



This is a repository copy of *EXPRESS: Translating, co-creating, and performing: reflections on a 15-year journey for impact into the grand challenge of disaster insurance.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/206149/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Jarzabkowski, P. [orcid.org/0000-0001-8674-6628](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8674-6628), Bednarek, R. [orcid.org/0000-0001-8345-2106](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8345-2106), Chalkias, K. [orcid.org/0000-0001-5365-9579](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5365-9579) et al. (4 more authors) (2023) *EXPRESS: Translating, co-creating, and performing: reflections on a 15-year journey for impact into the grand challenge of disaster insurance.* Strategic Organization. ISSN 1476-1270

<https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270231218094>

---

Jarzabkowski, P., Bednarek, R., Chalkias, K., Cacciatori, E., Kavas, M., Krull, E., and Gallagher-Rodgers, R., *EXPRESS: Translating, co-creating, and performing: Reflections on a 15-year journey for impact into the grand challenge of disaster insurance*, Strategic Organization. Copyright © 2023 The authors. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270231218>. Article available under the terms of the CC-BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



**Translating, co-creating, and performing: Reflections on a 15-year journey for impact into the grand challenge of disaster insurance**

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Journal:         | <i>Strategic Organization</i>   |
| Manuscript ID    | SO-23-0257.R2   |
| Manuscript Type: | Special Issue: Impact-driven strategy research on grand challenges  |
| Keywords:        | Qualitative Methods < RESEARCH METHODS, Field research < RESEARCH METHODS, Knowledge creation < TOPICS AND PERSPECTIVES, Climate change < TOPICS AND PERSPECTIVES, Markets < TOPICS AND PERSPECTIVES  |
| Abstract:        | <p>The grand challenges society faces compel strategy and organization scholars to engage meaningfully with practice and contribute towards solution development. As global complexities escalate, the importance of addressing these challenges intensifies. While the notion of 'impact' in organization theory remains elusive, a recent surge in scholarly work highlights the tensions and challenges associated with conducting impact-driven research. In this essay, we reflect on our 15-year program of research into financial responses to disasters, illustrating the process of doing impact through activities of 'translating', 'co-creating', and 'performing'. We show how these activities fostered the emergence of new research questions, new collaborations, and novel impacts. Based on our journey, we generate four reflexive insights. Firstly, translating, co-creating, and performing are an iterative, rather than sequential, process in which these activities partly overlap and build cumulatively on each other. Secondly, a flexible yet robust impact object is crucial. Thirdly, while co-creation is indispensable, it is also, often, contentious. Lastly, impactful research necessitates humility, courage, and persistence.</p> |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Strategic Organization

1  
2  
3 **Translating, co-creating, and performing:**  
4 **Reflections on a 15-year journey for impact into the grand challenge of disaster**  
5 **insurance**  
6  
7

8  
9 **Authors\***  
10

11 **Paula Jarzabkowski**  
12 University of Queensland  
13 City, University of London  
14 [p.jarzabkowski@uq.edu.au](mailto:p.jarzabkowski@uq.edu.au)  
15

16  
17 **Rebecca Bednarek**  
18 Victoria University of Wellington  
19 [rebecca.bednarek@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:rebecca.bednarek@vuw.ac.nz)  
20

21 **Konstantinos Chalkias**  
22 Birkbeck, University of London  
23 [k.chalkias@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:k.chalkias@bbk.ac.uk)  
24

25  
26 **Eugenia Cacciatori**  
27 City, University of London  
28 [eugenia.cacciatori@city.ac.uk](mailto:eugenia.cacciatori@city.ac.uk)  
29

30  
31 **Mustafa Kavas**  
32 University of Sheffield  
33 [m.kavas@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:m.kavas@sheffield.ac.uk)  
34

35  
36 **Elisabeth Krull**  
37 University of Manchester  
38 [elisabeth.krull@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:elisabeth.krull@manchester.ac.uk)  
39

40  
41 **Rhianna Gallagher Rodgers**  
42 University of Queensland  
43 [rhianna.gallagher@business.uq.edu.au](mailto:rhianna.gallagher@business.uq.edu.au)  
44

45  
46 \*Authors are in order of their joining our team  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 **Translating, co-creating, and performing:**  
5 **Reflections on a 15-year journey for impact into the grand challenge of disaster insurance**

6  
7 **Abstract**

8  
9  
10 The grand challenges society faces compel strategy and organization scholars to engage  
11 meaningfully with practice and contribute towards solution development. As global  
12 complexities escalate, the importance of addressing these challenges intensifies. While the  
13 notion of ‘impact’ in organization theory remains elusive, a recent surge in scholarly work  
14 highlights the tensions and challenges associated with conducting impact-driven research. In  
15 this essay, we reflect on our 15-year program of research into financial responses to disasters,  
16 illustrating the process of doing impact through activities of ‘translating, ‘co-creating’, and  
17 ‘performing’. We show how these activities fostered the emergence of new research  
18 questions, new collaborations, and novel impacts. Based on our journey, we generate four  
19 reflexive insights. Firstly, translating, co-creating, and performing are an iterative, rather than  
20 sequential, process in which these activities partly overlap and build cumulatively on each  
21 other. Secondly, a flexible yet robust impact object is crucial. Thirdly, while co-creation is  
22 indispensable, it is also, often, contentious. Lastly, impactful research necessitates humility,  
23 courage, and persistence.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 **Introduction**

44  
45 Now in its 15<sup>th</sup> year, our research program focuses on the financial response to global  
46 disasters. When some of us first started engaging in this program of research, our dataset  
47 covered key disasters with profound impacts, such as the 2010 Chilean earthquake, the  
48 2010/11 New Zealand earthquakes, and the 2011 Japanese tsunami. Throughout our research,  
49 disasters gathered pace in terms of their frequency, severity, and the economic and social  
50 devastation they caused. Indeed, as we began writing this essay in 2022 the world was still  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 dealing with the aftermath of a COVID-19 pandemic, devastating floods in Pakistan, a year  
4  
5 of prolonged flooding across every state in Australia, and an ongoing drought-induced famine  
6  
7 in East Africa. As the context for our program of impactful research is the grand challenge  
8  
9 presented by a growing gap in the capacity of global (re)insurance markets to provide capital  
10  
11 for disaster response and reconstruction, many of these disasters that were ‘in the news’ over  
12  
13 this 15-year period became part of our dataset.  
14  
15

16  
17 Our area of study, the ‘insurance protection gap’—the difference between insured and  
18  
19 economic losses following disasters such as floods, wildfires, and tropical storms—  
20  
21 constitutes a grand challenge due to its sheer magnitude, inherent complexity, and pervasive  
22  
23 societal effects (Ferraro et al., 2015; Jarzabkowski et al., 2019, 2022). Without adequate  
24  
25 insurance, individuals and societies struggle to rebuild post-disaster, exacerbating inequality,  
26  
27 hardship, and financial exclusion for those suffering repeated uninsured disasters and setting  
28  
29 back economies, sometimes for decades (Carpenter et al., 2020; Clarke and Dercon, 2016).  
30  
31 As often occurs with grand challenges, despite increasing calls to action, and many multi-  
32  
33 stakeholder interventions, the insurance protection gap has escalated during our research  
34  
35 journey. For example, in 2023 insurers have stopped offering new disaster insurance policies  
36  
37 in California, multiple insurers have withdrawn or failed altogether in Florida (Flavelle et al.,  
38  
39 2023), and the disaster insurance protection gap in Canada is growing rapidly, due to  
40  
41 escalating losses from extreme weather (DePillis, 2023). As the effects of climate change  
42  
43 gathered pace, we both studied and also increasingly experienced disasters and the challenges  
44  
45 of insuring them. Extreme weather displaced our colleagues and neighbors from their homes,  
46  
47 and they could no longer insure themselves from floods, tropical storms, and wildfires. While  
48  
49 we had always intended to have impact, our experience of impact escalated as we became not  
50  
51 simply observers but participants in our field. Yet at the same time, the enormity of the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 challenge – complex, systemic, intractable, with no easy fixes – makes us feel both frustrated  
4  
5 by, and humble about, our potential for impact.  
6

7  
8 This paper draws from our 15-year journey of trying (struggling) to do impactful  
9  
10 research (Bednarek et al., 2023), to provide insights into the process of translating, co-  
11  
12 creating, and performing through which impact emerges (Bansal and Sharma, 2022; Reinecke  
13  
14 et al., 2022), and reflect critically on our experiences of that process. Undertaking research  
15  
16 that aims to have a meaningful impact, even as the problem under scrutiny continues to  
17  
18 deteriorate, can be disheartening. This sense of frustration arises not merely from the inherent  
19  
20 bleakness of the topic but from the realization that despite our scholarly efforts, the issue  
21  
22 remains stubbornly persistent and increasingly severe. This underscores the complexity and  
23  
24 intractability of grand challenges, which require innovative and systemic solutions beyond  
25  
26 the realm of many current interventions. Many scholars point to the tensions and difficulties  
27  
28 of engaging in impact (e.g., Sharma and Bansal, 2020b; Williams and Whiteman, 2021). In  
29  
30 this paper we draw from our experiences of these tensions. We begin by describing our  
31  
32 impact journey and our impact activities and outputs to date. Next, we revisit some key  
33  
34 concepts and activities that have emerged in the management literature that are then  
35  
36 embedded in a vignette to illustrate their iterative rather than sequential nature. Finally, we  
37  
38 provide four reflexive insights into: the iterative nature of impact activities; the importance of  
39  
40 developing a flexible yet robust impact object; the contentiousness of co-creation; and the  
41  
42 importance of courage, humility, and persistence in the face of intractable and deepening  
43  
44 problems.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 51 **An overview of our impact journey**

