

为企业寻找创新者

文/泰德·普林斯

如何寻找创新者？这是一个长期困扰初创企业和成熟企业的问题。初创企业需要创新者为企业注入第一股创造全新的、有价值的产品或服务的推动力。步入发展正轨企业，需要创新者为产品带来新的活力，吸引更多消费者。成熟企业需要创新者为企业带来新气象，对产品革新。

寻找创新者需要注意两个重要事项，第一是如何在第一时间识别创新者；第二是如何识别不同种类的创新者，并且将这些不同种类的创新者运用到什么岗位中。

识别创新者

如何识别创新者？首先，要意识到发现创新者不是一件容易的事情，尤其是在创新者们还很年轻、还没有做出什么实际发明创造的时候。尽管不是一直如此，创新者通常很害羞、含蓄，而且不喜欢向别人展示自己。因此，你往往很难注意到他们。这类人群可能非常谦虚，同时也不擅长与他人沟通交流。

许多人认为自己非常具有创新性，但实际并非如此。通常这类人并不会很谦虚，而且常常声称他们是创新者。由于他们的这种表现力，你很可能相信他们确实是创新者，但在下面我们将看到有创造力和有创新性并不是一个概念。

真如接下来要讨论的，创新者分许多种。因此，即使你已经成功发现了一位创新者，即使这类创新者在他所处的领域非常出色，但也并不意味着他适合你这个特定的企业和业务。

创造不等同于创新

许多人都会产生这样的误解，认为创造和创新是同一概念。对许多人而言，这两者是同一件事情。正如所描述的那样，“如果你有创造力，你就有创新性；如果你有创新性，那么，你也是有创造力



的”。这个描述显示了人们对于创造力和创新性这两个概念的巨大误解。

有创造性是指发明出一个新的想法、产品、程序或者事物，通常很少有人或者没有人可以追上他们的想法。这种想法或者产品可能是前所未有、难以想象以及唯一的。

但是，在创造的概念中不存在这样的假设，即创造者能够从创造新的想法或产品坚持到该想法或产品被社会广泛接受这一整个过程。一个创造者可能会创造出一个全新产品，但创造新事物与令所有人接受并使用它还有很长一段距离。

因此，在这个过程中需要创造者具有一定程

你可以通过一个测试找出企业中的创新者，否则，你将无法知道谁真正具备创新能力。

度的决心和毅力，因为这可能需要持续几年。当最初的创新激情被残酷的现实蒸发殆尽之后，往往需要付出艰辛的努力来使人们接受和使用这个全新的、他们不熟悉的产品或想法。

具有创造性与行动相关。创造新事物伴随着激动和快乐，从现有的规矩和框架中跳出，这是一种为创造者提供强烈智慧快感的行动。然而，这与什么是创新相差甚远。

让我们看几个有关创新者的案例。我想我们都认同微软的比尔·盖茨和Facebook的马克·扎克伯格是不折不扣的创新者。然而，他们两个都没有创造出令他们名扬天下的产品。

在比尔·盖茨的发迹史中，他从西雅图电脑公司(Seattle Computer)收购了DOS，然后用它连带利地赢得了一大笔财富。马克·扎克伯格，正如我们所看到的，社交网络的兴起并不是从社交网络这个概念本身出现的时候开始的。他的确是从别人那里得到了这个概念，然后通过自己的运营使企业取得了巨大成功。

换言之，并不是比尔·盖茨和马克·扎克伯格创造了使他们成功的产品背后的概念。但是，他们对这些概念的贡献不容置疑也不容忽视。

他们首要的、极具价值的贡献在于，他们认识到自己从别人那里取得的产品或概念具有巨大发展潜力和价值；其次，他们的贡献在于不畏艰险地坚持了这个想法，动用了一切可以动用的、必要的力量来推动概念或产品的市场化，直到产品或概念获得市场的高度认可和接纳。

发布一个新产品很难，如果一个新市场正在因这个新产品而出现，获得该市场的认可会更难。达成这一切将是一个壮举，这需要钢铁般坚强的决心、巨大的勇气、不屈服的精神和彻底的坚持。这需要巨大的动力和注意力来坚持，即使每个人都鄙视这个想法，甚至是嘲笑这个想法。

