# Mapping Precariousness, Labour Insecurity and Uncertain Livelihoods

The condition of precariousness not only provides insights into a segment of the world of work or of a particular subject group, but is also a privileged standpoint for an overview of the condition of the social on a global scale. Because precariousness is multidimensional and polysemantic, it traverses contemporary society and multiple contexts, from industrial to class, gender, family relations as well as political participation, citizenship and migration.

This book maps the differences and similarities in the ways precariousness and insecurity in employment unfold and are subjectively experienced in regions and sectors that are confronted with different labour histories, legislations and economic priorities. Establishing a constructive dialogue amongst different global regions and across disciplines, the chapters explore the shift from precariousness to precariat and collective subjects as it is being articulated in the current global crisis. This edited collection aims to continue a process of mapping experiences by means of ethnographies, fieldwork, interviews, content analysis, where the precarious define their condition and explain how they try to withdraw from, cope with or embrace it.

This is valuable reading for students and academics interested in geography, sociology, economics and labour studies.

**Emiliana Armano** has a PhD in Labour Studies at the Department of Social and Political Sciences in the State University of Milan, Italy.

**Arianna Bove** is a Lecturer in Politics and Ethics at the School of Business and Management, Queen Mary, University of London, UK.

**Annalisa Murgia** is Associate Professor in Human Resources Management, Leeds University Business School, UK.

# Mapping Precariousness, Labour Insecurity and Uncertain Livelihoods

Subjectivities and Resistance

**Edited by**
**Emiliana Armano, Arianna Bove**
**and Annalisa Murgia**

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

LONDON AND NEW YORK

# Contents

# Mapping precariousness: Subjectivities and resistance

## An introduction

*Arianna Bove, Annalisa Murgia and Emiliana Armano*

*Mapping Precariousness* is an investigation of the experience of precariousness and the forms of subjectivation and counter-subjectivation it gives rise to.

In the past decade, interpretations and approaches to the question of precariousness have proliferated amongst scholars of different disciplines as well as social movements across the globe. With an international scope and a focus on subjectivity, the present book aims to offer different perspectives on the phenomenon as it gives rise to a variety of responses and interpretations that are shaped by the historical trajectories and geographical locations of the subjects affected by it (Lee and Kofman 2012; Breman and van der Linden 2014; Atzeni and Ness 2016).

Reconstructing the fragmented history of the concept of precariousness is not a straightforward task. In a way, the term has been in use since the beginning of critical political economy. Traces of it can be found in the works of Karl Marx, especially *Capital*.[1] Max Weber also made use of the term in *Science as Vocation*, to describe the new condition of researchers resulting from the alignment of the German academic system with the American model.[2] From the early 1960s, precariousness became the object of conversations in social movements and academia. The women's movement of Bologna, Italy, adopted the term in the context of demands for better working conditions (Betti 2013).[3] In the same decade, the *International Labour Review* published an article by Paolo Sylos Labini entitled 'Precarious Employment in Sicily', which presented a category of poorly paid and irregularly employed workers connected to but also wider and more heterogeneous than that of *lumpenproletariat* (Sylos Labini 1964). Then the debate on precariousness disappeared from academic discourse for nearly three decades [4] and in the 1990s researchers based mainly in France and Italy began to use the term again.[5] In the meantime, precariousness became a key word for social movements, especially the Italian movement of 1977, where students and protesters called themselves 'precarious' to mark their distance from parties concerned exclusively with protecting the salaried industrial working class (Lerner *et al.* 1978; Berardi 2009; Fumagalli 2011; Shukaitis 2013).

It was not until the end of the 1990s that a proliferation of theoretical developments of the notion of precariousness and of social enquiries and auto-ethnographies of the condition began to be documented in the Italian militant

research journal *I Quaderni di San Precario*, giving expression to struggles against precariousness. At that point, the academic debate lagged well behind social movements, as it was largely concerned with retracing the paradigm of flexibility and labelling as 'ideological' those standpoints that had assumed precariousness not only as their research object, but also as the interpretive framework of their analysis of the changes that labour market transformation effected on the production of new collective subjects. Therefore, the idea of investigating precariousness arose from social struggles (Neilson and Rossiter 2008; Betti 2014; Murgia 2014) that can be located within the political tradition of the global justice movement. Amongst social movement actors, there was a high level of awareness that various forms of precariousness were proliferating and of the need to fight against them with new political tools, as well as a strong desire to produce better analyses of the subjectivities involved. This is the political background we recognise our work as being part of and situated in.

