



Response-Ability: Re-E-Valuing Shameful Measuring Processes Within the Australian Academy

Melissa Joy Wolfe and Eve Mayes

Introduction

The entrepreneurial knowledge maker¹ is *affected through measurement*; she is touched, and simultaneously, she differentially affects and touches what she is impelled to measure as the ‘impact of standards reach deep into the ontological matter of everyday working life’ (Brøgger and Staunæs 2016: 228). The relational forces of the ‘touch’ of measurement impact on not only her capacity to respond, but shape the way she is able to respond. The knowledge maker is incited to craft her work and self, abiding within the material-discursive measurements of the *already given* aspirational knowledge-making that calls her. Processes of *evaluation* simultaneously produce and exclude, cutting both ways.

M. J. Wolfe (✉)
Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
e-mail: melissa.wolfe@monash.edu

E. Mayes
Deakin University, Geelong, VIC, Australia
e-mail: eve.mayes@deakin.edu.au

In this chapter, we seek to rethink concepts of measurement as objective numerical value through the paradigm shift (Barad 2007; St. Pierre 2013a, b, 2017; Jackson 2017) away from both quantitative and qualitative research systems. We arrive at a 'post-qualitative' turn that allows productive consequences to materialise through 'experiments in in/determinacy' (Barad 2012: 208). New materialist inquiry entails the analysis of materialising events (Barad's intra-actions²) and the consideration of how *things* come to be, rather than scrutinising the properties of things. We discuss evaluative and measurement processes as affective assemblages, with materialising affective affiliations (Rasmussen 2014) that are entanglements of power with our academic selves. Sellar (2015) has noted that 'researching affect implies researching with affect and thus acknowledging the unavoidably constructive or creative dimension of research' (142). Our creativity moves to re-conceptualise evaluative *measurement* as 'a form of touching' (Barad 2012: 208) where '*[t]ouching is a matter of response. Each of 'us' is constituted in response-ability. Each of 'us' is constituted as responsible for the other, as the other*' (Barad 2012: 215 emphasis in original). Our generative methodology implicates us as researchers in the research process with what Lisa Blackman (2007) has named 'embodied hauntology' (26), where we have endured experiences, have passionate attachments (Wolfe 2017b) and have something more to say. Writing as early career researchers in tenured positions at two Australian universities,³ we explore two personal vignettes associated with evaluation of research outputs, teaching, and performance management processes in higher education, in order to think through ways *shame* interpellates our academic selves.

Shame has previously been discussed in relation to evaluation in higher education. Loveday (2016) has linked the 'classed and gendered conditions that coalesce' (1141) in the production of shame through evaluation for higher education staff and students, so that 'shame becomes misrecognised as a classed and gendered problem of individuals, rather than a symptom of inequality' (1143). Brøgger and Staunæs' (2016) analysis of shame examines how educational *organisations* may also feel shame through performative evaluation processes against pre-determined standards, and pass on this shame to individuals in and through governance practices.

Like Brøgger and Staunæs' (2016), we have found Silvan Tomkins' re-working of the concept of shame to be generative, and have extended this work using the conceptual resources of Barad (see also Mayes and Wolfe 2018). Shame, according to Tomkins (1995a, b), is understood as fundamental to the self. Tomkins explains that shame is 'feelings of inferiority [rather] than of guilt' (1995a: 397) and thus is a powerful affect as it cannot be diminished through action. According to Tomkins, shame is *sensed* as inherent to self and results in inactivity, as the perceived transgression is given no specific attribute. Tomkins re-defines shame as an affect that only ever exists in relation *with* interest. As Sedgwick and Frank explain: '[w]ithout positive affect, there can be no shame; only a scene that offers you enjoyment or engages your interest can make you blush' (1995: 520). After Tomkins' auxiliary movement of interest-shame, and in engagement with Barad's concept of 'response-ability' (Haraway 2016; Barad 2007), we consider shameful *evaluation* processes within higher education, putting to work our prior theorisation of shame-interest as one affect (see Mayes and Wolfe 2018; Wolfe 2017b). The shame produced through 'evaluation' events thus becomes a matter of interest (Mayes and Wolfe 2018). We consider the stultifying affect of shame and attempt a playful reworking, to a more affirmative capacity for new knowledge making. We become attuned, where attunement 'is both a mode of responsiveness to this locale...and the capacity to respond' (Blackman 2007: 31).

The next section outlines our thinking with measurement and evaluation and the usefulness of thinking with affective assemblages. We then further interrogate our conceptual standpoint/s to include affect and in particular the affect shame-interest. We conduct an experimental *playing with patterning* of two sample vignettes—we flatten these encounters and think with the notion of capacity-building response-ability to consider ways these accounts *can be* affirmatively otherwise. Throughout we consider ways things come into relation as performative and productive *within* our thinking in the virtual here and now, in this very chapter the virtual reader engages with.