创新者往往是最忠实的追随者。他们能够发现一些新事物的潜力，然后用尽自己的所有能力、决心、勇气、注意力和执行力将这一概念变为现实。

这就是创造者和创新者的区别。作为一名创新者应该拥有常人所没有的良好的判断力和执行力等特殊品质。

创新者首先要有能够识别可以改变世界的想法或产品的能力。其次，要具备即使这种新产品或

想法需要很长时间才能被大众接受，也能坚持的决心和专注力。换言之，创新者并不是专注于最初的体验以及从中所得到的喜悦，而是随后而来的、长期艰难前行的过程。创造的过程是最有趣的阶段，而创新的过程则是最艰难的阶段。

在创造过程中，你享受了最愉悦、最兴奋的第一步，而紧随其后的创新过程，充满了艰难险阻。这将是痛苦的、危险的，往往也是非常无聊的。你必须始终坚信你最初的坚持是值得的，最终你必能成功。

那么，寻找创新者意味着什么？首先，你不能假定你所拥有的创造型人才具有创新性。事实上，他们几乎都不具备创新性。你必须识别出创新性人才，他们具备善于发现创造性想法的潜力，还具备能够坚持实现这一想法的勇气、决心和专注力。

通常创新者往往都有过创新的经验，甚至是在他们非常年轻的时候。因此，这是一种识别他们的方法。另一种识别方法是他们往往对现有事物和想法持怀疑态度。此外，还有一种方法是他们对工作十分执着并且能够坚持很久，而大多数极具创造力的人都缺乏持久性。

关于识别创新者的实验非常少，不过，有一个实验非常有效。它能够识别出你的雇员中哪些是创新者，而事实上你可能从来都没有想过他们具备这种能力。通常这类人内向且害羞，即使他们同样具有创造性，也很少会表现出来。

因此，你可以通过一个测试找出企业中的创新者，否则，你将无法知道谁真正具备创新能力。他们可能会离你而去或中途夭折，但无论哪种情况都会使公司失去他们所具备的潜力。

创新者有哪些

并不是所有的创新者都一样。事实上，即使创新者都具备以下基础特质：能够识别新想法的潜力、决心和专注力，他们仍然可以分为三个差别迥异的类型。这三类创新者为高影响力创新者、管理型创新者和哲学型创新者。

高影响力创新者通常对想法本身并不会非常感兴趣，他们会更关注这个想法在未来是否具有盈利潜力。这种人非常朴素，他们通常是非常严厉、要求苛刻的老板，而且注重细节。这类创新者总是能够创造出极为可观的利润。比尔·盖茨、迈克尔·戴

尔和马克·扎克伯格都是这类创新者的典型代表。

管理型创新者一般会对想法感兴趣，但他们从不过分沉迷于想法本身。与高影响力创新者相比，管理型创新者更愿意耗费成本将创新想法或产品推向市场，他们的盈利能力往往比高影响力创新者略逊色一些。

哲学型创新者重点关注想法本身，而不是这个想法能够带来多少利润。即使某个想法可能没有盈利的可能性，他们也愿意掏腰包购买这个想法。这是高影响力创新者和管理型创新者都不会做的。哲学型创新者几乎从来不曾盈利，如果公司是他们自己经营管理，常常以破产告终。他们是高消费者，在将想法推向市场时，他们往往会耗费巨资，他们的花费远高于高影响力创新者和管理型创新者。

这三种创新者完全不同。对比三者的特点可以明显发现，你应该雇佣高影响力创新者，因为他们总能够为企业带来盈利。

然而，事实并非如此简单。首先，这类创新者非常少，穷极一生也可能见不到几个高影响力创新者。其次，高影响力创新者通常非常独立，他们不愿意和自己以外的任何人分享由创新产品或想法而产生的利润。因此，如果你的公司有一个这类人才，未来他们必然会离你而去，创建他们自己的公司。第三，这类创新者很难与之共事。他们不喜欢为其他任何人工作，他们憎恨任何试图告诉他们该做什么的人。即使你拥有一个这样的人才，一旦他们开始着手一个创新项目，他们肯定会在不久后离你而去。防止这种现象发生的唯一方法是让他们成为公司合伙人，或者把公司的主要部分给他们。

