INTRODUCTION

College admission is often judged based on fairness. This inaccurately characterizes elite university admission which, in reality, selects applicants based on "fit."[1] This essay contends that such presumption is illusory. The question is not one of subjective fairness but of institutional integrity: the university's adherence to its core meritocratic mission.[2] The definition of "lowering admission standards" refers to explicitly trading Oxford's meritocratic entry criteria for financial contributions. Violating this integrity is an economically irrational act born from a mischaracterization of Oxford's identity as a commodity, not as a socially-constructed institution.

To substantiate this, I first establish a foundational understanding of Oxford's reputational asset, a product of social interactions with stakeholders. Drawing on phenomenological insights, I define Oxford's identity as a dynamic entity continuously co-created and valued by its stakeholders. Elinor Ostrom's economic framework formalizes this: Oxford's reputation functions as a vital common-pool resource (CPR) from alumni to future applicants.[3] This framework recasts the problem: policies that compromise integrity are a strategic failure that risks depleting communal resources beyond mere rule-breaking.

This strategic challenge necessitates game theory. Employing a two-stage sequential game allows quantifying rational payoffs of each policy choice beyond normative debate.[4] The two-stage game theoretic model demonstrates that compromising institutional integrity inevitably traps the university in a perilous coordination game prone to instability. Consequently, lowering admission standards has low payoff, making meritocracy the only rational choice.

PHILOSOPHICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATION

Constructing a payoff matrix requires establishing the philosophical and institutional foundations that define Oxford's unique identity and justify the key variables of the analysis for my economic model.

First, Oxford's reputation is defined not as a static object but as a dynamic, socially-constructed institutional asset. Heideggerian and Sartrean Phenomenology supplies the philosophical framework of social construction.

An object's identity is not inherent but is co-constituted through human engagement. Martin Heidegger writes that an object's meaning emerges from its practical role within our being-in-the-world (Dasein).[5] Similarly, Jean-Paul Sartre claims that this meaning is also shaped by intentional focus of consciousness, which distinguishes an inert object—a being-in-itself (en-soi)—from its perceived significance.[6] Applied to Oxford, these insights reveal that "Oxford-ness"—its global prestige and unique identity—is not a fixed essence. Rather, it is an identity continuously co-created and re-validated through its ongoing interactions with students, faculty, alumni, and society. In other words, Oxford's identity emerges from its embeddedness in academic practices, traditions, and global discourse. This philosophical framing is empirically reflected in the model as the prestige premium (z) and the cost of its diminishment C_{rep}.

Secondly, this reputational asset can be formalized through the economic lens of a CPR, which reveals its inherent vulnerability to a "tragedy of the commons" and thus explains the high stakes of the policy decision. Elinor Ostrom's seminal work defines CPRs as shared assets that are *non-excludable* yet *subtractable*—their value can be diminished by the actions of a single user.[7] Oxford's reputation fits this definition precisely: its benefits accrue broadly, but its value depends on collective restraint. A single act of compromise, such as admitting a student for a donation, diminishes its perceived quality for all. This is analogous to the "tragedy of the commons," where the university administration, acting with short-term self interest, considers a policy that risks depleting the shared "reputation bank."[8] This framework explains *why* a lowering admission standards is so strategically perilous. It treats a fragile collective asset as a private good, risking Oxford's long-term health for a short-term gain.

The stewardship of this CPR is executed through a system of polycentric governance, which provides the credible enforcement mechanism for the reputational costs that are central to my game-theoretic model. Ostrom's polycentric governance involves multiple, overlapping, and semi-autonomous decision centers rather than a single hierarchical authority.[9] Oxford's structure embodies this through its complex interplay of colleges, faculty, and administration alongside external stakeholders like alumni, ranking agencies, and employers. This

diverse, interdependent network collectively interprets and enforces the norms that uphold Oxford's reputation. A perceived breach of core principles could trigger tangible, decentralized responses across the network—from alumni backlash to drops in global rankings. This understanding proves that the reputation cost C_{rep} integrated into my model is a predictable, real-world consequence enforced by a complex and powerful system.

