

Higher Education Transformations and Casualization of the Academic Labor between the Two Atlantic Shores

Gigi Roggero*

Abstract

The article – based on qualitative interviews with scholars and academic workers, in order to capture not only the ‘structural trends’ of the higher education systems, but also the ‘subjective perceptions’ of its actors – is a comparative analysis of the US and European university context. As far as the US is concerned, it is difficult to speak about a uniform higher education national model, because it is dynamically drawn by a combination of private sector and state laws. In Europe the realization of the Bologna Process aim – a common higher education space – is accompanied with uncertainties linked to the adaptation reforms. So, my attention will focus on two case studies: the State of New York and Italy. I will analyze: 1) some general trends of changes in higher education in the two contexts; 2) the increasing casualization of academic labor; 3) the formation of new subjectivities, and their forms of mobilizations; 3) the new movements’ oppositional knowledges, that both involves possibilities for transformation and risks of co-optation.

Introduction

The changes in the production system in the last decades are a topic widely analyzed among scholars. Many of them talk about a transformation as great as the industrial revolution, to explain the passage from a model based on the factories and industrial work, vertically integrated and spatially concentrated, to a model based on service and knowledge production, organized in transnational networks, and able to combine different times and spaces (Fadini and Zanini 2001). These transformations are named in different ways: the passage from an industrial to a post-industrial economy (Bell 1973), or from a fordist to a post-fordist society (Amin 1994), the flexible accumulation as a new form of the capitalistic mode of production (Harvey 1990), the rise of the informational technology era (Castells 1996), or the cognitive capitalism (Vercellone 2006).

* Ph.D. student, Department of Sociology and Political Science, University of Calabria, Italy;
e-mail: roggero@unical.it

In order to highlight the close link between changes in the forms of production and the higher education systems, a number of scholars hypothesizes the rise of a “post-fordist university” (Vaira 2003), a “knowledge factory” (Aronowitz 2000), or “academic capitalism” (Leslie and Slaughter 1997). In spite of different contexts and forms of governance, the links between the market and higher education, the reproduction of the corporate model inside the university management, and the role of intellectual property (IP) are all related to the global level. Starting from my two case studies, the State of New York and Italy, as I will try to show, the casualization of academic labor, and the surge in mobilizations of temporary workers, emerge also as transnational common trends¹.

1. Trends in higher education transformations

There is – at least symbolically – a crucial year for the historical relationship between university, industry and market in the United States: 1980. It is the year of the Bayh-Dole Act, which “requires U.S. universities to put into use the intellectual property rights generated from their federally funded research” (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff 1998). Ross explains its consequences:

“It encouraged universities to give priority to commercially relevant research. Faculty had to be converted to this way of thinking by including them in a stakeholding role. Applied science and entrepreneurial sciences aimed at technology transfer became the frontline for funding as universities began to invest in start-ups, real estate holdings, and opportunities that would enable their ownership of intellectual property (copyrights, patents, trademarks). Inevitably, non-profit institutions have taken on the character of for-profits.”
(Ross 2006-interview)

In this article, the category of *corporate university* doesn't refer only to the private or the for-profit institution. On this point of view, the American system is a little more private than public in terms of numbers of institutions, but it is widely more public than private in terms of students' enrollment (Martinotti 2006-interview). Instead, the category stresses the assumption of the corporation model by the whole higher education system. This means: the shift of the funds raised from the public and given to the private sector; the corporate management of the institution; the close link between university, market, industries, and IP; the steady concentration of power upward into managerial administration; the pressure to adopt an entrepreneurial career mentality, and the consequent transformation of the faculty into entrepreneurs (Ross 2006-interview).

The European framework is partially different, first of all because of the historical diversity with regards to the role of the State and the welfare-state. In Italy, almost all the institutions are state universities: the private ones are a limited number, the industry does not invest much money in the education, while some non-profit actors (they are still few, but increasingly) are building up their institutions in a peculiar private and public combination. Moreover, if in US the regulation of the

academies depends on its 50 different states and not on a national legislation, in the Italian university system we can talk about a 'double power' within it: the State draws the general lines of the curricula, the faculty controls the management of the academy. As Clark has argued, the Italian academic system is a peculiar compromise between a centralizing managed bureaucracy and a self-government of the faculty (Clark 1977). The reforms of the last fifteen-twenty years have not changed this power structure very much. Even so they gave more institutional autonomy (first of all financial and administrative, and less didactics) to the universities, and has forced the academy to think itself as an enterprise that has to get funds, inside an educational framework decided at the central level (Capano 1998). In fact, in the Italian academy there is a sort of strange mix of feudal power and post-fordist reforms (Vaira 2006-interview).

