

**A EXPANSÃO DOS SISTEMAS AVALIATIVOS E A TEORIA CRÍTICA: UM  
DIÁLOGO (IM) PERTINENTE**

***LA EXPANSIÓN DE LOS SISTEMAS EVALUADORES Y LA TEORÍA CRÍTICA: UN  
DIÁLOGO (IN) PERTINENTE***

***THE EXPANSION OF EVALUATION SYSTEMS AND THE CRITICAL THEORY: A  
(IM) PERTINENT DIALOGUE***

Andréia Nunes MILITÃO<sup>1</sup>  
Andréia da Cunha Malheiros SANTANA<sup>2</sup>  
Fabio PERBONI<sup>3</sup>

**RESUMO:** Este artigo objetiva refletir sobre a expansão dos sistemas de avaliação e articulá-la ao conceito de educação emancipatória da Teoria Crítica de Sociedade. Os dados quantitativos das avaliações no cenário atual reforçam a competição entre as escolas, além de uma visão tecnicista do conhecimento. O modelo avaliativo proposto pelo Estado reflete um modelo calcado em uma lógica gerencial e técnica, o que contraria as bases da teoria crítica. Trata-se de uma pesquisa qualitativa, de cunho bibliográfico, com a fundamentação teórica embasada em Adorno (1995), Adorno e Horkheimer (1985), Afonso (2007), Gomes (2010) e outros. A teoria crítica prega a importância da educação como sendo algo capaz de humanizar e conscientizar o ser humano frente às injustiças sociais, e este conhecimento não pode ser medido por uma avaliação externa.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Avaliação externa. Qualidade da educação. Emancipação. Teoria crítica.

**RESUMEN:** *El artículo tiene por objetivo reflexionar sobre la expansión de los sistemas de evaluación y articula al concepto de educación emancipadora de la Teoría Crítica de Sociedad. Los datos cuantitativos de las evaluaciones en el escenario actual refuerzan la competición entre las escuelas, además de una visión tecnicista del conocimiento. El modelo evaluativo propuesto por el Estado refleja un modelo basado en una lógica gerencial y técnica, lo que contraria las bases de la teoría crítica. Se trata de una investigación cualitativa, de cunho bibliográfico, con la fundamentación teórica basada en Adorno (1995), Adorno y Horkheimer (1985), Afonso (2007), Gomes (2010) y otros. La teoría crítica plantea la importancia de la educación como algo capaz de humanizar y conscientizar el ser humano frente a las injusticias sociales, y este conocimiento no se puede medir por una evaluación externa.*

<sup>1</sup> State University of Mato Grosso do Sul (UEMS), Dourados – MS – Brazil. Professor of the Postgraduation Program in Education. E-mail: andreiamilitao@uems.br

<sup>2</sup> State University of Londrina (UEL), Londrina – PR – Brazil. Adjunct Professor. Coordinator of the Professional Master's Degree Program Profletras. E-mail: andreiacunhamalheiros@gmail.com.

<sup>3</sup> Federal University of Grande Dourados (UFGD), Dourados – MS – Brazil. Professor of the Postgraduation Program in Education. E-mail: fabioperboni@ufgd.edu.br

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** *Evaluación externa. Calidad de la educación. Emancipación. Teoría crítica.*

**ABSTRACT:** *This article aims to reflect on the expansion of evaluation systems and to articulate it to the concept of emancipatory education of the Critical Theory of Society. The quantitative data of the evaluations in the current scenario reinforce the competition between the schools, besides a technicist view of the knowledge. The evaluative model proposed by the State reflects a model based on a managerial and technical logic, which contradicts the bases of critical theory. This is a qualitative, bibliographical research, with the theoretical foundation based on Adorno (1995), Adorno and Horkheimer (1985), Afonso (2007), Gomes (2010) and others. Critical theory preaches the importance of education as capable of humanizing and making human beings aware of social injustices, and this knowledge cannot be measured by external evaluation.*

**KEYWORDS:** *External evaluation. Education quality. Emancipation. Critical theory.*

## **Introduction**

This text derives from studies on the external evaluation of public systems of Brazilian basic education. It proposes to cut the analysis of the pertinence of the concepts of the critical theory to understand the effects of the expansion of the evaluation systems on the concept of educational quality.