52  
53 This research began in 2009 to study changes in the global disaster reinsurance  
54  
55 market, which is the market that provides capital to pay for response, recovery, and  
56  
57 reconstruction in the aftermath of disasters, such as hurricanes, floods, earthquakes, wildfires,  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and droughts. Our research quickly evolved (2011-2015) as we recognized that profound  
4 changes were taking place that would affect the taken-for-granted availability of capital for  
5 disaster response and reconstruction. By 2016, our engagement with this research context and  
6 the challenges involved in providing financial protection from disaster had evolved to  
7 studying the insurance protection gap, which is the gap between economic and insured loss  
8 following disasters (Schanz and Wang, 2014). This gap was growing rapidly in both  
9 developing and advanced economies due to the increases in disaster risk generated by climate  
10 change, growing urbanization, and geopolitical instability (Kousky, 2022). By 2020, we had  
11 studied the 17 main government and market-based entities established to address this  
12 protection gap by providing disaster insurance to 49 countries around the world  
13 (Jarzabkowski et al., 2023). In 2020-2021 we used this knowledge and expertise to engage in  
14 a multi-stakeholder collaborative research project on addressing insurance protection gaps for  
15 pandemic risk (Jarzabkowski et al., 2020). And we are now engaged in research into how  
16 disaster risk reduction can be linked to sustainable and inclusive disaster insurance.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Throughout this process, as expected of a long-term program of research into a grand  
36 challenge (Ferraro et al., 2015; Sharma and Bansal, 2020a, 2020b), our research questions,  
37 participants, and indeed the research object have fundamentally evolved. The program of  
38 research was kept in play through over 20 linked and evolving research projects, some of  
39 which were small and funded by our workplaces or by industry sponsorship, and others of  
40 which were funded by research councils and research foundations. As we interacted ever  
41 more deeply with participants, we began to be invited to evaluate disaster insurance programs  
42 in different countries, to give evidence to governments seeking answers, and to be engaged in  
43 policy-informing bodies (see Table 1). This evolution not only reflects our deepening  
44 expertise in the complex, ever-evolving challenge of insuring disasters in the face of climate  
45 change, but also our growing credibility as recognized experts in the field. The number and  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 variety of our stakeholder engagements have steadily increased over time, revealing a broad  
4  
5 spectrum of perspectives and impacts related to these disasters.  
6

7  
8 Our research has always been guided by a desire to have impact, for three reasons.  
9  
10 First, demonstrating that we would provide practical outputs was important to establish and  
11  
12 maintain engagement with stakeholders. Our research requires access to insurance  
13  
14 organizations, development banks, humanitarian organizations, government finance and  
15  
16 environmental ministries, and emergency management and disaster response agencies.  
17  
18 Gaining access meant negotiating with high status participants (Ma et al., 2021) in often  
19  
20 politicized contexts. Access is rarely given by these participants on the basis of some vague  
21  
22 promises of advancing knowledge for the good of humanity. These interviewees challenge  
23  
24 and probe and expect to get something to help them think about the problems they face and  
25  
26 provide useful insights (Empson, 2018). They also have time frames that are much shorter  
27  
28 than academic publication cycles. So, providing some practically oriented outputs was an  
29  
30 important part of maintaining access and building respect and trust with our participants  
31  
32 (Wickert et al., 2021).  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 Second, practical outputs enabled us to engage deeply with phenomena (Jarzabkowski  
39  
40 et al., 2019). This direct engagement allowed us to see beyond theoretical understandings and  
41  
42 grapple with the complexities and nuances of real-world situations. Such immersion often  
43  
44 resulted in the emergence of new, previously unexplored questions. These questions  
45  
46 challenged the boundaries of our existing knowledge, prompting us to delve deeper into the  
47  
48 research context. Moreover, as we confronted these issues and developed a more intimate  
49  
50 understanding of their intricacies, we were struck by the need for significant change. This  
51  
52 realization did not merely increase our academic curiosity. It stirred in us a fervor to actively  
53  
54 participate in bringing about the changes we recognized as necessary.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 This fervor raises a third, critical motivation, which is our emotional responses to the  
4 challenge we were immersed in. Studying disasters that have enormous social and economic  
5 costs is unavoidably an emotional experience. As we observed the climate crisis eroding the  
6 taken-for-granted financial response of disaster insurance in ways that were creating and  
7 exacerbating inequality, often for the most vulnerable in society, we became increasingly  
8 passionate to raise awareness, and to be part of the urgently needed changes. This, more than  
9 anything – certainly more than the pathways to impact required by funding councils –  
10 became our key motivation for impact. We were no longer satisfied with being mere  
11 observers; we yearned to play a part in shaping the solutions to the grand challenge we were  
12 studying.

### INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

#### Have we had impact?

13  
14  
15 It is always possible to debate whether research has had impact. The Research  
16 Excellence Framework of the UK defines impact “as an effect on, change or benefit to the  
17 economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life,  
18 beyond academia” (REF, 2021). Based on this definition, research is impactful only when it  
19 is adopted (has effects, changes, or benefits) in practice. Yet this, at best, overlooks the  
20 longer-term contributions of theory to practice (Reinecke et al., 2022), and at worst, excludes  
21 as irrelevant any research that does not immediately change policy or practice. We have  
22 known the science of climate change for decades even as global warming escalates  
23 (Hoffman, 2021). This is not because climate scholars do irrelevant research or fail to have a  
24 clear pathway to impact. Rather, impact is multifaceted and politicized. There are many  
25 incumbent, inertial, interdependent, interdisciplinary, and institutionalized factors within  
26 which it is difficult to create change, even if research could provide a very clear answer to the  
27 grand challenges facing society. While in recent years the notion of research impact has

1  
2  
3 begun to be more clearly delineated and has been judged according to criteria developed by  
4  
5 universities and funding bodies, we feel that impact still remains somewhat elusive. Hence, to  
6  
7 substantiate that our work has been impactful – a prerequisite for reflecting on what we have  
8  
9 learned about the impact process – we simply note that our research has met the criteria for  
10  
11 impact from multiple different perspectives. That is, our research has comprised impact cases  
12  
13 within our universities, won impact awards and, as illustrated in Table 1, has produced  
14  
15 multiple forms of the educational and scholarly impact detailed by Wickert et al. (2021).  
16  
17 Beyond such substantiating of impact for external evaluation, we also *believe* that our  
18  
19 research is impactful. We have seen industry participants and leaders engage deeply with our  
20  
21 work and frameworks; using them as ‘conceptual’ tools to support their understanding and  
22  
23 assessment, as ‘instrumental’ tools in their decision-making process, and as ‘legitimative’  
24  
25 tools to gain acceptance for their decisions (Nicolai and Seidl, 2010). Having described our  
26  
27 impact journey, activities, and outputs, we now briefly review the existing team literature to  
28  
29 set the stage for our reflections.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

### 35 36 **What is Impact? A Brief Review**

37  
38 The question of what ‘impact’ is and how best to deliver it has become prominent  
39  
40 within management research, partly because of the growing importance of impact as a  
41  
42 performance criterion for the evaluation of universities and individual academics (Harley and  
43  
44 Fleming, 2021; Reinecke et al., 2022). Increasingly, impact has come to mean academic  
45  
46 research having relatively immediate practical relevance for managerial decision-making  
47  
48 (Cohen 2007; Starkey and Madan, 2001). In particular, the literature on impact calls for the  
49  
50 practitioner voice to be incorporated into research conversations (Bartunek and Rynes, 2014),  
51  
52 for deep research engagement with practitioners (Williams and Whiteman, 2021), for  
53  
54 research puzzles to be a collective inquiry between researchers and the practitioners who  
55  
56 experience them (Chen et al., 2022), and reimagining of business schools to better  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 accommodate new forms of partnerships and training (Hoffman, 2021; Starkey and Madan,  
4  
5 2001). Building on these calls, Bansal and Sharma (2022) present a framework of three, often  
6  
7 discrete, activities for doing impact, translating, co-creating, and performing, which we now  
8  
9 explain.

