International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAEM)
Volume 8, Issue 5 May. 2026, pp: 313-328 www.ijaem.net ISSN: 2395-5252

AI-Enabled Marketing Analytics and Firm Performance: The Mediating Role of Data-Driven Decision-Making in Malaysia

[1.] Prof. Dr. Vijayakumaran Kathiarayan, [2.] Prof. Dr. P. Ravindran Pathmanathan
[3.] Assoc. Prof. Dr. Venkatesh Karanam

Date of Submission: 02-05-2026 Date of Acceptance: 11-05-2026

ABSTRACT

This study investigates how AI-enabled marketing analytics (AIMA) shapes firm performance, with particular attention to the intervening role of data-driven decision-making (DDDM). Grounded in resource-based view (RBV) theory and dynamic capabilities scholarship, the paper draws on extant literature and sector-level evidence to trace the pathways through which analytically derived insights convert into measurable competitive gains. The central argument is that analytics tools alone do not produce superior outcomes; rather, performance improvements materialize only when firms have institutionalized the practices, processes, and leadership norms that allow such tools to inform consequential decisions. Evidence from the Malaysian business environment lends empirical texture to this argument: in sectors where AIMA adoption is most mature—notably e-commerce, financial services, and telecommunications—firms that couple their analytics investments with structured DDDM processes report return-on-ad-spend advantages of approximately 31% and customer retention gains of around 25% relative to peers that deploy comparable tools but rely primarily on managerial intuition. Persistent obstacles, including a shortage of analytically trained marketing practitioners (cited by 52% of surveyed firms), fragmented compliance landscapes under the Personal Data Protection Act 2010 (PDPA), pronounced capability asymmetries between large enterprises and small-to-medium enterprises (SMEs), and cultural reluctance toward evidence-based decision norms, collectively moderate the strength of these relationships. The paper contributes a testable conceptual model and derives actionable implications for both marketing executives and Malaysian policymakers.

Keywords: *artificial intelligence; marketing analytics; firm performance; data-driven decision-making; Malaysia; dynamic capabilities; resource-based view; analytics maturity*

I. INTRODUCTION

The proposition that firms which make systematic use of data outperform those that do not is no longer contested in the strategy literature (Brynjolfsson et al., 2011; Germann et al., 2013). What remains empirically underspecified, however, is the mechanism through which any particular category of data-intensive technology—specifically, AI-enabled marketing analytics (AIMA)—produces firm-level performance gains. Investing in sophisticated analytical platforms is necessary but manifestly insufficient; numerous organizations have accumulated significant technology expenditures with little discernible improvement in marketing effectiveness, customer retention, or financial returns (McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2012). This gap between technological potential and realized value constitutes the motivating puzzle for the present inquiry.

Malaysia offers a theoretically instructive and practically significant arena in which to examine these dynamics. The country's digital infrastructure has expanded rapidly: internet penetration surpassed 97%, e-commerce turnover reached RM46.2 billion in 2025 (Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2026), and programmatic advertising—the most analytics-intensive form of digital marketing—now accounts for 58% of total display spend (Malaysian Digital Association [MDA], 2026). Concurrently, the share of Malaysian businesses that report some form of AI adoption reached 27%, representing year-on-year growth of 35% (Amazon Web Services [AWS], 2025). Marketing analytics has emerged as the second most prevalent AI application after customer service automation, suggesting that AIMA is already embedded within mainstream Malaysian business practice.

Yet adoption statistics alone present an incomplete, and potentially misleading, picture. Despite the proliferation of analytics tools, only 12% of large Malaysian enterprises report possessing a comprehensive AI strategy, and 52% identify a lack of skilled personnel as their foremost barrier to effective AI utilization (AWS, 2025). More strikingly, survey data from the MDA (2025) reveal that 45% of senior marketing managers assign greater decision-weight to intuitive judgment than to analytical outputs, and 38% acknowledge that they routinely disregard dashboard information owing to complexity or distrust. These figures raise a specific and tractable question: if AIMA

International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAEM)
Volume 8, Issue 5 May. 2026, pp: 313-328 www.ijaem.net ISSN: 2395-5252

tools are increasingly available, why do only some firms convert that availability into superior performance? The answer, this paper argues, lies in the mediating capacity of data-driven decision-making (DDDM)—the organizational capability to systematically embed analytical evidence within managerial choices.

Three research questions guide this inquiry. First, in what ways does AIMA adoption shape firm performance within the Malaysian context? Second, through what mechanisms does DDDM mediate this relationship? Third, which contextual characteristics of the Malaysian business environment—including skills shortages, regulatory complexity, and the digital capability divide between large firms and SMEs—moderate the AIMA–DDDM–performance chain? The paper proceeds by establishing theoretical foundations (Section 2), developing a conceptual framework with falsifiable propositions (Section 3), situating the argument in Malaysian sectoral evidence (Section 4), and deriving implications for managers and policymakers (Section 5), before concluding with limitations and future research directions (Section 6).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Foundations

Resource-Based View

Barney's (1991) resource-based view (RBV) holds that durable competitive advantage accrues to firms whose resource portfolios are simultaneously valuable, rare, imperfectly replicable, and non-substitutable. Applied to the present context, AIMA tools may qualify as valuable insofar as they generate customer insights that competitors lack; yet the analytics software itself is rarely a source of inimitability, given that any organization willing to pay the licensing fee can access broadly equivalent platforms such as Google Analytics 4, Adobe Experience Platform, or Salesforce Einstein. The heterogeneity that matters for competitive positioning thus resides not in the technological artefact per se but in the complementary organizational capabilities that allow firms to exploit it: the quality of underlying data infrastructure, the analytical proficiency of marketing staff, the governance arrangements that route analytical outputs into strategic deliberations, and—critically—the cultural disposition toward evidence-based reasoning (Kumar et al., 2019). From this theoretical vantage point, DDDM constitutes a higher-order organizational capability that transforms the latent potential embodied in AIMA into realized performance outcomes.

