IJOSES International Journal of Social and Education Sciences

International Journal of Social and Educational Sciences

e-ISSN: 2148-8673

Exam-Free University Admission: A random Selection Method Based on Grade Point Average and in-Class Ranking

Sınavsız Üniversiteye Giriş: Lise Başarı Puanı ve Sınıf içi Başarı Sırasına Dayalı Rastgele Seçim Yöntemi

Süleyman Oktar*

MAKALE BİLGİSİ

Araştıma Makalesi
Research Article

Sorumlu Yazar:
Corresponding author:

* Konya İl Sağlık Müdürlüğü
suleyman.oktar@yahoo.com
ORCID:0000-0003-0151-5981

Başvuru / Submitted:
5 Kasım 2022

Kabul / Accepted:
5 Aralık 2022

DOI: 10.20860/ijoses.1199772

Atıf / Citation:

Oktar, S. "Exam-Free University Admission: A random Selection Method Based on Grade Point Average and in-Class Ranking". Uluslararası Sosyal ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 18(2022): 88-109.

Benzerlik / Similarity: %5

Abstract

Today, in order for a student to enter a university, he/she must go through many admission stages. The exam hollowed out the education and expelled the non-cognitive and human values that were not measured by the exam. Exams that completely swallowed the students' 6-18 age period caused disaster in the education system, contrary to their purpose of existence. It has already been observed that standardized exams do not predict university success. The high school Grade Point Average (GPA) is much more related to a student's academic achievement in the university. However, the inconsistency of high school GPAs between schools restricts their direct use of it at the university entrance. Our suggestion is to make random selection based on high school GPA. A lottery coefficient will be given to each student by using the student's high school GPA, class GPA, and class ranking. Thus, students will enter random selection with a lottery coefficient based on school success. Those with high success will have a higher coefficient and those with low success will have a lower coefficient. We hope that the random selection method will provide students with opportunities for their non-cognitive development and contribute to social peace.

Keywords: University Admission, Random Selection, Lottery, Grade Point Average, in-Class Ranking

Öz

Günümüzde bir öğrencinin üniversiteye girebilmesi için birçok kabul aşamasından geçmesi gerekmektedir. Çoğu ülkede merkezi üniversite giriş sınavları vardır. Giriş sınavları başvuranlar arasından en iyilerin seçildiği ve dezavantajlı öğrenciler için bir fırsat sunduğu gerekçesiyle meşrulaştırılmıştır. Fakat sınavlar sadece bilişsel kapasiteyi ölçtüğü için en yüksek puan alan en iyi olmayabilir. Dahası sınavlar zaten yarışa önde başlayan zengin ve eğitimli ailelerin çocukları için avantaj sağlamaktadır. Üstelik sınavlar K-12 eğitim sistemini müfredat yerine testi amaçlayan bir formata dönüştürmüştür. Sınav eğitimin içini boşaltmış, sınavla ölçülmeyen bilişsel olmayan ve insani değerleri okuldan kovmuştur. Öğrencilerin 6-18 yaş dönemini tamamen yutan sınavlar varoluş amacının aksine eğitim sisteminde felakete yol açmıştır. Öte yandan standardize sınavların üniversite başarısını yordamadığı görülmüştür. Lise başarı puanı bir öğrencinin üniversitedeki akademik başarısıyla çok daha ilişkilidir. Fakat lise başarı puanlarının okullar arasında tutarsızlık göstermesi üniversiteye girişte onu doğrudan kullanmayı kısıtlamaktadır. Önerimiz lise başarı puanı temelinde rastgele seçim yapılmasıdır. Öğrencinin lise başarı puanı, sınıfın başarı puanı ortalaması ve sınıf içi sıralaması kullanılarak her öğrenciye bir kura katsayısı verilmelidir. Böylece öğrenciler rastgele seçime okul başarısına dayalı bir kura katsayısı ile girebilir. Kura katsayısı belirlenirken hem yüksek puanlı hem düşük puanlı öğrencileri kollayacak dengeli bir oran belirlenmiştir. Araştırma, bu yöntemin okulların tekrar asıl fonksiyonlarına dönmesine önemli katkı sağlayacağını önermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Üniversiteye Giriş, Rastgele Seçim, Kura, Okul Diploma Notu, Sınıf İçi Başarı Sırası.

Introduction

Theoretically, a high school graduate should be able to continue to the university, which is a higher education institution, without encountering any obstacles. In the past, you could have attended a university directly with a high school diploma. Today, this is a very rare occasion and only applies to departments that are undesired. Nowadays, high school graduates in almost every country must pass various exams in order to attend a university. This is because there is a demand far above the supply, and the demand is extremely concentrated in certain universities and branches. Universities based on the so-called academic excellence principle want to receive the best students among the students who apply to them. There are exams such as the American College Test (ACT) based on the high school curriculum, the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) measuring cognitive abilities, and the Undergraduate Medicine and Health Sciences Admission Test (UMAT) based on a sample of medical curricula to identify the best ones. Some universities use exams developed by themselves. As a result, a high school graduate can continue a university after undergoing various qualification processes (Edwards vd., 2012).

At first glance, it seems reasonable for universities to develop or use a standardized exam for elimination due to excessive demand. But today, almost all over the world, students have to go through the process of admission to a university that starts from childhood and gradually increases and peaks in the early stages of adolescence and youth (Delbanco, 2020). Unfortunately, as competition for admission to an elite university intensifies, the adolescent years of children become the battlefield of a fiery struggle (Sandel, 2020). The negative effects of all the pre-university school stages of the exam-oriented admission process have reached a catastrophic level for students and families.

It is unacceptable that a simple set of qualification exams that will determine the students to be admitted to the university completely dominates the 6-18 age period of a child. "Because there are very small things, which swallow the bigger ones in some way." (Nursi, 2015). A small event that lasts a few hours, such as a university entrance exam, takes up almost all of the student's 12 years. If something leads to a situation other than its existential purpose, then reason disappears and there is oppression (Nursi, 2014). The university entrance exams have deviated from their purpose and caused oppression by removing the pre-university K-12 education from its reason and spirit.

Universities today legitimized the exam as a requirement to choose the best and most worthy, that is, the most merited. Choosing the one with the highest score in an exam at first glance seems unquestionably fair (Sandel, 2020). Today's sense of merit is that a reward is given to the person who deserves it the most. Merit-based rewarding suggests that our fate is in our hands and that we have the freedom to reach the reward through our own efforts (Sandel, 2020). In other words, the meritocratic ideal aims at a distribution based on merit, and not the fair distribution of the reward (Liu, 2011). Meritocracy legitimized itself based on the fact that everyone has an equal chance to climb the ladder of success (Sandel, 2020). But in reality, people do not deserve anything directly because of their innate advantages and virtues (Delbanco, 2020). Because each individual starts the race at different distances to the steps on the stairs. The meritocratic ideal is not a remedy for inequality, but rather an important cause of inequality (Sandel, 2020). In other words, while it seems to offer equal opportunities for everyone, it has legitimized unfair competition. Unfortunately, a number of tests and awards in the process of admission to the universities exist to ensure that the winners believe that they deserved to win (Delbanco, 2020).

Contrary to the claim of modern meritocracy that the best should get the prize, we claim that the merited should get the prize. If there is more than one person who deserves that award, an “absolute fair” decision-maker will choose one of them. What criterion will the “absolute fair” decision-maker look at when choosing from among the worthy? He/she will probably consider the past, present, and future of that person. It will also take into account the past, present, and future of the community in which that person will serve (Nursi, 1993). Since we humans are not “absolute fair”, how do we choose one among the merited? It seems reasonable to choose

the best among the good. But “the best” according to what? Moreover, is it best to choose the “best”? We encounter a question here: do we become the best and most successful only with our own will and power?

Is one's success a God's gift or a good fortune? Or does one succeed entirely by their own will and power? The effort is important for human success, but success is rarely just the result of hard work. Everyone knows that success is the result of a perfect mix of good fortune, talent, and effort. Yes, one is morally responsible for all their actions, but each of us cannot be held entirely responsible for our destiny (Sandel, 2020). But modern secular meritocracy gives success only to man, ignoring the role of God or good fortune. Of course, in the context of today's worldly life concept, merit has expelled grace from our lives. As faith in God diminishes in today's secular world, one achieves and gains with their own will and power. Thus, there is little reason to feel indebted or grateful to anyone for our success (Sandel, 2020). Secularism, which expelled God from life, planted a kind of alienation seed on all objects. And it made everything an enemy to everything (Nursi, 2014). As long as the modern secular man believes that they are self-sufficient, they cannot learn gratitude and modesty. An ungrateful and immodest society cannot meet on common welfare (Sandel, 2020).

The Problem and Its Context

Today, large-scale entrance assessments (LSAs) are applied for university admission in many countries around the world (Edwards vd., 2012). LSAs have many negative effects on education, especially high school education. One of the most important reasons for these negative effects is that exams affect all students, their families, teachers, school administrators and many others. University entrance exams carry a high risk as they are designed to have serious consequences for the test taker. For this reason, getting a good score in the exam is the ultimate goal for the student. Thus, the entire education system is dominated by exams and becomes exam-oriented. Whereas, university entrance exams can only measure a student's cognitive skills. Therefore, non-cognitive components of education such as human qualities, creativity, entrepreneurship, social-emotional well-being and morality are abandoned (Emler vd., 2019).

It is not possible to eliminate the negative effects of large-scale and high-risk exams such as university entrance exams with technical improvements. And harm cannot be avoided because the mechanism that causes harm is the same mechanism that makes it valuable and effective (Emler vd., 2019). The general opinion is that it is not possible in the near future to abolish university entrance exams or to configure them to measure non-cognitive features (Beghetto, 2019). We, on the other hand, argue that university entrance exams should be abolished.

We make an alternative suggestion: random selection. Random selection means selecting among students who provide the basic cognitive qualifications for a branch in a random manner. We explained that random selection would be the best way to bring lost souls, namely students, back to life. Although they are very rare, there are examples of random selection practices in the world. We believe that the random selection method should be used commonly instead of being rare.

Below, we have examined the reasoning behind the exams used in admissions to universities and whether they are rational or not. We tried to demonstrate that the exams do not reflect the student's success enough and contrary to what is believed, they do not provide equal opportunities. We put forward the psychological pressure of the exam on the student, the damage it does to education, and that the exam -contrary to what is believed- better serves the advantageous groups. Finally, we present our proposal for the random selection method.