10  
11  
12 *Translating* means shifting research findings from the realm of scientific debate to the  
13  
14 realm of managerial action, often through diagnostic tools and explanatory frameworks  
15  
16 (Jarzabkowski and Wilson, 2006; Pollock and D'Adderio, 2012). In practice, this means  
17  
18 academics making research accessible for a managerial audience by translating it into  
19  
20 practitioner language with minimal or no academic jargon. Crucially, it also means rewriting  
21  
22 and communicating findings in a way that allows managers to fit the knowledge into the  
23  
24 specific context of their organizations and make it actionable (Bartunek and Rynes, 2014;  
25  
26 Kelemen and Bansal, 2002). Translation work increases the uptake of research outside the  
27  
28 scientific community. However, as many scholars note, it often comes with tensions. For  
29  
30 example, Rynes et al. (2007) explore the translation of HR topics into practitioner journals  
31  
32 and find that the topics researchers believe are most important are barely covered. After a  
33  
34 long and often exhausting research process, it can be difficult to engage in additional work to  
35  
36 develop multiple versions of the same paper for different audiences (Bansal and Sharma,  
37  
38 2022; Bartunek and Rynes, 2014). Especially as this work is mostly unpaid and rarely  
39  
40 rewarded within academic institutions (Bansal and Sharma, 2022; Williams and Whiteman,  
41  
42 2021); even though doing it well often requires costly support, such as hiring translators to  
43  
44 help market the knowledge (Walsh et al., 2007). Despite these challenges, efforts at  
45  
46 translation and knowledge transfer can be rewarding (Williams and Whiteman, 2021)  
47  
48 because they support both dissemination and instrumental use of scholarly research  
49  
50 (Reinecke et al., 2022).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In *co-creating* researchers actively involve practitioners in the research process, such  
4 as in the formulation and evolution of research questions. Co-creation does not privilege the  
5 academic as the producer and translator of knowledge, but rather identifies impact as an issue  
6 of knowledge co-production (Bansal and Sharma, 2022; Reinecke et al., 2022). Examples  
7 include workshops where academics and practitioners construct research questions or  
8 interpret data together (Sharma and Bansal, 2020a). Co-creation does not simply mean  
9 developing answers to research questions of interest to managers. Not all managerial  
10 questions are relevant for research, sometimes because there are already well-known answers  
11 in the literature of which managers are unaware (Jarzabkowski et al., 2010). Rather,  
12 “practitioners become co-researchers, and researchers become co-practitioners” (Shotter,  
13 2006: 601), as they engage in co-creating the problems that are interesting to explore.  
14 Williams and Whiteman (2021) call such co-creation “deep engagement” as co-creation is  
15 not a ‘one-off’ but needs to be immersive and ongoing. Co-creating is “a radically different  
16 style of knowledge production” (Huff, 2000a: 288) based on collaborative scholarship (Van  
17 de Ven, 2007), where practitioners are engaged early in the research process (Ferrero et al.,  
18 2015; Wickert et al., 2021), and remain engaged over the duration of the research. This  
19 approach can enable problem-driven research focused on ‘what is important’ (and practically  
20 impactful), produce research aimed at intervention in a field, or even underpin scientific  
21 activism (Delmestri, 2022; Reinecke et al., 2022). Importantly for research into grand  
22 challenges, co-creation is not simply aimed at working with managers on immediate and  
23 utilitarian questions and answers (Chen et al., 2022) but on producing solutions and societal  
24 changes based on theorizing from research (Reinecke et al., 2022).

25  
26 In *performing* researchers actively engage in “responsive thinking, acting, and  
27 talking” within their research settings, rather than being outside observers (Shotter, 2006:  
28 585). Performing with a field is not simply utilitarian, enabling managers to act upon their

1  
2  
3 immediate problems. Rather, scholars engage practitioners in reflexive action that enables  
4  
5 them to observe and critique the problems they face (Alvesson and Spicer, 2012), that might  
6  
7 otherwise not be visible to them. Indeed, scholars may become activists to draw attention to  
8  
9 and prompt reflexive action by practitioners (Delmestri, 2022). For example, Williams and  
10  
11 Whiteman (2021) describe the experience of being unable to gain access to the World  
12  
13 Economic Forum's (WEF) annual meeting for five years. They, therefore, pitched a tent  
14  
15 outside and assembled Arctic scientists, heads of state, activists, actors, artists, and  
16  
17 organizational networks. In establishing this tent and attracting a multi-stakeholder team,  
18  
19 known as Arctic Basecamp, they aimed to prompt action to combat climate change. Together,  
20  
21 these stakeholders actively performed work of raising awareness about the risks of changes in  
22  
23 the Arctic to inspire further action. Sharma et al. (2022) discuss performing through their  
24  
25 Innovation Lab, in which practitioner and researchers work through wicked problems  
26  
27 together, enabling and, indeed, urging them to understand and resolve problems collectively.  
28  
29 Reinecke et al. (2022) go beyond these practical aspects of performing to also point to the  
30  
31 longer-term performativity of the theories that we develop. Theories that take hold, such as  
32  
33 economic models that guide policy (e.g., Ferraro et al., 2005), or theories that expose hidden  
34  
35 structures of domination, such as those aimed at decolonization (e.g., Cutcher et al., 2020),  
36  
37 can play a role in constructing and reconstructing the social world. These impactful effects of  
38  
39 theory that fall within the realm of scholarly impact (Wickert et al., 2021), are often longer-  
40  
41 term (Reinecke et al., 2022).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 Complex societal problems are dynamic with continuously unfolding phenomena that  
51  
52 may add to wider challenges. For research to stay relevant (and thus impactful), research  
53  
54 questions need to evolve in collaboration with practitioners (Chen et al., 2022; Sharma et al.,  
55  
56 2022). However, most studies with impact are based on accounts of discrete research projects  
57  
58 (e.g., Sharma and Bansal, 2020a). Even where practitioners and scholars co-create research  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 questions, the time needed to analyze and theorize from data for publication, means that the  
4  
5 work on one project may have become past knowledge by the time it is translated for  
6  
7 practitioner audiences (Williams and Whiteman, 2021), particularly where translation occurs  
8  
9 *after* academic publications. Bansal and Sharma (2022), therefore, argue that the three  
10  
11 approaches to doing impact have different temporalities located in distinct moments of a  
12  
13 research project. Co-creation and translation rely mostly on past knowledge. Problems that  
14  
15 are urgent, even though they might take place within the wider context of a long-term grand  
16  
17 challenge, require a shift to performing, in which achieving practical impact takes the front  
18  
19 seat in terms of focus and outputs, with academic knowledge development following later  
20  
21 (Reinecke et al., 2022; Wickert et al., 2021). We now explain our own experience of  
22  
23 translating, co-creating, and performing as interrelated, rather than discrete, activities within a  
24  
25 processual pattern of impact over time. We build on these scholars, drawing from our own  
26  
27 experience to extend understanding of long-term impact by unpacking its iterative nature  
28  
29 across multiple projects within a research program.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

### 35 36 **Reflecting on our impact journey**

37  
38 As we made our impact journey, we had no blueprint to follow for ‘success’. While  
39  
40 we had engaged with and actively contributed to the academic conventions for impact, such  
41  
42 as submitting impact cases for our universities (REF, 2021), hosting impact-related  
43  
44 workshops (Organization Studies Summer Workshop, 2007), editing special issues on impact  
45  
46 (Jarzabkowski et al., 2010), and winning prizes for impact (ESRC, 2013), this did not dictate  
47  
48 our path-to-impact. Rather, we were building from our prior field experiences and learning as  
49  
50 we went. We therefore present two vignettes based on our experiences, using them as the  
51  
52 basis for four reflexive insights on what we are learning about the iterative process of impact.  
53  
54 The first vignette tells the story of how our impact object (Sharma and Bansal, 2020a), a  
55  
56 framework composed of the concept ‘Protection Gap Entity (PGE)’ and set of associated  
57  
58  
59  
60

1:

1  
2  
3 tools to help explain and diagnose the activities of these PGEs, was developed, contributed to  
4  
5 giving us legitimacy, and then helped us discover and engage with new phenomena.  
6  
7

### 8 **Vignette: Translating, co-creating, and performing an impact object**

9 Our research into how different countries were addressing the insurance protection gap  
10 aimed to provide both theoretical and practical insights. One of our goals was  
11 developing an industry report that would make the results of our research accessible  
12 and usable to practitioners and policy makers [Translating].  
13  
14