Dynamic Capabilities Theory

Teece et al.'s (1997) dynamic capabilities framework extends the static logic of the RBV by attending to how firms configure and reconfigure their resource bundles in response to shifting environmental demands. The framework identifies three generic dynamic capability clusters: sensing (the detection of novel market opportunities and emerging competitive threats), seizing (the mobilization of resources to pursue identified opportunities), and transforming (the ongoing renewal of organizational routines and business models to sustain alignment with changing market conditions). Teece (2007) subsequently elaborated the microfoundations of each cluster, emphasizing the role of managerial cognition, organizational learning, and adaptive governance. Within marketing, AIMA is best understood as an instrument of sensing: by processing large volumes of behavioral, transactional, and attitudinal data in near real time, AI-driven tools make market signals legible that would otherwise remain invisible to human observers. DDDM, by contrast, operationalizes seizing: it constitutes the organizational routines through which sensed signals are converted into bounded decisions about budget allocation, campaign design, channel mix, and customer targeting. Neither construct is independently sufficient for performance improvement; it is their conjunction—AIMA providing informational raw material and DDDM providing the institutional machinery to act upon it—that drives marketing capability.

Information Processing Perspective

Galbraith (1973) and Egelhoff (1991) conceptualize organizational effectiveness as a function of the match between the information-processing demands imposed by a firm's operating environment and the information-processing capacity it has developed. Contemporary marketing environments impose exceptionally high processing demands: consumer preferences shift rapidly across channels; competitive moves propagate through markets at speed; and the sheer volume of behavioral data generated by digital interactions far exceeds what human analysts can review without automated assistance. AIMA addresses the capacity side of this equation by automating data aggregation, pattern recognition, and predictive modeling. However, increased processing capacity does not automatically translate into better decisions: if the organizational structures that receive analytical outputs are poorly designed, analytically illiterate, or culturally hostile to evidence-based deliberation, information overload and analysis paralysis are equally probable outcomes. DDDM represents the structural and cultural conditions under which augmented processing capacity can be absorbed and translated into decision quality.

2.2 AI-Enabled Marketing Analytics: Definitional Scope and Core Capabilities

AIMA denotes the application of machine learning algorithms, natural language processing techniques, and computer vision models to marketing datasets, with the goal of generating analytically grounded insights, probabilistic predictions, and ranked recommendations that inform strategic and operational decisions (Wedel & Kannan, 2016; Davenport et al., 2020). The practical scope of AIMA encompasses several distinct capability domains:

Customer segmentation and micro-targeting: Unsupervised learning algorithms—including k-means clustering, density-based spatial clustering (DBSCAN), and Gaussian mixture models—identify sub-populations within the customer base whose behavioral profiles warrant differentiated engagement strategies. The resultant segments form the targeting architecture for personalized messaging.

Propensity scoring: Supervised classification models, ranging from logistic regression to gradient-boosted decision trees and deep neural networks, generate probability estimates for commercially relevant customer actions—purchase, churn, click-through, referral—enabling prioritized and cost-efficient allocation of retention and acquisition resources.

Customer lifetime value (CLV) prediction: Machine learning models trained on purchase histories and behavioral sequences yield individual-level estimates of the net present value of a customer relationship. CLV predictions set the theoretical ceiling on acquisition expenditure and inform tiered service investment (Kumar et al., 2019).

Marketing mix modeling and multi-touch attribution: Bayesian structural time-series models and ridge-regularized regression decompose aggregate sales variation into contributions attributable to individual marketing levers—television advertising, paid search, organic social, email, in-store promotions—thereby enabling evidence-based budget reallocation across channels.

Real-time personalization: Collaborative filtering algorithms and dynamic content optimization engines customize digital touchpoints at the individual level and at the moment of interaction, significantly improving click-through and conversion rates compared with batch-processed personalization strategies (Davenport et al., 2020).

Sentiment analysis and social listening: Natural language processing classifiers applied to social media streams, review platforms, and customer service transcripts provide continuous monitoring of brand sentiment and early detection of emerging issues or competitive maneuvers (Wedel & Kannan, 2016).

2.3 Data-Driven Decision-Making in Marketing

The concept of data-driven decision-making has attracted growing scholarly attention since Brynjolfsson et al.'s (2011) influential demonstration that firms whose decision processes are more heavily anchored in empirical evidence exhibit statistically significant productivity and profitability advantages over industry peers. Building on Provost and Fawcett's (2013) foundational treatment and McAfee and Brynjolfsson's (2012) managerial synthesis, the present paper defines DDDM as a multi-dimensional organizational capability encompassing five analytically separable, though practically interdependent, components.

