RESEARCH ARTICLES

Myths of Meritocracy, Friendship, and Fun Work: Class and Gender in North American Academic Communities

Mary Leighton

ABSTRACT   Using the example of Andean archaeology, this article focuses on subtle forms of inequality that arise when academic communities are conceptualized as friendship-based and egalitarian, rejecting explicit hierarchy. I describe this as *performative informality* and argue that it stems from a meritocratic ideology that inadvertently reproduces Euro-American white-male privilege. In a discipline that prides itself on its friendliness, openness, and alcohol-fueled drinking culture, those who find themselves unable to enact or perform informality appropriately are at a distinct disadvantage. Drawing from a multisited ethnography of Andeanist archaeologists, I make the case that it is the ephemerality and plausible deniability of performative informality that makes it hard to recognize and thus mitigate against it. In doing so, I draw on and contribute to the theorization of gender/class intersectionality in anthropology and science studies, US conceptualizations of meritocracy in academia and higher education, and feminist Jo Freeman's concept of "the tyranny of structurelessness." [*anthropology of science, ethnography of archaeology, class, gender, anthropology of work and education*]

RESUMEN   Usando el ejemplo de la arqueología andina, este artículo se enfoca en las formas sutiles de la desigualdad que surgen cuando las comunidades académicas se conceptualizan como basadas en la amistad e igualitarias, rechazando la jerarquía explícita. Describo esto como *informalidad performativa* y argumento que proviene de una ideología de meritocracia que reproduce inadvertidamente el privilegio de hombre blanco euroamericano. En una disciplina que se enorgullece de su amabilidad, apertura, y una cultura impulsada por el consumo de alcohol, aquellos que se ven así mismos incapaces de actuar o representar la informalidad apropiadamente están en una desventaja distinta. Basada en una etnografía multilocal de arqueólogos andinos presento el argumento de que es la efimeralidad y la deseabilidad plausible de la informalidad performativa lo que hace difícil reconocer y por tanto mitigar en su contra. Al hacerlo, me baso en y contribuyo a la teorización de la interseccionalidad de género/clase en antropología y estudios de las ciencias, conceptualizaciones estadounidenses de meritocracia en academia y educación superior, y el concepto feminista de Jo Freeman de "la tiranía de la falta de estructuras". [*antropología de la ciencia, etnografía de la arqueología, clase, género, antropología del trabajo y la educación*]

During a 2011 interview, a North American[1] Andeanist archaeologist, who I'll call Hannah, described an early experience that almost led her to leave archaeology.

> I'm always respectful and I was always eager. But unfortunately, with the boss of the project, he sort of requires, and really really

likes, if you kiss ass. That was really hard. Because the other graduate students, they were much older than me and were like, "Well, you need to kiss more ass." Very blatantly, like, "If you want to make it in this field, you need to be doing this, you need to be…" And I was like, "Are you kidding me? I'm here every day, I do my work, I'm respectful, I'm eager." … And it was implied that this is how [archaeology] works, but especially with someone with such

a status [as] this person. For example, one of the other graduate students would read in the evening something that the professor wrote, and then come in the morning like, "I had this really great idea!" Something sort of related to what the professor had initially written, and he'd be like, "Oh, I totally agree!" And then they'd get in this discussion. It was obviously a game. (February 2011)

At the time we spoke, Hannah was nearing the end of her PhD at a North American university and had established a solid reputation for herself. With some satisfaction, she re-marked that the bullying students who'd told her to "kiss ass" were no longer working in archaeology at all. The moral she'd taken from this story was that hierarchies and nepo-tism do not, in fact, have a place in archaeology, and a suc-cessful career is best forged through hard work. Later in the same interview, I asked how she'd met the various mentors who'd invited her on their projects or encouraged her gradu-ate applications. In response, she described a series of chance encounters at conference parties or dinners that all led to career-changing invitations.

I met some people at a conference…. I don't know how it hap-pened, but I started talking to someone on the project and they had me over to dinner…. We went and ate dinner with the [project] crew, completely casual. Then, from there I went down [to their excavation] because I had this one contact [from the dinner]…. They gave me a scholarship, meaning I didn't really have to pay to come down. (February 2011)

When applying to graduate school, Hannah reached out to potential faculty advisors. One could not take her that year, but:

Hannah (H): He put [me] in contact with Sam. I came down to visit [Sam's university]…. I had put in my application but they hadn't done the selection yet. I'm like, "Well, I'm going to be in town," because I was driving [to that state anyway]. Obviously, it's *not* straight passing through. I had to make a detour. I know showing your face makes a big difference.

Mary (M): How did you know that showing your face and emailing people beforehand … ?

H: I think that any way that you can set yourself out from the pack helps because, otherwise, I'm sure the majority of applications are all good, or you wouldn't even be applying to grad school, you wouldn't have letters of recommendation. It was just an intuition thing. No one ever told me, "You should do this," but I had the understanding that you shouldn't apply to grad school unless you have someone who wants to accept you and work with you…. I just figured that if I can make any sort of impression personally, it's going to help my application because [my GRE scores[2]] weren't all that stellar. There's things that could count against me, you know what I mean? So I figure, you know, do anything you can. We actu-ally went out and we partied all night. We had a great time, I hung out with [Sam] and [another archaeology professor] and they all responded really well to me.

M: They took you out drinking?

H: We had a great time…. Anyway, I was very fortunate. I think that really made a difference because they only accepted two peo-ple that year. I don't think that I would have gotten in if I hadn't done that.

M: The fact that you'd made the effort to come and met with him made the difference?

H: Could be, but I think they had at least a feeling about me. They had had a conversation with me. I really don't think that I would have gotten in if they hadn't done that. (February 2011)

In this article, I explore subtle forms of inequality that arise when academic communities are conceptualized as friendship-based: built not through explicit hierarchy but through informal forms of sociality that are considered "ca-sual" and "intuitive." An ability to "fit in" determines who is present in the lab, field, or classroom—who, at the most fun-damental and insidious level, is positioned to create knowl-edge. As Hannah illustrates, and research on "cultural fit" argues (Garth and Sterling 2018; Friedman and Laurison 2019; Rivera 2012), in the United States, this ability to fit in is invariably ascribed to an individual's personality rather than their gender, race, class, or nationality. Andean archae-ology is thus an interesting case study to contrast with soci-ological studies of fit and meritocracy in middle-class pro-fessions; as *anthropologists*, the members of this professional community are, for the most part, aware of and committed to inclusive, feminist, anticolonial work. When inequalities arise, they do so in subtle, hard-to-pin-down ways. Draw-ing from theories of gender/class intersectionality in anthro-pology and science studies, US conceptualizations of meri-tocracy in academia and higher education, and feminist Jo Freeman's concept of "the tyranny of structurelessness," I ex-plore how and why subtle inequalities arise, using a concept I term *performative informality*. "Performative" emphasizes how informality is a norm remade through each instance of en-actment and draws attention to how such enactments are a negotiation of power. When a profession like archaeology is understood to be fun, open, friendly, and meritocratic, an individual's success depends on inhabiting or enacting that professional community's specific kind of informality cor-rectly. Performing informality *correctly* underpins whether people have a "good feeling" about you. Other professional skills—academic grades, publications, and so on—are im-portant, but formal professional opportunities, such as in-vitations to join excavations or encouragements to apply to graduate school with a particular professor, often stem from informal friendship-based contacts.

My goal is to contribute to the current debate in archae-ological practice surrounding discrimination and inequal-ity, as exemplified by both the #MeTooSTEM movement and the reaction to Kawa et al.'s (2019) analysis of biased hiring of graduates from "elite" universities, and a broader anthropological conversation about how meritocratic ide-ology perpetuates and masks class and gender discrimina-tion in the United States. The North American Andean ar-chaeologists I studied performed a Euro-American, middle-class, and male sociality. Women, people of color, people from working-class backgrounds, and foreigners found it harder to "do" this informality correctly. Archaeologists who were comfortable and successful in this community were not consciously excluding others; rather, exclusion was an unintended consequence of something that seems benign

or even admirable—colleagues hanging out and having fun together.

In exploring this process, it is interesting to trace how the emphasis on informality serves, unintentionally, to deny and mask hierarchy and inequality rather than negate it. On the one hand, unintentionality cannot serve as an excuse for perpetuating a problem. On the other, it is possible that, because of this masking quality, inequalities were *most* opaque to those who benefited from them. This may lead some Andeanists reading this article to find a representation of their community that they do not recognize—or, indeed, one to which they object (cf. Mosse 2006). With this in mind, it is important to remember that, following the standard conventions of ethnographic research and writing, I have included in this article anecdotes from specific excavations, conferences, or classrooms and quotes from individual interviews, but these serve to illustrate my argument and should not be taken as the sum of my ethnographic evidence. I make no claim to represent *each and every* Andeanist archaeologist, department, or excavation but rather address the process through which hierarchies are (re)created through an allegiance to informality within the epistemic community in which I conducted my research. Equally, I am aware that the structures and issues I discuss are by no means limited to Andeanists, nor even to archaeology. My hope is that by starting this conversation, others will explore parallel situations in other academic communities.

