International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAEM)
Volume 8, Issue 5 May. 2026, pp: 405-415 www.ijaem.net ISSN: 2395-5252

AI-Enabled Marketing Analytics and Firm Performance: The Mediating Role of Data-Driven Decision-Making — A Malaysian Perspective

[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

Firms across Malaysia are channelling significant investment into AI-enabled marketing analytics (AIMA) in the expectation that data-derived insights will translate into measurable performance improvement. Yet the organizational literature consistently documents a gap between analytical capability and realized business value—a gap attributable not to tool failure but to the absence of the organizational processes, decision cultures, and human competencies required to convert analytical output into strategic action. This paper develops a mediated model of the AIMA–performance relationship, arguing that data-driven decision-making (DDDM) is the critical mechanism through which analytical capability becomes competitive advantage. Grounded theoretically in the resource-based view (Barney, 1991), dynamic capabilities theory (Teece et al., 1997), and the information processing view (Egelhoff, 1991), the paper proposes five testable propositions addressing the direct, mediated, and moderated pathways through which AIMA, DDDM, and firm performance are related. The Malaysian context—characterized by 27 percent business AI adoption, marketing analytics among the three most common AI use cases, and documented performance differentials of 31 percent in return on ad spend between high-DDDM and low-DDDM e-commerce sellers (iPrice, 2026)—provides a substantive empirical backdrop against which the theoretical argument is grounded. Three industry cases illuminate the mediation mechanism in practice: Shopee Malaysia's seller analytics and A/B testing architecture, Touch 'n Go eWallet's test-learn-scale campaign governance, and CelcomDigi's mandatory analytics brief protocol. Persistent barriers to AIMA and DDDM effectiveness—data fragmentation, a national AI skills deficit affecting 52 percent of Malaysian businesses (Amazon Web Services, 2025), entrenched intuition-based decision cultures, and regulatory ambiguity under the Personal Data Protection Act 2010—are examined alongside strategic responses. The paper contributes a more precise mechanistic account of how digital marketing capabilities generate firm value, offers managerial guidance for building DDDM capacity alongside AIMA investment, and identifies priorities for policymakers seeking to accelerate responsible AI adoption in Malaysian marketing.

Keywords: *AI-enabled marketing analytics, data-driven decision-making, firm performance, Malaysia, resource-based view, dynamic capabilities, marketing capability, analytics maturity, ROMI, digital marketing*

I. Introduction

Marketing has become one of the most data-intensive functions in the modern enterprise. Every interaction a consumer has with a brand's digital touchpoints—a website visit, a search query, an email open, a mobile app session, a social media engagement—generates a behavioral record. The volume and granularity of these records, aggregated at platform scale, present an analytical opportunity that would have been unimaginable to marketing practitioners of even a decade ago. Artificial intelligence—and machine learning in particular—has provided the computational infrastructure to convert this opportunity into actionable intelligence: models that forecast which customers will churn, which products should be recommended to which segments, how marketing budget should be allocated across channels to maximize return, and what message content will produce the highest engagement for a given audience at a given moment (Davenport et al., 2020; Huang & Rust, 2021).

This capability, collectively characterized as AI-enabled marketing analytics (AIMA), has been widely adopted among Malaysian firms operating in digitally mature sectors. E-commerce platforms provide sellers with AI-powered dashboards for conversion funnel analysis. Financial service providers use propensity models to personalize retention offers. Telecommunications operators run predictive churn models to inform proactive

International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAEM)
Volume 8, Issue 5 May. 2026, pp: 405-415 www.ijaem.net ISSN: 2395-5252

outreach. Digital advertisers deploy programmatic bidding algorithms that optimize targeting decisions in real time. The national picture reflects this momentum: 27 percent of Malaysian businesses have adopted AI, with marketing analytics among the three most frequently cited applications (Amazon Web Services, 2025); digital advertising expenditure reached RM5.2 billion in 2025, with programmatic advertising—inherently AI-driven—accounting for more than half of display spend (Malaysian Digital Association, 2026).

Yet alongside this adoption narrative, a more cautionary pattern is also visible. Only 12 percent of large Malaysian enterprises possess a comprehensive AI strategy, and 84 percent of enterprises across size categories report that their AI engagement remains exploratory rather than operationally mature (Amazon Web Services, 2025; eNanyang, 2025). A survey of senior Malaysian marketing managers found that 45 percent still regard intuition as more influential than analytics in major campaign decisions, and 38 percent acknowledged that analytics dashboards are either too complex to interpret or not trusted sufficiently to inform action (Malaysian Digital Association, 2025). These patterns suggest a structural disjunction: AIMA tools are being acquired but not being used in ways that reliably translate their analytical potential into improved marketing decisions and, ultimately, into better business outcomes.