15  
16 Two years into our fieldwork, we felt that we had generated some robust insights and  
17 decided to communicate these back to the field. Based on our previous experience of  
18 translating research into practitioner reports (see Table 1), we thought our results  
19 would lend themselves to the production of what we called ‘diagnostic tools’  
20 embedded within the impact report. These tools are typically a set of linked  
21 frameworks under a thematic heading, that can be used by professionals to diagnose,  
22 discuss, and act upon their contexts (see, for example, Jarzabkowski et al., 2012). Over  
23 the course of a few months, we discussed how to translate our (interim) findings into  
24 themes that practitioners would find interesting and valuable. We spent time drawing  
25 frameworks on whiteboards and considering how they might support diagnosis of, and  
26 action on, the challenge we had been studying. The close working relationships with  
27 practitioners led us to engage them in discussions over some of these frameworks  
28 during our meetings and informal chats [co-creating]. This enabled us to evaluate our  
29 frameworks in the field, both for their ability to encompass the problem, and their  
30 value to our participants for working through the complex challenges they faced.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Through co-creating the diagnostic tools for translation, we realized that we needed a  
38 new, field-relevant but also conceptual label for the varied disaster insurance  
39 interventions we were studying in different countries. This would help our participants  
40 to conceptualize them differently. Otherwise, they became stuck in considering the  
41 specific issues in their local area, rather than considering them in the context of a global  
42 problem for disaster insurance. It also helped practitioners to recognize other, similar  
43 interventions that, at the surface would seem unrelated (e.g., terrorism), but in essence  
44 had strong similarities with the problem at hand (e.g., flooding or cyclones). We coined  
45 a new term, Protection Gap Entity (PGE), which we defined as a not-for-profit  
46 insurance scheme that is brought about through multi-stakeholder interaction and  
47 government legislation, to provide insurance protection in a country for a specific  
48 disaster that would not be insurable in the private sector. As one key stakeholder noted  
49 of our PGE concept and associated diagnostic tools *“you’ve got all these different*  
50 *examples from around the world dealing with different types of peril, originating at*  
51 *different times in different circumstances, yet the work you and your colleagues have*  
52 *been able to do is to sort of conceptualize that actually here are the models and here*  
53 *are the drivers”* (CEO of professional association).  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Having established the value of the PGE term and diagnostic tools for helping our collaborators conceptualize ways to address the broader problem with lack of adequate disaster insurance, we held a launch event for our industry report, to disseminate and debate our findings to practitioners [Translating]. We included expert panels with stakeholders from different perspectives on, and involvement in, the grand challenge we were studying. These panels included stakeholders from the insurance industry, development banks, donor agencies, and government ministries around the world. As these stakeholders would not typically meet in their everyday work, we ran the launch as a debate between them on different themes in the report. This debate was both an opportunity for the participants to think differently about their problem, and also helped fuel our research questions. Essentially, our report launch was a field-configuring event at which the participants could reflect and debate together, providing both them and us with new insights into the problem [Co-creating and Performing]. One point raised became particularly resonant to us, as the participants discussed whether and how PGEs should evolve to address the growing problem of uninsurable disasters in their countries. A CEO of one PGE argued that PGEs had a responsibility to evolve, “[it is] about creating the context in which the insurance market can evolve [...] through resilience [...] or through other activities over time that will significantly reduce uninsurability”. Others, particularly those from the for-profit insurance market were less enamored, stating that PGEs should only plug gaps in the private market, but not evolve or expand. One private-sector insurance CEO told us that PGE evolution was a matter of “*scope creep, managerial ambition*” rather than improved disaster protection, claiming that “[a PGE’s] number one mission, however it’s dressed-up, is to continue to survive and to grow their sphere of influence”.

The differences set the stage for further inquiries as we followed up with the different stakeholders. Ultimately, this led us to expand our research program and research questions to capture how and why PGEs were evolving to face future disasters, and the barriers they faced. Bringing together these different stakeholders with whom we had worked also deepened our relationships with them and our embeddedness in the field. For example, we were invited to join some industry advisory groups, such as a donor-funded initiative to provide advocacy and technical support for disaster protection in low-income economies, and an OECD Board looking at management of disaster risk in OECD countries. We sat on international panels where people debated the value of PGEs – some strongly denying their value, while others advocated for them as a source of protection in the face of increasing disaster. In 2020, as the COVID-19 pandemic exposed the problems of systemic risk for insurance, we became part of an industry working party looking at ways to form a PGE for pandemic, in the process developing our PGE framework (comprised of the PGE concept and the associated diagnostic tools) into new ways of understanding systemic risk (e.g., Jarzabkowski et al., 2021; Schanz et al., 2021). Our ongoing work of translating and

1  
2  
3 co-creating had led us into activities where we collaborated with stakeholders in  
4 shaping the future of this unfolding grand challenge [Performing].  
5  
6  
7

8 We now discuss two reflexive insights arising from our experience. These insights are  
9  
10 not developed solely from the incidents highlight in the vignette. Rather, the vignette is a  
11  
12 means to illustrate some of our ongoing reflections.  
13  
14

15 ***Reflexive Insight 1: Translating, co-creating, and performing are iterative.***  
16

17 Our research across several projects over 15 years allows us to elaborate on the  
18  
19 dynamics of translating, co-creating, and performing. In our experience, these are not  
20  
21 necessarily occurring at “different moments of time” (e.g., Bansal and Sharma, 2022: 831), or  
22  
23 as distinct pathways to impact (e.g., Reinecke et al., 2022). While some studies show  
24  
25 moments of co-creation or translation at points within a process (e.g., Sharma and Bansal,  
26  
27 2020a, 2020b), we experienced them as overlapping and iterative work aimed at  
28  
29 understanding a challenge and supporting action upon it. The process of creating impact is  
30  
31 iterative and cumulative, with different forms of impact (Wickert et al., 2021) and types of  
32  
33 impact work (Bansal and Sharma, 2022) building upon each other over time and evolving  
34  
35 across several projects within a program of research. Separation of impact work into types is  
36  
37 conceptually convenient for explaining the various activities and tasks associated with  
38  
39 impact. However, our first reflexive insight for those embarking upon an impact journey is to  
40  
41 expect to be engaged in these activities within a non-linear, shifting, and messy process of  
42  
43 building impact and impactful outputs (Wickert et al., 2021) over time.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Our impact pattern suggests making the most of opportunities as they emerge and  
50  
51 knitting together the various work and forms of impact produced to build and deepen impact  
52  
53 over time, and over multiple projects. The questions that are co-created, the research  
54  
55 activities that are performed, and the emerging answers that are translated do not start anew  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 each time. Rather, they are part of an ongoing renewal of engagement with and impact in a  
4 field and the challenges that it faces. This perspective on impact is not about building neat  
5 links between specific impact events or inputs (such as co-creation) and resultant clear  
6 outputs (such as translated industry reports). This iterative process is even more evident as we  
7 move from individual projects to our overarching and unfolding program of research. To  
8 illustrate, let us point to the examples of our impact in Table 1. While we have been writing  
9 industry reports and holding industry events since 2010, these outputs are not best understood  
10 as separate, stand-alone incidents of impact on specific parts of an industry. Rather, they are  
11 part of a stream of impacts that are connected to the wider policy conversations the team is  
12 now having about financial and physical protection from disaster in the context of climate  
13 change. Similarly, as indicated in the vignette reference to our 2012 experiences of  
14 developing frameworks, our seemingly expansive global conversations with industry,  
15 government and inter-governmental actors that are ongoing today cannot be understood  
16 without tracing this unfolding pattern of impact to those initial reports and discussions with  
17 reinsurance practitioners. This messy, emergent pattern of engagement that we explain is  
18 implicated within multiple forms and ways of doing impact.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 ***Reflexive Insight 2: A flexible yet robust impact object is important.***

42 Many scholars have noted the importance of objects in knowledge creation (e.g.,  
43 Carlile, 2002; Dougherty, 2004; Nicolini et al., 2012). Sharma and Bansal (2020a) point to  
44 the importance of objects, such as jointly developed PowerPoint slides or drawings, in  
45 knowledge co-creation between academics and practitioners. They note that objects generated  
46 through dialogic exchange between researchers and their participants are incomplete and  
47 evolving but can be taken by each party into their own thought worlds. Our experience goes  
48 beyond these dynamics, echoing work in the social studies of science, which argues that  
49 objects that become adopted and impact how scientific work is done are heterogeneous,  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 binding concepts (Star and Griesemer, 1989). As our vignette shows, our impact object – the  
4  
5 PGE concept with its specific techniques and tools – was both flexible enough to  
6  
7 accommodate local concerns (and thus be used by practitioners) but robust enough that it  
8  
9 remained recognizable across different applications (Fujimura, 1992). In our pursuit to  
10  
11 articulate our findings and make them usable, we standardized our language, ensuring that  
12  
13 our terminology, especially surrounding the PGE, was backed not just by the term itself but  
14  
15 by a comprehensive report and a suite of standardized diagnostic tools. This not only  
16  
17 provided context for action but also ensured that once adopted, the term could be used with  
18  
19 all the associated meanings and intentions we have embedded within it. Yet, as with any  
20  
21 robust and flexible concept, its adoption by different audiences might – and did – lead to uses  
22  
23 we never envisioned.  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 We had been studying forms of intervention on insurance protection gaps in multiple  
29  
30 countries around the world. We developed our impact object because it was difficult to lift  
31  
32 conversations with our participants beyond their specific contexts (e.g., gaps in insurance for  
33  
34 UK flood, Californian earthquake, or Australian terrorism), in which they were undoubtedly  
35  
36 experts. To move our translation of those specific contexts into co-creation across contexts,  
37  
38 we needed a conceptual impact object that, while faithful to each group’s local experience,  
39  
40 could also serve as a common focal point for examining their most salient challenges. The  
41  
42 PGE concept and associated tools in our initial report became that object. While it was  
43  
44 partial, evolving and co-created between us and our various participants at the outset, once  
45  
46 formalized and translated in a report with associated diagnostic tools (Jarzabkowski et al.,  
47  
48 2018), it became part of performing the field, beyond our co-creation. For example, it was  
49  
50 cited in government terrorism insurance legislation (Australian Terrorism Insurance Act,  
51  
52 2018), as part of a European Commission report on nuclear liabilities (EC, 2020), and  
53  
54 published by practitioners for their purposes and audiences (Intelligent Insurer, 2018). In  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 other words, our PGE framework (the PGE concept and its associated tools) became an  
4  
5 object with a life of its own, adopted in different contexts and for different conceptual,  
6  
7 instrumental and legitimative reasons (Nicolai and Seidl, 2010), and yet maintaining  
8  
9 sufficient integrity to be recognizable.  
10