Nevertheless, these reforms have partially changed the face of the Italian university. Berlinguer and Zecchino, the Education Ministers of the former governments of centre-left between 1996 and 2001, introduced the parameters that are the guide lines of the *Bologna Process*, the effort to build a European common space of higher education through the harmonization of the reform lines in the countries of the EU². The university model chosen in the Conference of Bologna is generally based on the UK model (Trowler 2003), with the introduction of the two levels of the undergraduate degree (respectively of three and two years), and the credits as evaluation parameters of the student's performance. This model is still far from the US one, with its great differentiation among institutions and the structure of qualifications (Stadtman 1992). The European harmonization process is not simple and linear, various countries prefer more gradual and flexible forms of convergence than the assumption of the whole model. But beyond the efforts of the EU and the resistances of the national governments, there is a "*grass-roots internationalization*" (Enders 2003), triggered by the students' and researchers mobility. In Italy, instead, the 'Bologna model' was adopted entirely, without a phase of experimentation. There is a political reason: the *Bologna Process* was used by Berlinguer as an instrument to speed up and legitimize the university reform of his government (Moscatti2006-interview).

There are at least two great similarities in trends between the EU and US university systems. The first, as I wrote, is the introduction of the credit system: it is in use in the United States as well in the UK for a long time, but only now in the large part of the Europe, through the founding of the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS). It is an attempt to quantify knowledge, a central commodity and mean of production in contemporary society³. But, according to some scholars, this opens a great contradiction in the core of the knowledge society: how is it possible to measure the knowledge production? In fact, the knowledge – contrarily to the tangible goods – is not a scarce resource, but it grows in its usage and consumption (Vercellone 2006). Gorz argues that the knowledge economy is not a new stage of the capitalism, but even the end of capitalism itself (Gorz 2003). Nonaka and Takeuchi highlight the unavoidability of knowledge sharing, their necessary common cognitive foundation, and as such, an element that constitutently exceeds private

appropriation (Nonaka and Takeuchi 1995). In any case, the attempts to measure the performance of the knowledge workers fail (Paletta 2004). Moreover, many scholars argue that the IP – that is comparable to the credit system in the attempts to quantify and so to privatize knowledge – is addressed to stop economic and social innovation (Mokyr 2002). So, there is a sort of knowledge spillover with respect to the quantification units (Roggero 2005).

The credit system provides possibilities to gain credits within informal and non-formal education, in the perspective of lifelong learning. This means that even the reform process of higher education sinks its roots in the awareness that knowledge production and the educational background are not only tied to the institutional and traditional agencies (family, schools, university), but are widespread in a multiplicity of experiences, relationships, and social networks. On one hand there is an ‘education market’ composed of different actors and institutions, public and private, with the difficult attempt and necessity of formally measuring performances and human capital; on the other hand, the singular background exceeds the criterion established by knowledge enterprises.

The second similar trend is the passage in the educational selective mechanisms from the exclusion to the *differential inclusion*. In other words, in the framework of the accreditation system the curriculum vitae does not depend so much on whether a person attended a higher education institution, but first of all it depends on *what* institution he or she attended. While the qualified education moves itself upward in the steps of the *lifelong learning*, the necessity to carry the Italian university to the international standard about the number of university degrees produces problems for the quality of study, as a temporary researcher say: “The system rewards the universities that give a degree to many people in a short time. The message that the establishment gives to us is: you have to not fail the students in the examination, you only have to give them a degree, because this is important for our statistics and to raise funds. The university is an examination factory” (Siciliano 2004-interview).