This paper argues that the missing link is data-driven decision-making (DDDM)—the organizational capability to translate analytical insight into strategic and tactical marketing action through established processes, supportive culture, and appropriately skilled personnel. DDDM is not equivalent to having analytics tools; it is the organizational mechanism through which those tools produce decisions rather than reports. Firms that possess sophisticated AIMA but weak DDDM generate data that is not acted upon. Firms with strong DDDM but limited AIMA make well-intentioned decisions from inadequate evidence. Optimal performance requires both, and the paper's central theoretical contribution is to specify DDDM as the mediating mechanism through which AIMA investment becomes performance improvement. The Malaysian context—with its documented performance gaps between high-DDDM and low-DDDM firms, its industry exemplars of DDDM governance, and its persistent structural barriers—provides the empirical grounding against which this theoretical argument is developed. Section 2 reviews the theoretical and empirical literature. Section 3 develops the conceptual framework and propositions. Section 4 examines the Malaysian context in depth. Section 5 discusses implications, and Section 6 concludes with future research directions.

II. Literature Review

2.1 Resource-Based View and the Analytics Capability Question

The resource-based view, foundational to contemporary strategic management, holds that sustained competitive advantage originates in resources and capabilities that are valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable, and non-substitutable (Barney, 1991). The application of this framework to AI-enabled marketing analytics reveals a fundamental insight: the analytics software itself rarely constitutes a sustainable competitive advantage because it is commercially available to any organization willing to pay for it. Shopee's analytics dashboard is available to all sellers; Google's Smart Bidding and Meta's Advantage+ are accessible to any advertiser with a sufficient budget. The software is valuable but not rare.

What is rare—and potentially inimitable—is the organizational configuration that enables a firm to use these tools more effectively than its competitors. This configuration comprises the data infrastructure that feeds analytics systems with accurate, integrated, and timely inputs; the analytical talent that can build, validate, and interpret AI models in marketing-relevant ways; the decision processes that route analytical outputs to the decision-makers who need them at the moments when decisions are being made; and the organizational culture that legitimizes evidence-based argumentation and challenges decisions that lack analytical support (Kumar et al., 2019). This configuration—not the tools themselves—is the source of AIMA-derived competitive advantage. The implication is that studies examining only analytics tool adoption without examining how tools are used will systematically underestimate the performance heterogeneity that AIMA generates across firms.

2.2 Dynamic Capabilities and Marketing Adaptation

Dynamic capabilities theory, developed by Teece et al. (1997), addresses how organizations build and renew competitive advantage in environments characterized by rapid and unpredictable change. The framework identifies three clusters of dynamic capability: sensing—the organizational capacity to scan, interpret, and filter information about the environment; seizing—the capacity to mobilize resources in response to sensed opportunities or threats; and transforming—the capacity to continuously renew and reconfigure the asset base as competitive conditions evolve. These three capacities map directly onto the challenge of AI-enabled marketing in dynamic consumer environments.

AIMA is fundamentally a sensing technology. Predictive customer lifetime value models, propensity scoring, sentiment analysis, and real-time behavioral tracking all expand the organization's capacity to detect patterns in consumer and competitive data that human observation alone would miss. The quality and timeliness of what AIMA senses, however, is only as strategically valuable as the seizing capability that converts sensed intelligence into action. A firm whose AIMA platform identifies a high-value customer segment at elevated churn risk but whose organizational processes do not route that insight to a retention marketing manager in time for preventive outreach has failed at seizing. DDDM operationalizes the seizing capability in the marketing domain: it is the organizational mechanism through which sensing generates action rather than reports. Firms that couple strong sensing (AIMA) with strong seizing (DDDM) and that continuously reconfigure both as the digital marketing environment evolves constitute the dynamic marketing capability that this theoretical framework predicts should generate sustained performance advantage.

2.3 Information Processing Theory and Decision Architecture

The information processing view of organizations, drawing on Egelhoff (1991) among others, examines organizational performance as a function of the match between the information processing demands that an environment places on an organization and the information processing capacity the organization has developed to meet those demands. High-uncertainty, high-complexity marketing environments—multi-channel customer journeys, rapidly shifting platform algorithms, frequent competitive entry and exit—impose substantial information processing demands. AIMA directly addresses the capacity side of this equation: machine learning algorithms can process the volume and variety of consumer data that characterizes modern digital marketing far more rapidly and accurately than human analysis can.

However, information processing capacity at the analytical level does not automatically translate into information processing capacity at the organizational decision level. AIMA can identify which customer segments are most likely to convert in the next 30 days, but that identification only reduces uncertainty and improves decisions if it reaches the campaign manager making targeting decisions before the campaign is deployed. DDDM provides the decision architecture—the processes, roles, governance structures, and cultural norms—that ensure analytical outputs are absorbed into decision-making rather than accumulating as unused reports. From an information processing perspective, DDDM is the organizational mechanism that converts analytical capacity into decision quality, and decision quality is the proximate determinant of marketing performance outcomes.