Using an Exam as a Selection Method for College Admissions

Admission to the university is usually done with central exams in many countries including Turkey, Greece, China, South Korea, Portugal in the world. In other countries including USA and Sweden, cognitive and curriculum-based exams such as the SAT and ACT or discipline specific admission tests such as UMAT, Medical Education Eligibility Test (MEET) and Dental Admissions Test (DAT) are an important part of the

admission process in Australia, South Korea and Canada. Therefore, the exam-oriented admission process is a phenomenon that affects the whole world. These exams are mostly prepared in the multiple-choice question-answer forms and the student is graded at the end of the exam (Edwards, Coates, & Friedman, 2012).

Today, modern societies have glorified the metric system more than ever and adopted tests as a selection tool (Grofman& Merrill, 2004). Exams used in university admissions are multiple-choice question-answer weighted metric exams. So how did the metric exams, which were almost unknown until the last 50-60 years become so popular today? The fact that mutual trust and reliability between humans have decreased in the modern world, led especially the managers to inhumane tools which they can trust. Simultaneously, the development of metric systems made it a godsent for managers. Because numerical data are far from personal subjectivity and lead to the perception that they are more precise and scientific because they are objective (Muller, 2019). However, that is not true. For instance, exams cannot distinguish between the intelligent one and the one that studies hard (Altbach& Salmi, 2011). Or, the SAT, which is a metric exam designed entirely based on cognitive ability and was not affected by educational disadvantages and high school grades at the beginning, did not deliver what was expected. Contrary to claims, it was revealed that the SAT exam did not measure scientific ability or local intelligence, regardless of social and educational background (Sandel, 2020).

What do Exams Measure?

One of the most important criticisms of the exam is whether it really provides equality of opportunity among students. For instance, the SAT exam is designed to measure the cognitive abilities of the students instead of their knowledge. This means that any short or mid-term study for the exam will not be able to contribute to the SAT grade. On the contrary, the SAT exam is sensitive to coaching and tutoring. Private tutors and counselors hired for a fee allow high school students to increase their scores by providing them with exam tricks, tips, and tactics (Sandel, 2020). Besides the general education advantages wealthy families may provide, SAT grades of privileged individuals increase with exam preparation courses and tutors. Moreover, with each successive step on the family income ladder, the average SAT grades increase. This is not exclusive to SAT, for instance, the university admission grade in Chile is highly correlated to the income and education levels of families (Fajnzylber, Lara, & León, 2019). The difference is much sharper in the higher grade levels that put students in conflict for the most elite of universities (Sandel, 2020). Even for low-risk, curriculum-based tests where no coaching is available, student performance appears to be very strongly associated with family income and education levels (Zwick, 2013). Children of high-income families attend good schools from a young age and can easily enter universities with higher rankings. In other words, the high scores of well-educated children from high-income families eliminate children from poor families in admission exams (Delbanco, 2020).

The SAT-I score is accepted as an exam in which the verbal and mathematical abilities of the student are measured independently of the high school curriculum. Thus, it is expected to serve as a very important equalizer for university admission in the American secondary education system, which consists of high schools at very different levels and suffers from grade inflation. However, the claim that this exam, which is claimed to measure basic cognitive abilities, meets these characteristics, has not been supported by modern research (Atkinson, 2001). In a study consisting of elite high schools in Turkey, the high school GPA shows a similar relation with ability-based exam ÖSS-I and curriculum-based ÖSS-II (Kelecioğlu, 2003). Accordingly, there is no difference between an exam, which is made at the end of high school, being based on talent or curriculum. It is also seen that the scores obtained from some courses in the school do not contribute to predicting the exam result (Kelecioğlu, 2002).

In fact, taking the test score as a basis for entering the university means eliminating high school grades, course history, teacher scores and extracurricular activities with test scores (Zwick, 2013). Applying tests not only sabotages the high school education but the university education as well. Developing the academic ability is not the sole purpose of a university. At the same time, it should provide the student with civil values (Sandel,

2020). The answer to seek for is to what degree the entrance to university depends on previous academic success. If the past academic achievement is to be taken as a basis, in any case, it is normal for it to include all the flaws of the K-12 education system (Zwick, 2013).

The USMLE-1 and USMLE-2 exams, which measure the proficiency of medical students in the United States, -apart from their purpose- are used as an assessment tool for the recruitment of assistants for medical specialization. However, USMLE-1 and 2 scores were not associated with clinical skill acquisition of students, assistants, and trainees with reliable measures (McGaghie, Cohen, & Wayne, 2011). Similarly, it has been shown that there is no relationship between USMLE scores and chief assistant selection (Cohen vd., 2020). In conclusion, even a standardized multiple-choice professional exam such as the USMLE does not predict clinical skills and clinical success.

Once more, contrary to what is believed, elite universities in the United States do not provide upward mobility. On the surface, a poor student has the chance to enter a university such as Harvard. In reality, only about 2% of Harvard students make it from the lowest to the highest income bracket. This is also true for other elite universities and large public universities (Sandel, 2020). In the Turkey case, admission through exam starts from the high school. While science high schools that admit students through exams get high PISA scores, other schools get very low scores (Berberoğlu&Kalender, 2005). There are large learning differences and inequalities between high schools. Turkey invests in better students by admitting students with central exams and ignores the students that underperform in the exams (Kalkan, 2014).

Can Non-cognitive Abilities be Measured with an Exam?

Metric scoring systems that measure cognitive ability are insufficient to evaluate university success. These exams neither serve the purpose of the university to provide non-cognitive skills. For this reason, the use of non-cognitive tests in the evaluation of university admissions has been discussed more recently. As expected, the present success tests do not predict factors such as leadership, creativity, ethical responsibility, active citizenship, professional performance in the future, and future success (Niessen& Meijer, 2017). Accordingly, the more the evaluation criteria used in university admission are based on cognitive ability and educational success -as long as the inequality in educational opportunities is present- the more negative effects will follow (Niessen& Meijer, 2017). It is obvious that cognitive-based standardized exams are insufficient to evaluate the student. Non-cognitive factors such as high school students' self-efficacy, goal commitment, and sense of belonging have been claimed to provide a stronger explanation for the success of university students (Han, Farruggia, & Solomon, 2022). However, the score obtained from a standardized test is a product of the effort made in an exam that lasts about a few hours (Briggs, 2013). Beyond grades and exams, an assessment of the whole personality is more appropriate for university admission (Rosovsky, 1995). It is worth acknowledging that tests and grades say little about a student's potential to make a positive difference in the world (Delbanco, 2020). Non-cognitive factors are at least as important as cognitive factors in the evaluation of the individual. On the other hand, developing non-cognitive tests is much more difficult than it is thought (Niessen& Meijer, 2017). Because personality is not something that can easily be measured (Delbanco, 2020). Moreover, the possibility of deception through imitation of non-cognitive tests is highly likely (Niessen& Meijer, 2017). Due to the concern of the stakeholders that fairness cannot be achieved, a non-cognitive admission procedure is not yet possible.

Adverse Effects of University Entrance Exams

Anxious parents looking for the best for their children follow a highly planned, repressive, stressful program to put their children in a good university. Exams in the process of admission to the university require students to take private lessons for many years and to attend private courses outside the school (Altbach& Salmi, 2011). Students almost start preparing for university entrance exams starting from primary school. Families prepare their children for the exam by including them in the support courses regime, special education consultants, private tutors, and many other activities during the 3 or 4-year high school period (Sandel, 2020). Preparing for

the university exam reduces students' time to study for school courses, especially in the senior year, and greatly weakens their learning (Kelecioğlu, 2002). Approximately 300-400 thousand people who took the university exam in Turkey in 2012-2014 could not even get 1 correct answer from the mathematics test. This number corresponds to approximately ¼ of the students who took the exam (ÖSYM, 2014). This situation indicates that students who graduated from high school are very inadequate. In the PISA test, the highest-scoring number of students was 1% for Turkey, while the OECD average was 4.4% (Çelik&Bakış, 2015). Today, secondary education institutions have become so exam-oriented that the only success criterion of schools is the rate of graduates entering a university (Köse, 1999). High schools that cannot send students to universities are considered unsuccessful and are not respected by any part of society, including their own students and parents. Under constant exam pressure, the K-12 system cannot provide real education. Moreover, due to exam pressure, children with middle and middle-lower academic achievements are devalued. Children who spend many years trying to get into a university attend the university weary and tired. They consider the university period as a holiday and rest break (Rosovsky, 1995).

Exams used in university admission processes cause a lot of unnecessary anxiety in students and distract their attention from more valuable academic pursuits (Adelman, 1999). The exam and the value it measured became so dominant that it almost reset all values except for itself (Alkanvd., 2008). The fact that the exams on which metric systems are based turn into goals that schools and students should achieve undermines education. Because in a school that focuses on the exam, all educational activity turns into an effort to get high scores on tests. No course, study, or activity that will not contribute to the entrance to the university has become undesirable to the students and their families (Delbanco, 2020). Education is no longer for the curriculum, but for the test. The student now manages to get a high score on the test even before learning. Since the test system does not measure non-cognitive abilities and gains, these values are ignored by instructors and learners. The exam system, which assumes a numerical character, excludes the main goals of the school such as character building, ethical reasoning, and scientific curiosity. So much so that a test-centered education alientes school administration and teachers from education while mechanizing the students. As a result, the non-academic non-cognitive abilities of students and teachers are dulled, their values are eroded, and what remains of the school is a soulless building full of machines (Muller, 2019).

The poor predictive power of SAT and similar standardized exams, their negative impact on educational equity, and their sensitivity to coaching will not change dramatically no matter what is done. All existing standardized admission exams that serve as gatekeepers for many talented students need to be eliminated. Unfortunately, the wider goal of higher education -providing opportunities for students from different backgrounds- has been severely truncated by the use of test scores (Perez, 2013). It is essential to reduce the role of the university entrance exam if we want to turn high schools into institutions that realize comprehensive, non-cognitive values (Alkanvd., 2008). It should even be completely eliminated.