Now the debate on precariousness has also entered the academic arena (Barbier 2005; Fudge and Owens 2006; Kalleberg 2009; Lee and Kofman 2012), where it has taken on a transnational dimension partly thanks to research sponsored by international institutions such as the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound) and other research initiatives supported by the European Union.

This 'institutional' strand of research conceptualises precariousness as a condition that is at the antipode of what has been known as the 'standard employment relation' (SER). SER was a normative standard for countries following the models of Keynesianism and Fordism in the post-war era, largely motivated by the objective of ensuring that as many people as possible had access to consumer goods and were granted a minimal purchasing power, ensured by a degree of certainty of continuing employment, job security and work regulation, and some control over labour conditions, intensity, and remuneration by means of representation on platforms of negotiation with employers (Vosko 2010). The standard employment relation was the way in which the 'Labour Question', a cause of great concern for political leaders and industrialists, was to some extent temporarily resolved during the post-war period; to some extent because falling outside of this standard were swathes of informal labour markets populated primarily by women and migrants. However, this was only a temporary solution or compromise. From the 1960s and 1970s, the standard employment relation came under attack in the name of greater flexibility.

Advocates of greater flexibility in employment relations have been informed by two sets of ideas. The first, the neoliberal agenda, has been discussed at length (Dockès 2006; Molé 2012; Standing 2011; Perlin 2011). The neoliberal model understands working class organisation as an impediment to progress, and the SER a temporary concession to the demands of workers, a burden that needs lifting for the sake of economic growth. This notion of progress tends to see the SER as a stepping stone to a new stage of deregulation and flexibility in labour relations, and the condition of precariousness experienced by growing numbers of people as the flipside of flexibility and a necessary evil. This

narrative also accuses critics of such condition of backwardness and nostalgia (Strangleman 2007).

Under a mantel of calls to entrepreneurship – a celebration of a culture of 'danger' and risk-taking – the neoliberal critique took the form of a veritable assault on the wage form itself; working should not de facto entail getting paid. Rather, out of necessity work must be reinstated as something that workers should feel grateful to be in receipt of (Perlin 2011; Southwood 2011). Neoliberalism thus, in its partial critique of the state, tried to alleviate the burden of social responsibility from business and clear the way for all kinds of new work arrangements aimed to free employers from the duty to give cause for hiring and firing and in many cases even paying wages.

Although this set of ideas has become dominant in the academic debate, where a critique of precariousness is formulated as a critique of neoliberalism, a very different set of ideas has informed arguments demanding flexibility. It is possible to discern in the literature a rich and populous strand of thought that acknowledges the struggles of the late twentieth century that refused work and the identity made between work and life (Bologna and Fumagalli 1997; Fleming 2014; Lazzarato 2016). These comprised political and cultural critiques of the permanent contract as a life-long commitment to one type of work, or one industrial sector, and much more. It meant women refusing being reduced to their reproductive abilities. It called for flexible hours, work from home, part-time arrangements, where severing the connection between work and life was a demand for freedom from standardised work time (clocking in and out) and place (office, factory). It also comprised challenging the idea of wealth, forcing us to consider the whole of society as making a contribution to the economic success of a nation. The linking of work with citizenship, civic duty, was questioned by a generation that saw work as a mode of discipline and repression (Ackroyd and Thompson 1999; Barchiesi 2011; Berardi 2009; Weeks 2011).

But of these two sets of ideas, the dominant one is the former, that severing the wage from work has in fact sanctioned the identity of work and life (and worklessness and death). In the neoliberal agenda, work is not a means of securing economic subsistence, and a generation of workers is at work for nothing but the development of their human capital. Whilst employers enjoy flexibility, employees experience precariousness, etymologically a condition of being in receipt of some favour (work). Compliance is thus ensured.