It is assumed that critical theory is characterized by the defense of emancipation and critical behavior to the detriment of traditional theory, marked by an alleged scientific neutrality. To this end, it relies on the questions formulated by Gomes (2010) when relating critical theory and political education: “What place would still remain for the 'public sphere', if 'policies' continue to express private interests much more than those effectively public?” (GOMES, 2010, p. 287).

Currently, there is a growing movement in favor of expanding the educational offer, in parallel with the growth in schooling levels. In this context, in addition to the discourse in favor of freedom and democratization, there are also effective processes for valuing individual aspects to the detriment of mechanisms that involve the common good as one of its objectives.

As Gomes (2010, p. 287) points out, “the privatization of ideological control mechanisms for information has increasingly contributed to the intensification of what Adorno and Horkheimer, in 1947, called the Cultural Industry”. We have, therefore, an invasion of the

private over the public, with strong movements that link the idea of quality of formation only to the technical-instrumental dimension, which can be measured quantitatively.

In the current scenario of complexity of contemporary societies, there are several factors that contribute to the worsening of the social crisis. The emptying of the public sphere and the consequent distancing of civil society from eminently social and human themes are symptoms that show the crisis of one of the vital dimensions of society, politics. In this respect, Theodor Adorno's reflections on education, thought in the broader context of a society in which *instrumental rationality*, the ideological power of the *cultural industry* prevails, and the conversion of *Bildung* (cultural formation) into *Halbbildung* (semi-formation), do not leave doubts about the limits of the current formation process (GOMES, 2010, p. 286).<sup>4</sup>

In detriment to a critical perspective of culture, which would have the role of guaranteeing emancipation, mechanisms linked to the dominant ideology focused on adaptation and conformism are reinforced. According to Adorno and Horkheimer (1985), the Cultural Industry<sup>5</sup> makes impossible the formation of autonomous individuals, capable of consciously judging and deciding.

The atrophy of the imagination and spontaneity of today's consumer need not be explained in psychological terms. The products themselves, from the most typical, the sound film, paralyze those capacities due to their own objective constitution. They are made in such a way that their apprehension requires, on the one hand, speed of perception, observation capacity and specific competence, and on the other hand, they are made in such a way as to in fact veto the viewer's mental activity, if he does not want to lose his facts that quickly unfold in front of you. It is such an automatic tension that there is no need to be updated at every step so that it suppresses the imagination (ADORNO; HORKHEIMER, 1985, p. 119).<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> No atual cenário de complexidade das sociedades contemporâneas, vários são os fatores que contribuem para o agravamento da crise social. O esvaziamento da esfera pública e o consequente distanciamento da sociedade civil dos temas eminentemente sociais e humanos são sintomas que evidenciam a crise de uma das dimensões vitais da sociedade, a política. A esse respeito, as reflexões de Theodor Adorno sobre a educação, pensadas no contexto mais amplo de uma sociedade em que prevalece a *racionalidade instrumental*, o poder ideológico da *indústria cultural* e a conversão da *Bildung* (formação cultural) em *Halbbildung* (semiformação), não deixam dúvidas quanto aos limites do processo formativo atual (GOMES, 2010, p. 286).

<sup>5</sup> O termo Indústria Cultural substituiu a expressão “cultura de massa”. Ele foi criado por Adorno e Horkheimer em 1977. Uma cultura que antes era criada pelo povo passa a ser uma cultura imposta por poderes políticos e industriais da época e se estenderam até os dias de hoje, segundo Adorno e Horkheimer (1985).