相对而言，管理型创新者比较容易共事。尽管他们也很注重盈利，但与高影响力创新者相比，他们对金钱的渴望没有那么强烈。他们更趋向于以企业为导向，因此，比较容易与之共事。他们对成为老板的渴望没有那么高，也不一定会离开他们所效力的公司。大多时间，他们的确能为企业带来盈利。因此，如果你能够找到这样的人才对你而言会是个很好的机遇，尽管他们不像高影响力创新者那样凤毛麟角，但也非常与众不同。

从本质上看，哲学型创新者更像是一个思考者而不是一个商人。这并不意味着他们没有将想法变为产品的能力，但很可能这个产品永远无法盈利。这类创新者不太注重细节，他们通常更加重视如何能够改良一个想法或产品，而不是如何赚取更多的钱。

你可能会认为你要尽力去避开哲学型创新者，但

其实你不需要这么做。这类创新者是最普通的类型，他们与你所见到或识别出的高影响力创新者和管理型创新者不同，因此，如果你发现了一个创新者，他很有可能属于这个类型。

因此，如果你希望聘用创新者，鼓励寻找创新者，那么大多数情况下你所能够找到的都会是这种类似于哲学型创新者的雇员，通常他们损失过很多钱，或者经历过创业的失败。如果他们为你工作，往往会花费很高的成本来追求一些与原有概念相关的延伸，而这部分延伸会耗费很高的成本，从而导致亏损增加。

挖掘创新者长处

在你创立一家新公司时，高影响力创新者是你最好的选择。那时你并不介意将公司50%甚至80%的股份给予这位即将为你公司做出巨大贡献的创新者。如果你不想这么做就不要聘请他们，因为如果你仅仅用很少的股权来吸引他们留在公司，最终他们很可能会以一种你最不想看到的方式来结束你的公司。他们甚至会采取一些不道德的、违法的手段来达到目的。

如果你的公司已经成立了一段时间，而且希望通过建立一家新公司来开发一个新产品，管理型创新者是你最好的选择。这类人喜欢处于发展中期公司环境下工作，而且不要求拥有大部分甚至整个公司。与高影响力创新者不同，这类创新者在处于发展较后期的公司环境中也能很好地工作。

如果你是一家成熟的公司，哲学型创新者最适合你。这类人喜欢成熟的工作环境下工作，因为公司能够给他们提供足够的资金来支持并保证实现他们的想法。因为他们过于注重想法本身而不是盈利性，因此，他们往往会耗费大量资金，即使在他们自己无法赚钱的情况下，他们也愿意与你长期共事。

在这种情况下你需要一位特别管理者对他们管理。这位管理者必须极具警惕性，既要能够杜绝非理性花费，同时也足够聪明能够使哲学型创新者持续追逐他们的梦想，实现创新。如果没有这样的管理者，哲学型创新者也会离你而去，因为他们非常善于令其他公司相信他们所创新产品的价值。

在寻找创新者时不要混淆创造和创新的本质。你一定要清楚你需要的是哪种类型的创新者，并运用不同方法对他们管理。如果你想确定这些人是创新者还是创造者，那么，使用行为评估是寻找创新者的最可靠方法。■

"Finding Innovators for Your Company"

Dr. E. Ted Prince
Founder and CEO
Perth Leadership Institute
www.perthleadership.org

Top Capital Magazine (Beijing)
August 2012

How do you find innovators? This is a perennial problem for both young and mature companies. In young companies they might be needed to help generate the initial push for a completely different and therefore valuable product or service. In established companies they might be needed to refresh the product. In mature companies they might be needed to regenerate the company and its products.

There are two major issues in finding innovators. These are:

- How to recognize innovators in the first place
- How to recognize the different types of innovators and where to use these different types

Recognizing Innovators

The first thing you have to recognize is that it isn't easy to identify an innovator particularly if they are young and haven't ever actually innovated anything. Often – although not always – innovators are shy and introverted and don't like to advertize themselves. So often you don't notice them. Usually these types of people are not good at communicating to others and may even be very modest.

And there are many people who like to think of themselves as being innovative who are not innovators. Sometimes such people are not so modest and will claim that they are innovative. You might believe them since they are creative, but as we will see below, being creative is not the same thing as being innovative.

And, as we will discuss below, there are different types of innovators. So even if you do successfully identify an innovator, it might not be the type of innovator that you need for your particular company and business at its own particular stage of development.

Being Creative Is Not The Same As Being Innovative

There is a very common misunderstanding that people who are creative are innovators. For many, the two are seen as being the same thing. As in: if you are creative you are also innovative and if you are innovative you are also creative. This reflects a massive misunderstanding of what innovation – and creativity – are all about.

