

## **Annex I: Summary and main scientific conclusions of the Lisbon Kick-off Meeting.**

As a result of this meeting, the specific questions for each work package were developed and are listed below. These questions constitute the conceptual framework common to the whole project and will guide the research of WP1, WP2, WP3 and WP4; working group 5 will work on the coordination and dissemination of the results derived from each of these questions).

### **WP 1 QUESTIONS**

#### **1. What is the lexicography and etymology of failure?**

#### **2. What are the logical notes of the concept of failure?**

- Is failure an axiologically biased concept?
- Is it necessarily gradual?
- Is failure an event, an action, a state or a property?
- Does it require a prior teleological framework?
- Can an inanimate object or an animal fail?
- Does it necessarily involve a non-deterministic ontological framework, or can one think of a strongly mechanistic model that allows failure?
- Can a voluntary failure exist?

#### **3. What are the mechanisms of attribution, rejection and negotiation of failure?**

- From the naming word to the named experience..
- Failure as a fact and the experience of it.

#### **4. What is the iconography and symbolism of failure?**

- What has been the influence of the view of failure as falling/decay/corruption?
- Does failure lie in guilt and/or debt?
- What is the consideration of the shipwreck in terms of failure?
- Can failure be perceived as a decline?
- Why do the ruins implicitly denote failure?
- Should the idea of suicide and its materialization be seen as a failure?

### **WP 2 QUESTIONS**

#### **1. What are the mechanisms of attribution, negotiation and reversal of the failure label?**

- Where lies the standpoint that gives the label of failure? Plurality of attribution: weighting in its gradualness. Instances and processes of attribution, rejection and negotiation, and reversal.

- What formulas of negotiation are given to accept or reverse the label of failure?
- What are the attributes or descriptive elements of the failure label, according to each context and period?

## **2. How does the label of failure influence the individual's life trajectory?**

- Ways to quantify and qualitatively understand the processes of success and failure
- How does the individual perceive and interpret failure? How does he or she manage it?
- What are the factors, both endogenous and exogenous, that determine failure, either their own or attributed, and influence their behavior?
- Can failure be viewed in relative terms as a process for achieving decisive successes? Signs of honor and social recognition versus the label of failure in another field.
- Formulas used by the individual, by himself or herself or helped by interest groups or institutions, to reverse the failure and turn it into an opportunity.

## **3. How does individual failure manifest itself within a particular group or corporate structure?**

- How does the individual and the community interpret it?
- How does individual failure affect the group to which one belongs or the dependents, or the corresponding institution?

## **WP 3 QUESTIONS**

Among the main objectives of this WP is to investigate the relationship between individual and collective notions of failure, to understand the role of corporations and communities in defining success and failure, and to explain the historical evolution of certain groups and communities usually stigmatized as failures.

Achieving this objective requires, therefore, reflection on the characteristics of communities and the corporate in the era under study. The variety of terms and groups (body, community, congregation, republic, junta, city, village, caste, guild, confraternity, etc.) also forces us to ask what gives each group a sense of belonging: jurisdiction, history, theology, nature...? And who gives validity to the existence of such a group?

### **1. What are the mechanisms for identifying failed groups?**

- Are there any groups that present themselves or conceive themselves in a generic way as failures or successes?
- What are the groups most commonly identified as failures?

- Are there changes in that identification throughout history? What are the main patterns of that evolution?
- How do corporate structures, communal governance, jurisdictional plurality or notions of lineage affect the collective identification of failure?
- Are there specific concepts, between the 16th and 19th centuries, to designate collective failure?
- How are groups defined as failures presented? What is their stigma (racial, economic, cultural, social...), how is this stigma articulated with “desirable” values? Does the stigma condemn the whole group or are there mechanisms to escape it?
- Are there scales/levels/fields/fields of success and failure among the different groups, and is there a possibility of moving within those scales?
- What is the relationship between collective failure and social exclusion as a group?

## **2. What are the most common mechanisms and practices for assigning success or failure to groups?**

- How are the clichés, stereotypes and social archetypes of failed groups constructed?
- Which institutions (corporations, unions, communities, etc.) are involved in the assignment of the condition of success/failure and also in the definition of mobility strategies? Which criteria and processes do they respond to?
- How does individual failure relate to that of the community? To what extent does the community place limits on individual ambition? Can the community or corporation push for failure?
- Is it possible to speak of an individual failure in the strict sense or does all failure have a social and community component? Is that community or group component more accentuated in the modern age?
- How does the stability or instability of vertical (hierarchical) and horizontal (community) ties affect the perception of failure?
- How does failure affect membership or exclusion from a particular community or social group?

## **3. How do the narratives of failure operate in the ways of thinking, feeling and acting of the individual within the communal-collective project of which he is a part?**

- Can you think of a successful individual in a failed collective? And vice versa?
- Can we talk about groups that voluntarily and actively identify themselves as failures?
- How are labels of failure imposed from outside the community assumed or rejected?
- What are the community strategies for rejecting these labels of failure?

## WP4 QUESTIONS

The aim of this package is to analyze the notion of failure when used to designate “macro” or “supra” realities, larger and different from the individuals or communities analyzed in WP2 and 3. It therefore asks about the institutional semantics of failure as applied to empires, monarchies, republics, borders, governments, nations, etc.

### **1. What are the processes for attributing failure by means of both pragmatic factors and ideological legitimation from power?**

- What are the main sociological, political, philosophical and historical criteria used to define failure (cohesion, integration, disintegration, asymmetry, imbalance, degrees of effectiveness)?
- How do dynamics “from below” intervene along with vertical mechanisms of failure attribution?
- What are the political structures most commonly linked to the notion of failure?

### **2. What are the modes of negotiation for institutional/jurisdictional crises?**

- What ideological, symbolic and affective mechanisms are involved in these negotiations (respect for frameworks of privilege -particularisms-, governance of affections, common dynastic/economic/religious/strong/weak ties).
- What forms of the exercise of power correspond to periods of institutional failure? (soft, hard or intelligent power).
- What forms of reaction emerge in these negotiation processes? (resistances, *particularisms of* privileged groups).

### **3. What processes of reversibility, both at the pragmatic level and the symbolic resignification of institutions, took place during the 16th-19th centuries?**

- What examples of governance have succeeded in reversing situations of failure?
- Can a correlation be found with the contemporary notion of *resilience* in the period studied?
- How do the processes of transformation of symbolic capital (legitimation) converge with the practices of institutional reformism?