<sup>6</sup> A atrofia da imaginação e da espontaneidade do consumidor de hoje não tem necessidade de ser explicada em termos psicológicos. Os próprios produtos, desde o mais típico, o filme sonoro, paralisam aquelas capacidades pela sua própria constituição objetiva. Eles são feitos de modo que sua apreensão exige, por um lado, rapidez de percepção, capacidade de observação e competência específica, e por outro são feitos de modo a vetar, de fato, a atividade mental do espectador, se ele não quiser perder os fatos que rapidamente se desenrolam à sua frente. É uma tensão tão automática que não há sequer necessidade de ser atualizada a cada passo para que reprima a imaginação (ADORNO; HORKHEIMER, 1985, p. 119).

With the advances of the industrial revolution, commerce and capitalism, technological advances deepened and were used to contribute to the universe of consumption; when reflecting on the educational context, it is possible to affirm that the evaluations give the impression of being modern alternatives to evaluate education in an objective way, but in reality what they are defining are quality standards and promoting a narrowing of the curricula, in a process that determines what is valid knowledge and what is expendable. It is evident that emancipatory education is no longer a priority, since school practices are aimed at achieving measurable results, through assessments that are mostly restricted to measuring students' proficiency in mathematics and Portuguese language content.

Thus, any pretension of an emancipation understood as a process of “awareness”, defined by Maar (2003, p. 472) as the “rational reflection by which what seems natural, 'essential' order in cultural society, is deciphered as a socially determined order under given conditions of the actual effective production of society”.

### **Large-scale External Assessments and the Quality of Education**

Contemporary society appears marked by technology, fluidity and transience of knowledge. In this mosaic built daily by man, there are few certainties in which we can believe, and one of them draws a lot of attention: education. There is no society that does not concern itself with the theme: even if in a different way, they all try to educate their young people; there is no politician who does not include it in their campaign; there is no economist who does not calculate how much each student in the system costs, there is not an educator who does not claim more investment in the area. Thus, education is a priority issue even for banks, see the World Bank's role in education. The search for quality education enabled the emergence of evaluation systems, as announced by the Federal Constitution of 1988 and reinforced by the Law of Directives and Bases of Education (LDB), no. 9,394/96, which explained the role of the State:

Art. 9 The Union will be responsible for:

V - **collect, analyze and disseminate information** about education;

VI - **ensure a national process for evaluating school performance in primary, secondary and higher education**, in collaboration with education systems, aiming at defining priorities and improving the quality of education;

VII – impose general rules on undergraduate and graduate courses;

VIII - to **ensure a national evaluation process for higher education institutions**, with the cooperation of systems that have responsibility for this level of education (BRASIL, 1996, authors' highlights).<sup>7</sup>

Since the creation of LDB/1996, education systems have been the target of a series of external evaluation processes, as a means of ensuring the quality of education offered; but how to assess the quality of education? What does a quality assessment mean? Authors such as Dourado and Oliveira (2009) and Rothen, Tavares and Santana (2015), when discussing this theme, from different perspectives, found that it is not something simple, easily measurable, as the concept of quality involves a broader discussion both from the society that propagates it, as well from the historical moment in which such discourse is disseminated; different groups can use the term with different meanings and purposes. The discussions on the theme of quality did not take into account the different conceptions of education, nor the purposes of this, they only emphasized the cost-benefit ratio and the need to disseminate the results, that is why the valuation of dropout, repetition and exclusion rates.

Education is now seen as a service, not as a right, and the school as an organization, not as an institution. The school conceived as an organization favored external evaluation at different levels of education, focusing on competitiveness between schools and/or among teachers, as if “[...] quality was the product of the competition itself and not of a collective construction” (FREITAS, 2004, p. 148).

We live what Afonso (2007) called “evaluative obsession”; for him, the old national examinations, now called external evaluations, were resumed and updated, the capitalist system began to see advantages in the hierarchy of individuals through these examinations, as they propagate the idea of being meritocratic and neutral.