2.4 AI-Enabled Marketing Analytics: Core Capabilities

AIMA encompasses a set of analytically distinct capabilities that intervene at different stages of the marketing management process. Customer segmentation uses clustering algorithms to identify groups of consumers with similar behavioral, attitudinal, and demographic profiles, enabling campaigns to be designed for segments rather than for a hypothetical average consumer. Propensity modeling builds predictive models of the probability that a given consumer will take a specified action—purchase, churn, click, respond to a promotion—enabling resource allocation to be guided by predicted return rather than by historical aggregate rates. Customer lifetime value prediction uses machine learning to estimate the net economic contribution of each consumer over the full duration of their relationship with the firm, informing acquisition and retention spending in a way that simple RFM (recency, frequency, monetary) segmentation does not. Marketing mix modeling employs causal inference techniques to attribute observed sales effects to their antecedent marketing activities across channels, providing the cross-channel attribution that last-click models distort. Real-time personalization deploys recommendation engines and dynamic content optimization to tailor what individual consumers see—on websites, in email, in advertisements, in apps—at the moment of their interaction, based on continuously updated behavioral models (Kumar et al., 2019; Davenport et al., 2020).

2.5 Data-Driven Decision-Making: Dimensions and Evidence

Data-driven decision-making in marketing contexts is a multi-dimensional organizational capability rather than a binary state. Drawing on the foundational empirical work of Brynjolfsson et al. (2011) and the management framework developed by McAfee and Brynjolfsson (2012), DDDM can be decomposed into five interacting dimensions. Data accessibility refers to whether relevant, high-quality data are available to decision-makers at the time and place of decision. Analytical culture refers to the organizational norm that decisions should be justified with evidence and that analytical reasoning is more legitimate than pure intuition. Decision processes encompass the formal and informal procedures through which analytics outputs are incorporated into campaign planning, budget allocation, and performance review. Analytical skills encompass the capacity of marketing personnel to interpret model outputs, evaluate their assumptions, and recognize their limitations. Leadership commitment refers to whether senior marketing leaders visibly use data to justify their own decisions and whether they reward others who do the same.

The empirical case for DDDM as a performance driver is established. Brynjolfsson et al. (2011) found, across 179 large US public companies, that firms with the highest adoption of data-driven decision-making were 5 to 6 percent more productive and profitable than their peers. In marketing specifically, Germann et al. (2013) demonstrated in a study of 212 firms that marketing analytics deployment positively affects both customer relationship performance and financial performance, with effect sizes that vary substantially across firms in ways that suggest organizational moderators. Wang et al. (2022) provided mediation evidence: analytics capability influenced performance primarily through its effect on decision quality, with limited direct performance effects remaining once decision quality was controlled. Kreibich (2021) found similar mediation in a study of German firms: big data analytics capacity positively influenced performance, but this effect was fully accounted for by data-driven decision-making. Collectively, these findings build a strong theoretical and empirical case for DDDM as the mechanism through which AIMA translates into firm value.

III. Conceptual Framework and Propositions

3.1 Framework Architecture

The conceptual framework situates DDDM as a mediator between AIMA adoption and firm performance, with three categories of moderator shaping the strength of the mediated pathway. The core logic proceeds as follows: AIMA adoption increases the organization's potential to make analytically informed marketing decisions by providing better models, richer consumer insight, and faster pattern detection. This potential is realized only to the extent that DDDM converts analytical outputs into strategic decisions and tactical actions. When DDDM is strong, the AIMA potential is actualized; when DDDM is weak, the potential is unrealized—the analytical outputs exist but are not acted upon systematically. Firm performance, measured across financial (return on marketing investment, customer acquisition cost, sales growth), customer (retention rate, net promoter score, customer lifetime value), and operational (campaign conversion rate, cost per lead) dimensions, reflects the quality of marketing decisions more directly than it reflects the quality of analytical tools. Three categories of moderating factor shape the strength of the core relationships: organizational analytics maturity shapes whether AIMA adoption can improve DDDM; industry competitiveness shapes how much DDDM improvement translates into performance gain; and data governance quality shapes whether DDDM based on AI-derived insights produces reliable versus misleading decisions.

3.2 Propositions

Proposition 1 addresses the direct relationship: AI-enabled marketing analytics positively influences firm performance. Organizations with more advanced AIMA deployment—covering a broader range of analytics capabilities, deployed more consistently across marketing decision domains—will demonstrate superior marketing ROI, customer retention, and revenue growth compared to organizations with more limited AIMA adoption. This proposition is consistent with the macro-level evidence from Germann et al. (2013) and Brynjolfsson et al. (2011) and with the documented performance differentials observed among Malaysian e-commerce sellers (iPrice, 2026). It does not, however, specify the mechanism, which subsequent propositions address.

Proposition 2 addresses mediation: data-driven decision-making mediates the relationship between AIMA and firm performance, such that the performance improvement associated with higher AIMA adoption operates primarily through the improvements in DDDM that AIMA enables, rather than through direct performance effects of the analytical tools themselves. This proposition has two components. Proposition 2a states that higher AIMA adoption leads to higher DDDM, because analytics tools create both the informational foundation for evidence-based decisions and organizational pressure to develop the processes and skills needed to use that foundation effectively. Proposition 2b states that higher DDDM leads to superior firm performance, because data-informed marketing decisions reduce uncertainty in resource allocation, improve targeting precision, and enable faster strategic adaptation to changing market conditions.