METHODOLOGY, ANONYMITY, AND STUDYING THE UNITED STATES

Between 2008 and 2011, I carried out a multisited ethnography of two archaeological communities. The first was the community of North American archaeologists who have worked in Bolivia for several decades, directing large-scale projects that return annually during Bolivia's dry season, which coincides with the summer semester at North American universities (roughly June–August).[3] Excavation projects are funded and directed by North American principal investigators (PIs) and employ local Bolivian archaeologists as well as large numbers of Indigenous workers and technicians. As I discuss in extensive detail elsewhere, the labor arrangements on these excavations are shaped by both the archaeologists and the local Indigenous communities, and they represent a hybrid Aymara-archaeological understanding of labor, archaeological ontology, and the significance of the past (Leighton 2016). North American team members[4] fund their participation through research/travel grants or student loans and are not paid to participate. At the time of my fieldwork, there were very few opportunities for Bolivian archaeologists to direct excavations of a similar scale themselves; as a result, foreign projects were an important source of paid employment for local archaeologists.

The second community I studied, that of Chilean archaeologists who work in Chile, contrasted with this model. Chilean research was funded through the Comisión Nacional de Investigación Científica y Tecnológica (National Commission for Scientific and Technological Research, or CONICYT). The 1973–1990 dictatorship's control of science/universities meant that almost no foreign projects worked in Chile in the last decades of the twentieth century (Rodriguez 1996). As a result, projects of the kind common elsewhere in South and Central America, where North Americans direct excavations and involve local archaeologists primarily as employees, did not develop and are today strongly resisted. My ethnographic work in Chile focused on Chilean excavations, the main university department for archaeology in Chile (the Universidad de Chile), and professional organizations like the Congreso de Arqueólogos and the incipient Colegio de Arqueólogos. I also studied a North American archaeological project that attempted to establish a field school in the north of Chile but was eventually required to leave.

My ethnographic fieldwork in Bolivia, Chile, Canada, and the United States covered a period of twenty-two months during 2008–2011.[5] I attended national and international conferences, such as the Chilean Congreso de Arqueólogos and meetings of the Society for American Archaeology and American Anthropological Association, was a participant observer in four different excavation projects (two directed by Chileans, two directed by North Americans), and conducted participant observation in four university departments (three North American and one Chilean). To gain a greater understanding of the role of archaeology and science in general in Chile, I created an archive of Chilean newspaper reports on archaeology, scientific research funding, and university reform. In both Bolivia and Chile, I also analyzed museums and archaeo-tourism. Additionally, I carried out ninety-six formal audio-recorded interviews with archaeologists at every career stage and many more informal interviews that were recorded after the fact in written fieldnotes. The community of North American Andean archaeology is overwhelmingly white, and none of the US or Canadian Andeanists I studied were people of color. As such, this is implicitly a study of whiteness.

This ethnography was supported by the National Science Foundation and the Wenner-Gren Foundation and approved by the University of Chicago's Institutional Review Board. Participants signed consent forms. I undertook this project as a sociocultural anthropologist conducting an ethnography of another branch of anthropology; unsurprisingly, this led to my informants and I discussing the limits of privacy and anonymity and the extent to which my findings would be shared in journals, conferences, and academic venues where they also participate. They were very aware that, even with the use of pseudonyms, they would be identifiable. Even when participants requested I use their real names, however, I use pseudonyms and have changed the names of archaeological projects. This is done not to ensure perfect anonymity; both my informants and I were aware that this would never be possible. Rather, I use pseudonyms to underline that these are ethnographic examples and

vignettes, not journalistic reports: the aim is to examine the epistemic culture of a specific academic community and the structures that perpetuate it, not to critique a specific set of individuals. The subject matter of an ethnography is a set of relationships that make up a community, not a specific individual.

I understand that there will be readers who (believe they) can identify the individuals quoted or discussed. Readers may also feel that it is inappropriate to discuss informal and intimate actions or relationships in the public and permanent space of an anthropological journal. My response is that the place of informal, intimate relationships within professional settings is precisely the topic under discussion in this article. The relationships, events, and attitudes I describe were not secret. They were and are habitual, well known, and commonly discussed in the community I describe. The queasiness some readers might feel about discussing intimate relationships and alcohol consumption in the context of professional and academic work is *exactly the discomfort I want to examine*.

Elsewhere, I argue US academic communities are just as local and "nationalist" as those from Latin America; but US nationalism is expressed through its blindness to its own particularity and an assumption that its particular epistemic culture is a universal standard (Leighton, n.d.). Following this, I argue that the North American's performative informality is not universal in archaeology but derives from specifically US conceptualizations of friendship, fun, and meritocracy. In what follows, I first discuss how this community's forms of sociality in the field appear from the outside. I then turn to sociality in conferences and university departments in North America.

CRAZY GRINGO CHICKEN FIGHTS

In 2010, I was in La Paz interviewing Bolivian archaeologists like Vanessa, a woman in her thirties who worked on numerous North American projects over the years. At one point, I commented on how sociable Andeanists are—always having parties while out in the field or hanging out in bars. Vanessa quickly corrected me: No, they are a very closed community. While *I* might experience Gringos as friendly, the network is impossible to access if they didn't already want you. As we talked about her experience on various North American projects, she mentioned that she and the other Bolivians tended to keep themselves apart from the drinking, partying, and flirting that were a common feature of excavation life. This distance and relative sobriety had its uses, she explained, citing the example of a chicken-fight incident.

A chicken fight is a game normally played in a swimming pool. It's a battle between two pairs of people. In each pair, the smaller person sits on the other's shoulders, and then they "fight," aiming to topple the opposing pair. As I said, this is supposed to be played in a pool. However, for a while there was a trend of playing this at Andeanist field parties—on land, in the dark, after a considerable amount of alcohol had been consumed—and on occasion bones were broken.

Vanessa told me the story of one such chicken fight during a party hosted by Justin, a North American PI. During the chicken fight, Vanessa said, a Gringa fell to the ground and cut her head open. The Bolivians were very worried and tried to persuade her to go to hospital. She reluctantly agreed, but then they had to explain to the doctor how she got the injury: by law, all fights are investigated by the police. Vanessa said she explained the situation to the doctor and the policeman by leaning on Bolivians' shared stereotypes. "They were doing crazy Gringo games," she said. "What can you expect?" It worked; the police laughed and didn't investigate further.

In transnational field sciences, one person's fieldsite is another person's home. Vanessa explained that Bolivians avoided drinking heavily or joining in potentially violent games at parties because they could not be dismissed as "crazy Gringos." Yet parties were often the only chance Bolivian students had to meet the North Americans who, as the main employers of excavation staff and as the authors of the most influential texts, dominated Andean archaeology. Vanessa described young Bolivians trying to corner Sam Smith—an influential US archaeologist and regular party host; but alas, Sam threw parties to get drunk and have fun, not to discuss some Bolivian student's dissertation.

I discuss the structural and epistemic reasons for disparities in epistemic power between scientists from North and South America elsewhere, including why any examination of North–South inequalities tends to be dismissed as merely irrational jealousy on the part of disgruntled "nationalist" archaeologists (Leighton, n.d.). Prior publications have explored how differences in labor organization (using Indigenous workers, students, or trained archaeologists) in different archaeological communities lead to noncommensurable epistemic cultures (Leighton 2015, 2016). Just as there are differences in how Bolivian, Chilean, and US archaeologists might evaluate colleagues' excavation techniques, so too are there differences in what they consider appropriate ways to socialize and have informal fun. Vanessa implied her Bolivian colleagues were being inappropriate when they tried to engage North Americans in serious theoretical debate at field parties. The Bolivian archaeologists turned up at the parties and drank, but they were not *doing* parties properly.

Vanessa told the story of Bolivians failing to connect with Sam to explain how some of her colleagues lacked knowledge of North Americans. But she was also explaining a common perception of Gringos: drunken, childish, and prone to doing crazy things. A Bolivian archaeologist's interpretation of North American fun is a lens through which US academic culture can be examined as an ethnographic object (cf. Gusterson 2017; Wisniewski 2000). Seeing the United States from the perspective of South American archaeologists like Vanessa, and the many others I interviewed who both agreed and disagreed with her, opens an alternative perspective on behaviors, attitudes, and relationships that are normal, habitual, and unremarkable in the United States. Many of the North Americans I interviewed framed their

ability to get drunk together and have fun as positive; parties allow people working on excavations in the same region to meet and let off steam. The heavy drinking contributes to the risqué appeal of doing fieldwork (Miller 2018).[6] This senior director's comments about the importance of being "represented" hints at the importance of such events: "I went to only one of those [parties]. The timing was such that it just didn't happen, but most of my team, all my team, went year in and year out, so I felt like our group was represented there" (September 2011).

