GO-TO-MARKET & PRICING

A voice-of-customer acquisition is not customer knowledge

The Amplitude-Kraftful case shows what an announcement, filing, product disclosure, and customer outcome can each prove, and where inference must stop.

Sinan Isoglu, MBA (Quantic)

Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher

PUBLISHED

25 August 2026

READING TIME

8 min

WORDS

1,845

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-a-voice-of-customer-acquisition-can-prove/

CONTENTS

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

An acquisition can promise a richer view of the customer without yet proving that customers used the resulting product or that the deal changed a business outcome. The public record around Amplitude's July 2025 acquisition of Kraftful makes the distinction concrete. Kraftful's announcement gives the acquired company's stated integration intent. Amplitude's 2025 Form 10-K records the completed transaction, the disclosed integration of qualitative feedback with quantitative behaviour data, and a November 2025 AI Feedback product launch. None of those observations establishes adoption, retention, revenue impact, or acquisition success. The useful output is an evidence ladder that tells a reader what each artifact can carry and what evidence is still missing.

Keywords: Voice of Customer · Product analytics · Customer evidence · Acquisitions

An acquisition announcement can tell you what a company wants to make true. It cannot tell you that customers used the resulting product, changed their behaviour, or produced a better commercial result.

The public record around Amplitude's acquisition of Kraftful makes that boundary unusually clear. The case gives us four different observations: a contemporaneous announcement, a filed transaction record, a company-reported product launch, and no customer-level outcome in the bounded source set. Treating those as one piece of evidence would turn a chronology into a verdict.

The better question is narrower: what can each public artifact actually establish?

Why is mistaking an acquisition announcement for operational adoption a fatal error?

Kraftful announced on 10 July 2025 that it was joining Amplitude. The page described the product as becoming part of Amplitude's Voice of Customer capability and presented native integration as the direction of travel. That is useful evidence about the acquired company's stated intent and account of the transaction.

It is not evidence that the integration was delivered. It is not evidence that customers adopted it. It is not evidence that a buyer made a better decision because qualitative feedback and behavioural data were placed together.

This sounds obvious until the announcement is used as the first paragraph of a case study and the conclusion quietly repeats its future tense as though it were an observed result. The wording changes from "the product will become" to "the platform now knows" without a new observation in between.

Why does an SEC filing prove financial closure without validating commercial success?

Amplitude's 2025 Form 10-K gives the public record a firmer floor. It records that the company completed the Kraftful acquisition on 3 July 2025. In its discussion of platform investments, Amplitude says it integrated Kraftful's Voice of Customer technology to unite quantitative user behavioural data and qualitative user feedback inside the platform.

That filing can support two claims. The transaction happened on a stated date. Amplitude described the integration in a stated way. Both are important, and both remain first-party disclosures. A filing is a stronger record of what the company did and said than a promotional announcement alone, but it is still the company's record. It does not become a customer observation because it appears in a regulatory document.

Table 1 The public evidence ladder

Public artifact	Observable fact	Safe conclusion	What remains missing
Kraftful announcement, 10 July 2025	Kraftful described joining Amplitude and a native Voice of Customer direction	The acquired company stated an integration intent	Delivery, usage, customer response
Amplitude 2025 Form 10-K	The acquisition was completed on 3 July 2025; the filing describes the technology integration	The transaction and first-party integration account are documented	Independent validation of the integration
AI Feedback disclosure in the 2025 filing	AI Feedback was reported as launched in November 2025 following the Kraftful acquisition	A dated product disclosure exists	Customer adoption, usage depth, and value created
Customer or business outcome	No Kraftful-specific adoption or outcome measure was found in the bounded record	The public record has an outcome boundary	Customer-level data, a defined cohort, and a comparison path

Author's synthesis of the Kraftful announcement and Amplitude's 2025 Form 10-K. The filing claims are first-party disclosures. The ladder does not establish customer adoption or business impact.

The key word in the filing is not “success”. It is “integrated”. That verb describes an action or state reported by the company. It does not describe what happened to a customer after the action.

Why is a product integration announcement an unreliable proxy for customer adoption?

The same 10-K says that Amplitude AI Feedback launched in November 2025 and was developed following the July acquisition. This is more than a plan. It gives the case a dated product disclosure that can be placed after the transaction.

But a product launch is still not a usage record. It cannot tell us how many customers activated the feature, which customer problems it solved, whether users returned, or whether the new workflow changed retention. The launch is a bridge between the transaction and the customer outcome, not a substitute for the bridge’s missing measurements.

This is where a public case needs disciplined verbs. “Amplitude disclosed a November launch” is a different sentence from “customers adopted the new feedback engine.” “The filing links the product’s development to the acquisition” is a different sentence from “Kraftful caused the improvement.”

The distinction also protects the acquired company from an unfair null. If the public record does not show customer adoption, that does not prove that adoption did not happen. It says that the outcome is not established by the sources in this case.

Where do post-acquisition case studies systematically overreach on synergy claims?

The temptation is to use an aggregate company metric as the missing result. Amplitude's filing contains company-level performance information, including retention and revenue context. But the case has no Kraftful-specific customer cohort, pre and post comparison, usage measure, or counterfactual that could connect those metrics to the acquisition.

