GROWTH THAT COMPOUNDS

The retention number is measured from your side of the table

Customer retention in M&A hides who owns the relationship. Firm loyalty protects price premiums; growth and defection risk walk out with the salespeople.

Sinan Isoglu, MBA (Quantic)

Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher

PUBLISHED	UPDATED	READING TIME	WORDS
16 August 2026	20 August 2026	6 min	1,385

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

CONTENTS

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

In B2B mergers and acquisitions, customer due diligence relies heavily on aggregate historical retention rates, treating customer relationships as an unpartitioned corporate asset. The one triadic study that measured customer loyalty across buyers, salespeople, and sales managers reveals that customer loyalty divides into two parts with opposing financial behaviors. Loyalty attached to the firm enables price premiums but produces zero organic account growth. In contrast, loyalty attached to individual salespeople drives cross-selling and revenue growth while carrying the strongest study-specific path to latent financial risk in the model if key reps depart post-deal.

Keywords: B2B customer retention · Post-merger integration · Salesperson-owned loyalty · Commercial due diligence · Customer lifetime value

During commercial due diligence, the deal team inspects the target's customer cohort table. The numbers look pristine: 92% annual net revenue retention, stable gross churn, and a loyal tier of enterprise accounts who have renewed their contracts for nearly a decade. In the financial model, that retention rate is treated as a steady-state annuity owned by the corporate entity being acquired.

As this site explored in how customer bases get priced, an acquirer buys an unhedged claim on future transactions. The spreadsheet assumes the customer base is a single asset that will transfer intact once the closing wire is confirmed.

There is only one flaw in this assumption: the retention rate is measured entirely from the seller's side of the table.

How does triadic decomposition separate behavioral retention from true loyalty?

When management researchers investigate customer loyalty in business-to-business markets, they usually survey a single executive informant at the selling company. In a landmark study on marketing integration in M&A, Christian Homburg and Matthias Bucerius documented that post-deal customer retention had a massive direct impact on post-merger financial performance (b = 0.67). Yet their own limitations section highlighted the central measurement gap: the retention metric was reported by a single acquiring executive, not by the customers themselves.

To understand what a customer base actually consists of, you have to look at the one empirical study that measured commercial relationships from all three perspectives at once.

In a rigorous paper published in the Journal of Marketing Research, Robert Palmatier, Lisa Scheer, and Jan-Benedict Steenkamp collected triadic data across 362 buyer–salesperson–sales manager relationships in industrial and commercial channels. Rather than treating customer loyalty as a monolithic attitude, their structural equation model separated the relationship into distinct components:

1. Firm-Owned Loyalty (FOL): The customer's institutional attachment to the company's brand, systems, and product capabilities.
2. Salesperson-Owned Loyalty (SOL): The customer's personal trust in and commitment to the individual commercial representative.
3. Value Received: The customer's perception of economic fairness and competitive utility.

When the authors evaluated how these distinct components influenced financial outcomes, the aggregate illusion collapsed.

Table 1 The triadic loyalty decomposition

Relationship Driver	Price Premium (WTP)	Selling Effectiveness	Organic Sales Growth (Cross-Sectional)	Organic Sales Growth (Longitudinal)	Latent Financial Risk
Loyalty to Selling Firm (FOL)	b = 0.18 (t = 3.30, p < 0.001)	b = -0.02 (ns)	b = -0.05 (ns)	b = 0.06 (ns)	b = -0.03 (ns)
Salesperson-Owned Loyalty (SOL)	b = 0.11 (t = 2.01, p < 0.05)	b = 0.26 (t = 4.02, p < 0.001)	b = 0.16 (t = 2.78, p < 0.01)	b = 0.14 (t = 1.86, p < 0.10)	b = 0.62 study-specific path (t = 7.86, p < 0.001)
Value Received by Customer	b = 0.25 (t = 4.80, p < 0.001)	b = 0.05 (ns)	b = 0.24 (t = 4.31, p < 0.001)	b = 0.15 (t = 1.93, p < 0.10)	b = 0.01 (ns)
Variance Explained (R^2)	R^2 = 0.15	R^2 = 0.07	R^2 = 0.09	R^2 = 0.06	R^2 = 0.38

Data from Palmatier, Scheer & Steenkamp (2007), Table 3 (p. 191).

Why does vendor-side retention measurement conceal latent buyer churn risk?

Every experienced dealmaker enters an acquisition with an unvoiced anxiety: “If the top three sales executives resign after we close, how much of this revenue will walk out the door with them?”

In standard valuation models, this fear is treated as an unquantifiable soft risk or addressed with generic non-compete covenants. But Palmatier et al.’s findings show that the buyer’s anxiety is backed up by the single strongest statistical relationship in the empirical data.

Within this study’s model, the direct path from Salesperson-Owned Loyalty to Latent Financial Risk is b = 0.62 (t = 7.86, p < 0.01), explaining 38% of the total variance (R^2 = 0.38). It is a standardized path coefficient, not a probability and not an account-level forecast.

To put that in perspective, the explanatory power of salesperson loyalty on latent defection risk is more than double any other outcome in the entire study. The authors measured latent financial risk by capturing the salesperson’s expectation and ability to redirect customer business if they were to switch firms. When loyalty is owned personally by commercial reps, the revenue base is not an embedded corporate asset; it is an unhedged option held by mobile employees.

As analyzed in the asset that can leave, attempting to bind mobile commercial talent through purely contractual covenants rarely prevents value leakage if post-merger incentives are misaligned.