Yet not everyone was able to participate in the drinking and partying that characterize North American Andean archaeologists' sociality with equal ease—and not just because, like the Bolivians described here, they were afraid of getting drunk with their employers. I observed instances at field and conference parties where European Andeanist archaeologists failed, in frustratingly intangible ways, to "hit it off" with North American colleagues. The Europeans had no trouble getting drunk, but there was a sense they did drunkenness "wrong." A male Chilean archaeologist described his embarrassment and shock when female North American students engaged in semi-ironic erotic dancing at field parties, grabbing his clothes and grinding against him without his consent. In Chile, I had also encountered situations that implied it was common to take illegal drugs, something I had never come across on North Americans excavations. My point is not to weigh the relative virtues of taking cocaine versus table dancing but rather to illustrate how what is considered an appropriate expression of informal letting loose in one place does not necessarily hold elsewhere. Expressions of appropriate fun vary by archaeological community, opening the possibility to confusion, embarrassment, and self-exclusion.

Among North American Andeanists, it happened that appropriate informality included "crazy" games, alcohol, and a particular kind of semi-joking eroticism. It is significant that this informality is enacted through humor. Humor in professional settings enables both the relativizing of managerial power and employee resistance to management (e.g., Bolton and Houlihan 2009; Butler, Hoedemaekers, and Russell 2015; Cahill and Densham 2014; Raiden 2016) in addition to potentially enabling insidious discrimination (Boxer and Ford 2011; Holmes and Stubbe 2015). As Kenny and Euchler (2012, 308) conclude, summarizing the substantial qualitative research on this topic,

> humour is seen to have potential for subverting and critiquing dominant forms of power. However, other studies from the field of organization research show that humour is frequently used as a tool by which the very forms of power discussed above, gender norms and managerial control, are in fact sustained and reinforced.

Boundary-pushing or "edgy" humor in middle-class professions that are understood to be creative or passion-driven sustain the idea that this is not *real* work and participants are not *really* hierarchically arranged in manager–employee re-

lations of power and authority (Kenny and Bell 2014). Similarly, within the North American Andeanist community, joking informality positions archaeology outside the category of "work," as something pursued instead because it is fun. When an archaeologist "confessed" that it wasn't "politically correct" to say you did archaeology because it "was fun—"because people on planes who have boring jobs think it's really exciting that you do archaeology" (fieldnotes, August 2009)—he was saying that archaeology definitely *is* different from those "boring jobs" because it *is* fun. This underlines the role of performative informality in creating archaeology as a particular kind of work, in contrast to other jobs. To explore this further, I consider the relationship between work, institutions of higher education, and meritocracy in the United States.

MERITOCRACY AND CULTURAL FIT IN US EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT

The archaeological communities I studied existed within institutions of higher education. Archaeological careers began with college, then graduate school, and ideally lead to a tenured position. Getting into graduate school is therefore not only about education but also about making the first step into a career and (eventually) full-time, secure employment. In terms of how one gets into and then ahead in graduate school, the archaeologist Hannah, quoted at the beginning of this article, was not unusual in crediting her success to her hard work and easygoing personality. This common narrative was repeated by another female graduate student. When I asked, "What kind of qualities does a good archaeology student need?" the student responded:

> They need to be dedicated, I think. And patient. That's in the fieldwork, need to be patient. And I will say again, proactive, because I really think you won't get anywhere…. I think you have to be generally liked by the archaeological community, because … at least in the Andes, because it is so small. And I think it would be really easy to get a reputation or something. So yeah, proactive, dedicated, driven. (September 2011)

When I asked North Americans how they first became involved in Andean archaeology, I heard remarkably similar stories of chance encounters at conference parties, introductions arranged by mentors, or fortuitous meetings in the field. The success of such opportunities was invariably attributed to a combination of *individual drive* and *likable personality*. Faculty and students alike maintained that getting on the inside of the Andeanist community is a matter of turning up and making yourself known—and this was something anyone *could* do, if they made the effort. You just have to put yourself forward. Get out of your comfort zone. Find the parties and write the emails, and you'll be welcomed with opportunities. In other words, this academic community is meritocratic, open to anyone who has the right combination of inborn, inherent abilities/qualities, and a commitment to hard work (cf. Traweek 1988, 147–49).

Meritocracy is a powerful and deep-rooted idea in the United States, and it is intimately entwined with the ideology

surrounding higher education (Killgore 2009; Liu 2011). Coming from the United Kingdom, I was initially bemused that social class in the United States is measured through parents' educational attainment rather than occupation, until I appreciated that the coupling of class to education is *the* fundamental concept defining the "American Dream." The conceptualization of education as a democratic and "systematic means to sort people" can be traced back to Thomas Jefferson (Posecznick 2017, 22–23). Education measures individuals' earned and natural worth: the effort they put in plus their natural skills. As long as there is equal opportunity for everyone to access education and thus prove their worth, inequality of outcome is *desirable* (Neves 2000; Newman 1999).

This reasoning was starkly revealed by the outraged response to "Operation Varsity Blues," an FBI investigation into US college-admissions scams that revealed Hollywood movie stars and other rich parents had fraudulently bought college places for their children. The celebrity-infused scandal was accompanied by both snide and serious commentary, arguing that the scam was not so far removed from legal admissions practices that privilege athletes, children of alumni, and children of rich donors (Albom 2019; Jaschik 2019; Newberry and Fry 2019). Such practices go against the ethic of rewarding students who "work their butts off in secondary school, take every AP course they can find, do all manner of community service, join every club, and generally devote their lives to producing the best possible paper records for the college admissions people" (Baum and McPherson 2019). Some commentators noted that even the ability to "work your butt off" depends on social and economic resources that are unequally distributed across society (Larkin 2019; Newberry and Fry 2019; North 2019). Of course, none of this came as a surprise to those who study race- and class-based discrimination in higher education (e.g., Alon 2009; Armstrong and Hamilton 2013; Berg 2016; Espenshade and Radford 2009; Golden 2006; Liu 2011). But the scandal revealed deep-seated fears that access to education is not, in fact, as meritocratic as it ought to be.

The arguments made by archaeologists like Hannah align with *and* contradict the meritocracy ideal. Her narration of her trajectory was typical in that it credited her success to hard work and personal skills, such as initiative and friendliness. On the one hand, Hannah demonstrated initiative and determination when she reached out to potential graduate school faculty mentors. On the other, Hannah only knew that it was *possible* to reach out to faculty because she had prior mentors within the archaeological community. But she could also credit her ability to make and maintain mentoring relationships to her personal qualities: the fact that she was friendly and therefore was recognized immediately as someone who "fit in."

Tellingly, in college admissions, "campus fit" is a term deliberately used to hide the preference given to wealthy students who can afford full tuition.[7] "Fit" is also a concept that employers use, consciously or unconsciously, to justify hiring or promoting those who are similar to them, particularly in "elite" professional careers like law, journalism, academia, and finance (Rivera 2012). A recent study of the legal profession argues that

> fit is a way for embedded histories and power relationships to make it more difficult for minorities, women, and people who do not possess the cultural capital represented by golf, for example, to succeed in particular settings—including the corporate law firm. (Garth and Sterling 2018, 127)

Discrimination that stems from "cultural fit" is difficult to distinguish from meritocratic sorting by "natural" smartness, drive, friendliness, or initiative. As Karen Ho (2009) explains, recruitment to Wall Street used to be through explicitly elitist family networks. The shift to Ivy League campus recruiting in the 1980s was understood as fairer: theoretically, jobs were now open to anyone "smart." This didn't stop women, people of color, and people from lower-class backgrounds implicitly being seen as lacking "cultural fit," however, once they actually started those jobs. The ironic result was that a move away from explicitly elitist recruiting practices made it harder for those inside the system to criticize the *implicit* privileging of white male upper-class heteronormativity, and they therefore blamed themselves for their lack of success (Ho 2009). A similar point is made in a recent UK-based study that shows how, once people enter an elite profession, career *progression* is determined by class origin (Friedman and Laurison 2019).

Fit as an attribute of friendliness, rather than smartness, is underlined by Rivera (2012), who found that recruiters in the fields of law, consulting, and finance explicitly and openly gave preference to applicants who had similar backgrounds, hobbies, and personal interests to themselves.

> When explaining the importance of fit to me, evaluators cited the time-intensive nature of their work. With long hours on the road, they saw having culturally similar colleagues as making rigorous work weeks more enjoyable, although not necessarily more productive or successful … evaluators at all levels of seniority reported wanting to hire individuals who would not only be competent colleagues but also held the potential to be playmates or even friends. (Rivera 2012, 1007)

When it is understood to be an individual personal attribute like smartness or drive, rather than a set of learned attributes, friendliness becomes a means of (intentional or unintentional) discrimination.