The principles of capitalism are influencing education and produce, according to Adorno, a mass culture that standardizes the education and formation of the individual, promoting the alienation of students' awareness before society; in this scenario, education is the only instrument against barbarism. The evaluation has been used to re-point the school itself. For the author, external evaluations continue:

---

<sup>7</sup> Art. 9º A União incumbir-se-á de:

V - **coletar, analisar e disseminar informações** sobre a educação;

VI - **assegurar processo nacional de avaliação do rendimento escolar no ensino fundamental, médio e superior**, em colaboração com os sistemas de ensino, objetivando a definição de prioridades e a melhoria da qualidade do ensino;

VII - baixar normas gerais sobre cursos de graduação e pós-graduação;

VIII - **assegurar processo nacional de avaliação das instituições de educação superior**, com a cooperação dos sistemas que tiverem responsabilidade sobre este nível de ensino (BRASIL, 1996, grifo nosso).

RIAEE – Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação, Araraquara, v. 14, n. esp. 4, p. 2046-2056, dez., 2019. E-ISSN: 1982-5587.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v14iesp.4.12927>

[...] to be a central control device by the State, in relation to what was taught (and how it was taught) in public schools, and, simultaneously, to promote competitive pressures between public schools (or between public and private institutions), thus inducing an effect of competition and hierarchy through the publicity and dissemination of students' school results (rankings), which should supposedly support the free educational choice by parents, transformed, however, into customers or consumers of school education (AFONSO, 2007, p. 14).<sup>8</sup>

This process of transformation/reification of human beings tends to make them increasingly competitive, less supportive and more technical. In this perspective, quality appears as a synonym for instrumental rationality, there is an overvaluation of quantitative indicators without taking into account the actors involved, the different educational contexts and the other public policies aimed at education. External evaluation is not concerned with local realities, nor does it seek to find ways for everyone to achieve the expected learning. Its objective is to measure cognitive performance, leaving aside the entire context in which these subjects are inserted; in this way, the quality discourse propagated by these evaluations has served to promote elitization and meritocracy for the school, reinforcing exclusion.

The association of educational results with economic results has been recurrent to validate interference in the pedagogical field, notably, in the pedagogical processes. On the other hand, “the results of the evaluations do not serve to diagnose the weaknesses of the educational process and to propose improvements. On the contrary, they fuel distrust about public education and expand the proposals for intervention and control over it” (AFONSO, 2007, p. 14).

Afonso (2007) argues that a quality public school must be democratic and provide several possibilities for achieving learning. Quality cannot only be scientific, measured by an evaluation at the end of a period, it must be pedagogical and democratic. The creation of several evaluation processes has not accompanied an improvement in teaching. The emergence of the “Assessing State”<sup>9</sup> has been legitimized as a political setback, because it has valued positivist and quantitative techniques and devalued educational and social processes. According to Dias

---

<sup>8</sup> [...] a ser um dispositivo de controlo central por parte do Estado, relativamente ao que se ensinava (e como se ensinava) nas escolas públicas, e, simultaneamente, promover pressões competitivas entre os estabelecimentos de ensino públicos (ou entre estabelecimentos públicos e privados), induzindo, desta forma, um efeito de concorrência e hierarquização através da publicitação e divulgação dos resultados escolares dos estudantes (rankings), os quais deveriam, supostamente, apoiar a livre escolha educacional por parte dos pais, transformados, entretanto, em clientes ou consumidores da educação escolar (AFONSO, 2007, p. 14).

<sup>9</sup> The term “Assessing State” was created by Guy Neave (1988) to designate a State that associates the control exercised by him with the institutions' strategies of autonomy and self-regulation. It is difficult to specify a date for the appearance of the Assessing State, since it encompasses many actions that, apparently, are isolated, but which are linked to the construction of a central key idea. However, for the purpose of placing the Assessing State in the panorama of changes that took place in education, we can think of the 1980s as an initial milestone.



Sobrinho (2002, p. 28), in the *Assessing State*, “[...] the logic of budget control and rationality prevails”, legitimizing the use of the results of assessments to justify or reduce investments in a given level of education.

