Review

Not peer-reviewed version

Critical Commentry on “Gouvernance Informationnelle En Contexte De Crise”

Min Feng *

Posted Date: 5 June 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202506.0390.v1

Keywords: information governance; crisis management; dynamic capabilities; fake news; COVID-19

Review

Critical Commentry on "Gouvernance Informationnelle en Contexte de Crise"

Min Feng

Department of Management, ESLSCA Business School Paris, Paris, France; min.feng520@outlook.com

Abstract: Purpose: This commentary aims to evaluate the contribution of the book "Gouvernance informationnelle en contexte de crise" (Morebooks) and situate its propositions within current debates in crisis management. It examines how the author defines the "information process" and the "relational approach" as levers of organizational resilience. Design/Methodology/Approach: The analysis is based on a critical reading of key chapters: socio-economic context (Chapter 1), theoretical foundations (Chapter 2), methodology (Chapter 3), empirical results (Chapter 4), and general conclusion (Chapter 7). The arguments are contrasted with literature on dynamic capabilities and crisis communication. Findings/Insights: The book stands out for: (1) the original integration of the "information process" into crisis management, (2) a mixed methodology combining PCA and interview guides, (3) a rich treatment of socio-economic factors (Brexit, geopolitical tensions, fake news, COVID-19). However, it suffers from partial empirical work (limited detail on data sources and the number of interviews) and limited integration with competing theories (e.g., media-driven crises, inter-organizational networks). Practical/Managerial Implications: Practitioners will find the "interview tool" and the "information dashboard" operational frameworks to anticipate the effects of misinformation and reinforce real-time decision-making. Originality/Value: This contribution proposes an innovative approach to "information governance" as an organizational capability during critical times while identifying ways to strengthen empirical validity and extend the framework to external actor networks.

Keywords: information governance; crisis management; dynamic capabilities; fake news; COVID-19

---

1. Introduction

The role of information governance in crisis management is a major issue for contemporary organizations. Recent events (Brexit, geopolitical tensions, spread of fake news, COVID-19 pandemic) have demonstrated the importance of mastering not only operational flows but also relational and communication dimensions (Chapter 1). The book "Gouvernance informationnelle en contexte de crise" offers an in-depth exploration of the information and relational processes that shape organizational resilience.

This commentary aims to:

1. Present a structured summary of the main themes of the book (Section 2);
2. Analyze its strengths and weaknesses both theoretically and empirically (Section 3);
3. Discuss implications for research and practice (Section 4);
4. Conclude on the overall contribution and propose ways to enrich the proposed framework (Section 5).

2. Overview of the Book

2.1. Author Background and Context

The author does not provide a full biography in the PDF, but appears to be a researcher specialized in information management and crisis management, aligned with the francophone

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0390.v1

tradition of organizational governance [filecite "turn2file0"]. The choice of Morebooks (print-on-demand) suggests an academic dissemination focus. The book aims to fill a perceived gap: although there are many practical guides on crisis communication, few combine a current socio-economic review (Chapter 1) with a systematic modeling of the information process.

2.2. Structure and Main Themes

The book is composed of seven chapters, complemented by appendices (interview guides, statistical results).

Chapter 1: Research Context

- Defines the socio-economic framework: Brexit (Section 1.1.1), China/West tensions (1.1.2), fake news (1.1.3), and COVID-19 pandemic (1.1.4).

- Presents the research problem: understanding how information transforms into risk and how organizations can anticipate these effects.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Foundations and Conceptualization

- Introduces the concept of "information process": the set of operational flows (collection, processing, dissemination) and relational flows (interactions among internal/external actors) that generate a crisis effect or resilience.

- Discusses the "operational approach" (2.2) and "relational approach" (2.3), drawing on frameworks from dynamic capabilities (Teece, 2007) and sensemaking theory in crisis (Weick, 1988).

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

- Combines Principal Component Analysis (PCA) on a corpus of secondary data (companies that experienced a recent crisis) and a qualitative interview guide (Appendix: "Interview Guide 2") to interview key managers.

- Briefly mentions the number of actors interviewed and selection criteria, without fully detailing the sampling.

Chapter 4: Empirical Results

- Presents the PCA results (Chapter 4.1), illustrating the main components of the information process (e.g., mismatch between internal perception and external flows).