PERFORMING INFORMALITY IN THE CLASSROOM: THE INTERSECTION OF GENDER AND CLASS

In fall 2011, I observed a first-year graduate seminar taught by Sam Smith, a tenured professor at a mid-sized North American university. Sam is prominent in Andeanist archaeology. His books are required reading and his theories are paradigm-setters. He hosts many raucous conference and field parties, and his excavations are infamous for all-night drinking. While waiting for Sam to arrive, the students groused that his classes always overran by an hour and joked

about staging a silent revolt. Sam's lack of punctuality was a common theme in the student interviews I conducted that week. I noticed, however, that no one felt empowered to raise this with him. Standing outside the class that day, when I suggested just asking to leave on time, their reactions ranged from confusion to giggles.

The students' fear of criticizing their professor, even over something as minor as ending class on time, contrasted strikingly with an overt performance of informality within the class itself. Thirty minutes into class, Sam reached into a bag at the side of his chair and pulled out several six-packs of beer, which he then placed on the table. The students reacted as if this were a routine and normal occurrence. All but one drank the beer, as did Sam and I. Class progressed (and ran over time). Someone brought homemade cookies, a point I will return to below. The class was engaged—there were jokes, students listened to each other and worked together, men and women participated equally, and both US and foreign students contributed. Sam was a skilled and well-liked teacher. But the beer in class did not negate the disparity in authority between the students and the professor.

Sharon Traweek (1988, 147) has noted how in the United States, "the style is informal but the group structure is hierarchical":

> Those at each level of the hierarchy are expected to observe and listen to those above and pattern their behavior accordingly. It is not appropriate to comment negatively on those in positions of greater status, no matter how informal the relationship. Informality is a gift or reward bestowed by those in charge. (148)

Beer in class is an act of informality that serves, paradoxically, to affirm the professor's status over his students. The students' inability to call out the professor's lateness demonstrates that they obeyed the unspoken rules of this engagement.

In an interview with Kaitlyn, the young woman who brought cookies, I asked what qualities/skills successful students need. To my surprise, her response was, "Bring baked goods." She went on to explain,

> It's [about] being nice to people, not creating enemies, don't piss people off. You know, like, be friendly to people inside and outside of the classroom. Like, and especially save the criticisms for the classroom, and outside of them I really think you need to be social and like hanging out with people in your department, because that way you really get to know them. (September 2011)

Sam exemplified this attitude for her. Rather than being competitive or arrogant, she said, "he's just buddies with everyone."

I'd first met Kaitlyn in Bolivia, a few years earlier, when several projects met up for a night of drinking. She'd struck me as a wide-eyed but deeply enthusiastic undergraduate. I'd felt nervously protective of her, the only underage undergraduate amid all these seasoned drinkers. I ended the evening helping her get home safely in a cab after she puked in the nightclub's toilets. During our interview, I learned she was the first in her family to go to college; her father was a plumber and her mother a secretary, and she joked about her parents' unrealistic expectations of her career after graduate school. She could not imagine a life without archaeology, and the attraction, for her, was deeply connected to its openness and informality. While those with more cultural capital and accumulated familial experience might be able to read through the unwritten rules that underpin the meritocratic ideology (Warnock and Appel 2012), first-generation students like Kaitlyn have no reason *not* to buy into it, completely, and to take such acts of informality at face value.

Performative informality serves to displace or mask hierarchies within the professional community of archaeology that might otherwise be understood as class/gender disparities, particularly those that frame professors or project directors as "managers" and students or field archaeologists as "employees." When I asked North American archaeologists about inequalities within the discipline, they invariably talked about gender, a topic well studied by US-based feminist archaeologists (e.g., Bardolph 2014; Bardolph and VanDerwarker 2016; Conkey 2003; Engelstad 1991; Gero 1985; Hutson 2002; Wylie 1992).[8] Few mentioned their own, their students', or their colleagues' class. (A rare exception was a female project director who wanted to draw attention to class disparities among *Bolivians*, not North Americans.) Sherry Ortner (2006) describes class in the United States as unspoken but not absent: discourses of class are routinely displaced onto gender and race, such that class is always gendered, and this certainly resonates with what I heard in interviews.

If it feels false to describe professors and graduate students as engaged in selling their labor, this is exactly my point. Why is academic work not "real work"? What are the consequences of thinking of academic work as a fun vocation rather than "labor" or "employment"? McCall Howard (2012, 57) emphasizes that the ability to manage someone else's labor is a mark of middle- versus working-class status. Ortner (2006, 30), drawing on Halle (1984), notes how working-class men describe "work" as that which is physically difficult, manual, and dirty; their female counterparts in low-level clerical and office position are, conversely, not thought to be engaging in "real work." Anthropologists and historians of science, meanwhile, have described laboratory hierarchies in terms of a division between technicians and scientists. Scientists engage in esoteric mental work and are motivated by a "passion" for science rather than a wage; in contrast, technicians—often women, people of color, and/or foreigners—engage in "less-skilled" manual labor, are managed by others, and are expected to work regular hours in return for wages (Bloom 1993; Kingori 2013; Lowe 2004; Shapin 1989).[9] Framing technicians as undertaking something like a "regular" job positions scientists, in comparison, as *not* "real" workers.

Performative informality is thus only one of many ways scientific and academic work is co-constituted as middle class and not real labor, but it contributes to these debates because

of its very pervasiveness and slipperiness, appearing to deny that which it reinforces. Similar to the way sexist humor in office environments reinforces gender hierarchies while allegedly giving women and men equal opportunity to engage (Kenny and Bell 2014; Cahill and Densham 2014), informality in archaeology asserts that anyone can join in if they bring cookies. In reality, as Traweek asserted, informality is a gift or reward bestowed by those who hold the power. Yet the notion that academic or scientific work is not "real work" affects individuals throughout the hierarchy. The price paid for being able to drink beer on the job is the erosion of other employee benefits: sick days, vacation days, weekends, evenings, lunch breaks, an HR department, and so on.

CONFERENCE HOTEL ROOM PARTIES

After class one day, I went with Kaitlyn, Sam, and Sam's girlfriend at the time (an Andeanist graduate student at a different university) to a happy hour, where we ordered beers and snacks and chatted for a few hours. As we were leaving, Kaitlyn was met by her boyfriend, a graduate student in history. He remarked how *weird* it was to be going out drinking with your professors; seemingly impressed, he said that never happened in the history department. Both Kaitlyn and Sam laughed, saying that archaeology is "a little special like that." "We all get to know each other during fieldwork," Sam added.

While Sam considers drinking with his students as a sign of how laid back he is, those who need his patronage have a different perspective. Amanda, a Bolivian archaeologist, explained her decision to turn down an invitation to work on Sam's excavation. It seemed like self-sabotage to decline the opportunity to get to know his site and his work better. But given his project's reputation, she knew she would be too uncomfortable. She effectively self-selected out of joining his network because of concerns that she wouldn't "fit" into his project's drinking culture. Other women in precarious employment positions had similar concerns.

During a party at a Society of American Archaeology meeting, I chatted with Alyssa, a North American graduate student on the job market. Like most of her female peers, she sported a pencil skirt, nice blouse, high heels, smart jewelry, and cute handbag. Some of these items were loans from a female mentor; others had been put on an overstretched credit card. Her cell phone was currently offline because she couldn't afford to receive calls. While preparing for the conference, she'd come up with the strategy of disguising Sprite as gin and tonic so she could pretend to be drinking. Given how actively and desperately she was working to get a job, she needed to stay sober to make a good impression. Plus, Sprite was cheap.

Alyssa knew the exact line between formality and informality, wearing feminine and formal clothes but also hanging out and drinking, switching from playing drinking games one moment to giving the "elevator pitch" the next. She was not a first-generation student, and in many respects she possessed all the cultural capital required to "play the game." Yet her precarious economic position meant that the act of presenting herself appropriately required strategizing, suppressing any sign of how desperately she needed a job behind a cheerful smile. Bringing too much attention to her dire financial situation, or being too earnest in her networking, would be inappropriate for the light, fun atmosphere at the conference bar.

But this wasn't the only problem, as we discussed in reference to her self-described "networking failure."

> Alyssa (A): It took me forever to actually be on friendly terms [with other Andeanists], and I don't even know if I am with [Sam], for example. Because I was always super careful.

> Mary (M): About what you said around him?

> A: About what I said, how I acted, and so, I wasn't like, "yay," bubbly. And well, like I try to be—act normal. But I've never interacted with him that much. I was also afraid, honestly, of being a woman. And his reputation, honestly. Because I was thinking, what if we're both drunk and he kissed me? What the fuck do I do? How do you say no to [Sam] fucking [Smith] when you're [an Andean] scholar? I mean, I would have said no. I would have at least tried. But I mean, do you see? I just wanted to make sure I was never in that situation. And maybe it's unfair to him because maybe he would have never done it. But really? Is it really that unfair? I don't know. (March 2011)

I have never had any reason to believe that Sam Smith would have acted in the way Alyssa feared, or that any of his relationships with students were nonconsensual. However, it is not hard to understand why someone on the periphery of the community, who knows only that it is characterized by blurred lines between professional and personal relationships, and that sexual relationships between senior and junior colleagues or students are common, would fear this kind of scenario and preemptively self-exclude themselves as a form of protection.

