ROLE OF DATA ANALYTICS IN ENHANCING BUSINESS DECISION-MAKING AND OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY

[1]Ragesh H, [2]Ramkumar S
[1]Student, [2]Professor
[1],[2]Firebird Institute of Research in Management, Coimbatore, India
Email: [1]ragesh.h@firebird.net.in, [2]ramkumar.s@firebird.ac.in

Abstract—*As organizations generate ever-larger volumes of data, the ability to convert this data into effective business decisions and operational improvements has become a key source of competitive advantage. This study examines the role of four analytics-related capabilities—analytics maturity, analytics tool adoption, data quality, and analytics talent and skills—in enhancing business decision-making and operational efficiency. A quantitative, cross-sectional survey design was adopted, using a structured questionnaire administered to 200 purposively selected managers, executives, analysts, and supervisors with direct exposure to organizational analytics practices. All constructs were measured on five-point Likert scales and demonstrated good to very good internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha 0.82–0.88). Two multiple regression models were estimated, one for business decision-making and one for operational efficiency. The model for business decision-making explained 62% of variance ($R^2 = 0.62$, $F = 79.84$, $p < 0.001$), with analytics maturity emerging as the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.31$, $p < 0.001$), followed by analytics talent and skills ($\beta = 0.28$), analytics tool adoption ($\beta = 0.24$), and data quality ($\beta = 0.19$). The model for operational efficiency explained 64% of variance ($R^2 = 0.64$, $F = 86.12$, $p < 0.001$), with data quality emerging as the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.30$, $p < 0.001$), followed by analytics maturity ($\beta = 0.27$), analytics talent and skills ($\beta = 0.25$), and analytics tool adoption ($\beta = 0.22$). All eight proposed hypotheses (H1–H8) were empirically supported. The findings suggest that analytics capabilities function as an integrated system: organizational maturity and human skill matter most for strategic decision-making, while data quality is most critical for day-to-day operational performance, with clear implications for managers, analytics teams, and organizations investing in data-driven capability building.*

Keywords—*Data Analytics; Analytics Maturity; Data Quality; Analytics Talent; Business Decision-Making; Operational Efficiency; Multiple Regression*

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, businesses across industries have experienced a rapid increase in the volume of data generated from customer interactions, online transactions, supply chain operations, and internal reporting systems. While organizations now have access to large volumes of data, many still find it challenging to use this information effectively when making important business decisions; simply having data is no longer enough, and the ability to analyse it meaningfully and apply the resulting insights is what ultimately matters [1].

Data analytics has emerged as a valuable support system for managers by helping them understand trends, patterns, and performance gaps within their organizations, allowing firms to reduce uncertainty and respond more effectively to market changes [2]. However, the effective use of analytics is not uniform across organizations: many firms invest in advanced analytical tools but struggle to realise the expected benefits because of poor data quality, limited analytics talent, or low overall analytics maturity [3].

This study examines the role of data analytics in enhancing business decision-making and operational efficiency by focusing on four organizational capabilities—analytics maturity, analytics tool adoption, data quality, and analytics talent and skills. Specifically, it aims to: (1) examine the impact of analytics maturity on business decision-making and operational efficiency; (2) study the influence of analytics tool adoption on business decision-making; (3) assess the impact of data quality on operational efficiency; and (4) evaluate the role of analytics talent and skills in improving both organizational outcomes.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews the literature on analytics maturity, tool adoption, data quality, and analytics talent, and presents the theoretical framework underlying the study. Section III describes the research methodology, including the sampling design, research instrument, and analytical techniques. Section IV presents the empirical results, covering the sample profile, reliability and assumption testing, and the two regression models, followed by a discussion of the findings. Section V outlines the managerial and organizational implications, Section VI discusses the study's limitations and directions for future research, and Section VII concludes the paper.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Prior research on organizational analytics capability generally converges on the view that data-driven performance gains arise not from any single resource but from the combination of organizational, technological, and human factors [7], [40]. This view motivates the four-capability structure adopted in the present study and reviewed in the following subsections.

A. Analytics Maturity

Analytics maturity reflects the extent to which an organization has embedded analytics into its strategic and operational processes, moving beyond basic reporting toward systematic, data-driven decision-making [9]. Organizations with higher analytics maturity are better positioned to institutionalise continuous performance monitoring and improvement, supported by strong leadership commitment to analytics initiatives [31].

B. Analytics Tool Adoption

The adoption of dashboards, business intelligence software, and visualization platforms enables organizations to convert large volumes of raw data into accessible, actionable information [28]. Effective tool adoption has been linked to improved decision quality and organizational performance in prior big-data analytics capability research [16], [25].