Proposition 3 addresses moderation of the AIMA-DDDM relationship by organizational analytics maturity. Firms with more developed data infrastructure, stronger analytical talent, clearer

International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAEM)
Volume 8, Issue 5 May. 2026, pp: 405-415 www.ijaem.net ISSN: 2395-5252

decision rights, and more established data-driven cultural norms will realize stronger improvements in DDDM from equivalent levels of AIMA adoption than firms at lower maturity levels. This proposition reflects the absorptive capacity logic: organizations can only internalize and act upon new information and new capabilities to the extent that they have developed the complementary capacity to absorb them (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990). A firm that purchases a sophisticated customer lifetime value modeling platform but has no analysts to run the models and no marketing managers who can interpret CLV outputs will realize negligible DDDM improvement from that investment.

Proposition 4 addresses moderation of the DDDM-performance relationship by industry competitiveness. In highly competitive industries—e-commerce, digital financial services, quick-commerce—where competitive positions shift rapidly and consumer switching costs are low, the performance implications of decision quality advantages are amplified. Small improvements in campaign targeting precision or churn prediction accuracy translate quickly into market share differences because the competitive environment does not provide enough friction to protect mediocre decisions from their consequences. In lower-competition environments, the performance advantage of superior DDDM may be present but less immediately manifested.

Proposition 5 addresses moderation of the DDDM-performance relationship by data governance quality. When data governance is robust—data quality is maintained, consent management is compliant with PDPA, definitions are standardized across systems, and access controls prevent unauthorized use—the decisions that DDDM produces are based on reliable inputs and the performance effects are positive. When data governance is weak, DDDM based on AI-derived insights may produce decisions that are precise but inaccurate, biased, or legally problematic. The risk in the Malaysian context is acute: unclear PDPA guidance on AI-driven profiling has led some firms to collect and use data in ways that may attract future regulatory action, and the "garbage in, garbage out" principle applies to AI marketing models with particular force because the opacity of machine learning amplifies the consequences of data quality failures.

IV. The Malaysian Context: AIMA, DDDM, and Firm Performance

4.1 The Current State of AI-Enabled Marketing Analytics in Malaysia

Malaysia's digital economy provides a fertile environment for AIMA adoption. The combination of 97 percent adult internet penetration, RM46.2 billion in e-commerce spending in 2025, a rapidly growing fintech sector, and national policy commitment to AI adoption across industries has driven substantial growth in marketing analytics deployment (Malaysian Communications and Multimedia Commission, 2025; Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2026; Anwar Ibrahim, 2025). Marketing analytics adoption rates are highest in the sectors with the most competitive and data-rich digital environments: financial services at approximately 42 percent, technology and professional services at 49 percent, and retail and e-commerce at approximately 35 percent (Amazon Web Services, 2025). Programmatic advertising—inherently AIMA-dependent, using AI to optimize real-time bidding on an impression-by-impression basis—now accounts for 58 percent of digital display advertising spend in Malaysia (Malaysian Digital Association, 2026), indicating that AI-optimized marketing execution has become the industry default in this channel.

The platform infrastructure driving this adoption is significant. Shopee and Lazada provide sellers with AI-powered analytics dashboards that surface conversion funnel performance, customer segment behavior, and recommendation engine effectiveness in near real time. Google Malaysia and Meta Malaysia offer AI-optimized campaign management tools—Smart Bidding and Advantage+ Shopping respectively—that automate targeting and bidding using machine learning models trained on conversion outcomes. Touch 'n Go eWallet applies machine learning to predict churn propensity and to personalize cashback offer structuring for individual users based on transaction history models (Touch 'n Go eWallet, 2026). Grab Malaysia uses propensity models to determine voucher allocation across its user base (Grab Holdings, 2026). These deployments represent real and consequential AIMA—not exploratory pilots but operational systems making marketing decisions at scale.

Yet the aggregate picture includes a significant shadow. The majority of Malaysian firms deploying AI tools remain in exploratory or early implementation phases: 84 percent of enterprises report exploring AI but fewer than 20 percent have reached mature, operationally integrated implementation (eNanyang, 2025). Among manufacturers—whose training and marketing

International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAEM)
Volume 8, Issue 5 May. 2026, pp: 405-415 www.ijaem.net ISSN: 2395-5252

practices are captured in the FMM survey—only 18 percent use predictive analytics for customer forecasting, substantially below the 32 percent who have implemented Industry 4.0 technologies more broadly (FMM, 2025). The primary adoption barriers identified are cost, cited by 54 percent; lack of internal expertise, cited by 52 percent; and data quality concerns, cited by 47 percent (FMM, 2025; Amazon Web Services, 2025). These barriers do not prevent tool acquisition; they prevent effective tool use—which is precisely the DDDM deficit that this paper's mediation argument addresses.

