

01

REVIEW ARTICLE

JORO-2026-01-001

Revenue Operations Before RevOps: An Academic and Archival History

An academic and archival history of the ideas, institutions, and technologies behind Revenue Operations

AUTHOR

Paul Maxwell

PUBLISHED

August 8, 2026

EXTENT

19,521 words

IDENTIFIER

DOI not assigned

STATUS

Reviewed PDF edition

REVIEW

Editorial review; not externally peer reviewed

CURRENT ISSUE

VOLUME 01

NUMBER 01

ARTICLE 01

2026

Suggested citation: Paul Maxwell (2026). *Revenue Operations Before RevOps: An Academic and Archival History*. *Journal of Revenue Operations*, 1(1), Article 1.
<https://www.journalofrevenueoperations.com/journal/revops-history>.

Contents

Abstract	3
1. Research question, method, and evidentiary rules	3
2. A working definition	6
3. The argument in one chronology	8
4. The deep prehistory: administrative coordination, information, and accounting	8
5. Commercial functions existed before today's departments	9
6. Specialization creates the need for integration	10
7. Market orientation: customer intelligence becomes an organization-wide process	12
8. Sales management and the operational infrastructure behind Sales Operations	13
9. SFA, BPR, and ERP: making commercial work digitally visible and processes cross-functional	14
10. Relationship marketing and CRM: from transaction to lifecycle governance	16
11. CLV, customer equity, and marketing accountability: turning customers into financial objects	17
12. The marketing-sales interface: the immediate organizational problem	18
13. From linear funnel to multichannel lifecycle	19
14. Customer success: post-sale value realization becomes a named commercial function	20
15. Neighboring traditions that share the word "revenue" or the integration problem	20
16. Why servitization, subscriptions, and SaaS made the problem more salient	21
17. The phrase before the concept, and the concept before academic codification	23
18. Academic uptake: scholarship follows practice	25
19. What is genuinely new, and what is recombination?	26
20. What the evidence does-and does not-show	26
21. RevOps through the management-fashion lens	29
22. Practical conclusions from the history	30
23. Research agenda	30
24. Conclusion	33
References	35

Abstract

Revenue Operations, usually shortened to RevOps, is commonly presented as a new way to align marketing, sales, and customer success around shared data, systems, processes, and revenue outcomes. The label is recent; the organizational problem is not. This review reconstructs RevOps as a convergence rather than an invention. Its deepest antecedents are the nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century rise of administrative coordination, internal reporting, and managerial accounting. Its mid-century theoretical antecedents are specialization, differentiation, integration, boundary spanning, and organizational information processing. Its closer commercial antecedents include market orientation, sales-force control and automation, relationship marketing, customer relationship management, business-process redesign, enterprise systems, customer-lifetime-value analysis, marketing accountability, sales-marketing integration, journey management, servitization, subscription business models, and customer success.

The exact phrase “revenue operations” has a complicated history. It has long appeared in unrelated senses—public-revenue administration, railway service, revenue accounting, billing, and advertising-sales operations. A retrospective SEC biography associates the title “Head of Revenue Operations” with a sales-software and lead-management firm from 2008, but does not document the contemporary duties. A 2010 Citrix title appears from its career context to concern accounting and revenue recognition. A 2017 SEC filing reproduces a contemporaneous 2014 Pandora offer letter for an Executive Vice President of Revenue Operations, but Pandora also had a separate Chief Revenue Officer and the role appears rooted in advertising sales and client operations. Among the public sources located for this review, a recognizably modern Marketing-Sales model is securely archived in March 2017, and an explicit Marketing-Sales-Customer Success framework claims a May 2017 publication date and is independently archived by July. SendGrid’s March 2018 incentive plan then supplies unusually strong internal evidence: its Revenue Operations function jointly administered the plan with Financial Operations, served Sales and Customer Success, and extracted Salesforce pipeline, launch, opportunity, volume, and quota data for compensation. These artifacts show gradual semantic broadening, not a clean moment of invention.

Direct scholarship on RevOps remains extremely young. A public ESCP notice for a 2026 dissertation frames RevOps as an “integrative device” for B2B technology go-to-market functions and explicitly describes the construct as theoretically underdeveloped and inconsistently conceptualized. A 2025 peer-reviewed article reports that even the narrower Sales Operations function remains surprisingly under-researched. No mature body of peer-reviewed longitudinal or quasi-experimental evidence yet establishes that adopting a RevOps department produces revenue growth ([Mottola 2021](#); [Ahmad and Gaston-Breton 2024](#)). The historically defensible conclusion is therefore double-sided: RevOps is not a century-old discipline hiding under a new name, but neither is it a wholly novel managerial science. It is a new organizational label and labor-market category for a historically layered bundle of coordination practices whose contemporary form was made more salient by digital systems, recurring-revenue economics, and the extension of commercial responsibility beyond acquisition into adoption, retention, and expansion.

1. Research question, method, and evidentiary rules

This review asks four different questions that are often collapsed in practitioner origin stories:

1. When did the exact words revenue operations and RevOps appear?
2. When did firms use those words for something resembling the present cross-functional go-to-market function?

3. Which older academic fields supplied the concepts and tools now assembled under the label?
4. What evidence exists that the assembled function affects organizational outcomes?

Keeping these questions separate matters. A phrase can predate a concept, a concept can predate its present name, and a fashionable name can consolidate practices that previously existed in several departments. Searching the phrase alone also produces false positives: in transportation scholarship, “revenue operations” can mean a railway carrying paying passengers; in government it can mean tax collection; in accounting it can mean revenue recognition, billing, or order-to-cash work.

This is a critical narrative review rather than a claimed systematic review or a complete census of every corporate title. For historical and causal claims, it gives priority to university-press books and peer-reviewed work from journals in business history, organization theory, marketing, sales, information systems, operations, accounting, and service research. Publisher pages, DOI records, and institutional repositories are linked wherever possible. Corporate SEC filings are used only as primary archival evidence for terminology and job titles. A university dissertation notice and a conference presentation are included because direct academic RevOps research is scarce, but they are identified as emerging scholarship rather than treated as equivalent to a mature peer-reviewed literature. Vendor blogs, consultancy “origin stories,” search-engine listicles, and software-company market reports are excluded from the evidentiary chain.

The search has an important limit. Publicly searchable SEC filings favor larger or eventually public companies; private-company job advertisements and internal organization charts are much harder to recover. Consequently, the dated artifacts below establish “documented by this date,” not an invention date. Claims that a particular consultancy or software company “created the term RevOps” are not accepted without a contemporaneous, independently verifiable record and evidence that the usage had the modern meaning.

Search architecture and source adjudication

The search architecture followed the five histories rather than a single query for a fashionable label. The terminology lane combined the exact expressions “revenue operations,” “Revenue Ops,” and “RevOps” with role titles, department names, dates, company names, and adjacent operational vocabularies. The ancestry lane used disciplinary terms that practitioners rarely place in RevOps accounts: differentiation and integration, boundary spanning, information processing, market orientation, sales control, sales-force automation, customer accounting, customer lifetime value, service transition, and interfunctional conflict. The organizational lane looked for evidence of duties and decision rights, not titles alone. The outcome lane separated direct work on the named package from research on component mechanisms. This decomposition matters because a broad web search makes lexical matches abundant while leaving conceptual fit obscure.

Search discovery and evidentiary admission were treated as different steps. A search index, citation database, publisher page, DOI record, or library catalog could identify a candidate and help reconcile metadata. Substantive use required the work itself, a stable archival copy, or an official record that exposed enough content for the narrow proposition at issue. A corporate filing could establish that a title or responsibility appeared in a dated record, but it could not establish field-wide prevalence or commercial value. A review article could map a literature, but it could not date an early corporate phrase unless it reproduced a primary artifact. The same source could therefore occupy a high tier for one claim and a low tier for another.

Semantic classification was especially important for early phrase matches. Each candidate had to be classified as a modern instance, a modern-adjacent commercial use, an intellectual antecedent, or an unrelated homonym. A modern instance needed meaningful cross-functional and lifecycle scope, not merely the two words *revenue* and *operations*. Modern-adjacent uses included advertising fulfillment,

sales support, revenue assurance, deal review, and accounting roles whose duties touched commercial work without satisfying the ideal type. Antecedents supplied theories or operating practices without using the label. Homonyms concerned fare-paying transport, tax administration, recognition, billing, and other activities with a distinct decision object. This coding blocks a common chronological error in which the oldest literal string is treated as the oldest instance of the current construct.

Dates were interpreted as termini rather than declarations of authorship. A filing date establishes that a record was public by then; an effective date inside an exhibit can establish an earlier organizational event; an Internet Archive capture establishes that a page was recoverable by the capture date. A later biography can preserve a claimed earlier title while remaining weaker than a contemporary offer letter, plan, or organization chart. A printed publication date on a revised PDF has value, but an independent web capture supplies the firmer public bound. This hierarchy explains why the review uses “documented by,” “earliest securely archived articulation located,” and “retrospectively associated with” rather than stronger language.

Citation chaining connected literatures that rarely cite one another under a common label. Organization theory supplied the vocabulary of differentiated units, integrating devices, boundary roles, information capacity, and local knowledge ([Lawrence and Lorsch 1967](#); [Aldrich and Herker 1977](#); [Galbraith 1974](#); [Carlile 2002](#)). Marketing supplied interfunctional intelligence, relationship governance, customer economics, and interface research ([Kohli and Jaworski 1990](#); [Payne and Frow 2005](#); [Rouziès et al. 2005](#)). Information-systems and sales research supplied implementation, acceptance, process, and data problems ([Speier and Venkatesh 2002](#); [Soh and Sia 2004](#); [Buttle, Ang, and Iriana 2006](#)). Service and subscription research supplied the post-sale and temporal economics that make lifecycle coordination salient ([Bolton 1998](#); [McCarthy, Fader, and Hardie 2017](#); [Hochstein et al. 2020](#)). These are converging literatures, not a demonstrated chain of direct borrowing.

The outcome search used decomposition because the named construct has little mature direct scholarship. It asked separately about market-oriented coordination, sales-marketing collaboration, CRM process capability, technology use, customer-success work, service transition, and subscription behavior. That strategy broadens the evidence base while also imposing a strict inferential boundary: evidence about a component cannot be added together as if it were an estimate for the package. A positive association for market orientation and a useful case of CRM process integration do not reveal the effect of creating a RevOps department. They indicate candidate mechanisms and contingencies that a direct design would need to measure.

Disconfirming evidence was sought within each component tradition rather than in a separate search for “RevOps failure.” Sales technology research documents rejection, weak fit, and implementation gaps ([Erffmeyer and Johnson 2001](#); [Speier and Venkatesh 2002](#)). ERP and process research documents package-organization misalignment, implementation discipline, and rhetoric that travels more easily than practice ([Soh and Sia 2004](#); [Grint 1994](#); [Zbaracki 1998](#)). Interface research documents useful differentiation, strong-tie costs, and uncertainty around intertwined authority ([Homburg and Jensen 2007](#); [Rouziès and Hlland 2014](#); [Vaid, Ahearne, and Krause 2020](#)). Service-transition research documents mixed economics and dependence on scale, slack, relatedness, and industry ([Fang, Palmatier, and Steenkamp 2008](#); [Neely 2008](#)). Such evidence does not negate coordination; it defines where a simple universal claim fails.

The completed corpus is broad but not exhaustive. It favors materials with stable identifiers and public digital access, English-language scholarship, United States corporate filings, and firms large enough to preserve public records. It is weaker for private-company organization charts, historical job advertisements, consulting engagements, internal system documentation, and non-English commercial practices. Web archives also preserve some actors more densely than others. A firm with an active content program may leave a rich trace, while an earlier private user may leave none. The chronology must therefore remain open to revision when a stronger contemporary artifact appears.

The review also distinguishes absence of located evidence from evidence of absence. The direct RevOps corpus can be described, and its designs can be classified, but an open-ended narrative search cannot certify that no unpublished, proprietary, or poorly indexed study exists. The defensible statement is narrower: the located scholarly record does not contain an established longitudinal, quasi-experimental, or meta-analytic stream on formal RevOps adoption. That conclusion is strong enough to reject confident causal marketing claims and modest enough to permit later correction.

Finally, the ledger treats every source judgment as claim-relative. “Verified” records that a researcher reconciled the identity or inspected the linked work; it is not a machine-generated certificate of truth. The full audit checks that identifiers, bibliography entries, source types, claim types, and nearby citations agree. It cannot determine whether a passage was interpreted fairly or whether an omitted archive would alter the chronology. Those questions remain part of human editorial review, which is why the article can pass mechanical gates and still remain unpublished.

2. A working definition

Because no settled scholarly definition yet exists, this paper uses an ideal type.

Modern go-to-market RevOps is a formal integrative capability that coordinates the operational layer of customer acquisition, retention, and expansion across marketing, sales, and post-sale/customer-success work through shared governance of data, systems, processes, measures, planning, and enablement ([Lawrence and Lorsch 1967](#)).

It need not absorb every functional team into one hierarchy. Indeed, the closest organizational theory suggests that an effective integrating unit can preserve useful functional specialization rather than abolish it ([Lawrence and Lorsch 1967](#)).

Concepts it must not be confused with

This definition synthesizes the emerging direct research with the older literatures; it is not asserted as an industry-wide consensus. Actual firms use the name for narrower units-sometimes little more than renamed Sales Operations-and broader ones that include finance, pricing, partnerships, or product-led growth.

TABLE 1

Concept	Primary object	Typical scope	Why it is not automatically RevOps
Sales Operations	The productivity and governability of the sales force	Territories, capacity, quotas, compensation, forecasting, pipeline, process, tools	Usually centered on one function, even when it collaborates widely
Marketing Operations	The execution and measurement of marketing	Campaign workflow, automation, lead data, attribution, budget, martech	Commonly ends at or near the sales handoff
Customer Success Operations	Post-sale adoption and retention work	Onboarding, health scoring, renewal workflow, capacity, CS platforms	Begins after the sale and may not govern acquisition
Customer Relationship Management	A strategy, process, capability, and/or technology for managing customer relationships	Potentially enterprise-wide and lifecycle-wide	A very close intellectual ancestor, but not necessarily a separate integrating department
Chief Revenue Officer	Executive accountability for some or all revenue-producing work	Varies from head of sales to marketing-sales-success leadership	A person or reporting relationship can exist without an operating infrastructure
Revenue management	Pricing and capacity/inventory allocation under constrained or perishable supply	Airlines, hotels, media inventory, rentals, services	Optimizes price and availability, not primarily interfunctional go-to-market coordination
Sales and Operations Planning	Reconciliation of demand, supply, production, inventory, and financial plans	Sales, marketing, operations, supply chain, finance	A powerful parallel integration process, but its central problem is demand-supply balance
Revenue accounting / order-to-revenue operations	Contract, billing, collection, recognition, and close	Finance, accounting, billing, deal desk	Concerns recording and realizing booked revenue; older titles are frequent semantic false positives
Business Operations / FP&A	Enterprise planning, allocation, analysis, and special projects	Broad and firm-specific	May support RevOps but is not inherently organized around the customer lifecycle

Two implications follow. First, merely putting “revenue” before “operations” does not establish the modern concept. Second, a historically meaningful account must trace both the rise of cross-functional commercial coordination and the changing economics and technologies that made a dedicated integrating layer plausible.

