



From Web Analytics to Marketing Value: A Digital Process Innovation Perspective

Ferdi Gunawan, Moch. Ragil Harun Al Rasyid, Jonkenedi*, Mohd. Rizwan, Armini Ningsih

Bussiness Administration, Politeknik Negeri Samarinda, Samarinda, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: jonkenedi.official@gmail.com¹

Article History

21st April 2026

Accepted:

30th April 2026

Published:

30th April 2026

*Corresponding Author

Abstract

This article reframes key performance indicators (KPI) and web analytics from passive measurement devices into process-intelligence mechanisms that support digital process innovation and marketing value creation. The revised manuscript responds to reviewer concerns by clarifying that the study is a structured literature-based conceptual synthesis, not a newly replicated stand-alone systematic literature review. The core evidence base consists of the 26 eligible studies previously identified from 378 records in the digital marketing and web analytics domains, while the present manuscript contributes a new conceptual recoding of that corpus through the lenses of digital transformation capability, customer journey theory, organizational learning, and analytics-enabled value creation. The method section now reports the review logic, search domains, inclusion and exclusion criteria, quality appraisal dimensions, coding procedure, and synthesis strategy. The findings show that quantitative indicators such as traffic, unique users, click-through rate, conversion rate, return on investment, leads, source type, and keyword ranking function as process-efficiency signals, whereas qualitative indicators such as A/B testing, user-flow analysis, user-experience diagnostics, calls to action, surveys, and forms operate as process-learning mechanisms. The article contributes a process-layer synthesis that links analytics to attraction and discovery, transition and conversion, interaction and experience, and learning and resource allocation. It concludes that web analytics generate marketing value only when they are embedded in decision routines that translate digital signals into diagnosis, experimentation, redesign, and organizational learning.

Keywords: digital process innovation, marketing value, KPI, web analytics, digital marketing, value creation

JEL: M31; M15; O32; L86; D83

1. Introduction

The expansion of internet-based technologies has transformed marketing from a predominantly promotional function into a dynamic system of interconnected digital processes. In contemporary digital environments, firms compete not only through message creativity and media exposure, but also through their ability to orchestrate search visibility, website interaction,

content flows, conversion pathways, and feedback mechanisms in real time. This shift requires a conceptual move away from viewing digital marketing solely as communication activity toward understanding it as a process architecture that is continuously shaped, measured, and refined.

Within this architecture, web analytics and key performance indicators (KPI) have become central managerial tools. Existing literature shows that firms rely on indicators such as traffic, unique users, click-through rate, return on investment, conversion rate, source quality, and keyword rankings to monitor digital marketing performance. Yet much of the discussion remains measurement-centric. KPI and analytics are commonly treated as instruments for retrospective control, campaign evaluation, or budget justification rather than as strategic enablers of process redesign. This narrow framing undervalues their role in identifying friction points, enabling experimentation, and improving customer journeys.

The article builds on a previously reported systematic review in the fields of digital marketing and web analytics that identified 378 records from Scopus, PubMed, PsycINFO, ScienceDirect, and Web of Science and retained 26 eligible studies. That earlier evidence base provides a useful foundation for understanding digital marketing metrics, but its interpretive emphasis can be advanced by asking a different question: how do KPI and web analytics function within the redesign of digital marketing processes? The present manuscript therefore offers a conceptual extension rather than a simple restatement of earlier metric classification.

This conceptual reorientation is important because value in digital marketing is increasingly produced through better process design. A firm creates marketing value when it can attract relevant audiences efficiently, convert attention into action, optimize user experience, allocate spending intelligently, and improve customer relevance over time. KPI and web analytics contribute to these outcomes when they function as process intelligence. They make customer interactions visible, reveal behavioral patterns across digital touchpoints, and support iterative improvements in acquisition, conversion, engagement, and retention processes.

The revised article addresses three research questions. First, how are KPI and web analytics positioned within the reviewed literature on digital marketing and web analytics? Second, which indicators are most relevant for enabling digital process innovation? Third, how do these indicators contribute to marketing value creation when interpreted as process intelligence? By answering these questions, the paper contributes a process-oriented synthesis that connects digital analytics to diagnosis, experimentation, redesign, and learning.

