



BEYOND THE FROZEN MIDDLE

Middle Management — The Transformation Bottleneck Everyone Blames

A Practitioner's Perspective on the Structural Forces That Trap Middle Leaders in Transformation Programmes

Middle Management — The Transformation Bottleneck Everyone Blames

Leadership · No. 66

Originally written February 2013 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition, 2025

“The middle manager who resists transformation is rarely resisting the transformation itself — they are resisting the impossible position it places them in, asked to champion a future they had no part in designing while delivering a present they are still held accountable for.”

1. The Convenient Scapegoat

Every transformation programme needs someone to blame when the pace of change disappoints, and middle management has become the default answer. The language varies — the "frozen middle," the "clay layer," the "permafrost" — but the diagnosis is always the same: senior leadership has the vision, frontline staff are willing to change, and middle managers are the obstruction between intent and execution.

This narrative is convenient, widely repeated, and fundamentally wrong. Not because middle managers never resist change — they sometimes do — but because the narrative mistakes a symptom for a cause, and in doing so, ensures that the real problem is never addressed.

The pattern I have observed across transformation programmes in multiple sectors is remarkably consistent. Senior leaders design a transformation. They communicate it with conviction. They establish a programme structure to deliver it. They set ambitious timelines. And then they express surprise and frustration when middle managers — the people who must translate strategic intent into operational reality — do not embrace the change with the enthusiasm the programme demands.

What is rarely examined is why the embrace does not come. The answer, in most cases, has nothing to do with attitude, capability, or willingness to change. It has everything to do with the structural position middle managers occupy, and the impossible set of demands that transformation programmes place upon them.

2. The Structural Trap

Middle managers in a transformation programme face a set of contradictions that are rarely acknowledged by the people who designed the programme.

The first contradiction is temporal. Middle managers are simultaneously accountable for delivering today's operational performance — the targets, the service levels, the budgets that define their current role — and for implementing a transformation that disrupts the very systems and processes through which that performance is delivered. They are asked to keep the engine running while replacing its parts, with no reduction in the performance expectations attached to the engine.

The second contradiction is informational. Transformation programmes are typically designed at senior leadership level, often with external consulting support, and communicated to the organisation as a decided strategy. Middle managers receive the output — the new operating model, the new processes, the new technology platform — but not the reasoning, the trade-offs, or the alternatives that were considered and rejected. They are expected to champion a direction they did not help to set, answer questions they were not equipped to answer, and defend decisions they may not agree with.

The third contradiction is relational. Middle managers are the people who have built the trust relationships with their teams. They know who is struggling, who is anxious, who needs more support, who is at risk of leaving. The transformation asks them to use these relationships in the service of a change that may not serve the people they have built those relationships with. This is not a trivial ask. It requires middle managers to spend the relational capital they have accumulated over years in the service of an agenda that is not their own.

The middle manager who resists transformation is rarely resisting the transformation itself — they are resisting the impossible position it places them in, asked to champion a future they had no part in designing while delivering a present they are still held accountable for.

3. The Capability Myth

A common response to middle management resistance is to diagnose it as a capability gap. The reasoning runs: middle managers were promoted for their operational expertise, not their change leadership skills. Therefore, they need training. Therefore, we should invest in a change leadership programme for the middle management tier.

This response is not entirely wrong — some middle managers would benefit from development in leading through change. But it is wrong in its framing. It treats the problem as a deficiency in the individual rather than a deficiency in the system. It assumes that if middle managers were better equipped, they would embrace the transformation. This assumption conveniently absolves the transformation design of any responsibility for the resistance it encounters.

In my experience, the most capable middle managers are often the most resistant to poorly designed transformation programmes — precisely because they can see the

flaws that senior leaders, operating at a higher altitude, cannot. They can see that the new operating model does not account for the complexity of the work their teams actually do. They can see that the technology platform will not deliver what was promised. They can see that the timelines are unrealistic. Their resistance is not a capability gap. It is pattern recognition.

The organisations that dismiss this resistance as a capability problem lose twice: they miss the valuable intelligence that middle managers are providing, and they alienate the people whose active engagement is essential to making the transformation work.

4. What Middle Managers Actually Need

The question is not how to get middle managers to stop resisting transformation. It is how to design transformation programmes that do not place middle managers in an impossible position.

This requires three shifts that most transformation programmes are not structured to make.

4.1 Involvement before commitment

Middle managers need to be involved in the design of the transformation, not merely informed of it. This does not mean that every decision should be made by committee, or that the transformation should be slowed to accommodate every concern. It means that the people who will be responsible for making the transformation work in practice should have a genuine opportunity to shape how it is designed.

The practical benefit of this is not primarily about engagement or buy-in — though those matter. It is about quality. Middle managers hold operational knowledge that senior leaders and external consultants do not have. A transformation designed without that knowledge will contain errors that only become visible during implementation, at which point they are expensive to fix. A transformation designed with that knowledge has a materially better chance of working.

4.2 Permission to be honest

Transformation programmes generate enormous pressure to be positive. Progress is reported upward through governance structures that reward good news and penalise bad news. Middle managers learn very quickly that raising concerns about the transformation is not welcome — it marks them as resisters, as people who "don't get it," as part of the problem rather than part of the solution.

This dynamic is catastrophic for transformation success, because it cuts off the flow of accurate information from the people closest to the reality of implementation. The pattern I have observed is depressingly consistent: middle managers stop reporting problems, problems compound, and by the time they become visible at senior leadership level, they are significantly harder and more expensive to resolve.

“The most dangerous moment in a transformation programme is not when middle managers resist. It is when they stop resisting and start complying — silently, without conviction, executing the letter of the plan while the spirit of the change dies in the space between what is reported and what is real.”

Creating genuine permission to be honest requires more than words. It requires that the governance structures, the reporting mechanisms, and the leadership behaviours actively reward accurate reporting over positive reporting. This is a leadership challenge, not a communications challenge.

4.3 Coherent accountability

The temporal contradiction — deliver today's performance while implementing tomorrow's change — cannot be resolved by exhortation. It can only be resolved by making explicit choices about what gives. If a middle manager is expected to lead a significant transformation in their area, something in their operational accountability must change. Either the performance targets are adjusted, or additional resource is provided, or some operational responsibilities are temporarily reassigned.

The failure to make these choices is, in my experience, the single most common reason that middle managers disengage from transformation programmes. They are rational actors responding to an irrational situation: held accountable for operational delivery on one axis and transformation delivery on another, with insufficient time, resource, or authority to do both well. Most will prioritise operational delivery, because that is where the immediate consequences of failure are most visible. The transformation then stalls at the middle layer, and senior leaders diagnose the problem as middle management resistance.

5. The Real Leadership Challenge

The "frozen middle" narrative is not just inaccurate. It is actively harmful, because it directs leadership attention to the wrong place. Instead of examining the structural conditions that make middle management resistance rational, it frames the problem as one of attitude or capability — and therefore amenable to training programmes, communications campaigns, and performance management.

The real leadership challenge is different and harder. It requires senior leaders to accept that the transformation they have designed may contain structural flaws that middle managers can see and they cannot. It requires them to create conditions in which those flaws can surface and be addressed. It requires them to make explicit trade-offs between operational delivery and transformation delivery, rather than expecting both simultaneously. And it requires them to treat middle managers as partners in the design of the transformation, not merely as implementers of it.

This is harder than blaming the frozen middle. It is also the only approach that works. The organisations I have seen succeed in transformation are not the ones that found ways to overcome middle management resistance. They are the ones that never created the conditions for that resistance to become entrenched — because they understood that the problem was never the middle. The problem was always the design.