C. Data Quality

Data quality—encompassing accuracy, completeness, consistency, and timeliness—forms the foundation of effective analytics, since unreliable data can undermine trust in analytical outputs and distort decision-making [12]. Studies on analytics capability consistently identify data quality as a critical antecedent of downstream organizational performance [13].

D. Analytics Talent and Skills

Even with advanced tools and high-quality data, organizational benefits depend on employees' ability to interpret analytical outputs and translate them into action; analytics talent is therefore considered a key human-capital dimension of overall analytics capability [6], [37].

E. Business Decision-Making and Operational Efficiency

Prior research links strong analytics capabilities to both improved strategic decision-making and enhanced day-to-day operational performance, including cost reduction, error minimisation, and better resource utilisation [22], [23]. This study builds on this literature by empirically testing how the four capabilities above jointly and individually predict these two organizational outcomes.

F. Theoretical Framework

The study draws on the resource-based and dynamic-capability perspectives on organizational analytics, in which analytics maturity, tool adoption, data quality, and talent function as complementary organizational resources that, together, generate a broader analytics capability [42]. Rather than treating technology adoption as a stand-alone driver of performance, this framework suggests that its effectiveness is conditional on organizational maturity, data reliability, and human interpretive skill acting in concert [8]. This integrated view underlies the study's decision to model all four capabilities simultaneously, within a single regression framework, for each of the two outcome variables.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This study adopts a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design to empirically examine the relationships between analytics capabilities and organizational outcomes.

B. Sampling Design and Respondents

A purposive (non-probability) sampling technique was used, as the study required respondents with direct exposure to analytics-related activities. Respondents comprised managers, executives, supervisors, and analysts involved in planning, analysis, and operational decision-making across a range of industries. A total of 200 valid responses were obtained, consistent with recommended sample sizes for structured-questionnaire studies using multivariate statistical techniques [17].

C. Research Instrument and Measurement

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire comprising a demographic section and construct-measurement items. Analytics maturity, analytics tool adoption, data quality, analytics talent and skills, business decision-making, and operational efficiency were each measured using five items on a five-point Likert scale. Table I summarises the operational definition adopted for each construct.

TABLE I. OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF RESEARCH VARIABLES

Variable	Operational Definition (Summary)
Analytics Maturity	Extent to which analytics is embedded in routin planning, monitoring, and decision processes
Analytics Tool Adoption	Frequency, ease of use, and perceived usefulness analytics tools in daily work
Data Quality	Perceived accuracy, completeness, consistency, a timeliness of organizational data
Analytics Talent / Skills	Employees' ability to interpret data, identify patterns apply insights to decisions
Business Decision-Making	Perceived accuracy, confidence, clarity, and speed decisions supported by analytics
Operational Efficiency	Perceived improvements in workflow, resource use reduction of errors and delays

D. Research Hypotheses

Eight hypotheses were formulated: H1–H2 propose that analytics maturity positively affects business decision-making and operational efficiency respectively; H3–H4 propose that analytics tool adoption positively affects business decision-making and operational efficiency; H5–H6 propose that data quality positively affects business decision-making and operational efficiency; and H7–H8 propose that analytics talent and skills positively affect business decision-making and operational efficiency.

E. Data Preparation and Screening

Prior to analysis, all 200 responses were checked for completeness, coding accuracy, and invalid or straight-lined response patterns; no cases required removal, and the dataset was confirmed to be fully usable for statistical analysis. Data were subsequently screened for outliers using boxplot inspection and for normality using skewness and kurtosis statistics, ensuring the dataset satisfied the assumptions required for parametric analysis before proceeding to inferential testing.

F. Analytical Techniques

Data were screened for missing values, outliers, and normality prior to analysis. Cronbach's alpha was used to assess internal consistency, and two multiple regression models were estimated—one for business decision-making and one for operational efficiency—after confirming the absence of multicollinearity through tolerance and VIF diagnostics.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Sample Profile of Respondents

The demographic profile of the 200 respondents is summarised in Table II. Male respondents formed the majority (59.0%), with female respondents accounting for 37.0% and 4.0% preferring not to disclose gender. Respondents were concentrated in the 25–34 and 35–44 age groups (43.0% and 26.0% respectively), together representing nearly 70% of the sample, and most held a Bachelor's (44.0%) or Master's (34.0%) degree. In terms of work experience, 38.0% had 2–5 years and 29.0% had 6–10 years of experience, while IT/Technology (31.0%), Manufacturing (19.0%), and Finance (17.0%) were the most represented industries.