2. The casualization of labor as a common trend

There is another common trend between the US and European university systems: the casualization of academic labor. To photograph this process, Vaira speaks of a progressive enlargement of the “academy periphery” and a corresponding shrinking of the “centre” (Vaira 2003). Mohanty ties this growing division directly to the corporatization of the university:

“Another result [of the privatization] is a growing division between a small core group of workers with higher pay, job security, and benefits, and a larger group of peripheral contract workers, predominantly women, with lower pay, job insecurity, and no benefits. Almost 30 percent of all classes nationally are now taught by part-time faculty, while 45 percent of all undergraduate faculty are part-time. In contrast, in 1970 only 22 percent of faculty worked part-time.” (Mohanty 2003, 178-179)

Just at the end of Nineties the US statistics were clear: “Colleges and universities employed 1,074,000 faculty members and others involved in instruction during the fall of 1998, and 43 percent of them worked part time” (Wilson 2001). In many community colleges, part-timers teach 75 percent of course sections (Aronowitz 2000). Nelson links the increase in casualized academic labor to the production system and economic transformations:

“Higher education as a whole has become structurally dependent on a pool of cheap labor to teach its lower-level courses. [...] Economics thus also exposes the claim that graduate assistants are not employees for what it is: a cynical lie. Part-timers, adjuncts, and graduate assistants are filling the same role in the university – teaching the same courses – and doing so for the same economic reasons. Indeed, the long-term collapse of the academic job market means that most graduate students can no longer look forward to tenure-track job.” (Nelson 1997, 4-5)

In Italy there are not precise data about the casualized labor, in front of different figures who daily (with diversity of contract typologies) bear the didactic workload: scholarships, grants, and contract employees (I use the category of temporary research workers), unpaid research assistants, tutor or exerciser, Ph.D. and post-doc students. Nevertheless, also short data can help to frame this phenomenon⁴. At the University of Milan (in the North) two of every three courses are entrusted to figures who are not faculty of first or second level, nor researchers⁵, with peaks of more than 90 percent in some departments. At the University of Bologna (in the Centre) the total of permanent faculty is about 2,500; there are 2,982 contracts, beyond the 600 grants, and 680 scholarship employees, 1,784 Ph.D. students. Finally, at the University of Calabria (in the South) the permanent faculty are 627, while the contracts workers instructors are 576, the Ph.D. students are 582, tutors are 713.

On the base of these flashes and on the interviews, I hypothesize that the temporary labor is not a contingent phase in the academic career, but it is a *structural element* in the functioning of the contemporary university. But the temporary and flexible labor is not only the shape of the university, but increasingly the global framework of contemporary society (Sennet 1998). So, an American graduate student says: “Our casualized job has to be framed in the wider economics and social trend” (Kershaw 2006-interview). In Italy there is a common agreement to distinguish the old and the new forms of casualization, that for some years have taken on the word *precariousness*, while *precarious* is the subject who lives inside this process: “Now the precariousness is widespread, and also people who did not come from rich families have access to the university career: so, the problem becomes social” (Andretta 2004-interview). But the perception of the problem is not only a passive statement: both on the two Atlantic shores there have been important struggles.

3. The rise of the 'precarious researchers' claims

In Italy the law on the juridical state and the recruitment of university professors, advanced by the centre-right Education, University, and Research Minister, Letizia Moratti, roused large protest. After the law proposal, January 16 2004, a lot of rectors, faculty, researchers, temporary workers, and students organized actions of dissent and demonstrations. Some points of the law are particularly contested: the abolition of the researcher, that was replaced by temporary contracts; the boost in efforts to realize research programs jointly with corporation and private actors, from which the universities have to raise its funds. But there is a diffuse awareness that the Moratti Law is only the institutionalization, and not the creator, of a trend of casualization that has occurred over a long period. Within the large front of the protest, my research focus is on the subjects who experiment with the 'precarious' condition in everyday life: students and the multitude of temporary, part-time, and contingent academic workers, who built up in the February 2004 the self-organized National Network of Precarious Researchers (Rete Nazionale dei Ricercatori Precari – RNRP)⁶. The RNRP has 'nodes' in 14 universities spread throughout all of Italy. It involves a heterogeneous composition of contractual typologies, and the age of the members ranges from 24 to 40 years. The mailing-list is the collective place of debate, coordination, and decision making, beyond some periodical meetings. The network chose not to become a formal association, neither an interest-lobby nor a union. The Moratti Law was approved October 25 2005, despite the fact that students and 'precarious researchers' occupied the universities for some weeks, and on that day there was a great demonstration of protest involving more than 150,000 persons. The RNRP continues with its activities, even after the change of government (from centre-right to centre-left).

