 2$ but $G(s_1) \neq G_\star$. Consider the school system $\mathbb{S}' = \{s'_1, s'_2\}$ where

$$s'_1 = \left(\cup_{i=1}^{I-1} \Theta_{s_i}, G_\star \right), \quad s'_2 = s_I.$$

By Propositions OA.5 and OA.6, and Lemma OA.7

$$\sum_{i=1}^{I-1} m_{s_i} v \left(c\bar{e}_{s'_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_1} \right) > \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} m_{s_i} v \left(c\bar{e}_{s_i}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_i} \right).$$

So \mathbb{S}' cannot be regular, for otherwise applying Lemma 2 would yield a contradiction with the optimality of \mathbf{M} for problem (\mathbf{P}_3''') . Hence: $c\bar{e}_{s'_1}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_1} > c\bar{e}_{s'_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_2}$. Now, given $0 \leq z < 1 - \inf \Theta_{s'_2}$, consider the school system $\mathbb{S}''(z) = \{s''_1(z), s''_2(z)\}$, where

$$s''_1(z) = ([0, \inf \Theta_{s'_2} + z], G_\star), \quad s''_2(z) = ((\inf \Theta_{s'_2} + z, 1], G_\star).$$

The difference

$$D(z) = (c\bar{e}_{s''_1(z)}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_1(z)}) - (c\bar{e}_{s''_2(z)}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_2(z)})$$

is continuous in z and satisfies $D(0) > 0$. So by virtue of the intermediate value theorem, either $D(z) > 0$ for all $z \in (0, 1 - \inf \Theta_{s'_2})$, or there exists $\tilde{z} \in (0, 1 - \inf \Theta_{s'_2})$ such that $D(\tilde{z}) = 0$. Suppose that the second case holds. Then

$$\begin{aligned} m_{s''_1(\tilde{z})} v(c\bar{e}_{s''_1(\tilde{z})}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_1(\tilde{z})}) + m_{s''_2(\tilde{z})} v(c\bar{e}_{s''_2(\tilde{z})}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_2(\tilde{z})}) &= v(c\bar{e}_{s''_2(\tilde{z})}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s''_2(\tilde{z})}) \\ &> v(c\bar{e}_{s'_2}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s'_2}) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^I m_{s_i} v(c\bar{e}_{s_i}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_i}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from $D(\tilde{z}) = 0$, the strict inequality from Lemma C.1, and the weak inequality from (OA.10). But notice that, by virtue of Lemma 2, $\mathbb{S}''(\tilde{z})$ forms part of a

feasible mechanism. The last inequality contradicts our hypothesis that \mathbf{M} solves (\mathbf{P}_3''') . ■

The following proposition summarizes the last step of our proof of Theorem OA.2.

Proposition OA.8. *Any school system \mathbb{S} forming part of a solution of (\mathbf{P}_0''') is such that Θ_s is almost an interval, for all $s \in \mathbb{S}$.*

Proof of Proposition OA.8: Let \mathbb{S} be part of a mechanism solving (\mathbf{P}_0''') . By Lemma 1, \mathbb{S} is a regular school system. Let $\{\hat{\theta}_i\}_{i=0}^I$ be the set of cutoffs characterizing \mathbb{S} (see Remark C.1). Suppose $I = 1$ (the arguments are similar for $I > 1$, and therefore omitted), that is,

$$c\bar{e}_{s_i}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_i} = c\bar{e}_{s_k}^* - \kappa\bar{\theta}_{s_k}, \quad \forall s_i, s_k \in \mathbb{S}.$$

Below, let $\mathbb{S}_< := \{s \in \mathbb{S} : \bar{\theta}_s < \theta^\diamond\}$ and $\mathbb{S}_> := \{s \in \mathbb{S} : \bar{\theta}_s > \theta^\diamond\}$.

Now reason by contradiction, and suppose that not every schools $s \in \mathbb{S}$ is such that Θ_s is almost an interval. We can then find two schools in \mathbb{S} , say s_1 and s_2 , with $\bar{\theta}_{s_1} \leq \bar{\theta}_{s_2}$, as well as subsets $\tilde{\Theta}_i \subset \Theta_{s_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$ satisfying: (a) $\int_{\tilde{\Theta}_1} dF(\theta) = \int_{\tilde{\Theta}_2} dF(\theta) > 0$, and (b) $\sup \tilde{\Theta}_2 \leq \inf \tilde{\Theta}_1$. Lemma OA.7 implies that the case in which $s_1 \in \mathbb{S}_<$ and $s_2 \in \mathbb{S}_>$ can be dealt with using the arguments given in the proof of Proposition C.1. The other cases are analogous and therefore omitted. ■