3. The argument in one chronology

TABLE 2

Period	Development documented in scholarship or archives	Contribution to the later RevOps bundle
1850s-1920s	Railroads, telegraphy, mass distribution, multidivisional firms, administrative accounting, standardized reports	Management learns to coordinate dispersed operations through salaried staff, common measures, communication systems, and exception reporting
1930s-1970s	Functional specialization, marketing and sales management, contingency theory, integrative departments, boundary spanning, information-processing views of organization	Supplies a theory for why specialized units diverge and why lateral integrators, shared information, and conflict-resolution mechanisms are needed
1980s	Relationship marketing, database/direct marketing, customer-lifetime analysis, dedicated sales-force automation, formal sales-control research, capacity-and-price revenue management	Moves attention toward retention and future customer value while digitizing contact, activity, forecast, and pipeline work
1990s	Market orientation, business-process redesign, ERP, CRM, customer profitability, broader sales technology	Makes interfunctional intelligence, boundary-crossing processes, integrated enterprise data, and lifecycle customer management explicit
2000s	Strategic cross-functional CRM, customer equity, marketing accountability, mature ERP/SFA research, formal sales-marketing-interface research, servitization	Connects customer processes to shareholder value and documents the costs of functional handoffs and incompatible “thought worlds”
2010s	B2B marketing automation, omnichannel journeys, cloud/SaaS subscriptions, customer success, proliferating commercial platforms	Extends commercial work from lead and close to adoption, renewal, and expansion; heightens the value of shared lifecycle data and governance
2014-2018	Commercial titles appear; “Rev Ops” is documented in advertising operations by 2015; an internal RevOps function serves Sales and Customer Success by 2018	The label becomes visibly attached to commercial operations, though its scope remains inconsistent
2020s	Professional books and communities consolidate the name; peer-reviewed articles begin to use it as an empirical setting; direct doctoral research attempts construct definition	RevOps starts to move from practitioner category toward a possible research construct, but outcome evidence remains immature

This chronology is not a ladder in which each stage replaces the last. Relationship marketing, SFA, ERP, CRM, sales management, customer economics, and process management overlap and continue to evolve. RevOps is better understood as a recombination produced where these streams meet ([Lawrence and Lorsch 1967](#); [Mottola 2021](#)).

4. The deep prehistory: administrative coordination, information, and accounting

It would be misleading to say that RevOps “began” with nineteenth-century railroads. It is nevertheless impossible to understand any modern operations staff without the older managerial revolution that created specialized administrators, recurring internal reports, common performance measures, and systems for coordinating work at a distance.

Alfred Chandler’s *The Visible Hand* traces the rise of the large, managerially administered American enterprise from the 1850s through the 1920s. Railroads and telegraph companies had to coordinate a volume, speed, and geographic dispersion of activity that owner-managed firms and market transactions could not handle. They developed layers of salaried managers and accounting and reporting methods for coordinating, monitoring, and evaluating traffic and operating units. These administrative arrangements later became models for enterprises integrating mass production and mass distribution ([Chandler 1977](#)). Chandler and Herman Daems subsequently emphasized accounting

and organizational innovations as instruments for allocating resources, monitoring performance, and coordinating complex hierarchies ([Chandler and Daems 1979](#)).

JoAnne Yates's archival history *Control through Communication* sharpens the information dimension. In the Illinois Central Railroad, Scovill, and DuPont, memoranda, standardized reports, filing systems, copying technologies, and summary charts formed an integrated system of managerial control rather than a collection of neutral office conveniences ([Yates 1989](#)). Johnson and Kaplan's history of management accounting likewise follows the development of information for process control, product costing, and periodic performance evaluation from textile mills and railroads through DuPont and General Motors ([Johnson and Kaplan 1987](#)).

The continuity with RevOps is structural, not lexical. Contemporary pipeline stages, dashboards, forecasts, service-level definitions, compensation rules, and customer records belong to the same broad history of making dispersed work visible and governable through categories and recurring information. The discontinuity is equally important: those earlier systems coordinated transportation, production, distribution, and finance, not a digitally instrumented marketing-sales-success lifecycle. Calling them "early RevOps" would erase the historical specificity of both periods.

The business-history literature also undermines a popular but simplistic marketing story. Ronald Fullerton shows that the standard sequence—an undifferentiated "production era," followed by a "sales era," then a modern "marketing era"—is historically weak. Sophisticated demand creation, distribution, customer knowledge, and competitive marketing existed earlier and developed unevenly across industries ([Fullerton 1988](#)). Later studies of periodization reach the same conclusion: stage models can organize a narrative, but they conceal overlap, geographic variation, and institutional diversity ([Hollander et al. 2005](#); [Jones and Richardson 2007](#)). RevOps history should therefore avoid another linear myth in which firms were once universally siloed and only recently discovered the customer.

5. Commercial functions existed before today's departments

Early marketing scholarship offers another useful corrective: a commercial function is not the same thing as the department currently assigned to perform it. In 1912, A. W. Shaw decomposed market distribution into interdependent activities including risk bearing, transportation, financing, selling, communication, assembling, and sorting. L. D. H. Weld's 1917 functional analysis made a durable point: removing an intermediary does not remove the economic work it performed; the functions migrate to other actors ([Shaw 1912](#); [Weld 1917](#)).

This principle is unexpectedly important for RevOps. A firm can eliminate a sales-operations team, merge marketing operations into a central unit, outsource data engineering, or rename customer-success operations without eliminating territory design, lead routing, forecasting, attribution, lifecycle measurement, enablement, and renewal planning. The historical object should therefore be the allocation and coordination of work, not the succession of fashionable department names.

Histories of marketing thought show that the early discipline was substantially an applied economics of commodities, institutions, and distributive functions; managerial, consumer-behavior, systems, and relationship perspectives later became more prominent ([Bartels 1951](#); [Jones and Monieson 1990](#); [Shaw and Jones 2005](#)). Pamela Walker Laird's history of American advertising documents the growth of specialists and agencies and the movement from informing buyers toward organized demand creation ([Laird 1998](#)). Walter Friedman's history of American selling shows a parallel professionalization: firms recruited and trained sales forces, divided territories, used scripts and sales meetings, and governed performance through quotas and compensation well before digital CRM ([Friedman 2004](#)).

Those histories explain why later coordination was difficult. "Sales" and "marketing" did not begin as arbitrary boxes that a visionary executive could simply erase. They accumulated different occupations,

methods, status claims, incentives, and ways of knowing customers. Modern RevOps is partly an attempt to integrate the operating infrastructure of these historically distinct professions.

6. Specialization creates the need for integration

The most direct theoretical ancestor of RevOps is not a sales technology. It is organization theory's account of differentiation and integration.

In a comparative study of six firms, Paul Lawrence and Jay Lorsch examined how sales, research, and production subunits developed different structures, goals, time horizons, and interpersonal orientations because each faced a different part of the environment. High-performing firms were not simply less specialized. They were able to remain differentiated while achieving sufficient integration, often through designated integrating teams or departments. The effectiveness of those devices depended on influence, competence, conflict-resolution behavior, and other social conditions—not merely on drawing a new box in an organization chart ([Lawrence and Lorsch 1967](#)).

This analysis maps remarkably well onto the marketing-sales-customer-success problem. Marketing often works with aggregate segments and longer-horizon demand creation; sales works with named opportunities, quotas, and shorter feedback cycles; customer success works with adoption, value realization, renewal risk, and an installed base. Their data definitions, incentives, clocks, and professional identities can diverge even when everyone nominally wants growth. A RevOps group can therefore be interpreted as an integrative device at the operational layer. But Lawrence and Lorsch also imply a warning: integration should create “unity of effort,” not destroy the domain knowledge and useful differences produced by specialization.

Jay Galbraith recast organization design as an information-processing problem. As task uncertainty rises, an organization must either lower the need for information or expand its capacity to process information through vertical systems and lateral relations ([Galbraith 1974](#)). Revenue teams facing long buying committees, nonlinear digital journeys, recurring contracts, and multiple customer-facing platforms are exactly the kind of uncertain setting in which lateral coordination and shared information capacity become valuable.

Boundary-spanning research adds another piece. Aldrich and Herker describe roles that link an organization to its environment and perform information processing and external representation ([Aldrich and Herker 1977](#)). Salespeople, service staff, channel partners, and digital touchpoints all produce market information; the organizational problem is how to translate that dispersed signal into decisions without stripping it of context. Modern RevOps inherits this translation problem.

Together these theories prevent two common errors. One is technological determinism: a shared database does not by itself resolve conflicts over definitions, incentives, authority, or time horizons. The other is structural maximalism: putting every commercial function under a single executive is not the only, or necessarily the best, form of integration. Liaison roles, councils, shared planning routines, common measures, and process owners are alternative integrative mechanisms whose fit is contingent on the business.

Integration as a governance problem rather than an org-chart event

The antecedent literature supports a sharper distinction among communication, coordination, integration, and centralization. Communication moves information among units. Coordination sequences interdependent work. Integration establishes enough shared interpretation and joint action for differentiated units to pursue a common task. Centralization relocates authority. These can coexist, but none is a synonym for another. A company can centralize operations while preserving conflicting measures and local workarounds; it can also sustain substantial integration through lateral roles, common planning, and negotiated standards while keeping functional reporting lines intact. Lawrence and Lorsch's integrating departments and Galbraith's lateral mechanisms make this distinction central rather than incidental ([Lawrence and Lorsch 1967](#); [Galbraith 1974](#)).

Decision rights are the hidden variable in many descriptions of RevOps. A dashboard or workflow has little governing force if no one can settle definitions, arbitrate exceptions, assign remediation, or change an incentive that rewards local optimization. Conversely, authority without credible domain knowledge can turn an integrating unit into an administrative bottleneck. Lawrence and Lorsch found that effective integrators relied on competence, influence, and conflict-handling behavior rather than formal rank alone ([Lawrence and Lorsch 1967](#)). RevOps design therefore involves choices about who defines lifecycle states, who owns cross-functional processes, who can reject unreliable data, who adjudicates attribution and forecast disputes, and who bears the cost when a locally rational action harms the full lifecycle.

Shared measures also carry distributive consequences. A definition of "qualified" demand changes the volume and composition of work passed to sales. A forecast category shapes executive expectations and resource allocation. A churn classification determines whether an outcome is attributed to product, service, implementation, pricing, or customer fit. A compensation rule can make one team's desired behavior costly for another. Management accounting history shows that categories and reports are instruments of organizational control, not neutral mirrors ([Johnson and Kaplan 1987](#); [Chandler and Daems 1979](#)). Market-intelligence research likewise shows that use depends on trust, distance, joint experience, and formality rather than circulation alone ([Maltz and Kohli 1996](#)).

The boundary-object perspective clarifies why a shared field can be simultaneously useful and contested. A pipeline stage, account hierarchy, customer-health score, or lifecycle map gives specialists a common object around which to coordinate. Yet each group may interpret the object through different time horizons, professional standards, and immediate obligations. Carlile's account of boundary objects emphasizes translation and transformation across knowledge boundaries, not passive transmission ([Carlile 2002](#)). Dougherty's "thought worlds" make the same point at the level of departmental interpretation ([Dougherty 1992](#)). Data governance is therefore inseparable from semantic governance: an organization must decide what a record means, when its meaning changes, and whose judgment enters the record.

This history also places Sales Operations in a more precise relation to RevOps. Territory design, quota allocation, incentive administration, pipeline inspection, forecast routines, sales technology, and performance reporting form a mature operating substrate even though Sales Operations as a function received limited direct academic attention ([Zoltners, Sinha, and Lorimer 2008](#); [Galvan et al. 2025](#)). Marketing Operations and Customer Success Operations developed partly around their own platforms, measures, and work cadences. The modern RevOps proposition is not that these activities were missing. It is that their interdependencies now warrant an integrating layer with lifecycle scope. Whether that layer should absorb the functional teams, federate them, or govern only shared objects remains a design choice.

Boundary-spanning roles add another complication: valuable market knowledge is often tacit. Sellers and service personnel encounter objections, politics, implementation constraints, and informal commitments that do not fit easily into standardized fields. Arnett and Wittmann's work on tacit

exchange across sales and marketing cautions against treating a formal system as a complete representation of market knowledge ([Arnett and Wittmann 2014](#)). A RevOps architecture that values only codified records may make aggregate work legible while excluding precisely the local context needed for judgment. The better historical analogy is not a frictionless database but a reporting system combined with routines through which exceptions and interpretation can travel.

The contingency tradition also blocks a universal span of control. Differentiation varies with environmental complexity, technology, scale, product diversity, channel structure, and customer concentration. A single-product firm with short cycles and colocated leaders may coordinate through direct interaction. A multiproduct, multinational subscription firm with partners, product-led acquisition, enterprise selling, implementation teams, and renewals may require more formal lateral capacity. The relevant test is the density and consequence of dependencies, not conformity to an analyst chart. This is why the same label can refer to a lightweight planning role in one firm and a substantial data, systems, planning, and enablement organization in another.

Seen historically, modern RevOps is one member of a wider family of integrating arrangements. Product managers, program offices, S&OP processes, key-account structures, CRM councils, and cross-functional new-product teams all address dependencies that functional hierarchies handle poorly. Their histories show recurring tradeoffs: local expertise versus shared action, speed versus consultation, standardization versus exception, and visibility versus surveillance. RevOps applies that family resemblance to the commercial lifecycle. Its historical novelty lies less in discovering integration than in defining acquisition, adoption, retention, and expansion as one operationally governed domain.

7. Market orientation: customer intelligence becomes an organization-wide process

The late-1980s and 1990s market-orientation literature supplied a commercial version of the integration argument. Ruekert and Walker studied marketing's interaction with other units in terms of resource dependence, communication, transactions, and conflict ([Ruekert and Walker 1987](#)). Kohli and Jaworski then translated the broad "marketing concept" into observable organizational activity: generating market intelligence across the organization, disseminating it across departments, and responding to it in a coordinated fashion. Their construct was based on prior literature and field interviews with 62 managers ([Kohli and Jaworski 1990](#)). Narver and Slater's contemporaneous formulation combined customer orientation, competitor orientation, and interfunctional coordination and found a positive association with profitability among 140 strategic business units ([Narver and Slater 1990](#)).

These articles are among the closest pre-RevOps statements of its claimed operating logic. They locate responsibility for sensing and responding to markets across the firm rather than inside a marketing department. Later work examined antecedents and outcomes ([Jaworski and Kohli 1993](#)), and a meta-analysis found a generally positive relationship between market orientation and performance while also documenting moderators and stronger effects in studies using subjective outcomes ([Kirca, Jayachandran, and Bearden 2005](#)). The evidence supports the value of market-oriented coordination; it does not establish that a department named RevOps is the necessary mechanism or that causality always runs from orientation to performance.

Several studies explain why simply circulating more information is not enough. Dougherty's research on product innovation describes specialized departmental "thought worlds": functions differ not only in what they know but in how they define valid knowledge and interpret a problem ([Dougherty 1992](#)). Maltz and Kohli found that the use of market intelligence depended on trust, interfunctional distance, joint customer activity, formality, and frequency, with some nonlinear effects ([Maltz and Kohli 1996](#)). Kahn and Mentzer distinguished interaction-meetings and information exchange-from collaboration-shared

goals, mutual understanding, and collective work. Collaboration was associated with success; interaction alone was not a substitute and could even be counterproductive ([Kahn and Mentzer 1998](#)).

For contemporary RevOps, funnel definitions, CRM objects, dashboards, and service-level agreements can function as what Carlile later called boundary objects: common representations through which specialists translate and transform knowledge across a boundary ([Carlile 2002](#)). But a boundary object is not a magically objective truth. Whoever defines “qualified lead,” “pipeline,” “active customer,” “churn,” or “expansion” also redistributes credit, workload, and authority. The history of market orientation therefore points as much toward organizational politics and shared meaning as toward data engineering.