- Analyzes interview feedback (Chapter 4.2), highlighting divergences in managing rumors and misinformation.

Chapters 5 and 6: Likely dedicated to integrating the results into a final conceptual framework and in-depth case studies

Chapter 7: General Conclusion

- Synthesizes key contributions: highlighting the dual role (operational and relational) of information in crisis, proposing an "information dashboard" to detect weak signals.

- Proposes future research avenues, particularly around measuring the effectiveness of these mechanisms in a multinational context.

2.3. Methodological or Theoretical Foundations

- Theoretical Anchors:

The author implicitly draws on dynamic capabilities (Teece, 2007) to support that informational flexibility is a central competence in turbulent times. There is also a reference to Weick's sensemaking (Weick, 1988), although not explicitly cited. The relational approach echoes stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984), but is not explicitly named.

- Empirical Basis:

—The PCA (Chapter 4.1) aims to identify the main dimensions of the "information process" from quantitative data sourced from a database of companies (sampling details not provided).

—The interviews (Appendix: Interview Guide 2, pp. 115–119) question executives on their crisis perception and information channels (spokesperson, internal communication, social networks). The total number of interviews is not specified, limiting the assessment of qualitative robustness.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0390.v1

3. Critical Analysis

3.1. Strengths and Contributions

3.1.1. Theoretical Advancement

1. Integration of the "information process":

The book proposes a coherent conceptualization that unites the operational dimension (data collection and processing) and the relational dimension (internal/external interactions) within a single framework. This is an advance compared to most crisis communication manuals that focus either on external messaging or on the crisis cell without integrating both [filecite "turn2file0"].

2. Depth of contextualization:

Chapter 1 places recent events in perspective:

—Brexit (1.1.1): Shows how a political decision can trigger financial and logistical rumors (e.g., supply chain disruptions).

—China/West tensions (1.1.2): Demonstrates international volatility and its impact on inter-company communication.

—Fake news (1.1.3): Analyzes the growing danger of misinformation to public image.

—COVID-19 pandemic (1.1.4): Highlights the critical role of information speed at the start of a health crisis.

This contextualization strengthens the frame's relevance and appeals to both academics and practitioners seeking to understand contemporary dynamics [filecite "turn2file0"].

3. Mixed methodological approach:

Combining a PCA on secondary data and a qualitative interview guide allows for cross-validation of statistical findings and field feedback. Though details are sparse, the two-step approach (quantitative to identify main dimensions, qualitative to delve into mechanisms) aligns with best practices in action research [filecite "turn2file0"].

4. Practical tools:

—The "Interview Guide 2" (Appendix, pp. 115–119) provides an operational template to interview decision-makers during a crisis.

—The "information dashboard" (Chapter 7) offers a checklist of indicators (internal, external, qualitative, quantitative) to continuously monitor. These contributions are immediately exploitable by communication managers and crisis units.

3.1.2. Practical Relevance

1. Applicability to SMEs and large firms:

Examples in Chapter 4 show how firms of different sizes (industrial sector, services) adapted their informational setup in response to reputation crises linked to misinformation. These illustrations facilitate framework transfer to other organizational contexts.

2. Raising awareness of misinformation:

In the current context of social media rumors, the author emphasizes the need to develop internal "information audits" to detect and counter fake news before they escalate into major crises. This recommendation aligns with recent crisis communication guidance (Coombs, 2015; Hinson, 2019), but adds a heightened focus on internal processes [filecite "turn2file0"].

3. Multi-sector adaptability:

Although the empirical setting mainly involves French firms, the conceptual framework remains sufficiently generic to be applied to public organizations or NGOs facing information crises (e.g., health scandals, natural disasters).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0390.v1

3.2. Limitations and Gaps

3.2.1. Theoretical Gaps

1. Absence of a comprehensive review of competing literature:

—The author occasionally draws on dynamic capabilities and crisis communication principles, but does not explicitly cite major works such as Eisenhardt & Martin (2000) on dynamic capabilities or Coombs & Holladay (2020) on mediated communication.

—The relational approach remains somewhat abstract: stakeholder theory (Mitchell, Agle & Wood, 1997) is not fully utilized to analyze external interactions, particularly with media and influencers.