The originality of this article lies in its conceptual recoding of web analytics as a process-innovation capability. The paper does not claim to produce a new empirical dataset; rather, it clarifies and extends an existing evidence base by developing an integrative framework. This framework explains how digital metrics become valuable when embedded in organizational routines that turn signals into decisions and decisions into service-process improvement.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Digital process innovation in marketing systems

Digital process innovation refers to the redesign, integration, and continuous improvement of organizational processes through digital technologies and data-driven feedback loops. In a marketing context, process innovation is visible when firms optimize how users discover a brand, move across touchpoints, respond to content, complete transactions, and remain engaged after conversion. This perspective shifts attention from isolated campaign outputs to the underlying systems that shape customer interaction and organizational learning.

Digital transformation research emphasizes that firms must renew resources, structures, metrics, and managerial routines to create value in digitally mediated markets (Verhoef et al., 2021; Vial, 2019). This view is directly relevant to marketing analytics because dashboards do not generate value by themselves. Value emerges when data are interpreted, translated into action, and institutionalized within decision processes. Thus, digital process innovation is not simply the adoption of tools; it is the reconfiguration of how work is designed and improved.

From a capability perspective, analytics becomes valuable when it supports sensing, learning, and reconfiguration. Dynamic capabilities theory argues that firms must sense opportunities, seize them through managerial action, and transform organizational resources in response to environmental change (Teece, 2007). KPI and web analytics support these functions by making market signals visible and actionable. Their strategic relevance therefore depends on whether firms can convert information into process change.

2.2 KPI and web analytics as digital process intelligence

Web analytics has traditionally been defined as the measurement, collection, analysis, and reporting of internet data for understanding and optimizing web usage. That definition remains useful, but it becomes more analytically powerful when interpreted through the lens of process intelligence. KPI and analytics reveal where users enter a digital journey, how they navigate across pages, where they hesitate, what triggers action, and when they abandon the process. These indicators therefore make the digital marketing process legible.

Quantitative indicators such as impressions, traffic, unique users, leads, conversion, CTR, ROI, and cost-based metrics capture visible outcomes and relative efficiencies. Qualitative indicators such as A/B testing, user flow, calls to action, surveys, and user experience analysis explain why particular outcomes occur. Together, these measurement families offer diagnostic capability: one family identifies performance patterns, while the other clarifies the behavioral or design reasons behind them.

Recent marketing analytics research also indicates that analytics capabilities can affect value creation when they are linked to organizational capabilities and decision quality. Marketing data analytics assets and sensing capabilities contribute differently to unit and firm performance (Sáenz et al., 2022). Similarly, marketing analytics use can support customer agility and customer satisfaction under dynamic market conditions (Agag et al., 2024). These findings strengthen the argument that metrics should be understood as capability inputs rather than isolated reporting outputs.

2.3 Marketing value creation in digital environments

Customer journey theory provides a useful bridge between analytics and process innovation. Customer value is shaped through sequences of touchpoints before, during, and after purchase or conversion (Lemon & Verhoef, 2016). For this reason, digital metrics should not be interpreted as disconnected numbers. Traffic, CTR, conversion rate, time on page, goal completion, source type, and repeat visits each represent a partial signal about a specific moment in the customer journey.

Marketing value in digital environments is created when firms improve relevance, efficiency, and responsiveness in ways that lead to desirable economic and relational outcomes. Such value may take the form of lower customer acquisition cost, higher conversion, stronger engagement, greater retention, improved brand visibility, or better allocation of marketing investment. In

practice, these outcomes are process dependent: they arise from how well a firm designs and refines the stages through which digital users move.

Business analytics research further supports the need to link analytics to process-level value creation. Analytics systems create value through decision-making and knowledge-creation paths, particularly when organizations use feedback to adapt processes over time (Kunz et al., 2025). This means that the central contribution of KPI and web analytics lies not in measurement itself, but in value-oriented process optimization. Measurement matters because it reduces uncertainty, enables experimentation, and directs managerial attention toward actionable bottlenecks.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research design and relationship to the source corpus

This study uses a structured literature-based conceptual synthesis. The revised design is stated more explicitly to address methodological concerns. The article does not present itself as a newly replicated stand-alone systematic literature review. Instead, it reinterprets a previously reported SLR corpus in which 378 records were identified through the domains of digital marketing and web analytics and 26 studies were retained after screening. The present manuscript contributes a new process-innovation interpretation of that corpus, supported by additional theoretical literature on digital transformation, analytics capability, customer journey, and organizational learning.