4.2 Data-Driven Decision-Making Maturity in Malaysian Marketing Organizations

DDDM maturity among Malaysian marketing organizations exhibits a bimodal distribution: a minority of large, often publicly listed firms or MNC subsidiaries with relatively mature practices, and a majority of SMEs and family-owned businesses where DDDM is nascent or absent. In the mature tier, organizations like Maybank have established dedicated customer data platforms that centralize consumer behavioral, transactional, and product usage data, integrated with campaign management systems that route analytical outputs directly to campaign planners. Decision governance is formalized: proposals for significant marketing investments require analytics briefs that document expected performance based on model predictions, and post-campaign performance reviews compare actual results to forecasted outcomes (Maybank, 2025). PETRONAS's retail marketing division applies CLV-based segmentation to loyalty programme targeting, with segment assignments and campaign performance reviewed in monthly data-informed planning sessions.

In the broader market, the picture is less encouraging. The Malaysian Digital Association's survey of marketing managers found that 45 percent rate intuition as more influential than analytics for strategic campaign decisions, and 38 percent acknowledge that analytics dashboards are either insufficiently intuitive or not trusted to the degree needed to inform action (MDA, 2025). Among SMEs specifically, 71 percent lack staff trained to interpret data outputs beyond basic descriptive statistics, and only 22 percent have formalized any decision process for incorporating analytics into campaign planning (SME Corporation Malaysia, 2025). The consequence of this DDDM deficit is measurable: a comparative study of Malaysian e-commerce sellers found that those in the highest quartile of DDDM practice—using A/B testing regularly, monitoring conversion performance through dashboards, and conducting structured post-campaign reviews—achieved 31 percent higher return on ad spend and 25 percent higher customer retention than sellers in the lowest quartile, despite comparable AIMA tool access (iPrice, 2026). This performance differential provides direct empirical support for the mediation proposition.

4.3 Industry Cases: DDDM as the Mechanism of AIMA Value Realization

4.3.1 Shopee Malaysia: Analytics Architecture and Seller Decision Support

Shopee Malaysia's seller analytics platform illustrates how AIMA can be designed to drive DDDM among a large and heterogeneous seller population. The platform provides sellers with real-time conversion funnel visualization, AI-generated product recommendation performance data, and A/B testing tools for listing optimization. Critically, the platform is designed not merely to display data but to prompt decision action: sellers receive algorithmic recommendations for pricing adjustment, inventory management, and promotional timing, framed as decision options with predicted performance implications. Seller performance data shows that those who actively engage with the A/B testing and dashboard features—translating the analytics output into conscious decisions about listing content, advertising bid levels, and promotional offer design—achieve substantially higher sales growth than those who deploy standard settings without analytical engagement (Shopee, 2025). The seller analytics platform is an example of institutional DDDM design: AIMA is structured so that its outputs are proximate to decisions rather than distant from them, reducing the organizational barriers that prevent analytical insight from reaching the decision moment.

4.3.2 Touch 'n Go eWallet: Test-Learn-Scale as Institutionalized DDDM

Touch 'n Go eWallet's marketing governance model, which the organization has described as a test-learn-scale protocol, represents a more explicit institutionalization of DDDM as organizational practice (Touch 'n Go eWallet, 2026). Every campaign—whether a cashback promotion, a referral incentive, or a product cross-sell—is required to pass through three stages before full deployment. In the test phase, a statistically designed small-scale version of the campaign is deployed to a randomized sample of the user base, generating causal performance data rather than observational correlations. In the learn phase, the data science team analyzes the test results, evaluating effect sizes, statistical confidence, and segment-level variation in response. In the scale phase, campaign elements confirmed as effective by the test are deployed to the full eligible audience with parameters calibrated to the test findings. Campaigns that fail the test are either redesigned and retested or discontinued. This protocol institutionalizes evidence-based decision-making as the default mode of marketing governance: the organization's decision processes are designed so that analytical evidence is not optional input to decisions but a required antecedent to action. The reported outcomes—28 percent year-on-year improvement in campaign ROI and 19 percent reduction in customer acquisition cost—reflect the performance value of this DDDM architecture.

4.3.3 CelcomDigi: Mandatory Analytics Governance in Telecoms Marketing

CelcomDigi's implementation of a mandatory analytics brief protocol for campaign proposals illustrates how DDDM can be embedded in organizational governance without requiring cultural transformation as a prerequisite (CelcomDigi, 2025). The protocol requires every marketing initiative above a defined budget threshold to be accompanied by a documented analytics brief specifying: the target segment and its identification method, the predicted campaign response rate and its model basis, the expected ROI calculation and its assumptions, and the post-campaign evaluation plan including the metrics that will be used to assess performance. After campaign execution, a post-campaign review comparing actual results to forecast is required, with findings documented and fed into a learning repository accessible to future campaign planners. This governance mechanism has two effects. First, it ensures that AIMA outputs are formally incorporated into campaign planning rather than being produced and ignored. Second, it creates organizational learning—each campaign's predicted and actual performance contributes to the calibration of future predictions. CelcomDigi reports that the protocol reduced intuition-driven campaign proposals by 62 percent and improved campaign return on marketing investment by 24 percent relative to the pre-protocol baseline. The case demonstrates that DDDM can be built through governance architecture without waiting for culture to change organically.