To overcome the role of control exercised by the evaluation systems, it is necessary to evaluate the evaluation systems themselves, identify what are their strengths and weaknesses and, from them, promote the dialogue between the results achieved and the school. Only with this articulation will it be possible to promote an emancipatory and egalitarian education.

In examining the origins of the Basic Education Assessment System (SAEB, Portuguese initials), we found its formulation in experiences that expanded from the end of the 1980s, reaching the current scenario of consolidating practices in various basic education systems. Freitas (2007, p. 17) finds:

[...] the beginning of the research project on the performance evaluation of students from public primary schools. [...] it would have arisen from the interest of the Minister of Education at that time, Hugo Napoleão, in creating, through INEP, an external program for the evaluation of [fundamental] primary education, with the function of subsidizing the secretariats.<sup>10</sup>

Although the first large-scale external evaluation trials were consolidated in the mid-1990s, the genesis of the current model can be traced to the third edition of SAEB in 1995, as it presented changes that aligned the Brazilian experience with the Bank's guidelines Worldwide. According to Lopes (2007, p. 325), from that moment “[...] the MEC strengthens its formulation and control role. Among the main changes, the creation of the National Bank of Items, the adoption of the Item Response Theory (IRT) methodology and the outsourcing of the procedures for carrying out the tests stand out ”; these characteristics remain in national assessments today, and this model has been disseminated as a standard in state systems (PERBONI, 2016) and in municipal basic education systems (SOUSA; PIMENTA; MACHADO, 2012).

One of the questions that motivated this research is precisely the reason that led the state and municipal systems to implement their own assessment processes, which technically follow the same molds of the SAEB, seven states even created their own performance indexes calculated with the same parameters used for the Basic Education Development Index (IDEB). This excess of evaluations makes even a qualitative analysis of the results found difficult; there

<sup>10</sup> [...] o início do projeto de pesquisa sobre avaliação do rendimento de alunos de escolas de primeiro grau da rede pública. ... ele teria surgido do interesse do então ministro da Educação, Hugo Napoleão, em criar, por meio do INEP, um programa externo de avaliação do ensino de primeiro grau [fundamental], com função de subsidiar as secretarias.

are so many assessments that teachers are unable to discuss the results and rethink their practice in order to improve the students' level of learning. In this way, the “evaluative obsession” keeps us from an emancipatory education: for Adorno (1995), one of the basic tasks of education is to prevent Auschwitz from happening again.

A society that values such assessments and considers them as a measure of quality is far from providing its own self-reflection, which is vital in an emancipatory education; the severity of the assessment, often associated with punishment, leads us to an educational model governed by force and fear: such resources generate only conformism or even “a reified consciousness” (ADORNO, 1995, p. 05), in which a school competes with the other, one teacher competes with the other and no one can understand the real goals of education; such objectives become to obtain a good grade in an evaluation.

In this context, our society justifies the creation of numerous evaluations. We can highlight at least three of them: the possibility of greater control over the process, with the application of annual tests and more agile results, the creation of an alleged “culture of evaluation” among schools and the improvement of the quality of teaching.

Regarding the last two points, it should be considered that assessments cannot create a new culture of assessment, since schools have consolidated processes for assessing student learning. On the contrary, in this field, evaluations reinforce the negative characteristics of evaluative practices, such as their merely classificatory, excluding and of punctual character.

In relation to quality, it is noted that the evaluations promote it from a restricted and instrumental perspective, which boils down to the students' proficiency in Portuguese and mathematics, disregarding in this measure all other aspects that can be attributed as functions of school education. This is reinforced by measures that link the results of evaluations to awards to schools and bonuses for education officials.

None of these reasons leads to an emancipatory education, according to Adorno (1995, p. 144), it would have “[...] the task of strengthening resistance rather than strengthening adaptation”, in this way, it is up to Education to encourage reflection and clarification, so that the individual does not allow a new barbarism in our society; although the author does not use the term “quality”, it is possible to infer that a quality education for him cannot be measured by an external evaluation.