This design is appropriate because the objective is conceptual extension rather than statistical estimation. The unit of analysis is not an individual metric in isolation, but the role performed by a metric within digital marketing processes. Accordingly, the synthesis asks how analytics make processes visible, how they support diagnosis, and how they enable experimentation and redesign.

3.2 Search logic and evidence base

The core evidence base was derived from the previously reported search domains of digital marketing and web analytics. To make the review logic more transparent, the revised manuscript reports the search logic used to interpret the corpus and to organize the supplementary theoretical literature. The core corpus retained the 26 studies reported by the source review, while the supplementary theoretical layer was used only to strengthen interpretation and did not alter the 26-study corpus.

Table 1. Review logic and evidence base

Element	Description
Core search domains	Digital marketing; web analytics; KPI; marketing metrics; online marketing; internet marketing; search engine marketing; social media marketing.
Databases identified in the source review	Scopus, PubMed, PsycINFO, ScienceDirect, and Web of Science.
Illustrative Boolean logic	("digital marketing" OR "online marketing" OR "internet marketing" OR "search engine marketing" OR "social media marketing") AND ("web analytics" OR "digital analytics" OR "marketing analytics" OR "KPI" OR "key performance indicator" OR "metric") AND ("conversion" OR "customer journey" OR "user experience" OR "value creation" OR "optimization").
Core corpus	378 initial records and 26 eligible studies reported in the source review.

Element	Description
Supplementary theoretical search	Digital transformation, dynamic capabilities, marketing analytics capability, customer journey, process intelligence, business analytics value creation, and organizational learning.
Purpose of supplementary literature	To strengthen theoretical grounding, not to expand the core corpus or create a new SLR dataset.

3.3 Inclusion, exclusion, and quality appraisal criteria

The screening and interpretation were guided by eligibility criteria that match the purpose of the article. Studies were considered relevant when they discussed digital marketing metrics, web analytics, digital campaign performance, user behavior, conversion, customer acquisition, or marketing analytics capability. Studies were excluded when they were unrelated to digital marketing processes, lacked conceptual or empirical relevance to analytics, or treated metrics only as technical reporting tools without marketing implications.

Table 2. Eligibility and quality appraisal criteria

Criterion	Inclusion rule	Exclusion rule
Topical relevance	The study addresses digital marketing, web analytics, KPI, marketing analytics, customer acquisition, conversion, or digital performance.	The study focuses on unrelated information systems, general accounting, offline marketing, or non-marketing analytics.
Process relevance	The study provides insight into customer journey, optimization, campaign performance, UX, search visibility, engagement, or decision support.	The study only defines metrics without explaining any managerial, behavioral, or process role.
Evidence value	The study offers empirical findings, conceptual models, systematic review evidence, or relevant managerial frameworks.	The study lacks a clear research basis, is purely promotional, or does not provide usable analytical content.
Quality appraisal	Conceptual clarity, methodological transparency, relevance to digital marketing, and usefulness for process interpretation.	Low relevance, weak conceptual connection, insufficient methodological description, or non-scholarly source when not used as contextual material.

3.4 Coding and synthesis procedure

The synthesis was conducted in four stages. First, the identified indicators were extracted and grouped as quantitative or qualitative metrics. Second, each indicator was coded according to the digital process stage it primarily informs attraction and discovery, transition and conversion, interaction and experience, or learning and resource allocation. Third, the innovation function of each indicator was interpreted by asking whether the metric supports visibility, diagnosis, experimentation, redesign, or strategic learning. Fourth, the marketing value created by each process role was synthesized into an integrative framework.

To strengthen analytical rigor, the revision distinguishes between descriptive classification and conceptual inference. Descriptive classification identifies which indicators appear in the literature. Conceptual inference explains how these indicators may support process innovation. The paper therefore presents its claims as theoretically grounded propositions rather than as causal effects directly measured by the reviewed studies.