Measurement and Evaluation

Evaluation is the assessed pre-empted value of a bounded *thing* that is measured. Evaluations are usually abstracted and expressed as a number (unrelated to context) or as qualitative data coded to a number. Measurement is the deemed quantified level of assessment, most often reduced to a number. Both evaluation and measurement represent ‘values’ or worth and significantly do not account for the apparatus of measurement. What we highlight here is ways the selected *apparatus of measurement* impacts significantly on the material outcomes of the measure (cf. Sellar 2015). Apparatuses, according to Barad (2007), are material-discursive practices, they include the measuring tool and the researcher observer, which are inextricable from the bodies that are produced through the measuring. As knowledge makers, we are inseparable from the entangled assemblages that we speak through; research outcomes only materialise from the measurements conducted within the research. They were never simply there to begin with. Researchers are of the world and are limited by our own research horizons. They perform a relational self within both research credentials and a prescribed academic language that set limits to knowledge. Once researchers critique these boundaries, they may be able to action material-discursive practices in new ways that interfere in the world, to become productive, political and of consequence.

Evaluation, as measurable and ‘evidence based’—understood to be measuring the one reality through objective quantifying methods—is pivotal in the neoliberal university. Much has been written about globalised contemporary shifts in the measurement and evaluative practices of academic work: the “‘metricization” of the academy’ (Burrows 2012: 355) that systematically compares individuals, departments and national and international institutions as a qualitative reduction to numbers (see Peseta et al. 2017). Selwyn (2015) notes ways educational institutions ‘function increasingly along “data driven” lines’ (66): digital data have become ‘a core element of managerialist techniques of accountability, auditing, evidence-based management, “evidence based” practice, effectiveness’ (72). There are metrics for everything: student evaluations of teaching, numerical quantification of research

outputs, research impact (journal indexing), tallying of grant funding etc. Processes of measurement work through and across *multiple temporalities, devoid of context*, enabling and blocking particular modes of relationality. What comes to matter is reconfigured in the very marking or rather making of time. Marking time is the process of becoming as materialisation, the process of enfolding, where the past and the future are enfolded in the present becoming.

These highly visible measurements publicly evaluate and circulate the productivity of the *individual academic knowledge maker into numbers* with material consequences: impact on tenure, promotion, grant approvals and general preferential treatment; they impact on modes of living for academic knowledge makers. These measurements, often of impossible standards (Taylor and Gannon 2018), have ‘discursive accompaniments: failure to measure up, failing to count, cutting and letting go, what the numbers say’ (Ocean and Skourdoumbis 2016: 442). Claims of metrics’ ‘neutrality’ betray the masculinist, white, heteronormative logics where autonomy and competition are privileged, where individuals are responsible for their own success/failure (Ahmed 2012). The entrepreneurial academic knowledge maker is encouraged to take up these metricised logics in practices of simultaneous self-promotion and self-surveillance (Hey and Bradford 2004). The measured knowledge maker thus emerges through a spacetime-mattering (Barad 2007). The practices researchers enact *with* the university are productive and ‘practices of knowing are specific material engagements that participate in (re)configuring the world’ (Barad 2007: 91). Systems reproduce what they measure and ‘rather than encourage difference, they trap us in the *given*, the myth of [positivist] Science’ (St. Pierre 2013a: 226).

Affective Assemblages

We call into question, spurred along by others (St. Pierre 2013a, b; MacLure 2013; Jackson 2017; Mazzei 2017), not only what counts ‘as “data”, but our relation to those data’ (MacLure 2013: 660) that evaluate us, and that we generate to evaluate ourselves *in relation* to others. Evaluation data are not benign and objective; *data does*. We explicitly notice

what is *felt* by the researcher (and participants and reader) in relation to the data rather than what is deciphered through qualitative coding and thematic analysis based on words as ‘*quasi-numbers*’ (St. Pierre 2013a: 224).

In this chapter, we re-evaluate evaluative processes employing a Baradian ethic, thinking with the notion that, ‘measurement is surely a form of touching’ (2012: 208). We use the concept of ‘response-ability’ as entanglement, in order to highlight the co-constitution of evaluation processes. This in turn enables a re-evaluation, a possibly affirmative opening up of capacity through shifting relationality. This methodology moves to ‘capture various affective reconfiguration[s] of education’ (Staunaes 2016: 65) and enacts ‘knowledge production... as performative’ (Staunaes 2016: 66) where we analyse ‘*tendencies* with the purpose of reconfiguring the world’ (Staunaes 2016: 67, emphasis in original). Our conceptualising is a way of creative thinking and we conduct thought experiments as a way of playing with other worlding (Haraway 2016). The two vignettes recount shameful personal encounters in the academy, as an illustration of ways the entrepreneurial knowledge maker is affectively incited to craft her work and her *self* to ensure she becomes, as reductively measured—a particular *type* of knowledge maker; a body that fits the system, a body that matters. Processes of *evaluation* simultaneously produce and erase, cutting both ways (Barad 2007). To think these evaluative processes with entanglement, we are required to abandon linear thought and move to diffractive thinking where ‘any type of epistemological individuality is being composed... taking place: *only* as contractions in a surface’ (Dolphijn 2016: para. 14). We attempt to action new thinking through the concept of response-ability. The task here is to think how capacity for new ‘thinking’ can be increased, as enabling responses not yet thought. Beausoleil (2015) explains that ‘we experience situated knowledges as universal truths’ (4) and this is not only an epistemic violence that erases but one of affective violence (Hook and Wolfe 2017). Beausoleil (2015) compels a shift in ‘the ethics of encounter from epistemological to affective terms: in a word, it demands a dispositional ethics that construes responsibility as responsiveness’ (6).