It's been eight years since I interviewed Kaitlyn, then in her first year of graduate school and unable to imagine a life without archaeology. When I started writing this article, I looked her up. I already knew that another female first-generation student had dropped out after a long-term relationship with Sam, her PhD advisor, came to an end because he cheated on her with another Andeanist student at a different university. Through Facebook, I found that Kaitlyn had finished her PhD but left archaeology to become a school teacher. And after several years working in temporary adjunct and postdoc positions, Alyssa also left archaeology to retrain in another career.

FRIENDSHIP GROUPS AND ELITISM

Sam's relationships with students were conducted in the open, with the tacit approval of his Andeanist and university colleagues. He was far from the only male professor to flirt or engage in romantic/sexual relationships with students during excavations. Indeed, this is common across archaeology, not only among Andeanists. Despite this, it remains true that a certain amount of willful blindness is required to ignore the ramifications of a professor entering into multiple

sexual relationships with undergraduate and graduate students, no matter how consensual. As the decisions of Alyssa, Amanda, and other junior women indicate, the impact of senior men pursing junior women extends far beyond the individuals involved because it actively discourages women from seeking out or taking advantage of professional opportunities for fear of being unable to say "no" to sexual advances. This broader point has gained wider acceptance with the rise of the #MeToo movement, the work of scholars studying sexual harassment in fieldwork (e.g., Meyers et al. 2018; SEAC Task Force on Sexual Harassment and Assault; Field Initiative to Stop Sexual Trauma),[10] and sessions on sexual harassment in archaeology held at the American Anthropological Association meeting in 2018 and the Society for American Archaeology meeting in 2019 (Wade 2019).

My aim in this article is not to focus exclusively on sexual relationships, however, but rather to situate these and other forms of inclusion/exclusion within the wider exploration of performative informality: to understand how gender and class inequalities flourish unacknowledged in a community precisely because there is an allegiance to informality and friendship as the mark of *equality*.

Most Andean archaeologists might agree that engaging in romantic/sexual relationships with students is problematic. But what of going for drinks or bringing cookies to class? What of the parties that allow friends to catch up and new students to be introduced to potential mentors? Indeed, female professors may blur the boundaries between professional and personal relationships with their students in ways that are nonsexual but still intensely intimate. In my ethnographic study, I documented situations where female *and* male graduate students became enmeshed in intense friendships with their female or male professors—for instance, providing emotional support during a professor's divorce or sharing very personal details of their childhoods and family lives. The forms of friendship and sociality that characterize archaeology, and the intimacy they promote, are seen as advantageous. Most of my informants would agree with the sentiment that "archaeology is just a little bit special" and that intimacy is a sign of equitability. Excavations are periods of intense social interaction and highly emotional interrelationships. What is the harm in colleagues being friends?

"The tyranny of structurelessness" is a phrase coined by Jo Freeman, a US-based feminist, to describe a particular problem in the women's liberation movement of the 1960s and 1970s. At that time, women came together in "rap groups" that explicitly rejected leaders or formal rules. While this was a natural reaction to the patriarchal and overtly hierarchical society women wanted to resist, Freeman (1971) argued that structurelessness only pushed elitism out of sight.

> To strive for a "structureless" group is as useful and deceptive, as to aim at an "objective" news story, "value-free" social science or a "free" economy. A "laissez-faire" group is about as realistic as a "laissez-faire" society; the idea becomes a smokescreen for the strong or the lucky to establish unquestioned hegemony. This

hegemony can easily be established because the idea of "structurelessness" does not prevent the formation of informal structures, but only formal ones.

Rather than being the result of "conspiracies," elitism arises in informal groups as a result of friendship.

> The members of a friendship group will relate more to each other than to other people. They will listen more attentively and interrupt less. They repeat each other's points and give in amiably…. Because people are friends, usually sharing the same values and orientations, because they talk to each other socially and consult with each other when common decisions have to be made, the people involved in these networks have more power in the group than those who don't. (Freeman 1971)

Freeman goes on to examine how class, marital status, race, age, and sexuality shaped membership of friendship groups and thus membership of the feminist movement's leadership. Something similar occurred in the community of Andeanists. Those at the center of the group were strong friends because they shared similar values, backgrounds, and tastes; they had been trained in the same archaeological tradition, at similar universities, reading similar books. This closeness extended to developing idiosyncratic methods and epistemology (Leighton 2015). Informants would tell me that their colleagues were their second family. The intense communality of the field is part of what makes archaeology an attractive career. But friendship must be a matter of individual choice. It can't be forced; and being free, it can't be critiqued. As Carey (2017) argues, friendship is meant to be about choice, equality, sympathy, and disinterestedness. Being forced to make friends with your colleagues just feels like another form of work—perhaps even emotional labor.

Mealtime seating on excavation projects came up frequently in my interviews because they made divisions between nationality-based friendship groups visible and audible. Some project directors saw this as problematic: "Everybody would launch into English and these poor Bolivians are sitting there eating quietly and I … tried to, you know, get people around a table to sit differently, but…" (September 2011). But other directors and archaeologists defended the importance of friendship in professional spaces. For instance, Alyssa, the graduate student mentioned above:

> Alyssa (A): So at the end of the day, at the end of a work day, yeah you can go and do more cultural exchange, blah blah, or you can just hang out with your friends. That's what they [the Bolivians] do, I'm not insulted.
>
> Mary (M): Well it's partly maybe a language thing as well?
>
> A: Yeah of course. At the end of the day, like, you're exhausted, and I'm convinced that it's exhausting for them to try to listen to me in Spanish, you know?
>
> […]
>
> A: I think it's natural to maybe want to hang out more with people who maybe understand you more easily. And not just in terms of the language, but in terms of culture. (March 2010)

In this article, I have used an ethnography of Andean archaeology to elaborate a point made by other researchers (e.g., Arciniega 2018; Ford and Hundt 1994, 154), namely, that subtle prejudices often stem from a preference for comfort. My intervention has been to situate this within a specifically US ideology of meritocracy and friendship-based collegiality. Because these ideas are so entrenched, and positively valued, it is difficult for academics to consider that the very thing they enjoy about their professional community might be inadvertently exclusionary. While the intellectual and sensual engagement with archaeological objects and problems were certainly elements of the attractiveness of archaeology for my informants (cf. Keller 1983; Shapin 2009), the intense sociality of the field and the friendships made there were equally important. To suggest archaeologists should stop having fun is to be what Sara Ahmed (2017) describes as the "feminist killjoy."

Performative informality enables the unintentional, unthinking perpetuation of hierarchies and exclusion in academic disciplines that are otherwise committed to feminist and postcolonial agendas. And yet, although I did not observe it among my informants or hear of it from them, it is also quite likely that a culture of fun, friendship, and informality allows *intentional* bullying, harassment, or discrimination to be masked, denied, or downplayed (Keashly and Neuman 2010). The tech industry, for instance, has been scrutinized for the way its age discrimination, sexism, and racism are hidden in plain sight behind appeals to fun (Corby 2015; Lyons 2016).

The historian of archaeology Pamela Smith (2009) argues that "tea time" was crucial to the development of British archaeology at Cambridge University. Anthropologists and philosophers in Liisber, Pedersen, and Dalsgård's (2015, 40) transdisciplinary collaboration credit their success to liberal amounts of "coffee and cake." We cannot do away with the kinds of "shop talk" and collegiality that historians and anthropologists of science recognize as being crucial to the production of scientific knowledge (Lynch 1985, 155–66). But if the line between professional and inappropriate is difficult to draw with exactitude, this does not mean it does not exist.

POSTSCRIPT

In October 2019, not long after this article was accepted for publication, a central figure in the Andean archaeological community died from suicide. John W. Janusek was deeply loved and respected as a friend and colleague. In the days and weeks after news of his death spread, the tributes that flooded his Facebook page were a testament to the respect with which he was held and the intensity with which he will be missed. The aftermath of his tragic death illustrated all that is good about this community of academics. Friends and colleagues living too far away to hold each other in person reached out over the phone, Facebook, and email to grieve together. There was an outpouring of love and support for John's wife, family, and closest friends.

The sense that this community is a family, held together by strong ties of love, friendship, and intimacy, helped people mourn during those first weeks and will no doubt continue to bring comfort in the years to come. The response to this shocking tragedy demonstrated everything that is good about friendship-based sociality and why close professional friendships are so valuable and strongly cherished.