The trustworthiness of the synthesis was improved by cross-checking each process layer against three forms of support: metric definitions in the reviewed corpus, theoretical alignment with digital transformation and analytics capability literature, and practical relevance to the customer journey. This procedure reduces arbitrary interpretation while acknowledging that the study remains conceptual and literature based.

4. Result And Discussion

4.1 Profile of the reviewed literature

The reviewed studies span business, information science, computer science, services, and systems-oriented journals. This disciplinary spread is meaningful because digital marketing analytics is not solely a marketing communication issue. Business studies tend to emphasize value generation, customer acquisition, conversion, and strategic return. Information science and computer science studies contribute technical and behavioral insights related to information retrieval, user interaction, search dynamics, and data interpretation. Together, these traditions indicate that digital marketing performance cannot be understood through a single disciplinary lens.

The literature has concentrated heavily on search-related performance, online promotion, conversion-oriented indicators, and analytics-enabled decision making. This concentration suggests that firms have historically treated digital marketing optimization as a problem of visibility and measurable action. However, once these insights are integrated across studies, a broader picture emerges what is actually being optimized is the process through which users discover, evaluate, and respond to digital offerings.

The revised contribution is therefore twofold. First, the paper reframes web analytics as process intelligence rather than dashboard reporting. Second, it develops a process-layer synthesis that explains how metrics create value through attraction, conversion, experience, and learning mechanisms. This contribution is conceptual rather than empirically novel, but it is useful because it clarifies the managerial logic through which analytics becomes valuable.

4.2 KPI and web analytics across the digital marketing process

A process-oriented synthesis of the reviewed literature shows that KPI and analytics can be grouped into four functional layers of digital process innovation. These layers explain where metrics operate in the customer journey and how they contribute to marketing value creation.

Table 3. KPI and analytics as digital process innovation mechanisms

Process layer	Relevant indicators	Innovation function	Marketing value created
Attraction and discovery	Impressions, traffic, unique users, source type, keyword ranking, non-branded keyword traffic.	Improve visibility logic, refine search presence, and diagnose channel effectiveness.	Higher discoverability, better audience reach, and lower acquisition inefficiency.
Transition and conversion	CTR, leads, conversion rate, goal completion, cost per lead, cost per action, pay-per-click, cost per click.	Reduce friction from click to action and optimize commercial pathways.	Higher conversion efficiency and improved monetization.

Process layer	Relevant indicators	Innovation function	Marketing value created
Interaction and experience	A/B testing, call-to-action performance, user flow, page interaction, time on site, UX diagnostics, surveys, and forms.	Redesign interfaces, messages, and pathways based on observed behavior.	Stronger user relevance, better usability, and improved engagement.
Learning and resource allocation	ROI, returning visitors, user type, campaign source, cross-channel comparison, source quality.	Support iterative learning, budget optimization, and strategic adaptation.	Greater accountability, better investment decisions, and sustained marketing value.

4.3 Quantitative indicators as signals of process efficiency

The quantitative indicators identified in the review are often presented as straightforward measures of digital performance. From a process innovation perspective, they should be interpreted as efficiency signals. Traffic indicates whether attraction mechanisms are functioning. Unique users and source type reveal the breadth and composition of audience entry. CTR signals whether the movement from exposure to engagement is persuasive enough. Conversion rate shows whether the pathway from attention to desired action has been designed effectively.

ROI occupies a particularly important position because it connects process performance to managerial accountability. However, ROI should not be treated as a terminal metric only. It also captures the cumulative quality of upstream processes: if targeting is weak, search visibility is poor, landing pages are inefficient, or calls to action are unclear, ROI will suffer. In this respect, ROI is not simply a financial indicator; it is a summary signal of whether the digital process architecture is creating value.

Cost models such as CPM, CPC, CPL, and CPA illuminate how digital marketing value is appropriated. These models shape the economics of process design because they determine which actions are paid for and which thresholds of efficiency matter most. As a result, pricing logic and process logic are intertwined. Quantitative metrics therefore tell managers not only what happened, but where process redesign may be required.