11  
12 Our second reflection, therefore, is that translation is not a discrete, post-publication  
13  
14 activity that is ‘safeguarded’ by the publication process (Harley and Cornelissen, 2019).  
15  
16 Rather, the objects produced in translation are heterogeneous in their uses and can become  
17  
18 part of performing the field even before the first publication. This adds value to the research  
19  
20 team in understanding and validating their findings but also comes with deep responsibility.  
21  
22 While our field assumes that the objects in a published article are ‘rigorous’ because they  
23  
24 have been through the hurdles of the publication process (Harley and Cornelissen, 2019;  
25  
26 Jarzabkowski and Wilson, 2006; Pettigrew, 2001), a translated object is different. First, it is  
27  
28 not primarily a statement of fact (although it is built on scientifically-inferred ‘facts’) but a  
29  
30 tool for managers to see the world in a different way in a way that stimulates their own  
31  
32 reflective processes. The value of ideas and concepts in seeing differently is one of the most  
33  
34 important forms of impact by university research, one in which academic research adds value  
35  
36 to the experiential knowledge of managers (James March in Huff, 2000b). The CEO quote in  
37  
38 the above vignette is a confirmation of the value of our impact object to managers. Second,  
39  
40 because it is different in nature, an impact object has gone through a different, co-created  
41  
42 process of validation. That process puts impact objects through different rigors (Harley and  
43  
44 Cornelissen, 2019); those of the field, exposing them to criticism and insight from multiple  
45  
46 different angles, so that, as a team of scholars, you can be confident in the robustness and  
47  
48 generativity of the objects co-created and translated, despite the subsequent criticisms and  
49  
50 consequences that these objects may undergo as they become part of performing the field.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 We now present a second vignette, in which we note that efforts at impact and the  
4  
5 objects created in those efforts may be contentious, with implications for both the iterative  
6  
7 process of doing impactful research, and for the motivations of the researchers engaged. We  
8  
9 use this second vignette as the basis for two further reflective insights.  
10  
11

### 12 **Vignette: Impact and its Objects are Contentious**

13 The 2018 event around our PGE object (report containing the PGE framework and  
14 diagnostic tools) helped us further co-create the research problems we were studying,  
15 in the process bringing in more stakeholders. While PGEs were already phenomena in  
16 the world, our impact object gave voice to them by bringing a wider set of stakeholders  
17 together to interact over their role in public fora. These stakeholders, who would not  
18 routinely interact with each other, held different viewpoints on PGEs, which then came  
19 to the surface. Some stakeholders, particularly from private-sector incumbents, were  
20 adamant that they were a disruption to the market and should be avoided. For example,  
21 one such stakeholder noted that “*we were extremely unhappy about them [PGEs] and*  
22 *so we made clear we would, you know, fight them tooth and nail*”. Others considered  
23 that a PGE should only be a last resort – such as for the collapse of the terrorism  
24 insurance market after the attacks on the World Trade Centre. As another such  
25 stakeholder noted, pointing to a major flood insurance PGE in one country, PGEs  
26 should be avoided because they could have unintended consequences; “*we’re not*  
27 *having anything that might end up like the [country] system. We’re well aware of the*  
28 *[country] system as well and we’re not aiming to copy it*”. The phenomena we had  
29 labeled and made into a common object for discussion was contentious for the  
30 stakeholders we had drawn together, some of whom were happy to take issue with our  
31 findings. Fortunately, our impact journey to date had already prepared us for the  
32 inevitability of our impact object developing a life of its own while performing in the  
33 field, as practitioners attempted to deploy it in support of their own agenda.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 In 2015, we released a book titled *Making a Market for Acts of God* (Jarzabkowski et  
40 al., 2015), based on our study of the profound changes in the global reinsurance market  
41 that pays for recovery from many of the local disasters around the world. The  
42 underlying research had been developed through the iterative process described in  
43 Reflexive Insight 1. The book had then been written as a crossover text, suitable for an  
44 academic audience but also intended to be insightful for an informed lay audience. In  
45 our penultimate chapter, we developed a nuanced reflection on the potentially  
46 problematic implications of capital changes, particularly the entry of catastrophe bonds,  
47 into the reinsurance market. We were slightly bemused, if pleased, to see it written up  
48 on the front page of the Financial Times as “Catastrophe deals threaten reinsurance  
49 sector collapse”. It seemed that those three to four pages of our book had been taken  
50 out of context to write a headline-grabbing story. Consistent with our insights on impact  
51 objects, we were confident that the findings had been subjected to the rigors of co-  
52 creating, translating, and performing impact work over several years, and were robust.  
53 We, therefore, hoped the media attention would attract people to read the book and  
54 learn more about how to sustain this very important yet hidden industry. It certainly did  
55 attract attention! Five days later, the headline on the front page of the Financial Times  
56 was “Catastrophe bonds pioneer hits back at book”, as the CEO of a hedge fund  
57  
58  
59  
60

1'

1  
2  
3 declared that “the business school analysis that warns of dangers in the market reaches  
4 ‘completely false’ conclusions.”  
5

6  
7 Obviously, it is very disturbing to be publicly attacked by powerful incumbents who  
8 may view a grand challenge, or the solutions to it, in very different ways. While the  
9 nuanced, thoughtful debate at our book launch a few weeks later helped us to  
10 understand the value of our research to the various industry stakeholders, including  
11 many incumbents, it also made us reflect on who and what we were trying to impact.  
12 We began to see strong reactions to our impact efforts as generative of new research  
13 questions. This experience prepared us to value the 2018 reactions to our PGE object  
14 as an important stimulus for further impactful research. We now draw from the  
15 incidents recounted in this vignette, which illuminates the often-contentious nature of  
16 impactful research, to offer two further reflexive insights.  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 ***Reflexive Insight 3: Co-creation is both contentious and essential.***  
22

23 The contentious nature of some of our efforts has led us to reflect on the work of co-  
24 creation, which we find to be contentious but also essential. First, while many impact studies  
25 note the tensions between academics and practitioners during co-creation (e.g., Sharma and  
26 Bansal, 2020a, 2020b), fewer note the tensions between the practitioners themselves within  
27 the focal context for impact. Any grand challenge will attract multiple viewpoints on ways  
28 forward (Couture et al., 2023; Jarzabkowski et al., 2022; Williams et al., 2019). As others  
29 have shown, on challenges such as climate change, incumbents find it difficult to consider  
30 anything that goes beyond business-as-usual (Wright and Nyberg, 2017). Co-creation is thus  
31 not just a matter of reconciling tensions between researchers and practitioners, difficult as  
32 that may be, but also of working out the researchers’ own stance on the tensions between  
33 practitioners. A key aspect of this insight, therefore, is not to confuse co-creation with  
34 consensus. While there will be tensions between practitioner and researchers (Sharma and  
35 Bansal, 2020a, 2020b), and between the practitioners themselves, reconciling these tensions  
36 within co-creation is not always necessary, or even desirable. Rather, topics where some  
37 participants vehemently oppose solutions proposed by others may very well be the areas  
38 where impact-oriented research is most needed, even if its conduct proves challenging.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Indeed, the resistance to PGE evolution by some stakeholders, particularly insurance industry  
4 incumbents, guided our evolving research agenda, as we began to look at the rationales for  
5 and barriers to PGE evolution, including how to address the dysfunctional unintended  
6 consequences that incumbents often used as a reason to dismiss PGEs as a viable solution to  
7 the insurance crisis (Jarzabkowski et al., 2023).  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Second, while co-creation is contentious it is also essential, as changes to grand  
16 challenges will involve at least some input from, or effect upon, the incumbents, not least in  
17 changing their own attitudes and actions. Co-creation thus demands that researchers both  
18 work with practitioners' interests in developing the research questions but also maintain  
19 integrity, ensuring they are not swayed by dominant stakeholders' interests. This dimension  
20 of co-creation requires a delicate balance, as researchers need to uphold their scientific  
21 principles while ensuring their continued access to the fields they scrutinize. Many  
22 researchers operate within existing power structures, needing to find a balance in "speaking  
23 science to power" (Williams & Whiteman, 2021) whilst also maintaining access to the very  
24 power structures that they seek to change. Yet it is important to understand that impactful  
25 science is not impartial. While we should strive for responsible advocacy from our research,  
26 the problems to which we will dedicate our energy for impact are likely to be those where we  
27 have already taken a stance as part of our interest in addressing them (Schmidt, 2015).  
28 Sometimes, therefore, as with Whiteman's establishment of the Artic Basecamp (see  
29 Williams and Whiteman, 2021), the most impactful problems to study are those that are too  
30 contentious to find a point of co-creation within existing power structures, leading to our final  
31 reflection.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 ***Reflexive Insight 4: Impactful research requires courage, persistence, and humility.***  
55