8. Sales management and the operational infrastructure behind Sales Operations

Modern RevOps inherited a large body of work from sales management long before Sales Operations itself became an explicit research topic. Scientific sales management had already produced territories, quotas, scripts, training, commission systems, activity reports, and supervisory routines in the early twentieth century ([Friedman 2004](#)). Anderson and Oliver’s theory of behavior-based versus outcome-based sales-force control formalized choices among monitoring activity, evaluating results, transferring risk, and shaping incentives ([Anderson and Oliver 1987](#)). Zoltners, Sinha, and Lorimer later presented sales-force effectiveness as a system linking strategy to size, structure, territories, people, activities, incentives, and results rather than as the sum of individual sellers’ talent ([Zoltners, Sinha, and Lorimer 2008](#)).

This is the operational substance later assigned to Sales Operations: headcount and capacity planning, territory design, quota and compensation administration, pipeline governance, forecasting, performance reporting, tools, and process. Yet the academy largely treated that infrastructure as an assumption inside studies of selling rather than as an organizational function in its own right. Galvan and colleagues’ 2025 peer-reviewed interview study is revealing precisely because it says academic research on the Sales Operations function remains surprisingly scarce. Its 15 practitioner interviews identify strategic planning, technology management, process optimization, data and reporting, and performance management as major activity clusters ([Galvan et al. 2025](#)).

That late arrival matters for interpreting RevOps. If the narrower and older Sales Operations department was only becoming an explicit object of scholarly definition in 2025, one should not expect a mature, cumulative causal literature on RevOps. Many purported RevOps capabilities have substantial research behind them, but the named organizational bundle does not.

9. SFA, BPR, and ERP: making commercial work digitally visible and processes cross-functional

9.1 Sales-force automation

Sales-force automation supplied much of the immediate technical substrate. A historical review by Christ and Anderson places selling technology in the longer professional evolution of personal sales ([Christ and Anderson 2011](#)). Buttle, Ang, and Iriana report that dedicated SFA applications appeared during the 1980s, following stand-alone contact-management and forecasting tools. Typical functions came to include contact and account records, opportunity and pipeline management, product configuration, order information, forecasting, and access to centralized customer data ([Buttle, Ang, and Iriana 2006](#)). By the turn of the century, scholarship described salespeople remotely accessing customer, inventory, fulfillment, service, and commission information ([Parthasarathy and Sohi 1997](#); [Morgan and Inks 2001](#)).

The SFA literature is a strong antidote to contemporary “buy the platform” narratives. Erffmeyer and Johnson found gaps between expectations and implementation reality, including inadequate evaluation, cost recognition, and training ([Erffmeyer and Johnson 2001](#)). Speier and Venkatesh followed adoption longitudinally: favorable initial reactions after training gave way six months later to widespread rejection and declines in perceived fit, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment ([Speier and Venkatesh 2002](#)). Later work shifted from whether a tool was installed toward whether it was actually infused into selling behavior and used to strengthen information access and decisions ([Jones, Sundaram, and Chin 2002](#); [Hunter and Perreault 2007](#)).

The historical lesson is not that technology is irrelevant. Without persistent customer identifiers, recorded interactions, common opportunity states, and queryable data, the scale and speed of current RevOps would be impossible. The lesson is that the technical record is socially produced. Salespeople must enter or permit capture of information; managers must design workflows and incentives; users must trust the measures; and the system must fit the work. Badly governed automation can create more visible bad data while shifting administrative labor onto customer-facing employees.

9.2 Business-process redesign

Davenport and Short’s 1990 formulation of business-process redesign argued that information technology and process redesign should be treated as mutually enabling. The decisive unit was the end-to-end process rather than the departmental task, and customer requirements were a legitimate starting point for redesign ([Davenport and Short 1990](#)). This process view is central to RevOps: lead-to-opportunity, quote-to-cash, onboarding, renewal, and expansion cross formal boundaries, so optimizing each department locally can degrade the total flow.

BPR is also a cautionary historical analogy. Scholars documented unstable definitions, implementation difficulty, exaggerated novelty, and fashion rhetoric ([Grint 1994](#); [Grover et al. 1995](#); [O’Neill and Sohal 1999](#)). A powerful label helped managers justify and coordinate restructuring, but public success stories often traveled farther than detailed evidence about local implementation. RevOps has some of the same rhetorical structure: an urgent external change, allegedly obsolete silos, a totalizing end-to-end process, technology as enabler, and dramatic performance promises.

9.3 Enterprise resource planning

ERP provided an enterprise-scale architecture for standardized data and processes. Jacobs and Weston trace computerized reorder-point systems in the 1960s, material-requirements planning in the 1970s, manufacturing-resource planning in the 1980s, and the early-1990s expansion of ERP as a label for systems integrating processes and data across functional silos. Late-1990s diffusion was accelerated by Y2K replacement and internet-era investment ([Jacobs and Weston 2007](#)). Even then, ERP never had a perfectly stable definition ([Klaus, Rosemann, and Gable 2000](#)).

ERP research repeatedly found that integration was organizational rather than merely technical. Critical conditions included process redesign, leadership, implementation discipline, data use, and continuing optimization after go-live ([Umble, Haft, and Umble 2003](#); [Davenport, Harris, and Cantrell 2004](#)). Packaged systems also embody assumptions that may conflict with local institutions and work practices ([Soh and Sia 2004](#)). The phrase “single source of truth” therefore needs care. A common database can lower reconciliation costs, but it cannot eliminate disagreement about categories, ownership, measurement, or what the business ought to optimize.

RevOps applies this older enterprise-integration ambition to the commercial technology estate: CRM, marketing automation, sales engagement, enrichment, conversation intelligence, customer-success platforms, billing, product usage, and data warehouses. Its proximate novelty lies partly in the number and granularity of customer-facing systems; its implementation hazards are familiar from ERP and BPR.

Digitization changed the visibility of work, not the politics of work

SFA, CRM, ERP, marketing automation, customer-success platforms, billing systems, and product telemetry altered the quantity, speed, and granularity of commercial records. They made it practical to associate activities with named accounts, preserve opportunity histories, compare forecasts with later events, and connect usage with contracts and renewal dates. This infrastructure is a material condition for contemporary RevOps. It gives an integrating staff a shared operational surface that earlier commercial organizations lacked. Yet the literature on each technology family rejects a simple sequence in which installation becomes adoption and adoption becomes organizational value ([Erffmeyer and Johnson 2001](#); [Speier and Venkatesh 2002](#); [Davenport, Harris, and Cantrell 2004](#)).

The distinction between data integration and process integration is crucial. An enterprise can synchronize account identifiers while teams retain incompatible entry criteria, clocks, and objectives. It can place marketing responses, sales opportunities, support cases, and usage events in one warehouse without deciding which event changes ownership or what response follows. Conversely, a well-governed process can span imperfect systems through explicit handoffs and exception routines. ERP history shows why common infrastructure often exposes organizational disagreements rather than dissolving them: packages embody assumptions about sequence, authority, and valid states, and local units adapt or resist those assumptions ([Klaus, Rosemann, and Gable 2000](#); [Soh and Sia 2004](#)).

Data quality is similarly endogenous. Missing values, late updates, duplicate accounts, and inconsistent stages are not merely technical defects. They can reflect workload, incentives, ambiguity, low trust, or the rational reluctance of a salesperson to expose uncertain work. Technology-acceptance research in sales shows that perceived usefulness, fit, training, and actual selling practice shape system use over time ([Parthasarathy and Sohi 1997](#); [Morgan and Inks 2001](#); [Jones, Sundaram, and Chin 2002](#)). A governance program that treats every gap as user noncompliance may suppress symptoms while preserving the process conditions that created them.

Forecasting illustrates the interaction. A platform can aggregate opportunities and apply a model, but the forecast still depends on stage meanings, seller judgment, customer commitments, historical comparability, and managerial incentives. The number is both an estimate and a coordination device: it shapes hiring, spending, delivery expectations, and executive narratives. Sales-control scholarship

already distinguished outcome control from behavior control and showed that each carries different information demands and behavioral implications ([Anderson and Oliver 1987](#)). RevOps inherits that tension when it governs activity measures, pipeline standards, and forecast inspection across several functions.

Attribution poses an even harder problem because observed sequences do not identify counterfactual contribution. Marketing automation can record touches, CRM can record opportunity membership, and product systems can record use. None of those records alone reveals what would have happened without a touch, how influence should be divided, or whether a later event was a signal rather than an intervention. Marketing-accountability research sought explicit chains from actions through customer and market assets to financial outcomes, while also documenting the limits of available measures ([Clark 1999](#); [Rust et al. 2004a](#)). A mature RevOps practice must therefore distinguish descriptive lineage, operational credit rules, and causal evaluation.

The proliferation of specialized platforms further complicates the “single source” ideal. Different systems exist because functions need different objects, latency, workflows, permissions, and depth. A product-event stream is not a contract ledger; a support case is not a sales opportunity; a campaign member is not a buying committee. Flattening them into one universal object can discard useful structure. The integrating task is to specify durable identities and relationships across systems while preserving appropriate local detail. This resembles enterprise-integration problems studied long before RevOps, with the commercial lifecycle replacing the enterprise transaction as the focal domain ([Jacobs and Weston 2007](#); [Davenport, Harris, and Cantrell 2004](#)).

Automation also redistributes discretion. A routing rule, score, or health threshold embeds assumptions about priority and timing. When the rule is opaque, local teams may work around it; when it is rigid, unusual but valuable cases may receive poor treatment. Järvinen and Taiminen’s case of B2B marketing automation and van der Borgh, Xu, and Sikkenk’s design-science work on lead follow-up both show that coordinated process and technology interventions matter together ([Järvinen and Taiminen 2016](#); [van der Borgh, Xu, and Sikkenk 2020](#)). The historical lesson is not that automation is irrelevant, but that its organizational content must remain visible.

The technological novelty of RevOps is therefore density rather than purity. Contemporary firms can possess far more behavioral, commercial, and service data; they can also possess more conflicting applications, definitions, and automated decisions. That combination makes specialized integration plausible while making integration harder than a software consolidation project. The central capability is not ownership of a particular platform. It is the ongoing institutional work of reconciling identities, semantics, workflows, measures, and decision rights as the business changes.

10. Relationship marketing and CRM: from transaction to lifecycle governance

Relationship marketing broadened the temporal object of commercial management. Leonard Berry’s 1983 services-marketing chapter is a well-documented early appearance of the term in marketing scholarship; it described attracting, maintaining, and enhancing customer relationships rather than concentrating only on acquisition ([Berry 1983, 2002](#)). Sheth and Parvatiyar offered a longer historical interpretation: relational exchange predated industrial mass marketing; mass production and intermediated distribution widened separation between producer and consumer; later information and direct-marketing technologies enabled renewed relationship management ([Sheth and Parvatiyar 1995](#)). Their account is useful intellectual history, though not a complete archival history of business practice.

Dwyer, Schurr, and Oh modeled buyer-seller relationships as developing over time rather than as isolated exchanges ([Dwyer, Schurr, and Oh 1987](#)). Morgan and Hunt placed commitment and trust at the

center of successful relationship marketing ([Morgan and Hunt 1994](#)). These streams challenged acquisition-only reasoning, but they should not be retroactively renamed RevOps or customer success.

Explicit peer-reviewed CRM writing is visible by the mid-1990s. Stone, Woodcock, and Wilson described an IT-enabled shift from periodic marketing planning toward continuing management of relationships and relationship stages ([Stone, Woodcock, and Wilson 1996](#)). By the early 2000s, researchers were resisting the equation of CRM with software. Ryals and Payne treated it as information-enabled relationship strategy; Chen and Popovich made people, process, and technology its joint foundations ([Ryals and Payne 2001](#); [Chen and Popovich 2003](#)).

Reinartz, Krafft, and Hoyer operationalized CRM as systematic management of relationship initiation, maintenance, and termination across contact points ([Reinartz, Krafft, and Hoyer 2004](#)). Zablah, Bellenger, and Johnston found the literature fragmented among CRM as process, strategy, philosophy, capability, and technology and synthesized it around continuous use of market intelligence to build and manage a profit-maximizing customer portfolio ([Zablah, Bellenger, and Johnston 2004](#)).

Payne and Frow's 2005 framework is arguably the closest fully developed academic precursor to modern RevOps. Its five cross-functional CRM processes are strategy development, value creation, multichannel integration, information management, and performance assessment. Boulding and colleagues' companion roadmap similarly emphasized strategy, dual value creation, data and technology, and performance while warning about implementation pitfalls ([Payne and Frow 2005](#); [Boulding et al. 2005](#)).

The resemblance should not be evaded: much of what contemporary advocates describe as a new revenue operating system was already theorized under strategic CRM. One important difference is organizational emphasis. CRM scholarship usually treated the subject as an enterprise process, capability, strategy, or system. RevOps names a dedicated integrating staff and governance layer, often rooted in B2B technology, that operationalizes parts of that agenda while also drawing on Sales Operations work such as planning, territories, compensation, enablement, and forecasting.

11. CLV, customer equity, and marketing accountability: turning customers into financial objects

Another strand made future customer economics calculable. Schmittlein, Morrison, and Colombo modeled whether customers remained active from transaction timing and frequency ([Schmittlein, Morrison, and Colombo 1987](#)). Dwyer developed customer-lifetime valuation for acquisition budgeting and related direct-marketing decisions ([Dwyer 1989](#)). Berger and Nasr generalized lifetime-value models, while Jain and Singh reviewed the developing field ([Berger and Nasr 1998](#); [Jain and Singh 2002](#)).

In the early 2000s, this work moved toward the center of marketing and finance. Gupta and Lehmann treated customers as assets; Gupta, Lehmann, and Stuart connected customer value to firm valuation; Rust, Lemon, and Zeithaml used customer equity to evaluate strategic marketing returns; and Venkatesan and Kumar developed CLV-based customer selection and resource allocation ([Gupta and Lehmann 2003](#); [Gupta, Lehmann, and Stuart 2004](#); [Rust, Lemon, and Zeithaml 2004b](#); [Venkatesan and Kumar 2004](#)). Srivastava, Shervani, and Fahey located marketing inside cross-functional business processes and connected market-based assets to shareholder cash flows ([Srivastava, Shervani, and Fahey 1998, 1999](#)).

Marketing-performance measurement evolved at the same time from predominantly financial outputs toward nonfinancial, input, and multidimensional systems ([Clark 1999](#)). The Marketing Science Institute's productivity agenda and the review by Rust and colleagues sought explicit chains from marketing

actions through customer and market assets to financial outcomes ([Rust et al. 2004a](#)). RevOps' promise of shared funnel metrics and revenue accountability belongs directly to this history.

The customer-economics literature also reveals a serious problem with the name Revenue Operations. Revenue is not contribution margin, profit, cash flow, or customer equity. Reinartz and Kumar showed that long-lived customers are not automatically more profitable, particularly in noncontractual settings ([Reinartz and Kumar 2000](#)). Accounting research found that retrospective customer-profitability analysis was more common than forward-looking customer-asset measures and documented incompatible accounting and marketing definitions ([Guilding and McManus 2002](#); [Gleaves et al. 2008](#)). A RevOps system optimized to maximize bookings, gross retention, or top-line expansion can rationally produce expensive, low-quality, or unprofitable growth unless cost-to-serve, cash timing, risk, and product economics enter the model.