In the US the first great mobilization of the graduate students was at the Yale University in December 1995, with a strike of 250 teaching assistants (who teach 60 percent of the undergraduate courses). The struggle was about gaining recognition of their union, the Graduate Employees and Students Organization (GESO)⁷. Actually, if the unions (first of all the teachers' ones) are legitimated actors of the governance in state universities, in private institutions the administrations refuse graduate students the possibility of organizing. The main argument is that graduates are not workers, but only students; so, teaching is a form of apprenticeship, and not a mode of employment. A graduate student evidences what, in her eyes, is an evident contradiction: "The university is fully inside the business and corporation world, but the administration denies that we are workers in the name of intellectual status. In their opinion, if we want a union we renounce our academic and intellectual freedom. But we students are workers, we support a relevant part of the didactic workload, and it is impossible to separate the intellectual activity from the teaching work" (Bonifazio 2006-interview). The mobilization at Yale was defeated, but it opened new perspectives on the claims and subjective perception in relation to the academic work.

Between the fall of 2004 and the spring of 2005 the two graduate student strikes at the Columbia University had also not succeeded, and the administration did not count the ballots for the union referendum. In 2002, instead, after a long mobilization, NYU was the first private university that recognized a graduate students union, the Graduate Student Organizing Committee (GSOC)⁸. But three years later the administration, with the complicity of a change of the members' composition of the National Labor Relations Board, brought up that appointed the private universities are not obliged to bargain with the graduate students union. After a large civil disobedience demonstration in August (in which 71 persons was arrested), daily picket-lines, and various protest manifestations, the November 9 2005 the GSOC started with a strike, that is still in course. So, these struggles seem to make reasonable the ways in which Rhoads and Rhoades understand the graduate students' unionization, and I add the rising 'precarious researchers' mobilizations, as a paradigmatic resistance movement in the neoliberal framework (Rhoads and Rhoades 2006).

The common element in the two contexts is the awareness that today an intellectual is first of all a (temporary) worker: "One time the precariousness in the university was accepted as a test time. Instead, I was born into permanent precariousness, it is the natural habitat. I have to think of my life not as a researcher, but as precarious" (Capocci 2004-interview). The political consequence is highlighted by a graduate student interviewed by Rhoads and Rhoades: "There's that kind of identity politics – getting graduate students to see themselves with other union workers around the country as opposed to seeing themselves aligned with the university administration. So getting them to identify themselves with each other as employees instead of as individual scholars ... that's an important form of identity" (Rhoads and Rhoades 2006, 284-285). This social identity formation, as intellectual 'precarious' and workers, led GSOC to support the New York transit workers strike in December 2005, and to participate to the undocumented migrant mobilizations in the spring of 2006, and the RNRP to take part in the EuroMayDay process, a European self-organized network that is concerned with the topics of work casualization⁹.

Nevertheless, in the Italian context the struggle is wide when it is against the government, but it is more difficult to translate this into a change of the daily power and labor relationships within the university, where there is often an ambiguous connection between 'precarious researchers' and the 'barons', the academic oligarchies. In the US university, where the corporate model is fully developed, the relationship between casualized employees and administration is on class issues, and the full professors have to choose their part. So, also the relationships with the unions are different in the two contexts. In Italy there is an important union tradition, but there is almost no powerful official organization inside the university. In the US case study, instead, a graduate student at NYU speaks about this relationship in a clear way: "At the end of Nineties we created an organizing committee, then we were informed of some national unions and we chose the United Auto Workers. We can use their resources and their strike funds: so we have more organizing possibilities, but at the same time we are always autonomous" (Krupat 2006-interview). So, if in Italy the union forms its organ inside

the university, trying to involve a new membership, in the US the academic workers organizing committees choose, on the 'unions free market', the more convenient organization with regards to funds, communication networks, and general support.

As a result of the different contexts and forms of organization, in US the mobilization is more focused on unionist issues against the administration – such as bargaining rights, wages and fellowships, health insurance –, in Italy it is more oriented to political action with respect to the government, and on the topics of the critique of educational model and the free circulation of knowledge. In the US someone noted that union action is almost only about “bread-and-butter issues” (Ross 2006-interview), while in Italy there are not so many class claims and bargaining power within the academy (Caruso 2004-interview). Moreover, in the NYU strike a great problem about composition emerges: there are very few non-white people. On one hand, this depends on the selective politics of the university system (Aronowitz 2006-interview). But, according to a graduate student, on the other hand this question is linked to the mobilization strategy: “Since the union concerned only bread-and-butter issues caused splits inside the membership along color lines. Many students of color renounced participating in these struggles because they think their issues are not welcomed and understood” (Kirvin 2006-interview).