And yet, as time passed, I began to believe that I was not wrong in drawing attention to the unintentional negative consequences of performative informality. I have been drawing attention in this article to the unintended consequences of expecting, condoning, or encouraging informality in a professional community and have focused on those who get left out as a result—women, people from working-class backgrounds, people of color, and people who are not from the United States. But with John's death, I began to think that we should also be concerned about the repercussions of this kind of sociality for those on the inside: those who appear to be benefiting the most, but in fact might also be damaged.

Looking at the problem from a structural rather than a personal perspective, we can consider how such a narrow frame of sociality (namely, intense friendships formed around alcohol) can be problematic for those whose professional reputation is intrinsically tied to the work they do bringing others together socially. As professionals in other careers have noted (Cole 2014; Gale 2018; Quenqua 2012; Smedley 2017), there are consequences to going sober and stepping away from the party, if this is how people in your field socialize and network. If one's professional reputation is built not only on one's scholarship but also on one's ability to draw people in, to be the most fun, to "bring the party" at every possible occasion, we can imagine a situation where admitting a problem with alcohol or depression, or a need to step back from the socializing for a while, could be a daunting proposition with potentially damaging career consequences.

Drinking or work friendships are not inherently problematic. Rather, the problem lies in the extent to which one's professional reputation is bound up in one's ability to perform a fun, friendly, alcohol-tolerant persona, such that stepping away from this persona could potentially impact one's career. It is the *lack of boundaries* between what a person is and does in their private life, and what they are and do in their professional capacity, that we should question.

While the style of performative informality I have described in the Andeanist archaeological community is one that is predominantly male, Euro-American, middle class, and white, this does not mean that such men are not also negatively impacted by it in some ways. In addition to carrying significant social and economic privilege, US white middle-aged men have one of the highest suicide rates[11] and rates of what public health researchers term "deaths of despair."[12] Moreover, in this demographic, "alcohol misuse both follows and contributes to mental health conditions that increase the risk of suicide."[13]

What is archaeology without alcohol? The historian of science Perrin Selcer, currently analyzing the archival history of archaeologists from the University of Michigan as part of an exploration of how scientists from the late nineteenth century to the present explain the origins of civilization, notes that the official archives of archaeologists contain an excessive number of references to alcohol in comparison to other scientific disciplines.

> There were references to heavy drinking in the field, including to the point where alcohol consumption impaired the ability to do work—or at least jokes about impairment rang true. There was even more talk about cocktails at meetings. The tone of all this correspondence about drinking tended to be jokey, college humor, but the ubiquity of drinking jokes, recollections, and invitations suggested a heavy drinking culture. In the correspondence of mid-twentieth-century archaeologists I have read, alcohol seemed to play a more important role in the sociality of the field than other disciplines. (personal communication, February 2020)

The ubiquity of alcohol in the archives, and the joking quality of those references, suggests that the centrality of drinking to North American archaeologists' performance of informality has a long history. It is also not unique to those working in the Americas. Discussing contemporary examples, Benjamin Porter (2010) describes the difficulties he faced trying to ban alcohol on Middle Eastern excavations, in countries where alcohol consumption is either illegal or unwelcome. His efforts were thwarted by North American archaeologists continuing to smuggle beer onto the project to drink in secret.

> We assumed that [the project members'] awareness of archaeology's origins in imperialist projects, especially in the Middle East, would provide an additional rationalization for the changes. But this was hardly the case. Project members instead believed that despite these circumstances, this project should be the exception to such rules. To me, these contradictions between awareness and practice suggest that our ivory tower discussions regarding ethics and archaeology can ring hollow when practiced in the field. Ethics are easy to talk about—and make for great conference sessions—but can they overcome traditions that are so deeply embedded in the discipline? (Porter 2010, 9)

Looking beyond explanations that focus on specific individuals, an ethnographic approach allows us to understand how specific kinds of sociality and community organization reward or encourage unhealthy behavior, to the extent that it is almost impossible to imagine archaeology without this very specific kind of informal, alcohol-led sociality. My hope, however, is that this article will open up a conversation about how we *could* imagine a different kind of academic community: one that welcomes a wider range of people, that focuses more sincerely on the work people do rather than how much "fun" they are, and that accepts, expects, and makes space for boundaries between our personal and professional lives.

Mary Leighton [iD] *Department of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States; marylei@umich.edu*

NOTES

1. I use the word "North American" to describe archaeologists who are based in either Canadian or US universities, but who have been trained in an "Andeanist" tradition that has historically been associated with US neoimperialism (Salvatore 2016). Unfortunately, there is no English word for "person from the United States," given that "American" refers to a continent, not a single country (Mergan et al. 1999; Weydt 2008; Santos 2014). Some of my informants used the slang term "gringo," which sometimes has derogatory connotations (Kane and Manelis Klein 2013), to describe those I am calling "North Americans." When I use "gringo," it is an echo of my informants usage, capitalized to indicate that its use as a proper noun. Someone who had European or South American citizenship, but was trained in a US university system as an "Andeanist," would be counted as a "North American" archaeologist in this article. In other ethnographic instances and other articles, their citizenship may be more relevant than their academic community.

2. Graduate Record Examination: a standardized test taken by applicants to US graduate schools.

3. Foreign and Bolivian archaeologists have worked in and around Tiwanaku since the end of the nineteenth century (Kojan and Angelo 2005, 385–86; Yates 2010, 33), and their research has been regulated to varying degrees since 1909 (Friedman 2008, 4; Rhebergen 2012, 44). Various North American projects have worked in Tiwanaku since Alan Kolata's excavations began in 1979. Much has been written on Tiwanaku's ideological uses and abuses, making the history of how Tiwanaku has been interpreted over the last 150 years a history of Bolivian nationalism and indigenismo (e.g., Arnold and Yapita 2005; Fernández-Osco 2010; Kojan 2008; Sammells 2012a, 2012b, 2013; Yates 2010, 2011). Additionally, prior authors have written about the relationship between archaeologists and the local indigenous communities in this region (Copa Mamani et al. 2012; Hastorf 2006;

Kojan 2008; Kojan and Angelo 2005; Leighton 2015, 2016; Swartley 2002).

4. Non-PI team members from North America are either graduate students or faculty. Team members generally work on subprojects related to their individual specialization (e.g., ceramic analysis, microbotanical analysis, zooarchaeology, etc.), within the larger research project. Bolivian team members are a mixture of students and nonstudents.

5. Preliminary ethnographic fieldwork in 2006 and 2007 included Peru. My own archaeological experience, prior to graduate school in sociocultural anthropology in the United States, was primarily on British excavations in Europe, but I also worked as an archaeologist on British and North American excavations in Peru and Bolivia prior to 2006.

6. Clare Sammells notes heavy drinking is at odds with highland Bolivian culture. "In rural areas, people only drink at major festivals, weddings, etc. They only have alcohol in their homes when they are seen as alcoholics. And in Tiwanaku, for example, there was a minor scandal involving two high school teachers of opposite genders being seen having a beer together—the assumption is that this was indicative of a closer relationship than was appropriate. So, Bolivian archaeologists (while generally urban, of course), especially women, are actually conforming to their own societies understandings of appropriate drinking and especially the expectations about when it is appropriate for women to drink. Also, a lot of archaeology team drinking occurs where they are staying, which is seen as 'home' for them. Again, domestic spaces are not where drinking is supposed to happen (and only does when there is a serious problem with alcohol). I [once] talked with one of the shopkeepers in Tiwanaku who sold beer to an archaeological excavation—about a case a night. She was clearly scandalized and wondered what they could possibly be doing in there. . . . The idea of having a beer at the end of the day is simply not done" (personal communication 2018).

7. See: http://www.thecut.com/2019/03/college-cheating-scandal-an-admissions-officer-speaks-out.html.

8. In contrast, in my experience British archaeologists tend to talk first about class-based inequalities, and neocolonial inequalities sprung to mind first for both Chilean and Bolivian archaeologists who were part of my ethnography.

9. Such a debate is seen even in archaeological writing from the United Kingdom—where, unlike the United States, class is an endless topic of explicit conversation. Ethnographies of archaeology written by British archaeologists about primarily British-style excavations are overwhelmingly concerned with the class division between those archaeologists who do manual work and those who do academic work, whether this division is conceptualized as contract archaeology (i.e., commercial/CRM) versus academic archaeology, or field excavators versus artifact/ecofacts specialists (Berggren et al. 2015; Berggren and Hodder 2003; Edgeworth 1991; Everill 2009; Yarrow 2006).

10. See: https://www.southeasternarchaeology.org/sexual-harassment-task-force/ and http://fieldworkinitiative.org/

11. See: https://afsp.org/about-suicide/suicide-statistics/ and http://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/publications/suicide-faq/index.shtml.

12. See: https://www.jec.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/republicans/2019/9/long-term-trends-in-deaths-of-despair.

13. See: https://niaaa.scienceblog.com/227/alcohol-and-deaths-of-despair/.

REFERENCES CITED

Ahmed, Sara. 2017. *Living a Feminist Life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Albom, Mitch. 2019. "College Admissions Scandal Is News, But Not New." *Detroit Free Press*, March 17. https://www.freep.com/story/sports/columnists/mitch-albom/2019/03/17/mitch-albom-college-admissions-scandal-lori-loughlin/3185590002/.

