Why Growth Often Destroys What Made a Start-Up Successful

01.08.2026 17:07:49 | Management Insights, Lukas Michel | 0 Comments | Growth

The story of a successful transition.

Growth is usually treated as proof that something is working.

Demand is rising.
Customers are responding.
The product has found traction.
Revenue is growing.
The team is expanding.
The organization is becoming more visible, more complex, more serious.

From the outside, growth looks like momentum.

And it is.

But growth also marks one of the most dangerous transitions in organizational life. It is the point where success begins to attract the very management habits that can quietly destroy the conditions that created success in the first place.

This is the central warning in the growth-stage pattern described in Patterns of Mastery.

The manuscript shows a sharp contrast between the typical start-up and the typical growth organization. Start-ups tend to operate with strong purpose, trust, awareness, choice, and founder-led involvement that helps people work in flow. Growth companies, by contrast, often introduce newly minted managers, formal structures, targets, and command-and-control routines that weaken leadership, damage culture, stall innovation, and redirect people away from contribution toward compliance.

That is why growth deserves much more careful leadership than it usually receives.

The danger is not growth itself.

The danger is what organizations often do in order to manage it.

What made the start-up work

In the start-up phase, many things are still imperfect.

Systems are immature.
Processes are incomplete.
Roles are fluid.
Formal structures are limited.

And yet the start-up often works remarkably well.

The manuscript describes start-ups as organizations in which people are highly engaged, trust is high, awareness is strong, focus and choice are sufficient for people to work in flow, and the founder's highly involved leadership creates a culture of common understanding, motivation, and responsiveness.

This is not accidental.

The founder is close to the work.
Communication is direct.
Purpose is vivid.
People understand why they are there.
Knowledge moves quickly.
Teams improvise around real problems.
Energy is concentrated rather than dispersed.

The start-up does not succeed because it has perfect systems.

It succeeds because human capability is still close to the center of how the organization operates.

That creates speed, commitment, creativity, and a sense that what people do actually matters.

Why growth changes the management problem

Once demand rises and the organization expands, the management problem changes.

What worked informally at smaller scale no longer seems

sufficient. More people must be coordinated. New functions emerge. Decisions can no longer all flow through the founder. Customers expect consistency. Capacity has to expand. Accountabilities need to become clearer.

All of this is real.

The manuscript acknowledges that enlightened founders understand growth introduces new challenges and that effective leaders confront these challenges by building new capabilities. But it also shows that many start-ups fail at exactly this point because they cannot find the right balance between expansion and controlled capability building.

That balance is the crux of the growth stage.

The organization does need more structure.

But the question is what kind of structure.

Too often, the answer is the wrong one.

The classic growth-stage mistake

The manuscript is unusually direct here.

It states that most organizations in the growth stage have a business model designed for exploitation, and that newly minted managers create traditional command-and-control structures that redirect the energy of people toward plans and performance goals rather than toward creative value creation. It also states that results on the Leadership Scorecard indicate the emergence of a toxic environment that stifles the abilities of people.

That is the classic growth-stage mistake.

An organization that succeeded because of people-centric energy begins to manage growth through traditional control logic.

The shift often looks reasonable.

More reporting.
More controls.
More performance metrics.
More approvals.
More role definitions.
More managers.

More structure.
More emphasis on efficiency.

Each of these may sound sensible in isolation.

Together, however, they often create a very different organization from the one that actually earned the right to grow.

How growth destroys the original strengths

The most dangerous thing about this shift is that it happens under the banner of professionalism.

Leaders tell themselves the company is maturing.
Managers believe they are bringing order.
Processes are introduced in the name of scale.
Controls are justified as necessary discipline.

And yet, underneath this language, something is being lost.

The manuscript makes the contrast stark. In the start-up stage, cultural attributes are strong, leadership is solid, motivation is high, and the company is nimble and responsive. In the growth stage, leadership and culture fall sharply, systems remain only middling, agility drops, innovation stalls, and success begins to decline even while growth continues.

This means growth can remain visible even as the internal quality of the organization worsens.

That is the trap.

The company expands.
But the work environment weakens.
Headcount rises.
But flow declines.
Processes multiply.
But initiative falls.
Revenue grows.
But the organization becomes less capable of learning.

What made the company attractive to customers may still carry it forward for a while.

What made it alive internally begins to erode.

Why new managers are often the turning point

One of the strongest themes in the manuscript is the role of new managers in this transition.

It notes that growth organizations often function as programmed machines because creative individuals are either thrust into managerial positions and overreact to their loss of control by introducing rules and processes, or founders bring in professionally trained managers who standardize work using traditional methodologies. Either way, layers of rules and procedures emerge that stifle the creativity and innovation that drove the organization in the first place.

This is not an argument against managers.

It is an argument against managers carrying the wrong mental model into a growth-stage organization.

Growth does not only require more management.

It requires different management.

If newly appointed managers do not understand the delicate relationship between leadership, culture, and systems, they may unintentionally damage all three at once.

They introduce goals without meaning.
Control without trust.
Processes without learning.
Metrics without understanding.
Structure without vitality.

That is how a successful start-up becomes a growth company with top-line momentum and internal drag.