4.4 Qualitative Indicators as Mechanisms of Process Learning

The reviewed literature also highlights a second class of indicators that is often under-theorized in performance discussions: qualitative analytics. A/B testing, user flow analysis, UX assessment, surveys, and form-based feedback explain why users behave as they do. These indicators matter because digital process innovation depends on interpretation, not merely observation. Firms need to know not only that a user exits a page, but also what element of the design or message contributes to that exit.

A/B testing is a clear example of analytics-driven experimentation. By comparing two variants of a page, title, image, or button, firms can identify which design choice better supports desired action. User flow analysis complements this by revealing the sequence and pattern of movement across a site. Survey data and forms provide direct feedback, while UX assessment reveals whether the structure and content of the site support usability and cognitive clarity.

Together, these qualitative indicators convert static analytics into learning systems. They allow organizations to move from counting behavior to explaining it, and from explaining it to redesigning the experience. This is why qualitative analytics should be treated as core

components of digital process innovation rather than as optional supplements to quantitative dashboards.

4.5 Causal Logic and Boundary Conditions of Analytics-Based Value Creation

The revised synthesis makes the causal logic more explicit. KPI and web analytics contribute to value creation through a sequence of five mechanisms: visibility, diagnosis, experimentation, redesign, and learning. Visibility occurs when data reveal what users do. Diagnosis occurs when managers interpret why users behave in particular ways. Experimentation occurs when alternative designs, messages, or channels are tested. Redesign occurs when insights are translated into improved customer journeys. Learning occurs when these improvements are institutionalized in future decisions.

However, analytics do not automatically generate value. Several boundary conditions determine whether metrics become process intelligence. First, data must be reliable and relevant to the decision being made. Second, organizations need interpretive capability, because the same metric can have different meanings across contexts. Third, analytics must be connected to decision routines; otherwise dashboards remain descriptive. Fourth, firms need cross-functional coordination between marketing, technology, content, and operations. Fifth, privacy, ethics, and trust must be considered when customer data are collected and acted upon.

These boundary conditions help avoid an overly deterministic view of analytics. The presence of KPI does not guarantee marketing value. Value emerges when metrics are embedded in routines that help managers choose, test, and refine customer-facing processes. In this sense, the contribution of web analytics is conditional, organizational, and process dependent.

4.6 Integrative framework for marketing value creation

When synthesized across the reviewed studies and theoretical literature, the evidence supports an integrative proposition: KPI and web analytics create marketing value when they are embedded in a cycle of visibility, diagnosis, experimentation, redesign, and strategic learning. The value of analytics does not reside in reporting alone. It resides in the firm’s ability to convert digital signals into process adjustments that improve performance over time.

Table 4. Analytics-enabled process innovation cycle

Mechanism	Managerial question	Analytics role	Expected process outcome
Visibility	What is happening in the digital journey?	Capture traffic, source, reach, navigation, and interaction patterns.	Customer behavior becomes observable.
Diagnosis	Where does friction occur?	Identify drop-off points, weak channels, low conversion, poor UX, or ineffective CTA.	Problem areas become actionable.
Experimentation	Which alternative performs better?	Use A/B testing, source comparison, landing-page tests, and message variation.	Design choices become evidence-informed.

Mechanism	Managerial question	Analytics role	Expected process outcome
Redesign	How should the process be improved?	Translate insights into journey simplification, content adjustment, UX improvement, or channel reallocation.	Customer-facing processes become more efficient.
Learning	What should be institutionalized?	Convert repeated analytics insights into routines, guidelines, and resource-allocation logic.	Marketing capability becomes stronger over time.

5. Conclusion

This article has reframed KPI and web analytics as mechanisms of digital process innovation that create marketing value. Building on the review evidence contained in a previously reported digital marketing and web analytics corpus, it argues that digital metrics should not be understood solely as instruments of control or post hoc evaluation. Rather, they function as process intelligence that helps organizations diagnose friction, experiment with alternatives, redesign user journeys, and improve resource allocation.