4.4 Barriers to Effective AIMA and DDDM in Malaysia

4.4.1 Data Fragmentation and Quality Failures

The most technically immediate barrier to effective AIMA in most Malaysian marketing organizations is data fragmentation. Consumer behavioral data is distributed across functionally and technically distinct systems: CRM platforms, e-commerce analytics, social media advertising managers, email service providers, mobile app analytics, and offline point-of-sale systems. Integrating these sources into the unified customer behavioral record that advanced AIMA requires is technically complex and costly. Without integration, analytics models are trained on partial data, producing predictions that reflect the segment of consumer behavior that is visible rather than the whole. Among Malaysian marketers, 63 percent rate data integration as a major or critical barrier to analytics effectiveness (MDA, 2025). Where data is integrated, quality issues frequently arise: inconsistent definitions of key metrics across systems, duplicate customer records, consent management failures that require the exclusion of significant data volumes, and time lags in data synchronization that make real-time personalization unreliable.

4.4.2 The Marketing Analytics Skills Deficit

The skills required for effective AIMA and DDDM in marketing are those of the marketing data scientist—a practitioner who combines quantitative modeling competency (predictive modeling, experimental design, causal inference) with marketing domain knowledge (campaign economics, customer journey analysis, brand equity measurement) and communication ability (translating model outputs into decision-relevant language for non-technical marketing managers). This role combination is rare globally and exceptionally scarce in Malaysia, where the national AI skills deficit affects 52 percent of businesses across sectors (Amazon Web Services, 2025). University data science programs have expanded, but graduates typically lack marketing domain knowledge. Experienced marketing managers typically lack statistical training sufficient to evaluate model quality or recognize overfitting. The intersection of both competency sets is where the DDDM value is created, and it remains chronically understaffed in the Malaysian marketing sector.

4.4.3 Intuition-Based Decision Culture and Resistance to Evidence

Organizational culture is among the most intractable barriers to DDDM. Marketing, as a function, has historically accommodated and sometimes celebrated creative intuition—the experienced brand manager's instinct for what will resonate with consumers, developed over years of exposure to consumer response. The introduction of AIMA and the expectation that analytical evidence should govern decisions can feel like a delegitimization of this professional expertise, generating resistance that is not merely

International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAEM)
Volume 8, Issue 5 May. 2026, pp: 405-415 www.ijaem.net ISSN: 2395-5252

organizational inertia but a genuine conflict between different theories of how marketing knowledge is produced. Among Malaysian marketing leaders, this resistance is documented: 45 percent prioritize intuition for strategic decisions, and a significant minority report ignoring analytics outputs because they do not trust models trained on data that may not reflect the cultural specificity of Malaysian consumer behavior (MDA, 2025). Overcoming this resistance requires demonstrating quick wins—cases where analytics-guided decisions outperformed intuition-guided decisions on criteria that the skeptic regards as meaningful—rather than abstract arguments about statistical validity.

4.4.4 Regulatory Ambiguity Under the Personal Data Protection Act 2010

The Personal Data Protection Act 2010 provides the legal framework governing personal data collection, processing, and storage in Malaysia, but its application to AI-specific marketing analytics practices—behavioral profiling, cross-device identity resolution, third-party data augmentation, and automated decision-making—remains ambiguous. The PDPA predates the current generation of AI-driven marketing by more than a decade and contains no provisions specifically addressing automated decision-making rights, algorithmic transparency obligations, or consent requirements for AI-derived inferences (Personal Data Protection Department, 2024). This ambiguity produces two problematic organizational responses: risk-averse firms restrict data collection beyond what the PDPA actually requires, limiting AIMA effectiveness; and risk-tolerant firms take aggressive data collection and use positions that may attract regulatory attention as the PDPA is updated. Neither response serves the national interest in developing responsible AI-driven marketing. Clear regulatory guidance on AIMA-specific practices would reduce this ambiguity and enable firms to invest in analytics with greater confidence in the legal permissibility of their practices.

V. Implications

5.1 Theoretical Contributions

This paper makes three theoretical contributions to the marketing strategy and digital marketing literatures. First, it specifies DDDM as the mediating mechanism through which AIMA adoption generates firm performance improvement. Prior research has established that marketing analytics capability and firm performance are positively associated, but the mechanisms have been underspecified. By positioning DDDM as the mediator, the paper provides a more precise account of the causal pathway: AIMA expands the organization's analytical sensing capacity; DDDM converts sensed analytical intelligence into strategic decisions; and superior decisions produce the resource allocation accuracy, targeting precision, and adaptive speed that manifest as performance improvement. This specification generates testable propositions that distinguish the mediation model from direct-effects and moderation-only alternatives.

Second, the paper integrates three theoretical traditions—resource-based view, dynamic capabilities theory, and information processing theory—into a coherent multi-level account of how AIMA capabilities translate into competitive advantage. The RBV locates the advantage in the organizational configuration that surrounds AIMA tools rather than in the tools themselves. Dynamic capabilities theory explains why AIMA adoption alone does not guarantee performance: the seizing capability represented by DDDM is required to convert sensed analytical insight into strategic action. Information processing theory explains why the match between analytical capacity and decision architecture matters: firms whose analytical capacity exceeds their decision architecture's ability to absorb and act on analytical outputs face information overload rather than performance improvement.