The gender question is different. For many years some scholars spoke about a ‘feminization of work’, in order to capture the increasing presence of women in the labor market, the peculiarities of the contemporary forms of production thought of as typically feminine – i.e. care, language, informality, relationships –, the use of new technologies, and the impact of the feminist movements. Nevertheless, as the university case shows the feminization of work is accompanied by its casualization. In Italy the women Ph.D. students are more than the men, but they are 40 percent of the researchers, 25 percent of the associates, and only 10,1 percent of the ordinaries (Micali 2001). The gender situation is similar in the United States: “Department of Education statistics [...] indicate that there has been no change since 1977 in the percent of women professors that have tenure, and full professors across all schools and disciplines are 79 percent male, and almost 90 percent white” (Mohanty 2003, 179). But the women also make up the larger part of graduate students unions in the US (Carter 2006-interview), and a good number of the ‘precarious researchers’ activists in Italy. Faced with a feminization of (casualized) work, maybe we can also speak of an increasing feminization of the university mobilizations.

Finally, in both the case studies, the struggles against casualization does not become a desire to come back to old forms of labor relationships, marked by the rigidity of work time, space, and tasks, that are moreover irreconcilable with the cognitive activity (Vercellone 2006). In fact, there are many temporary researchers who prefer the casualized but stimulating work in the university to the safe but boring full-time job in other state or private industries (Kershaw 2006-interview; Gianfelice 2004-interview). It is not possible to explain these behaviours with ‘rational choice’ theories. It is more useful to speak of the ambivalence of flexibility highlighted by Boltanski and Chiappello: in the

genealogy of this category, that became the magic word of labor politics and of the casualization process in the Nineties, there are also the workers' struggles and the mass exodus from wage labor in the Seventies (Boltanski and Chiappello 1999). The temporary workers are both insiders and outsiders, or rather, they are on the borders of the academy. The struggle lines are not so much between inclusion and exclusion, but first of all about new claims to rights (income continuity, mobility and communication networks, public services, and so on) that make them able to overturn the casualization of their job and life, and to manage an autonomous flexibility.

4. The oppositional knowledges between challenge and institutionalization

The two mobilizations, beyond their outcomes, are first of all a subjectivation process of the new stratum of temporary, contingent, and 'precarious' researchers and teachers. In both cases the struggles are not only composed of people with a political and union background, but there are also many people who are living their first movement experience (Conte 2006-interview; Cordovana 2004-interview). In this subjectivation process there is a production of *oppositional knowledges*, which always involves both fundamental challenges and the risk of co-optation (Mohanty 1990). For example, the rise of the women, lgbt, race, or ethnic studies in the American academies is rooted in the social movements of Sixties and Seventies. In a similar way, according to Mohanty: "Postcolonial studies comes from the anticolonial struggles. Without this genealogy, it is impossible to understand their political dimension, they are simply high theory" (Mohanty 2006-interview). The alternative knowledge creation is visible in the use of the new technologies. The RNRP experience is unthinkable without Internet: it chose the network not only as a technical way to communicate, but also as an organizing model, peculiarity of the new social movements. So, the new technologies can be used as a way to reduce the permanent faculty, but also to link struggles and to organize cooperation (Rossiter 2006). Other experiments in Italy to create oppositional knowledges are the 'self-formation seminars', the building up of courses inside the academy structures and curriculum, but activated by self-organized networks of students, 'precarious researchers', and activists outside the university. The objective, as an agitation journal says, is to create new educational models, to knock down the IP and to allow the free circulation of knowledge, and "to inflate the credits", claiming the recognition of all self-managed activities (Rete Universitaria 2003).

Conclusions

My hypothesis is that the mobilizations in Italy and New York, in a way not dissimilar to the students' revolt in France against a labor law proposal last spring, indicate that jobs casualization is one of the main issues of conflict in the long history of university activism, as in the wider society

(Roggero et al. 2005). Moreover, in the university a new stratum of figures is on the rise, composed of temporary researchers and teachers. On one hand they already support a large part of the daily academic functioning; on the other hand they have behaviours, life conditions, and practices more similar to the students than to the traditional faculty. So, they can *potentially* change the higher education system, producing knowledges that are constitutively ambivalent, both radically transformative and institutionally innovative. So, in the differential inclusion system I described, culture and knowledge are fundamental terrains of struggle (Mohanty 1990).

