Advances in Consumer Research
https://acr-journal.com/
Volume-3 | Issue-3 | March 2026

Original Researcher Article

Big Data Analytics and Its Impact on Maturity,Organizational Future Readiness, and Predictive Capability

A.Mahesh Babu [1], Dr. Buggavarapu VSS Subbarao [2], Dr.Delli Kumar Koti [3], Narasimharao Vallabhu[4], Dr Chakravarthi Bachina[5], Dr.Obulesu Varikunta[6]
[1]VIT-AP School of Business, VIT-AP University, Amaravati.
mahesh.23phd7240@vitap.ac.in
[2.]Assistant Professor Department of Business Administration KCT Business School, Kumaraguru College of Technology, Coimbatore
[3] ACADEMIC CONSULTANT MBA - Dept.of Management Studies SVUCCM & CS, S. V UNIVERSITY, TIRUPATI
5-69/1, Sri Krishna Nagar, M. R. PALLI, TIRUPATI - 517502
Email id:- drdkkoti@gmail.com
Country: India
Pincode: 517502
4. Assistant Professor Department of Management Studies Vignan's Foundation for Science, Technology and Research (Deemed to be University), Vadlamudi, Guntur.
vallabhunarasimha@gmail.com
7382746346
[5.] Associate Professor Department of Management Studies Ballari Institute of Technology and Management, Ballari
[6.] Assistant Professor, College of Management & Computer Applications, MIT-ADT University Pune, India.

ABSTRACT
This study presents an empirical investigation into how Big Data Analytics (BDA) maturity influences organizational future readiness and predictive capability. Using a cross-sectional survey design, data were collected from 412 senior managers and data professionals across manufacturing, financial services, healthcare, and retail sectors in India, the UAE, and the United Kingdom. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) and hierarchical regression analysis were employed to examine the proposed relationships. Results indicate that BDA maturity is a strong and statistically significant predictor of both organizational future readiness ($\beta = 0.61$, $p < 0.001$) and predictive capability ($\beta = 0.57$, $p < 0.001$). Infrastructure quality, analytical talent density, and data governance practices emerged as the three leading sub-dimensions driving these outcomes. The findings contribute to the growing body of literature on data-driven organizational transformation and provide actionable guidance for executives seeking to leverage analytics for strategic foresight..
Keywords: Big Data Analytics, BDA Maturity, Organizational Future Readiness, Predictive Capability, Structural Equation Modeling, Data Governance, Digital Transformation..

INTRODUCTION:

Data Analytics (BDA) to decode complex market dynamics, anticipate customer behavior, and sharpen competitive positioning. The volume, velocity, and variety of data generated daily — estimated to exceed 2.5 quintillion bytes — have transformed analytics from a supportive tool into a core strategic capability (IDC, 2023). Yet the mere adoption of BDA technologies does not guarantee superior outcomes; rather, it is the maturity of an organization's analytics ecosystem that determines whether data assets translate into foresight and future readiness.

Despite widespread investment in data infrastructure, a striking gap persists between data collection and actionable insight. McKinsey's Global Analytics Survey (2022) found that only 28% of organizations surveyed reported that their analytics investments had delivered expected business value. This disparity raises a critical question: what factors of BDA maturity most significantly drive an organization's capacity to predict future conditions and prepare for them?

This study addresses this gap empirically by developing and testing a BDA Maturity–Future Readiness–Predictive Capability (BDA-FRC) model. The research makes three contributions: (1) it operationalizes and validates a five-dimensional BDA maturity construct, (2) it empirically tests the direct and mediated relationships between BDA maturity and future readiness/predictive capability, and (3) it identifies sector-specific heterogeneity in these relationships, offering nuanced guidance for practitioners.

2. Literature Review & Theoretical Framework

2.1 Big Data Analytics: Conceptualization and Maturity

Big Data Analytics refers to the application of advanced computational and statistical techniques to large-scale, heterogeneous datasets to generate insights that inform decision-making (Chen & Zhang, 2014). Maturity models for BDA conceptualize the progression from nascent data collection practices to sophisticated, real-time predictive and prescriptive capabilities. Commonly cited frameworks include the Gartner Analytics Ascendancy Model (descriptive, diagnostic, predictive, prescriptive) and the Data & Analytics Maturity Model by TDWI, which delineates five stages: reactive, aware, repeatable, managed, and optimized.

Lavalle et al. (2011) found that top-performing organizations are three times more likely to use analytics to inform decision-making versus lower performers, an early empirical affirmation of the maturity-performance nexus. More recently, Gupta and George (2016) demonstrated that human, intangible, and technological BDA resources jointly explain 48% of variance in firm performance, underscoring the multidimensional nature of analytics capability.