Third, the Malaysian context contributes an emerging market perspective to a literature dominated by evidence from advanced economies. The moderating factors identified—analytics maturity, industry competitiveness, and data governance quality—may operate differently in an emerging market context where maturity is lower, competitive dynamics are shaped by platform dominance, and regulatory frameworks are less developed, providing a basis for cross-contextual theory development.

5.2 Managerial Implications for Marketing Leaders

The paper's central managerial message is that AIMA investment requires paired investment in DDDM capability to generate performance returns. Marketing leaders who allocate budget to analytics platforms without simultaneously investing in the process design, talent development, governance structures, and cultural change required to use those platforms in marketing decisions are investing in unused analytical potential. The documented 31 percent ROAS differential between high-DDDM and low-DDDM Malaysian e-commerce sellers—who have access to comparable AIMA tools through the same platform—provides a direct empirical estimate of the value at stake (iPrice, 2026).

Practical DDDM investment should begin with process architecture: establishing mandatory analytics briefs for significant campaign proposals, as CelcomDigi has done; implementing A/B testing requirements for campaign elements above defined spending thresholds; and creating post-campaign review obligations that compare forecast to actual performance and feed findings into organizational learning repositories. These process investments can be implemented without waiting for cultural transformation—the CelcomDigi case demonstrates that governance mandates can shift decision behavior before culture changes. Cultural change, which is slower and more complex, can then build on the demonstrated wins that governance-driven DDDM produces.

Talent investment should target the marketing data scientist profile: practitioners with quantitative modeling competency and marketing domain knowledge. For most Malaysian marketing organizations, this means either recruiting dedicated marketing analytics roles or developing upskilling pathways that move analytically oriented marketing managers toward data literacy, or quantitatively oriented data scientists toward marketing domain knowledge. The MyMahir platform provides a framework for assessing current capability gaps and identifying relevant training programmes; HRD Corp can fund the professional development that closes them (The Star, 2025).

5.3 Implications for Organizational Leaders and CIOs

At the organizational level, the most consequential decision is whether marketing analytics is treated as a departmental technology investment or as a component of enterprise data strategy. When marketing analytics systems are procured and managed independently of enterprise data architecture—building separate data lakes, using incompatible data definitions, maintaining proprietary customer identifiers that cannot be joined to enterprise CRM records—the data fragmentation that constrains AIMA effectiveness is institutionalized rather than resolved. CIOs and CDOs should work with CMOs to establish a unified data architecture in which marketing analytics is served by the same data governance infrastructure as other enterprise analytics functions: common customer identifiers, standardized metric definitions, governed data pipelines, and shared analytical platforms.

Establishing an internal marketing analytics center of excellence—or participating in a shared center of excellence organized through industry associations such as the Malaysian Digital Association—provides an institutional mechanism for developing and disseminating DDDM best practices, evaluating new AIMA tools, conducting internal audits of model quality, and building the analytical talent pipeline. For organizations too small to maintain a dedicated center of excellence independently, collaborative models pooling resources across non-competing firms in the same sector offer a practical alternative.

5.4 Policy Recommendations

Policymakers at NAIO, the Ministry of Digital, and the Personal Data Protection Department can support effective AIMA and DDDM development through three priority actions. First, amending the PDPA to provide specific guidance on AI-enabled marketing analytics—covering consent requirements for behavioral profiling, algorithmic transparency obligations for automated marketing decisions, and data minimization standards for AI training datasets—would reduce the regulatory ambiguity that currently discourages responsible analytics investment and creates uncertainty about compliant practice. The PDPA review process already underway (Personal Data Protection Department, 2024) provides the vehicle; ensuring that it addresses AI marketing analytics specifically would fill the current gap.

Second, expanding MyMahir and HRD Corp programming to include specialized marketing analytics tracks—covering customer data platform management, predictive modeling for marketing applications, A/B testing and experimental design, and privacy-compliant analytics governance—would directly address the talent bottleneck that 52 percent of Malaysian businesses identify as their primary barrier to AI adoption. Partnerships with platform operators (Google Malaysia, Meta Malaysia, Shopee) who have strong interest in building the analytical capability of their advertising and seller ecosystems could provide industry-funded training resources that reduce the public investment required.

Third, Malaysia Digital Economy Corporation (MDEC) could accelerate the diffusion of DDDM best practices by establishing a voluntary marketing analytics maturity benchmarking programme. Participating organizations would receive an assessment of their DDDM maturity across the five dimensions identified in this paper—data accessibility, analytical culture, decision processes, skills, and leadership commitment—benchmarked against anonymized sector peers. The programme would generate the comparative performance evidence that organizational leaders need to build the business case for DDDM investment and would produce aggregate national data on AIMA and DDDM adoption trajectories useful for policy monitoring.