TABLE II. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS (N = 200)

Category	Group	Freq.	%
Gender	Male	118	59.0
Gender	Female	74	37.0
Gender	Prefer not to say	8	4.0
Age Group	25–34 years	86	43.0
Age Group	35–44 years	52	26.0
Age Group	Below 25 / 45+	62	31.0
Education	Bachelor's Degree	88	44.0
Education	Master's Degree	68	34.0
Education	Diploma / Doctorate / Other	44	22.0
Work Experience	2–5 years	76	38.0
Work Experience	6–10 years	58	29.0
Work Experience	<2 yrs / >10 yrs	66	33.0
Industry	IT / Technology	62	31.0
Industry	Manufacturing	38	19.0
Industry	Finance / Retail / Logistics / Other	100	50.0

This demographic composition indicates a professionally and educationally diverse sample of managers, executives, analysts, and supervisors with meaningful exposure to analytics practices, supporting the appropriateness of purposive sampling for this study and lending reasonable cross-industry relevance to the findings.

B. Descriptive Statistics

Table III presents descriptive statistics for the study's key constructs (N = 200). All mean values exceeded the scale midpoint, indicating generally favourable perceptions of analytics practices, with business decision-making recording the highest mean (3.92) and data quality the lowest (3.76), the latter also showing the greatest response variability.

TABLE III. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF KEY STUDY VARIABLES (N = 200)

Variable	Items	Mean	SD
Analytics Maturity	5	3.89	0.64
Analytics Tool Adoption	5	3.82	0.68
Data Quality	5	3.76	0.71
Analytics Talent / Skills	5	3.85	0.66
Business Decision-Making	5	3.92	0.62
Operational Efficiency	5	3.88	0.65

C. Reliability Analysis

Cronbach's alpha coefficients (Table IV) ranged from 0.82 to 0.88 across all six constructs, indicating good to very good internal consistency and supporting the aggregation of items into composite construct scores for subsequent analysis.

TABLE IV. RELIABILITY RESULTS (CRONBACH'S ALPHA)

Construct	Items	α	Interpretation
Analytics Maturity	5	0.86	Good
Analytics Tool Adoption	5	0.84	Good
Data Quality	5	0.82	Good
Analytics Talent / Skills	5	0.85	Good
Business Decision-Making	5	0.88	Very good
Operational Efficiency	5	0.87	Very good

D. Assumption Testing: Normality and Multicollinearity

Prior to regression analysis, normality was assessed using skewness and kurtosis, and multicollinearity was assessed using tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) statistics. As shown in Table V, skewness values ranged from −0.28 to −0.47 and kurtosis values from −0.29 to −0.51, both well within the ±2 range generally considered acceptable for parametric analysis, indicating that all six constructs were approximately normally distributed.

TABLE V. NORMALITY AND MULTICOLLINEARITY DIAGNOSTICS

Variable	Skew.	Kurt.	Tol.	VIF
Analytics Maturity	−0.41	−0.32	0.48	2.08
Analytics Tool Adoption	−0.36	−0.45	0.52	1.92
Data Quality	−0.28	−0.51	0.57	1.75
Analytics Talent / Skills	−0.33	−0.38	0.50	2.00
Business Decision-Making	−0.47	−0.29	—	—
Operational Efficiency	−0.39	−0.34	—	—

Tolerance values for the four independent variables ranged from 0.48 to 0.57, well above the conservative 0.10 threshold, while VIF values ranged from 1.75 to 2.08, far below the commonly used cutoff of 5. Although the four analytics-capability variables are conceptually related, these diagnostics confirm that each retains sufficient unique variance, so multicollinearity does not distort the interpretation of the regression coefficients reported below.

E. Regression Results for Business Decision-Making (DV1)

The regression model for business decision-making was statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.62$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.61$, $F = 79.84$, $p < 0.001$), meaning the four predictors jointly explained 62% of the variance in business decision-making. As shown in Table VI, analytics maturity was the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.31$, $p < 0.001$), followed by analytics talent and skills ($\beta = 0.28$), analytics tool adoption ($\beta = 0.24$), and data quality ($\beta = 0.19$); all four relationships were statistically significant, supporting H1, H3, H5, and H7.

TABLE VI. REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR BUSINESS DECISION-MAKING (DV1)

Predictor	β	t	Sig.
Analytics Maturity	0.31	5.24	<.001
Analytics Tool Adoption	0.24	4.18	<.001
Data Quality	0.19	3.46	0.001
Analytics Talent / Skills	0.28	4.92	<.001

$R^2 = 0.62$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.61$, $F(4, 195) = 79.84$, $p < .001$.