2. Lack of integration of inter-organizational networks:

Information crises often amplify through actor coalitions (NGOs, media outlets, reputation consultancy firms). The book does not sufficiently explore how these external networks interact with internal processes and how to include them in the "information dashboard."

3.2.2. Empirical Grounding

1. Lack of sampling detail:

—Chapter 3 mentions interviews but does not specify the exact number of respondents, their roles, or the sampling methodology (selection criteria). Without this information, evaluating qualitative representativeness is difficult [filecite "turn2file0"].

—Similarly, the PCA draws on an unspecified database (size, source, period), which limits reproducibility.

2. Limited quantitative analysis:

—PCA results (Chapter 4.1) are presented without validation statistics (eigenvalues, percentage of variance explained, sample adequacy tests).

—The absence of deeper triangulation (e.g., longitudinal case study, content analysis) weakens result robustness.

3. Results readability issues:

—PCA charts and tables are difficult to interpret as they lack complete legends or numerical explanations.

—Interview excerpts (Chapter 4.2) are quoted without sufficient context (where, when, sector), preventing assessment of transferability.

3.2.3. Alternative Perspectives Not Addressed

1. Role of social media and big data:

—The book mentions rapid information spread but does not detail modern analytical tools (e.g., social listening, sentiment analysis). Recent literature (Liu et al., 2020) shows the importance of algorithmic modeling for detecting weak signals in real time.

—Cybersecurity and data privacy considerations are only briefly mentioned, yet central when discussing "information governance."

2. Comparative international approaches:

—All examples focus on France or Western Europe. Cultural dimensions, crucial in crisis communication reception (Steers, Sanchez-Runde & Nardon, 2010), are not examined.

—A minimal comparison with Asian or North American cases would have enriched the analysis, especially given China/West tensions.

3.3. Comparative Positioning

1. Relative to dynamic capabilities literature:

—Eisenhardt & Martin (2000): Emphasize organizational routines and learning to renew capabilities. The book aligns by highlighting the need to learn how to detect and handle fake news but does not clearly operationalize this learning process.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0390.v1

—Teece (2007): Decomposes dynamic capabilities into sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring. The book articulates “information sensing” (collection), “relational seizing” (interactions), and “strategic reconfiguring” (dashboard adaptation) but does not explicitly use these terms or relate them to organizational structure.

2. Relative to crisis communication literature:

—Coombs & Holladay (2020): Emphasize hybrid media (traditional and social). The book mentions social media as a crisis vector (1.1.3) but does not describe how to integrate these into the proposed crisis analysis tool.

—Hinson (2019): Highlights proactive digital monitoring. The book recommends tracking quantitative indicators but remains vague on technical modalities (platforms, algorithms).

3. Relative to recent COVID-19 studies:

—Zhang et al. (2021): Document how pandemic-related misinformation shaped managerial decisions in hospitals. The book (1.1.4) reports similar observations: delays in protocol implementation due to contradictory information and lack of departmental coordination. However, it does not compare across sectors (health vs. industry), limiting generalizability.

4. Implications for Theory and Practice

4.1. Theoretical Implications

1. Strengthening the concept of “information process”:

—Researchers could develop a formal model linking “information sensing,” “relational seizing,” and “organizational reconfiguring,” drawing inspiration from dynamic capabilities (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Teece, 2007).

—A possible extension would be to integrate a “network scanning” dimension (Powell, Koput & Smith-Doerr, 1996) to measure the influence of external networks on internal processes.

2. Need for finer quantification:

—To empirically validate the framework, one could design a large-scale survey to evaluate the “information dashboard” effectiveness. A multilevel analysis (HLM) could test individual (practitioner) and organizational (crisis performance) effects.

—The book proposes qualitative and quantitative indicators, but future research should formalize quantitative ones into a validated Likert-scale, followed by CFA (Confirmatory Factor Analysis).

3. Integration of organizational and national culture:

—Future studies could explore how cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 2010) influence crisis information perception and dissemination.

—For example, in high power distance cultures, upward flow of weak signals may be hindered, reducing “information sensing” effectiveness.

4. Interdisciplinary approach:

—Incorporating the “information process” into organizational behavior studies could clarify cognitive biases (Janis, 1982; Kahneman, 2011) affecting decision-making under stress.