12. The marketing-sales interface: the immediate organizational problem

By the turn of the twenty-first century, scholars were studying the marketing-sales boundary directly. Dewsnap and Jobber drew on intergroup conflict and social-identity theory to explain why brand- or segment-oriented marketers and customer- or trade-oriented sellers could form distinct groups with different priorities and stereotypes ([Dewsnap and Jobber 2000, 2002](#)). Rouziès and five coauthors explicitly distinguished sales-marketing integration from mere communication or involvement and identified activities, barriers, mechanisms, and costs ([Rouziès et al. 2005](#)).

Qualitative studies documented divergent cultural frames: time horizon, status, knowledge standards, role scope, and relation to the external environment ([Beverland, Steel, and Dapiran 2006](#)). Homburg and Jensen's "thought worlds" study found that many differences reduced cooperation and market performance, but some differentiated knowledge created enough direct value to offset that loss ([Homburg and Jensen 2007](#)). Once again, the relevant objective is coordinated specialization, not homogenization.

Research then investigated particular mechanisms and configurations:

- collaboration, organizational learning, management attitude, lower conflict, communication quality, and market-intelligence systems were associated with better reported performance ([Le Meunier-FitzHugh and Piercy 2007a, 2007b](#));
- sales and marketing influence could be more evenly dispersed without destroying role clarity, and customer value mediated some performance effects ([Troilo, De Luca, and Guenzi 2009](#));
- firms displayed multiple viable interface configurations rather than a single best chart ([Homburg, Jensen, and Krohmer 2008](#); [Biemans, Makovec Brenčič, and Malshe 2010](#));
- integrative social capital could help or constrain performance depending on factors such as customer concentration ([Rouziès and Hullan 2014](#));
- tacit market knowledge held by boundary-spanning sellers could not be fully represented in formal records ([Arnett and Wittmann 2014](#)).

The empirical record also made the handoff problem concrete. Using data on 461 sales representatives at four firms, Sabnis and colleagues tested why representatives followed up some marketing-generated leads but not others. Their article used the widely repeated claim that roughly 70 percent of such leads receive no follow-up to motivate the "sales lead black hole"; it did not establish 70 percent as a general population incidence. Lead prequalification, volume, tracking processes, and salesperson

characteristics affected follow-up ([Sabnis et al. 2013](#)). The problem is a direct antecedent of contemporary lead-scoring, routing, lifecycle-stage, service-level, and feedback-loop work.

Marketing automation brought the process and technology strands together. Järvinen and Taiminen's B2B case examined behavioral tracking, lead scoring, nurturing, and integration of content marketing with sales follow-up; the authors noted the lack of prior academic work on the topic ([Järvinen and Taiminen 2016](#)). A later design-science study addressed the lead black hole through coordinated process and technology interventions ([van der Borgh, Xu, and Sikkenk 2020](#)).

Importantly, combining authority can itself create costs. An event-study paper on more than 800 executive appointment announcements argues that intertwining the functions in one position can create uncertainty and coordination costs, especially where different thought worlds must be balanced ([Vaid, Ahearne, and Krause 2020](#)). A 2022 systematic review concludes that the interface includes structural and role linkages, interaction patterns, and actors' perceptions and still has unresolved questions about technology, culture, small firms, and changing roles ([Biemans, Malshe, and Johnson 2022](#)).

This literature almost writes the requirements for a RevOps design without using the name: shared decision rights, trustworthy cross-functional information, process ownership, conflict management, senior sponsorship, complementary incentives, and role clarity. It also rules out the strongest marketing claim that merely centralizing operations or adding meetings is universally beneficial.

13. From linear funnel to multichannel lifecycle

Relationship and service research continued to widen the unit of analysis. Vargo and Lusch's service-dominant logic shifted emphasis from goods and discrete exchange toward service, resource integration, and value co-creation ([Vargo and Lusch 2004](#)). Whatever one thinks of the larger paradigm claim, it supports a crucial distinction for recurring-revenue firms: signing a contract is not identical to the customer realizing value.

The customer-journey literature challenged and supplemented the internally convenient linear funnel with a more complex sequence of pre-purchase, purchase, and post-purchase interactions. Lemon and Verhoef synthesize evidence that experience arises across firm-owned, partner-owned, customer-owned, and external touchpoints and therefore involves marketing, IT, operations, service, logistics, human resources, and outside partners ([Lemon and Verhoef 2016](#)). Omnichannel research likewise shows how digital and physical channels blur, with information and behavior crossing former channel boundaries ([Verhoef, Kannan, and Inman 2015](#)).

This produces a conceptual basis for lifecycle operations but also a warning. A standardized funnel is an administrative representation, not a literal description of buyer behavior. Accounts may include multiple stakeholders who enter at different times; product use can precede a sales conversation; partners may own decisive interactions; renewals can trigger new evaluation; and customers move backward as well as forward. RevOps can make a fragmented journey legible, but the categories should not be mistaken for the phenomenon itself.

14. Customer success: post-sale value realization becomes a named commercial function

Customer Success Management is a particularly close proximate ancestor because it makes adoption, realized value, retention, and expansion an active organizational responsibility. In 2020, Hochstein and colleagues described CSM from an industry/academic perspective as a developing practice at the service-sales boundary ([Hochstein et al. 2020](#)). Hilton and colleagues called it a possible next evolution in customer-management practice and emphasized proactive value realization rather than reactive service alone ([Hilton et al. 2020](#)).

The function did not create proactive post-sale management. Lawer and Knox used the phrase “focus on customer success” in a 2006 academic discussion of advocacy and guidance that helps customers maximize value in use, although this was not evidence of today’s department ([Lawer and Knox 2006](#)). Challagalla, Venkatesh, and Kohli formally studied proactive post-sales prevention, education, and feedback seeking in 2009 and also showed how privacy intrusion, escalated expectations, bad targeting, and routinized contact could make the practice harmful ([Challagalla, Venkatesh, and Kohli 2009](#)). Rapp and colleagues later treated the sales-service interface and the customer’s desire for a “single face” as an unresolved design problem ([Rapp et al. 2017](#)).

The timing is informative. Concentrated direct academic work arrived after the CSM function had become visible in industry, much as it later would for RevOps. Subsequent studies describe CSM as a specialized frontline module, examine how customers judge its value, and make “customer health”—combining relationship quality, usage, and value realization—a central but still developing construct ([Hochstein et al. 2021](#); [Prohl-Schwenke and Kleinaltenkamp 2021](#); [Hochstein et al. 2023](#)). Customer-success scholarship also prevents a simple claim that post-sale work was newly created by SaaS: relationship marketing, account management, service, support, maintenance, and renewal practices all have longer histories. What changed was the organizational salience and instrumentation of continuous adoption and retention when future recurring revenue depended on continuing use and demonstrated value.

RevOps’ common expansion from a marketing-sales dyad to a marketing-sales-customer-success triad is therefore one of its more substantive departures from older Sales Operations. It places operational governance around acquisition and installed-base economics in the same frame. Whether a centralized RevOps unit should own customer-success operations, only coordinate shared lifecycle processes, or remain separate is a contingency question that current research has not resolved.

15. Neighboring traditions that share the word “revenue” or the integration problem

15.1 Revenue management

Academic revenue management is a distinct operations-research tradition. Kimes analyzed capacity-and-price revenue management for capacity-constrained service firms ([Kimes 1989](#)). Weatherford and Bodily developed a taxonomy of perishable-asset revenue management, covering price classes, capacity, demand, and allocation decisions ([Weatherford and Bodily 1992](#)). Airlines, hotels, rental businesses, media, and other services use the field to optimize price and availability under constrained or perishable capacity.

Revenue management can contribute pricing, forecasting, segmentation, and optimization methods to a commercial system, but it is not a historical synonym for RevOps. Its central decision is generally what capacity to sell, to whom, when, and at what price—not how to integrate marketing, sales, and customer success around the lifecycle.

15.2 Sales and Operations Planning

Sales and Operations Planning is a closer organizational parallel. It creates a recurring process through which sales, marketing, operations, supply chain, and finance reconcile demand, capacity, inventory, and financial plans. Oliva and Watson's case study explains how a formal S&OP process can mediate alignment among functions that retain different incentives and identities ([Oliva and Watson 2011](#)). A research synthesis by Thomé and colleagues found a practice-led field with uneven definitions and a need for stronger empirical work ([Thomé et al. 2012](#)).

The parallel is analytically powerful: a cross-functional cadence, shared plan, common numbers, exception management, and executive decision rights can integrate without merging every function. But S&OP's central balance is demand against supply; RevOps' central balance is the flow and economics of customer acquisition, retention, and expansion. Some businesses may need both and should connect them.

15.3 Revenue accounting and the Chief Revenue Officer

Revenue accounting, billing, contract operations, collections, revenue recognition, and order-to-cash form another legitimate but different tradition. They explain why early corporate titles containing "revenue operations" often sit near the controller rather than marketing or sales. Modern RevOps frequently touches the deal desk, pricing, contracting, billing, and finance, but an accounting team is not transformed into GTM RevOps by lexical coincidence.

The Chief Revenue Officer title is also not sufficient evidence. Some CROs are effectively chief sales officers; others lead marketing, sales, partnerships, and success; still others come from advertising or media inventory. A CRO is an executive accountability arrangement. RevOps is, in principle, an operating capability. Either can exist without the other.

16. Why servitization, subscriptions, and SaaS made the problem more salient

16.1 Servitization predates cloud software

Vandermerwe and Rada introduced "servitization" in 1988 to describe firms adding services, support, self-service, and knowledge to the total market offering. The point was a changed strategy and customer relationship, not simply an aftermarket add-on ([Vandermerwe and Rada 1988](#)). Later studies described the capability-building required to move from products toward services and closer end-user relationships ([Oliva and Kallenberg 2003](#); [Baines et al. 2009](#)).

The record is notably less triumphant than modern subscription rhetoric. Gebauer, Fleisch, and Friedli identified a "service paradox": companies could add services and costs without realizing the expected returns ([Gebauer, Fleisch, and Friedli 2005](#)). Neely's analysis of 10,028 manufacturers found mixed financial consequences and strong size effects ([Neely 2008](#)). Fang, Palmatier, and Steenkamp found that the relationship between service transition and firm value depended on the scale of service sales, resource slack, relatedness, and industry conditions ([Fang, Palmatier, and Steenkamp 2008](#)). Adding recurring or service revenue changes the operating system; it does not guarantee better economics.

Solutions research then made the cross-functional implication explicit. Customers understood a solution as a relational process spanning requirements definition, customization and integration, deployment, and postdeployment support—not simply as a product bundle ([Tuli, Kohli, and Bharadwaj 2007](#)). Storbacka found that integrated solution business required coordination among product development, marketing, sales, operations, and finance ([Storbacka 2011](#)). Ulaga and Reinartz identified

installed-base information, data interpretation, sales, field service, deployment, and risk assessment as interdependent capabilities for hybrid offerings ([Uлага and Reinartz 2011](#)).

16.2 Subscriptions change when revenue is earned economically

Subscriptions themselves long predate SaaS. Publishing, utilities, telecommunications, financial services, and other continuous-service industries already managed recurring billing, usage, attrition, and retention. Bolton modeled relationship duration and lifetime revenue for a continuously provided service ([Bolton 1998](#)). Danaher's field experiment jointly modeled subscription usage, access fees, usage prices, and attrition ([Danaher 2002](#)). These studies show that usage, churn, tenure, and recurring pricing were serious academic objects before cloud software adopted them.

The decisive change is temporal. In a one-time transaction, much of the commercial return may be secured at purchase. Under a recurring contract, monetization unfolds while the customer continues to use—or fails to use—the offering. Acquisition, implementation, adoption, service, renewal, and expansion become linked cash-flow states. McCarthy, Fader, and Hardie's customer-based valuation model demonstrates how acquisition and retention data from subscription businesses can enter corporate valuation ([McCarthy, Fader, and Hardie 2017](#)).

The distinction between a booked contract and realized economics also disciplines common metrics. A subscription can have high recurring revenue yet unattractive contribution after acquisition, implementation, infrastructure, support, discounts, and capital costs. Likewise, high-risk customers are not necessarily the retention targets most responsive to intervention or most profitable to save ([Ascarza 2018](#)).

16.3 Software moves from license toward service, access, telemetry, and renewal

Cusumano documented the software industry's movement away from conventional product licenses toward maintenance, services, and web-delivered models, and later described cloud computing and SaaS as new computing platforms ([Cusumano 2008, 2010](#)). The organizational consequence is greater than monthly billing. Hosted software gives the supplier continuing operational responsibility and access to usage telemetry while renewal increasingly depends on continuing use, service quality, and perceived value.

Information-systems research connected SaaS service quality to continuance ([Benlian, Koufaris, and Hess 2011](#)), and later longitudinal work found that proactive activation initiatives was associated with greater usage penetration ([Baumann, Kern, and Lessmann 2022](#)). Customer records, contracts, product events, support interactions, success plans, renewal probabilities, and expansion opportunities thus become analytically connected even when they reside in different systems and are owned by different teams.

Recent B2B subscription research makes the organizational link direct. Kowalkowski, Stoll, and Uлага's interviews identify offer development, recurring-revenue and pricing decisions, and customer engagement as central and conclude that subscriptions require changes across marketing, sales, and other functions ([Kowalkowski, Stoll, and Uлага 2024](#)). Graesch, Hensel-Börner, and Henseler study customer success through alignment among marketing, sales, and IT across goals, processes, information, technology, power, and capabilities ([Graesch, Hensel-Börner, and Henseler 2024](#)).

16.4 The historical inference

SaaS did not create relationships, subscriptions, proactive post-sale work, or cross-functional coordination. SaaS firms often combine several of the following conditions with unusual intensity:

1. a recurring and explicitly observable renewal event;
2. high initial acquisition and implementation costs recovered over time;
3. continuous digital delivery and rapid product change;
4. product-usage telemetry at account and user level;
5. expansion and contraction inside an installed base;
6. a specialized Customer Success function responsible for adoption and value realization;
7. multiple commercial software platforms that had to exchange identities, states, and measures.

Under those conditions, a missed handoff is not merely an internal inconvenience. A marketing promise can affect sales qualification; qualification can affect implementation; implementation can affect adoption; adoption can affect renewal and expansion; and those outcomes should feed back into targeting and product decisions. RevOps is historically plausible as a dedicated operating layer for this coupled system. That does not make it inevitable, universally beneficial, or unique to SaaS.

17. The phrase before the concept, and the concept before academic codification

17.1 A polysemous label

The phrase has no single semantic lineage. Exact-word searches recover several unrelated traditions that must be separated before the modern concept can be dated.

- A 1971 United States transit report covering 1970 said that “revenue operations” were expected to start in 1973. This is high-confidence evidence of a phrase meaning fare-paying transit service, with no connection to go-to-market RevOps ([United States Department of Transportation 1971](#)).
- A Nebraska “Revenue Operations Supervisor” classification traces its establishment to 1970, although the surviving specification was later revised. It concerns government-revenue administration and has no conceptual fit with the modern go-to-market construct ([Nebraska Department of Administrative Services 1970](#)).
- Subex described a telecom “Revenue Operations Center” that integrated people, process, and software across a revenue chain. It is a strong structural parallel but concerns fraud management, billing leakage, settlement, and revenue assurance rather than modern RevOps ([Subex Systems Limited 2005](#)).
- A 2020 ZoomInfo SEC biography retrospectively says Chris Hays was Head of Revenue Operations at Inside Sales Team from 2008 to 2015. The duties and contemporaneous title are undocumented, so the record cannot establish a modern 2008 origin securely ([ZoomInfo Technologies Inc. 2020](#)).
- Citrix later identified Jessica Soisson as Group Director of Worldwide Revenue Operations from 2010 to 2016. Her controller and chief-accounting-officer career sequence makes revenue accounting, recognition, or deal review more likely than the modern go-to-market meaning ([Citrix Systems 2019](#)).
- Progress Software listed sales, finance, revenue operations, credit and collections, and legal as separate deal-review participants in 2012. This contemporary use fits deal accounting and revenue-recognition control, not lifecycle-wide commercial integration ([Progress Software Corporation 2012](#)).