2.2 Organizational Future Readiness

Organizational future readiness (OFR) is conceptualized as the degree to which an organization is prepared — strategically, operationally, and culturally — to respond to and shape future conditions (Teece et al., 2016). It encompasses adaptive capacity, environmental scanning, scenario planning, and resilience. In the digital era, OFR is increasingly mediated by the quality of data-driven foresight available to decision-makers. Firms that anticipate disruptions rather than merely react to them sustain competitive advantages over time (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000).

2.3 Predictive Capability

Predictive capability is the organizational ability to accurately forecast future states — of markets, customers, operations, or risks — through systematic application of quantitative models, machine learning algorithms, and advanced statistical inference. Beyond technical modeling, predictive capability encompasses an organization's readiness to act on forecasts, embedding predictions into planning cycles and operational workflows (Davenport & Harris, 2007).

2.4 Research Hypotheses

H1: BDA maturity is positively and significantly associated with organizational future readiness.

H2: BDA maturity is positively and significantly associated with predictive capability.

H3: Infrastructure quality moderates the relationship between BDA maturity and predictive capability.

H4: Data governance maturity mediates the relationship between BDA maturity and organizational future readiness.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design and Sample

A quantitative, cross-sectional survey design was adopted. The population of interest comprised senior managers, data scientists, IT directors, and chief analytics officers in organizations with annual revenues exceeding USD 50 million. Purposive and snowball sampling were employed to recruit 412 valid respondents across four sectors: manufacturing (n = 98), financial services (n = 117), healthcare (n = 101), and retail (n = 96). The geographic distribution was: India (n = 158), UAE (n = 127), and United Kingdom (n = 127). Data were collected via an online structured questionnaire administered between October 2023 and January 2024.

3.2 Measures and Operationalization

BDA Maturity was operationalized as a second-order reflective construct comprising five first-order dimensions: (1) Data Infrastructure Quality (DIQ), (2) Analytical Talent Density (ATD), (3) Data Governance Practices (DGP), (4) Analytics Culture (AC), and (5) Decision Integration (DI). Each dimension was measured using validated multi-item scales adapted from Gupta and George (2016) and Wamba et al. (2017). Organizational Future Readiness (OFR) was measured using an 8-item scale developed by Teece et al. (2016) and adapted for digital contexts. Predictive Capability (PC) was measured using a 7-item scale adapted from Davenport and Harris (2007). All constructs used a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 7 = Strongly Agree).

3.3 Analytical Approach

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was first used to validate the measurement model in AMOS 26. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was then employed to test the structural relationships among constructs. Mediation was assessed using bootstrapped confidence intervals (5,000 iterations). Moderation was tested via the inclusion of interaction terms in hierarchical regression models. Common Method Bias (CMB) was assessed using Harman's single-factor test and a marker variable technique.

4. Empirical Results

4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics and inter-construct correlations. The mean BDA Maturity score across the full sample was 4.72 (SD = 1.08) on a 7-point scale, indicating moderate-to-high maturity. Organizational Future Readiness had a mean of 4.61 (SD = 1.14) and Predictive Capability 4.55 (SD = 1.21). All inter-construct correlations were statistically significant at $p < 0.001$, providing preliminary support for hypothesized relationships.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Construct Correlations (n = 412)

Construct	Mean	SD	1. BDA-M	2. DIQ	3. DGP	4. OFR	5. PC
1. BDA Maturity (BDA-M)	4.72	1.08	—				

2. Data Infrastructure Quality (DIQ)	4.88	1.11	0.74**	—			
3. Data Governance Practices (DGP)	4.59	1.19	0.68**	0.61**	—		
4. Org. Future Readiness (OFR)	4.61	1.14	0.63**	0.57**	0.55**	—	
5. Predictive Capability (PC)	4.55	1.21	0.59**	0.54**	0.48**	0.71**	—

*** p < 0.001 (two-tailed). BDA-M = Big Data Analytics Maturity; DIQ = Data Infrastructure Quality; DGP = Data Governance Practices; OFR = Organizational Future Readiness; PC = Predictive Capability.*

4.2 Measurement Model Validation

Confirmatory Factor Analysis confirmed acceptable model fit: $\chi^2/df = 2.31$, CFI = 0.961, TLI = 0.954, RMSEA = 0.057 (90% CI: 0.049–0.064), SRMR = 0.048. All factor loadings exceeded the threshold of 0.70 (range: 0.71–0.89). Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values ranged from 0.54 to 0.72, exceeding the 0.50 threshold, indicating convergent validity. Composite Reliability (CR) values ranged from 0.81 to 0.92, exceeding the 0.70 threshold. Discriminant validity was established as the square root of each construct's AVE exceeded its correlations with all other constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 2: Measurement Model Results — Convergent Validity Indicators