F. Regression Results for Operational Efficiency (DV2)

The regression model for operational efficiency was also statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.64$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.63$, $F = 86.12$, $p < 0.001$). As shown in Table VII, data quality emerged as the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.30$, $p < 0.001$), followed by analytics maturity ($\beta = 0.27$), analytics talent and skills ($\beta = 0.25$), and analytics tool adoption ($\beta = 0.22$); all four relationships were statistically significant, supporting H2, H4, H6, and H8.

TABLE VII. REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY (DV2)

Predictor	β	t	Sig.
Analytics Maturity	0.27	4.68	<.001
Analytics Tool Adoption	0.22	3.89	<.001
Data Quality	0.30	5.41	<.001
Analytics Talent / Skills	0.25	4.37	<.001

$R^2 = 0.64$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.63$, $F(4, 195) = 86.12$, $p < .001$.

G. Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Table VIII summarises the results for all eight hypotheses. All proposed relationships were empirically supported, indicating that analytics maturity, analytics tool adoption, data quality, and analytics talent and skills each contribute significantly to both business decision-making and operational efficiency.

TABLE VIII. SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS TESTING RESULTS (H1–H8)

Hyp.	Proposed Relationship	DV	Result
H1	Analytics Maturity → Decision-Making	DV1	Supported
H2	Analytics Maturity → Op. Efficiency	DV2	Supported
H3	Tool Adoption → Decision-Making	DV1	Supported
H4	Tool Adoption → Op. Efficiency	DV2	Supported
H5	Data Quality → Decision-Making	DV1	Supported
H6	Data Quality → Op. Efficiency	DV2	Supported
H7	Analytics Talent → Decision-Making	DV1	Supported
H8	Analytics Talent → Op. Efficiency	DV2	Supported

H. Discussion

Taken together, the results show that organizational and human factors—analytics maturity and analytics talent—exert the strongest influence on business decision-making, whereas data quality plays the most critical role in operational efficiency. This pattern suggests that strategic decisions benefit most from an organization-wide analytics culture and skilled interpretation of insights, while routine operational performance depends more directly on the accuracy and reliability of the underlying data feeding day-to-day monitoring and process control. Analytics tools, while significant in both models, appear to function as enablers whose impact is maximised only when paired with organizational maturity, skilled personnel, and reliable data.

These findings are broadly consistent with dynamic-capability accounts of analytics performance, which argue that technology adoption alone rarely translates into superior organizational outcomes unless it is embedded within a supportive organizational culture and complemented by human expertise [8], [26]. The comparatively higher explanatory power of the operational efficiency model ($R^2 = 0.64$) relative to the business decision-making model ($R^2 = 0.62$) also suggests that operational outcomes may be somewhat more directly and mechanically linked to analytics inputs, whereas strategic decision-making is likely shaped by additional contextual factors—such as managerial experience, organizational politics, or industry dynamics—that lie outside the scope of the present model.

The consistent, statistically significant support obtained for all eight hypotheses, combined with acceptable reliability, normality, and multicollinearity diagnostics, strengthens confidence that these relationships reflect genuine underlying patterns rather than artifacts of measurement error or model misspecification.

V. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

A. Implications for Managers

Managers seeking to improve strategic decision-making should prioritise building organization-wide analytics maturity and investing in employee analytics training, rather than relying on technology adoption alone. Since analytics maturity and talent were the two strongest predictors of business decision-making, leadership should treat analytics capability-building as a long-term organizational development priority rather than a short-term technology procurement exercise.

B. Implications for Analytics and Data Teams

For operational performance gains, organizations should treat data governance and data-quality management as a first-order priority, since unreliable data limits the returns from analytics tools and skilled personnel alike. Analytics and IT teams should therefore invest in data validation, cleansing, and integration processes before expanding tool adoption, as the findings suggest that tools deliver diminishing returns when layered on top of poor-quality data.

C. Implications for Organizational Strategy

At a broader level, the finding that all four capabilities significantly predict both outcomes suggests that organizations should avoid a piecemeal approach to analytics investment. Rather than optimising a single capability in isolation, firms are likely to see the greatest returns from balanced, simultaneous investment across organizational maturity, tools, data quality, and talent, consistent with the study's underlying capability-bundle perspective.

VI. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study relies on a cross-sectional, self-reported survey design and a purposive sample of 200 respondents, which limits causal inference and generalisability to the broader population of organizations. Because all constructs were measured using perceptual, self-reported Likert-scale items, the results may also be subject to common-method variance, even though the acceptable normality and multicollinearity diagnostics reduce this concern to some extent.