Nevertheless it is impossible to analyze the link between transformations in higher education, the casualization of academic labor, and the rise of new agencies and mobilizations, focusing only the university system as a space and time unit. As I tried to show in my work, the university system has been exceeded – with evident diversities of gradation and power – by antagonistic forces: the market, the model of the corporation, and the IP on one hand, but also the knowledge circulation, the social cooperation of the movements, and the creation of self-organized educational networks on the other hand. In this framework, the corporate university is not limited to the campus, but becomes a complex system that involves the traditional academy, the metropolis area, and transnational space. For example, these are the cases of NYU and the Fairleigh Dickinson University in New Jersey. The former for a long time has adopted outsourcing (Nelson 1997) and has opened global campuses around the world, to increase the profits, to enroll students also outside the US, and to gain their IP (Ross 2006-interview). In the latter case, to face the decrease of the foreign students in the American universities in the last years, the Fairleigh Dickinson University has build up a campus in Canada, in order to catch them getting round the US borders and the restrictive legislation after September 11 (Altbach 2006-interview). If in Europe the corporate model is not fully developed, and in Italy it is mixed with a sort of ‘feudal power’, there are many problems for the US higher education system to confront the international competition (Welch 2006-interview). This is the worry of Florida, who denounces the flight of the ‘creative class’: “The real foreign threat to the American economy is not terrorism; it’s that we may make creative and talented people stop wanting to come here” (Florida 2005).

I hypothesize the *becoming university* of the metropolis in order to highlight the informal circulation of knowledge and widespread social cooperation outside the official education system, implemented by the communication possibilities of the new technologies, and in part recognized by the credit system too. The transnational space, as we saw in the European case, is often opened by the circulation of students and researchers before capital and legislation. To face this, the corporations’ problem (and on tendency of the corporate universities too) is to control the workforce’s ‘horizontal mobility’. In fact, if the flexibility imposed by the corporations becomes a casualization instrument, the knowledge workers often practice autonomous forms of flexibility as a weapon of resistance and self-enhancing, first of all in the workplace with a low union density (Ross 2006; Ong 2006). Paradoxically, sometimes one of the problems for the corporations is not to increase the workers

flexibility, but to make them more faithful, in order to avoid the ‘intellectual property steal’ – like in the famous Taborsky case (Press and Washburn 2000) –, to retain their skills, to capitalize their knowledge, and to prevent their escape to other competitors.

Finally, these international trends bring into question the traditional dialectic between centre and periphery, between industrialized and developing countries. This does not mean the hierarchies, inequalities, and exploitative forms disappear; on the contrary, as many postcolonial scholars argue, they are globally widespread beyond the traditional lines of First and Third World, to cross the borders, and to reproduce themselves inside the metropolitan areas (Chakrabarty 2000). Inside these new lines, dynamically determined both by corporatization of higher education and self-managed networks, IP and free knowledge circulation, casualization of labor and autonomous use of flexibility and mobility, it is necessary to inquire into the transformations of the university and the new agencies of the actors who live in it, and along its borders.

References

- Amin, A. (Ed., 1994), *Post-Fordism. A Reader*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Aronowitz, S. (2000), *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning*, Beacon Press, Boston.
- Bell, D. (1973), *The Coming of Post-industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*, Basic Books, New York.
- Boltanski, L. – Chiappello, E. (1999), *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme*, Gallimard, Paris.
- Capano, G. (1998), *La politica universitaria*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Castells, M. (1996), *The Rise of the Network Society. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2000), *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, Princeton University Press, Oxford.
- Clark, B. R. (1977), *Academic Power in Italy. Bureaucracy and Oligarchy in a National University System*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Enders, J. (2003), *Istruzione superiore “à la bolognese”?*, in *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia*, n. 3, 371-386.
- Etzkowitz, H. – Leydesdorff, L. (1998), *The Triple Helix as a Model for Innovation Studies*, Science & Public Policy, Vol. 25 (3), 195-203, available at <http://users.fmg.uva.nl/leydesdorff/th2/spp.htm>
- Fadini, U. – Zanini, A. (Eds., 2001), *Lessico Postfordista*, Feltrinelli, Milano.