56 We have been working in this field for 15 years. Beyond the evidence of our impact  
57 as measured by evaluating bodies, the processes that we describe above give us confidence  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 that we have had impact, if nothing else because our results were controversial and stimulated  
4  
5 debate among industry participants. Nonetheless, as we outlined at the start, the problem we  
6  
7 are studying – the retreat of disaster insurance in the face of extreme weather – has worsened.  
8  
9  
10 And that worsening brings negative consequences such as delayed post-disaster recovery and  
11  
12 reconstruction, insecure housing, widening inequality, financial exclusion, and huge  
13  
14 emotional and social costs to society. Those consequences, with real effects on lives in the  
15  
16 communities where we live, are emotionally difficult to behold. Yet we cannot change them  
17  
18 solely through our research. Not because we do not have impact, but because the intractable  
19  
20 (systemic, wicked, grand) challenges that we are addressing are themselves evolving (Ferraro  
21  
22 et al., 2015; Schad and Bansal, 2018). Our final insight, therefore, is that impact scholars  
23  
24 need humility about their ability to generate change, alongside the courage to persist and to  
25  
26 keep looking for new ways to co-create and perform potential solutions with an ever-wider  
27  
28 group of stakeholders.  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 As our second vignette shows, courage is needed to keep trying to impact systems,  
34  
35 policies, and people that can be vocal in their resistance to change. As many have noted, the  
36  
37 traditional academic system does not always reward impact activities (e.g., Bansal & Shamra,  
38  
39 2022; Baudoin et al., 2022; Bednarek et al., 2023), whilst overlooking the fact that the  
40  
41 practitioner world may also not reward efforts at impact, and the personal costs to the  
42  
43 researcher might be high. This may mean turning our attention, as scholars with a passion for  
44  
45 impact, towards including other, perhaps initially peripheral, stakeholders with whom to co-  
46  
47 create that impact. This search for alternative stakeholders in co-creation has become  
48  
49 important to us, as, despite our engagement within and impact in the field, the problem of  
50  
51 uninsurable disaster risk has kept growing. We have thus begun shifting our focus to the links  
52  
53 between insurance systems, PGEs, and climate adaptation (Jarzabkowski et al., 2023). In  
54  
55 doing so, we are persisting with our focus on the challenge of the growing insurance  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

2:

1  
2  
3 protection gap, and with our engagement with the incumbent insurance system, even as we  
4  
5 also bring it into dialogue with wider parts of the system we hope to impact (Bednarek et al.,  
6  
7 2021), such as disaster risk reduction agencies, government-funded resilience initiatives, and  
8  
9 community resilience initiatives (Jarzabkowski, Mason, Meissner, et al., 2023). In these  
10  
11 endeavors, we are humble about our ability to change the world. Furthermore, we expect our  
12  
13 efforts to be deeply unpopular with at least some stakeholders in our grand challenge. But we  
14  
15 hope that our persistent efforts to evolve our research questions and seek new impact  
16  
17 partners, will enable us to continue performing actions that might ameliorate some of the  
18  
19 effects of a breakdown in disaster insurance. Our fourth reflexive insight, therefore, is that it  
20  
21 is important to be humble about the impact that your research can have, whilst having the  
22  
23 courage to persist in doing that research. In the spirit of the Artic Basecamp (Williams and  
24  
25 Whiteman, 2021), we encourage impact scholars to consider their humble but courageous  
26  
27 persistence in studying intractable problems as important and scientific activism (Delmestri,  
28  
29 2022; Schmidt, 2016).

### 35 Conclusion

36  
37 Having actively reflected on our impact work journey, we conclude that such work is  
38  
39 nuanced and, in our experience, neither fits neatly into a predefined framework nor has the  
40  
41 impact anticipated. Instead, impact activities of translating, co-creating, and performing take  
42  
43 place iteratively and collectively over many years and many linked and evolving projects in  
44  
45 which benefits may take years to eventuate. While the concepts developed by scholars of  
46  
47 impact have guided our reflections, we do not aim to propose a specific blueprint for  
48  
49 conducting impact research. From experience, we have seen that such a blueprint does not  
50  
51 exist. Rather, we aim to inspire the courageous journey of the impact-driven scholar and, with  
52  
53 this essay, stand by their side when frustrations and difficulties arise that might discourage  
54  
55 them from persisting.

1  
2  
3 Of course, our reflections are limited to our particular research context (the global  
4 arena of disaster insurance), our team (that evolved over time and is generally interested to  
5 have impact (Bednarek et al., 2023), serendipity (the emerging insurance puzzle and its  
6 relevance to disasters such as COVID-19, with which the team was ready to engage), and, at  
7 times, a little luck. Nonetheless, we believe that our four reflective insights will stand impact  
8 scholars in good stead on their own journey: to embrace the iterative process of doing impact  
9 work, secure in the knowledge that that messy process will bring to the surface those issues  
10 most worth studying; to develop robust impact objects that can be a common focal point for  
11 stakeholders, whilst acknowledging that those objects will go on to have a life of their own,  
12 beyond your intentions; to engage in the essential process of co-creation, even so that efforts  
13 to do so will be contentious to at least some stakeholders, often those with much power over  
14 the system; and to combine humility over your ability to affect intractable challenges with the  
15 courage to persist and to involve an ever wider set of stakeholders in your endeavors. We  
16 hope that our reflections inspire our colleagues and, importantly, heighten their sensitivity to  
17 the potential opportunities for impact that may present in their own impact journeys.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

#### 40 **Acknowledgments**

41 We thank our dear colleagues and collaborators who have been part of this 15-year journey at  
42 different points in time; Adrianna Allocato, Gary Burke, Laure Cabantous, Michael Smets,  
43 and Paul Spee.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

#### 51 **References**

52 Alvensson M and Spicer A (2012) Critical leadership studies: The case for critical  
53 performativity. *Human Relations* 65(3): 367–390.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Australian Terrorism Insurance Act (2018) Terrorism Insurance Act Review: 2018.

4  
5 Australian Treasury. Available from: [https://treasury.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-](https://treasury.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-03/Terrorism_Insurance_Act_Review.pdf)  
6  
7  
8  
9 03/Terrorism\_Insurance\_Act\_Review.pdf

10 Bansal P and Sharma G (2022) Three different approaches to impact: Translating, cocreating,  
11  
12 and performing. *Business & Society* 61(4): 827–832.

13  
14 Bartunek JM and Rynes SL (2014) Academics and practitioners are alike and unlike: The  
15  
16 paradoxes of academic–practitioner relationships. *Journal of Management* 40(5): 1181–  
17  
18  
19 1201.

20  
21 Baudoin L, Simone C, Nava L, Poggioli N and van der Broek, OM (2022) Imagining a Place  
22  
23 for Sustainability Management: An Early Career Call for Action. *Journal of*  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
*Management Studies* 60(3): 754–760.

Bednarek R, Cacciatori E, Chalkias K, Gallagher Rodgers R, Jarzabkowski P, Kavas M and  
Krull E (2023) Delivering impact via the ebb-and-flow of a research team: Reflection  
on a long-term program of research into a global societal challenge. *The Journal of*  
*Applied Behavioral Science*, 0(0) <https://doi.org/10.1177/00218863231207873>

Bednarek R, e Cunha MP, Schad J and Smith WK (2021) The value of interdisciplinary  
research to advance paradox in organization theory. In Bednarek R, e Cunha MP, Schad  
J and Smith WK (eds) *Both/and-ing Paradox Theory: Interdisciplinary Dialogues on*  
*Organizational Paradox*, (Research in the Sociology of Organization, Vol. 73A).  
Bingley: Emerald.

Carlile PR (2002) A pragmatic view of knowledge and boundaries: Boundary objects in new  
product development. *Organization Science* 13(4): 442–455.

Carpenter O, Platt S, Evan T, Mahdavian F and Coburn A (2020) Optimising disaster  
recovery: The role of insurance capital in improving economic resilience. UK: AXA

- 1  
2  
3 and Centre for Risk Studies at the University of Cambridge, Judge: Available from:  
4  
5 <https://axaxl.com/-/media/axaxl/files/optimizing-disaster-recovery.pdf>  
6  
7  
8 Chen S, Sharma G and Muñoz P (2022) In pursuit of impact: From research questions to  
9  
10 problem formulation in entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and*  
11  
12 *Practice* 47(2): 232–264.  
13  
14  
15 Clarke, DJ and Dercon S (2016) *Dull Disasters? How planning ahead will make a difference*  
16  
17 (p. 160). Oxford University Press.  
18  
19  
20 Cohen DJ (2007) The very separate worlds of academic and practitioner publications in  
21  
22 human resource management: Reasons for the divide and concrete solutions for  
23  
24 bridging the gap. *Academy of Management Journal* 50(5): 1013–1019.  
25  
26  
27 Couture F, Jarzabkowski P and Lê JK (2022). Triggers, traps, and disconnect: How  
28  
29 governance obstacles hinder progress on grand challenges. *Academy of Management*  
30  
31 *Journal*, In Press. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2020.1716>  
32  
33  
34 Cutcher L, Hardy C, Riach K and Thomas R (2020) Reflections on reflexive theorizing: The  
35  
36 need for a little more conversation. *Organization Theory* 1(3): 1–28.  
37  
38  
39 Delmestri G (2022) Are we all activists? *Organization Studies* 44(1): 159–162.  
40  
41  
42 DePillis L (2023) Canada Offers Lessons in the Economic Toll of Climate Change. *New York*  
43  
44 *Times*, 3 July. Available from:  
45  
46 [https://www.nytimes.com/2023/07/03/business/economy/canada-wildfires-](https://www.nytimes.com/2023/07/03/business/economy/canada-wildfires-economy.html)  
47  
48 [economy.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2023/07/03/business/economy/canada-wildfires-economy.html)  
49  
50  
51 Dougherty D (2004). Organizing practices in services: Capturing practice-based knowledge  
52  
53 for innovation. *Strategic Organization* 2(1): 35-64.  
54  
55  
56 European Commission (EC) (2020) Study on The Insurance, Private and Financial Markets in  
57  
58 The Field of Nuclear Third-Party Liability. European Commission. Luxembourg:  
59  
60

Publications Office of the European Union, ISBN: 978-92-76-27385-1, DOI:  
10.2833/9667 15/12/2020

Empson L (2018) Elite interviewing in professional organizations. *Journal of Professions and Organization* 5(1): 58–69.