Construct	**No. of Items**	**CR**	**AVE**	**Min Loading**	**Max Loading**
BDA Maturity (2nd order)	25	0.92	0.68	0.73	0.89
Data Infrastructure Quality	5	0.88	0.65	0.75	0.87
Analytical Talent Density	5	0.86	0.61	0.72	0.84
Data Governance Practices	5	0.85	0.59	0.71	0.83
Analytics Culture	5	0.83	0.56	0.71	0.81
Decision Integration	5	0.81	0.54	0.70	0.80
Org. Future Readiness	8	0.90	0.72	0.76	0.89
Predictive Capability	7	0.89	0.70	0.74	0.88

CR = Composite Reliability; AVE = Average Variance Extracted. All values exceed recommended thresholds (CR > 0.70; AVE > 0.50).

4.3 Structural Model and Hypothesis Testing

The overall structural model demonstrated good fit: $\chi^2/df = 2.44$, CFI = 0.956, TLI = 0.949, RMSEA = 0.059 (90% CI: 0.051–0.067), SRMR = 0.051. The model explained 62% of variance in Organizational Future Readiness ($R^2 = 0.62$) and 54% of variance in Predictive Capability ($R^2 = 0.54$). Table 3 summarizes the path coefficients and hypothesis testing results.

Table 3: Structural Path Coefficients and Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis / Path	**Std. β**	**S.E.**	**t-value**	**p-value**	**95% CI**	**Supported**
H1: BDA Maturity → Future Readiness	0.61	0.048	12.71	< 0.001	[0.52, 0.70]	✓ Yes

H2: BDA Maturity → Predictive Capability	0.57	0.051	11.18	< 0.001	[0.47, 0.67]	✓ Yes
H3: Infra. Quality × BDA-M → Pred. Cap. (Interaction)	0.19	0.063	3.02	0.003	[0.07, 0.31]	✓ Yes
H4: DGP (Mediator) → Future Readiness (indirect via DGP)	0.24	0.039	6.15	< 0.001	[0.16, 0.32]	✓ Yes

Note: Standardized β coefficients reported. S.E. = standard error; CI = confidence interval (bootstrapped, 5,000 iterations). DGP = Data Governance Practices.

4.4 Sub-Dimension Analysis: Relative Importance of BDA Maturity Components

To identify which components of BDA maturity most strongly drive Future Readiness and Predictive Capability, a relative weights analysis (RWA) was conducted. Table 4 presents the standardized regression weights of the five BDA sub-dimensions on each outcome, ranked by contribution.

Table 4: Sub-Dimension Regression Weights on Outcome Variables

BDA Sub-Dimension	**β → OFR**	**β → PC**	**Rank (OFR)**	**Rank (PC)**
Data Infrastructure Quality (DIQ)	0.53**	0.59**	1st	1st
Analytical Talent Density (ATD)	0.48**	0.52**	2nd	2nd
Data Governance Practices (DGP)	0.46**	0.41**	3rd	3rd
Analytics Culture (AC)	0.39**	0.37**	4th	4th
Decision Integration (DI)	0.34**	0.33**	5th	5th

*** $p < 0.001$. OFR = Organizational Future Readiness; PC = Predictive Capability. β values are standardized regression coefficients from hierarchical OLS regression.*

4.5 Sector-Specific Analysis

Multigroup SEM (MG-SEM) was used to test whether the BDA Maturity → Future Readiness and BDA Maturity → Predictive Capability paths differed significantly across the four sectors. Table 5 presents the sector-specific path estimates. Financial services exhibited the strongest BDA Maturity → Predictive Capability relationship (β = 0.68), followed by healthcare (β = 0.61) and retail (β = 0.54). Manufacturing showed the weakest relationship (β = 0.47), potentially reflecting lower baseline data maturity and legacy system constraints. Chi-square difference tests confirmed that sector-level differences were statistically significant ($\Delta\chi^2 = 18.34$, $\Delta df = 6$, $p = 0.005$).

Table 5: Multigroup SEM — Sector-Specific Path Coefficients

Sector	**n**	**β (BDA → OFR)**	**β (BDA → PC)**	**R² (OFR)**	**R² (PC)**	**Mean BDA Maturity**
Financial Services	117	0.65**	0.68**	0.66	0.57	5.21 (SD=0.97)
Healthcare	101	0.62**	0.61**	0.63	0.55	4.89 (SD=1.04)
Retail	96	0.58**	0.54**	0.59	0.49	4.65 (SD=1.09)
Manufacturing	98	0.51**	0.47**	0.53	0.42	4.27 (SD=1.14)

Full Sample	412	0.61**	0.57**	0.62	0.54	4.72 (SD=1.08)

*** p < 0.001. OFR = Organizational Future Readiness; PC = Predictive Capability. Sector differences significant at $\Delta\chi^2(6) = 18.34$, p = 0.005.*

4.6 Common Method Bias Assessment

Harman's single-factor test revealed that no single factor accounted for more than 24.3% of total variance, well below the 50% threshold, suggesting that CMB is not a major concern. The marker variable technique (using a theoretically unrelated variable) confirmed that CMB-adjusted path coefficients did not differ substantively from unadjusted estimates (all $\Delta\beta < 0.03$).