Standardized Exams and Grade Point Average-GPA

The first condition for studying at a university is to be a high school graduate. Normally, a person with a high school degree is qualified to study at a university. But why do we conduct an exam when the number of applicants is more than the quota? The candidate completed a 12-year education until applying to the university and mostly passed many exams during a 3 or 4-year high school education. If an election is to be held, it would be fairer to accept those with high school GPAs, wouldn't it? Why do we choose students by taking an SAT or similar exam instead of choosing them with high school GPAs? The main argument of those who argue that the exam score should be used instead of the achievement score is that the achievement scores are not objective. It is believed that high school GPA is inconsistent in evaluating students due to differences between high schools and that standardized tests in which all students participate give more comparable results (Allensworth & Clark, 2020). Different teachers of different courses in different schools can be subjective when grading students. Even

in two different high schools in the same region, there is a huge discrepancy between the ratings. Therefore, the inequality caused by the inconsistency between high school achievement scores can only be eliminated by a compensatory exam. This argument makes a lot of sense at first. However, according to this logic, high school achievement scores should not have been taken into account when entering a university. However, admission systems all over the world evaluate high school GPAs to a certain extent.

Secondly, the scores obtained from the exams should logically have predicted university success more. However, many studies show that a high high-school GPA is a good indicator of academic performance in the university and is the most effective criterion to be used in admission decisions. For example, high school GPA has been shown to be the most important predictor of university freshman achievement grades in the United States (Zwick &Sklar, 2005). Again, it was revealed that high school grades were better than SAT scores in identifying low-income students who were likely to be successful at university (Sandel, 2020).Exams like SAT force a successful student to verify their high school GPA. For those with low high school success, SAT offers an opportunity to correct their situation (Briggs, 2013).

Standardized tests showing readiness for mathematics and English lessons are used in the admission of students to the Community colleges in the USA. The test results show that one-third of the students are inadequate in English and two-thirds in mathematics. For this reason, these students take support courses for English and mathematics. However, the results of the decision tree analysis show that high school GPA is the most consistent predictor of success in mathematics and English courses. In other words, standardized tests cannot measure the competence of the student. It is seen that students with the same GPA or the same ACT score graduated from the university at very different rates depending on which high school they studied. Nevertheless, the relationship between high school GPA with university graduation is strong and greater than the school impact. A high ACT score does not mean that the student is much more ready for university education (Allensworth & Clark, 2020). In New Zealand, medical schools conduct their own admission exams called UMAT. It was determined that these exams failed to predict the preclinical and clinical success of medical faculty students (Poole vd., 2012). In fact, as we move from the first grade to the last grade, the relationship of UMAT score with university GPA decreases, and its relation with especially clinical and verbal communication skills disappears (Wilkinson, Zhang, & Parker, 2011; Poole vd., 2012).

Similar inconsistencies exist in high school transition, university entry, or postgraduate test-driven exams in Turkey. According to the comparisons made between the sub-tests of the Turkey university entrance exam (YGS) and the 7-12th grade GPA, it was reported that the scores obtained in the school did not generally predict the scores obtained in the exam (Özdemir&Gelbal, 2016). This inconsistency indicates that there is no significant relationship between high school GPA and YGS. According to another study, there isn't a sufficiently consistent relationship between the undergraduate GPA of the graduates of the faculty of teaching and the university entrance test (OSS) score (Bahar, 2011). While the students who entered the faculty with a mid-level OSS score increased to the first place in graduation, the students who entered the faculty with a high-level OSS score graduated in the middle and lower rankings (Yorulmaz, 2013). The academic self-efficacy scale, which evaluates their characteristics such as expressing themselves in academic environments, participating in classroom discussion, and communicating with instructors scores of the students who attend the classroom teaching department with different OSS scores are similar (Ercoşkun&Ağırman, 2018). Accordingly, standardized exams such as OSS cannot predict university GPA, nor can they predict the student's non-cognitive academic self-efficacy.

Instead of standardized tests, the usability of curriculum sampling tests was researched. The curriculum sampling test was shown not to be superior to the high school GPA when compared to the first and third-grade GPAs of the university. Therefore, curriculum sampling tests can only be used in addition to high school GPA in cases where it is not possible to use high school GPA directly (Niessen, Meijer, &Tendeiro, 2018). However,

in our opinion, correcting or reducing the GPA differences between different schools and classes is the best option.

The researchers examined the relationship between the scores of high school core courses and academic success in the university instead of high school GPA. The findings revealed that core course scores were not better at predicting university GPA than high school GPA. High school GPA is the best indicator for the highest academic performance of medical school students (Schripsema, 2017). Various evidence confirms that high school GPA is the best predictor of academic achievement in colleges (Vulperhorstvd., 2018). Because high school GPA reflects the accumulation of years of effort by schools, teachers, and students. The effects of grades and tests diminish over time, but the content of learning does not disappear (Adelman, 1999).

Random Selection Method Based on GPA

It is understood that the various exam types used in the university admission process do not provide equal opportunities among students but are in favour of advantageous groups. On the other hand, it is seen that the criterion that best predicts the success of the student in the university is GPA. However, high school grades are also known to be related to family income to some extent (Sandel, 2020). In addition, when the predictive power of ACT and high school GPA on the GPA of the first year of the university was compared, it was seen that the ACT-compound test is generally more successful (Noble & Sawyer, 2002). All of this shows us that it is not appropriate to use the score earned in school directly in university admission. Because, if we rank the students from top to bottom according to their GPA, we will reward the innate advantages. For this reason, we recommend the application of a random selection system to prevent providing to the interest of the elite due to wealth and other protective factors.

So, does a random selection system exist in the world? Random selection is used by Charter schools in America, provided schools in Sweden, and medical schools in the Netherlands. Since 1972, the Netherlands has been admitting students to medical schools by random selection, that is, by lottery. The focus of the system in the Netherlands is to increase the number of applications and make applications easier (Stasz& von Stolk, 2007). While students with a GPA of 8 or above out of 10 are directly admitted to faculty, those with a GPA of 5.5 to 8 out of 10 are selected via the random selection method. The lottery coefficient of a student with a high score is higher. And one student can only participate in the lottery 3 times. Interestingly, random selection is welcomed by all stakeholders (Ten Cate, 2021). The most recent example is the McMaster University School of Medicine. McMaster University medical school has replaced the structured admissions interview process with a partial lottery as it faced the need for social distancing during the COVID-19 pandemic. Random selection was made among students who were considered roughly equal (Mazer, 2021). The lottery system is applied not only in medicine but also in other health schools in the Netherlands. The Netherlands health system, which consists of doctors, nurses, and midwives who are randomly selected for health education, is in better condition than other developed countries, such as the USA, based on the international indicators. The health systems of countries that apply more detailed and strict admission criteria and exams are not better than the Netherlands (Ten Cate, 2021).

One of the legitimate justifications for a random selection system for a medical school is that none of the exam methods used predict the student's post-university life. Besides academic capability, there are tens of qualifications sought after in a good doctor. However, none of the examination methods have the ability to accurately measure these qualifications. Then again, even the definition of "good doctor" is debatable. For this reason, ranking according to exam scores causes many inequalities and unfairness. While random selection reduces discrimination, inequality, and unfairness (Mazer, 2021) Netherlands medical faculties reached some of their quotas by exam and some by lottery in the 2000s. As a result, it was seen that there was no difference in the academic achievement between the students who were admitted by exam or random selection and most of the faculties stopped the exam application and continued only with the random selection system (Stasz& von

Stolk, 2007). Studies show that selection based on academic achievement yields only small and insignificant wins compared to a lottery procedure. (Woutersvd., 2018). In fact, it has been shown that there is no difference between the students who failed the medical school entrance exam and were rejected and those who passed the exam (Schripsema, 2017). Interestingly, the students who failed the exam participated in the selection by the lottery system of the faculty and were accepted this time. There is no difference in the long-term academic performance between those who were accepted to the faculty by lottery after being rejected and those who were accepted directly after passing the exam.

Today, independent institutions such as the New Zealand Health Research Council and the Volkswagen Foundation in Germany, which support research projects, have started to distribute research funds by the random selection method. A lot is drawn between projects that meet certain basic criteria. The reason for choosing random selection is to get rid of the bias of peer assessment. Because peer assessment puts original ideas at a disadvantage and leaves control over science only to the scientific elite. In other words, scientists want a lottery because they do not find the evaluation of scientists fair (Reinhart &Schendzielorz, 2020). Organizations supporting the research can choose via the random selection system from projects that meet certain basic qualifications. Thus, while saving both time and resources, it will be a fairer choice for the projects and their owners (Roumbanis, 2019).

The university entrance exam is a ranking project and is not fair. The random selection system provides a kind of adjustment opportunity for people who have been disadvantaged beyond their control. Random selection does not disregard merit but acknowledges the fact that no exam method can assess who will be better in the future among 18-year-olds. Therefore, everyone who can graduate from university should have the right to participate in the lottery. Here, the element of merit is the qualification to "successfully graduate" from the university (Sandel, 2020). Random selection will act as a safety valve against unfairness caused by schools inflating differences that provide an advantage to the student, such as achievement scores, test scores, or extracurricular activities (Mazer, 2021). Then again, high school scores cannot predict non-cognitive skills such as cultural competence, good citizenship, and ethical reasoning that universities value. If a rational choice cannot be made among the candidates, the random selection method should be applied (Ten Cate, 2021). Therefore, the minimum threshold should be determined on the cognitive criteria and a draw should be made among the candidates who pass the minimum cognitive threshold (Niessen& Meijer, 2017). Thus, the negative effects of inequality of opportunity and innate disadvantages can be mitigated (Grofman& Merrill, 2004).

The gold standard for modern medical evidence is randomized controlled trials, and accordingly, a randomized controlled student selection system should be supported mostly by medical schools (Mazer, 2021). For example, in the USA, the results of the USMLE-1 exam will now only be announced as pass/fail. Thus - since there is no point grade- all candidates are successful and equal. Random selection is the fairest method to choose between equals (Ten Cate, 2021). All universities, including elite ones, must randomly select students who meet a certain admission requirement. In other words, it seems much fairer to choose one of the best instead of the best of the best (Warikoo, 2018).

Random selection has been used by humans since the earliest societies. For instance, lots are drawn for the worst and one-time risks (Goodwin, 1984). According to Barbara Goodwin, in today's world where people are more equal than the difference between the ones that have and the ones that don't, the one-off distribution will always involve unfairness (Saunders, 2010). Although random selection does not guarantee a fair distribution, it does randomize the injustice that would result from an unfair distribution. The random selection gives everyone a “fair chance” to change their situation and get better (Goodwin, 1984). According to Peter Stone, it is fairer to decide by lottery, especially if we want to exclude the negative factors (Saunders, 2012).