Finally, this institutional framework compels a shift away from the common but flawed lens of "fairness" toward the more precise and quantifiable concept of "institutional integrity." The public demand for absolute fairness in admissions often stems from a misconception.[10] First, elite admissions have never been strictly "fair" i.e. if fairness means the absence of discrimination or favoritism. This is largely due to holistic review processes, which prioritize subjective measures like institutional "fit." Second, research shows that enforcing rigid fairness metrics can lead to strongly Pareto-dominated outcomes, making everyone worse off.[11] This reveals the inherent "Fallacy of Fairness." Therefore, this essay focuses on the more precise concept of institutional integrity: whether Oxford remains true to its stated missions. Admitting a student for a donation is a fundamental corruption of this mission. This intellectual shift is the essential bridge to my economic analysis: bypassing a subjective moral debate and instead using game theory to quantify the rational consequences of an *integrity* violation.

ECONOMIC PROOF

The core question is not how Oxford should act within an Oxford donor-slot system, but whether it should create such a system in the first place. Adopting a two-stage sequential game captures a foundational policy decision preceding any subsequent transactional interaction.[12] In Stage 1, Oxford makes the fundamental policy choice between Policy A (Meritocracy) and Policy B (Donor-Slots). To be precise, this policy does not model an autonomic sale of admission; rather, it formalizes a system where, in consideration of a donation, Oxford *de facto* lowers the academic bar, thereby admitting a student who would not have secured a place based on pure merit.[13] This initial choice dictates the rules for Stage 2, the transactional "subgame" that unfolds only if Policy B is chosen. This model compares the total expected utility of these two distinct paths.

The model's key parameters are carefully calibrated using empirical data and established economic principles. This process transforms my theoretical framework into a quantifiable game with real-world values. First, I establish positive incentives for donors by defining a clear cost-benefit structure. The one-time gift cost (d) is normalized to 1 unit, representing a benchmark donor-slot gift of £849,000. This figure is derived from benchmarking Oxford's major philanthropic gifts – ranging from £30 M at the college level to the £150 M Schwarzman donation – against an estimated 3.25% 'development-case' cohort, a percentage informed by practices at peer institutions, and then selecting a defensible midpoint from the resulting per-slot value range.[14] [15] [16] [17] The total prestige benefit (z) is calibrated to 1.10 units through a two-step process that distinguishes between tangible financial value and intangible prestige. First, the baseline utilitarian value is calculated by determining the 40-year present value of the Oxford salary premium which yields a lifetime financial benefit of approximately £266,760.[18] [19] Second, to account for the intangible social and signalizing value, a prestige multiplier (m=3.5) is applied. Multiplying the baseline by this factor results the final total prestige benefit: $z \approx 1.10$ units. This ensures the transaction is a rational investment for the donor (z > d). Second, I create a genuine dilemma for Oxford. The revenue gain (ΔR) is also normalized to 1 unit, representing the annual spendable income (≈£36,083) generated from the gift, based on Oxford's 4.25% endowment payout rate.[20] The cohort quality loss (ΔQ) is set at 0.235 units, a value derived from empirical data by normalizing the 47-point average SAT deficit of legacy admits at a peer institution (Princeton) against the test's 200-point standard deviation.[21] [22] This calibration ensures Oxford receives a positive net payoff from the transaction (ΔR > ΔQ), creating a real strategic temptation. Finally, the integrity cost to Oxford (ε) is calibrated to 0.059 units. This value is stemmed from the principle that a *procedural* integrity failure is less costly than a *substantive* one[23]; it is therefore calculated as 25% of the quality loss (ΔQ).[24] This parameter represents the reputational penalty for administrative incompetence, allowing a "free-rider" to bypass the system rather than the direct cost of academic underperformance. It ensures the game remains strategically non-trivial. The student's windfall gain (k) is set at +0.157 units, a value designed to capture the immediate hedonic value of admission, distinct from the long-term utilitarian benefit (z).[25] This value is originated by posting that this psychological "win" is worth

50% of the baseline first-year salary premium. The inclusion of this parameter gives the donor a positive payoff in the "free-rider" scenario, ensuring the game possesses the necessary strategic tension for a non-trivial analysis.