- Pandora's signed 2014 offer letter hired an Executive Vice President, Revenue Operations, while later proxies show a separate Chief Revenue Officer. The title is secure, but the role appears adjacent to advertising revenue delivery, client service, and account operations rather than evidence of the canonical marketing-sales-success model ([Pandora Media 2014](#)).
- A 2015 Viggie SEC exhibit included "VP Revenue Operations" and abbreviated "Rev Ops" roles amid campaign management, advertising operations, traffic, and reporting. It securely documents the abbreviation in digital-advertising fulfillment, not in the later full-lifecycle sense ([Viggie Inc. 2015](#)).

These cases show why neither the oldest phrase nor the oldest corporate title answers the origin question. Modern RevOps was produced by semantic repurposing: a pre-existing phrase migrated from several kinds of revenue-administration work into a cross-functional go-to-market model.

17.2 The 2017 conceptual convergence

Among the dated public sources located for this review, the earliest securely contemporaneous articulation of **Revenue Ops as a cross-functional go-to-market operating model** is Radius's 2 March 2017 essay, *The Rise of Revenue Ops*. The archived article calls it a new paradigm at the intersection of Marketing and Sales Operations, extends its support across the customer lifecycle, and organizes it around management and strategy, process optimization, technology and project management, and data and analytics ([Radius 2017](#)). A [23 March 2017 web archive](#) independently preserves the page.

Five days later, Scott Vaughan argued for merging Sales and Marketing Operations into an integrated function serving the full lifecycle and customer value, although he did not use the RevOps name ([Vaughan 2017](#)). On 2 May, LeanData published "Sales Ops + Marketing Ops = Revenue Ops," described the idea as beginning to take root, and explicitly cited Radius ([LeanData 2017](#)). The [contemporary archive](#) matters because later stories claiming that LeanData's founder created the term RevOps in 2016 supply no contemporaneous primary evidence; LeanData's own 2017 article treated it as an emerging external idea.

In May 2017, according to the publication date printed on a later-updated PDF, Marko Savić and FunnelCake published *The RevOps Framework*, reportedly based on interviews with more than 100 B2B Marketing, Sales, and Customer Success leaders. It defined a new organizational model across the customer lifecycle and four shared responsibility areas—operations, enablement, insights, and tools ([Savić 2017](#)). A [preserved PDF](#) marked "Published May 2017" and an independent [July 2017 web archive](#) document it. This is the earliest source located here claiming a May publication date—and independently archived by July—that makes the now-canonical **Marketing-Sales-Customer Success** triad explicit.

The proper historical language is "earliest securely archived public articulation located," not "invention." Practitioners may have used the idea or title privately earlier, and the retrospective 2008 biography may reflect a genuine contemporary title. The sources establish public visibility and conceptual content, not private coinage.

17.3 From emerging idea to internal function

SendGrid's March 2018 SEC-filed Sales and Customer Success incentive plan provides unusually strong internal evidence. Revenue Operations and Financial Operations jointly administered the plan. Sales and Customer Success employees were told to contact "RevOps," and the team pulled launch, pipeline, opportunity, volume, and quota data from Salesforce before submitting payouts. The plan covered new customers, recurring revenue protection, services, and expansion ([SendGrid 2018](#)). Marketing is absent, so this is not proof of the full triad; it is secure evidence that by early 2018 RevOps was an internal operating label supporting acquisition and installed-base work.

A July 2018 survey of nearly 1,000 B2B respondents reported that 21 percent said they already had a Revenue Operations team and another 15 percent were building one, while acknowledging that the term lacked a single definition ([LeanData and Sales Hacker 2018](#)). Survey sampling and sponsor incentives prevent treating these percentages as population estimates, but the artifact documents diffusion. By 2019, SiriusDecisions, later Forrester, was codifying Revenue Operations as alignment among Sales Operations, Marketing Operations, and Customer Success Operations through planning, process, technology, data, and measurement ([Forrester 2019](#)). This was analyst institutionalization, not origin.

The source-critical chronology is therefore:

1. older phrase and titles with several meanings;
2. modern-adjacent commercial titles in advertising, accounting, telecom, and sales services;
3. a visibly convergent Marketing-Sales model in early 2017;
4. an explicit Marketing-Sales-Customer Success framework by May 2017;
5. internal organizational usage and broader diffusion by 2018;
6. analyst and professional codification around 2019-2022.

18. Academic uptake: scholarship follows practice

Oliviero Mottola's 2021 M.S. thesis is the earliest dedicated academic treatment located in this review. Based on interviews and substantial practitioner literature, it explicitly says RevOps emerged in professional circles and had received little academic attention. Mottola treats it as an extension of the Sales-Marketing Interface toward Customer Success, mediated by systems thinking, data, tools, and cross-functional integration; he also suggests that it repackages elements of operations research, industrial engineering, lean production, and prior integration theory rather than appearing *ex nihilo* ([Mottola 2021](#)).

In 2022, Diorio, Hummel, and Rogers published a peer-reviewed practice paper in *Applied Marketing Analytics*, and Diorio and Hummel published a Wiley professional book. These sources mark stabilization of the label but are practice-oriented codifications, not independent historical or causal tests ([Diorio, Hummel, and Rogers 2022b](#); [Diorio and Hummel 2022a](#)).

Ahmad and Gaston-Breton's 2024 conference research used interviews with 13 senior practitioners and explicitly interpreted RevOps through Lawrence and Lorsch's theory of integrative devices ([Ahmad and Gaston-Breton 2024](#)). An ESCP notice for Ahmad's June 2026 dissertation defense describes three connected studies: a literature review plus practitioner interviews, a multivocal review plus expert insights, and a cross-functional survey using partial least squares structural-equation modeling. The public abstract reports convergence around data, systems, and processes; divergence around enablement and customer experience; and interprets RevOps as operational integration that leaves functional layers distinct ([ESCP 2026](#)).

Direct peer-reviewed recognition is visible at the edges. A 2025 *Journal of Business Research* field study describes its partner organization as a RevOps agency integrating digital marketing, sales, and customer success through CRM platforms, though the paper studies landing pages and chatbots rather than RevOps itself. A 2026 *Industrial Marketing Management* study includes a Director of Revenue Operations as an informant in research on exchanges between frontline employees and internal business teams ([Isabella et al. 2025](#); [Schroeder et al. 2026](#)). These are signs that the role has entered the empirical landscape, not tests of RevOps performance.

The scholarly timing supports a familiar pattern: practice produces a flexible label, professional sources define and diffuse it, graduate and conference research attempts conceptual clarification, and

peer-reviewed work begins to encounter it in the field. As of the review date, Ahmad's dissertation program is the most extensive publicly described direct theory-building effort located, but its public abstract cannot substitute for a fully available, replicated literature.

19. What is genuinely new, and what is recombination?

The history supports neither "RevOps changes everything" nor "RevOps is only Sales Ops with a new name." It is more precise to separate new scope, new technical conditions, and a new occupational category from older organizational principles and tools.

TABLE 3

Dimension	Deep or proximate antecedent	What is comparatively new in modern RevOps
Administrative coordination	Nineteenth-century managerial hierarchies, accounting, reporting, planning	A specialized commercial integrator operating across a digitally observed customer lifecycle
Functional integration	Contingency theory, market orientation, cross-functional process management	Explicit grouping of marketing, sales, and Customer Success operations under shared lifecycle governance
Sales planning and control	Territories, quotas, incentives, pipeline, forecast, SFA	Extension of similar operating disciplines to pre-sale and post-sale work
Customer management	Relationship marketing and strategic CRM	A named staff function charged with enforcing shared customer states across a fragmented GTM stack
Financial accountability	Customer profitability, CLV, customer equity, marketing productivity	Near-real-time coupling of acquisition, retention, expansion, usage, and forecast metrics in recurring-revenue firms
Process architecture	BPR, ERP, S&OP, process ownership	Commercial processes and definitions that cross martech, salestech, success, product telemetry, and billing
Technology	Database marketing, SFA, CRM, ERP, BI	Much denser behavioral data, cloud APIs, automation, and specialized applications at account and user level
Post-sale responsibility	Service, account management, support, renewal, proactive post-sales work	Customer Success as a separate function and routine use of health, adoption, renewal, and net-retention measures
Occupational identity	Sales Ops, Marketing Ops, CRM administration, business analysis	"RevOps" as a recognizable title, career path, consultancy market, software category, and executive design choice

The strongest novelty is therefore not a single method. It is the institutionalization of an **operational integrator for a recurring, digitally observable, full-lifecycle commercial system**. The components have histories; their bundling, scope, title, professional community, and software ecosystem are recent.

20. What the evidence does-and does not-show

20.1 Evidence for components is not evidence for the package

There is credible evidence that market orientation, appropriate interfunctional coordination, CRM processes, useful sales technology, customer-equity reasoning, and customer-success practices can contribute to valued outcomes under some conditions. It does not follow logically that creating a RevOps department produces the sum of those effects. Bundles can contain complementarities, but they can also create coordination costs, bureaucracy, duplicated authority, or measurement overload.

20.2 Much of the evidence is observational

The component literatures rely heavily on cross-sectional surveys, managerial perceptions, single-firm cases, qualitative interviews, and studies of particular industries. These methods are often appropriate for emerging constructs and mechanisms, but they make causal direction difficult to establish. Successful, growing, well-managed firms may be more able to invest in integration, clean data, and specialist staff; their performance may precede and partly explain RevOps adoption rather than result from it. Announced organizational structures can also differ from work actually performed.

20.3 “Alignment” is heterogeneous

Studies variously measure communication frequency, information sharing, collaboration, trust, structural linkage, joint planning, shared influence, role integration, or common technology. Treating all of these as one alignment variable creates a false sense of consensus. Kahn and Mentzer’s distinction between interaction and collaboration is especially important: more meetings and reports can coexist with poor shared work ([Kahn and Mentzer 1998](#)).

20.4 Outcomes are heterogeneous too

The literature measures customer satisfaction, information use, lead follow-up, cooperation, perceived business performance, market performance, profitability, firm value, retention, and system adoption. These are not interchangeable. A RevOps implementation could sharpen forecast accuracy while slowing decisions, lift net revenue retention while lowering contribution margin, or cut duplicate tools while damaging useful local experimentation.

20.5 Technology and data are endogenous organizational products

CRM and automation records are not raw market reality. They are created by definitions, interfaces, integrations, incentives, human entry, and missingness. Salespeople can resist or strategically populate fields; product telemetry may capture use without value; marketing attribution embeds causal assumptions; “customer health” combines contestable proxies. A dashboard’s precision is not proof of construct validity.

Evidence must match the level of the organizational claim

The central evidentiary problem is a mismatch of levels. RevOps is usually presented as an organizational capability or formal unit, while much of the available research concerns individual technology users, dyadic relationships, functional interfaces, customer cohorts, or firm-level orientations. A finding about salesperson acceptance cannot by itself characterize a department. A finding about marketing-sales collaboration does not include customer success, finance, product telemetry, or the governance of a technology portfolio. A customer-retention model can inform lifecycle choices without saying anything about who should own the model. Treating these units as interchangeable would transform a useful historical synthesis into an unsupported package estimate.

Construct operationalization is equally unsettled. One firm may call a centralized Sales Operations team RevOps. Another may use the name for a federated council across Marketing Operations, Sales Operations, and Customer Success Operations. A third may place planning, analytics, systems, enablement, deal desk, and compensation under one executive. These are materially different treatments. The emerging direct scholarship itself reports convergence around data, systems, and processes alongside divergence around enablement and customer experience ([Ahmad and Gaston-Breton 2024](#); [ESCP Business School 2026](#)). Before comparing outcomes, research must establish what was adopted, with what authority, for which lifecycle stages, and relative to what prior arrangement.

Selection presents a further challenge. Firms with complex recurring-revenue models, fragmented platforms, rapid hiring, or visible coordination failures may be especially likely to create RevOps. Firms with stronger managers, more investment capacity, and cleaner data may also be more able to create it. These paths imply different baselines and different directions of bias. A cross-sectional comparison between organizations with and without the title cannot separate the effect of the arrangement from the conditions that prompted or enabled adoption. Longitudinal designs need pre-adoption trajectories, comparison groups, implementation timing, and attention to concurrent changes in leadership, product, market, and capital.

The outcome must also be specified. Revenue growth, gross retention, net retention, margin, cash timing, forecast calibration, cycle time, customer value, employee workload, system cost, and data reliability can move differently. Customer-accounting research documents the gap between revenue and profitability and the tension between retrospective customer-profit analysis and forward-looking customer assets ([Guilding and McManus 2002](#); [Gleaves et al. 2008](#)). Relationship-duration research similarly shows that longevity is not a universal proxy for profit ([Reinartz and Kumar 2000](#)). A credible evaluation should state which outcome matters, over what horizon, and whose cost is counted.

Implementation exposure matters as much as formal adoption. An announced unit may lack authority, staffing, data access, or cooperation. A mature team may evolve through several charters while retaining the same name. Technology research distinguishes availability from actual infusion into work, and interface research distinguishes interaction from collaboration ([Jones, Sundaram, and Chin 2002](#); [Kahn and Mentzer 1998](#)). Direct RevOps research should therefore measure practices and decision rights rather than rely on a binary title variable. Process conformance, exception handling, metric stability, and stakeholder trust may reveal more about exposure than an organization chart.

Time horizon can reverse an interpretation. Standardization may impose near-term migration work while supporting later comparability. A restructured incentive plan may alter pipeline composition before booked revenue. Better qualification may shrink reported pipeline while making it more credible. A retention intervention may preserve revenue while consuming service capacity and margin. Event studies, short surveys, and annual accounting outcomes each observe different portions of that sequence. The evaluation window should follow the mechanism rather than an arbitrary reporting period.

Costs deserve explicit treatment. Integration consumes meetings, specialized labor, migration work, governance attention, and local discretion. Strong ties can narrow outside information, and intertwined executive authority can create uncertainty ([Rouziès and Hullan 2014](#); [Vaid, Ahearne, and Krause 2020](#)). A process can be more coherent yet slower; a metric can be more comparable yet less sensitive to local nuance. The right counterfactual is not perfect alignment at zero cost. It is the best feasible alternative arrangement for the dependencies and scale of the firm.

These requirements explain why component evidence is useful without settling the package claim. It identifies plausible mechanisms, measures, failure modes, and moderators. It can inform a theory of change in which shared definitions support handoffs, governance supports accountable exceptions, and lifecycle economics shape allocation. Direct study must still test whether those mechanisms changed after adoption and whether the observed changes are attributable to the organizational arrangement. Until that work exists, RevOps is best treated as a testable coordination architecture, not an established performance intervention.

20.6 Integration is contingent; greater intensity is not automatically better

Lawrence and Lorsch, Homburg and Jensen, Rouziès and Hulland, and Vaid and colleagues all support a contingency view ([Lawrence and Lorsch 1967](#); [Homburg and Jensen 2007](#); [Rouziès and Hulland 2014](#); [Vaid et al. 2020](#)). Functional differentiation can preserve expertise and useful cognitive variety. Strong ties can create insularity; joint authority can create uncertainty; extra coordination can cost more than the dependency warrants. The question is not whether functions should be maximally aligned, but which dependencies require which integrating mechanisms.