Can random selection really be superior to a "regulated" justice? (Goodwin, 1984). Some, especially the advocates of merit, will label random selection as unfair. According to them, why should the second place be

taken into account when there is a first in the class! What's it to the second when there is a first? Random selection will not seem fair unless it takes into account that the first is superior and has priority over the second. And the first will object to the random selection method of admission (Zwick, 2013). A society consists of various layers, and it is not possible to completely eliminate this. Today, we try to provide justice in a society with "regulations". But these "regulated" laws do not take into account the layers of society and are based on the principle that everyone is equal (Goodwin, 1984). In reality, however, everyone is born with advantages and disadvantages at birth. Only a few's families are wealthy, well-educated, and few are more intelligent than others. This leads to marginal differences among people. Lots should be drawn to reduce this inequality. However, an equally weighted lottery causes the feeling that it is not fair, as it puts those who work and those who do not work together. One solution to this is to grant the right of weighted draw. By that, we mean that students with higher scores enter the lottery with a higher chance. One objection to weighted selection is that if a person deserves a better chance for a prize than another, they should receive it directly. For Saunders, however, the case is different: a weighted draw gives more chances to the most ambitious, while not completely neglecting the less ambitious (Saunders, 2012). In our opinion, weighting should be done in a balanced way. That is, if the share given to the high scorer leaves little chance for the low scorer, it would not be fair.

One of the objections to random selection is the decline in academic quality. Such a problem will disappear if the correct threshold is set (Sandel, 2020). And the correct threshold should be “graduation”. The person who is accepted to the school by random selection and graduates in the specified time is successful and the entry high school GPA scores of these people can be taken as the threshold value. The success of the random selection is mostly evaluated in terms of academic criteria. However, the effect of ensuring justice and compensating inequalities in society should be highlighted. The purpose of the random selection -for example, equality, justice, diversity- must be fully clarified, because it is the purpose itself that will determine the rules of the lottery method. Random selection seems very fair at first glance. Because the student is not affected by any factors such as talent, ethnicity, gender, residence, or family, and is independent. So all candidates are equal in the draw pool (Stasz& von Stolk, 2007). If random selection is adopted, candidates need to be certain that the implementation is fair and transparent. For this, the application conditions must be reasonable and understandable, and the candidates must not feel prevented (Woutersvd., 2016).

Selection by lottery will increase the number of humble students who say "God gave me good luck or I was fortunate" instead of egoistic students who say "an honest win". Because the students who pass a series of exams have turned into egoists who think that they completely deserve the position they have achieved. However, people do not deserve anything directly because of their innate advantages and virtues (Delbanco, 2020). One advantage of random selection is that those who were not chosen to do not feel bad. Because the reason why the candidate was not selected is not a personal failure, but because of bad luck. While in exam-based elections, the blame for failure is entirely on the candidate: the candidate loses self-esteem, experiences shame and a sense of failure. On the other hand, the candidate who is admitted through the exam clings to the belief that they have achieved success through their own efforts and becomes arrogant (Woutersvd., 2016). For example, administrators, professors, and students in elite institutions cling to the exam system that reproduces their elite status. But in reality, they value not the collective value of the elite institution, but the superior and advantageous position it has given them in accordance with their own interests (Warikoo, 2018).

Another objection is that random selection will damage the prestige of institutions (Sandel, 2020). Universities that offer strict selectivity as proof that the system is fair do not care that this increases inequality (Warikoo, 2018). But is it really a prestige to take the highest-rated students and graduate them? Also, is an institution that deepens inequality and is far from fairness really an institution of quality? (Sandel, 2020). In an interview with students from elite US and British universities, Warikoo saw that students eventually legitimized and advocated the admission systems of their own schools. They approve and defend the practices that they may have seen as an unfair selection process before they enter the university after they are accepted to the university.

In other words, elite universities instill their elitist approaches to their students and elitism feeds itself (Warikoo, 2018). Of course, the practices of an institution that deepen inequality in society for the sake of its prestige cannot be allowed. The institution can reproduce its prestige in more reasonable ways than a rigid examination system.

As a result, it is much fairer to set a certain academic qualification criterion and leave the rest to chance. Thus, it may be possible to prevent the deterioration of the mental health of the students in high school, the death of their souls, and being lost among the test books. It allows those who are admitted to a good university to understand that they are doing this not alone, but with the help of their families, their teachers at school, and many others, and with the help of good fortune (Sandel, 2020). Universities are misleading people by advertising the decreasing acceptance rates, which are supposed to be an indicator of increasing excellence today. If universities emphasize the legitimacy of the new method when they choose random selection, students will be more convinced of the random selection over time (Warikoo, 2018). We hope that the universities will adopt random selection and spread its legitimacy as penance for their past sins.

The Problem of GPA Inflation

According to the literature data, the high school GPA is the best indicator of the success of a student in the university. In other words, making a random selection based on high school GPA during the university admission process is the most logical way. However, there are a few problems that prevent us from using GPA alone. First, it is obvious that GPAs are not fairly distributed among students due to different regions, high schools, and different types of schools. The very low and very high high school GPAs are far from predicting the university GPA (Noble & Sawyer, 2002). For example, in the United States, there is a high correlation between the GPA of white students of British origin and the GPA at the end of the first year of university. On the other hand, the SAT scores of Black and Hispanic students are more correlated with the university first grade GPA (Zwick &Sklar, 2005). Grade inflation is probably the reason why the relationship between high school GPA and university GPA is low in non-white groups.

In Chile, a new adaptation has been made in the high school GPA to increase the chances of disadvantageous groups entering the university. Accordingly, new graduates with a higher average than the average of the graduates of the last 3 years were given a bonus score in addition to GPA. In this case, the GPA of the new graduates of the schools has increased. The source of this increase is not that the students work more as hoped, but rather that the GPA is inflated and adjusted according to the new situation (Fajnzylbervd., 2019). In a study conducted at the level of 7th and 8th grades in Turkey, it was shown that there was grade inflation. In the study, the grades given in the school exams were compared with the grades achieved in the central high school transition (TEOG) exam. Accordingly, it is seen that teachers inflate more in numerical lessons than in verbal lessons, and there is a higher grade inflation in private schools than in public schools (Karali, 2021).

Grade inflation is a problem all over the world. For example, grade inflation is quite common in American higher education (Pfeffer & Fong, 2002). When the universities are examined, it is seen that GPAs increased considerably compared to the 1970s. The reason for these high grades is due to the inflation of grades rather than an increase in students' learning (Felton & Koper, 2005). Although the SAT scores of the students admitted to universities do not change, there is an increase in their GPAs. Again in 1950, while approximately 15 percent of Harvard students had a B grade average and above, as of 2007, more than half of all Harvard grades were at the A grade (Primack, 2008).

A New Method: The Random Selection Based on GPA andin-Class Rank

Above, the necessity of choosing the random selection method at the entrance to the university is explained. The high school graduation criterion is not sufficient for this method. Random selection should be based on the GPA achieved by the student at the end of 3 or 4-year high school education. However, a student entering the

draw with an inflated GPA will benefit unfairly. We have two recommendations to prevent this case. The first is the use of in-class ranking. Accordingly, students will be ranked according to the order of success in the class regardless of the student's GPA. The first will have the highest lottery coefficient and the last will have the lowest lottery coefficient. Our suggestion here is that the range of the lottery coefficient is 20-1 (Equation 1). In the in-class ranking, the first student will gain 20 lottery coefficients, the second student will gain 19, and so forth in a decreasing manner. When there are more than 20 students in the class, those who are after the 20th rank will also receive a lottery coefficient of 1. This right of draw will be added to the right of draw earned by the GPA (Table 1). Formula.

$$R_{rank} = 21\text{-}r \qquad \text{(Equation 1)}$$

***R_{rank}**: The lottery coefficient obtained from the ranking, **r:** The success ranking of the student in the class according to the GPA ranking.*

Table 1. Student's in-Class Ranking, and the LotteryCoefficientObtained

Student Name	**X highschool Q class***	
	GPA Ranking (r)	Lotterycoefficient **(R_{rank}= 21-r)**
A	1	20
E	5	16
K	10	11
Y	19	2
Z	20	1

** Thereare 20 students in total in Q class of X highschool. **R_{rank}**: The lotterycoefficientobtainedfrom the ranking, **r:** The successranking of the student in the classaccording to the GPA ranking.*

Secondly, in order to prevent an arbitrary attitude in the GPA distribution, the student's GPA will be compared to the average GPA of the class. Here, in order to reduce arbitrariness, student GPA will be compared to both the average of the whole class (M_{GPA100}) and the average of the students who enter the first 50% (M_{GPA50}). Thus, a lottery coefficient will be obtained by multiplying the square of the ratios obtained by 25 (Table 2). In our study, GPA was rated in the range of 0-100 (Equation 2). Formula.

$$\mathbf{R_{GPA} = [(S_{GPA}/M_{GPA50})^2 + (S_{GPA}/M_{GPA100})^2] x 25} \qquad \text{(Equation 2)}$$

***R_{GPA}**:GPA basedlotterycoefficient, **S_{GPA}**:Student GPA, **M_{GPA50}**:GPA average of the studentswhoare in the top 50% in the classranking, **M_{GPA100}**: GPA average of the wholeclass.*

Thus, the total lotterycoefficient (R_{TOTAL}) is obtainedbysumming the GPA-basedlotterycoefficientfrom the student'sranking in the classroom (Equation 3), (Table 3). Formula.

$$\mathbf{R_{TOTAL} = R_{rank} + R_{GPA}} \qquad \text{(Equation 3)}$$

Table 2 . Students' GPA-BasedLotteryCoefficient (R_{GPA})