This divides commentators into at one end those who regard the SER as a point of reference and a 'solution' to precariousness, and at the other those who systematically question the organisation of work and life built on the premises of Keynsianism and Fordism, and then many stances in between. For this reason, there exists a wide variety of definitions of the concept of precariousness, some of which are conflicting (Neilson and Rossiter 2005; Gill and Pratt 2008; Puar 2012; Armano and Murgia 2013; Cingolani 2014; Lorey 2015). With no pretence at exhaustiveness or systematisation, we here wish to outline the main phenomena that this condition is said to designate, to explain the remit of our project in this book.

In the current debate, precariousness is theorised in one or more of the following ways:

- An ontological and existential problem, informed by the assumption that we are all contingent beings and in life there are no guarantees (Puar 2012). Here precariousness describes the fragility of human corporeal existence, well thematised in the work of Judith Butler (2004) on the aftermath of 9/11 in the United States. In these terms, recognising precariousness entails an ethical encounter, an understanding of 'the precariousness of the Other' essential to the constitution of vulnerability and interdependence as prerequisites of being human.
- A watchword used for decrying worsening labour contract conditions, the demise of trade unions' influence over labour reforms, or the growing endorsement by successive governments of all dispositions and past legacies, whether social democratic or liberal in orientation, of an aggressive and unforgiving neoliberal agenda. In this understanding, the term is elected to provide a voice and visibility to the effects of what to some appears to be a silent takeover of industrial relations by employers at the expense of employees (Fudge and Owens 2006; Kalleberg 2009). Here precariousness is an umbrella term that describes different work situations, from self-employment to part-time, temporary employment, internship and zero-hour contract work; designating a condition that is atypical and contingent, characterised by uncertainty, unpredictability of income streams, insecurity, vulnerability, lack of protection and regulation (Crompton *et al*. 2002; Blossfeld *et al*. 2005).
- A condition inherent to contemporary global capitalism that allows for the production and reproduction of capital as a whole. In this perspective, insecurity, informality and precariousness represent a dominant mode of governance (Mitropoulos 2004; Neilson and Rossiter 2008; Breman and van der Linden 2014) implemented by different means. For instance, an increasing number of people find employment outside of conventional work arrangements, in global cities or as crowd workers in the digital economy, arrangements that are made invisible by the global dynamics of contemporary capitalism (Atzeni and Ness 2016).
- An experiential condition investing a person's life as a quality inherent to that person and his/her specific position. The new spirit of capitalism is based on the self-identification of workers with the products of their labour (Boltanski and Chiappello 1999) and the putting to work and valorisation of emotional and relational skills (Morini 2010).

  In this framework, the analytical focus is on the process whereby individuals are required to be masters of their own destiny and entrepreneurs of their selves and lives (Ross 2009; Dardot and Laval 2009; Armano and Murgia 2013), a process that aims to turn citizens into entrepreneurs of their own human capital, and thus gives rise to forms of subjectivation and construction of the self that rely on fragmentation, individuation, and the logic of the

enterprise. Following a rhetoric of self-realisation, the system of discipline and obedience typical of Fordism is here overturned thanks to the interiorisation of the principles of merit and the 'praising of skills' (Lazzarato 2012).

- A way of recognising and organising a collective actor and new forms of political struggle and solidarity that reach beyond the traditional organisational models of political parties or trade unions (VV.AA. 2004; Tarì and Vanni 2005). In this sense, precariousness can be seen as 'not only oppressive, but also as offering the potential for new subjectivities, new socialities and new kinds of politics' (Gill and Pratt 2008: 3). This is the *class in-the-making* that Guy Standing, popularising a term already widely in use amongst social movements, calls 'the Precariat' (2011). In this sense, the growth of the precariat is not merely a result of changes in the labour market and an increase in temporary contracts; it is also driven by the transformation of production processes, the rights connected with them and, above all, the deliberate governance strategies of capitalism. Therefore, this term is not meant to identify a distinctive socioeconomic group, but to point to the potential to construct an identity and an imagery for the collective experience of precarious subjectivities. This brief survey gives us a glimpse of the multidimensional and poly-semantic nature of the concept of precariousness, of the ways it traverses contemporary societies in multiple contexts, from industrial to class, gender, family relations as well as political participation and citizenship.