Affect is not a thing, it is a relation, a touching that cannot be captured. Affective assemblages that produce the university continually

move and shift in relation. Puar (2007) argues that by foregrounding the notion of assemblage, attention falls on ways ontology is entangled with epistemology, and affect works *in conjunction* with ‘representational economies, within which bodies interpenetrate, swirl together, and transmit affects and effects to each other’ (205). She clarifies that the entities that intersect are the body (not the subject) and population (206). Bennett (2010) develops the concept of an agentic assemblage to convey that ‘an actant never really acts alone. Its efficacy of agency always depends on the collaboration, cooperation, or interactive interference of many bodies and forces’ (21). To study assemblages is to map unforeseen, divergent and productive relations in motion rather than to discover essences (Puar 2012).

Re/Conceptualizing Measurement and Its Affects

Affective shifts have been critically described as by-products of the neoliberalist university, with accompanying calls to resist these practices (Olssen and Peters 2005).⁴ We do not take for granted ‘neoliberalism’ and are wary, like Grealy and Laurie (2017), of explanations of contemporary university practices that suggest that neoliberalism is a ‘universalising ideology’—as ‘something that happens *to* people in institutions rather than something that happens *through* people in institutions’ (Grealy and Laurie 2017: 464, emphasis in original). Fox and Alldred (2018), after Bruno Latour, also raise concerns about overarching sociological accounts of ‘social structures’, ‘systems’ or ‘underlying mechanisms’ like ‘neoliberalism’ to ‘make sense of perceived patterns’ (6). For them, ‘[w]hat has appeared structural or systemic to sociologists is rather a product of reproduced affect economies or intra-actions between assembled relations’ (8). We concur with Fox and Alldred’s claim that a ‘materialist sociology’ should ‘analyse forces and social relations, power and resistance from within the immanent, relational micropolitics of events, activities and interactions themselves’ (7).

We are not much interested in what measurement *is* but are interested in what it *does*. The apparatus utilised in assessment matters; it will impact what comes to matter (two-fold). Measurement acts as the *making*

of difference and thus the maker of exclusions. Evaluative measures must include the apparatus of observation as this is not/cannot be separated from the subject of observation (Barad 2007). This discussion seeks to make sense of the infinite void of exclusions in *all* measurement acts—and the ethico-political possibility of making otherwise (Barad 2012: 216).

Rather than suggest that academics are being beset by dis/comforting affects of metricisation in the ‘neoliberal university’, we are interested in *our own entanglement with* these assemblages. Knowledge makers engineer their value through engaging and affiliating within boundary making processes: ones that reward pre-defined knowledge practices and thus exclude others. Thus, academics *become* determined with the university assemblage, not separate from it. We (consciously and/or unconsciously) re-orient our pedagogical interests, language and practices moving to maximise our recognition and capacity to act within these affective and affiliating assemblages.

We suggest that metrics *do* something affectively, beyond just generating a reductive mode of shame that inhibits the capacity to act. Brøgger and Staunæs (2016) suggest that although ‘[s]hame profits from the positive investment in the object that activates the shame, and is felt as an exposing affect’, shame ‘is also an affect which produces action’ (230). Our work here attempts to generate new relations within academic spacetimematter (Barad 2007) configurations by understanding our stories differently through ‘relational (re-)threading[s] of new places, affects and subjectivities’ (Charteris et al. 2016: 42). Affects are not passive—in Spinoza’s (1994) sense of the word—as if measurement practices and their affects are foisted on the inert academic subject. *We are affected*, but we also *affect* measurement practices. *We* are invested in university assemblages, we are named, we identify, we affectively affiliate, and we belong. There is an incitement to persevere—that perpetuates these modes of relating to ourselves, each other, our institutional workplaces, and the world. Our compliance is rewarded with the drive for recognition, promotions and tenure (see Brøgger and Staunæs 2016). Burrows (2012) describes this as ‘our own knowing collusion with a joyless bureaucratic auditing process’ (364) but we prefer to think of it more as an affective incitement to belong, maintain recognition and a livable life (Wolfe 2017b). We continue to consider ways shame-interest (Mayes and Wolfe

2018) are simultaneous co-constitutive: how and why we come to be interested in the very thing(s)/numbers that constrain our flourishing (Berlant 2011); how interest-shame co-habit everyday routinised modes of enacting our academic subjectivities.