Parameter	Data & Calculation	Model Value
Slot price d	Midpoint of $\frac{£10\,M}{106}$ and $\frac{£150\,M}{106} \Rightarrow$ $\frac{283K + 1415K}{2}$	1 unit = £849 000
Base prestige benefit z_{base} (before multiplying with m)	PV of £7,600 annuity (40 yrs, g=3%, r=3.5%): $7600 \times \frac{[1-(\frac{1.03}{1.035})^{40}]}{0.035-0.03}$	0.314
Total prestige benefit z	3.5×0.314	1.10
Revenue gain ΔR	$4.25\% \times £849,000$	1 unit = £36,100
Quality loss ΔQ	47-point SAT Gap ÷ 200pt SD	0.235
Free-rider penalty ε	$25\% \times 0.235$	0.059
Student benefit k	$50\% \times 0.314$	0.157
Rep cost C_{rep}	$12.5\% \times 0.082$ (PV of long-run reputation)	0.010

Fig. 1: The summary of the model's key parameter calibrations

The analysis of this calibrated subgame (Stage 2) reveals that a donor-slot policy does not create a simple, predictable market, but instead traps the university in a perilous Coordination Game with two distinct and stable outcomes. The transactional subgame played under Policy B is represented by the following payoff matrix:

Oxford \ Donor	Donate	Not Donate
Accept	Oxford: $\Delta R - \Delta Q$ = +0.765 Donor: $z - d$ = +0.1	Oxford: $-$ ε = -0.059 Donor: $+ k$ = +0.215
Reject	Oxford: 0 Donor: -1	Oxford: 0 Donor: 0

Fig. 2: The Stage 2 payoff matrix between Oxford and Donor

INTERPRETATION OF THE MODEL

The subgame reveals that a donor-slot policy traps Oxford university in a precarious Coordination Game with two distinct outcomes. The game has two pure-strategy Nash Equilibria: a "High-Trust" cooperative equilibrium at (Accept, Donate), where both parties achieve a positive outcome; and a "Low-Trust" uncooperative equilibrium at (Reject, Not Donate), a state of mutual inaction driven by the donor's fear of a wasted donation and Oxford's fear of a costly "free-rider." The analysis of this subgame shows the profitable result is not guaranteed but depends entirely on achieving a state of high trust and coordination.

This strategic instability means that adopting a donor-slot policy is an immense gamble, as Oxford cannot force the profitable, high-trust outcome. The Coordination Game structure reveals the policy's fundamental weakness. For the profitable (Accept, Donate) equilibrium to be reached, both donors and Oxford must trust the other's compliance. However, the presence of the safe, "Low-Trust" equilibrium acts as a powerful gravitational pull. Rational donors, fearing the -1 payoff of a rejected donation, may choose not to participate, thereby forcing the

game into the zero-sum (Reject, Not Donate) outcome. This transforms the policy from a simple revenue source into a precarious game of trust, where Oxford stakes its reputation on the unpredictable actions of others.

The full two stage game indicates that the inherent risk of the donor-slot policy is a worse choice given the certainty and stability of a pure meritocracy. In Stage 1, a rational institution compares the total expected utility of each policy. The payoff for Policy A is the *certain* and high value of maintaining its full institutional reputation ($U_A = z_{high}$). The payoff for Policy B is the *uncertain* and expected value of the Coordination Game, *minus* the certain, upfront reputational cost of adopting the policy in the first place ($U_B = E[\pi_O^{subgame}] - C_{rep}$). Given that the subgame's positive outcome is not guaranteed, and the policy incurs a definite reputational cost, the total expected utility of Policy B will always be lower than the stable, high payoff of Policy A. Consequently, it holds true *even if* one assumes the "High-Trust" equilibrium is likely. The existence of the "Low-Trust" failure state, combined with the certain reputational damages, is enough to make the policy the inferior strategic choice. Ultimately, committing to meritocracy is practically the only rational move.