*Mapping Precariousness* aims to present an inquiry into the phenomenon in three main parts. Part I – *Subjectivities: a cartography of experiences* – investigates precariousness as a driver of the process whereby risk is damped onto individuals in multiple ways: financial, social, existential. Part II – *Resistance: social movements against precariousness* – follows the narrative of how the 'Precariat' has come to develop a variety of forms of political actions and expressions of collective subjectivity. Part III – *Conceptual outlooks* – presents a series of proposals to reconsider the way we understand precariousness from a theoretical, epistemological and political point of view.

A pilot project of *Mapping Precariousness* was developed in 2010 and published in two volumes (Armano and Murgia 2012). This focused on collective responses to precariousness in Italy and Europe and aimed to build a network of agents within and outside the academia who interpreted precariousness in terms of subjectivity and biographical and experiential narratives. The present volume aims to cast the net wider and expand this network of mappers.

The thread uniting all chapters is an accent on subjectivity and how it intersects the ongoing transformation in the experiences and representations of those affected by precariousness. These are hard to discern through the statistical measures of sociological findings on labour market trends. Far from providing a comprehensive map and an exhaustive definition, we aim to continue a process of mapping experiences by means of ethnographies, fieldwork, interviews, content analysis, where the precarious define their condition and explain how they try to

withdraw from, survive within or embrace it. What follows is a brief overview of the contents of the chapters.

## Subjectivities: a cartography of experiences

Part I surveys international standpoints and a heterogeneous set of industries, economic sectors, political experiences, and regions characterised by different histories of labour relations, legislations and welfare provisions, that are also currently confronted with different economic pressures. These are investigated with the aim to begin to help dissect points of commonality and difference between regions and sectors. What emerges from China, Romania, Japan, Africa, the United Kingdom, Australia, Greece, Italy, France, the United States, Spain, and sectors ranging from factory work, to IT, education, journalism, care, unemployment and prison, is a moving picture, not a snapshot, but stories of an ongoing process that is transforming society and our relation with work and life in significant ways.

Part I opens with a displacement of the discourse on precariousness: away from Eurocentric accounts of development progressing from the social democratic aspirations of the SER to the precarious work relations of neoliberal policies, in 'The precariousness of work in postcolonial Africa', Franco Barchiesi charts the trajectory of the imposition of waged work in Africa and the experience of those who resist full proletarianisation as a form of colonial rule, to highlight that 'capitalist command is constitutively precarious'.

In 'The Chinese Dream and the precarity plateau: why industrial workers are looking to entrepreneurship', Brandon Sommer then transports us to China, the region of Guangdong, and shares his findings from fieldwork and interviews, seeking an explanation for the rise of entrepreneurialism that he tentatively ascribes to the institutional instability, poor prospects for retirement, and ineffective market mechanisms conjuring up to push industrial workers into self-employment and small business ventures, from one form of precariousness to another. The ambivalence here is this threshold between the possibility of experiencing an autonomous self-organisation and the subsumption of one's subjectivity as it gets put to work. Emiliana Armano and Annalisa Murgia further explore this ambivalence of the experience of precariousness of self-employed workers and freelancers in 'Hybrid areas of work in Italy: hypotheses to interpret the transformations of precariousness and subjectivity'. Reporting on their interviews, they investigate the way precariousness makes inequalities more entrenched and significantly changes the subjectivities involved by demanding an entrepreneurial internalisation of the logic of command.

Marie-Christine Bureau and Antonella Corsani are also concerned with the rise of self-employment but, writing from France, in 'The French Business and Employment Co-operative: an autonomy factory?' they give us a snapshot of the possibilities of moving beyond the identification of self-employment with precariousness and individualisation and present us with the experience where self-employed workers share their risks in return for some protections.