ESRC (2013) Outstanding impact in business award for ‘Tackling systemic risk in the re-insurance industry’. Available from: <https://www.ukri.org/about-us/how-we-are-doing/research-outcomes-and-impact/esrc/esrc-celebrating-impact-prize/previous-winners-and-finalists-2013/>

Ferraro F, Pfeffer J and Sutton RI (2005) Economics language and assumptions: How theories can become self-fulfilling. *Academy of Management Review* 30(1): 8–24.

Ferraro F, Etzion D and Gehman J (2015) Tackling grand challenges pragmatically: Robust action revisited. *Organization Studies* 36(3): 363–390.

Flavelle C, Cowan J and Penn I (2023) Climate Change is Making Part of America Uninsurable. It Just got Worse. *New York Times*, 31 May. Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/05/31/climate/climate-change-insurance-wildfires-california.html>

Fujimura JH (1992) Crafting science: Standardized packages, boundary objects, and “translation.” *Science as Practice and Culture* 168(1992): 168–69.

Harley B and Fleming P (2021) Not even trying to change the world: Why do elite management journals ignore the major problems facing humanity? *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 57(2): 133–152.

Harley B and Cornelissen J (2019). Reframing rigor as reasoning: Challenging technocratic conceptions of rigor in management research. In *The production of managerial knowledge and organizational theory: New approaches to writing, producing and consuming theory* (Vol. 59, pp. 59-76). Emerald Publishing Limited.

1  
2  
3 Hoffman AJ (2021) Business education as if people and the planet really matter. *Strategic*  
4  
5 *Organization* 19(3): 513–525.

6  
7  
8 Huff AS (2000a) 1999 presidential address: Changes in organizational knowledge  
9  
10 production. *Academy of Management Review* 25(2): 288–293.

11  
12 Huff AS (2000b) Citigroup's John Reed and Stanford's James March on management  
13  
14 research and practice. *Academy of Management Perspectives* 14(1): 52–64.

15  
16  
17 Intelligent Insurer (2018) Government pools: A way to reduce the protection gap. Intelligent  
18  
19 Insurer, Issue 4: 2018.

20  
21 Jarzabkowski P and Wilson DC (2006) Actionable strategy knowledge: A practice  
22  
23 perspective. *European Management Journal* 24(5): 348–367.

24  
25  
26 Jarzabkowski P, Mohrman SA and Scherer AG (2010) Organization studies as applied  
27  
28 science: The generation and use of academic knowledge about organizations  
29  
30 introduction to the special issue. *Organization Studies* 31(9-10): 1189–1207.

31  
32  
33 Jarzabkowski P, Bednarek R, Burke G, Cabantous L and Smets M (2012) *Beyond borders:*  
34  
35 *Charting the changing global reinsurance landscape*. Aston Business School, U.K.

36  
37 Available from

38  
39  
40 [https://www.pauljarzabkowski.com/dimg/research/IICI\\_Global\\_Report\\_Beyond\\_Bord](https://www.pauljarzabkowski.com/dimg/research/IICI_Global_Report_Beyond_Borders_Jarzabkowski_2012_-_online_version.pdf)  
41  
42 [ers\\_Jarzabkowski\\_2012\\_-\\_online\\_version.pdf](https://www.pauljarzabkowski.com/dimg/research/IICI_Global_Report_Beyond_Borders_Jarzabkowski_2012_-_online_version.pdf)

43  
44  
45 Jarzabkowski P, Chalkias K, Cacciatori E and Bednarek R (2018) Between state and market:  
46  
47 Protection Gap Entities and catastrophic risk. Available from:

48  
49 <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/26795/1/PGE-Report-FINAL.pdf>

50  
51 Jarzabkowski P, Bednarek R, Chalkias K, and Cacciatori E (2019) Exploring inter-  
52  
53 organizational paradoxes: Methodological lessons from a study of a grand challenge.  
54  
55 *Strategic Organization* 17(1): 120–132.

- Jarzabkowski P, Chalkias K, Cacciatori E, Kavas M and Krull E (2021) Risk sharing mechanisms team *and Social Research Council* grant, UK.
- Jarzabkowski P, Krull E, Kavas M and Chalkias K (2021) Strategies for responding to pandemic risk: Removal and / or redistribution. *Journal of Financial Transformation* 54: 62–69.
- Jarzabkowski P, Bednarek R, Chalkias K and Cacciatori E (2022) Enabling rapid financial response to disasters: Knotting and reknitting multiple paradoxes in interorganizational systems. *Academy of Management Journal* 65(5): 1477–1506.
- Jarzabkowski P, Chalkias K, Cacciatori E, and Bednarek R (2023) *Disaster Insurance Reimagined: Protection in a Time of Increasing Risk*. Oxford University Press.
- Jarzabkowski P, Mason M, Meissner K, Avanzi B, Johnson L, Rambaldi A and Wyeth S (2023). Evaluating the Resilient Homes Fund. *Natural Hazards Research Australia* grant, Australia.
- Kelemen M and Bansal P (2002) The conventions of management research and their relevance to management practice. *British Journal of Management* 13(2): 97–108.
- Kousky C (2022) *Understanding disaster insurance: New tools for a more resilient future*. Island Press.
- Ma S, Seidl D, and McNulty T (2021) Challenges and practices of interviewing business elites. *Strategic Organization* 19(1): 81–96.
- Nicolai A and Seidl D (2010) That’s relevant! Different forms of practical relevance in management science. *Organization Studies* 31(9-10): 1257–1285.
- Nicolini D, Mengis J and Swan J (2012) Understanding the role of objects in cross-disciplinary collaboration. *Organization Science* 23(3): 612–629.
- Organization Studies Summer Workshop (2007) 'Organization Studies as Applied Science: The Generation and Use of Academic Knowledge about Organizations' 7-8 June 2007,



1  
2  
3           Crete, Greece. Available from:

4  
5           <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0170840606069476?journalCode=ossa>

6  
7  
8 Pettigrew AM (2001) Management research after modernism. *British Journal of Management*  
9  
10       12: S61–S70.

11  
12 Pollock N and D’Adderio L (2012) Give me a two-by-two matrix and I will create the  
13  
14       market: Rankings, graphic visualisations and sociomateriality. *Accounting,*  
15  
16       *Organizations and Society* 37(8): 565–586.

17  
18  
19 Reinecke J, Boxenbaum E and Gehman J (2022) Impactful theory: Pathways to mattering.  
20  
21       *Organization Theory* 3(4): 1–20.

22  
23  
24 Research Excellence Framework (REF) (2021) FAQs on the REF 2021 Impact case study  
25  
26       database. Available from: [https://www.ref.ac.uk/guidance-on-results/impact-case-](https://www.ref.ac.uk/guidance-on-results/impact-case-study-database-faqs/)  
27  
28       study-database-faqs/

29  
30  
31 Rynes SL, Giluk TL and Brown KG (2007) The very separate worlds of academic and  
32  
33       practitioner periodicals in human resource management: Implications for evidence-  
34  
35       based management. *Academy of Management Journal* 50(5): 987–1008.

36  
37  
38 Schad J and Bansal P (2018) Seeing the forest and the trees: How a systems perspective  
39  
40       informs paradox research. *Journal of Management Studies* 55(8): 1490–1506.

41  
42  
43 Schanz KU and Wang S eds. (2014) *The Global Insurance Protection Gap: Assessment and*  
44  
45       *Recommendations: A Geneva Association Research Report*. Geneva Association-  
46  
47       International Association for the Study of Insurance Economics. Available from:  
48  
49       [https://www.genevaassociation.org/sites/default/files/research-topics-document-](https://www.genevaassociation.org/sites/default/files/research-topics-document-type/pdf_public/ga2014-the_global_insurance_protection_gap_1.pdf)  
50  
51       type/pdf\_public/ga2014-the\_global\_insurance\_protection\_gap\_1.pdf

52  
53  
54 Schanz KU, Jarzabkowski P, Cacciatori E, Chalkias K, Kavas M and Krull E (2021) *Public-*  
55  
56       *private solutions to pandemic risk: Opportunities, challenges and trade-offs*. Available  
57  
58

1  
2  
3 from:

4  
5 [https://www.genevaassociation.org/sites/default/files/pandemic\\_risks\\_report\\_web.pdf](https://www.genevaassociation.org/sites/default/files/pandemic_risks_report_web.pdf)

6  
7 Schmidt GA (2015) What should climate scientists advocate for? *Bulletin of the Atomic*  
8  
9 *Scientists* 71(1): 70–74.

10  
11  
12 Sharma G and Bansal P (2020a) Cocreating rigorous and relevant knowledge. *Academy of*  
13  
14 *Management Journal* 63(2): 386–410.

15  
16  
17 Sharma G and Bansal P (2020b) Partnering up: Including managers as research partners in  
18  
19 systematic reviews. *Organizational Research Methods* 26(2): 262–291.