To be creative is to think up a new idea, product, process or thing that, usually either no-one else or at most just a few people have come up with. That idea or product might be startlingly new, imaginative or unique.

But there is no presumption in the concept of creativity that says a creator is someone who also stays with this new idea or product through to broad social acceptance. A creator might well build a new product. But creating something new is a far cry from getting others to accept and use it.

That is because to do this requires a level of determination and persistence that might have to be sustained for many years, well after the original creative thrill has evaporated in the hard grind of the often herculean task of getting people to accept and use something new and unfamiliar.

Being creative is all about the act. The thrill and the joy that goes with doing something new, getting out of the rut. It is an act which provides intense intellectual pleasure to the creator. It's all about intensity of experience. That's a far cry from what innovation is all about, as we shall see below.

Let's take a couple of examples of innovators. I think we would all agree that Bill Gates of Microsoft fame and Mark Zuckerberg of Facebook would both be regarded as innovators. Yet neither created the basic product that took them to fame.

In the case of Bill Gates, he acquired DOS from Seattle Computer and then later parlayed this into a huge fortune. And Mark Zuckerberg, as we saw in the enlightening film, "The Social Network" didn't actually come up with the idea for a social network himself. He actually got the idea from others and then ran with it until it too took off in a big way.

In other words, neither Bill Gates nor Mark Zuckerberg created the idea behind the product that later made them famous. But that is not to deprecate their contribution.

Their first incalculably valuable contribution was to recognize that the ideas and products that they got from others had huge potential value. Their second huge contribution was to stick with the ideas through thick and thin, to mobilize the resources around it necessary for acceptance and to promote the idea until it gained critical mass and broad social acceptance.

It's very hard to launch a new product and even harder to gain market acceptance if a new market is being created for it. To achieve this is a tremendous feat requiring steely determination, great courage, grit and sheer persistence. It requires the energy and focus to keep on going even when everyone else is either ignoring or even making fun of the idea.

Innovators are often fast followers. They recognize something new for its potential. Then they apply their prodigious capabilities of determination, courage, focus and execution to bring the concept to reality.

This is what separates the sheep from the goats, the creators from the innovators. To be an innovator is to have these particular qualities of execution in great measure in a way that very few people possess.

The hallmark of innovation is thus firstly the ability to recognize a world-changing idea and/or product. Secondly it is to provide the focus, determination and persistence to get it accepted against the longest of odds over what may turn out to be a very long period of time.

In other words, innovation focuses not on the initial experience and the pleasure that comes from it, but about the hard slog that comes after. The act of creation is the fun part. The innovation part is the really hard bit.

In creation you take the first exhilarating step. Innovation is the other 1000 miles over tough, forbidding terrain. It is going to be painful, dangerous, often boring, and nowhere is there any presumption that you will actually make it. And all the time you have to believe in your original vision that it will eventually be worth it.

So what does this mean for finding innovators? First, you can't assume that your creative people are innovative. In fact they almost certainly won't be. You have to identify people who are good at

recognizing the potential of creative ideas and then have the courage, determination and focus to be able to stick with this idea until fruition.

Often innovators have innovated before, even when they were very young. So that's one way of recognizing them. Another is that they are usually very skeptical about existing things and ideas. A further one is that they stick with jobs and are very persistent. Most people who are very creative are not very persistent.

There are very few tests for identifying innovators. We have one which is very effective. It identifies those amongst your employees who are innovators that you would not have usually guessed them to be such. Often these people are introverted and shy and, even if they are also creative, often don't want to show it.

So you often need a test to find your innovators, otherwise you just won't know who they are. Then they will probably either leave you, or just die on the vine. Either way their potential will be lost to your organization.

What Are the Different types of Innovators?

All innovators are not the same. In fact there are three types of innovators who are dramatically different to each other, even though each of these three types shares the basic characteristics of being able to recognize the potential of a new idea, and have determination and focus.

We call the three types of innovators the High-Leverage Innovators, the Managerial Innovators and the Philosopher-Innovators.

High-Leverage Innovators: this type of innovator is less interested in the idea itself and much more interested in its potential to make a lot of money. This person is very frugal, an extremely tough and demanding boss and very detail-oriented. This innovator is always very, very profitable. Bill Gates, Michael Dell and Mark Zuckerberg are good examples of this type of innovator.