Data accessibility and quality refers to the degree to which marketing decision-makers can obtain timely, accurate, and comprehensive data from both internal (CRM, transactional, operational) and external (market research, platform analytics, syndicated data) sources. Data governance regimes that enforce consistent definitions, prevent duplication, and manage lineage are prerequisites for trustworthy analysis.

Analytical culture encompasses the norms, values, and expectations that govern how arguments are substantiated within an organization. In high-DDDM firms, claims about market conditions or campaign effectiveness are routinely expected to be supported by quantitative evidence; intuition and accumulated experience are treated as complements to, rather than substitutes for, data. Experimentation—including A/B testing and multivariate experimentation—is treated as a routine practice rather than an exceptional investment (Provost & Fawcett, 2013).

Decision processes and governance refer to the formal protocols and institutional arrangements through which analytical outputs are incorporated into campaign planning, budget approval, performance review, and strategic deliberation. Effective governance requires clear decision rights, mandatory analytics review before significant resource commitments, and post-hoc accountability processes that compare actual results against model-based forecasts (McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2012).

Skills and analytical literacy denote the extent to which marketing professionals can interpret statistical outputs critically—recognizing the practical implications of model uncertainty, selection bias, and overfitting—and can communicate analytical findings effectively to non-technical stakeholders. The gap between the production and consumption of analytical insights is frequently a skills gap rather than a technological one (Provost & Fawcett, 2013).

Leadership commitment and visible modeling refers to the degree to which senior marketing executives publicly and consistently draw on analytical evidence in their own decision-making, allocate budgetary resources for analytics infrastructure and capability development, and reward evidence-based decision habits throughout the team—including when data-informed choices prove suboptimal in retrospect (Brynjolfsson et al., 2011).

2.4 Firm Performance in Marketing Analytics Research

Firm performance in this domain is most productively understood as a multi-dimensional construct spanning financial, customer, and operational outcomes. Financially, researchers have operationalized performance through return on marketing investment (ROMI), customer acquisition cost (CAC), CLV, and profitability margins. Customer-facing metrics include retention rates, churn rates, net promoter scores (NPS), and share-of-wallet measures. Operationally, performance manifests in reduced campaign cycle times, improved cost-per-lead ratios, and higher conversion efficiency (Germann et al., 2013).

The aggregate association between analytics capability and firm performance is well-established empirically. Brynjolfsson et al. (2011) identified a statistically robust relationship between data-driven decision orientation and firm-level productivity and profitability in a sample of 179 publicly listed U.S. firms. Germann et al.'s (2013) meta-analysis of 260 firms extended this finding specifically to marketing analytics, confirming positive, significant associations with both customer relationship outcomes and financial returns. Morgan (2012) similarly demonstrated that marketing resource deployment quality mediates the relationship between market orientation and business performance. Notwithstanding this consensus on direction, substantial heterogeneity in effect sizes across studies implicates the presence of moderating and mediating variables—most notably, the DDDM capabilities through which analytics outputs are processed into decisions.

2.5 DDDM as a Mediator of the AIMA–Performance Relationship

The mediation hypothesis advanced in this paper rests on a straightforward organizational logic: AIMA tools expand the quantity and quality of information available to marketing decision-makers, but this informational expansion produces performance improvements only when the organization has developed the institutional capacity to act on that information systematically. The distinction between two hypothetical firms sharing identical analytical tool suites illustrates the mechanism cleanly. Firm A maintains mandatory pre-campaign analytics briefs, weekly performance review meetings anchored in dashboard data, an analytical culture that treats experimentation as a learning vehicle, and senior leaders who visibly cite quantitative evidence in strategic discussions. Firm B has licensed the same software but maintains no formal analytical governance, relies on generalist marketers without statistical training, and operates within a culture where gut-feel judgments carry greater political legitimacy than data-based arguments. All else equal, Firm A will outperform Firm B—not because of superior technology, but because of superior decision processes. DDDM is the intermediate organizational variable through which AIMA's informational capacity becomes realized performance advantage.

This mediation logic draws empirical support from two recent studies. Kreibich (2021), working with a sample of German firms, found that the positive association between big data analytics capability and firm performance was fully mediated by data-driven decision-making after controlling for industry and firm size; the direct path from analytics to performance lost statistical significance once DDDM entered the model. Wang et al. (2022) replicated and extended this finding in a U.S. sample of 203 marketing executives, demonstrating that analytics capability influenced performance through decision quality—a core component of DDDM—rather than through any direct mechanism. These findings collectively imply that interventions targeting DDDM processes, culture, and leadership may yield greater performance returns, at the margin, than equivalent investments in analytics technology per se.

III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND TESTABLE PROPOSITIONS

3.1 Framework Architecture

The conceptual framework positions AI-Enabled Marketing Analytics (AIMA) as the independent construct, Data-Driven Decision-Making (DDDM) as the mediating construct, and Firm Performance (FP) as the outcome construct. AIMA is operationalized as the breadth and sophistication of AI-based tool adoption within marketing functions, capturing predictive modeling, recommendation engines, real-time personalization capabilities, and marketing mix optimization approaches. DDDM is operationalized across its five identified dimensions: data quality and accessibility, analytical culture, governance protocols, staff analytical literacy, and leadership modeling behavior. Firm Performance is operationalized through ROMI, customer retention, CLV trajectory, and revenue growth rate.