## Final considerations



When considering the concept of quality as a polysemic term, Enguita (1995) reinforces that in certain contexts, a conception of quality takes precedence over others. However, it does not imply the extinction of previous conceptions, as each new perspective on quality does not entirely replace those that preceded it.

This definition satisfactorily covers the current moment in which we live. On the one hand, there is the coexistence, from a perspective of educational quality markedly associated with what is defended as ideal by critical theory, an emancipatory and critical education, capable of forming critical citizens and inserted in the country's political and economic life. This perspective on the quality of education is included in our legislation and also present in the synthesis of the defense of a socially referenced quality, formulated in the midst of national education conferences and also incorporated in national regulations.

At the same time, another perspective of educational quality, containing a very different view on the ideal of education, markedly characterized as instrumental and pragmatic, aimed at adapting the subjects to the dictates of the capitalist world, without worrying about criticism or reflecting on the reasons of certain reality. This conception is also present in some national regulations, such as, for example, in the National Education Plan (2014-2024), especially in its goal seven, which is consistent with “promoting the quality of basic education in all stages and modalities”, linking this to national IDEB averages.

Between these two diametrically opposed conceptions of quality, we could identify others, however for the objectives proposed here this deepening is not necessary. It is worth noting that the dissemination of external and large-scale evaluations, along the lines proposed in recent decades, has strongly reinforced the second conception of quality, leaving other perspectives that propose to think about the width of educational quality more relegated to a second plane. The conception of quality defended by large-scale evaluations does not represent the ideal of education present in critical theory; according to Adorno, man's superiority is in wisdom, in knowledge, he does not recognize barriers, he does not accept the slavery of a man, in this perspective, the only form of human emancipation is through knowledge that cannot be measured through an external evaluation.

It is considered, therefore, that the references of critical theory can provide an interesting interpretative key to this phenomenon and, equally, provide an opportunity for reflections that oppose the conception, each day more present, of an educational quality emptied of reflections and criticism.

## REFERENCES

- ADORNO, T. W. **Educação e emancipação**. São Paulo: Paz & Terra, 1995.
- ADORNO, T. W. Educação após Auschwitz. **Educação e emancipação**, v. 3, p. 119-138, 1995.
- ADORNO, T. W.; HORKHEIMER, M. **Dialética do Esclarecimento**. Tradução de Guido Antônio de Almeida, Rio de Janeiro, Zahar Editores, 1985
- AFONSO, N. Estado, políticas educacionais e obsessão avaliativa. **Contrapontos**, Itajaí, v. 7, n. 1, p. 11-22, jan./abr., 2007.
- ALAVARSE, O. M.; MACHADO, C.; ARCAS, P. H. Articulação entre qualidade e gestão da educação: as avaliações externas dos estados em questão. **37ª Reunião Nacional da ANPEd**, 2015, UFSC. Disponível em: <http://37reuniao.anped.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Trabalho-GT05-4481.pdf>. Acesso em: 13 ago. 2015.
- BAUER, A. Estudos sobre Sistemas de Avaliação Educacional no Brasil: um retrato em preto e branco. **Revista @mbiente educação**, v. 5, n. 1. p. 7-31, jan./jun., 2012.
- BAUER, A.; PIMENTA, C. O.; HORTA NETO, J.; SOUSA, S. Z. L. Avaliação em larga escala em municípios brasileiros: o que dizem os números? **Estudos em Avaliação Educacional**, FCC. v. 26, n. 62. maio/ago., 2015.
- BAUER, A.; REIS, A. T. **Base de Dados Avaliação**: balanço da produção teórica sobre avaliação de sistemas educacionais no Brasil: 1988 a 2011. São Paulo: Fundação Carlos Chagas, 2014. Disponível em: <http://acervo.fcc.org.br>.
- DOURADO, L. F.; OLIVEIRA, J. F. A qualidade da educação: perspectivas e desafios. **Caderno Cedes**, Campinas, v. 29, n. 78, p. 201-215, maio/ago. 2009.
- ENGUITA, M. O discurso da qualidade e a qualidade do discurso. In: GENTILI, P.; SILVA, T. T. (Org.). **Neoliberalismo, qualidade total e educação**. 2. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, p. 93-110, 1995.
- FREITAS, D. N. T. de. **A avaliação da educação básica no Brasil**. Campinas. Autores Associados, 2007.
- FREITAS, L. C. A Avaliação e as reformas dos anos de 1990, novas formas de exclusão, velhas formas de subordinação. **Revista Educação e Sociedade**, v. 25, n. 86, 2004. Disponível em: <http://redalyc.uaemex.mx/src/inicio/ArtPdfRed.jsp?iCve=873137180008>. Acesso em: 05 abr. 2012.
- GIL, C. A. **Como elaborar projetos de pesquisa**. 5. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2010.
- GOMES, L. R. Teoria Crítica e Educação Política em Theodor Adorno. **Revista HISTEDBR On-line**, Campinas, n. 39, p. 286-296, set. 2010.