5. Discussion

The results strongly support all four hypotheses, confirming that BDA maturity is a robust predictor of both organizational future readiness and predictive capability. The standardized path coefficient of $\beta = 0.61$ for H1 indicates that a one-standard-deviation increase in BDA maturity is associated with a 0.61 standard-deviation increase in future readiness — a large effect by conventional benchmarks (Cohen, 1992). This aligns with the dynamic capabilities perspective (Teece et al., 1997), which posits that organizations with superior sensing and learning routines are better positioned to adapt to environmental shifts.

The moderation finding (H3) is particularly noteworthy: data infrastructure quality amplifies the maturity-to-predictive-capability relationship. Organizations with above-average infrastructure quality benefit disproportionately from investments in broader analytics maturity. This suggests a threshold effect: analytic talent, governance, and culture initiatives yield greater returns once foundational infrastructure reaches a minimum level of adequacy.

The mediation result (H4) reveals that data governance practices explain approximately 39% of the total BDA Maturity → Future Readiness relationship. This finding adds granularity to existing literature by specifying how maturity translates into readiness: through structured, accountable data stewardship. Without robust governance, even technically sophisticated analytics environments fail to produce the reliable, trustworthy foresight needed for strategic planning.

The sector heterogeneity observed in Table 5 merits strategic attention. Financial services firms' stronger relationships likely reflect their longer tradition of quantitative modeling and regulatory pressure to maintain data accuracy. Healthcare organizations are catching up rapidly, driven by electronic health records mandates and precision medicine demands. Manufacturing's comparatively weaker relationships suggest an opportunity gap that sector leaders should prioritize.

6. Conclusion and Implications

6.1 Theoretical Implications

This study extends the dynamic capabilities framework into the domain of data-driven organizations by empirically demonstrating that BDA maturity constitutes a foundational capability underpinning strategic foresight. The validated BDA-FRC model provides a theoretically grounded and empirically supported structure for future research on analytics-strategy alignment.

6.2 Managerial Implications

For practitioners, the findings suggest three prioritization principles. First, data infrastructure investment should precede culture and talent initiatives, as it serves as a foundational moderator. Second, governance structures should be treated as a strategic mediating mechanism, not an administrative overhead — with dedicated data stewardship roles and cross-functional analytics councils. Third, organizations should benchmark their BDA maturity against sector-specific norms rather than generic industry averages, given the significant sectoral heterogeneity observed.

6.3 Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations. The cross-sectional design precludes causal inference; longitudinal research is warranted to establish directionality. The sample, though geographically diverse, is limited to three countries and four sectors, constraining generalizability. Future research should explore the role of AI and machine learning maturity as extensions of the BDA maturity construct, and examine how external macroeconomic volatility moderates the BDA-Future Readiness relationship.

.

REFERENCES

1. Chen, C. P., & Zhang, C. Y. (2014). Data-intensive applications, challenges, techniques and technologies: A survey on Big Data. Information Sciences, 275, 314–347.
2. Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. Psychological Bulletin, 112(1), 155–159.
3. Davenport, T. H., & Harris, J. G. (2007). Competing on Analytics: The New Science of Winning. Harvard Business School Press.
4. Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? Strategic Management Journal, 21(10–11), 1105–1121.
5. Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of Marketing Research, 18(1), 39–50.
6. Gupta, M., & George, J. F. (2016). Toward the development of a big data analytics capability. Information & Management, 53(8), 1049–1064.
7. IDC. (2023). Global DataSphere Forecast 2023–

2027. International Data Corporation.

8. Lavalle, S., Lesser, E., Shockley, R., Hopkins, M. S., & Kruschwitz, N. (2011). Big data, analytics and the path from insights to value. MIT Sloan Management Review, 52(2), 21–32.

9. McKinsey Global Institute. (2022). The Age of Analytics: Competing in a Data-Driven World. McKinsey & Company.

10. Teece, D., Peteraf, M., & Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and strategy in the innovation economy. California Management Review, 58(4), 13–35.

11. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. Strategic Management Journal, 18(7), 509–533.

12. Wamba, S. F., Gunasekaran, A., Akter, S., Ren, S. J. F., Dubey, R., & Childe, S. J. (2017). Big data analytics and firm performance: Effects of dynamic capabilities. Journal of Business Research, 70, 356–365.

.

.