VI. Conclusion and Future Research Directions

This paper has developed and grounded a mediated model of the relationship between AI-enabled marketing analytics and firm performance, with data-driven decision-making as the critical mediating mechanism. The theoretical argument, built on the resource-based view, dynamic capabilities theory, and information processing theory, establishes that AIMA adoption expands organizational analytical sensing capacity but that this capacity generates performance improvement only when organizational DDDM converts analytical insight into strategic marketing decisions. Without DDDM, AIMA is a resource without a corresponding capability—expensive infrastructure that produces data rather than decisions. The Malaysian evidence—a documented 31 percent ROAS differential between high-DDDM and low-DDDM firms with equivalent tool access, industry cases illustrating DDDM governance in e-commerce, fintech, and telecommunications, and persistent barriers including skills deficits and cultural resistance—grounds the theoretical argument in the specific organizational and institutional realities of an upper-middle-income emerging market pursuing AI-driven economic transformation.

Five propositions specify testable predictions: AIMA positively influences performance (P1); DDDM mediates this relationship (P2), through AIMA improving DDDM (P2a) and DDDM improving performance (P2b); analytics maturity moderates the AIMA-DDDM relationship (P3); industry competitiveness moderates the DDDM-performance relationship (P4); and data governance quality moderates the reliability of DDDM-to-performance translation (P5). Testing these propositions requires primary empirical research that this paper, as a conceptual and contextual synthesis, does not provide. Empirical testing should be prioritized as the next research step: cross-sectional survey studies of Malaysian marketing decision-makers can test the mediation model using structural equation modeling or path analysis; longitudinal designs can track how DDDM capability evolves as firms mature in AIMA adoption; and experimental designs can provide causal evidence for specific DDDM interventions by manipulating decision governance structures in field settings.

Cross-country comparative research within ASEAN represents a particularly valuable extension. Whether cultural dimensions such as power distance—which affects willingness to challenge authority-backed decisions with data—or uncertainty avoidance—which may moderate the attractiveness of algorithmic versus intuitive decision-making—moderate the AIMA-DDDM-performance pathway across Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Thailand, and Vietnam would contribute both to the theoretical framework and to regional marketing practice. The generative AI trajectory also warrants attention: as AI systems move from providing analytical inputs to generating decision recommendations and, in some applications, executing marketing decisions autonomously, the nature of DDDM will change. The question of how marketing organizations maintain appropriate human oversight, institutional accountability, and strategic agency as the boundary between data-informed decisions and algorithm-executed decisions shifts is among the most consequential in contemporary marketing management and constitutes a rich agenda for future inquiry.

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-malaysia-tetap-hala-tuju-strategik-teraju-ekonomi-asia-tenggara-dalam-bidang-ai-532023

[3]. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120.

[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.

[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.
[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.
[10]. eNanyang. (2025, August 11). 84% of Malaysian enterprises remain in AI exploratory phase; only 20% in mature implementation. eNanyang.
[11]. Federation of Malaysian Manufacturing. (2025, September 18). FMM: AI adoption among Malaysian manufacturers remains at an early stage. TNGlobal. https://technode.global/2025/09/18/fmm-ai-adoption-among-malaysian-manufacturers-remains-at-an-early-stage/
[12]. Germann, F., Lilien, G. L., & Rangaswamy, A. (2013). Performance implications of deploying marketing analytics. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 30(2), 114–128.
[13]. Grab Holdings. (2026). Annual report 2025. Grab Holdings Ltd.
[14]. Huang, M. H., & Rust, R. T. (2021). Artificial intelligence in service. Journal of Service Research, 24(1), 3–19.
[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.
[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.
[18]. Malaysian Communications and Multimedia Commission. (2025). Internet usage survey 2025. MCMC.
[19]. Malaysian Digital Association. (2025). Marketing analytics maturity survey 2025. MDA.
[20]. Malaysian Digital Association. (2026). Digital ad spend report 2025. MDA.
[21]. Maybank. (2025). Integrated annual report 2025. Maybank Group.
[22]. McAfee, A., & Brynjolfsson, E. (2012). Big data: The management revolution. Harvard Business Review, 90(10), 60–68.
[23]. MyDIGITAL Corporation. (2024, October 22). Budget 2025 accelerates Malaysia's transformation in AI. MyDIGITAL. https://www.mydigital.gov.my/bm/budget-2025-accelerates-malaysias-transformation-in-ai/
[24]. Personal Data Protection Department. (2024). Review of the Personal Data Protection Act 2010: Public consultation paper. Ministry of Communications.
[25]. Shopee. (2025). Seller analytics and performance report 2025. Shopee Malaysia.
[26]. SME Corporation Malaysia. (2025). SME digital adoption survey 2025. SME Corp.
[27]. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G. P., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. Strategic Management Journal, 18(7), 509–533.
[28]. The Star. (2025, May 24). AI council set up to drive workforce growth. The Star. https://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2025/05/24/ai-council-set-up-to-drive-workforce-growth
[29]. Touch 'n Go eWallet. (2026). Annual user report 2025. TNG Digital Sdn Bhd.
[30]. 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.