The review shows that quantitative indicators such as traffic, CTR, conversion rate, ROI, leads, source type, and keyword ranking illuminate the efficiency and direction of digital marketing processes, while qualitative indicators such as A/B testing, user flow, UX diagnostics, surveys, forms, and calls to action enable deeper process learning. Their strategic value lies in combination. Together, they form an architecture of continuous optimization. The central conclusion is that KPI and web analytics create the most marketing value when they are embedded in a broader system of digital process innovation. Firms that treat analytics as an active capability for redesigning acquisition, conversion, interaction, and learning processes are better positioned to generate relevance, efficiency, accountability, and sustained value in digital markets.

This article remains limited by its reliance on a previously reported core corpus and by the conceptual nature of the present reframing. It does not claim to measure causal effects between analytics use and firm performance. Future research may extend this argument empirically by testing how analytics capabilities influence customer journey performance, experimentation speed, conversion efficiency, customer agility, and value outcomes across industries and platform settings.

6. Theoretical and managerial implications

Theoretically, the paper contributes to digital marketing literature by connecting web analytics to process innovation, dynamic capabilities, customer journey theory, and organizational learning. It suggests that KPI should not be studied only as measurement variables, but also as signals that help firms sense, interpret, and reconfigure digital marketing processes. This view extends prior KPI-focused studies by explaining the organizational logic through which metrics become valuable.

Managerially, the paper warns against analytics myopia. Firms should not evaluate digital marketing maturity by the number of dashboards available. Instead, they should examine whether analytics are connected to actual decisions: redesigning landing pages, improving calls to action, reducing conversion friction, reallocating budgets, strengthening customer relevance,

and improving post-conversion engagement. In practical terms, organizations should define each KPI together with the managerial action it is expected to inform.

A useful managerial approach is to create a metric-to-action map. For example, traffic data should inform attraction decisions; CTR should inform message and offer decisions; conversion rate should inform journey redesign; A/B testing should inform experimentation; user flow should inform navigation design; and ROI should inform resource allocation. This prevents KPI from becoming symbolic reporting outputs and turns them into tools for continuous process improvement.

7. References

- Agag, G., Eid, R., Shehawy, Y. M., Elbaz, A. M., & Omar, A. (2024). Understanding the relationship between marketing analytics, customer agility and customer satisfaction: A longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 77, 103644.
- Arch, G., Woodside, J., & Milner, W. (1992). Buying and marketing CPA services. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 21, 265-272.
- Ashrafi, A., Zare Ravasan, A., Trkman, P., & Afshari, S. (2019). The role of business analytics capabilities in bolstering firms' agility and performance. *International Journal of Information Management*, 47, 1-15.
- Aswani, R., Kar, A. K., Ilavarasan, P. V., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2018). Search engine marketing is not all gold: Insights from Twitter and SEOClerks. *International Journal of Information Management*, 38, 107-116.
- Baye, M. R., De los Santos, B., & Wildenbeest, M. R. (2015). Search engine optimization: What drives organic traffic to retail sites? *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 25(1), 6-31.
- Bourne, M., Neely, A., Platts, K., & Mills, J. (2002). The success and failure of performance measurement initiatives: Perceptions of participating managers. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 22(11), 1288-1310.
- Chaffey, D., & Patron, M. (2012). From web analytics to digital marketing optimization: Increasing the commercial value of digital analytics. *Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice*, 14, 30-45.
- Choudhary, V., Currim, I., Dewan, S., Jeliaskov, I., Mintz, O., & Turner, J. (2017). Evaluation set size and purchasing: Evidence from product search engines. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 37, 16-31.
- Dotson, J. P., Fan, R. R., Feit, E. M., Oldham, J. D., & Yeh, Y. H. (2017). Brand attitudes and search engine queries. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 37, 105-116.
- Fagan, J. C. (2014). The suitability of web analytics key performance indicators in academic library environments. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40(1), 25-34.
- Fiorini, P. M., & Lipsky, L. R. (2012). Marketing traffic tracking and performance models. *Computer Standards & Interfaces*, 34(5), 517-526.
- Germann, F., Lilien, G. L., & Rangaswamy, A. (2013). Performance implications of deploying marketing analytics. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 30(2), 114-128.
- Homburg, C., Jozić, D., & Kuehnl, C. (2017). Customer experience management: Toward implementing an evolving marketing concept. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45, 377-401.
- Iacobucci, D., Petrescu, M., Krishen, A., & Bendixen, M. (2019). The state of marketing analytics in research and practice. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 7, 152-181.