The shift from flow to mediocrity

One of the manuscript’s most revealing observations is that growth organizations often still have high choice and trust, yet lose focus. Employees begin to settle for mediocrity. Leadership and culture deteriorate dramatically compared with the start-up

stage, while innovation and agility fall with them.

This is a subtle but critical shift.

The people may not become less capable.

The organization simply stops giving them an environment in which their capability can matter.

Instead of working in flow, they begin working around the system.
Instead of building on early energy, they conserve it.
Instead of using judgment freely, they navigate process.
Instead of strengthening capability, the organization teaches detours.

The manuscript even notes that people develop detours to circumvent ineffective or nonexistent systems.

That is one of the clearest signs of decline in a growing company.

People are still trying to get good work done.

But they are increasingly doing it in spite of management, not because of it.

Why growth makes culture fragile

Culture in a start-up is often held together by founder proximity, constant interaction, and shared sense of purpose.

Growth changes all three.

The founder cannot be everywhere.
Teams multiply.
Distance increases.
New managers create local climates.
Processes begin shaping behavior more than personal example.

If this transition is not handled with care, culture becomes the casualty.

The manuscript describes the growth-stage Leadership Scorecard as showing significant negative shifts compared with the start-up, particularly in leadership and culture. It warns of a dangerous zone where flawed leadership combines with a toxic culture and where newly established performance norms and managerial practices destroy the positive culture that had powered early

success.

This is why growth is not simply a scaling challenge.

It is a cultural transmission challenge.

Can the organization preserve the people-centric logic that created early flow while building the systems needed for larger scale?

That is the real test.

Why control feels safer than capability building

When companies grow quickly, uncertainty rises.

That naturally creates anxiety.

And anxiety tempts leaders toward control.

Control feels measurable.
It feels responsible.
It feels like maturity.
It feels safer than trust, delegation, and capability development.

But the manuscript points toward a different conclusion. It argues that organizations need to move beyond traditional management in order to reach mastery in the digital economy with growth-type patterns. The first step is to develop dynamic and people-centric capabilities embedded into the DNA of the organization, supported by systems that enable delegation rather than suppress it.

This is the deeper lesson:

What feels safer in the short term may be exactly what weakens the organization in the long term.

Growth does require more structure.

But if that structure is built on fear of losing control rather than on trust in capability, it will eventually undermine the company’s future.

What leaders should look for in a growth-stage company

Leaders should look for the points where professionalization is becoming deformation.

Where have new managers introduced control faster than understanding?
Where are systems multiplying without actually supporting better work?
Where has cultural energy dropped compared with the start-up phase?
Where are talented people working around management rather than through it?
Where are growth targets crowding out learning, contribution, and collaboration?
Where has the founder’s original people-first logic been replaced by managerial habits that look mature but weaken the company?

These are not signs that growth is failing.

They are signs that growth is being managed in the wrong way.

And until that becomes visible, the company may continue expanding while becoming less alive, less adaptive, and less innovative.

The development path: complete the dynamic shift

The manuscript is very clear about the path forward.

Growth organizations need to complete a dynamic shift in thinking and return to people-centric practices. They need leaders who can objectively recognize the damage being done, rediscover the core capabilities that drove success, evaluate whether management practices are helping or hurting people’s ability to add value, and build systems that support delegation rather than command-heavy interference.

This does not mean returning to start-up informality.

The company does need systems.

It does need direction.
It does need management depth.

But it needs a kind of management that protects capability while building scale.

That means:

Building systems that help rather than hinder.
Recruiting managers who understand people-centric principles.
Strengthening delegation without meddling from above.
Protecting culture while increasing clarity.
Designing growth so that structure amplifies human capability rather than replacing it.

That is how a growth company avoids destroying what made it successful.

The first step: create your own Organization Twin

The most practical first step is not another growth initiative.

It is to create your own Organization Twin.

Through a Structured Reflection—a standardized online questionnaire that takes about 15 minutes—you create a first evidence-based representation of how your organization currently works.

This produces two practical views:

The Capability Profile, which makes visible the broader organizational pattern: strategy, business model, organizational form, management context, growth stage, operating capabilities, and competitive barriers.

The Leadership Scorecard, which reveals how systems, leadership, culture, and success interact, and whether the organization supports understanding, thinking, delivery, engagement, and meaningful boundaries.

Together, they help leaders see whether growth is strengthening the organization—or quietly damaging the culture, leadership, and capability base that once powered it.

Not as a judgment.
Not as a ranking.
Not as criticism of individuals.

But as preparation for a Guided Clarity Session.

Growth should extend the original strengths, not erase them

The real task of growth is not to become more corporate.

It is to become more capable.

That is a very different ambition.

A good growth-stage organization does not erase what made the start-up strong. It translates those early strengths into a more scalable form. It protects purpose while adding clarity. It builds systems without bureaucratizing the work. It appoints managers who strengthen capability instead of suppressing it. It learns how to scale without losing flow.

That is rare.

But it is possible.

And it is one of the most important leadership transitions in the life of any organization.

Because growth should be the stage where a company becomes more of what made it successful—
not the stage where it quietly forgets.

- Version zum Drucken
- Per E-Mail versenden
- Newsletter abonnieren

- Twittern

No comments yet.