In 'Against precarity, against employability', Ivor Southwood examines the relationship between precariousness and the recent discourse of employability within the remit of social policies implemented in Britain, where it functions, particularly through the provision of welfare and education services, as a mode of governance and legitimation of precariousness and accustoms young people to accept social and economic inequality and conform to the increasing demands of the labour market.

In 'The 'academic career' in the era of flexploitation', George Morgan and Julian Wood examine the condition of precariousness in academia with an ethnography and case studies of the higher education sector in Australia, to investigate the effects of the rise of managerialism and precariousness on new entrants into the profession.

Manos Spyridakis's 'Coping with uncertainty: precarious workers of the Greek media sector[2] reports on a prime example of the sort of experimentation that the experience of the struggle against precariousness can give rise to, discussing his interviews with the workers of a major TV channel in Greece during the crisis.

In 'Stories of precarious lives', Joanne Richardson offers us the transcripts of a documentary assembling ten portraits of Romanian women working in different countries, questioning the dominant discourse on precariousness and its disregard of the gender and economic inequalities that separate the first and third worlds of Europe.

Steffi Richter closes this cartography with 'Precarious Japan', an outlook on a new 'lost generation' and the ways it makes sense of its conditions of economic and social uncertainty, with a focus on how they voice their plight in publications and through forms of self-organisation.

## Resistance: social movements against precariousness

As we have mentioned, as a watchword the concept of precariousness has emerged from and was developed in the context of European social movements, their theory and activism. Because of this, Part II includes analyses of their politics and practices of self-organisation. The term 'precariat' was first evocatively adopted in 2000 by various sections of the Italian social movement (Frassanito-Network 2005; Mattoni 2015) to designate a new fragmented subject and both give it a voice and harness its potential to act politically. From 2000 onwards, a series of activists' interventions gave rise to the singular and lively experience of Euro May Day, a Europe-wide coalition. These movements believed that those excluded from income and rights could unite and represent themselves with no recourse to traditional forms of representation. Thus, initially, 'precariat' was not an analytical category and precariousness described a subjective condition: the existential condition and experience of shared meanings of a whole generation, rather than a particular group identifiable by a particular social or employment status. Part II charts the genealogy of the resistance to precariousness in social movements from Euro May Day to the present. Their political agenda is plural and includes making precariousness visible to policy

makers and public opinion, creating spaces and services that assist those affected by it, and organising collective struggles against it.

Part II opens with Dimitris Papadopoulos's 'The two endings of the precarious movement', where we are presented with two interpretations of the forms of struggle against precariousness in social movements from Euro May Day to the present. Following an initial phase of struggle against worsening contractual and working arrangements, in 2008 Papadopoulos sees the beginning of a new phase of struggles where precariousness is associated with the financialisation of life and its bio-economic subsumption under systems of rating and evaluation. Rather than the impasse diagnosed in the following chapters, Papadopoulos here sees a leap in the movement against precariousness that with the crisis broadens the scope of its demands, yet still struggles to find a voice.

In 'The precariat for itself: Euro May Day and precarious workers' movements', Alex Foti offers a reflection on the 'precariat' as a political subject. Whilst Guy Standing defines the precariat as the sum of all those at risk of job insecurity, and Andrew Ross as the sum of service labour in the North and informal labour in the South, Foti's definition of the precariat is 'the sum of people working precarious jobs in dependent and formally independent employment, as well as those experiencing unemployment'. Tracing the trajectory of the Euro May Day movement against precariousness and its legacy, Foti insists on the need for this category to overcome 'leftist mythologies of the industrial working class'.

In 'Fake it until you make it: prefigurative practices and the extrospection of precarity', Valeria Graziano investigates the apparent stalling in the processes of composition of a political subject that recognises itself as precarious, and ascribes it to an underestimation of the micropolitical dynamics of the struggle in past movements, to put forward a new strategy of recomposition that relies on a micropolitics of solidarity and sociability.

In 'Precariedad everywhere?!' Rethinking precarity and emigration in Spain', María Isabel Casas-Cortés and Sebastian Cobarrubias reflect on the experience of recent social movements in Spain, and report on the dialogue between struggles against precariousness and migrants' struggles. Exploring the staggering rise of emigration from Spain that followed the global crisis, they show how precariousness can be identified not only as the cause of emigration, but also as the condition of all migrants in destination countries, thus furnishing important points of commonality between emigrants and immigrants in Spain and beyond, whilst questioning the identification of work with citizenship and rights.