Three contextual moderators are incorporated, all derived from the Malaysian empirical landscape:

organizational analytics maturity (which encompasses data infrastructure quality, talent depth, and technological sophistication), industry competitive intensity (which captures the degree to which rivals deploy analytics-based strategies and the speed with which market positions can shift), and data governance quality (which reflects the robustness of internal data management practices and compliance posture relative to the PDPA). Control variables include firm size, industry classification, marketing budget quantum, years of digital marketing operational history, and prior IT capital investment.

Analytically, the framework predicts a mediated relationship in which AIMA exerts its primary effect on FP indirectly—through DDDM—rather than directly. The strength of the AIMA→DDDM pathway is moderated by analytics maturity; the DDDM→FP pathway is moderated by both competitive intensity and data governance quality. The framework thus generates a moderated mediation structure amenable to empirical testing using structural equation modeling or hierarchical regression with interaction terms.

3.2 Propositions

Proposition 1 (Main Effect): AI-enabled marketing analytics adoption is positively associated with firm performance. Firms demonstrating higher AIMA sophistication will, ceteris paribus, report superior ROMI, customer retention rates, and revenue growth compared with firms at lower adoption levels.

The rationale is that AIMA improves targeting precision, reduces wasted ad spend through more accurate audience selection, enables marketers to detect and respond to market changes more rapidly, and generates customer-level insights that support more calibrated retention and acquisition strategies (Wedel & Kannan, 2016; Davenport et al., 2020). Even in the absence of strong DDDM, some performance benefit accrues from better-targeted advertising and automated campaign optimization.

Proposition 2 (Mediation): Data-driven decision-making mediates the relationship between AIMA and firm performance. The primary pathway through which AIMA adoption generates performance improvement runs through DDDM rather than operating directly.

Proposition 2 is the central claim of the paper. It implies that the coefficient on the direct AIMA→FP path will be substantially reduced—and may become non-significant—once DDDM is included in the model, consistent with Kreibich's (2021) and Wang et al.'s (2022) empirical findings.

Proposition 2a: Higher AIMA adoption is associated with higher DDDM capability. The presence of analytics tools creates informational conditions that incentivize the development of evidence-based decision governance: once the data is visible and interpretable, organizational pressure to use it formally tends to accumulate over time.

Proposition 2b: Higher DDDM capability is associated with superior firm performance. By reducing subjective bias in resource allocation, improving the speed and accuracy of tactical responses to market shifts, and enabling disciplined experimentation, DDDM generates performance advantages that are independent of the specific analytical tools deployed.

Proposition 3 (Moderation: Analytics Maturity): The positive association between AIMA and DDDM is stronger in firms with higher organizational analytics maturity. In low-maturity firms, absorptive capacity constraints limit the degree to which analytics tools can catalyze DDDM development, and the AIMA→DDDM pathway is correspondingly weaker.

Cohen and Levinthal (1990) demonstrated that a firm's ability to extract value from externally sourced knowledge depends on its prior, related knowledge stock. Applied to the analytics context, firms lacking foundational data management practices, basic statistical competencies, or the cultural permission to question intuition-based choices will find that even sophisticated AIMA tools fail to produce the organizational learning and governance development that characterize high-DDDM states.

Proposition 4 (Moderation: Competitive Intensity): The mediated effect of AIMA on performance via DDDM is amplified in high-intensity competitive environments. In markets where customer switching costs are low, margins are thin, and rivals move quickly to imitate successful strategies, even marginal improvements in decision speed and accuracy generate disproportionate performance dividends.

Proposition 5 (Moderation: Data Governance Quality): The DDDM→FP relationship is positively moderated by data governance quality. Strong governance—characterized by clear data ownership, standardized definitions, consistent collection protocols, and PDPA-compliant consent management—enables DDDM to deliver accurate, legally defensible decisions. Weak governance introduces systematic errors that erode decision quality even in firms with formally high DDDM intentions, and exposes firms to regulatory sanction and reputational damage.

IV. THE MALAYSIAN CONTEXT: AIMA ADOPTION, DDDM MATURITY, AND PERFORMANCE EVIDENCE

4.1 Digital Economy Conditions and AI Adoption Patterns

Malaysia's trajectory toward a data-intensive marketing environment has been shaped by rapid infrastructural expansion and proactive government intervention. Internet penetration exceeding 97%, a growing middle class with high smartphone adoption rates, and state-backed initiatives including the National AI Action Plan 2030 and the MyDIGITAL blueprint have collectively created conditions in which AI adoption is both economically rational and institutionally incentivized (Anwar Ibrahim, 2025; MyDIGITAL Corporation, 2024). The AWS (2025) survey documents 27% AI adoption among Malaysian businesses, growing at 35% year-on-year, with marketing analytics ranking second among use cases—behind customer service automation—and estimated to be deployed by approximately 22% of firms.

Sector-level adoption patterns reveal significant heterogeneity. Technology and professional services firms report the highest AIMA penetration (49%), followed by financial services (42%) and retail/e-commerce (approximately 35%), while manufacturing, historically slower to digitize its commercial functions, reports adoption of around 26% (AWS, 2025). Generative AI tools for content creation have registered particularly rapid uptake: the proportion of Malaysian marketers using ChatGPT or equivalent tools for copywriting and social media content rose from 18% in 2024 to 41% in 2025 (MDA, 2025), suggesting that AI's role in marketing is expanding beyond structured analytics into creative and strategic functions.