Student Name		**Student Success Ranking**	**GPA**		**R_{GPA}= $[(S_{GPA}/M_{GPA50})^2+(S_{GPA}/M_{GPA100})^2]$x25**	
Q class	**W class**		**X high school Q class**	**Y high school W class**	**X highschool Q class**	**Y High School W class**
A	A	1	99	99	61	75
B	B	2	98	98	59	73
C	C	3	97	97	58	72
D	D	4	97	96	58	70
E	E	5	96	96	57	70
F	F	6	96	88	57	59
G	G	7	95	82	56	51
H	H	8	94	80	55	49
J	J	9	94	74	55	42
K	K	10	93	74	53	42
L	L	11	93	73	53	41
M	M	12	92	72	52	40
N	N	13	90	71	50	38
P	P	14	89	67	49	34
R	R	15	88	66	48	33
S	S	16	76	60	36	27
T	T	17	60	54	22	22
V	V	18	53	53	17	21
Y	Y	19	52	52	17	21
Z	Z	20	50	50	15	19
			Mean= 85.1	Mean= 75.1		

R_{GPA}: *GPA basedlotterycoefficient,* ***S_{GPA}:*** *Student GPA,* ***M_{GPA50}:*** *GPA average of the studentswhoare in the top 50% in the classranking,* ***M_{GPA100}:*** *GPA average of the whole class.* Thereare 20 students in Class* ***Q*** *of* ***X*** *High School and 20 students in Class* ***W*** *of* ***Y*** *High School. The average of the first 10 students (whoentered the first 50%) in the* ***Q****class is 95.8. The average of the top 10 students in class****W*** *(50%) is 88.4.* ***R_{GPA}*** *coefficientwascalculated for eachstudent. Fractionsareroundedup.*

The studentwill be able to apply to anyuniversitywith the total lotterycoefficienttheyhave. Whentherearetoomanyapplications to a universityor a department, studentswill be rankedaccording to their total lotterycoefficients. 10 times the quotawillqualify for randomselection. The number of students to be included in the randomselection to reduceinequalitymayalso be morethan 10 times the quota. Unselectedstudentswill be able to apply to otheruniversities and faculties.

The studentwill be given the right to apply to universities 2 timeswith the same R_{TOTAL} coefficient. After the secondattempt, the student's R_{TOTAL} coefficientwilldecrease for eachyearaftergraduation. Wedid not determine the rate of lotterycoefficientdecrease in thisstudy. However, the rate of decrease in the coefficientshouldprotect the newgraduates and should not completelydespair the oldgraduates.

Finally, if, despiteeverything, the problem of GPA inflationamongschoolscannot be solved, werecommend a standardizedleveldetermination test (LDT) withcognitiveability at the forefrontsuch as SAT.

LDT scorewill be scored in the range of 0-100 like GPA (Equation 4). Formula:

$$\mathbf{R_{GPA\text{-}LDT}= [(S_{GPA}/M_{GPA50})^2 + (S_{GPA} \times M_{LDT50}/5000)^2]}x25 \qquad \text{(Equation 4)}$$

$R_{GPA-LDT}$: GPA and leveldetermination test lotterycoefficient, S_{GPA}: Student GPA, M_{LDT50}: Average of studentswhoachieved the first 50% in the leveldetermination test, M_{LDT100}: Average of allstudentswhoentered the leveldetermination test.

In the leveldetermination test, the student's GPA will be compared to the class LDT average. The student's LDT scorewillonly be used to determine the average of the class. Thus, the studentwill not be directlyaffectedby the score he/shewillreceivefrom the exam. Here, as the scoreobtainedfrom the examincreases, the contribution of the students to the lotterycoefficientwillincrease. The test score of the studentswho do not participate in the examwill be calculated as the minimum (approximately 30).

Table 3. Total LotteryCoefficient of the Student (R_{TOTAL})

Student Name	X highschool Q class*		Lotterycoefficient		
	GPA Ranking (r)	S_{GPA}	R_{rank}	R_{GPA}	R_{TOTAL}
A	1	99	20	61	81
E	5	96	16	57	73
K	10	93	11	53	64
Y	19	52	2	17	19
Z	20	50	1	15	16

*R_{GPA}:GPA basedlotterycoefficient,S_{GPA}:Student GPA,R_{TOTAL}: the total lotterycoefficient,R_{rank}: The lotterycoefficientobtainedfrom the ranking, **r:** The successranking of the student in the classaccording to the GPA ranking.* Thereare a total of 20 students in Q class of X highschool.*

Verbal and science GPA and LDT scores of the students can also be calculated. Separate$R_{GPA-LDT}$ can be determined for eachtype of score. For example, whilecalculating the GPA-SCI score, the scoresobtainedfromphysics, chemistry, biology, and mathematicscourses; for GPA-VERB, the scoresobtainedfromcoursessuch as nativelanguage, history, and geography can be calculated. The student can useany of the GPA, GPA-SCI, GPA-VERB scoretypes at the entrance to the university.

Conclusion

The literature and our observations together show us that university entrance exams hinder the humane development of students and favour advantageous groups. We have shown that the aim of university entrance exams is to choose the best score, but it is not fair to choose the best score. Because being the best in terms of the score ranking depends more on what people are born with than on their own abilities. The best thing to do is to use a random selection method until we develop an absolute fair method. Random selection will make college students humbler and more humane. It would be accurate to make the random selection on the basis of weighting based on high school GPA, class grade point average, and class ranking. Managers must make a decision: select the best from the best with the exam or select one of the best at random. However, politicians should know that their preferences include the potential to affect the entire K-12 system and perhaps all social dynamics. While the election with the exam will make children and society nervous, the random selection will make children and society calm and peaceful. If we are to imagine a world based on human values, we must immediately initiate the practice of random selection.

Acknowledgments
I would like to thank anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on an earlier version of this article.
Disclosure statement
No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.
Funding
This research was not in receipt of any funding.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Giriş ve Amaç

Bugün dünya genelinde bir çok ülkede üniversiteye kabul için geniş ölçekli giriş sınavları uygulanmaktadır. Geniş ölçekli sınavların eğitim üzerine bir çok olumsuz etkisi vardır. Bunun en önemli sebeplerinden biri sınavların tüm öğrencileri, onların ailelerini, öğretmenleri, okul idarecilerini ve daha pek çok kimseyi etkilemesidir (Edwards, Coates, & Friedman, 2012). Üniversite giriş sınavları sınava giren kişi üzerinde ciddi sonuçlar doğuracak şekilde tasarlandıkları için yüksek risk taşır. Bu sebeple sınavda iyi bir puan almak öğrenci için nihai hedeftir. Böylece tüm eğitim sistemi sınav tarafından domine edilir ve sınav odaklı bir hale gelir. Oysa üniversite giriş sınavları öğrencinin sadece bilişsel becerilerini ölçebilir. Bundan dolayı insani nitelikler, yaratıcılık, girişimcilik, sosyal-duygusal refah ve ahlak gibi eğitimin bilişsel olmayan bileşenleri terk edilir (Emler vd., 2019).

Üniversite giriş sınavları gibi geniş ölçekli ve yüksek riskli sınavların olumsuz etkilerinin teknik iyileştirmelerle düzeltilmesi mümkün değildir. Ve zarardan kaçınılamaz çünkü zarara neden olan mekanizma, onu değerli ve etkili kılan mekanizma ile aynıdır (Emler vd., 2019). Genel kanı üniversite giriş sınavlarının kaldırılmasının veya bilişsel olmayan özellikleri ölçecek şekilde yapılandırılmasının yakın gelecekte mümkün olmadığı yönündedir (Beghetto, 2019). Biz ise üniversite giriş sınavlarının kaldırılması gerektiğini iddia ediyoruz. Alternatif bir öneride bulunuyoruz: rastgele seçim. Rastgele seçim bir üniversite için temel bilişsel yeterlilikleri sağlayan öğrenciler arasından çekilişle rastgele seçim yapmaktır. Böylece sınav baskısından kurtulan eğitim ortamında girişimcilik, liderlik, yaratıcılık, etik davranış, sorumluluk, aktif vatandaşlık gibi insani değerlerin gelişmesine fırsat oluşacağını öngörmekteyiz.

Kuramsal Çerçeve

Üniversiteye kabul edilecek öğrencileri seçmek amacıyla yapılan geniş ölçekli sınavlar eğitim sistemini baskı altına almıştır. Tek bir sınav öğrencinin gideceği üniversiteyi ve buna bağlı olarak gelecekteki hayatını belirlemektedir. Bu yüksek-risk içeren sınavlar doğal olarak öğrencinin eğitim hayatını daha okulun ilk gününden itibaren belirlemeye başlamaktadır. Hatta okula başlamadan bile öğrencinin hayatını etkilemektedir. Öyleki aileler akrabalarını, yakın arkadaşlarını ve çevresini bırakarak daha iyi okulların olduğu mahallelere ve bazen uzak şehirlere dahi taşınmaktadır. Sadece üniversiteye kabul edilecek öğrencileri belirleyen basit bir sınav setinin bir çocuğun 6-18 yaş dönemini tamamen etki altına alması kabul edilemez. "Çünkü çok küçük şeyler var, çok büyükleri bir cihette yutar." (Nursi, 2015). Üniversiteye giriş sınavı gibi birkaç saat süren küçük bir şey öğrencinin neredeyse 12 yılının tamamını yutmaktadır. Bir şey varoluşsal amacı dışında bir duruma yol açıyorsa o işte hikmet ortadan kalkar, zulüm olur (Nursi, 2014). İşte üniversite giriş sınavları amacından saparak üniversite öncesi K-12 eğitimini hikmet ve ruhundan uzaklaştırarak zulme yol açmaktadır.

Sınav ve onun ölçtüğü değer o kadar baskın hale gelmiştir ki sınav dışındaki tüm değerleri adeta sıfırlamıştır (Alkan vd., 2008). Üniversiteye girişte herhangi bir katkısı olmayacak hiçbir ders, çalışma, faaliyet öğrenci ve aileleri tarafından istenmez hale gelmiştir (Delbanco, 2020). Artık müfredat için değil test için öğretim yapılır olmuştur. Test sistemi bilişsel olmayan yetenekleri ve kazanımları ölçmediğinden bu değerler öğretenler ve öğrenenler tarafından göz ardı edilmektedir. Sayısal bir karaktere bürünen sınav sistemi okulun karakter inşası, etik muhakeme ve bilimsel merak oluşturma gibi temel hedeflerini dışlamaktadır. Öyle ki test merkezli bir eğitim öğrencileri makineleştirirken okul idareci ve öğretmenlerini eğitimden uzaklaştırır. Sonuçta öğrencilerin ve öğretmenlerin akademik ve bilişsel olmayan yetenekleri körelir, değerleri erozyona uğrar ve okuldan geriye sadece makinelerle dolu ruhsuz bir bina kalır (Muller, 2019).

