
Editorial

Louis Jacques Filion

Rogers-J.A. Bombardier Chair of Entrepreneurship
HEC Montréal
3000 Ch. Côte Ste-Catherine
Montréal, QC H3T 2A7, Canada
E-mail: louisjacques.filion@hec.ca

Biographical notes: Louis Jacques Filion is a Rogers-J.A. Bombardier Professor of Entrepreneurship at HEC Montréal, Canada. His research interests include the activity systems of entrepreneurs, the visionary process, entrepreneurial soft systems thinking, new venture creation, corporate entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship and technological entrepreneurship.

Over the years, corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship have both been identified as important priority topics for entrepreneurship research. To remain competitive, organisations need to support intrapreneurship by offering a set of policies that not only allow employees to engage in intrapreneurship, but also make intrapreneurship attractive to all employees. A corporate entrepreneurship framework will certainly help to improve the intrapreneurial expression of employees. However, intrapreneurship is most frequently expressed in organisations where there is no support, and even, in some cases, in organisations where top management resents it. However, students and others who are interested in learning about organisations and their management will benefit from knowing more about intrapreneurial practices. This knowledge will also help to shape a more efficient corporate entrepreneurship framework that will truly lead to intrapreneurial practice.

Our aim in publishing this special issue is to present papers that discuss the subject of intrapreneurship, and its sister subject of corporate entrepreneurship.

The first paper by Fayolle and Basso discusses the entrepreneurial spirit and corporate entrepreneurship in large companies. These authors suggest a tentative framework to characterise entrepreneurial companies. They provide examples showing that intrapreneurship can be an individual or collective process that involves three areas simultaneously or in sequence, namely state of mind, behaviour, and situations.

The second paper by Allali suggests an intrapreneuriality indicator that measures the intrapreneurial predisposition of employees, along with a perceived organisational autonomy indicator to assess the extent to which the organisational context is conducive or not to innovative initiatives by employees.

The third paper by Bager *et al.* discusses similarities and differences between intrapreneurs, entrepreneurs and spin-off entrepreneurs. Their comparisons show that intrapreneurs are more competent and growth-oriented than entrepreneurs, that spin-off entrepreneurs are more competent and growth-oriented than independent entrepreneurs, and that spin-off firms quickly reach higher performance levels.

The fourth paper by Baronet and Riverin discusses intrapreneurship levels. The authors verified aspects of the regional environment that may influence these levels, and observed that aspects of regional knowledge resulting from regional innovation systems had a positive impact on a region's level of intrapreneurship.

The fifth paper by Ferreira discusses corporate entrepreneurship and small firm growth. The results suggest that dimensions of the entrepreneurial orientation, life-cycle, resources and capabilities, motivation and environment have an effect on the growth of small firms. However, the paper also shows that small firm growth depends on the type of environment in which the firm operates, and suggests that environmental hostility has a negative impact on growth.

The sixth paper by Bonnafous-Boucher and Lamy examines the profiles of entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs in French Biotechnology SMEs. The authors suggest two main types of intrapreneurs. The first type focuses on relationships characterised by trust and is particularly sensitive to any form of control, while the second type bases its approach on a division of labour between SMEs and large companies and is favourable to normative constraints. The typology of intrapreneurs proposed by these authors is based on a typology of scientific entrepreneurs. The authors argue that biotechnology companies are led by entrepreneurs, but the entrepreneurs act within the framework of an inter-firm relationship with major drug companies. Therefore, they are acting as both entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs at the same time.