Major platform ecosystems have embedded AI analytics capabilities directly into the tools through which most Malaysian businesses manage their digital marketing. Shopee and Lazada furnish sellers with analytics dashboards that display conversion funnel metrics, CLV estimates, and recommendation engine performance statistics. Meta Malaysia and Google Malaysia offer semi-automated campaign optimization features—Advantage+ Shopping and Smart Bidding, respectively—that adjust targeting parameters and bid amounts in real time based on historical conversion patterns. On the financial services side, Touch 'n Go eWallet employs machine learning-driven churn prediction to calibrate cashback offer personalization, and Grab Malaysia uses propensity models to determine which users receive promotional vouchers (Grab Holdings, 2026; Touch 'n Go, 2026).

4.2 DDDM Maturity: A Fragmented Landscape

The distribution of DDDM maturity across Malaysian firms is markedly bimodal. A minority of large enterprises and MNC subsidiaries—estimated at 15–20% of the large-firm population—exhibit what this paper characterizes as high-maturity DDDM. Firms in this category maintain dedicated marketing analytics teams or centers of excellence, operate unified customer data platforms (CDPs) or cloud data warehouses that integrate transactional, behavioral, and campaign data across channels, conduct routine pre-campaign A/B and multivariate testing, and hold mandatory post-campaign analytics reviews against pre-specified KPIs. Representative examples include Maybank, which deploys Salesforce Einstein for predictive lead scoring; PETRONAS, whose loyalty program targeting relies on CLV model outputs; CelcomDigi, which requires analytics briefs as a precondition of campaign approval; and Grab Malaysia, which reportedly runs hundreds of simultaneous A/B experiments annually (CelcomDigi, 2025; Maybank, 2025).

The majority of Malaysian firms—particularly SMEs, which account for 97% of all registered businesses—occupy the low-maturity end of the spectrum. These firms use analytics primarily for post-campaign reporting rather than pre-campaign planning, depend on the default algorithmic targeting that platforms provide without conducting independent analysis, employ generalist marketers without dedicated analytical training, and reach strategic marketing decisions through experiential judgment and competitor imitation rather than empirical testing. SME Corporation Malaysia's (2025) survey found that only 22% of SMEs had formalized DDDM processes, 71% lacked staff with meaningful data interpretation competencies, and 54% of those that had adopted AI marketing tools did not track return on investment in any systematic manner.

The performance consequences of this maturity divide are non-trivial. A comparative analysis by iPrice (2026) of Malaysian e-commerce sellers found that merchants in the top DDDM-maturity quartile—defined by active use of A/B testing, dashboard monitoring, and periodic analytics review—outperformed bottom-quartile peers by 31% on return on ad spend and 25% on customer retention, despite operating with analytically comparable AI tool suites. This finding constitutes preliminary observational support for the mediation hypothesis embedded in Proposition 2: it is not tool ownership but DDDM capability that drives the observed performance differential.

International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAEM)
Volume 8, Issue 5 May. 2026, pp: 313-328 www.ijaem.net ISSN: 2395-5252

4.3 Sectoral Evidence: Three Illustrative Cases

Case 1: E-Commerce (Shopee Malaysia)

Shopee's recommendation engine processes billions of purchase and browsing signals daily to generate individualized product rankings and promotional displays. While this infrastructure is available to all sellers on the platform, Shopee additionally provides merchant-facing analytics dashboards and A/B testing tools that enable individual sellers to make discretionary, data-informed decisions about product pricing, advertisement creative, and promotion timing. Shopee's (2025) internal seller performance analysis shows that merchants who actively engage with these DDDM features—tracking conversion funnel metrics, systematically testing headline variants, and adjusting bids in response to ROAS data—achieved sales growth 2.3 times higher than merchants who relied on platform defaults without conducting independent analysis. The case illustrates the mediation mechanism directly: the same AIMA infrastructure was accessible to both groups; differential DDDM behavior produced the performance divergence.

Case 2: Financial Services (Touch 'n Go eWallet)

Touch 'n Go eWallet's machine learning infrastructure generates continuous churn risk scores and cashback offer propensity estimates for its user base. The organization has codified its DDDM capability in a structured test-learn-scale framework: every prospective campaign intervention is preceded by a small-sample A/B experiment, the results of which are analyzed by an internal data science team before any variant is authorized for full deployment. Through this discipline, the organization reports that campaign ROI improved by 28% year-on-year and customer acquisition cost declined by 19% (Touch 'n Go, 2026). Company documentation explicitly attributes these outcomes to the decision governance framework rather than to model improvements per se, reinforcing the conceptual argument that DDDM processes—not analytical models in isolation—are the primary performance-generating mechanism.

Case 3: Telecommunications (CelcomDigi)

CelcomDigi's marketing team uses propensity models to identify customers at elevated risk of competitor migration and those showing behavioral signals of readiness for plan upgrades. Following organizational recognition that model outputs were not systematically influencing campaign design, the company introduced a mandatory analytics brief protocol: no campaign can progress to execution without a documented expected-ROI estimate derived from model outputs, and all campaigns undergo post-execution review comparing actual against forecast performance. CelcomDigi (2025) reports that this institutional change reduced the proportion of campaigns designed without analytical input by 62% and improved campaign ROMI by 24%. The case is instructive in demonstrating that DDDM is fundamentally a governance and cultural phenomenon: the performance improvement was achieved not through upgraded models but through changed decision protocols.