Metrics, as indicators of institutional worth, make us viable knowledge makers—they simultaneously enable and constrain, shaming us and inciting our interest. Chubb et al. (2017) describe the simultaneity of ‘despair and despondency’ with ‘commitment and/or love for what [we] do’ (556). The analysis that we seek surrounds simultaneous and entangled affects, not as two but one multiplicity—attraction/repulsion, shame/interest, hope/fear. As Grealy and Laurie (2017) write:

Pressures to conform to metric cultures may feel compelling because individuals are already compelled by other commitments. These may involve a love of reading and writing, a sense of fulfilment in the classroom, a pleasure in mentoring future academics, a desire for social status or simply the habitual comforts of working in a familiar and supportive social environment. (465)

Yet, this affective simultaneity may not always *feel* affirmative. As we affectively invest these measurement practices, dividends may be felt at times, for some, but may be experienced by others as ‘cruel optimism’—where the optimistic promises of the university are desired but become an obstacle to one’s flourishing (Berlant 2011; Lipton 2017).

In the next section, we examine ways our evaluative practices may generate shame that is apprehended as personal. We think shame-interest in indeterminate Baradian superposition⁵ where shame-interest as one affect is multi-directional, ambivalent and arbitrary; it is *made* determinate only in the event (Mayes and Wolfe 2018) of the material-discursive action of measurement.

Vignettes as Affective Assemblages That Matter

In the vignettes below, we attune to *evaluation-events* where we participate in the evaluative practices within the Academy and where we interact with numbers in a constrained manner. These evaluation events, as

sense-events (Springgay and Truman 2017) are not passive data that are considered sedimentary, they remain open and lively. We think in virtual movements that digress from what appears as *is*, to consider what might be, as imagined justice-to-come (Barad 2010). We think concepts, dynamically action-ing thinking as ontological (Dolphijn 2016). As self-identified knowledge makers, we live our theories. Here we consider ways experience can become affirmatively generative. To make this shift, we flatten two personal vignettes, experimenting with(in) the event (rather than just re-counting the experience felt) to speculate on alternate outcomes (Springgay and Truman 2017). We place these encounters *within* a measuring assemblage patterning in-action that intrinsically situate knowledge makers as entangled with, and responsible (in-action) for outcomes. We attune to affective flows, forces and intensities, as relationality that comes to matter. We focus on the relations or affections that always contain alternatives (unthought), as Barad (2007) would argue, indeterminate entities (Wolfe 2017a). We (Wolfe and Mayes) as knowledge makers can interfere and become responsible in order to enable greater capacity as ‘thinking/making/doing’ (Springgay and Truman 2017: 4) or even feelingthinking/making/doing. We do not seek to ‘uncover’ underlying ‘structures’ or ‘logics’ of measurement and evaluation in contemporary universities, but rather examine these events as moments of potential and consider where something else could be feltthought/created/done differently, that may re-modulate the situation. What we attempt is to create interference patterns, or new patterning into the problematic sense-making practices that we not only utilise but that bring us to being. A spacetimeattering (Barad 2007).

Vignette #1—Melissa Becoming a Measured Academic

I sit in the auditorium of a large stadium at an international educational conference. I have been a full-time academic for twelve months. There is a buzz in the early morning crowd as they anticipate the renowned academic about to take the stage. I take my seat where I can get a good view, maybe three rows from the front and five seats in from the aisle to allow other delegates to move in. The plastic seat is cold and hard causing me to shift around, trying to get comfortable. The air-conditioning has been put into overload

*and it is freezing despite the heat of Melbourne summer. I am reading the program and planning out my day – nervously thinking about my own presentation later that afternoon. A hard working, competent and well-respected colleague from the same University gruffly sits down next to me. I greet her warmly. This particular academic I believed was instrumental in my success at securing a tenured position due to her strong reference regarding my teaching in her Unit and I considered her a friend and mentor. She turns to me without a greeting and curtly blurts, ‘how many publications did you get last year?’ I blink, **feeling** unnerved by her tone and answer dumbly, ‘errrr three’. She looks straight ahead at the empty stage, raising her eyebrows and disapprovingly murmurs – ‘mm’. Then nothing – silence. She does not ask about my research or even what my publications are reporting on. I feel ashamed. My cheeks burn.*

Reconceptualising shameful *evaluation* in higher education processes and practices with the concept of ‘response-ability,’ the shame of ‘evaluation’ is noticed within the intra-action, as a matter of interest and focus. By speaking our now ‘flattened’ shame (below), we can account for the patterns materialising effects of our ‘identity arising from ongoing activities’ (Bryant 2016: 33). We can notice the stultifying effect of shame. This is what happens when we flatten the event, and we examine what bodies and what affections arise from the intra-action (Wolfe and Rasmussen 2019; Bryant 2016).