Granted, the model's two assumptions, the rational player assumption and parameter uncertainty poses limitations that qualifies the result. In reality, decision-makers are not perfectly rational agents.[26] Additionally, data used for calibration contains inherent variability.[27] Yet, my model represents a conservative best-case scenario; in practice, the donor-slot policy would likely be even riskier, because of the fundamental strategic instability Coordination Game. As a result, the low-trust equilibrium is more likely in practice, making a donor-slot policy veritably irrational.

Endnotes

1. TEDx Talks, “College Admissions Is NOT Fair | Dr. Cynthia Colón | TEDxSouthCentral,” February 13, 2024, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LFTU-Qg9sPY.

2. Nikolas Kirby, “Institutional Integrity: Its Meaning and Value,” *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 25, no. 5 (November 1, 2022): 809–34, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-022-10330-8.

3. Elinor Ostrom, “AN INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF SELF-ORGANIZATION AND SELF-GOVERNANCE IN CPR SITUATIONS,” in *Cambridge University Press eBooks*, 1990, 29–57, https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511807763.004.

4. *An Introduction to Game Theory* (Martin J. Osborne, 2000), https://mathematicalolympiads.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/martin_j-_osborne-an_introduction_to_game_theory-oxford_university_press_usa2003.pdf.

5. “Martin Heidegger (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy),” January 31, 2025, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/heidegger/.

6. “Jean-Paul Sartre (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy),” March 26, 2022, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/sartre/#BeiInfPoiCon.

7. Elinor Ostrom, “AN INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF SELF-ORGANIZATION AND SELF-GOVERNANCE IN CPR SITUATIONS,” in *Cambridge University Press eBooks*, 1990, 29–57, https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511807763.004.

8. “Public Goods (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy/Winter 2024 Edition),” July 21, 2021, https://plato.stanford.edu/archIves/win2024/entries/public-goods/.

9. Michael D. McGinnis, “Polycentric Governance in Theory and Practice: Dimensions of Aspiration and Practical Limitations,” *SSRN Electronic Journal*, January 1, 2016, https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3812455.

10. TEDx Talks, “College Admissions Is NOT Fair | Dr. Cynthia Colón | TEDxSouthCentral,” February 13, 2024, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LFTU-Qg9sPY.

11. Sam Corbett-Davies et al., “The Measure and Mismeasure of Fairness,” arXiv.org, July 31, 2018, https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.00023.

12. *An Introduction to Game Theory* (Martin J. Osborne, 2000), https://mathematicalolympiads.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/martin_j-_osborne-an_introduction_to_game_theory-oxford_university_press_usa2003.pdf.

13. Frederick M. Hess, “Payoff-based College Admissions,” National Affairs, n.d., https://www.nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/payoff-based-college-admissions.

14. “Payoff-based College Admission |,” January 7, 2023, https://studentsforfairadmissions.org/payoff-based-college-admission/.

15. Julia Ingram, “Nearly 18% of Class of 2023 Are Legacy Students or Relatives of Donors, Report Reveals,” *The Stanford Daily*, June 26, 2020, https://stanforddaily.com/2020/06/26/nearly-18-of-class-of-2023-are-legacy-students-or-relatives-of-donors-report-reveals/.

16. “300-year-old Oxford University College Receives Record £30m Donation,” n.d., https://www.civilsociety.co.uk/news/300-year-old-oxford-university-college-receives-record-30m-donation.html.