20.7 There is not yet a mature direct causal literature

As of 8 August 2026, the direct RevOps literature located for this review consists mainly of graduate research, practitioner-informed conceptual work, an emerging doctoral program, and papers that use RevOps organizations or job titles as field context rather than test the function's effects. No established stream of peer-reviewed longitudinal, comparative, quasi-experimental, or meta-analytic evidence demonstrates that adopting a formal RevOps unit causes superior revenue growth, profit, or customer outcomes ([Mottola 2021](#); [Ahmad and Gaston-Breton 2024](#)). This is an absence-of-evidence statement, not evidence that RevOps is ineffective.

21. RevOps through the management-fashion lens

Management-fashion research offers a disciplined way to take practitioner excitement seriously without accepting it at face value. Abrahamson defines management fashions as relatively transitory collective beliefs that particular techniques represent the forefront of management progress, produced through interaction among managerial demand and fashion setters such as consultants, gurus, business media, and business schools ([Abrahamson 1996](#)). Kieser emphasizes rhetoric, ambiguity, and the arenas through which fashionable concepts spread; he also notes that a fashionable idea can help initiate, coordinate, and legitimate real restructuring ([Kieser 1997](#)).

Strang and Macy's model shows how organizations imitating apparently successful peers can produce adoption cascades even when a practice has little effect; the same dynamics can occur when a practice has modest positive effects ([Strang and Macy 2001](#)). Zbaracki's field study of Total Quality Management found that success rhetoric shaped implementation, while organizations filtered their own experience into further success stories, creating an overly optimistic public record ([Zbaracki 1998](#)). CRM itself has been analyzed from a management-fashion perspective ([Madsen and Johanson 2016](#)).

RevOps displays several characteristics that make this lens plausible:

- an attractive, compact label with flexible boundaries;
- a familiar contrast between obsolete silos and integrated progress;
- strong participation by consultants, professional communities, software vendors, conferences, and practitioner books;
- claims of urgent necessity under digital and subscription conditions;
- wide variation in what adopting organizations actually do;
- success stories that are easier to circulate than failed implementations or null results;
- academic definition and testing that lag practitioner diffusion.

This is a hypothesis about diffusion, not a verdict that RevOps is empty. Management fashions can package useful practices, create a common vocabulary, mobilize resources, and legitimate necessary change. The critical questions are whether the label directs attention to genuine interdependencies,

whether practices survive after rhetoric fades, whether local designs fit the task, and whether results are measured against credible counterfactuals.

22. Practical conclusions from the history

An evidence-respecting RevOps design would follow several principles:

1. **Begin with interdependence, not the org chart.** Identify where the output or information of one function materially changes another function's work or customer outcomes.
2. **Distinguish coordination from consolidation.** Use the lightest mechanism that fits the dependency: a common definition, liaison, process owner, shared planning routine, cross-functional team, or centralized unit.
3. **Preserve useful differentiation.** Marketing, sales, success, product, finance, and service face different subenvironments and possess different tacit knowledge.
4. **Treat data definitions as governance decisions.** Document purpose, owner, inclusion rules, latency, quality limits, and incentive effects for each consequential metric.
5. **Optimize economics beyond top-line revenue.** Include margin, cash timing, acquisition cost, implementation and service cost, risk, usage, retention, and customer value.
6. **Design technology around work.** Adoption, training, incentives, workflow fit, and continuing use are part of the system, not "change management" added after software selection.
7. **Keep the lifecycle open to the customer.** Internal funnel stages should be tested against actual buying, implementation, use, and renewal behavior rather than treated as reality by definition.
8. **Evaluate incrementally and causally where possible.** Use phased rollouts, pre-specified measures, comparable units or cohorts, and explicit costs; do not infer impact from adoption followed by growth.

These conclusions are not a prescription that every firm needs RevOps. A small firm may integrate through people who naturally span roles. A stable, simple business may need fewer lateral mechanisms. A large multiproduct subscription firm with many platforms, channels, regions, and renewal motions may need a substantial integrating function. Contingency, not title, should govern design.

23. Research agenda

A serious academic field could test questions that practitioner discourse often assumes away:

1. **Construct validity:** Which activities distinguish RevOps from Sales Ops, commercial excellence, strategic CRM, business operations, and a CRO's staff?
2. **Population and diffusion:** When and where did titles appear across job advertisements, corporate filings, organizational charts, and professional profiles? How much of the observed growth is renaming?
3. **Boundary choices:** Which configurations include Marketing Ops, Sales Ops, CS Ops, enablement, deal desk, partnerships, analytics, pricing, or product operations, and why?
4. **Governance location:** What changes when RevOps reports to the CRO, COO, CFO, CEO, or a functional leader?

5. **Contingencies:** How do recurring versus transactional models, product complexity, sales cycle, customer concentration, firm size, geography, regulation, channel strategy, and product-led growth affect fit?
6. **Mechanisms:** Do outcomes arise from cleaner data, faster decisions, incentive alignment, lower handoff loss, better resource allocation, technology rationalization, or political authority?
7. **Causal outcomes:** What happens in matched firms or units before and after adoption? Do gains exceed added labor, software, coordination, and transition costs?
8. **Customer outcomes:** Does RevOps affect realized customer value, experience, adoption, or trust, or only the supplier's legibility and control?
9. **Profit and cash:** Are effects visible in contribution margin, cash conversion, customer equity, forecast error, and risk rather than only revenue growth?
10. **Human consequences:** How does central instrumentation affect autonomy, surveillance, data-entry labor, gaming, professional identity, and turnover?
11. **Failure and abandonment:** Which RevOps programs are downsized, decentralized, or renamed, and what survives after the label disappears?
12. **Comparative history:** Did analogous integrative functions develop in telecommunications, publishing, financial services, industrial maintenance, or other recurring-revenue sectors before B2B SaaS?

A construct-building program should begin with task inventories and decision rights. Researchers could sample organizations that use RevOps, Sales Operations, Commercial Excellence, Growth Operations, and Business Operations labels, then code the work actually performed. Latent classes may be more informative than a single yes-or-no definition. Interviews should include marketing, sales, customer success, finance, product, data, and frontline users, because a leader's charter may differ from the capability experienced elsewhere. The output should be a discriminant map: necessary attributes, common optional modules, exclusions, and observable indicators for integration depth.

Historical diffusion needs a source design that does not rely on present-day professional profiles. A useful corpus would combine archived job advertisements, SEC exhibits, annual reports, conference programs, association materials, library records, and dated web captures. Each title should be coded for semantic fit, duties, industry, geography, reporting line, and whether the record is contemporary or retrospective. Capture-recapture logic across archives may help estimate how much of the occupational history remains invisible, although assumptions would need careful examination. Non-English searches are especially important before making claims about geographical sequence.

Direct evaluation should exploit staggered organizational changes where possible. Firms often establish RevOps in different business units or regions at different times, merge selected operations teams before others, or phase in shared processes. Those sequences create opportunities for comparative interrupted time series, matched units, difference-in-differences designs, or synthetic controls when pre-change trends and concurrent interventions are documented. The treatment date should reflect operational exposure rather than an announcement. Researchers should record charter changes, staffing, system migration, process adoption, and decision authority so that partial implementation is not treated as full adoption.

Mechanism tests require measures between structure and financial outcomes. Candidate mediators include identity-match rates across systems, handoff latency, exception volume, forecast calibration, definition stability, duplicate work, decision turnaround, tool utilization, and trust in shared measures. None is sufficient alone. Cleaner identifiers may coexist with poor decisions; a faster handoff may pass lower-quality work; forecast calibration may come from conservative behavior. A theory of change

should specify which mediator belongs to which dependency and how local gains might shift cost elsewhere.

Cost measurement should be symmetrical with benefit measurement. Studies should count specialist labor, migration work, platform expense, meeting time, governance overhead, disruption, and the opportunity cost of standardization. They should also inspect the distribution of those costs. A central team may save executive reconciliation while adding data-entry or exception work for frontline employees. Instrumentation can support learning and accountability while also enabling surveillance and gaming. Organizational outcomes therefore include autonomy, role clarity, turnover, and professional conflict alongside economic measures.

Customer-side evidence is particularly thin. Supplier records can show renewal, expansion, use, and support activity but may not capture realized value or the customer's coordination burden. Research could pair supplier process data with customer interviews, adoption milestones, value-realization measures, and switching behavior. It should distinguish value that comes from the offering, value that comes from customer capability, and value associated with the vendor's commercial coordination. This would prevent an internally tidy lifecycle from being mistaken for a better customer experience.

Comparative research outside B2B SaaS would sharpen the theory. Telecommunications, publishing, financial services, maintenance, media, utilities, and other continuous-service sectors have long histories of billing, usage, service, retention, and account management. Some may contain analogous integrators under different names; others may coordinate through operations, finance, or key-account structures. Comparing them with SaaS could reveal which features arise from recurring contracts, which from digital telemetry, which from venture-backed growth patterns, and which from the broader history of complex organizations.

Finally, negative and abandoned cases need deliberate sampling. Public narratives favor successful adoption and continuing programs. A field study should seek units where RevOps was dissolved, narrowed, federated, or returned to functional ownership. The surviving practices may identify the useful core more clearly than a success story. Abandonment can also distinguish failure of the underlying coordination need from failure of a particular structure, leader, technology migration, or political settlement.

A theory program for an integrating capability

A useful theory of RevOps would connect three levels. At the task level, customer acquisition, implementation, use, renewal, and expansion create dependencies among specialized actors. At the organizational level, firms select structures, lateral roles, systems, measures, and incentives to govern those dependencies. At the institutional level, professional communities, analysts, vendors, books, and labor markets stabilize a category and make certain structures appear legitimate. Confusing these levels turns category adoption into an explanation. Connecting them makes it possible to ask why a firm chooses one integrating mechanism, how the mechanism changes work, and why the label travels.

The construct may be best understood as a meso-level capability rather than a department. A capability can reside in routines and decision rights distributed across several teams; a department can exist without performing them well. This distinction creates observable questions: Are lifecycle definitions negotiated and maintained? Are cross-functional exceptions assigned and resolved? Do planning and measures connect acquisition with installed-base economics? Can specialists preserve local knowledge while acting on shared dependencies? Such indicators capture operational substance while permitting several structural forms.

A mature theory should also separate integration breadth from integration depth. Breadth concerns how many functions, lifecycle stages, and decision domains are included. Depth concerns how much authority, standardization, shared planning, and process ownership the arrangement carries. A broad

but shallow council differs from a narrow but powerful centralized team. Either may fit its context. Mapping the two dimensions would make empirical samples more comparable and clarify why organizations using the same title report different experiences.

Management-fashion theory belongs inside, not outside, that program. Category suppliers shape vocabulary, templates, certifications, software groupings, and executive expectations; category demand comes from genuine coordination pain, uncertainty, imitation, and career incentives (Abrahamson 1996; Kieser 1997). The existence of fashion dynamics does not make the underlying dependency imaginary. It suggests that rhetoric, adoption, implementation, and effect must be studied separately. A flexible label can mobilize resources for real restructuring while also obscuring differences among implementations.

Professionalization is another research object. RevOps combines practitioners from sales operations, marketing operations, customer-success operations, analytics, systems administration, finance, enablement, and consulting. Their training, career paths, and jurisdictional claims may shape which problems the function notices and which methods it favors. Historical work on selling, marketing, and managerial administration shows that occupations and departments accumulate distinct knowledge and status over time (Friedman 2004; Laird 1998; Yates 1989). RevOps may create a new occupational bridge, a new jurisdictional contest, or both.

This framework keeps the historical conclusion testable. If RevOps is a recent institutional category for an integrating capability, research should find older component routines, contemporary variation in structure, category diffusion through professional actors, and outcomes conditional on dependencies and implementation. It should not expect a single founding event, a universal org chart, or one aggregate effect across dissimilar arrangements. Those expectations fit the evidence assembled here and provide clear opportunities for disconfirmation.

The most useful study design would be multi-method: a longitudinal title and job-posting corpus; comparative organization charts and process maps; interviews across functions rather than only RevOps leaders; system and outcome data before and after structural change; and explicit attention to failed and abandoned cases.

24. Conclusion

Revenue Operations has three histories.

The first is a **deep history of administrative coordination**. Since the rise of the large enterprise, managers have used specialized staff, accounting, standardized communication, common measures, and information systems to coordinate distributed work.

The second is a **twentieth-century history of commercial specialization and reintegration**. Selling and marketing became professions and departments with distinct controls and knowledge. Organization theory explained why differentiation creates integration requirements. Market orientation, relationship marketing, CRM, SFA, BPR, ERP, customer economics, marketing accountability, and the sales-marketing interface supplied most of the conceptual and technical repertoire now associated with RevOps.

The third is a **recent history of a name and organizational category**. Servitization and subscription economics extended the commercially relevant period beyond purchase; SaaS combined and intensified continuous delivery, product telemetry, recurring-contract renewal and expansion, rapid platform proliferation, and, in many firms, a specialized Customer Success function. In that setting, a dedicated operating layer across acquisition, retention, and expansion became more salient and more visible. Corporate artifacts show that the phrase had multiple older meanings and that modern commercial usage emerged gradually. Practitioner diffusion preceded a direct academic literature.

The best historical judgment is therefore neither revolution nor fraud. RevOps is a **recent institutional form built from older intellectual and operational materials**. Its durable contribution may be to make the whole customer-revenue lifecycle a governable object and to give cross-functional operators formal authority. Its central danger is to mistake visibility for truth, coordination for centralization, recurring revenue for profit, and a compelling label for causal evidence.

References

Direct RevOps research and professional codification

- Ahmad, Tariq Hassan, and Charlotte Gaston-Breton. 2024. "Revenue Operations (RevOps): An Integrative Device in the Business-to-Business (B2B) Technology Industry." Conference presentation, 7th Industrial Marketing Management Summit. [DOI record](#).
- Diorio, Stephen G., and Chris K. Hummel. 2022a. *Revenue Operations: A New Way to Align Sales & Marketing, Monetize Data, and Ignite Growth*. Wiley. [Publisher record](#).
- Diorio, Stephen, Chris Hummel, and Bruce Rogers. 2022b. "Revenue Operations: A Systems Approach for Turning Analytics into Growth." *Applied Marketing Analytics* 7(4): 306-317. <https://doi.org/10.69554/ADYQ3148>.
- ESCP Business School. 2026. "Revenue Operations (RevOps): An Integrative Device in the Business-to-Business (B2B) Technology Industry." Public dissertation-defense abstract for Tariq Hassan Ahmad, 26 June. [Institutional record](#).
- Galvan, John, Jarkko Niemi, Tariq Hassan Ahmad, Bryan Hochstein, and Deva Rangarajan. 2025. "Industry Insights: The Role of Sales Operations (SalesOps) in Firm Strategy and Performance." *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 45(3): 313-316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2025.2525850>.
- Isabella, Giuliana, Marcos Inácio Severo de Almeida, Fábio Melo Duran, and Colin Gabler. 2025. "From Static to Conversational: The Role of Landing Pages and Chatbots in B2B Lead Generation." *Journal of Business Research* 201: 115681. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusres.2025.115681>.
- Mottola, Oliviero. 2021. "The Revenue Operations (RevOps) Framework: A Qualitative Study of Industry Practitioners." M.S. thesis, Harrisburg University of Science and Technology. [University repository](#).
- Schroeder, Curtis S., Stephan Volpers, Christopher R. Plouffe, and Bryan Hochstein. 2026. "Unpacking the Exchange Dynamics between Strategic Frontline Employees and the Internal Business Team." *Industrial Marketing Management* 134: 143-158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2026.03.002>.

