GROWTH THAT COMPOUNDS

# The playbook study never asked who made the tools

Consultancies sell M&A playbooks as repeatable capability. The study that proved playbooks work measured tools the acquirer built: buying is unmeasured.


**Sinan Isoglu**, MBA (Quantic)

Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher



| PUBLISHED | UPDATED | READING TIME | WORDS |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 16 August 2026 | 20 August 2026 | 9 min | 1,975 |

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/the-playbook-study-never-asked-who-made-the-tools/

CONTENTS



MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Consulting firms sell post-merger integration playbooks on the promise of an off-the-shelf, repeatable capability, citing synergy lifts with no public method attached. The academic record does show that codified tools predict acquisition performance, but in Zollo & Singh's landmark study, knowledge codification was explicitly defined as the sum of tools developed internally by the acquirer. The landmark Academy of Management Annals review confirms that the performance impact of externally bought tools remains unmeasured, while research by Heimeriks and colleagues reveals that routine codification breeds rigidity unless paired with active customization. What transfers is a working exemplar and the team that operated it, not a binder of methodologies.

Keywords: Post-merger integration · Knowledge codification · Integration playbooks · Dynamic capabilities · Evidence-based management

Before you sign the acquisition, the consulting firm opens a deck. The pitch is reassuringly familiar: post-merger integration is dangerous, most deals destroy value, but an off-the-shelf integration playbook turns chaotic execution into a "repeatable, adaptable capability." On vendor websites, the claims are even bolder. Bain & Company promises that its integration support delivers "75% greater cost and revenue synergies" and "16% higher indexed shareholder returns": bold figures presented without sample sizes, methodologies, or explanatory footnotes.

Much like the circulating failure statistics that nobody can trace back to a dataset, these consultancy synergy figures circulate without an empirical paper behind them.

If you turn to the peer-reviewed management literature to see whether codified integration playbooks actually improve merger outcomes, you find something that initially looks like total validation.

In a landmark paper published in the Strategic Management Journal, Maurizio Zollo and Harbir Singh examined 228 acquisitions in the US commercial banking sector. Their empirical models revealed a striking pattern: raw acquisition experience: simply having done many prior deals: had no statistically significant effect on post-acquisition operating performance (coefficients of −0.037 to −0.098, all non-significant). What actually predicted post-acquisition return on assets was knowledge codification ($b = 0.198$, $p < 0.01$ to $b = 0.207$, $p < 0.001$), along with the interaction between codification and the depth of integration ($b = 0.142$, $p < 0.01$).

The finding became an immediate cornerstone of corporate strategy. Much as programmatic acquirers lean on volume without examining execution limits, dealmakers concluded that playbooks manufacture success.

There is only one catch. You have to read how the authors measured the variable.

## How does variable definition alter empirical conclusions on M&A integration tools?

On page 1244 of the published article, Zollo and Singh describe the construction of their core explanatory variable:

> **"Knowledge codification is measured as the sum of acquisition tools developed by the acquiring firm at the time of the focal acquisition."**

The tools analyzed in the study: standardized manuals, due diligence checklists, IT conversion matrices, human resource integration frameworks, and sales integration guidelines: were built by the acquiring firms themselves.

The performance gain did not come from holding a generic checklist. It was the residue of an organization sitting down after prior transactions, debating what went wrong, reconciling divergent operating practices, and codifying their own hard-won operational judgements. Codification was effective because it was the culmination of deliberate learning.

Buying a pre-written integration manual gives an acquirer the physical artifact of codification without any of the organizational learning that produced it. In addition, research shows that acculturation needs social controls, meaning that human integration cannot be achieved through mechanical task execution alone. As explored in how post-merger integration consumes deal value, holding a template does not protect against execution decay.

## What does academic research reveal about the performance of acquired playbooks?

In 2017, Melissa Graebner, Koen Heimeriks, Quy Nguyen Huy, and Eero Vaara published the definitive systematic review of post-merger integration in the Academy of Management Annals. Surveying decades of empirical literature on integration practices, tools, and outcomes, they explicitly addressed the question of externally sourced tools (p. 18):

> "Codified tools may play a particularly important role in PMI, but we have little understanding of how acquirers decide whether and how to create and apply these tools. We also know little regarding whether acquirers learn about PMI from external sources such as consultants or colleagues at other firms, and what conditions may foster such learning."

In Table 1's summary of unresolved research questions, the authors put it even more plainly:

> "How do acquirers (and acquirees) obtain, select and apply PMI tools? Do they obtain tools from external [parties]... we do not know whether and how codified tools are drawn from external sources, and if so, how they impact PMI performance."