Phenomenon (no particular order) *Becoming: Academic A- Academic B –stadium-cold chairs-cold-conference-presentation-publications-public-performance standards-promotions-tenure-esteem.*

Affective Affiliations (no particular order) *Becoming: un/friendship-mentor-in/debt-colleague-professional-competition-dis/respect-interest/shame-un/ belonging-vulnerable-nervous-un/love-un/care-un/sync.*

Academic A has been interested to engage intellectually—she has turned to greet her senior colleague-mentor, anticipating and interested in the reciprocation of a warm greeting—and feels shame when her colleague-mentor confronts her instead with a question about her number of publications. Academic A is compelled, in this spacetime-mattering

relation, with its past, present and future relations of power, to give an account of herself—in numerical terms that translate her worth. ‘Three’—is what she *is* in this equation—the question incites the measuring apparatus that cuts her together and apart in numerical terms. Uttering ‘three’, in this particular context is generative of shame: shame at the number, and shame in relation with her colleague-mentor. Shame in what this number brings to bear on both academics as the number generates a competitive rather than collaborative relation. Academic A blushes and does not respond further; her capacity is diminished as she is ‘touched’ affectively through the measure.

Melissa’s shame in this event is politically interesting; it is *a matter of interest*. *Now we rethink it as an affirmative opening up of capacity for new collaborative knowledge making*. In this informal everyday encounter within a measurement assemblage of becoming, Melissa is affected and brought into being in particular ways. She is not shamed by her three publications but by the affective relation of those three publications (as autonomously measured) and ways they bring her into being *with* another academic (who she cares about) and who may or may not have produced three publications. Through rethinking and flattening the event she can now realise that, in this particular affective assemblage, she would have felt shame irrespective of the number of papers she produced. The apparatus is in full force to incite her to never feel good enough in relation to these measures. Melissa also affects through the measurement apparatus. Her response, her utterance ‘three’ affects Academic B. But this ‘three’ never belongs to Melissa; it is an affective force of mattering brought into being through the assemblage. The ‘three’ abstracts and excludes contextual factors: teaching load, acts of service, and extra-institutional labour. Melissa understands, now, that it is also not Academic B’s disapproving voice she hears, as ‘the utterance is not treated as the product of the individual, but of the assemblage’ (Mazzei 2017: 4). Utterances are always collective and emerge through relationality. The assemblage’s relational force interferes in a negative way, falsely situating individual components as always autonomous. The measure of research publications segments; it makes a cut of difference; it makes and creates. Melissa now notices the forces (the patterns) inciting her to accept autonomy, refusing her entanglement, that

reduce her capacity to affirmatively respond. The work on these pages is her other, her response-ability, a re-patterning as a reciprocal building response-enabling move. This work calls to attention the forces of the measuring assemblage.

Vignette #2—Eve’s Student Evaluations of Teaching

My first teaching Trimester, I am cautious about the end-of-semester Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET)⁶. I do not see the pedagogical utility of them; they seem to be mostly used as a tool to insidiously infect the individual academic knowledge maker with anxiety to perform. I have previously written about their imbrication with the subject position of the student-customer. (Mayes 2018a, b)

I don’t explicitly encourage students, towards the end of the Semester, to complete the formal end of trimester SET, ignoring the influx of machine-generated reminder emails. After the semester has finished, I find myself opening an email and a link to the SET. My stomach is tight. I am pleasantly surprised and relieved to see the number 100. One hundred percent student satisfaction with the course and with me as a lecturer. I smile, I respond by copying and pasting the comments into my upcoming Performance Review document. I note that only four students completed the evaluation. I am no statistician, but I know that this low sample size makes the results (within the measurement assemblage) invalid. The university measurement assemblage does not count these four students. I repeat to myself that these metrics don’t mean anything (but I feel good, I now have value, even if measured as invalid).

The following year, with a different cohort, I similarly neglect to remind students to complete the end of semester SET. As I open this cohort’s formal evaluations, I remind myself not to invest too much into these measurements or comments. But I am interested to see them. The numbers are now quite different. What had I expected? Seven students have responded, and it seems that some were not ‘satisfied’. Indeed, there are a number of ‘strongly disagrees’.

My flesh flushes. Am I ashamed? I am, again, surprised, but now my anxiety increases – I attempt to justify my now unvalued self. I evaluate my professional practice and effort in a practice of ‘self-responsibilisation’ accompanied

by 'an unarticulated but felt sense of somehow never being good enough/working hard enough' (Taylor and Gannon 2018: 2). I had refined the course, attempting to challenge and encourage students, and I assessed this cohort as particularly responsive to the course content. These seven evaluation responses negate my felt sense and satisfaction of the semester's pedagogical intra-actions and my worth. I remind myself of the critiques that I have written, but this does not shift the shameful sensations resting with me.

I don't open my upcoming Performance Review document this time. I don't want to become this shame.

Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) are part of the apparatus that materialises different accounts of the academic knowledge maker, fluxing feelings, and differential responses. The apparatus includes the SET questions, as well as apparent 'observers': students, educators, institutional superiors. There is no stable academic knowledge maker 'being' that is independent of her intra-actions with students, their completion of the SET, and institutional responses and uses made of these evaluations by the individual academic knowledge maker and others. These evaluations are completed by the student in dynamic, distinct affective assemblages that cannot be known in advance, nor retrospectively. Each SET response cannot be disentangled from its material-discursive, affective and temporal arrangement—its spacetime-mattering (Barad 2007).