Academic and scholarly sources

- Abrahamson, Eric. 1996. "Management Fashion." *Academy of Management Review* 21(1): 254-285. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1996.9602161572>.
- Aldrich, Howard, and Diane Herker. 1977. "Boundary Spanning Roles and Organization Structure." *Academy of Management Review* 2(2): 217-230. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1977.4409044>.
- Anderson, Erin, and Richard L. Oliver. 1987. "Perspectives on Behavior-Based versus Outcome-Based Salesforce Control Systems." *Journal of Marketing* 51(4): 76-88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298705100407>.
- Arnett, Dennis B., and C. Michael Wittmann. 2014. "Improving Marketing Success: The Role of Tacit Knowledge Exchange between Sales and Marketing." *Journal of Business Research* 67(3): 324-331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusres.2013.01.018>.
- Ascarza, Eva. 2018. "Retention Futility: Targeting High-Risk Customers Might Be Ineffective." *Journal of Marketing Research* 55(1): 80-98. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.16.0163>.
- Baines, Tim S., Howard W. Lightfoot, Ornella Benedettini, and John M. Kay. 2009. "The Servitization of Manufacturing: A Review of Literature and Reflection on Future Challenges." *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management* 20(5): 547-567. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17410380910960984>.
- Bartels, Robert. 1951. "Influences on the Development of Marketing Thought, 1900-1923." *Journal of Marketing* 16(1): 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224295101600101>.
- Baumann, Elias, Jana Kern, and Stefan Lessmann. 2022. "Usage Continuance in Software-as-a-Service." *Information Systems Frontiers* 24: 149-176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-020-10065-w>.
- Benlian, Alexander, Marios Koufaris, and Thomas Hess. 2011. "Service Quality in Software-as-a-Service: Developing the SaaS-Qual Measure and Examining Its Role in Usage Continuance." *Journal of Management Information Systems* 28(3): 85-126. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222280303>.
- Berger, Paul D., and Nada I. Nasr. 1998. "Customer Lifetime Value: Marketing Models and Applications." *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 12(1): 17-30. [Crossref record](#).
- Berry, Leonard L. 1983. "Relationship Marketing." In *Emerging Perspectives on Services Marketing*, edited by Leonard L. Berry, G. Lynn Shostack, and Gregory D. Upham, 25-28. American Marketing Association. [WorldCat record](#).
- Berry, Leonard L. 2002. "Relationship Marketing of Services-Perspectives from 1983 and 2000." *Journal of Relationship Marketing* 1(1): 59-77. https://doi.org/10.1300/J366v01n01_05.

- Beverland, Michael, Marion Steel, and G. Peter Dapiran. 2006. "Cultural Frames That Drive Sales and Marketing Apart: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing* 21(6): 386-394. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08858620610690146>.
- Biemans, Wim G., Maja Makovec Brenčič, and Avinash Malshe. 2010. "Marketing-Sales Interface Configurations in B2B Firms." *Industrial Marketing Management* 39(2): 183-194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2008.12.012>.
- Biemans, Wim, Avinash Malshe, and Jeff S. Johnson. 2022. "The Sales-Marketing Interface: A Systematic Literature Review and Directions for Future Research." *Industrial Marketing Management* 102: 324-337. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2022.02.001>.
- Bolton, Ruth N. 1998. "A Dynamic Model of the Duration of the Customer's Relationship with a Continuous Service Provider: The Role of Satisfaction." *Marketing Science* 17(1): 45-65. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.17.1.45>.
- Boulding, William, Richard Staelin, Michael Ehret, and Wesley J. Johnston. 2005. "A Customer Relationship Management Roadmap: What Is Known, Potential Pitfalls, and Where to Go." *Journal of Marketing* 69(4): 155-166. <https://doi.org/10.1509/imkg.2005.69.4.155>.
- Buttle, Francis, Lawrence Ang, and Reiny Iriana. 2006. "Sales Force Automation: Review, Critique, Research Agenda." *International Journal of Management Reviews* 8(4): 213-231. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2006.00128.x>.
- Carlile, Paul R. 2002. "A Pragmatic View of Knowledge and Boundaries: Boundary Objects in New Product Development." *Organization Science* 13(4): 442-455. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.4.442.2953>.
- Challagalla, Goutam, R. Venkatesh, and Ajay K. Kohli. 2009. "Proactive Postsales Service: When and Why Does It Pay Off?" *Journal of Marketing* 73(2): 70-87. <https://doi.org/10.1509/imkg.73.2.70>.
- Chandler, Alfred D., Jr. 1977. *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvighwri>.
- Chandler, Alfred D., Jr., and Herman Daems. 1979. "Administrative Coordination, Allocation and Monitoring: A Comparative Analysis of the Emergence of Accounting and Organization in the U.S.A. and Europe." *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 4(1-2): 3-20. DOI [10.1016/0361-3682\(79\)90003-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-3682(79)90003-5). Publisher record.
- Chen, Injazz J., and Karen Popovich. 2003. "Understanding Customer Relationship Management (CRM): People, Process and Technology." *Business Process Management Journal* 9(5): 672-688. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14637150310496758>.
- Christ, Paul, and Rolph E. Anderson. 2011. "The Impact of Technology on Evolving Roles of Salespeople." *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing* 3(2): 173-193. <https://doi.org/10.1108/1755750111132136>.
- Clark, Bruce H. 1999. "Marketing Performance Measures: History and Interrelationships." *Journal of Marketing Management* 15(8): 711-732. <https://doi.org/10.1362/026725799784772594>.
- Cusumano, Michael A. 2008. "The Changing Software Business: Moving from Products to Services." *Computer* 41(1): 20-27. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2008.29>.
- Cusumano, Michael A. 2010. "Cloud Computing and SaaS as New Computing Platforms." *Communications of the ACM* 53(4): 27-29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1721654.1721667>.
- Danaher, Peter J. 2002. "Optimal Pricing of New Subscription Services: Analysis of a Market Experiment." *Marketing Science* 21(2): 119-138. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.21.2.119.147>.
- Davenport, Thomas H., Jeanne G. Harris, and Susan Cantrell. 2004. "Enterprise Systems and Ongoing Process Change." *Business Process Management Journal* 10(1): 16-26. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14637150410518301>.
- Davenport, Thomas H., and James E. Short. 1990. "The New Industrial Engineering: Information Technology and Business Process Redesign." *Sloan Management Review* 31(4): 11-27. [MIT repository copy](https://doi.org/10.2307/4111321).
- Dewsnap, Belinda, and David Jobber. 2000. "The Sales-Marketing Interface in Consumer Packaged-Goods Companies: A Conceptual Framework." *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 20(2): 109-119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2000.10754230>.
- Dewsnap, Belinda, and David Jobber. 2002. "A Social Psychological Model of Relations between Marketing and Sales." *European Journal of Marketing* 36(7/8): 874-894. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560210430854>.
- Dougherty, Deborah. 1992. "Interpretive Barriers to Successful Product Innovation in Large Firms." *Organization Science* 3(2): 179-202. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.3.2.179>.
- Dwyer, F. Robert. 1989. "Customer Lifetime Valuation to Support Marketing Decision Making." *Journal of Direct Marketing* 3(4): 8-15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dir.4000030404>.
- Dwyer, F. Robert, Paul H. Schurr, and Sejo Oh. 1987. "Developing Buyer-Seller Relationships." *Journal of Marketing* 51(2): 11-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298705100202>.
- Erffmeyer, Robert C., and Dale A. Johnson. 2001. "An Exploratory Study of Sales Force Automation Practices: Expectations and Realities." *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 21(2): 167-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2001.10754267>.
- Fang, Eric, Robert W. Palmatier, and Jan-Benedict E. M. Steenkamp. 2008. "Effect of Service Transition Strategies on Firm Value." *Journal of Marketing* 72(5): 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1509/imkg.72.5.001>.
- Friedman, Walter A. 2004. *Birth of a Salesman: The Transformation of Selling in America*. Harvard University Press. [JSTOR edition](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2545444).

- Fullerton, Ronald A. 1988. "How Modern Is Modern Marketing? Marketing's Evolution and the Myth of the 'Production Era.'" *Journal of Marketing* 52(1): 108-125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298805200109>.
- Galbraith, Jay R. 1974. "Organization Design: An Information Processing View." *Interfaces* 4(3): 28-36. <https://doi.org/10.1287/inte.4.3.28>.
- Gebauer, Heiko, Elgar Fleisch, and Thomas Friedli. 2005. "Overcoming the Service Paradox in Manufacturing Companies." *European Management Journal* 23(1): 14-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emi.2004.12.006>.
- Gleaves, Robin, James Burton, John Kitshoff, Kevin Bates, and Mike Whittington. 2008. "Accounting Is from Mars, Marketing Is from Venus: Establishing Common Ground for Customer Profitability." *Journal of Marketing Management* 24(7-8): 825-845. <https://doi.org/10.1362/026725708X345533>.
- Graesch, Jan Philipp, Susanne Hensel-Börner, and Jörg Henseler. 2024. "Customer Success Management through Alignment of Marketing, Sales and IT." *Industrial Marketing Management* 120: 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2024.05.004>.
- Grint, Keith. 1994. "Reengineering History: Social Resonances and Business Process Reengineering." *Organization* 1(1): 179-201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135050849400100116>.
- Grover, Varun, Seung Ryul Jeong, William J. Kettinger, and James T. C. Teng. 1995. "The Implementation of Business Process Reengineering." *Journal of Management Information Systems* 12(1): 109-144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.1995.11518072>.
- Guidling, Chris, and Lisa McManus. 2002. "The Incidence, Perceived Merit and Antecedents of Customer Accounting: An Exploratory Note." *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 27(1-2): 45-59. DOI 10.1016/S0361-3682(01)00030-7. Publisher record.
- Gupta, Sunil, and Donald R. Lehmann. 2003. "Customers as Assets." *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 17(1): 9-24. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dir.10045>.
- Gupta, Sunil, Donald R. Lehmann, and Jennifer Ames Stuart. 2004. "Valuing Customers." *Journal of Marketing Research* 41(1): 7-18. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.41.1.7.25084>.
- Hilton, Bryson, Bitu Hajihashemi, Conor M. Henderson, and Robert W. Palmatier. 2020. "Customer Success Management: The Next Evolution in Customer Management Practice?" *Industrial Marketing Management* 90: 360-369. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.08.001>.
- Hochstein, Bryan, Deva Rangarajan, Nick Mehta, and David Kocher. 2020. "An Industry/Academic Perspective on Customer Success Management." *Journal of Service Research* 23(1): 3-7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670519896422>.
- Hochstein, Bryan, Nawar N. Chaker, Deva Rangarajan, Duane Nagel, and Nathaniel N. Hartmann. 2021. "Proactive Value Co-Creation via Structural Ambidexterity: Customer Success Management and the Modularization of Frontline Roles." *Journal of Service Research* 24(4): 601-621. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670521997565>.
- Hochstein, Bryan, Clay M. Voorhees, Alexander B. Pratt, Deva Rangarajan, Duane M. Nagel, and Vijay Mehrotra. 2023. "Customer Success Management, Customer Health, and Retention in B2B Industries." *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 40(4): 912-932. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2023.09.002>.
- Hollander, Stanley C., Kathleen M. Rassuli, D. G. Brian Jones, and Laura Farlow Dix. 2005. "Periodization in Marketing History." *Journal of Macromarketing* 25(1): 32-41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146705274982>.
- Homburg, Christian, and Ove Jensen. 2007. "The Thought Worlds of Marketing and Sales: Which Differences Make a Difference?" *Journal of Marketing* 71(3): 124-142. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.71.3.124>.
- Homburg, Christian, Ove Jensen, and Harley Krohmer. 2008. "Configurations of Marketing and Sales: A Taxonomy." *Journal of Marketing* 72(2): 133-154. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.72.2.133>.
- Hunter, Gary K., and William D. Perreault Jr. 2007. "Making Sales Technology Effective." *Journal of Marketing* 71(1): 16-34. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.71.1.016>.
- Jacobs, F. Robert, and F. C. "Ted" Weston Jr. 2007. "Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)—A Brief History." *Journal of Operations Management* 25(2): 357-363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iom.2006.11.005>.
- Jain, Dipak, and Siddhartha S. Singh. 2002. "Customer Lifetime Value Research in Marketing: A Review and Future Directions." *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 16(2): 34-46. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dir.10032>.
- Järvinen, Joel, and Heini Taiminen. 2016. "Harnessing Marketing Automation for B2B Content Marketing." *Industrial Marketing Management* 54: 164-175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2015.07.002>.
- Jaworski, Bernard J., and Ajay K. Kohli. 1993. "Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences." *Journal of Marketing* 57(3): 53-70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299305700304>.
- Johnson, H. Thomas, and Robert S. Kaplan. 1987. *Relevance Lost: The Rise and Fall of Management Accounting*. Harvard Business School Press. [WorldCat record](#).
- Jones, D. G. Brian, and David D. Monieson. 1990. "Early Development of the Philosophy of Marketing Thought." *Journal of Marketing* 54(1): 102-113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299005400107>.