As of August 2026, the academic record contains not a single rigorous, peer-reviewed study demonstrating that purchasing an external integration playbook from a third party improves realized post-merger performance.

The claim that an external playbook provides a proven capability is an extrapolation across a boundary that the research itself explicitly marked as untested.

Table 1 Three perspectives on codified integration playbooks

| Study / Source | Sample & Scope | What was measured | Headline finding |
|---|---|---|---|
| Zollo & Singh (2004) | 228 US bank acquisitions | Sum of acquisition tools developed by the acquiring firm | Knowledge codification strongly predicts performance ($b = 0.207$, $p < 0.001$); deal experience alone does not (ns) |
| Heimeriks, Schijven & Gates (2012) | 85 active corporate acquirers | Codified routines vs higher-order risk management practices | Routine codification creates organizational rigidity; benefits vanish unless mediated by active customization |
| Graebner et al. (2017) | Systematic review, AOM Annals | Synthesis of decades of PMI empirical research | Explicitly states: the performance impact of externally sourced tools (consultants) is completely unmeasured |
| Consultancy Market (e.g. Bain 2026) | Vendor promotional material | Proprietary methodologies (“Signal”, “Integration Thesis”) | Asserts 75% higher synergies and 16% TSR lift; zero published methodology or sample data |

Author's synthesis of Zollo & Singh (2004), Heimeriks et al. (2012), and Graebner et al. (2017).

## How does excessive process codification transform into commercial rigidity?

The situation is actually more nuanced than simply “bought playbooks lack proof.” In many acquisition contexts, an off-the-shelf playbook is worse than an uncodified approach.

In a 2012 study published in the Academy of Management Journal, Koen Heimeriks, Mario Schijven, and Stephen Gates investigated 85 active acquirers to examine the mechanisms of post-acquisition learning. Their findings exposed what they termed “the central weakness of codification – the rigidity it breeds.”

When an acquiring firm applies codified routine checklists, managers tend to substitute protocol adherence for situational analysis. The standardized checklist creates behavioral inertia and negative transfer: forcing the specific operating model, culture, and customer interface of the acquired target into an inflexible template designed for a generic transaction.

Heimeriks and colleagues showed that the direct positive effect of routine codification on integration performance is fully mediated by higher-order risk management and contextual adaptation. When acquirers lacked the specific capability to customize their tools to the unique hazards of a deal, codification increased execution failure.

An externally purchased playbook maximizes this exact vulnerability. Because the acquiring team did not design the tool, they do not understand the implicit assumptions baked into its workflows. They follow the manual as a compliance exercise rather than an adaptable framework.

## Why do operational exemplars transfer across organizations while documentation fails?

The problem with buying an integration playbook connects directly to the foundational literature on organizational knowledge transfer. In classic research on best-practice replication, scholars demonstrated that codified documents alone almost never transfer operational capabilities across organizations.

What successfully transfers a complex organizational capability is not a manual, but a working exemplar paired with the people who built and executed it.

When a software or industrial acquirer buys an external methodology deck, it receives abstract process maps ("Day 1 Readiness", "100-Day Plan", "Synergy Tracking"). But integration success happens at the messy boundaries:

- Deciding which sales compensation plans to preserve when merging two enterprise quotas.
- Knowing how much product roadmap friction the acquired engineering team will tolerate before key developers resign.
- Evaluating whether consolidating customer service onto a single ERP system will destroy customer-level responsiveness.

These decisions require tacit domain knowledge and organizational legitimacy. A consulting framework can index the questions, but it cannot supply the contextual judgment required to answer them.

## How do business-model acquisitions differ from resource-absorption deals?

Clayton Christensen and colleagues articulated a vital boundary condition in their 2011 Harvard Business Review analysis, "The New M&A Playbook." They distinguished between two fundamental acquisition archetypes:

1. Leverage-My-Business-Model Deals: The acquirer purchases a target to plug its resources into the acquirer's existing, highly optimized operating model. Here, strict, standardized integration checklists work because the goal is rapid assimilation into a known process.
2. Reinvent-My-Business-Model Deals: The acquirer buys a company to secure a new capability, technology, or business model. In these deals, imposing a standard integration playbook destroys the very asset that was purchased.

Off-the-shelf consulting playbooks are almost universally designed for the first archetype: cost-synergy extraction and operational consolidation. When applied to strategic growth acquisitions, their standardized milestones crush target autonomy and accelerate talent defection.