- Florida, R. (2005), *The Flight of the Creative Class. The New Global Competition for Talent*, HarperCollins Publishers, New York.
- Gorz, A. (2003), *L'immatériel. Connaissance, valeur et capital*, Galilée, Paris.
- Harvey, D. (1990), *The Condition of Postmodernity: an Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Changes*, Blackwell, Cambridge.
- Leslie, L. L. – Slaughter, S. (1997), *Academic Capitalism. Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Marx, K. (1973), *Grundrisse. Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*, Vintage, New York.
- Micali, A. (2001), *Donne all'Università*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Mohanty, C. T. (1990), *On Race and Voice: Challenges for Liberal Education in the 1990s*, in *Cultural Critique*, n. 14, Winter 1989-90.
- Mohanty, C. T. (2003), *Feminism Without Borders. Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, Duke University Press, Durham.
- Mokyr, J. (2002), *The Gifts of Athena: Historical Origins of the Knowledge Economy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Nelson, C. (1997), *Between Crisis and Opportunity: The Future of the Academic Workplace*, in Nelson, C. (Ed.), *Will Teach For Food. Academic Labor in Crisis*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 3-31.
- Nonaka, I. – Takeuchi, H. (1995), *The Knowledge-Creating Company. How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Ong, A. (2006), *Neoliberalism as Exception. Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*, Duke University Press, Durham.
- Paletta, A. (2004), *Il governo dell'università*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Press, E. – Washburn, J. (2000), *The Kept University*, available at www.colorado.edu/Sociology/gimenez/papers/keptu.html
- Rete Universitaria (2003), *Fermare i saperi di guerra*, DeriveApprodi, Roma, March 2003.
- Rhoads, R. A. – Rhoades, G. (2006), *Graduate Student Unionization as a Postindustrial Social Movement: Identity, Ideology, and the Contested US Academy*, in Rhoads, R. A. – Torres, C. A. (Eds.), *The University, State, and Market. The Political Economy of Globalization in the Americas*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Roggero, G. (2005), *Intelligenze fuggitive. Movimenti contro l'università-azienda*, Manifestolibri, Roma.
- Roggero, G. et al. (2005), *Precariopoli. Parole e pratiche delle nuove lotte sul lavoro*, Manifestolibri, Roma.
- Ross, A. (2006), *Fast Boat to China: Corporate Flight and the Consequences of Free Trade; Lessons from Shanghai*, Pantheon Books, New York.

- Rossiter, N. (2006), *Organized Networks. Media Theory, Creative Labour, New Institutions*, NAI Publishers, Rotterdam.
- Sennet, R. (1998), *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*, Norton, New York.
- Stadtman, V. (1992), *United States*, in Clark, B. R. – Neave, G. (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education*, Pergamon Press, New York, 777-788.
- Trowler, P. (2003), *Il Regno Unito e lo "Spazio Europeo dell'Istruzione"*, in *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia*, n. 3, 357-370.
- Vaira, M. (2003), *Verso un'Università post-fordista?*, in *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia*, n. 3, 337-355.
- Vercellone, C. (Ed.) (2006), *Capitalismo cognitivo. Conoscenza e finanza nell'epoca postfordista*, Manifestolibri, Roma.
- Wilson, R. (2001), *Percentage of Part-Timers on College Faculties Holds Steady After Years of Big Gains*, in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 23, available at <http://chronicle.com/daily/2001/04/2001042301n.htm>

¹ The research on the Italian case is based on participant observation and qualitative interviews (April 2004-March 2006) with 6 scholars and 32 'precarious researchers' of the National Network of the Precarious Researchers in the universities of Milan, Bologna, Florence, Pisa, Rome, Naples, and Cosenza. The research on the US case is based on the participant observation and qualitative interviews (March-June 2006) with 8 scholars, and 22 graduate students and adjuncts (union activists and not) in the New York University, City University of New York, Columbia University, The New School, and Yale University.

² The first agreement was signed at the Sorbonne University in Paris in May 25 1998 by the Education Ministers of France, Italy, Great Britain, and Germany, then was widened to thirty countries at the Conference of Bologna in June 18 1999. Now there are forty-five countries involved in the *Bologna Process*, which also shows the weakness of the traditional ties between university and the nation-State.

³ Many analyses of the becoming productive force of the social knowledge use the famous Marx's *Grundrisse* (Marx 1973).

⁴ The data are referred to as 2004.

⁵ Before the Moratti Law, in Italy the faculty in role was composed by a first level (ordinaries), a second level (associates), and the researchers.

⁶ www.ricercatoriprecari.org

⁷ www.yaleunions.org/geso

⁸ www.2110uaw.org/gsoc

⁹ www.euromayday.org