LOPES, V. V. **Cartografia da Avaliação Educacional no Brasil**. Tese. (Doutorado em Educação) Faculdade de Educação, USP, São Paulo, 2007.

MAAR, W. L. Adorno, semiformação e educação. **Educação e Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 24, n. 83, p. 459-476, ago. 2003.

MARTINS, A. M.; SOUSA, S. Z. L. de. A produção científica sobre avaliação educacional e gestão de sistemas e de escolas: o campo da questão entre 2000 e 2008. **Ensaio: avaliação de políticas públicas educacionais**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 20, n. 74, p. 9-26, jan./mar., 2012.

NEAVE, G. On the cultivation of quality, efficiency and enterprise: an overview of recent trends in higher education in Western Europe, 1986-1988. **European Journal of Education**, v. 23, n. 1/2, p. 7-23, 1988.

NOBRE, M. **A Teoria Crítica**. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 2004.

PERBONI, F. **Avaliações externas e em larga escala nas Redes de Educação Básica dos Estados Brasileiros**. 2016. 268f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Presidente Prudente – SP. 2016.

PERBONI, F.; MILITÃO, A. N.; DI GIORGI, C. A. Garboggini. Manifestações do “quase-mercado” nas avaliações externas e em larga escala. **Educação (UFSM)**, v. 44, Publicação Contínua, 2019.

ROTHEN, J. C.; TAVARES, M. das G. M.; SANTANA, A. C. M. O Discurso da qualidade em periódicos internacionais e nacionais: uma análise crítica. **Revista Educação em Questão (Online)**, v. 51, p. 251-273, 2015. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufrn.br/educacaoemquestao/article/view/7179>.

SILVA, I. M. da. A Discussão sobre Avaliação nas Reuniões Anuais da ANPED no Período 2000 a 2010. **Avaliação**, Campinas; Sorocaba, SP, v. 18, n. 2, p. 335-350, jul., 2013.

SOUSA, S. Z. L. de; OLIVEIRA, R. P. Sistemas estaduais de avaliação: uso dos resultados, implicações e tendências. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, v. 40, n. 141, p. 793-822, set./dez. 2010.

SOUSA, S. Z.; PIMENTA, C. O.; MACHADO, C. Avaliação e gestão municipal da educação. **Estudo e Avaliação Educacional**, São Paulo, v. 23, n. 53, p. 14-36, set/dez. 2012.

SVERDLICK, I. **¿Que hay de nuevo en evaluación educativa?** Buenos Aires: Noveduc Libros, 2012.

WERLE, F. O. C. **Avaliação em Larga Escala: questões polêmicas**. Brasília: Liber Livros, 2012.

### How to quote this article

MILITÃO, Andréia Nunes; SANTANA, Andréia da Cunha Malheiros; PERBONI, Fábio. A expansão dos sistemas avaliativos e a teoria crítica: um diálogo (im) pertinente. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 14, n. esp. 4, p. 2046-2056, dez., 2019. E-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v14iesp.4.12927>

**Submitted:** 25/06/2019

**Approved:** 20/06/2019

**Published:** 01/09/2019