Table 2 Integration governance against the empirical record

| Governance Decision | What the market sells | What the evidence says | Evidence-Based Rule |
|---|---|---|---|
| Tool Provenance | Buy a comprehensive external playbook to instantly acquire "best-practice integration capability" | Zollo & Singh (2004) proved performance gains come from internally developed tools; external tools are completely unmeasured (AOM Annals) | Budget to build, not to buy: Treat external playbooks only as structural prompts; codify your own internal retrospectives |
| Execution Flexibility | Strict adherence to standardized integration milestones across all functional workstreams | Heimeriks et al. (2012) show rigid checklist adherence causes negative transfer and execution failure | Mandate customization: Explicitly empower integration leads to prune or override playbook steps based on deal hazards |
| External Advisors | Retain strategy consultancies for methodology documents and governance templates | Knowledge-transfer research shows abstract manuals fail to transfer capability without working exemplars | Buy operators, not binders: Insist on external advisors who personally executed identical integrations, and embed them in delivery |
| Deal Archetype Matching | One repeatable corporate playbook applied to every transaction | Christensen et al. (2011) show standard assimilation destroys value in capability-seeking acquisitions | Branch the playbook: Separate cost-assimilation deals from capability-preservation deals before drafting integration charters |

Author's synthesis of the cited literature.

## What operational playbook audit should integration leaders execute next?

If your organization is planning an acquisition or evaluating an integration advisory proposal, what can you do on Monday that takes an hour and costs nothing?

1. Audit your advisory SOW for artifact deliverables versus embedded expertise: Look at the statement of work. If 70% of the fee is paying for "customized integration playbooks, workstream charters, and methodology toolkits," you are buying documentation that the literature shows cannot transfer capability. Shift the scope to retaining specialized operators who have managed identical system cutovers or sales-force integrations.
2. Establish a post-close deliberate learning ritual: Do not let the integration team disband when Day 100 arrives. Conduct a structured post-mortem at 6 months and 12 months. Document the specific operational failures, customer friction points, and cultural bottlenecks. That internal synthesis is the exact mechanism Zollo and Singh measured: the creation of proprietary, firm-specific integration capability.
3. Classify the transaction by archetype before opening the checklist: Determine explicitly whether the deal is an assimilation play (where standardized processes are required) or a capability-growth play (where target practices must be ring-fenced).

The deck presented in the boardroom will always claim that a standardized playbook removes the uncertainty from M&A. But the measured record is clear: playbooks only work when an organization does the hard, internal work of building them. You cannot outsource the learning and expect to keep the return.

## Where are the methodological boundaries of integration playbook studies?

Boundary. The studies explain codification and tool creation, not a universal post-merger outcome. Keep the business-model distinction separate from the evidence about who built the tools.

Evidence base. The analytical frame also draws on these additional sources: Bain & Company 2026. The links identify the exact works; they support the mechanisms and boundary conditions discussed here, not every claim in isolation.

Bain & Company. (2026). Post-merger integration (PMI) consulting [Consulting service page]. Wayback Machine snapshot of March 14, 2026. https://www.bain.com/consulting-services/mergers-acquisitions/post-merger-integration-pmi

Christensen, C. M., Alton, R., Rising, C., & Waldeck, A. (2011). The new M&A playbook. Harvard Business Review, 89(3), 48–57. https://hbr.org/2011/03/the-new-ma-playbook

Graebner, M. E., Heimeriks, K. H., Huy, Q. N., & Vaara, E. (2017). The process of postmerger integration: A review and agenda for future research. Academy of Management Annals, 11(1), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2014.0078

Heimeriks, K. H., Schijven, M., & Gates, S. (2012). Manifestations of higher-order routines: The underlying mechanisms of deliberate learning in the context of postacquisition integration. Academy of Management Journal, 55(3), 703–726. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.0572

Zollo, M., & Singh, H. (2004). Deliberate learning in corporate acquisitions: Post-acquisition strategies and integration capabilities in U.S. bank mergers. Strategic Management Journal, 25(13), 1233–1256. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.426

END OF ESSAY

HOW TO CITE THIS ESSAY

Isoglu, S. (2026, August 16). The playbook study never asked who made the tools. Sinan Isoglu. https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/the-playbook-study-never-asked-who-made-the-tools/

KEEP READING

Growth that compounds

**Knowledge transfer is asset retention with a receiving context**

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/knowledge-transfer-is-asset-retention-with-a-receiving-context/

Growth that compounds

**The retention number is measured from your side of the table**

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/the-retention-number-is-measured-from-your-side/

Growth that compounds

**Dynamic capabilities are routines, not magic**

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/dynamic-capabilities-are-routines-not-magic/

Sinan Isoglu, MBA (Quantic)
Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher


Online version: https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/the-playbook-study-never-asked-who-made-the-tools/