That is not a minor technicality. An acquisition can coincide with product launches, pricing changes, sales execution, macroeconomic movement, and changes in the customer base. A company metric can move while the acquired feature is unused. It can also stay flat while the feature creates value for a small group. Without an identification path, the metric cannot carry the causal sentence.

Table 2 The outcome boundary

Sentence a case wants to make	Minimum evidence needed	What B07 currently has
Customers were heard	A defined feedback source and an observation of what was collected	A disclosed Voice of Customer capability
Customers used the product	Customer-level activation or usage data with a time window	A company-reported November launch
Customers changed behaviour	A before and after behaviour measure or a valid comparison group	No Kraftful-specific behaviour measure
Retention improved	A defined cohort, retention definition, and comparison path	No acquisition-specific retention path
The acquisition caused the result	A counterfactual or credible identification strategy	No causal identification in the public record

Author's operating test derived from the B07 case record. It separates first-party disclosure from customer observation and causal attribution.

Why does qualitative customer voice require independent behavioral confirmation?

The broader literature explains why this boundary matters. Homburg and Bucerius studied marketing integration after mergers and checked firm-side measures against customer interviews and financial data. That is a useful design lesson: a company-side account becomes more informative when it is set beside observations from the customer side and the business record. It is not a license to treat any two sources as causal identification.

Palmatier, Scheer, and Steenkamp offer a related warning in a different setting. Their work separates firm-owned loyalty, salesperson-owned loyalty, and value received by the customer. A stated intention to move purchases and a later financial outcome are not the same observation. The actor, measurement, time window, and outcome have to stay attached to the claim.

Applied to the Amplitude case, the test is straightforward. The filing can tell us what Amplitude says it integrated. A product record can tell us that a named capability was launched. A customer record can tell us whether someone used it. A cohort or experiment can tell us whether the use changed an outcome. The case has the first two layers. It does not yet have the latter two.

That is not a criticism of Voice of Customer work. It is a reason to avoid asking one instrument to answer every question. Feedback can help identify a problem. Behavioural data can show where the problem appears in product use. A commercial outcome needs its own definition and observation. The three layers can reinforce one another, but they should not be collapsed into one confidence word.

What empirical diagnostic test should corporate development apply to customer-driven M&A?

The same ladder can be used whenever a company acquires a research, analytics, or customer-feedback capability.

1. Name the announcement. What did each party say it intended to build or combine? Keep the speaker and tense visible.
2. Name the filed fact. What transaction, date, asset, or integration description is recorded in a primary filing? Treat company disclosure as company disclosure.
3. Find the product change. Is there a dated launch, release note, documentation change, or observable interface? State whether it is independently observed or only company-reported.
4. Define the customer observation. What would usage, adoption, satisfaction, or changed behaviour look like? Name the unit, time window, and denominator before looking for a result.
5. Test the outcome. What cohort, comparison, or counterfactual would be needed for retention, revenue, or causal language? If it is absent, stop at the weaker claim.
6. Record the null. Say what the public record does not establish. A visible boundary is more useful than a confident sentence built from an invisible gap.

The method is modest, but it changes the quality of the case. It lets a reader see what the evidence does and does not know. It also makes future work easier: a later customer study can fill the outcome row without rewriting the transaction history or pretending the earlier announcement was stronger than it was.

Where are the empirical limits of customer feedback acquisition studies?

This case does not decide whether Amplitude's Kraftful acquisition was strategically good, whether AI Feedback created customer value, or whether the product changed retention or revenue. It shows what the bounded public record can support: a completed transaction, a first-party integration description, and a dated product disclosure. The missing customer outcome is not a verdict. It is the point at which the next source would have to begin.

The ladder complements case study as evidence design and the attribution model that needs a counterfactual: one keeps the evidence boundary explicit, while the other shows why an observed difference is not yet an outcome. Furthermore, when interpreting user feedback signals, remember that the buyer is not the user in a B2B journey, meaning product feedback cannot be conflated with commercial purchasing decisions.

Evidence base. The analytical frame also draws on these additional sources: Amplitude 2026; Homburg and Bucerius 2005; Kraftful 2025; Palmatier et al. 2007. The links identify the exact works; they support the mechanisms and boundary conditions discussed here, not every claim in isolation.

Amplitude, Inc. (2026). Annual report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2025. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1866692/000119312526057847/ampl-20251231.htm

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

Kraftful. (2025, July 10). Kraftful is joining Amplitude. https://www.kraftful.com/blogs/joining-amplitude

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 25). A voice-of-customer acquisition is not customer knowledge. Sinan Isoglu. https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-a-voice-of-customer-acquisition-can-prove/

KEEP READING

Go-to-market & pricing
Voice of customer is not observed choice
https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/voice-of-customer-is-not-observed-choice/

Go-to-market & pricing
What is product-led growth? Product usage is not a growth loop
https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-is-product-led-growth/

Go-to-market & pricing
Dynamic pricing needs a trigger, constraint, and explanation
https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/dynamic-pricing-needs-a-trigger-constraint-and-explanation/

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

Online version: https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-a-voice-of-customer-acquisition-can-prove/