Why does relationship tenure protect prices while failing to generate volume growth?

The second critical revelation of Table 1 is the structural asymmetry between price protection and organic revenue growth:

1. Firm-Owned Loyalty protects current price levels, but produces zero growth. Loyalty attached to the company institutionally generates a statistically significant willingness to pay a price premium ($b = 0.18$, $p < 0.01$). Customers who value the corporate infrastructure accept higher pricing without defecting. However, firm-owned loyalty has no statistically significant effect on selling effectiveness ($b = -0.02$, ns) or organic sales growth ($b = -0.05$, ns cross-sectional; $b = 0.06$, ns longitudinal).
2. Salesperson-Owned Loyalty drives selling effectiveness and forward growth. The personal relationship with the sales representative is what actually expands the account. Salesperson loyalty strongly predicts cross-selling effectiveness ($b = 0.26$, $p < 0.01$) and positive sales growth ($b = 0.16$, $p < 0.01$).
3. Customer Value is the fundamental growth foundation. Direct economic value received by the buyer drives both willingness to pay ($b = 0.25$, $p < 0.01$) and account growth ($b = 0.24$, $p < 0.01$). The authors explicitly noted that the sources of customer value (whether created by firm technology or salesperson consultation) remain deeply intertwined.

This asymmetry explains why post-merger integration plans so frequently encounter unexpected revenue stalls. When acquirers standardize sales operations and replace senior account executives with centralized customer success desks, as detailed in how post-merger integration consumes deal value, they preserve the firm-owned price premium while inadvertently severing the exact personal relationships that generated organic account growth.

Table 2 Commercial due diligence: testing loyalty ownership

Diligence Dimension	Standard Model Assumption	Empirical Finding (Palmatier et al., 2007)	Due Diligence Audit Action
Revenue Portability	Aggregate 90%+ retention means customer relationships belong to the enterprise	The study-specific SOL path to latent risk is b = 0.62 (R^2 = 0.38); the coefficient is not a customer-level probability	Rep-to-revenue concentration audit: Map the top 20% of revenue to individual rep tenure and relationship age
Account Growth Engine	Corporate brand and product line drive organic account expansion	Firm loyalty produces zero sales growth (b = -0.05, ns); growth is driven by reps (b = 0.16) and value (b = 0.24)	Cross-sell origin audit: Review whether new product adoption required rep-led bespoke selling or automated uptake
Pricing Power vs Retention	Customers renew because switching costs to another vendor are too high	Firm loyalty supports price premiums (b = 0.18), but personal loyalty provides the primary relationship buffer	Price elasticity interview sample: Test customer sensitivity to price increases versus rep reassignment
Integration Restructuring	Consolidating sales teams under an acquirer CRM creates immediate synergy	Disrupting rep alignment destroys the growth engine and triggers latent defection	Multi-threading index: Audit whether accounts have deep relationships with product/engineering teams or single-rep touchpoints

Author's synthesis of the cited literature.

How can commercial teams audit buyer-perceived relationship value next week?

If your team is evaluating an acquisition or pricing an existing customer base, what can you do on Monday that takes an hour and costs nothing?

1. Calculate the single-rep customer concentration index: Pull the revenue table for the top 50 accounts. Do not look at product lines; look at the commercial representatives assigned to them. If 40% of the gross margin is managed by three senior account directors who have held those relationships for over six years, you are not buying an institutional customer base. You are buying an unhedged portfolio of personal relationships.
2. Audit the multi-threading ratio before drafting integration charters: Measure how many distinct institutional touchpoints exist for key accounts. Do not assign an account a risk probability of 0.62: the study's coefficient is not portable that way. Use the finding to identify accounts where the relationship depends on one person, then test whether customer success, executive sponsorship, and technical support create real institutional alternatives.

3 Structure post-close earnouts around customer transition rather than raw volume: If personal goodwill is high, generic non-compete clauses will not transfer the capability. Mandate a formal 12-month co-management period where relationship handoffs are tied to commercial compensation.

The customer cohort table presented in the confidential information memorandum will always report retention as a single, clean percentage. But the measured record is unambiguous: retention measures what stayed in the past; it cannot tell you who owns the relationship tomorrow.

Where are the empirical limits of customer loyalty and retention metrics?

Boundary. The study-specific path coefficient is not a customer-level risk probability. Use it to design a portability audit, then replace the inference with observed rep, account and transition data.

Evidence base. The analytical frame also draws on these additional sources: Homburg and Bucerius 2005. The links identify the exact works; they support the mechanisms and boundary conditions discussed here, not every claim in isolation.

Homburg, C., & Bucerius, M. (2005). A marketing perspective on mergers and acquisitions: How marketing integration affects post-merger performance. Journal of Marketing, 69(1), 95–113. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.69.1.95.55511

Palmatier, R. W., Scheer, L. K., & Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (2007). Customer loyalty to whom? Managing the benefits and risks of salesperson-owned loyalty. Journal of Marketing Research, 44(2), 185–199. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.44.2.185

END OF ESSAY

HOW TO CITE THIS ESSAY

Isoglu, S. (2026, August 16). The retention number is measured from your side of the table. Sinan Isoglu. https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/the-retention-number-is-measured-from-your-side/

KEEP READING

Growth that compounds

What is customer churn?

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-is-customer-churn/

Growth that compounds

Customer selection is a resource-allocation decision

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/customer-selection-is-a-resource-allocation-decision/

Growth that compounds

The LTV:CAC ratio hides the timing

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/ltv-cac-ratio-hides-the-timing/

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

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