## Conceptual outlooks

Part III, far from attempting to provide a theoretical systematisation of what emerges from the cartography of experiences and the narratives of social movement actors, instead hopes to solicit new research trajectories and the use of innovative theoretical tools to make sense of precariousness, with a heuristic and explorative agenda.

In 'Working for nothing: the latest high-growth sector?' Andrew Ross discusses the way in which precariousness has spread to affect a whole generation and such a growing number of workers that it would no longer seem appropriate to see it as an 'atypical' condition. If anything, Ross contends that it signals a strong trend in labour relations towards the large scale de-regulation of the labour market and progressive financialisation of the economy. In this context, Ross discusses the trend towards the increasing exploitation of 'free labour'.

In 'Labour, (in-)dependence, care: conceptualizing the precarious', Isabell Lorey introduces three analytical categories: precariousness, precarity, and governmental precarisation, and focuses on the ways these help distinguish between the socio-ontological and legal-economic realms from those where the ambivalences of freedom and subjection intersect.

The volume concludes with Angela Mitropoulos's 'Encoding the law of the household and the standardisation of uncertainty', a theoretical discussion of precariousness as a mode of governance. A unique angle on the political epistemology of precariousness, the closing chapter charts a genealogy of the category in discourses on statistical measures and spontaneous order.

The present book hopes to furnish new tools, empirical and theoretical, to understand the condition of precariousness as it unfolds across borders, and we would like to thank all contributors, including all the participants in their inquiries, for joining this project and continuing the work of mapping new subjectivities and resistances.

## Notes

1   In Chapter 25 of Book I of *Capital*, Marx writes: 'The higher the productivity of labour, the greater is the pressure of the workers on the means of employment, the more precarious therefore becomes the condition for their existence' (Marx 1990: 798). For more on Marx's theory of working-class precariousness, see Jonna and Foster (2015).
2   'Thus the assistant's position is often as precarious as is that of any "quasi-proletarian" existence and just as precarious as the position of the assistant in the American university' (Weber 1946: 131).
3   In 1963, an intervention entitled '*Graduale superamento delle forme di occupazione precaria e delle attività meno produttive*' [Gradual overcoming of forms of precarious employment and less productive activities] (Betti 2013).
4   An exception is the 1989 publication of Rodgers and Rodgers (eds) *Precarious Jobs in Labour Market Regulations.*
5   See Robert Castel (1995), Alain Supiot (1999), Sergio Bologna and Andrea Fumagalli (1997), Luciano Gallino (1998), Pierre Bourdieu (1998), Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello (1999). A contribution to the debate also came from Richard Sennett (1998), Ulrich Beck (1999) and Zygmunt Bauman (2000).

## References

Ackroyd, S. and Thompson, P. (1999) *Organisational Misbehaviour*. London: Sage.
Armano, E. and Murgia, A. (eds) (2012) *Mappe della precarietà*, vols 1 and 2. Bologna: Odoya.

Armano, E. and Murgia, A. (2013) The precariousnesses of young knowledge workers. A subject oriented approach. *Global Discourse* 3(3–4): 486–501.

Atzeni, M. and Ness, I. (2016) Precarious work and workers resistance: Reframing labor for the 21st century. *Working USA* 19(1): 5–7.

Barbier J.C. (2005) La précarité, une catégorie française à l'épreuve de la comparaison internationale. *Revue française de sociologie* 46(3): 351–71.

Barchiesi, F. (2011) *Precarious Liberation. Workers, the State, and Contested Social Citizenship in Postapartheid South Africa*. New York: SUNY Press.

Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck, U. (1999*) Schöne neue Arbeitswelt. Vision: Weltbürgergesellschaft*. Frankfurt: Campus.

Berardi, F. (2009) *Precarious Rhapsody. Semiocapitalism and the Pathologies of the Post-Alpha Generation.* Edited by E. Empson and S. Shukaitis. Translation by A. Bove, E. Empson, M. Goddard, G. Mecchia, A. Schintu and S. Wright. London: Minor Compositions.