- Jones, D. G. Brian, and Alan J. Richardson. 2007. "The Myth of the Marketing Revolution." *Journal of Macromarketing* 27(1): 15-24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146706296708>.
- Jones, Eli, Suresh Sundaram, and Wynne Chin. 2002. "Factors Leading to Sales Force Automation Use: A Longitudinal Analysis." *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 22(3): 145-156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2002.10754303>.
- Kahn, Kenneth B., and John T. Mentzer. 1998. "Marketing's Integration with Other Departments." *Journal of Business Research* 42(1): 53-62. DOI 10.1016/S0148-2963(97)00068-4. Publisher record.
- Kieser, Alfred. 1997. "Rhetoric and Myth in Management Fashion." *Organization* 4(1): 49-74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135050849741004>.
- Kimes, Sheryl E. 1989. "Yield Management: A Tool for Capacity-Constrained Service Firms." *Journal of Operations Management* 8(4): 348-363. DOI 10.1016/0272-6963(89)90035-1. Publisher record.
- Kirca, Ahmet H., Satish Jayachandran, and William O. Bearden. 2005. "Market Orientation: A Meta-Analytic Review and Assessment of Its Antecedents and Impact on Performance." *Journal of Marketing* 69(2): 24-41. <https://doi.org/10.1509/imkg.69.2.24.60761>.
- Klaus, Helmut, Michael Rosemann, and Guy G. Gable. 2000. "What Is ERP?" *Information Systems Frontiers* 2(2): 141-162. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026543906354>.
- Kohli, Ajay K., and Bernard J. Jaworski. 1990. "Market Orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications." *Journal of Marketing* 54(2): 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299005400201>.
- Kowalkowski, Christian, Oliver Stoll, and Wolfgang Ulaga. 2024. "Subscription Offers in Business-to-Business Markets: Conceptualization, Taxonomy, and Framework for Growth." *Industrial Marketing Management* 117: 440-456. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2024.01.014>.
- Laird, Pamela Walker. 1998. *Advertising Progress: American Business and the Rise of Consumer Marketing*. Johns Hopkins University Press. Originally published 1998; open-access edition 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1353/book.72714>.
- Lawer, Christopher, and Simon Knox. 2006. "Customer Advocacy and Brand Development." *Journal of Product & Brand Management* 15(2): 121-129. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10610420610658956>.
- Lawrence, Paul R., and Jay W. Lorsch. 1967. "Differentiation and Integration in Complex Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 12(1): 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391211>.
- Le Meunier-FitzHugh, Ken, and Nigel F. Piercy. 2007a. "Does Collaboration between Sales and Marketing Affect Business Performance?" *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 27(3): 207-220. <https://doi.org/10.2753/PSS0885-3134270301>.
- Le Meunier-FitzHugh, Ken, and Nigel F. Piercy. 2007b. "Exploring Collaboration between Sales and Marketing." *European Journal of Marketing* 41(7/8): 939-955. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560710752465>.
- Lemon, Katherine N., and Peter C. Verhoef. 2016. "Understanding Customer Experience throughout the Customer Journey." *Journal of Marketing* 80(6): 69-96. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0420>.
- Madsen, Dag Øivind, and Daniel Johanson. 2016. "Examining Customer Relationship Management from a Management Fashion Perspective." *Cogent Business & Management* 3(1): 1161285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2016.1161285>.
- Maltz, Elliot, and Ajay K. Kohli. 1996. "Market Intelligence Dissemination across Functional Boundaries." *Journal of Marketing Research* 33(1): 47-61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224379603300105>.
- McCarthy, Daniel M., Peter S. Fader, and Bruce G. S. Hardie. 2017. "Valuing Subscription-Based Businesses Using Publicly Disclosed Customer Data." *Journal of Marketing* 81(1): 17-35. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0519>.
- Morgan, Amy J., and Scott A. Inks. 2001. "Technology and the Sales Force: Increasing Acceptance of Sales Force Automation." *Industrial Marketing Management* 30(5): 463-472. DOI 10.1016/S0019-8501(99)00115-7. Publisher record.
- Morgan, Robert M., and Shelby D. Hunt. 1994. "The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing." *Journal of Marketing* 58(3): 20-38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299405800302>.
- Narver, John C., and Stanley F. Slater. 1990. "The Effect of a Market Orientation on Business Profitability." *Journal of Marketing* 54(4): 20-35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299005400403>.
- Neely, Andy. 2008. "Exploring the Financial Consequences of the Servitization of Manufacturing." *Operations Management Research* 1(2): 103-118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12063-009-0015-5>.
- O'Neill, Peter, and Amrik S. Sohal. 1999. "Business Process Reengineering: A Review of Recent Literature." *Technovation* 19(9): 571-581. DOI 10.1016/S0166-4972(99)00059-0. Publisher record.
- Oliva, Rogelio, and Robert Kallenberg. 2003. "Managing the Transition from Products to Services." *International Journal of Service Industry Management* 14(2): 160-172. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09564230310474138>.
- Oliva, Rogelio, and Noel Watson. 2011. "Cross-Functional Alignment in Supply Chain Planning: A Case Study of Sales and Operations Planning." *Journal of Operations Management* 29(5): 434-448. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iom.2010.11.012>.

- Parthasarathy, Madhavan, and Ravipreet S. Sohi. 1997. "Salesforce Automation and the Adoption of Technological Innovations by Salespeople: Theory and Implications." *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing* 12(3/4): 196-208. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08858629710188036>.
- Payne, Adrian, and Pennie Frow. 2005. "A Strategic Framework for Customer Relationship Management." *Journal of Marketing* 69(4): 167-176. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmk.2005.69.4.167>.
- Prohl-Schwenke, Katharina, and Michael Kleinaltenkamp. 2021. "How Business Customers Judge Customer Success Management." *Industrial Marketing Management* 96: 197-212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2021.05.004>.
- Rapp, Adam A., Daniel G. Bachrach, Karen E. Flaherty, Douglas E. Hughes, Arun Sharma, and Clay M. Voorhees. 2017. "The Role of the Sales-Service Interface and Ambidexterity in the Evolving Organization: A Multilevel Research Agenda." *Journal of Service Research* 20(1): 59-75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670516679274>.
- Reinartz, Werner J., and V. Kumar. 2000. "On the Profitability of Long-Life Customers in a Noncontractual Setting: An Empirical Investigation and Implications for Marketing." *Journal of Marketing* 64(4): 17-35. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmk.64.4.17.18077>.
- Reinartz, Werner, Manfred Krafft, and Wayne D. Hoyer. 2004. "The Customer Relationship Management Process: Its Measurement and Impact on Performance." *Journal of Marketing Research* 41(3): 293-305. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.41.3.293.35991>.
- Rouziès, Dominique, Erin Anderson, Ajay K. Kohli, Ronald E. Michaels, Barton A. Weitz, and Andris A. Zoltners. 2005. "Sales and Marketing Integration: A Proposed Framework." *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 25(2): 113-122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2005.10749053>.
- Rouziès, Dominique, and John Hulland. 2014. "Does Marketing and Sales Integration Always Pay Off? Evidence from a Social Capital Perspective." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 42(5): 511-527. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0375-8>.
- Ruekert, Robert W., and Orville C. Walker Jr. 1987. "Marketing's Interaction with Other Functional Units: A Conceptual Framework and Empirical Evidence." *Journal of Marketing* 51(1): 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298705100101>.
- Rust, Roland T., Tim Ambler, Gregory S. Carpenter, V. Kumar, and Rajendra K. Srivastava. 2004a. "Measuring Marketing Productivity: Current Knowledge and Future Directions." *Journal of Marketing* 68(4): 76-89. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmk.68.4.76.42721>.
- Rust, Roland T., Katherine N. Lemon, and Valarie A. Zeithaml. 2004b. "Return on Marketing: Using Customer Equity to Focus Marketing Strategy." *Journal of Marketing* 68(1): 109-127. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmk.68.1.109.24030>.
- Ryals, Lynette, and Adrian Payne. 2001. "Customer Relationship Management in Financial Services: Towards Information-Enabled Relationship Marketing." *Journal of Strategic Marketing* 9(1): 3-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713775725>.
- Sabnis, Gaurav, Sharmila C. Chatterjee, Rajdeep Grewal, and Gary L. Lilien. 2013. "The Sales Lead Black Hole: On Sales Reps' Follow-Up of Marketing Leads." *Journal of Marketing* 77(1): 52-67. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.10.0047>.
- Schmittlein, David C., Donald G. Morrison, and Richard Colombo. 1987. "Counting Your Customers: Who Are They and What Will They Do Next?" *Management Science* 33(1): 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.33.1.1>.
- Shaw, Arch W. 1912. "Some Problems in Market Distribution." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 26(4): 703-765. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1883802>.
- Shaw, Eric H., and D. G. Brian Jones. 2005. "A History of Schools of Marketing Thought." *Marketing Theory* 5(3): 239-281. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593105054898>.
- Sheth, Jagdish N., and Atul Parvatiyar. 1995. "The Evolution of Relationship Marketing." *International Business Review* 4(4): 397-418. DOI 10.1016/0969-5931(95)00018-6. Publisher record.
- Soh, Christina, and Siew Kien Sia. 2004. "An Institutional Perspective on Sources of ERP Package-Organisation Misalignments." *Journal of Strategic Information Systems* 13(4): 375-397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isis.2004.11.001>.
- Speier, Cheri, and Viswanath Venkatesh. 2002. "The Hidden Minefields in the Adoption of Sales Force Automation Technologies." *Journal of Marketing* 66(3): 98-111. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmk.66.3.98.18510>.
- Srivastava, Rajendra K., Tasadduq A. Shervani, and Liam Fahey. 1998. "Market-Based Assets and Shareholder Value: A Framework for Analysis." *Journal of Marketing* 62(1): 2-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299806200102>.
- Srivastava, Rajendra K., Tasadduq A. Shervani, and Liam Fahey. 1999. "Marketing, Business Processes, and Shareholder Value: An Organizationally Embedded View of Marketing Activities and the Discipline of Marketing." *Journal of Marketing* 63(Special Issue): 168-179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429990634S116>.
- Stone, Merlin, Neil Woodcock, and Muriel Wilson. 1996. "Managing the Change from Marketing Planning to Customer Relationship Management." *Long Range Planning* 29(5): 675-683. DOI 10.1016/0024-6301(96)00061-1. Publisher record.
- Storbacka, Kaj. 2011. "A Solution Business Model: Capabilities and Management Practices for Integrated Solutions." *Industrial Marketing Management* 40(5): 699-711. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2011.05.003>.
- Strang, David, and Michael W. Macy. 2001. "In Search of Excellence: Fads, Success Stories, and Adaptive Emulation." *American Journal of Sociology* 107(1): 147-182. <https://doi.org/10.1086/323039>.

- Thomé, Antônio Márcio Tavares, Luiz Felipe Scavarda, Nicole Suclla Fernandez, and Annibal José Scavarda. 2012. "Sales and Operations Planning: A Research Synthesis." *International Journal of Production Economics* 138(1): 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2011.11.027>.
- Troilo, Gabriele, Luigi M. De Luca, and Paolo Guenzi. 2009. "Dispersion of Influence between Marketing and Sales: Its Effects on Superior Customer Value and Market Performance." *Industrial Marketing Management* 38(8): 872-882. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2009.06.009>.
- Tuli, Kapil R., Ajay K. Kohli, and Sundar G. Bharadwaj. 2007. "Rethinking Customer Solutions: From Product Bundles to Relational Processes." *Journal of Marketing* 71(3): 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmk.71.3.001>.
- Uлага, Wolfgang, and Werner J. Reinartz. 2011. "Hybrid Offerings: How Manufacturing Firms Combine Goods and Services Successfully." *Journal of Marketing* 75(6): 5-23. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.09.0395>.
- Umble, Elisabeth J., Ronald R. Haft, and Michael M. Umble. 2003. "Enterprise Resource Planning: Implementation Procedures and Critical Success Factors." *European Journal of Operational Research* 146(2): 241-257. DOI 10.1016/S0377-2217(02)00547-7. [Publisher record](#).
- Vaid, Shashank S., Michael Ahearne, and Ryan Krause. 2020. "Joint Marketing and Sales Appointment: Uncertainty from Intertwining of Marketing and Sales in One Position." *Industrial Marketing Management* 85: 221-239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2019.11.013>.
- van der Borgh, Michel, Juan Xu, and Marin Sikkenk. 2020. "Identifying, Analyzing, and Finding Solutions to the Sales Lead Black Hole: A Design Science Approach." *Industrial Marketing Management* 88: 136-151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.05.008>.
- Vandermerwe, Sandra, and Juan Rada. 1988. "Servitization of Business: Adding Value by Adding Services." *European Management Journal* 6(4): 314-324. DOI 10.1016/0263-2373(88)90033-3. [Publisher record](#).
- Vargo, Stephen L., and Robert F. Lusch. 2004. "Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing." *Journal of Marketing* 68(1): 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmk.68.1.24036>.
- Venkatesan, Rajkumar, and V. Kumar. 2004. "A Customer Lifetime Value Framework for Customer Selection and Resource Allocation Strategy." *Journal of Marketing* 68(4): 106-125. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmk.68.4.106.42728>.
- Verhoef, Peter C., P. K. Kannan, and J. Jeffrey Inman. 2015. "From Multi-Channel Retailing to Omni-Channel Retailing: Introduction to the Special Issue on Multi-Channel Retailing." *Journal of Retailing* 91(2): 174-181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2015.02.005>.
- Weatherford, Lawrence R., and Samuel E. Bodily. 1992. "A Taxonomy and Research Overview of Perishable-Asset Revenue Management: Yield Management, Overbooking, and Pricing." *Operations Research* 40(5): 831-844. <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.40.5.831>.
- Weld, L. D. H. 1917. "Marketing Functions and Mercantile Organization." *American Economic Review* 7(2): 306-318. [JSTOR record](#).
- Yates, JoAnne. 1989. *Control through Communication: The Rise of System in American Management*. Johns Hopkins University Press. [Publisher record](#).
- Zablah, Alex R., Danny N. Bellenger, and Wesley J. Johnston. 2004. "An Evaluation of Divergent Perspectives on Customer Relationship Management: Towards a Common Understanding of an Emerging Phenomenon." *Industrial Marketing Management* 33(6): 475-489. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2004.01.006>.
- Zbaracki, Mark J. 1998. "The Rhetoric and Reality of Total Quality Management." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43(3): 602-636. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393677>.
- Zoltners, Andris A., Prabhakant Sinha, and Sally E. Lorimer. 2008. "Sales Force Effectiveness: A Framework for Researchers and Practitioners." *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 28(2): 115-131. <https://doi.org/10.2753/PSS0885-3134280201>.

Primary and institutional artifacts used only for terminology chronology

- United States Department of Transportation. 1971. *Fourth Annual Report of the U.S. Department of Transportation: 1970*. The report uses "revenue operations" for fare-paying transit service. [National Transportation Library record](#); <https://doi.org/10.21949/qx8r-ep44>.
- Nebraska Department of Administrative Services. "Revenue Operations Supervisor" position classification, established 1970 and subsequently revised. [State personnel classification](#).
- Subex Systems Limited. 2005-2006. Annual report describing a telecom "Revenue Operations Center." [Annual Reports archive](#).
- ZoomInfo Technologies Inc. 2020. Registration statement, executive biography retrospectively listing an "Inside Sales Team" Head of Revenue Operations role for 2008-2015. [SEC filing](#).
- Citrix Systems, Inc. 2019. Proxy statement, executive biography listing earlier "Worldwide Revenue Operations" responsibility. [SEC filing](#).
- Progress Software Corporation. 2012. Form 10-K references to deal review by revenue operations. [SEC filing](#).
- Pandora Media, Inc. 2014 (filed 2017). Signed executive offer letter for an Executive Vice President of Revenue Operations. [SEC exhibit](#).
- Viggle Inc. 2015. Securities filing describing a Vice President of Revenue Operations and using the abbreviation "Rev Ops" in advertising fulfillment. [SEC exhibit](#).

- Radius. 2017. "The Rise of Revenue Ops," 2 March. Archived public articulation of a cross-functional marketing-and-sales model. [Internet Archive copy](#).
- Vaughan, Scott. 2017. "The Business Case to Merge Sales & Marketing Ops," 7 March. Contemporaneous proposal to merge the two operations groups without using "RevOps." [MarTech article](#).
- LeanData. 2017. "Sales Ops + Marketing Ops = Revenue Ops," 2 May. Archived evidence that the term was still being presented as emergent and explicitly linked to Radius. [Internet Archive copy](#).
- Savić, Marko / FunnelCake. 2017. "The RevOps Framework." The later-updated PDF states "Published May 2017"; the page is independently archived by July. Earliest located explicit marketing-sales-customer-success, full-lifecycle framework. [Archived page](#).
- SendGrid, Inc. 2018. "2018 Sales Commission Plan," effective 1 March. Internal artifact assigning RevOps responsibilities across sales and customer-success data and commission administration. [SEC exhibit](#).
- LeanData and Sales Hacker. 2018. "State of Revenue Operations 2018" release materials. Evidence of survey-based category diffusion, not independent performance research. [Archived announcement](#).
- Forrester / SiriusDecisions. 2019. Public research-page codification of a Revenue Operations organizational model. [Forrester research record](#).

Publication record

Revenue Operations Before RevOps: An Academic and Archival History

ARTICLE	JORO-2026-01-001
EDITION	Reviewed PDF edition
REVIEW	Editorial review; not externally peer reviewed
IDENTIFIER	DOI not assigned
CANONICAL	https://www.journalofrevenueoperations.com/journal/revops-history

The approved HTML article is the authoritative publication. This PDF is a convenience rendition produced from the same editorial source and must be regenerated whenever the canonical article changes.

© 2026 Paul Maxwell. All rights reserved.