Each SET response materialises different e/affect that are not predictable nor stable. Regardless of Eve's skeptical pedagogical stance towards SET, she feels, in different times and configurations, differentially interested and shamed, attracted and repulsed by them, simultaneously. These feelings include a stultifying mode of shame—a sense of not having 'satisfied' the insatiable student customer (Nixon et al. 2016). But these phenomena and their affective affiliations (Rasmussen 2014) exceed an account of shame as stultifying (alone).

Phenomenon (no particular order): Becoming; Lecturer-Student-Student evaluations-Performance Review-Promotion-protocols-measures-value-numbers-computer-algorithm.

Affective affiliations (no particular order): Becoming: cautious/relief-nervous/relaxed-careful-interest/shame-un/belonging-un/satisfied-non/action-un/professional-in/valid-un/loved-dis/belief-un/worth.

In the first year, she is pleasantly surprised and interested in affirmative responses, and simultaneously feels shame that she has bought into the logics of the entrepreneurial academic knowledge maker (who copies and pastes positive student comments into a Word document for performance review ‘evidence’ of ‘quality’ teaching). In a later encounter with another conglomeration of SET responses, her earlier interest is met with comments that sting—they hurt; they make her flush with shame that she was ever interested (cf. Boswell 2016). The surprising intrusion of shame-interest belies her ‘suspicious critique’ of ‘neoliberal’ higher education ‘reforms’ (Stern 2012: 387). These SET responses are ambivalent: they are compelling and repulsive, simultaneously. The measurement touches. They enable new thought—perhaps, of what might be done differently, but they simultaneously dis-enable, through stultifying pedagogical relations-in-formation. These SET responses materialise the phenomena of the thoroughly evaluated educator, with fluxing affective affiliations (Rasmussen 2014) in different configurations.

Could this shame-interest be creatively reworked into an affirmative opening up of capacity for new knowledge making? Recognising shame-interest might enable a reworking of it, rethinking and re-feeling shame-interest as a different slant on the same thing. Pedagogical intra-actions surrounding the evaluative event (where the students are sent the SET link by the university) may be thought and felt differently—through, for example, conversations about what such evaluations can simultaneously enable and constrain. Such pedagogical intra-actions could be understood to be ‘interested’ in improving the educators’ later evaluation (through making students aware of their potential negative consequences), or to shame students for hastily-written critiques. But they may be more than interested (and shame-inducing); educators and students may interrogate contemporary apparatuses that touch them and that they are touched by. Could educators and students collectively inquire into what evaluative

apparatuses can do, and respond differently, beyond critique (alone)? Could they shift understandings of student-educator as autonomous subjects, and acknowledge and apprehend their discursive-material-affective intra-relationality with each other, as well as with numbers, measurement practices, and the world?

Concluding Discussion: Shame—As Response-Ability

The affective economies of the neoliberal university are re-produced, yet potentially reconfigured, moment-by-moment, as evaluative practices affect and are affected. Selwyn (2015: 79) has called for ‘the need to recognise – and then act against – the ‘politics of data’ in education’. However, maintaining a stance of critique (alone) against evaluative practices suggests that we stand apart from these evaluative practices that materialise shame-interest. This stance will not suffice. In this chapter we have, instead, examined how we are part of the evaluative apparatus, entangled with the numbers which are of/for us. We have disentangled the ‘material affects that derive from repeated, routinised and habituated patterns of interactions, memories, experiences and outcomes that encourage marketised behaviours’ (Fox and Alldred 2018: 321). Such analysis of ‘interrelation’ is the ‘precondition of politics’ (Beausoleil 2015: 7), to be attended simultaneously by (re)theorising. Barad (2012) purports that theorising is a way of being open to the world’s liveliness—to be curious, surprised and to wonder, where ‘[t]heories are living and breathing reconfigurings of the world’ (207) and where the world experiments on itself. The task, then, becomes to interfere and intervene into not only our practices, but also our habits of thought and feeling, with the ‘pulse and pause of attentiveness’ (Beausoleil 2015: 2). It is to ‘embrace the creative effects that can be produced by performance data in its relation to affective sense-making’ (Sellar 2015: 143).

We have attempted this creative task of theorising, interference and intervention through ‘disrupt[ing] data-writing’ so that ‘attunements

can emerge' (Taylor and Gannon 2018: 20). We have played with, flattened, and re-patterned our accounts in an attempt to disrupt and create new more affirmative attunements within our academic lives, as spacetime-mattering (Barad 2007). We have felt, noticed, thought, created and done, creating alternate perspectives on past encounters to make these encounters matter differently. We have not *found* anything new, as there is nothing to find, but we have articulated and re/created how matter comes to matter through evaluation and measurement processes within knowledge making assemblages. We hope to have illustrated ways differences can get made and how as academic knowledge makers we encourage practices of becoming response-able for our encounters within assemblages—response-able to build capacity for ourselves and others—to feelthink/create/do differently.