Alon, Sigal. 2009. "The Evolution of Class Inequality in Higher Education: Competition, Exclusion, and Adaptation." *American Sociological Review* 74 (5): 731–55.

Arciniega, Luzilda Carrillo. 2018. "The Spirit of Affirmative Action in Hollywood and Academia." *Anthropology News* 5 (2): e105–8.

Armstrong, Elizabeth A., and Laura T. Hamilton. 2013. *Paying for the Party*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Arnold, Denise Y., and Juan de Dios Yapita. 2005. "Strands of Indigenism in the Bolivian Andes: Competing Juridical Claims for the Ownership and Management of Indigenous Heritage Sites in an Emerging Context of Legal Pluralism." *Public Archaeology* 4 (2–3): 141–49.

Bardolph, Dana N. 2014. "A Critical Evaluation of Recent Gendered Publishing Trends in American Archaeology." *American Antiquity* 79 (3): 522–40.

Bardolph, Dana N., and Amber M. VanDerwarker. 2016. "Sociopolitics in Southeastern Archaeology: The Role of Gender in Scholarly Authorship." *Southeastern Archaeology* 35 (3): 175–93.

Baum, Sandy, and Michael S, McPherson. 2019. "Putting the College Admissions Scandal in Context." Brookings website, March 18. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2019/03/18/putting-the-college-admissions-scandal-in-context/.

Berg, Gary A. 2016. *Low-Income Students and the Perpetuation of Inequality: Higher Education in America*. London: Routledge.

Berggren, Åsa, and Ian Hodder. 2003. "Social Practice, Method, and Some Problems of Field Archaeology." *American Antiquity* 68:421–34.

Berggren, Åsa, Nicolo Dell'Unto, Maurizio Forte, Scott Haddow, Ian Hodder, Justine Issavi, Nicola Lercari, et al. 2015. "Revisiting Reflexive Archaeology at Çatalhöyük: Integrating Digital and 3D Technologies at the Trowel's Edge." *Antiquity* 89 (344): 433–48.

Bloom, Lisa. 1993. *Gender on Ice: American Ideologies of Polar Expeditions*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bolton, Sharon, and Maeve Houlihan. 2009. "Are We Having Fun Yet? A Consideration of Workplace Fun and Engagement." *Employee Relations* 31 (6): 556–68.

Boxer, Christie Fitzgerald, and Thomas E. Ford. 2011. "Sexist Humor in the Workplace: A Case of Subtle Harassment." In *Insidious Workplace Behavior*, edited by J. Greenberg, 175–205. London: Routledge.

Butler, Nick, Casper Hoedemaekers, and Dimitrinka Stoyanova Russell. 2015. "The Comic Organization." *Ephemera* 15 (3): 497.

Cahill, Sharon, and Rachel Densham. 2014. *Women, Humour and Power … in the Workplace*. London: University of East London.

Carey, Matthew. 2017. *Mistrust: An Ethnographic Theory*. Chicago: HAU Books.

Cole, Samantha. 2014. "The Correlation between Drinking with Coworkers and Success." *Fast Company*, August 7. https://www.fastcompany.com/3034056/the-correlation-between-drinking-with-coworkers-and-success.

Conkey, Margaret W. 2003. "Has Feminism Changed Archaeology?" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28 (3): 867–80.

Copa Mamani, Jacobo, Mary Luz Choque Apaza, Murillo Flores, José Luis, and Ricardo Vasquez Rivera. 2012. "Relaciones, condiciones y acción pública en la practica de la arqueología en Bolivia" [Relations, conditions, and public action in the practice of archaeology in Bolivia]. In *Proceedings of the XXIII Reunión Anual de Etnología Museo de Etnografía y Folklore*, 153–68. La Paz: Museum of Ethnography and Folklore.

Corby, Zoë. 2015. "Silicon Valley Is Cool and Powerful. But Where Are the Women?" *The Guardian*, March 8. https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2015/mar/08/sexism-silicon-valley-women.

Edgeworth, Matthew. 1991. "The Act of Discovery: An Ethnography of the Subject-Object Relation in Archaeological Practice." Doctoral dissertation, Durham University.

Engelstad, Ericka. 1991. "Images of Power and Contradiction: Feminist Theory and Post-Processual Archaeology." *Antiquity* 65 (248): 502–14.

Espenshade, Thomas J., and Alexandria Walton Radford. 2009. *No Longer Separate, Not Yet Equal: Race and Class in Elite College Admission and Campus Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Everill, Paul. 2009. *The Invisible Diggers: A Study of Commercial Archaeology in the UK*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Fernández-Osco, Marcelo. 2010. "La arqueología Boliviana: ¿Eslabón de la colonialidad?" [Bolivian archaeology: Another link in the chain of coloniality?]. In *Pueblos indígenas y arqueología en América Latina*, edited by Cristóbal Gnecco and Patricia Ayala Rocabado, 555–68. Bogota: Universidad de los Andes.

Ford, Anabel, and Anna Hundt. 1994. "Equity in Academia—Why the Best Men Still Win: An Examination of Women and Men in Mesoamerican Archeology." *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 5 (1): 147–56.

Freeman, Jo. 1971. "The Tyranny of Structurelessness." The Struggle Site. https://struggle.ws/pdfs/tyranny.pdf.

Friedman, Leslie A. 2008. "The Making of Place: Myth and Memory at the Site of Tiwanaku, Bolivia." Sixteenth ICOMOS General Assembly and International Symposium, September 29–October 4, Quebec, Canada.

Friedman, Sam, and Daniel Laurison. 2019. *The Class Ceiling: Why It Pays to Be Privileged*. London: Policy Press.

Gale, Rebecca. 2018. "Drinking with Co-Workers." *Slate*, February 27. https://slate.com/human-interest/2018/02/harassment-isnt-the-only-reason-we-should-rethink-drinking-at-work.html.

Garth, Bryant G., and Joyce S. Sterling. 2018. "Diversity, Hierarchy, and Fit in Legal Careers: Insights from Fifteen Years of Qualitative Interviews." *The Georgetonwn Journal of Legal Ethics* 31: 123–74.

Gero, Joan M. 1985. "Socio-Politics and the Woman-at-Home Ideology." *American Antiquity* 50 (2): 342–50.

Golden, Daniel. 2006. *The Price of Admission: How America's Ruling Class Buys Its Way into Elite Colleges—and Who Gets Left Outside the Gates*. New York: Crown Publishing Group/Random House.

Gusterson, Hugh. 2017. "Homework: Toward a Critical Ethnography of the University." *American Ethnologist* 44 (3): 435–50.

Halle, David. 1984. *America's Working Man: Work, Home, and Politics among Blue Collar Property Owners*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hastorf, Christine. 2006. "Building the Community Museum at Chiripa, Bolivia." In *Archaeological Site Museums in Latin America*, edited by Helaine Silverman, 85–98. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Ho, Karen. 2009. *Liquidated: An Ethnography of Wall Street*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Holmes, Janet, and Maria Stubbe. 2015. *Power and Politeness in the Workplace: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Talk at Work*. London: Routledge.

Hutson, Scott R. 2002. "Gendered Citation Practices in American Antiquity and Other Archaeology Journals." *American Antiquity* 67 (2): 331–42.

Jaschik, Scott. 2019. "Just Because It's Legal Doesn't Make It Right." *Inside Higher Ed*, March 18. https://www.insidehighered.com/admissions/article/2019/03/18/admissions-scandal-focuses-attention-legal-donations-parents.

Kane, Stephanie, and Harriet Manelis Klein. 2013. "Gringo/a as Sociolinguistic Fractal." *Ethnologies* 35 (1): 3–27.

Kawa, Nicholas C., José A. Clavijo Michelangeli, Jessica L. Clark, Daniel Ginsberg, and Christopher McCarty. 2019. "The Social Network of US Academic Anthropology and Its Inequalities." *American Anthropologist* 121 (1): 14–29.

Keashly, Loraleigh, and Joel H. Neuman. 2010. "Faculty Experiences with Bullying in Higher Education: Causes, Consequences, and Management." *Administrative Theory & Praxis* 32 (1): 48–70.

Keller, Evelyn Fox. 1983. *A Feeling for the Organism: The Life and Work of Barbara Mcclintock*. New York: Owl Books.

Kenny, Kate, and Emma Bell. 2014. "Irony as Discipline: Self-Help and Gender in the Knowledge Economy." *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* 21 (4): 562–84.

Kenny, Kate, and Gordon Euchler. 2012. "'Some Good Clean Fun': Humour, Control and Subversion in an Advertising Agency." *Gender, Work & Organization* 19 (3): 306–23.

Killgore, Leslie. 2009. "Merit and Competition in Selective College Admissions." *The Review of Higher Education* 32 (4): 469–88.