Giriş sınavlarının meşru olduğunu iddia edenlerin en önemli dayanaklarından biri dezavantajlı öğrencilere üniversiteye girme fırsatı verdiği şeklindedir. Oysa eğitim durumu ve geliri yüksek ailelerin çocukları küçük yaşlardan itibaren iyi okullarda okumakta ve üniversitelere üst sıralardan kolaylıkla girebilmektedir. Yani iyi eğitim almış yüksek gelirli aile çocuklarının yüksek puanları fakir aile çocuklarını üniversite giriş sınavlarında elemektedir (Delbanco, 2020).

Bugün ortaöğretim kurumları o kadar sınav odaklı hale gelmiştir ki okulların tek başarı kriteri mezunlarının üniversiteye girme oranlarıdır (Köse, 1999). Üniversitelere öğrenci gönderemeyen liseler başarısız kabul edilmekte kendi öğrencileri ve velileri dahil toplumun hiçbir kesiminden saygı görmemektedir. Devamlı sınav baskısı altındaki K-12 sistemi gerçek bir eğitim verememektedir. Üstelik sınav baskısı nedeniyle birçok orta ve orta-alt akademik başarı gösteren çocuklar değersizleştirilmektedir. Uzun yıllarını bir üniversiteye girmek için harcayan çocuklar üniversiteye bıkkın ve bezgin olarak gelmektedir. Bunun bir sonucu olarak öğrenciler üniversite dönemini bir tatil ve istirahat molası olarak görmektedirler (Rosovsky, 1995).

Peki merkezi yapılan geniş ölçekli giriş sınavları bu kadar kötüyse niçin bu kadar rağbet görmektedir? Bunun cevabı modernitenin gelişiminde yatmaktadır. Modern toplum liyakati ödülün merkezine koymuştur (Sandel, 2020). Yani modern meritokrasi ödülü en iyi olanın alması gerektiğini iddia eder. Öte yandan bugün modern toplumlar daha önceki çağlarda hiç görülmediği kadar metrik sistemi yüceltmiş ve testleri bir seçim aracı olarak benimsemiştir (Grofman & Merrill, 2004). Modern dünyada insanlar arası karşılıklı güven ve itimadın azalması özellikle idare edenleri güvenecekleri insan dışı araçlara yöneltmiştir. Çünkü sayısal veriler kişisel öznellikten uzaktır ve nesnel oldukları için daha kesin ve bilimsel oldukları algısına yol açmaktadır (Muller, 2019). Böylece metrik başarılar liyakati belirleme ölçütü olarak kullanılmaktadır.

Peki başarı -ölçüm yönteminden bağımsız olarak- gerçekte kişinin kendi malı mıdır? Herkes bilir ki başarı iyi talih, yetenek ve çabanın mükemmel bir karışımının neticesidir. İnsanın başarısı için çaba elbette önemlidir ancak başarı nadiren yalnızca çok çalışmanın bir neticesidir (Sandel, 2020). Fakat modern seküler meritokrasi başarıyı sadece insanın kendisine verir, Tanrı'nın veya iyi talihin rolünü yok sayar. Elbette günümüz dünyevi hayat anlayışı bağlamında liyakat lütfu yaşamımızdan kovmuştur. Bugünün seküler dünyasında Tanrı'ya olan inanç azaldıkça, artık insan tamamen kendi iradesi ve kudretiyle başardığına inanmaktadır. Böylece başarımızdan dolayı ailemiz, okulumuz, öğretmenlerimiz ya da başka birilerine karşı borçlu veya minnettar hissetmek için pek bir sebebimiz kalmamıştır (Sandel, 2020). Tanrıyı yaşamdan kovan sekülerizm bütün eşyaya bir nevi yabancılaşma tohumunu ekmiştir (Nursi, 2014). Ve her şeyi her şeye, herkesi herkese bir ölçüde yabancılaştırmış ve düşmanlaştırmıştır. Sonuç olarak kimse kimseye özellikle üstte olanlar altta olanlara minnettarlık duymaz ve sorumluluk hissetmez hale gelmiştir.

Üniversite kabul sınavları hemen tüm dünyada öğrencilerin bilişsel becerilerini ölçen standartlaştırılmış sınavlardır. Beklendiği gibi mevcut başarı testleri liderlik, yaratıcılık, etik davranış, sorumluluk, aktif vatandaşlık, gelecekteki iş performansı, sonraki yaşamdaki başarı gibi durumları öngörmemektedir. Buna göre üniversiteye girişteki kullanılan değerlendirme ölçütleri ne kadar bilişsel yetenek ve eğitim başarısına dayanırsa -eğitim fırsatlarındaki eşitsizlikler ortadan kaldırılmadıkça- o kadar olumsuz etkilere yol açacaktır (Niessen & Meijer, 2017).

Yetenekli birçok öğrenci için kapı bekçisi görevi gören mevcut tüm standartlaştırılmış kabul sınavlarının kaldırılması gerekmektedir. Maalesef yüksek öğrenimin daha geniş hedefi -farklı geçmişlerden gelen öğrencilere fırsatlar sağlamak- test puanlarının kullanılmasıyla ciddi şekilde budanmıştır (Perez, 2013). Eğer liseleri kapsamlı, bilişsel olmayan değerleri gerçekleştiren kurumlar haline getirmek istiyorsak üniversite giriş sınavının rolünün azaltılması elzemdir (Alkan vd., 2008).

Gerçekte not ve sınavların ötesinde kişiliğin bütünü üzerine yapılan bir değerlendirme üniversiteye kabul açısından daha uygundur (Rosovsky, 1995). Testler ve notların bir öğrencinin dünya üzerinde olumlu bir farklılık yaratma potansiyeli hakkında çok az şey söylediğini kabul etmek gerekir. Fakat paydaşların adaletin sağlanamayacağı endişesi nedeniyle günümüzde bilişsel olmayan bir kabul prosedürü henüz mümkün gözükmemektedir. Bu sebeple biz öğrencinin okul başarısına dayanan rastgele seçim yöntemini önermekteyiz. Eğer bir seçim yapılacaksa doğrudan lise GPA'sı yüksek olanların kabul edilmesi daha adil olmalı değil mi? Birçok araştırma lise GPA'sının üniversitedeki akademik performansın iyi bir göstergesi olduğunu ve kabul kararlarında kullanılacak en etkili ölçüt olduğunu göstermektedir (Briggs, 2013)-(Schripsema, 2017)-(Vulperhorst, Lutz, de Kleijn, & van Tartwijk, 2018)

Fakat GPA'yı tek başına kullanmamızı engelleyen birkaç sorun vardır. Birincisi lise puanlarının da bir dereceye kadar aile geliriyle ilişkili olduğu bilinmektedir (Sandel, 2020). GPA'ya göre öğrencileri yukarıdan aşağıya sıralarsak yine doğuştan gelen avantajları ödüllendirmiş oluruz. İkincisi farklı bölgeler, liseler ve farklı okul türleri sebebiyle GPA'ların öğrenciler arasında adil bir şekilde dağıtılmadığı aşikardır. Lise GPA'sının çok düşük ve çok yüksek olduğu puanlar üniversite GPA'sını yordamaktan uzaktır (Noble & Sawyer, 2002). Ayrıca not enflasyonu dünyanı her yerinde bir sorundur (Pfeffer & Fong, 2002). Bu yüksek notların sebebi öğrencilerin öğrenmesinde bir artıştan ziyade notların şişirilmesinden kaynaklanmaktadır (Felton & Koper, 2005). Bu durumda hangi öğrencinin notunun gerçek hangisinin şişirme olduğunu ayırt etmek imkansızdır. Tüm bunlar bize okulda kazanılan puanın üniversiteye kabulde doğrudan kullanılmasının uygun olmadığını göstermektedir. Bu nedenle zenginlik ve diğer kollayıcı faktörlerin herhangi bir kesimin çıkarına fırsat vermemesi için rastgele seçim sistemi uygulanmasını öneriyoruz.

Rastgele Seçim Yöntemi

Rastgele seçim en eski toplumlardan bu yana insanoğlu tarafından kullanılmaktadır. Rastgele seçim "düzenlenmiş" bir adaletten gerçekten üstün olabilir mi? (Goodwin, 1984). Bazıları, özellikle liyakat savunucuları rastgele seçimi haksızlık olarak yaftalayacaktır. Onlara göre sınıfında birinci olan varken neden ikinci olan hesaba katılsın ki! Birinci varken ikinciye ne oluyor? Rastgele seçim birincinin ikinciden üstün ve öncelikli olduğunu hesaba katmadıkça adil gözükmeyecektir. Ve birinciler rastgele seçimle yapılan bir kabul yöntemine itiraz edeceklerdir (Zwick, 2013). Bir toplum çeşitli tabakalardan oluşur ve bunun tamamen ortadan kaldırılması mümkün değildir. Bugün bir toplumda adaleti "düzenlemeler" ile sağlamaya çalışmaktayız. Fakat bu "düzenlenmiş" kanunlar toplumdaki tabakaları dikkate almaz ve herkesin eşit olduğu esasına dayanır (Goodwin, 1984). Oysa gerçekte herkes doğarken avantaj ve dezavantajlarla dünyaya gelir. Çok azının ailesi zengin, iyi eğitimli ve çok az insan diğerlerinden çok daha zekidir. Bu durum insanlar arasında marjinal farklılıklara yol açmaktadır.

Öğrenciler arasındaki eşitsizlikleri azaltmak için kura çekilmelidir. Fakat eşit ağırlıklı bir kura çalışan ve çalışmayanı aynı yere koyacağından adil olmadığı hissi oluşturur. Bunun bir çözümü ağırlıklı kura hakkı vermektir. Yani yüksek puanlı öğrencilerin çekilişe daha yüksek bir şansla girmesini kastediyoruz. Ağırlıklı seçime gelen bir itiraz şudur: Eğer bir kişi bir ödül için diğerinden daha fazla şansı hakkediyorsa onu doğrudan almalıdır. Saunders'a göre ise olay daha farklıdır: ağırlıklı bir çekiliş, en iddialı olana daha fazla şans verirken, daha az iddialı olanı ise tamamen ihmal etmez (Saunders, 2012). Bize göre ağırlıklandırma dengeli bir şekilde yapılmalıdır. Yani yüksek puanlıya verilen pay düşük puanlıya çok az bir şans bırakıyorsa bu adil olmaz.