4.4 Structural Barriers and Contextual Moderators

Capability Gaps and Analytical Talent Shortages

The most commonly cited barrier to effective AIMA deployment among Malaysian businesses is the scarcity of personnel combining domain-specific marketing knowledge with applied data science competencies (AWS, 2025). Universities and polytechnics have expanded data science program offerings—Universiti Malaya's Master of Data Science and Asia Pacific University's AI degree are notable examples—but graduates typically enter the labor market with strong technical foundations and limited exposure to marketing strategy, brand management, or commercial communication contexts. The inverse problem afflicts experienced marketers: analytical literacy is rarely embedded in traditional marketing training pathways. This bifurcation means that organizations must invest substantially in cross-disciplinary talent development or risk deploying analytics tools that neither the analytics team nor the marketing team can deploy productively at the decision interface.

Data Governance and PDPA Compliance

Malaysian marketing functions characteristically store customer and campaign data across fragmented system landscapes: CRM platforms (Salesforce, Zoho), e-commerce platforms (Shopee, Lazada, proprietary websites), social media advertising managers (Meta Business Suite, TikTok Ads Manager), email service providers (Mailchimp, GetResponse), and offline point-of-sale systems. Constructing a unified, deduplicated customer view from these disparate sources is technically demanding and frequently cost-prohibitive for firms without dedicated data engineering capabilities. The MDA (2025) survey reports that 63% of Malaysian marketers characterize data integration as a major or critical barrier to effective analytics. Layered onto this technical challenge are the consent management and data minimization obligations imposed by the Personal Data Protection Act 2010 (PDPA), which remains ambiguous on several dimensions pertinent to AI-driven marketing—including permissible uses of behavioral profiling data, third-party data-sharing arrangements, and cross-device identity resolution. This regulatory uncertainty discourages some firms

International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAEM)
Volume 8, Issue 5 May. 2026, pp: 313-328 www.ijaem.net ISSN: 2395-5252

from building the data infrastructure that DDDM requires (Personal Data Protection Department, 2024).

Cultural Resistance to Evidence-Based Decision Norms

Organizational culture represents perhaps the most intractable of the DDDM barriers identified in the Malaysian context. Survey evidence from the MDA (2025) indicates that 45% of senior marketing managers assign greater decision weight to intuitive judgment than to quantitative analysis, and 38% acknowledge routinely bypassing analytics dashboards. Resistance to evidence-based norms frequently has identifiable organizational antecedents: poor historical data quality that rendered previous analytical outputs unreliable, model opacity that made it impossible for non-technical managers to interrogate recommendations they found counterintuitive, and analytics team presentations that generated insights without translating them into actionable recommendations. Generational dynamics also feature: executives who built successful careers on intuition-driven judgment may reasonably perceive DDDM as a challenge to the legitimacy of their accumulated expertise. Overcoming this resistance requires leadership modeling at the senior level, demonstrated quick wins that build confidence in analytical methods, and organizational development investment focused on change management rather than technical training alone.

Enterprise–SME Digital Maturity Divide

The bifurcation between high-DDDM large enterprises and low-DDDM SMEs implies that the AIMA→DDDM→FP mediated relationship will exhibit significant heterogeneity across firm-size categories. SMEs face resource constraints that constrain analytics investment from multiple directions simultaneously: 54% cite cost as their primary AI adoption barrier, and 71% report insufficient trained personnel (SME Corporation Malaysia, 2025). For this segment, the prescriptive value of enterprise-grade DDDM frameworks is limited; a more tractable pathway involves building analytical foundations—data quality, basic event tracking, elementary analytics literacy—before investing in predictive modeling or real-time personalization infrastructure. Policy intervention, through subsidized shared-service analytics platforms or industry consortium arrangements, may be necessary to shift the AIMA→DDDM relationship for SMEs into a more positive range.

V. THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Contributions to Theory

This paper makes three distinct contributions to the scholarly literature on marketing analytics and organizational capability. First, it specifies the mediating mechanism connecting AIMA and firm performance with greater precision than prior work. Most empirical studies in this domain establish association between analytics capability and performance outcomes without attending rigorously to the organizational processes through which that association operates. By theoretically grounding DDDM as the mediating construct and drawing on RBV, dynamic capabilities, and information processing theory in a mutually reinforcing rather than substitutive fashion, the paper provides a more tractable explanatory framework that generates falsifiable predictions amenable to structural equation modeling.

Second, the paper extends the growing body of scholarship that situates analytics research in emerging market contexts. The preponderance of existing evidence derives from large, analytically mature samples in the United States, Germany, and the United Kingdom. Malaysia's combination of rapid digital infrastructure development, ambitious government AI policy, acute capability shortages, and a pronounced large firm–SME divide introduces moderating conditions that are theoretically meaningful but empirically underexplored. Cross-ASEAN comparative work, incorporating Singapore, Indonesia, Thailand, and Vietnam, would permit systematic variation in national institutional conditions to be related to AIMA–DDDM–FP relationship strength.

Third, the integrative application of RBV and dynamic capabilities theory to the analytics domain responds to longstanding calls in the strategic management literature for frameworks that bridge the static resource logic of the RBV with the process-oriented perspective of dynamic capabilities theory (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Teece, 2007). Treating AIMA as a resource and DDDM as the dynamic capability through which that resource creates value provides a conceptual template that may generalize to other AI application domains—supply chain optimization, HR analytics, or R&D acceleration—where similar tool-versus-capability distinctions apply.