Notes

1. We have used the term knowledge maker here instead of academic to highlight the way knowledge is generated through performance.
2. Intra-action is different from interaction where entities are considered distinct prior to the encounter: intra-action reminds us of the ontological inseparable nature of all entities in the world. The encounter as an intra-action is productive as a boundary-making process and determines the materialization of objects and subjects. The participants in this study are a product of encounter with an education system that is a field of forces where entities remain forever entangled.
3. We acknowledge that we are situated in comparatively privileged positions, at major Australian universities, and in secure employment. Our attempt to write and theorise shame and evaluation as feminist academics does not attempt to generalise: gendered subjectivities are traversed by intersecting racialised, classed and sexual identifications, further differentiated by the global stratifications of higher education, employment conditions (casual, permanent/tenured), age, (dis)abilities, chronic illness and caring responsibilities.
4. It is worth noting that there is a plurality of theories of the logics of neoliberalism—from those influenced by Michel Foucault's lectures on neo-liberal technologies of government that foreground new modes of

- subjectivity-formation and ethics, and Marxist accounts that stress the whittling away of collectivized labour (see Flew 2014; Grealy and Laurie 2017).
5. Superpositions are not mixtures of particles with determinate properties but are the entanglement of matter. The value of matter is indeterminate until measured and the apparatus of measurement impacts the value that materializes.
 6. In Australia, the 2011 formation of the regulatory body Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) following the Review of Australian Higher Education (Bradley et al. 2008) bolstered the use of Student Evaluation of Teaching data (Tucker 2013). These evaluations frequently take the form of Likert scale responses to statements about teaching and learning, and open-ended comments elaborating on these responses. Student Evaluations of Teaching have become a dominant means of evaluating teaching effectiveness, managing performance and informing instructional decision-making (Richardson 2005).

References

- Ahmed, S. (2012). *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. London: Duke University Press.
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Barad, K. (2010). Quantum Entanglements and Hauntological Relations of Inheritance: Dis/Continuities, SpaceTime Enfoldings, and Justice-to-Come. *Derrida Today*, 3(2), 240–268.
- Barad, K. (2012). On Touching—The Inhuman That Therefore I Am. *Differences*, 25(5), 206–223.
- Beausoleil, E. (2015). Embodying an Ethics of Response-Ability. *Borderlands*, 14(2), 1–16.
- Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Berlant, L. (2011). *Cruel Optimism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Blackman, L. (2007). Researching Affect and Embodied Hauntologies: Exploring an Analytics of Experimentation. In B. T. Knudsen & C. Stage (Eds.), *Affective Methodologies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Boswell, S. S. (2016). Ratemyprofessors Is Hogwash (but I Care): Effects of Ratemyprofessors and University-Administered Teaching Evaluations on Professors. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 56, 155–162.
- Bradley, D., Noonan, P., Nugent, H., & Scales, B. (2008). *Review of Australian Higher Education: Final Report*. Canberra, A.C.T.: Dept. of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.
- Brogger, K., & Staunæs, D. (2016). Standards and (Self)Implosion: How the Circulation of Affects Accelerates the Spread of Standards and Intensifies the Embodiment of Colliding, Temporal Ontologies. *Theory & Psychology*, 26(2), 223–242.
- Bryant, L. R. (2016). Phenomenon and Thing: Barad's Performative Ontology. *Rhizomes: Cultural Studies in Emerging Knowledge* (30), 133–144.
- Burrows, R. (2012). Living with the h-Index? Metric Assemblages in the Contemporary Academy. *The Sociological Review*, 60(2), 355–372.
- Charteris, J., Gannon, S., Mayes, E., Nye, A., & Stephenson, L. (2016). The Emotional Knots of Academicity: A Collective Biography of Academic Subjectivities and Spaces. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(1), 31–44.
- Chubb, J., Watermeyer, R., & Wakeling, P. (2017). Fear and Loathing in the Academy? The Role of Emotion in Response to an Impact Agenda in the UK and Australia. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(3), 555–568.
- Dolphijn, R. (2016). Critical Naturalism: A Quantum Mechanical Ethics. *Rhizomes: Cultural Studies in Emerging Knowledge* (30), 145–151.
- Flew, T. (2014). Six Theories of Neoliberalism. *Thesis Eleven*, 122(1), 49–71.
- Fox, N., & Alldred, P. (2018). Social Structures, Power and Resistance in Monist Sociology: (New) Materialist Insights. *Journal of Sociology*, 54(3), 315–330.
- Grealy, L., & Laurie, T. (2017). Higher Degree Research by Numbers: Beyond the Critiques of Neo-Liberalism. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(3), 458–471.
- Haraway, D. J. (2016). *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hey, V., & Bradford, S. (2004). The Return of the Repressed?: The Gender Politics of Emergent Forms of Professionalism in Education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 19(6), 691–713.
- Hook, G. A., & Wolfe, M. J. (2017). Affective Violence: Re/Negotiating Gendered-Feminism Within New Materialism. *Journal of Gender Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2017.1340151>.