17. Admin, “Oxford University Received the Biggest Single Donation Ever Given to a UK HEI - ACA,” ACA - the Academic Cooperation Association Is a Federation of National Organisations From Europe and Beyond, Which All Fund and Encourage the Internationalisation of Their Higher Education Systems., June 2, 2020, https://aca-secretariat.be/newsletter/oxford-university-received-the-biggest-single-donation-ever-given-to-a-uk-hei/.

18. “Financial Formulas (With Calculators),” n.d., https://financeformulas.net/.

19. admin@twk, “Studying at Oxbridge Earns You £7,600 More Than Studying at a New University - the Sutton Trust,” The Sutton Trust, December 11, 2019, https://www.suttontrust.com/news-opinion/all-news-opinion/studying-at-oxbridge-earns-you-7600-more-than-studying-at-a-new-university/.

20. “The Oxford Endowment Fund | OUem,” n.d., https://www.ouem.co.uk/the-oxford-endowment-fund/.

21. “The Recentering of SAT® Scales and Its Effects on Score Distributions and Score Interpretations,” *College Entrance Examination Board* (New York, United States of America: Neil J. Dorans, November 2002), https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED563023.pdf.

22. “Admission-preference Study Raises Legacy Questions,” Princeton Alumni Weekly, n.d., https://paw.princeton.edu/article/admission-preference-study-raises-legacy-questions.

23. Leppard Law: Florida DUI & Criminal Defense Attorneys PLLC, “Procedural Vs Substantive Reasonableness in Sentence Review - Leppard Law - Top Rated Orlando DUI Lawyers &Amp; Criminal Attorneys in Orlando,” Leppard Law - Top Rated Orlando DUI Lawyers & Criminal Attorneys in Orlando, March 23, 2025, https://leppardlaw.com/federal/sentencing/procedural-vs-substantive-reasonableness-in-sentence-review/.

24. Charles Fombrun and Mark Shanley, “What’s in a Name? Reputation Building and Corporate Strategy,” *The Academy of Management Journal* 33, no. 2 (1990): 233–58, https://doi.org/10.2307/256324https://www.jstor.org/stable/256324.

25. Ruffalo Noel Levitz, “Enrollment and the Emotional Well-Being of Prospective College Students | RNL,” October 31, 2024, https://www.ruffalonl.com/papers-research-higher-education-fundraising/enrollment-and-the-emotional-well-being-of-prospective-students/.

26. “Bounded Rationality (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy),” December 13, 2024, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/bounded-rationality/.

27. “Game Theory Applications in the Real World — What Are the Limitations? : Networks Course Blog for INFO 2040/CS 2850/Econ 2040/SOC 2090,” September 7, 2022, https://blogs.cornell.edu/info2040/2022/09/07/game-theory-applications-in-the-real-world-what-are-the-limitations/.

Bibliography

Admin. “Oxford University Received the Biggest Single Donation Ever Given to a UK HEI - ACA.” ACA - the Academic Cooperation Association Is a Federation of National Organisations From Europe and Beyond, Which All Fund and Encourage the Internationalisation of Their Higher Education Systems., June 2, 2020. https://aca-secretariat.be/newsletter/oxford-university-received-the-biggest-single-donation-ever-given-to-a-uk-hei/.

An Introduction to Game Theory. Martin J. Osborne, 2000. https://mathematicalolympiads.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/martin_j-_osborne-an_introduction_to_game_theory-oxford_university_press_usa2003.pdf.

“Bounded Rationality (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy),” December 13, 2024. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/bounded-rationality/.

Corbett-Davies, Sam, Johann D. Gaebler, Hamed Nilforoshan, Ravi Shroff, and Sharad Goel. “The Measure and Mismeasure of Fairness.” arXiv.org, July 31, 2018. https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.00023.

“Financial Formulas (With Calculators),” n.d. https://financeformulas.net/.