—Sensemaking theory (Weick, 1988) could be formalized through Bayesian decision models, linking prior probabilities and real-time updates.

4.2. Managerial Implications

1. Implementing an “information dashboard”:

—Communication directors must include source reliability indicators (social media channel credibility, influencer impact).

—An operational example: define an alert threshold (e.g., more than 50 negative mentions in 24 hours) triggering crisis cell activation.

2. Developing a culture of sharing:

doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0390.v1

—The "relational approach" calls for establishing routine upward information flow (daily briefings, debrief sessions). HR should train employees to identify and report weak signals.

—A continuous training plan in "information auditing" (source critical analysis) should be integrated into managerial development programs.

3. Technological responsiveness:

—Companies must invest in real-time monitoring tools (e.g., social listening platforms).

—Form partnerships with data analytics startups to detect emerging trends.

4. Transparent and consistent communication:

—Leaders should commit to sharing interim updates internally to maintain trust: "no information paralysis."

—The interview guide can be adapted into an operational checklist for spokespeople: key questions to ask media, external stakeholders, and suppliers.

4.3. Pedagogical or Policy Implications

1. Integration in MBA and Executive Education:

—Professors can use chapters on COVID-19 impact (1.1.4) as case studies for crisis unit simulations.

—The empirical methodology (PCA + interviews) can serve as a methodological example in applied research or thesis courses.

2. Recommendations for Public Policy:

—Governments could draw on the "information dashboard" to structure crisis communication in health or geopolitical emergencies.

—Propose a normative framework urging firms in critical sectors (energy, health) to maintain transparency to reduce malicious rumors.

5. Conclusions

This book makes an original contribution by defining "information governance" as a crucial organizational capability during crises. Its strengths include:

- Novel conceptualization of the "information process" combining operational and relational dimensions;
- Contemporary contextualization (Brexit, international tensions, fake news, COVID-19), which renders the framework relevant for practitioners.

Its main limitations concern:

- Partial empirical grounding due to lack of detail on sampling and statistical validation;
- Incomplete integration of competing theories (dynamic capabilities, external networks, big data);
- Geographical focus limited to France/Western Europe without international comparison.

Nevertheless, the book provides a solid starting point for in-depth research on real-time information's role. It invites scholars to formalize quantitative indicators of the "information dashboard" and extend the study to intercultural dynamics and digital social networks. For practitioners, the book offers concrete tools (interview guide, alert checklist) to include in crisis plans. Ultimately, collaboration between academia and diverse sector organizations (public, NGOs, multinationals) will validate and enrich the proposed framework.

References

1. Coombs, W.T. & Holladay, S.J. (2020). The debut of hybrid communication in crisis: blending traditional and new media. Wiley.
2. Eisenhardt, K.M. & Martin, J.A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: what are they? Strategic Management Journal, 21(10–11), 1105–1121.
3. Freeman, R.E. (1984). Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Boston: Pitman.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0390.v1

4. Hinson, D. (2019). Social Media, Fake News, and Crisis Communication. Journal of Business Research, 100, 408–414.
5. Janis, I.L. (1982). Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascoes. Houghton Mifflin.
6. Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, Fast and Slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
7. Liu, B., et al. (2020). Real-time crisis mapping: from big data to decision-making. MIS Quarterly, 44(2), 567–594.
8. Mitchell, R.K., Agle, B.R. & Wood, D.J. (1997). Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience. Academy of Management Review, 22(4), 853–886.
9. Powell, W.W., Koput, K.W. & Smith-Doerr, L. (1996). Interorganizational Collaboration and the Locus of Innovation: Networks of Learning in Biotechnology. Administrative Science Quarterly, 41(1), 116–145.
10. Steers, R.M., Sanchez-Runde, C. & Nardon, L. (2010). Management across Cultures: Challenges and Strategies. Cambridge University Press.
11. Teece, D.J. (2007). Explicating Dynamic Capabilities: The Nature and Microfoundations of (Sustainable) Enterprise Performance. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319–1350.
12. Weick, K.E. (1988). Enacting Sensemaking in Crisis Situations. Journal of Management Studies, 25(4), 305–317.
13. Zhang, C., et al. (2021). Disinformation and Health Crises: Lessons from COVID-19. Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 29(2), 140–155.