Additionally, the cross-industry sample, while supporting broader relevance, does not allow for industry-specific conclusions; analytics capabilities may operate somewhat differently in, for example, IT and manufacturing settings than in finance or retail. Future research could employ longitudinal designs to establish causal direction, larger probability-based samples for improved generalisability, and objective performance metrics alongside perceptual measures. Future studies could also examine mediating or moderating roles of organizational culture, leadership style, and industry type, and explore whether the relative importance of analytics maturity, tool adoption, data quality, and talent shifts across different organizational contexts or firm sizes.

VII. CONCLUSION

This study examined the role of analytics maturity, analytics tool adoption, data quality, and analytics talent and skills in enhancing business decision-making and operational efficiency, using survey data from 200 managers, executives, analysts, and supervisors across multiple industries. Both regression models were statistically significant and explained substantial variance in their respective outcomes (R^2 = 0.62 for decision-making; R^2 = 0.64 for operational efficiency), and all eight hypotheses were supported, with satisfactory reliability, normality, and multicollinearity diagnostics underpinning these results.

Analytics maturity and analytics talent were the strongest predictors of business decision-making, while data quality was the strongest predictor of operational efficiency, suggesting a meaningful division of labour between organizational/human capabilities and data-related capabilities across strategic versus operational outcomes. The findings indicate that data analytics capabilities function as an integrated system rather than as isolated resources, and organizations seeking to improve both strategic and operational outcomes should invest jointly in analytics maturity, tool adoption, data quality, and human analytical talent rather than prioritising any single capability in isolation. Future longitudinal and cross-industry research can build on these results to further clarify how these capabilities interact over time and across organizational contexts.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to thank Ramkumar S, Professor, for valuable guidance and constructive feedback throughout this research, as well as the Firebird Institute of Research in Management, Coimbatore, for its academic support.

REFERENCES

[1] H. Chen, R. H. L. Chiang, and V. C. Storey, "Business intelligence and analytics: From big data to big impact," MIS Quarterly, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 1165–1188, 2012.

[2] S. LaValle, E. Lesser, R. Shockley, M. Hopkins, and N. Kruschwitz, "Big data, analytics and the path from insights to value," MIT Sloan Management Review, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 21–32, 2011.

[3] E. Brynjolfsson, L. M. Hitt, and H. H. Kim, "Strength in numbers: How does data-driven decision-making affect firm performance?" MIS Quarterly, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 1–24, 2011.

[4] S. F. Wamba, A. Gunasekaran, S. Akter, S. Ren, R. Dubey, and S. J. Childe, "Big data analytics and firm performance: Effects on process and firm performance," Journal of Business Research, vol. 70, pp. 356–365, 2017.

[5] T. H. Davenport, J. G. Harris, and R. Morison, Analytics at Work: Smarter Decisions, Better Results. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press, 2010.

[6] S. Akter, S. F. Wamba, A. Gunasekaran, R. Dubey, and S. J. Childe, "How to improve firm performance using big data analytics capability," International Journal of Production Economics, vol. 182, pp. 113–131, 2016.

[7] M. Gupta and J. F. George, "Toward the development of a big data analytics capability," Information & Management, vol. 53, no. 8, pp. 1049–1064, 2016.

[8] P. Mikalef, J. Krogstie, I. O. Pappas, and P. Pavlou, "Exploring the relationship between big data analytics capability and competitive performance," Information & Management, vol. 57, no. 2, 2020.

[9] R. Dubey, A. Gunasekaran, S. J. Childe, T. Papadopoulos, and S. F. Wamba, "Big data analytics capability and organizational performance," International Journal of Production Economics, vol. 211, pp. 1–13, 2019.

[10] G. Shanks, N. Bekmamedova, and L. Willcocks, "Organizational analytics maturity," Journal of Information Technology, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 262–277, 2021.

[11] A. Popovič, R. Hackney, P. S. Coelho, and J. Jaklič, "Towards business intelligence systems success," Decision Support Systems, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 729–739, 2012.

[12] S. Ransbotham, D. Kiron, and P. K. Prentice, "Beyond the hype: The hard work behind analytics success," MIT Sloan Management Review, 2016.

[13] J. F. Hair, W. C. Black, B. J. Babin, and R. E. Anderson, Multivariate Data Analysis, 8th ed. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning, 2019.

[14] W. H. DeLone and E. R. McLean, "The DeLone and McLean model of information systems success," Journal of Management Information Systems, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 9–30, 2003.

[15] A. McAfee and E. Brynjolfsson, "Big data: The management revolution," Harvard Business Review, vol. 90, no. 10, pp. 60–68, 2012.