Peki rastgele seçim sistemi dünyada var mıdır? Rastgele seçim Amerika'da Charter okulları, İsveç'te belediye okulları ve Hollanda'da tıp fakülteleri tarafından kullanılan bir yöntemdir. Hollanda 1972'den beri tıp fakültelerine rastgele seçim yani çekiliş ile öğrenci almaktadır. Hollanda'daki sistemin odak noktası başvuru sayısını arttırmak ve başvuruyu kolaylaştırmaktır (Stasz & von Stolk, 2007). Bir tıp fakültesi için rastgele seçim sisteminin meşru gerekçelerinden biri kullanılan sınav yöntemlerinin hiçbirinin öğrencinin üniversite sonrası hayatını yordamamasıdır. Bu sebeple sınav puanlarına göre sıralama birçok eşitsizliğe ve adaletsizliğe sebep olmaktadır. Rastgele seçim ise ayrımcılığı, eşitsizliği ve adaletsizliği azaltmaktadır (Mazer, 2021). Hollanda tıp fakülteleri 2000'li yıllarda kontenjanlarının bir kısmını sınavla bir kısmını ise kurayla almıştır. Sonuçta sınavla veya rastgele seçimle alınan öğrenciler arasında herhangi bir akademik başarı farkı olmadığı görülmüş, çoğu fakülte sınav uygulamasını kaldırıp sadece rastgele seçim sistemine devam etmiştir (Stasz & von Stolk, 2007). Gerçekten de araştırmalar, akademik başarıya dayalı seçimin bir piyango prosedürüne kıyasla yalnızca küçük ve önemsiz kazanımlar sağladığını göstermektedir (Wouters, Croiset, & Kusurkar, 2018). Hatta tıp fakültesine giriş sınavında başarısız olup reddedilen öğrenciler ile sınavı kazananlar arasında hiçbir fark olmadığı gösterilmiştir (Schripsema, 2017). İlginç olan sınavı kaybeden öğrenciler fakültenin çekilişle seçim sistemine katılıp bu defa kabul edilmişlerdir. Reddedildikten sonra çekilişle fakülteye kabul edilenler ve sınavı kazanıp doğrudan kabul edilenler arasında uzun süreli akademik performans açısından bir farklılık bulunmamaktadır.

Rastgele seçim sistemi kontrolü dışında dezavantajlı duruma gelmiş kişilere karşı bir çeşit tanzim imkânı vermektir. Rastgele seçim liyakati yok saymaz fakat şu gerçeği kabul eder: 18 yaşındakiler arasında gelecekte

kimin daha iyi olacağını hiçbir sınav yöntemi değerlendiremez. Öyleyse üniversiteden mezun olabilecek herkes kuraya katılma hakkına sahip olmalıdır. Burada liyakat unsuru üniversiteyi "başarıyla bitirebilme" yeterliliğidir (Sandel, 2020). Rastgele seçim okulların başarı puanı, test puanı veya müfredat dışı etkinlikler gibi öğrenciye avantaj oluşturan farkları şişirmesinin oluşturacağı haksızlıklara karşı güvenlik supabı görevi görecektir (Mazer, 2021). Kaldı ki lise puanları üniversitelerin değer verdiği kültürel yeterlilik, iyi vatandaşlık ve etik akıl yürütme gibi bilişsel olmayan becerileri öngöremez. Eğer adaylar arasında rasyonel bir seçim yapılamıyorsa rastgele seçim yöntemi uygulanması gerekir (Ten Cate, 2021). Öyleyse bilişsel kriterlerde minimum eşik belirlenmeli ve minimum bilişsel eşiği geçen adaylar arasında çekiliş yapılmalıdır.

Rastgele seçime çok sayıda itiraz gelecektir. Birisi rastgele seçimin kurumların prestijini zedeleyeceğine dairdir. Üniversiteler bugün artan mükemmelliğin sözde bir göstergesi olan azalan kabul oranlarının reklamını yaparak insanları yanıltmaktadırlar. Üniversiteler rastgele seçim metodunu tercih ettiklerinde yeni yöntemin meşruiyetini ön plana çıkarırlarsa zamanla öğrenciler rastgele seçime daha fazla ikna olacaklardır (Warikoo, 2018). Kurum prestijini katı bir sınav sistemi yerine daha makul başka yollarla yeniden üretebilir. Umarız üniversiteler geçmişteki günahlarına kefaret olarak rastgele seçime sahip çıkar ve meşruiyetini yayarlar.

Rastgele seçim için gelecek itirazlardan birisi de akademik kalitenin düşeceği yanılgısıdır. Doğru eşik ayarlanırsa böyle bir sorun ortadan kalkacaktır (Sandel, 2020). Doğru eşik ise "mezuniyet" olmalıdır. Rastgele seçimle okula kabul edilen ve belirlenen sürede mezun olan kişi başarılıdır ve bu kişilerin giriş lise GPA puanları eşik değer olarak alınabilir.

Rastgele seçimin başarısı çoğunlukla akademik kriterler açısından değerlendirilmektedir. Oysa toplumda adaletin sağlanmasının ve eşitsizliklerin tazmin edilmesinin etkisi ön plana çıkarılmalıdır. Rastgele seçimin amacı -örneğin eşitlik, adalet, çeşitlilik gibi- tam olarak netleştirilmelidir, çünkü çekiliş yönteminin kurallarını belirleyecek olan amacın kendisidir. Rastgele seçim oldukça adil gözükmektedir. Çünkü öğrencinin dezavantajlı olduğu yetenek, etnik köken, cinsiyet, ikamet, aile gibi hiçbir durumdan etkilenmez, bağımsızdır. Yani tüm adaylar kura havuzunda eşittir (Stasz & von Stolk, 2007).

Rastgele seçim benimsendiği takdirde adayların yapılacak uygulamanın adil ve şeffaf olduğundan emin olması gerekir. Bunun için başvuru koşullarının makul ve anlaşılır olması, adaylarda engellenmiş hissi oluşturmaması gerekir (Wouters vd., 2016). Rastgele seçim "alnımın hakkıyla kazandım" diyen egoist öğrenciler yerine "Tanrı lütfetti veya talihim yaver gitti" diyen mütevazi öğrencilerin sayısını arttıracaktır. Çünkü bir dizi sınavlardan geçerek gelen öğrenciler elde ettikleri pozisyonu çoktan hakkettiklerini düşünen egoistlere dönüşmüşlerdir. Oysa insanlar doğuştan sahip oldukları avantajlar ve meziyetler sebebiyle doğrudan hiçbir şeyi hak etmezler (Delbanco, 2020). Sonuç olarak belirli bir akademik yeterlilik kriteri belirleyip gerisini şansa bırakmak çok daha adildir. Böylece lisede öğrencilerin akıl sağlığının bozulmasının, ruhlarının ölmesinin ve test kitapları arasında kaybolmasının önüne geçilebilir. Rastgele seçim, iyi bir üniversiteye kabul edilenlerin bunu tek başına değil ailelerinin, okuldaki öğretmenlerinin ve daha birçok kişinin ve Tanrı'nın (veya iyi talihin) yardımıyla yaptıklarını anlamalarını sağlar (Sandel, 2020).

Sonuç ve Öneriler

Önerdiğimiz rastgele seçim yöntemi başarı puanına dayalı olarak öğrenciye bir kura hakkı verilmesidir. Fakat şişirilmiş bir GPA ile çekilişe giren bir öğrenci haksız bir fayda sağlamış olacaktır. Bunu önlemek için iki önerimiz vardır. Birincisi sınıf içi sıralamanın kullanılmasıdır. Buna göre öğrencinin GPA'sından bağımsız olarak sınıftaki başarı sırasına göre öğrenciler sıralanacaktır. Birinci olan en yüksek kura katsayısı sonuncu ise en düşük kura katsayısı alacaktır. İkinci olarak GPA dağılımında keyfi bir tutumu önlemek için öğrencinin GPA'sı sınıfın ortalama GPA'sına kıyaslanacaktır. Burada keyfiliği azaltmak için öğrenci GPA'sı hem tüm sınıfın ortalamasına hem de ilk %50'ye giren öğrencilerin ortalamasına kıyaslanacaktır. Böylece sınıfın tümüne veya bir kısım öğrencilere kasıtlı olarak şişirilmiş puanlar verilmesinin önüne geçilecektir.

Öğrenci başarı puanı ve başarı puanının sınıf ortalamasına oranı ve sınıf içi başarı sırasına dayanarak bir kura katsayısına sahip olacaktır. Öğrenci bu kura katsayısı ile herhangi bir üniversiteye başvurabilecektir. Bir üniversiteye veya bir bölüme çok aşırı başvuru olduğunda öğrenciler bu kura katsayılarına göre sıralanacaktır. Okul kontenjanının üstünde bir katsayı belirlenerek (örneğin kontenjanın 10 katı) rastgele seçim yapılacaktır. Seçilmeyen öğrenci başka üniversitelere ve fakültelere başvurabilecektir. Günümüz yapay zeka teknoloji tek bir başvuru ve tercih sistemi ile milyonlarca öğrenciyi aynı anda kuraya alabilecek teknolojik düzeye ulaşmış durumdadır.

Alternatif olarak her şeye rağmen okullar arasında GPA enflasyonu sorunu çözülemezse bilişsel yeteneğin ön planda olduğu SAT benzeri standardize bir seviye belirleme testi (LDT) öneriyoruz. Seviye belirleme sınavında öğrencinin GPA'sı sınıfın LDT ortalamasına kıyaslanacaktır. Öğrencinin LDT puanı sadece sınıf ortalamasının tespitinde kullanılacaktır. Böylece öğrenci sınavdan alacağı puandan doğrudan etkilenmeyecektir. Burada sınıf ve okulun sınavdan aldığı toplam puan yükseldikçe tüm öğrencilerin kura katsayısı yükselecektir. Yani öğrenci okulun toplam başarısından avantaj sağlarken kendi aldığı puandan dolayı cezalandırılmayacaktır. Böylece giriş sınavının yukarıda bahsedilen olumsuz etkileri çok hafif düzeyde kalacaktır.