Betti, E. (2013) Precarieta e fordismo. Le lavoratrici dell'industria bolognese tra anni Cinquanta e Sessanta. *Culture del lavoro 1*: 17–45.

Betti, E. (2014) La precarietà del lavoro come fenomeno storico: un approccio di genere. Prime riflessioni metodologico-storiografiche. *Memoria e Ricerca*. maggio-agosto: pp. 51–71.

Blossfeld, H.P., Klijzing, E., Mills, M. and Kurz, K. (eds) (2005) *Globalization, Uncertainty and Youth in Society: The Losers in a Globalizing World*. London: Routledge.

Bologna, S. and Fumagalli, A. (eds) (1997) *Il lavoro autonomo di seconda generazione. Scenari del postfordismo in Italia*. Milan: Feltrinelli.

Boltanski, L. and Chiappello, E. (1999) *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme*. Paris: Gallimard.

Bourdieu, P. (1998) La précarité est aujourd'hui partout. In P. Bourdieu, *Contre-feux*. Paris: Liber Raison d'agir, pp. 95–101.

Breman, J. and van der Linden, M. (2014) Informalizing the economy: The return of the social question at a global level. *Development and Change* 45(5): 920–40.

Butler, J. (2004) *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London and New York: Verso.

Castel, R. (1995) *Les Métamorphoses de la question sociale. Une chronique du salariat*. Paris: Fayard.

Cingolani, P. (2014) *Révolutions précaires*. Paris: La Découverte.

Crompton, R., Gallie, D. and Purcell, K. (eds) (2002) *Changing Forms of Employment: Organizations, skills and gender*. London: Routledge.

Dardot, P. and Laval, C. (2009) *La Nouvelle Raison du monde. Essai sur la société néolibérale*. Paris: La Découverte.

Dockès, P. (2006) Metacapitalismo e trasformazioni dell'ordine produttivo. In Vercellone, C. (ed.) *Capitalismo Cognitivo. Conoscenza e Finanza nell'Epoca Postfordista.* Roma: Manifestolibri.

Fleming, P. (2014) *Resisting Work. The Corporatization of Life and its Discontents*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Frassanito-Network (2005) *Precarious, Precarization, Precariat? Impacts, traps and challenges of a complex term and its relationship to migration*. Available from: http://05.diskursfestival.de/pdf/symposium_4.en.pdf [Accessed: 15 August 2016].

Fraune, D. (2015) *The Refusal of Work. The Theory and Practice of Resistance to Work.* London: Zed Books.

Fudge, J. and Owens, R.J. (eds) (2006) *Precarious Work, Women, and the New Economy*. Oxford and Portland Oregon: Hart Publishing.

Fumagalli, A. (2011) La condizione precariat come paradigm biopolitico. In Chicchi, F. and Leonardi, E. (ed.). *Lavoro in frantumi. Condizione precariat, nuovi conflitti e regime neoliberista*. Verona: Ombre corte, pp. 63–78.

Gallino, L. (1998) *Se tre milioni vi sembran pochi. Sui modi per combattere la disoccupazione*. Torino, Einaudi.

Gill, R. and Pratt, A. (2008) In the social factory? Immaterial labour, precariousness and cultural work. *Theory, Culture & Society* 25(7–8): 1–30.

Jonna, R. J. and Foster, R. B. (2015) Marx's theory of working-class precariousness – and its relevance today. In C. Fanelli and J. Shields (eds) *Precarious Work and the Struggle for Living Wages.* Special issue of *Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research.* 27: 21–45.

Kalleberg, A.L. (2009) Precarious work, insecure workers: Employment relations in transition. *American Sociological Review* 74(1): 1–22.

Lazzarato, M. (2012) L'uomo indebitato. Roma: Derive Approdi.

Lazzarato, M. (2016) *Experimental Politics. Work, Welfare, and Creativity in the Neoliberal Age.* Edited by J. Gilbert. Translation by A. Bove, J. Gilbert, A. Goffey, M. Hayward, J. Read and A. Toscano. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lee, C. and Kofman, Y. (2012) The politics of precarity: views beyond the United States. *Work and Occupations* 39(4): 388–408.