20  
21  
22 Sharma G, Greco A, Grewatsch S and Bansal P (2022) Cocreating forward: How researchers  
23  
24 and managers can address problems together. *Academy of Management Learning &*  
25  
26 *Education* 21(3): 350–368.

27  
28  
29 Shotter J (2006) Understanding process from within: An argument for ‘witness’-thinking.  
30  
31 *Organization Studies* 27(4): 585–604.

32  
33  
34 Star SL and Griesemer JR (1989) Institutional ecology, ‘translations’ and boundary objects:  
35  
36 Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley’s Museum of vertebrate zoology, 1907-39.  
37  
38 *Social Studies of Science*, 19(3), 387–420.

39  
40  
41 Starkey K and Madan P (2001) Bridging the relevance gap: Aligning stakeholders in the  
42  
43 future of management research. *British Journal of Management* 12: S3–S26.

44  
45  
46 Van de Ven AH (2007) *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social*  
47  
48 *research*. Oxford University Press.

49  
50  
51 Walsh JP, Tushman ML, Kimberly JR, Starbuck B and Ashford S (2007) On the relationship  
52  
53 between research and practice: Debate and reflections. *Journal of Management Inquiry*  
54  
55 16(2): 128–154.

1  
2  
3 Wickert C, Post C, Doh JP, Prescott JE and Prencipe A (2021) Management research that  
4  
5 makes a difference: Broadening the meaning of impact. *Journal of Management Studies*  
6  
7 58(2): 297–320.  
8  
9

10 Williams A and Whiteman G (2021) A call for deep engagement for impact: Addressing the  
11  
12 planetary emergency. *Strategic Organization* 19(3): 526–537.  
13

14 Williams A, Whiteman G and Parker JN (2019) Backstage interorganizational collaboration:  
15  
16 Corporate endorsement of the sustainable development goals. *Academy of Management*  
17  
18 *Discoveries* 5(4): 367–395.  
19  
20

21 Wright C and Nyberg D (2017) An inconvenient truth: How organizations translate climate  
22  
23 change into business as usual. *Academy of Management Journal* 60(5): 1633–1661.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1. Forms of impact and examples in our research**

| Forms of impact | Definition: Wickert et al. (2021)   | Illustrative examples in our work  |
|-----------------|---|--|
| Scholarly:      | “the ability to provide a clear, compelling, and meaningful theoretical contribution.” (p. 299)   | Evidenced by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 peer-reviewed publications;</li> <li>• 2 books;</li> <li>• 3 book chapters.</li> </ul> Our aim was to make theoretical contributions that other researchers could build upon.   |
| Practical:      | “practices that consider collective welfare and social interests; present possibilities for social transformation; offer opportunities for self-management; and question power relationships.” (p. 303) | Evidenced by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• membership of 3 advisory groups/ boards addressing different types of protection gaps in developing and advanced economies;</li> <li>• 6 publications in practitioner journals;</li> <li>• 7 industry reports;</li> <li>• 49 individual company feedback reports;</li> <li>• 32 keynotes at industry conferences;</li> <li>• participating in 9 industry panels;</li> <li>• hosting 25 organizational and inter-organizational workshops on our results.</li> </ul> We aimed to provoke thinking and provide diagnostic and evaluative tools and frameworks to enable participants to reflect upon their practices and expose their taken-for-granted beliefs about the challenges they face.  |
| Societal:       | “contribute[s] more substantially to broader societal concerns [...] may be as much about identification, edification, and information as it is about changed behaviour or practice.” (p. 307)          | Evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• over 100 print, radio and TV media outlets. These reports often stimulated media debate, invitations for industry keynotes, and requests to talk to regulators and government bodies about our results. Media commentary allowed us to explain the wider societal implications of the grand challenge we were examining. For example, in some media interviews we explained how a decline in available and affordable disaster insurance was exacerbating inequality and financial exclusion;</li> <li>• acting as expert advisors in evaluating whether a specified PGE alleviated the effects of disaster;</li> </ul> collaborative research with an industry working group to generate potential financial protection solutions to pandemic and other systemic risk. |
| Policy:         | “management scholarship could provide a deeper  | Evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• books (see scholarly example row), reports and</li> </ul>   |

|              |   |   |
|--------------|---|---|
|              | <p>understanding of important policy issues among political decision-makers. However, for a variety of historical reasons, management studies scholars and policy makers rarely engage with each other.” (p. 310)</p> | <p>practitioner publications (see practical examples row) aimed at informed practitioner, professional, and policy-making audiences;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• outputs called upon for policy forums, such as government evaluations of protection gaps for earthquake and terrorism risk and evidence to parliamentary bodies developing risk assessment white papers;</li> <li>• informing global bodies developing policy on climate adaptation;</li> </ul> <p>membership of policy-informing boards, such as the OECD, and on advisory groups that feed into disaster risk financing aid and development strategies for countries.</p>   |
| Educational: | <p>“students – and therefore graduates – are the first conduits whereby universities make impact on society at large, [...] good education is fundamentally based on state-of-the-art research.” (p. 314)</p>         | <p>Evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 masterclasses which are teaching resources to help people learn about specific changes and issues in disaster (re)insurance. They have been used in teaching our MSc students, executives, and picked up by other universities and companies for their teaching;</li> <li>• training programs for industry professionals and civil servants in different countries that were informed by our research results;</li> <li>• teaching case studies that address wider issues such as how stakeholders can respond to paradoxical tensions in addressing insurance protection gaps;</li> </ul> <p>books that appear on university teaching lists for explaining the technical and social aspects of risk management and climate change.</p> |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 **Paula Jarzabkowski** is Professor of Strategic Management at University of Queensland and  
6 City, University of London, a Fellow of the British Academy and a Fellow of the Academy  
7 of Management. Paula's research focuses on the practice of strategy and markets in complex,  
8 pluralistic, and paradoxical contexts. She publishes this research in leading journals,  
9 including *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Organization*  
10 *Science*, *Organization Studies*, and *Strategic Management Journal*. She is author and editor  
11 of several books including, *Strategy as Practice: An Activity-Based Approach* (Sage), *Making*  
12 *a Market for Acts of God* (Oxford University Press), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational*  
13 *Paradox*, and *Disaster Insurance Reimagined* (Oxford University Press).  
14  
15

16 **Rebecca Bednarek** is an Associate Professor at Victoria University of Wellington (New  
17 Zealand). She researches social practices in complex, often paradoxical, contexts from  
18 science organizations to the global (re)insurance industry. Her research has been published in  
19 journals such as *Academy of Management Journal*, *Human Relations*, *Long Range Planning*,  
20 *Organizational Studies*, *Strategic Management Journal* and *Strategic Organization*. Her  
21 recent co-authored book *Disaster Insurance Reimagined* (Oxford University Press) proposes  
22 solutions to the growing crisis in disaster insurance.  
23  
24

25 **Konstantinos Chalkias** is a senior lecturer in management at Birkbeck, University of  
26 London. He is interested in practice-based theorizing of strategy, organizations, and  
27 markets and the co-formative relation between practices and fields. He is also interested in  
28 pluralistic contexts that are described by paradoxical tensions. His recent focus has been on  
29 how government and industry work together to address a grand challenge – the global  
30 insurance protection gap. He is the co-author of *Disaster Insurance Reimagined* (Oxford  
31 University Press). His research has been published in journals such as the *Academy of*  
32 *Management Journal*, *the British Journal of Management* and *Strategic Organization*.  
33  
34  
35

36 **Eugenia Cacciatori** is Senior Lecturer in Management at Bayes Business School, City,  
37 University of London. Her research is on organizational and technological innovation, with a  
38 focus on how the integration of knowledge and collaboration can be accomplished to tackle  
39 complex problems; and how stable new processes (routines) can be developed in  
40 organizations. She has tackled these issues in vaccine development, engineering design, and  
41 disaster insurance. Her research has been published in journals such as *Academy of*  
42 *Management Journal*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Organization Studies*, and *Research*  
43 *Policy*.  
44  
45

46 **Mustafa Kavas** is an Assistant Professor of Strategic Management at Sheffield University  
47 Management School. He received his PhD in Management from Bayes Business School  
48 (formerly Cass), City, University of London, where his research explored the interplay of  
49 spirituality and strategy within family firms. Prior to his current role at the University of  
50 Sheffield, he served as a postdoctoral research fellow at Bayes Business School, investigating  
51 economic resilience to pandemics through risk-sharing mechanisms. His research has been  
52 published in the *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Organization Theory*, and the *Journal of Applied*  
53 *Behavioral Science*, among others.  
54  
55

56 **Elisabeth Krull** is a Lecturer in Innovation at Alliance Manchester Business School (AMBS)  
57 at the University of Manchester and is a member of the Manchester Institute of Innovation  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Research (MIOIR). Her current research interests include strategising and organising in pluralistic and uncertain contexts. Prior to joining AMBS, Elisabeth was a Research Fellow in Strategic Management at Bayes Business School (formerly Cass) at City, University of London where she studied risk-sharing mechanisms to mitigate the economic consequences of pandemics. She received her PhD in Management from the University of Auckland.

**Rhianna Gallagher Rodgers** is a PhD student at the University of Queensland. She researches experiences of natural disasters, and is particularly interested in hidden narratives, and inequalities. Prior to her PhD she worked as a Research Assistant within this author team.

Peer Review Version