Sonuç olarak yöneticiler bir karar vermelidir: sınavla iyilerden en iyiyi seçmek veya rastgele iyilerden birini seçmek. Ancak politikacılar şunu bilmelidir ki tercihleri tüm K-12 sistemini ve belki tüm toplumsal dinamikleri etkileme potansiyeli içermektedir. Sınavla seçim çocukları, gençleri ve tüm bir toplumu baskı altına alırken, rastgele seçim paydaşların daha insani değerler temelli yaşamasına fırsat verme potansiyeline sahiptir. İnsani değerler temelli bir dünya hayal ediyorsak rastgele seçim uygulamasını en kısa zamanda başlatmalıyız.

References

Adelman, C. (1999). *Answers in the tool box: Academic intensity, attendance patterns, and bachelor's degree attainment*. US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Alkan, A., Çarkoğlu, A., Filiztekin, A., & İnceoğlu, F. (2008). *Türkiye ortaöğretim sektöründe katma değer oluşumu: Üniversiteye giriş yarışı*. İstanbul: TÜBİTAK.

Allensworth, E. M., & Clark, K. (2020). High school GPAs and ACT scores as predictors of college completion: Examining assumptions about consistency across high schools. *Educational Researcher*, *49*(3), 198-211.

Altbach, P. G., & Salmi, J. (2011). *The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities*. World Bank Publications.

Atkinson, R. C. (2001). Achievement versus aptitude in college admissions. *Issues in Science and Technology*, *18*(2), 31-36.

Bahar, H. H. (2011). ÖSS puanı ve lisans mezuniyet notunun KPSS 10 puanını yordama gücü. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *36*(162), 168-181.

Beghetto, R. A. (2019). Large-scale assessments, personalized learning, and creativity: Paradoxes and possibilities. *ECNU Review of Education*, *2*(3), 311-327.

Berberoğlu, G., & Kalender, İ. (2005). Öğrenci başarısının yıllara, okul türlerine, bölgelere göre incelenmesi: ÖSS ve PISA analizi. *Journal of Educational Sciences & Practices*, *4*(7), 21-35.

Briggs, D. C. (2013). Evaluating SAT coaching: Gains, effects and self-selection. İçinde *Rethinking the SAT* (ss. 239-256). London & New York: Routledge.

Cohen, E. R., Goldstein, J. L., Schroedl, C. J., Parlapiano, N., McGaghie, W. C., & Wayne, D. B. (2020). Are USMLE scores valid measures for chief resident selection? *Journal of graduate medical education*, *12*(4), 441-446.

Çelik, Z., & Bakış, T. (2015). Ortaöğretime ve yükseköğretime geçiş sınavlarının kıskacında ortaöğretim sistemi. *Toplum Eğitim Politikaları*, *273*, 298.

Delbanco, A. (2020). *Üniversite-Neydi, Ne Durumda ve Nasıl Olmalı*. Istanbul: Küre Yayınları.

Edwards, D., Coates, H., & Friedman, T. (2012). A Survey of International Practice in University Admissions Testing. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, *24*(1). Paris: OECD Publishing.

Emler, T. E., Zhao, Y., Deng, J., Yin, D., & Wang, Y. (2019). Side effects of large-scale assessments in education. *ECNU Review of Education*, *2*(3), 279-296.

Ercoşkun, M. H., & Ağırman, N. (2018). 1. Ve 4. Sınıftaki Sınıf Öğretmeni Adaylarının Akademik Öz-Yeterliklerinin Üniversiteye Giriş Başarı Sıralamaları Açısından Karşılaştırılması. *Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *13*(26), 477-498.

Fajnzylber, E., Lara, B., & León, T. (2019). Increased learning or GPA inflation? Evidence from GPA-based university admission in Chile. *Economics of Education Review*, *72*, 147-165.

Felton, J., & Koper, P. T. (2005). Nominal GPA and real GPA: A simple adjustment that compensates for grade inflation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *30*(6), 561-569.

Goodwin, B. (1984). Justice and the Lottery. *Political studies*, *32*(2), 190-202.

Grofman, B., & Merrill, S. (2004). Anticipating Likely Consequences of Lottery-Based Affirmative Action. *Social science quarterly*, *85*(5), 1447-1468.

Han, C., Farruggia, S. P., & Solomon, B. J. (2022). Effects of high school students' noncognitive factors on their success at college. *Studies in Higher Education*, *47*(3), 572-586.

Kalkan, B. (2014). Eğitim kuponu: Eğitimde fırsat eşitliği için bir öneri. *Liberal Düşünce Dergisi*, (76), 63-99.

Karali, T. (2021). *Sınıf Düzeyine, Bölgelere, Okul Türü ve Ders Türüne Göre Not Enflasyonunun İncelenmesi*. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Kelecioğlu, H. (2002). Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin üniversiteye giriş sınavları ve sınavın öğrenimlerine etkisi hakkındaki görüşleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *2002*(23), 135-144.

Kelecioğlu, H. (2003). Ortaöğretim başarı puanlarının üniversiteye girişte iki aşamalı sınavda uygulanan ÖYS, ÖSS ve tek aşamalı sınavda uygulanan ÖSS ile ilişkileri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *2003*(24), 70-78.

Köse, M. R. (1999). Üniversitye giriş ve liselerimiz. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15, 51-60.

Liu, A. (2011). Unraveling the myth of meritocracy within the context of US higher education. *Higher education*, *62*(4), 383-397.

Mazer, B. L. (2021). Accepting randomness in medical school admissions: The case for a lottery. *Medical teacher*, *43*(10), 1216-1218.

McGaghie, W. C., Cohen, E. R., & Wayne, D. B. (2011). Are United States Medical Licensing Exam Step 1 and 2 scores valid measures for postgraduate medical residency selection decisions? *Academic Medicine*, *86*(1), 48-52.

Muller, J. Z. (2019). *The tyranny of metrics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Niessen, A. S. M., & Meijer, R. R. (2017). On the use of broadened admission criteria in higher education. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*(3), 436-448.

Niessen, A. S. M., Meijer, R. R., & Tendeiro, J. N. (2018). Admission testing for higher education: A multi-cohort study on the validity of high-fidelity curriculum-sampling tests. *PloS one*, *13*(6), e0198746.

Noble, J., & Sawyer, R. (2002). *Predicting Different Levels of Academic Success in College Using High School GPA and ACT Composite Score.*ACT Research Report Series, 2002-4. Iowa City: ACT Publication.

Nursi, S. (1993). *From the Risale-i Nur Collection: The words*. Istanbul: Sozler Nesriyat.

Nursi, S. (2014). *Mesnevi-i Nuriye*. Manila: Risale Press.

Nursi, S. (2015). *Flashes*. Manila: Risale Press.

ÖSYM (2014). Geliş tarihi gönderen https://www.osym.gov.tr/TR,867/2014-osys-yerlestirme-sonuclarina-iliskin-sayisal-bilgiler.html

Özdemir, A., & Gelbal, S. (2016). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim başarı ölçülerinin yükseköğretime geçiş sınav puanlarını yordama gücü. *Journal of Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology*, *7*(2), 309-334.

Perez, C. (2013). Reassessing college admissions: Examining tests and admitting alternatives. In *Rethinking the SAT* (ss. 367-376). London & New York: Routledge.

Pfeffer, J., & Fong, C. T. (2002). The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye. *Academy of management learning & education*, *1*(1), 78-95.

Poole, P., Shulruf, B., Rudland, J., & Wilkinson, T. (2012). Comparison of UMAT scores and GPA in prediction of performance in medical school: A national study. *Medical education*, *46*(2), 163-171.

Primack, P. (2008). Doesn't Anybody Get a C Anymore? *The Boston Globe*, *5*.

Reinhart, M., & Schendzielorz, C. (2020). The lottery in Babylon—On the role of chance in scientific success. *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, *7*(sup2), S25-S29.

Rosovsky, H. (1995). *Üniversite: Bir dekan anlatıyor*. Ankara: TÜBİTAK.

Roumbanis, L. (2019). Peer review or lottery? A critical analysis of two different forms of decision-making mechanisms for allocation of research grants. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, *44*(6), 994-1019.

Sandel, M. J. (2020). *The tyranny of merit: What's become of the common good?* London: Penguin Books.

Saunders, B. (2010). *Barbara Goodwin, Justice by Lottery*. The Journal of Value Inquiry, 44, 553–556.

Saunders, B. (2012). *The Luck of the Draw: The Role of Lotteries in Decision Making–By Peter Stone*. Wiley Online Library.

Schripsema, N. R. (2017). *Medical student selection: Effects of different admissions processes*. University of Groningen, Amsterdam.

Stasz, C., & von Stolk, C. (2007). *The use of lottery systems in school admissions*. RAND Europa.

Ten Cate, O. (2021). Rationales for a Lottery Among the Qualified to Select Medical Trainees: Decades of Dutch Experience. Journal of Graduate Medical Education,13 (5): 612–615.

Vulperhorst, J., Lutz, C., de Kleijn, R., & van Tartwijk, J. (2018). Disentangling the predictive validity of high school grades for academic success in university. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(3), 399-414.

Warikoo, N. (2018). What meritocracy means to its winners: Admissions, race, and inequality at elite universities in the United States and Britain. *Social Sciences*, *7*(8), 131.

Wilkinson, D., Zhang, J., & Parker, M. (2011). Predictive validity of the undergraduate medicine and health sciences admission test for medical students' academic performance. *Medical Journal of Australia*, *194*(7), 341-344.

Wouters, A., Croiset, G., Galindo-Garre, F., & Kusurkar, R. A. (2016). Motivation of medical students: Selection by motivation or motivation by selection. *BMC medical education*, *16*(1), 1-9.

Wouters, A., Croiset, G., & Kusurkar, R. A. (2018). Selection and lottery in medical school admissions: Who gains and who loses? *MedEdPublish*, *7*(4), 50.

Yorulmaz, B. (2013). *Üniversiteye giriş sıralaması ile lisans mezuniyet sıralamasında meydana gelen değişim*. Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 6 (28), 469-490.

Zwick, R. (2013). *Rethinking the SAT: The future of standardized testing in university admissions*. London & New York: Routledge.

Zwick, R., & Sklar, J. C. (2005). Predicting college grades and degree completion using high school grades and SAT scores: The role of student ethnicity and first language. *American Educational Research Journal*, *42*(3), 439-464.