- Jackson, A. Y. (2017). Thinking Without Method. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417725355>.
- Lipton, B. (2017). Measures of Success: Cruel Optimism and the Paradox of Academic Women's Participation in Australian Higher Education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(3), 486–497.
- Loveday, V. (2016). Embodying Deficiency Through 'Affective Practice': Shame, Relationality, and the Lived Experience of Social Class and Gender in Higher Education. *Sociology*, 50(6), 1140–1155.
- MacLure, M. (2013). Researching Without Representation? Language and Materiality in Post-qualitative Methodology. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 658–667.
- Mayes, E. (2018a). The Ontological Plurality of Digital Voice: A Schizoanalysis of Rate My Professors and Rate My Teachers. In D. Cole & J. Bradley (Eds.), *Principles of Transversality in Globalization and Education*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Mayes, E. (2018b). Student Voice in School Reform? Desiring Simultaneous Critique and Affirmation. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2018.1492517>.
- Mayes, E., & Wolfe, M. (2018). Shameful Interest in Educational Research. *Critical Studies in Education*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2018.1489871>.
- Mazzei, L. A. (2017). Following the Contour of Concepts Toward a Minor Inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417725356>.
- Nixon, E., Scullion, R., & Hearn, R. (2016). Her Majesty the Student: Marketised Higher Education and the Narcissistic (Dis)Satisfactions of the Student-Consumer. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1196353>.
- Ocean, J., & Skourdoumbis, A. (2016). Whose Counting? Legitimizing Measurement in the Audit Culture. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 37(3), 442–456.
- Olssen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, Higher Education and the Knowledge Economy: From the Free Market to Knowledge Capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313–345.
- Peseta, T., Barrie, S., & McLean, J. (2017). Academic Life in the Measured University: Pleasures, Paradoxes and Politics. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(3), 453–457.
- Puar, J. K. (2007). *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Puar, J. K. (2012). 'I Would Rather Be a Cyborg Than a Goddess': Becoming-Intersectional in Assemblage Theory. *philoSOPHIA*, 2(1), 49–66.
- Rasmussen, M. (2014). Affecting Affiliations: Queer Relationality and the Boy in the Dress. *Methodological Affects: Considering Research Emotion in Qualitative Research*. Symposium—American Educational Research Association.
- Richardson, J. T. E. (2005). Instruments for Obtaining Student Feedback: A Review of the Literature. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(4), 387–415.
- Sedgwick, E. K., & Frank, A. (1995). Shame in the Cybernetic Fold: Reading Silvan Tomkins. *Critical Inquiry*, 21(2), 496–522.
- Sellar, S. (2015). A Feel for Numbers: Affect, Data and Education Policy. *Critical Studies in Education*, 56(1), 131–146.
- Selwyn, N. (2015). Data Entry: Towards the Critical Study of Digital Data and Education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 40(1), 64–82.
- Spinoza, B. D. (1994). The Ethics. In E. M. Curley (Ed.), *A Spinoza Reader: The Ethics and Other Works*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Springgay, S., & Truman, S. E. (2017). On the Need for Methods Beyond Proceduralism: Speculative Middles, (In)Tensions, and Response-Ability in research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417704464>.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2013a). The Appearance of Data. *Cultural Studies: Critical Methodologies*, 13(4), 223–227.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2013b). The Posts Continue: Becoming. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 646–657.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2017). Haecceity: Laying Out a Plane for Post Qualitative Inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417727764>.
- Staunaes, D. (2016). Notes on Inventive Methodologies and Affirmative Critiques of an Affective Edu-Future. *Research in Education*, 96(1), 62–70.
- Stern, M. (2012). "We Can't Build Our Dreams on Suspicious Minds": Neoliberalism, Education Policy, and the Feelings Left Over. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 12(5), 387–400.
- Taylor, C. A., & Gannon, S. (2018). Doing Time and Motion Diffractively: Academic Life Everywhere and All the Time. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2017.1422286>.
- Tomkins, S. (1995a). *Exploring Affect: The Selected Writings of Silvan S. Tomkins*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press; New York, Paris: Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme.

- Tomkins, S. (1995b). *Shame and Its Sisters: A Silvan Tomkins Reader* (E. K. Sedgwick & A. Frank, Eds.). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Tucker, B. (2013). Development of a Student Evaluation Quality Culture: The eVALUate Experience at Curtin University. Enhancing Student Feedback and Improvement Systems in Tertiary Education. In Commission for Academic Accreditation (Ed.), *CAA Quality Series; 5* (pp. 16–33). Abu Dhabi, UAE: Commission for Academic Accreditation.
- Wolfe, M. J. (2017a). Refracting Schoolgirls: Pedagogical Intra-actions Producing Shame. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 38(5), 727–739.
- Wolfe, M. J. (2017b). Affective Schoolgirl Assemblages Making School Spaces of Non/Belonging. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 25, 63–70.
- Wolfe, M. J., & Rasmussen, M. L. (2019, forthcoming). The Affective Matter of School Uniforms: The [School] Dress that is and Does. In B. Dernikos, N. Lesko, S. McCall, D., & A. Niccolini (Eds.), *High Passions: An Affect and Education Reader*. Duke University Press.