Why Fast-Moving Tech Firms Still Need Better Management, Not Less of It

03.08.2026 16:27:16 | Management Insights, Lukas Michel | 0 Comments | Tech firms

The dominant pattern of tech firms

Technology companies often look modern from the outside.

They build advanced products.
They work in project structures.
They move quickly.
They hire highly educated people.
They operate in industries defined by speed, precision, innovation, and constant technological change.

Because of that, many leaders assume technology firms are automatically modern in how they are managed.

But that is often not true.

One of the most useful insights from the technology chapter in *Patterns of Mastery* is that many technology organizations are technologically advanced while still being managerially conventional. The manuscript describes the typical technology organization as operating in a change-based mode within a dynamic context, with an engineering mindset and traditional management practices. These organizations are successful, but their leadership and management patterns often stunt growth and cause opportunities to be missed.

That is the central tension.

Technology companies may be built for technical complexity.

But many are not yet built for management complexity.

Why technology firms often appear stronger than they are

The manuscript’s technology profile is not a story of weak companies.

It is a story of capable companies carrying hidden limits.

Technology organizations in the sample are described as successful despite structural and mental barriers in senior executives and managers. Their technological expertise and engaged workforce drive results despite flaws in management. They typically operate at the enablers maturity level, often with a hybrid business model, and function in complex, decentralized, project-based structures.

That combination matters.

Because it means the organization can keep performing for quite a while even when management is not yet fully aligned with its context.

The products may be strong.
The talent may be strong.
The customer need may be real.
The engineering discipline may be impressive.

And yet the management system may still be underdeveloped for the world the company is actually operating in.

The engineering mindset: strength and limitation

The manuscript is especially sharp on the role of the engineering mindset.

It identifies the engineering mindset as one of the defining characteristics of technology organizations and links it directly to both quality and constraint. The engineering mindset helps produce precision, quality products, and complex technical delivery. At the same time, when combined with traditional leadership, tight goals, and incentive systems, it contributes to “ok” results rather than great ones.

This is a subtle but important point.

The problem is not engineering rigor.

The problem is when engineering logic becomes the dominant management logic.

Engineering logic is excellent for solving technical problems.
It is less effective when used as the main answer to human coordination, motivation, learning, and collaboration.

That is where many technology firms become trapped.

They try to manage people with the same mindset used to manage projects, specifications, and delivery systems.

That works only up to a point.

Why project-based organizations keep changing structure

The manuscript describes technology firms as organizations where tasks are accomplished on a project-by-project basis and where projects come and go, resulting in continuous change in structure and reallocation of resources. Leaders constantly adjust the structure and become personally involved in ongoing projects.

This is instantly recognizable in many technology businesses.

Resources are moved to priority programs.
Teams are reorganized around new launches.
Leaders intervene when major delivery pressure builds.
Structures shift with customer demand, platform priorities, or technical opportunities.

None of this is irrational.

In fast-moving technical environments, flexibility is necessary.

But this pattern comes with a cost.

When structure is constantly adjusted, people can lose stable orientation. When leaders keep getting drawn into projects, they may end up managing technical motion instead of designing better managerial conditions. When priorities keep moving, attention fragments and the organization begins to rely more on

heroic effort than on a durable operating system.

That is the hidden tax of project-driven complexity.

Why motivation is often still treated the old way

One of the clearest tensions in the manuscript is the gap between the strength of the workforce and the weakness of the motivational logic.

The technology chapter states directly that motivation in these organizations is often driven by stringent goals, management by objectives, and financial incentives. It also identifies traditional management techniques and weak leadership as root causes of the dominant capability barriers.

This matters because technology companies often depend on highly educated people whose contribution cannot be reduced to compliance.

They need people to think.
To solve.
To connect ideas.
To learn across boundaries.
To focus attention on what matters.
To share knowledge under uncertainty.

Yet many firms still use motivational systems better suited to control-based environments.

That creates a mismatch.

The company needs ingenuity.
The system still leans on targets and extrinsic reward.

The result is often technically competent performance, but underused human capability.

Why “successful” can still mean

underperforming

The manuscript’s wording on technology organizations is revealing: they are successful, yet held back; they get “ok” results, yet overlook opportunities; they need to release the untapped innovative potential inherent in their people.