Lerner, G., Manconi, L. and Sinibaldi, M. (1978) *Uno strano movimento di strani studenti. Composizione, politica e cultura dei non garantiti*. Milano: Feltrinelli.

Lorey, I. (2015) *State of Insecurity: Government of the Precarious*. London: Verso.

Marx, K. (1990 [1867]) *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Translation by B. Fowkes. London: Penguin Classics.

Mattoni, A. (2015) The many frames of the precarious condition. Some insights from Italian mobilizations against precarity. In D. della Porta, T. Silvasti, S. Hänninen, M. Siisiäinen (eds). *The New Social Division. Making and Unmaking Precariousness*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 233–48.

Mitropoulos, A. (2004) Precari-Us?. *Mute. Culture and Politics after the Net* 29: 88–96.

Molé, N. J. (2012) *Labor Disorders in Neoliberal Italy. Mobbing, Well-Being, and the Workplace*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Morini, C. (2010) *Per amore o per forza: femminilizzazione del lavoro e biopolitiche del corpo*. Verona: Ombre corte.

Murgia, A. (2014) Representations of precarity in Italy. Collective and individual stories, social imaginaries and subjectivities. *Journal of Cultural Economy* 7(1): 48–63.

Neilson, B. and Rossiter, N. (2005) From precarity to precariousness and back again: labour, life and unstable networks. *Fibreculture* 5. Available from: http://five. fibreculturejournal.org/fcj-022-from-precarity-to-precariousness-and-back-again-labour-life-and-unstable-networks/ [Accessed: 15 August 2016].

Neilson, B. and Rossiter, N. (2008) Precarity as a political concept, or, Fordism as exception. *Theory, Culture & Society* 25(7–8): 51–72.

Perlin, R. (2011) *Intern Nation. How to Earn Nothing and Learn Little in the Brave New Economy*. London: Verso.

Puar, J. (2012) Precarity talk: A virtual roundtable with Lauren Berlant, Judith Butler, Bojana Cvejić, Isabell Lorey, Jasbir Puar, and Ana Vujanović. *TDR/The Drama Review* 56(4): 163–77.

Rodgers, G. and Rodgers, J. (eds) (1989) *Precarious Jobs in Labour Market Regulation: The Growth of Atypical Employment in Western Europe*. Belgium: International Institute for Labour Studies.

Ross, A. (2009) *Nice Work if You Can Get It: Life and Labor in Precarious Times*. New York: NY University Press.

Sennett, R. (1998*) The Corrosion of Character. The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*. London: W.W. Norton & Company.

Shukaitis, S. (2013) Recomposing precarity: Notes on the laboured politics of class composition. *Ephemera* 13(3): 641–58.

Southwood, I. (2011) *Non-Stop Inertia*. Winchester: Zero Books.

Standing, G. (2011) *The Precariat. The New and Dangerous Class.* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Strangleman, T. (2007) The nostalgia for permanence at work? The end of work and its commentators. *Sociological Review*. 55(1): 81–103.

Supiot, A. (1999) *Au-delà de l'emploi*. Paris: Flammarion.

Sylos Labini, P. (1964) Precarious employment in Sicily. *International Labour Review*. 89(3): 268–85.

Tarì, M. and Vanni, I. (2005) On the life and deeds of San Precario, Patron Saint of precarious workers and lives. *Fibreculture Journal* 5.

Vosko, L. F. (2010) *Managing at the Margins. Gender, Citizenship, and the International Regulation of Precarious Employment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

VV.AA. (2004) Middlesex Decalration of Europe's Precariat, Available from: http://five. fibreculturejournal.org/fcj-022-from-precarity-to-precariousness-and-back-againlabour-life-and-unstable-networks/ [Accessed: 17 January 2017].

Weber, M. (1946 [1922]) Science as a vocation. In Gerth, H.H. and Wright Mills, C. (eds) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 129–56.

Weeks, K. (2011) *The Problem with Work. Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries*. Durham: Duke University Press.