“Game Theory Applications in the Real World — What Are the Limitations? : Networks Course Blog for INFO 2040/CS 2850/Econ 2040/SOC 2090,” September 7, 2022. https://blogs.cornell.edu/info2040/2022/09/07/game-theory-applications-in-the-real-world-what-are-the-limitations/.

Hess, Frederick M. “Payoff-based College Admissions.” National Affairs, n.d. https://www.nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/payoff-based-college-admissions.

Ingram, Julia. “Nearly 18% of Class of 2023 Are Legacy Students or Relatives of Donors, Report Reveals.” *The Stanford Daily*, June 26, 2020. https://stanforddaily.com/2020/06/26/nearly-18-of-class-of-2023-are-legacy-students-or-relatives-of-donors-report-reveals/.

"Jean-Paul Sartre (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," March 26, 2022. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/sartre/#BeiInfPoiCon.

Kirby, Nikolas. "Institutional Integrity: Its Meaning and Value." *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 25, no. 5 (November 1, 2022): 809–34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-022-10330-8.

Leppard Law: Florida DUI & Criminal Defense Attorneys PLLC. "Procedural Vs Substantive Reasonableness in Sentence Review - Leppard Law - Top Rated Orlando DUI Lawyers &Amp; Criminal Attorneys in Orlando." Leppard Law - Top Rated Orlando DUI Lawyers & Criminal Attorneys in Orlando, March 23, 2025. https://leppardlaw.com/federal/sentencing/procedural-vs-substantive-reasonableness-in-sentence-review/.

"Martin Heidegger (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," January 31, 2025. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/heidegger/.

McGinnis, Michael D. "Polycentric Governance in Theory and Practice: Dimensions of Aspiration and Practical Limitations." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, January 1, 2016. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3812455.

Ostrom, Elinor. "AN INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF SELF-ORGANIZATION AND SELF-GOVERNANCE IN CPR SITUATIONS." In *Cambridge University Press eBooks*, 29–57, 1990. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511807763.004.

"Payoff-based College Admission |," January 7, 2023. https://studentsforfairadmissions.org/payoff-based-college-admission/.

Princeton Alumni Weekly. "Admission-preference Study Raises Legacy Questions," n.d. https://paw.princeton.edu/article/admission-preference-study-raises-legacy-questions.

"Public Goods (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy/Winter 2024 Edition)," July 21, 2021. https://plato.stanford.edu/archIves/win2024/entries/public-goods/.

Ruffalo Noel Levitz. "Enrollment and the Emotional Well-Being of Prospective College Students | RNL," October 31, 2024.

https://www.ruffalonl.com/papers-research-higher-education-fundraising/enrollment-and-the-emotional-well-being-of-prospective-students/.

Shanley, Charles Fombrun and Mark. “What’s in a Name? Reputation Building and Corporate Strategy.” *The Academy of Management Journal* 33, no. 2 (1990): 233–58. https://doi.org/10.2307/256324https://www.jstor.org/stable/256324.

TEDx Talks. “College Admissions Is NOT Fair | Dr. Cynthia Colón | TEDxSouthCentral,” February 13, 2024. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LFTU-Qg9sPY.

“The Oxford Endowment Fund | OUem,” n.d. https://www.ouem.co.uk/the-oxford-endowment-fund/.

“The Recentering of SAT® Scales and Its Effects on Score Distributions and Score Interpretations.” *College Entrance Examination Board*. New York, United States of America: Neil J. Dorans, November 2002. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED563023.pdf.

“300-year-old Oxford University College Receives Record £30m Donation,” n.d. https://www.civilsociety.co.uk/news/300-year-old-oxford-university-college-receives-record-30m-donation.html.

admin@twk. “Studying at Oxbridge Earns You £7,600 More Than Studying at a New University - the Sutton Trust.” The Sutton Trust, December 11, 2019. https://www.suttontrust.com/news-opinion/all-news-opinion/studying-at-oxbridge-earns-you-7600-more-than-studying-at-a-new-university/.