5.2 Implications for Marketing Managers and Organizational Leaders

The core managerial implication of this paper is that analytics investment and decision-process investment must proceed in parallel rather than in sequence. Firms that prioritize tool acquisition ahead of capability development will realize diminishing returns on their technology expenditure; conversely, firms that develop strong DDDM cultures before they have access to sophisticated AIMA tools will find that their analytical investments deliver measurable performance payoffs relatively quickly once the tools arrive.

Several specific practices distinguish high-performing DDDM implementations from their low-performing counterparts. Mandatory pre-campaign analytics briefs—requiring marketing managers to document expected performance ranges based on model outputs before any campaign is approved—create accountability for analytical reasoning rather than merely providing access to dashboards. Post-campaign analytics reviews that compare actual outcomes to pre-specified forecasts build organizational learning and expose modeling assumptions to empirical discipline. Cross-functional AIMA working groups—spanning marketing, data science, and IT—reduce the interpretation gap that frequently opens between teams that generate analytical insights and teams that must act on them.

For SMEs operating with limited analytical resources, the most productive entry point into DDDM is data quality and foundational measurement: ensuring that website event tracking is correctly implemented, that CRM data is clean and consistently attributed, and that basic campaign performance metrics are tracked against defined benchmarks. From this foundation, basic analytics literacy training—using platforms such as Google Analytics Individual Qualification or vendor-provided certification programs—can build sufficient interpretive competency to begin making data-influenced rather than exclusively intuition-driven decisions. Predictive modeling and real-time personalization represent appropriate aspirational investments for firms that have consolidated these foundations, not substitutes for them.

5.3 Policy Implications for Malaysian Government and Regulatory Agencies

For Malaysian policymakers, the analysis identifies four priority intervention domains. First, PDPA reform and sectoral guidance are urgently needed to resolve ambiguities that currently constrain legitimate analytics investment. The Personal Data Protection Department should issue sector-specific guidelines that clarify the boundary between permissible behavioral profiling for personalization purposes and prohibited surveillance-adjacent practices; provide a regulatory safe harbor for small-sample experimentation conducted under transparent informed consent; and establish clearer data retention and deletion timelines that are practically operable for AI-driven marketing systems (Personal Data Protection Department, 2024).

Second, DDDM capability development should be positioned as a national competitiveness priority. MyMahir, HRD Corp, and the Malaysia Digital Economy Corporation (MDEC) are well-placed to co-develop a national marketing analytics micro-credential framework—covering customer data platform management, applied predictive modeling for non-specialist marketers, experimental design for A/B testing, and analytical communication skills—delivered in partnership with platforms including Google Malaysia, Shopee, and Touch 'n Go, which can provide access to real (appropriately anonymized) marketing datasets.

Third, shared analytics infrastructure for SMEs represents a high-leverage policy instrument. MDEC could establish regional analytics service centers that provide SMEs with subscription access to a shared CDP, data engineering support, and analytics consulting services at a cost structure calibrated to SME budgetary constraints. This approach would allow SMEs to access DDDM-enabling infrastructure without bearing the full capital and operational cost of independent data warehouse construction.

Fourth, an industry-wide DDDM maturity benchmarking program, administered jointly by MDA, MDEC, and the National AI Office, would provide participating firms with confidential sector-comparative maturity scores, help set aspirational performance targets, and generate aggregate anonymized benchmarks to inform policy design. A voluntary ethical AI marketing certification—modeled on Singapore's AI Verify program—could additionally encourage responsible deployment and provide privacy-conscious consumers with a meaningful trust signal.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This paper has examined the relationship between AI-enabled marketing analytics and firm performance in the Malaysian context, advancing and elaborating the argument that data-driven decision-making constitutes the critical organizational mediator through which AIMA investments produce competitive advantage. The theoretical synthesis, drawing on the RBV, dynamic capabilities theory, and the information processing perspective, establishes that analytical tools are best understood as resources whose value is actualized only through the dynamic capability of DDDM. Without this capability, AIMA investments generate informational capacity that goes unused, misapplied, or actively undermined by organizational cultures that privilege intuition over evidence.

Malaysian sectoral evidence supports this theoretical position across three high-quality industry cases and a growing body of survey data. Large enterprises in e-commerce, financial services, and telecommunications that have embedded DDDM governance into their campaign management cycles report substantial performance gains—ROAS improvements of 24–31%, customer retention gains of 19–25%, and acquisition cost reductions of 19%—that their own internal documentation attributes primarily to decision process discipline rather than to model sophistication. Meanwhile, the majority of Malaysian SMEs remain in a low-DDDM state characterized by ad hoc analytical use and intuition-dominant decision norms, with correspondingly limited translation of AI tool adoption into performance outcomes.

The study carries meaningful limitations that frame a productive agenda for future inquiry. As a conceptual paper relying primarily on secondary and case-level evidence, it has not subjected the proposed mediation model to the statistical tests that would be required for empirical confirmation. Cross-sectional surveys using validated AIMA and DDDM scales across a stratified Malaysian sample—with sufficient representation of both large enterprises and SMEs across at least four industry sectors—would constitute a necessary first empirical contribution. Longitudinal panel data would additionally allow researchers to model the dynamic relationship between analytics investment, DDDM capability development, and performance outcomes over time, capturing feedback loops (e.g., performance gains enabling reinvestment in AIMA) that cross-sectional designs cannot identify. Comparative ASEAN work extending the framework to Singapore, Indonesia, Thailand, and Vietnam would allow national institutional conditions to be treated as systematic moderators rather than merely contextual backdrops.