- Järvinen, J., & Karjaluoto, H. (2015). The use of web analytics for digital marketing performance measurement. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 50, 117-127.
- Kaushik, A. (2009). *Web analytics 2.0: The art of online accountability and science of customer centricity*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Kannan, P. K., & Li, H. A. (2017). Digital marketing: A framework, review and research agenda. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 34(1), 22-45.
- Kunz, P. C., Spohrer, K., & Heinzl, A. (2025). Process-level value creation from business analytics: A theoretical literature review of value creation paths and changes induced by machine learning. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 34(2), 101902.
- Leeflang, P. S. H., Verhoef, P. C., Dahlström, P., & Freundt, T. (2014). Challenges and solutions for marketing in a digital era. *European Management Journal*, 32(1), 1-12.
- Lemon, K. N., & Verhoef, P. C. (2016). Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 69-96.
- Li, L. Y. (2011). Marketing metric use: Predictors and implications for customer relationship management. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40(1), 139-148.
- Mathews, S., Bianchi, C., Perks, K. J., Healy, M., & Wickramasekera, R. (2016). Internet marketing capabilities and international market growth. *International Business Review*, 25(4), 820-830.
- Mavridis, T., & Symeonidis, A. L. (2015). Identifying valid search engine ranking factors in the context of Web 2.0 and Web 3.0 for efficient SEO mechanisms. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 41, 75-91.
- Nabout, N. A., & Skiera, B. (2012). Return on quality improvements in search engine marketing. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 26(3), 141-154.
- Nabout, A., Skiera, B., Stepanchuk, T., & Gerstmeier, E. (2012). Profitability analysis of fee-based compensation plans for search engine marketing. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 29(1), 68-80.
- Oberoi, P., Patel, C., & Haon, C. (2017). Technology sourcing for website personalization and social media marketing: A study in e-retailing. *Journal of Business Research*, 80, 10-23.
- Pauwels, K., Aksehirli, Z., & Lackman, A. (2016). Like the ad or the brand? Marketing stimulates different electronic word-of-mouth content to drive online and offline performance. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 33(3), 639-655.
- Peters, K., Chen, Y., Kaplan, A. M., Ognibeni, B., & Pauwels, K. (2013). Social media metrics: A framework and guidelines for managing social media. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 27(4), 281-298.
- Saénz, J., Ortiz de Guinea, A., & Peñalba-Aguirrezabalaga, C. (2022). Value creation through marketing data analytics: The distinct contribution of data analytics assets and capabilities to unit and firm performance. *Information & Management*, 59(8), 103724.
- Saura, J. R., Palos-Sánchez, P., & Cerdá Suárez, L. M. (2017). Understanding the digital marketing environment with KPIs and web analytics. *Future Internet*, 9(4), 76.
- Seggie, S. H., Cavusgil, E., & Phelan, S. E. (2017). Marketing return on investment metrics: A conceptual framework and the future of marketing metrics. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36, 834-841.
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319-1350.

- Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889-901.
- Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 28(2), 118-144.
- Vollrath, M. D., & Villegas, S. G. (2022). Avoiding digital marketing analytics myopia: Revisiting the customer decision journey as a strategic marketing framework. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 10(2), 106-113.
- Wedel, M., & Kannan, P. K. (2016). Marketing analytics for data-rich environments. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 97-121.
- Welling, R., & White, L. (2006). Website performance measurement: Promise and reality. *Managing Service Quality*, 16(6), 654-670.
- Wilson, R. D. (2004). Using web traffic analysis for customer acquisition and retention programs in marketing. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 26(2), 1-22.
- Xu, Z., Frankwick, G. L., & Ramirez, E. (2016). The effects of big data analytics and traditional marketing analytics on new product success: A knowledge fusion perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(5), 1562-1566.
- Yang, Z., Shi, Y., & Wang, B. (2015). Search engine marketing, financing ability and firm performance in e-commerce. *Procedia Computer Science*, 55, 1106-1112.