Managerial Innovators: this type of innovator is interested in the idea but not obsessive about the idea itself. They will spend more than the High-Leverage Innovator to get the innovation to market. This type of innovator is usually profitable but much less so than the High-Leverage Innovator.

Philosopher-Innovators: this type of innovator is mainly interested in the idea and not in the money it can generate. They will often pursue the idea even if there is no possibility of a profit, something that neither the High-Leverage or Managerial Innovator will do. The Philosopher Innovator almost never makes a profit and usually goes out of business if it is their own company. They are high-expense people who will spend much more than either the High-Leverage or the Managerial Innovator to try to bring the idea to the market.

As you can see these three types of innovators are completely different. It might seem obvious that you would only hire the High-Leverage Innovator since they are always very profitable.

However it's not as easy as that. For a start, this type of innovator is very rare and you won't see too many of them in your lifetime. Also High-Leverage Innovators are intensely independent and they don't want to share the profits from the innovation with anyone but themselves. So if you have one in your company, he or she will almost certainly leave and found their own company.

Third, these types of innovators are hard to get along with. They don't like to work for anyone else and they will resent anyone who tries to tell them what to do. Even if you have one, once they start working on an innovation they will almost certainly leave you. The only way to prevent this is to make them a full partner or give them a major part of the company.

Managerial Innovators are a bit easier to work with. They are not quite as money-hungry as the High-Leverage innovators although they are still very profit focused. However they tend to be a bit more company-oriented and will be easier to get along with. They are less demanding as bosses and are less likely to leave a company that they don't own. They do make money most of the time. So these are a good bet if you can find them because although they are not as rare as the High-Leverage innovators, they are still very uncommon.

The Philosopher-Innovators are essentially thinkers rather than business people. That doesn't mean that they can't take an idea through to production. But it will usually never make money. This type of innovator is not detail oriented. They usually focus more on making the idea better than on making money.

So it would appear that you should avoid the Philosopher-Innovator right? Nope. This type of innovator is the most common type. It's unlikely that you will ever see or recognize a High-Leverage or even a Managerial innovator but if you see an innovator at all it will usually be one of these.

So if you do hire, promote or find an innovator it will most likely be a Philosopher-Innovator. This person will usually lose a lot of money and will often fail in their own company. If they work for you they will usually spend too much money chasing interesting extensions of the original idea but these extensions will just cost more money and result in increased losses.

Where to use the Different Innovators

The High-Leverage Innovators are the best people to choose if you are starting a new company where you don't mind giving away most of the company – maybe 50-80% to that person. If you don't want to do this you should not use them because if you do keep them with less equity, they will end up getting the company in another way that you probably won't like. They might even resort to unethical, immoral or illegal means to achieve this.

If you are an established company and want to develop a new product by setting up a new company, the Managerial Innovator is the best. This person will be comfortable working in a semi-corporate environment and will not demand to own most or all of the company. This sort of innovator is also comfortable in later stage company environments, unlike the High-Leverage Innovator.

If you are an established or mature company, the Philosopher-Innovator might be the best for you. This type of person fits in very well with a mature environment providing that they have enough funding to support working on their ideas. Since they are so focused on the idea rather than profitability they will use a lot of money without ever being profitable themselves but they will likely stay with you for a long time.

In this case you need to have a special kind of manager for them. That manager must be watchful to ensure that they don't have unreasonable spending but still be wise enough to let them pursue their ideas and innovations programs. If he is not like this, even the Philosopher-Innovator will leave because they are usually quite good at convincing another company of the value of their innovations.

Recommendations

- In looking for innovators don't confuse creativity with innovation
- Recognize that there are different types of innovators who must be used and managed in different ways
- Using a behavioral assessment is the most reliable way to find innovators if you want to be sure

Dr. E. Ted Prince, the Founder and CEO of the Perth Leadership Institute, located in Florida in the US has also been CEO of several other companies, both public and private. He is the author of 'The Three Financial Styles of Very Successful Leaders (McGraw-Hill, 2005) and numerous other publications in this area. He is a frequent speaker at industry conferences. He works with large corporations globally on leadership development programs and coaches senior executives and teams in the area of financial leadership. He has held the position of Visiting Professor at the University of Florida in the US in its Graduate Business School and also at the Shanghai University of Finance and Economics in China.