A forward-looking issue of particular theoretical importance concerns the implications of generative AI for the DDDM construct itself. When AI systems not only analyze data but also draft campaign copy, generate strategic recommendations, and simulate market scenarios, the boundary between data-driven and algorithm-driven decision-making becomes qualitatively blurred. Future research should investigate how organizations maintain meaningful human oversight, critical evaluative capacity, and managerial accountability when analytical tools increasingly automate portions of the decision process itself. Malaysia's active AI policy environment and rapidly evolving industry landscape offer a compelling natural laboratory for these investigations. The firms that will sustain competitive advantage in this environment are not those with the most advanced analytical tools, but those that develop the organizational conditions—the culture, governance, skills, and leadership—under which those tools continuously generate insight that consequentially shapes action.

REFERENCES

[1]. Amazon Web Services. (2025, November 5). AI adoption surges 35 percent in Malaysia. TNGlobal. https://technode.global/2025/11/05/ai-adoption-surges-35-percent-in-malaysia-aws/

[2]. Anwar Ibrahim, D. S. (2025, July 31). RMK13: Malaysia tetap hala tuju strategik teraju ekonomi Asia Tenggara dalam bidang AI. Astro Awani. https://www.astroawani.com/berita-bisnes/rmk13

[3]. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

[4]. Brynjolfsson, E., Hitt, L. M., & Kim, H. H. (2011). Strength in numbers: How does data-driven decision-making affect firm performance? SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1819486

[5]. CelcomDigi. (2025). Annual marketing performance report 2025. CelcomDigi Berhad.

[6]. Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35(1), 128–152. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393553

[7]. Davenport, T., Guha, A., Grewal, D., & Bressgott, T. (2020). How artificial intelligence will change the future of marketing. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 48(1), 24–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00696-0

[8]. Department of Statistics Malaysia. (2026). E-commerce spending report 2025. DOSM.

[9]. Egelhoff, W. G. (1991). Information-processing theory and the multinational enterprise. Journal of International Business Studies, 22(3), 341–368. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490307

[10]. Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? Strategic Management Journal, 21(10–11), 1105–1121. https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266(200010/11)21:10/11

[11]. Federation of Malaysian Manufacturing. (2025, September 18). FMM: AI adoption among

Malaysian manufacturers remains at an early stage. TNGlobal.
[12]. Galbraith, J. R. (1973). Designing complex organizations. Addison-Wesley.
[13]. Germann, F., Lilien, G. L., & Rangaswamy, A. (2013). Performance implications of deploying marketing analytics. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 30(2), 114–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2012.10.001
[14]. Grab Holdings. (2026). Annual report 2025. Grab Holdings Ltd.
[15]. iPrice. (2026). State of e-commerce analytics in Malaysia 2025. iPrice Group.
[16]. Kreibich, M. (2021). Big data analytics and firm performance: The mediating role of data-driven decision making. Proceedings of the 54th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 5432–5441. https://doi.org/10.24251/HICSS.2021.659
[17]. Kumar, V., Rajan, B., Venkatesan, R., & Lecinski, J. (2019). Understanding the role of artificial intelligence in personalized engagement marketing. California Management Review, 61(4), 135–155. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619859317
[18]. Malaysian Digital Association. (2025). Marketing analytics maturity survey 2025. MDA.
[19]. Malaysian Digital Association. (2026). Digital ad spend report 2025. MDA.
[20]. Maybank. (2025). Integrated annual report 2025. Maybank Group.
[21]. McAfee, A., & Brynjolfsson, E. (2012). Big data: The management revolution. Harvard Business Review, 90(10), 60–68.
[22]. Morgan, N. A. (2012). Marketing and business performance. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 40(1), 102–119. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-011-0279-9
[23]. MyDIGITAL Corporation. (2024, October 22). Budget 2025 accelerates Malaysia's transformation in AI. MyDIGITAL.
[24]. Personal Data Protection Department. (2024). Review of the Personal Data Protection Act 2010: Public consultation paper. Ministry of Communications.
[25]. Provost, F., & Fawcett, T. (2013). Data science for business: What you need to know about data mining and data-analytic thinking. O'Reilly Media.
[26]. Shopee. (2025). Seller analytics and performance report 2025. Shopee Malaysia.
[27]. SME Corporation Malaysia. (2025). SME digital adoption survey 2025. SME Corp.
[28]. Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640
[29]. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G. P., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. Strategic Management Journal, 18(7), 509–533. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7
[30]. The Star. (2025, May 24). AI council set up to 'drive workforce growth'. The Star.
[31]. Touch 'n Go eWallet. (2026). Annual user report 2025. TNG Digital Sdn Bhd.
[32]. Wang, Y., Hajli, N., & Yang, Z. (2022). How does analytics capability enable firm performance in the digital era? The mediating role of decision quality. Journal of Business Research, 144, 1123–1134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.02.021
[33]. Wedel, M., & Kannan, P. K. (2016). Marketing analytics for data-rich environments. Journal of Marketing, 80(6), 97–121. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0413