This is a crucial distinction for leaders.

A technology company can be objectively successful and still be underperforming relative to its own potential.

It may deliver.
It may grow.
It may compete effectively.
But it may still fall short of what its people, knowledge base, and market position could make possible.

That is why performance alone is not the right standard.

The better question is:

Are we getting the most from the capability we already have?

The deeper issue: complexity needs better leadership, not just better systems

The manuscript identifies two core barriers in the technology pattern:

traditional management techniques combined with the engineering mindset and weak leadership, and the sheer complexity of the organization, which requires outstanding leadership to produce outstanding results.

That is exactly right.

As technology firms grow, complexity rises faster than many leaders expect.

Not only technical complexity.
Organizational complexity.
Coordination complexity.
Priority complexity.

Communication complexity.
Cultural complexity.

At that point, better engineering is not enough.

The organization needs a better way to lead complexity.

This is why the answer is not “less management.”

It is better management.

More precise leadership.
Better communication.
Clearer contribution dialogue.
Systems that support knowledge sharing.

Management practices that strengthen focus instead of scattering it.

The crisis of sovereignty

The manuscript gives the technology chapter a distinctive life-cycle tension.

Most technology organizations in the cluster are described as operating in the collaboration growth stage, with webs of businesses or projects in platform-type structures. This creates a crisis of sovereignty, where business-unit or project leaders compete for independence and resources. The resulting competition creates interferences that inhibit responsiveness and lead to missed opportunities.

This is a very useful lens.

Many technology firms do not primarily suffer from lack of initiative.

They suffer from too many partially competing initiatives.

Too many strong leaders protecting their domain.
Too many projects competing for scarce talent.
Too many priorities justified locally but misaligned globally.

In this situation, management has to do something much more demanding than monitor delivery.

It has to integrate.

That is why the manuscript argues for integrating people-first, people-centric management techniques into existing dynamic operating systems so the organization can build agility, speed, and resilience despite complexity.

What leaders should look for in technology organizations

Leaders in technology firms should look beyond technical excellence and ask harder management questions.

Where is engineering rigor helping the business, and where is it narrowing how people are managed?
Where are tight goals improving focus, and where are they replacing intrinsic commitment?
Where do projects create responsiveness, and where do they create constant reallocation and noise?
Where are leaders too deeply pulled into execution instead of shaping better operating conditions?
Where is knowledge sharing strong, and where is project competition weakening it?
Where are opportunities being missed not because the company lacks talent, but because the management system does not release it?

These are not secondary questions for technology firms.

They are central to whether the company remains merely capable — or becomes masterful.

The development path: from engineering-led control to people-centric capability

The manuscript’s direction is very clear.

Technology organizations need to adopt more people-centric management principles, shift toward human systems with intrinsic reward rather than tight targets and extrinsic incentives, and refine dynamic capabilities that release the power of people

and help the organization cope with complexity and take advantage of missed opportunities.

That is not a rejection of discipline.

It is a redesign of discipline around the realities of knowledge work.

The company still needs precision.
It still needs quality.
It still needs delivery.
It still needs strong project management.

But it also needs management practices that fit highly educated people working in dynamic, interdependent environments.

That means:
better communication,
better performance dialogue,
more focus on contribution and alignment,
stronger knowledge sharing,
and systems that help people handle complexity without being buried by it.

The first step: create your own Organization Twin

The most practical first step is not another reorganization.

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 the company's technical success is being fully supported by its management system — or quietly limited by it.

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

But as preparation for a Guided Clarity Session.

Better management is the next competitive advantage in technology

Technology firms rarely lack intelligence.

They rarely lack ambition.

They rarely lack technical expertise.

What they often lack is a management system equal to their technical sophistication.

That is why fast-moving tech firms still need better management, not less of it.

Because the next competitive advantage in technology may not come only from a better product, faster code, or a stronger platform.

It may come from a better-designed organization — one that can turn engineering strength, project intensity, and human capability into sustained innovation, stronger coordination, and more of the opportunities it is currently missing.

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

- Twittern

No comments yet.