Kingori, Patricia. 2013. "Experiencing Everyday Ethics in Context: Frontline Data Collectors Perspectives and Practices of Bioethics." *Social Science & Medicine* 98:361–70.

Kojan, David. 2008. "Paths of Power and Politics: Historical Narratives at the Bolivian Site of Tiwanaku." In *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*, edited by Junko Habu, Clare Fawcett, and John M. Matsungaga, 69–85. New York: Springer.

Kojan, David, and Dante Angelo. 2005. "Dominant Narratives, Social Violence and the Practice of Bolivian Archaeology." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 5 (3): 383–408.

Larkin, Max. 2019. "College Admissions Scandal Troubles Disadvantaged Students." WBUR, March 21. https://www.wbur.org/edify/2019/03/21/admissions-scandal-trouble.

Leighton, Mary. n.d. "'To Stand There Silent': Looking beyond 'Nationalism' or 'Imperialism' to Understand the Breakdown of Transnational Collaborations."

Leighton, Mary. 2015. "Excavation Methodologies and Labour as Epistemic Concerns in the Practice of Archaeology. Comparing Examples from British and Andean Archaeology." *Archaeological Dialogues* 22 (1): 65–88.

Leighton, Mary. 2016. "Indigenous Field Technicians at Tiwanaku, Bolivia: A Hybrid Form of Scientific Labor." *American Anthropologist* 118 (4): 742–54.

Liisberg, Sune, Esther Oluffa Pedersen, and Anne Line Dalsgård, eds. 2015. *Anthropology and Philosophy: Dialogues on Trust and Hope*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Liu, Amy. 2011. "Unraveling the Myth of Meritocracy within the Context of US Higher Education." *Higher Education* 62 (4): 383–97.

Lowe, Celia. 2004. "Making the Monkey: How the Togean Macaque Went from 'New Form' to 'Endemic Species' in Indonesians' Conservation Biology." *Cultural Anthropology* 19 (4): 491–516.

Lynch, Michael. 1985. *Art and Artifact in Laboratory Science*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Lyons, Dan. 2016. *Disrupted: My Misadventure in the Start-up Bubble*. New York: Hachette.

McCall Howard, Penny. 2012. "Workplace Cosmopolitanization and the Power and Pain of Class Relations at Sea." *Focaal* 2012 (62): 55–69.

Mergen, Bernard, Stelamaris Coser, Michael Aaron Rockland, Clemencia Rodriguez, Larry McReynolds, Ana Celi, and Bruce Tucker. 1999. "¿American? Studies: A Dialogue across the Americas." *American Studies International* 37 (3): 5–17.

Meyers, M. S., E. T. Horton, E. A. Boudreaux, S. B. Carmody, A. P. Wright, and V. G. Dekle. 2018. "The Context and Consequences of Sexual Harassment in Southeastern Archaeology." *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 6 (4): 275–87.

Miller, Allison. 2018. "In Some Disciplines, Heavy Drinking Is Part of the Culture. That Can Be a Problem." *Science*, December 6. https://www.sciencemag.org/careers/2018/12/some-disciplines-heavy-drinking-part-culture-can-be-problem.

Mosse, David. 2006. "Anti-Social Anthropology? Objectivity, Objection, and the Ethnography of Public Policy and Professional Communities." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 12 (4): 935–56.

Neves, Livia Martins Pinheiro. 2000. "Putting Meritocracy in Its Place: The Logic of Performance in the United States, Brazil and Japan." *Critique of Anthropology* 20 (4): 333–58.

Newberry, Laura, and Hannah Fry. 2019. "The Legal Way the Rich Get Their Kids into Elite Colleges: Huge Donations for Years." *Los Angeles Times*, March 18. https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-college-admissions-scandal-legal-ways-20190318-story.html.

Newman, Katherine S. 1999. *Falling from Grace: Downward Mobility in the Age of Affluence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

North, Anna. 2019. "What the College Admissions Scandal Reveals about the Psychology of Wealth in America." Vox, March 15. https://www.vox.com/2019/3/15/18264399/college-admissions-scandal-lori-loughlin-cheating-huffman.

Ortner, Sherry B. 2006. *Anthropology and Social Theory: Culture, Power, and the Acting Subject*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Porter, B. W. 2010. "Dry Dig: Ethics and Alcohol in Middle Eastern Archaeological Practice." *The SAA Archaeological Record* 10 (5): 7–11.

Posecznick, Alex. 2017. *Selling Hope and College: Merit, Markets, and Recruitment in an Unranked School*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Quenqua, Douglas. 2012. "Feeling the Pressure to Drink for Work." *New York Times*, October 1. https://well.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/01/feeling-the-pressure-to-drink-for-work/.

Raiden, Ani. 2016. "Horseplay, Care and Hands on Hard Work: Gendered Strategies of a Project Manager on a Construction Site." *Construction Management and Economics* 34 (7–8): 508–21.

Rhebergen, Annemiek Dorian. 2012. "Facing Different Views: The Effect of Legislation on the Engagement with Indigenous Peoples during Archaeological Heritage Management Projects in the Andean Region of Bolivia from the Early 1990s Onwards." Master's thesis, Department of Archaeology, University of Leiden, Arnhem.

Rivera, Lauren A. 2012. "Hiring as Cultural Matching: The Case of Elite Professional Service Firms." *American Sociological Review* 77 (6): 999–1022.

Rodríguez, Mario Orellana. 1996. *Historia de la arqueología en Chile, 1842–1990* [History of archaeology in Chile, 1874–1990]. Santiago: Bravo y Allende.

Salvatore, Ricardo D. 2016. *Disciplinary Conquest: US Scholars in South America, 1900–1945*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Santos, Luis Claudio Villafane. 2014. "American, United Statian, US-American, or Gringos?" In *Imagined Identities: Identity Formation in the Age of Globalization*, edited by Gönül Pultar, 289–99. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Sammells, Clare A. 2012a. "Ancient Calendars and Bolivian Modernity: Tiwanaku's Gateway of the Sun, Arthur Posnansky, and the World Calendar Movement of the 1930s." *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 17 (2): 299–319.

Sammells, Clare A. 2012b. "The City of the Present in the City of the Past: Solstice Celebrations at Tiwanaku, Bolivia." In *On Location: Heritage Cities and Sites*, edited by D. Fairchild Ruggles, 115–30. Springer: New York.

Sammells, Clare A. 2013. "Complicating the Local: Defining the Aymara at Tiwanaku, Bolivia. International." *Journal of Historical Archaeology* 17 (2): 315–31.

Shapin, Steven. 1989. "The Invisible Technician." *American Scientist* 77 (6): 554–63.

Shapin, Steven. 2009. *The Scientific Life: A Moral History of a Late Modern Vocation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smedley, Tim. 2017. "The Jobs Where Career Success Means Drinking at Work." *BBC Worklife*, April 25. https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20170425-the-jobs-where-career-success-means-drinking-at-work.

Smith, Pamela Jane. 2009. *A "Splendid Idiosyncrasy": Prehistory at Cambridge*. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.

Swartley, Lynn. 2002. *Inventing Indigenous Knowledge: Archaeology, Rural Development, and the Raised Field Rehabilitation Project in Bolivia*. New York: Routledge.

Traweek, Sharon. 1988. *Beam Times and Life Times: The World of Particle Physics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wade, Lizzie. 2019. "#MeToo Controversy Erupts at Archaeology Meeting." *Science*, April 15. https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2019/04/metoo-controversy-erupts-archaeology-meeting.

Warnock, Deborah M., and Sara Appel. 2012. "Learning the Unwritten Rules: Working Class Students in Graduate School." *Innovative Higher Education* 37 (4): 307–21.

Weydt, Harald. 2008. "The Semantics of Ethnic Denominations: What is the Meaning of Mexican, American, etc.?" In *Lengua, nación e identidad. La regulación del plurilingüismo en España y América Latina*, edited by Kirsten Süselbeck and Ulrike Mühlschlegel, 99–109. Madrid: Iberoamericana Editorial.

Wisniewski, Richard. 2000. "The Averted Gaze." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 31 (1): 5–23.

Wylie, Alison. 1992. "The Interplay of Evidential Constraints and Political Interests: Recent Archaeological Research on Gender." *American Antiquity* 57 (1): 15–35.

Yarrow, Thomas. 2006. "Sites of Knowledge: Different Ways of Knowing an Archaeological Excavation." In *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice: Cultural Encounters, Material Transformations*, edited by Matthew Edgeworth, 20–31. Oxford: Rowman Altamira.

Yates, Donna. 2010. "Nationalistic and Indigenous Archaeology in Bolivia: Professional Identity and Archaeological Ethics." Doctoral dissertation, Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge.

Yates, Donna. 2011. "Archaeology and Autonomies: The Legal Framework of Heritage Management in a New Bolivia." *International Journal of Cultural Property* 18 (3): 291–307.