

30-03-2026

Strategic decision through integrated marketing communication and strategy analysis for Siakad Mataer digital platform

Dini Fallah, Pri Hermawan

To cite this article: Fallah, D., & Hermawan, P. (2026). Strategic decision through integrated marketing communication and strategy analysis for Siakad Mataer digital platform. *Priviet Social Sciences Journal*, 6(3), 554–572. <https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v6i3.1680>

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v6i3.1680>



Follow this and additional works at: <https://journal.privietlab.org/index.php/PSSJ>
Priviet Social Sciences Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

This PSSJ: Original Article is brought to you for free and open access by Privietlab. It has been accepted for inclusion in Priviet Social Sciences Journal by an authorized editor of Privietlab Journals

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use are available at: <https://journal.privietlab.org/index.php/PSSJ/about>



Strategic decision through integrated marketing communication and strategy analysis for Siakad Mataer digital platform

Dini Fallah* & Pri Hermawan

School of Business and Management, Institute Teknologi Bandung, alan Ganesha No.10, Lebak Siliwangi, Coblong, Bandung, West Java, Indonesia

*e-mail: 29324037@mahasiswa.itb.ac.id

Received 24 January 2026

Revised 20 March 2026

Accepted 27 March 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examines how PT Mataer Digital Nusantara (MDN) can strengthen its marketing strategy and integrated marketing communication to overcome inconsistent client acquisition for its SIAKAD 4.0 platform in Indonesia's higher education sector. A mixed-method case study approach is employed, combining primary internal data from interviews and Likert-scale surveys involving employees in marketing, sales, product, and client management, with secondary data from PDDIKTI, government regulations, market reports, and competitor documents. Internal conditions are analyzed using segmentation–targeting–positioning (STP) and the 7Ps marketing mix, while external factors are evaluated through PESTLE and competitor analysis. The results are synthesized into a SWOT framework and further developed into strategic alternatives using the TOWS matrix. To ensure objective prioritization, a Weighted Scoring Model is applied as a multi-criteria decision-making tool. The findings reveal that MDN's strengths include competitive pricing, platform credibility, and strong cross-functional execution, while weaknesses lie in limited segmentation adaptability and inconsistent strategic evaluation. The recommended strategy focuses on expanding market penetration among small- and medium-sized institutions through flexible pricing aligned with national digitalization trends, supported by trust-building communication. The study concludes with an actionable roadmap covering pricing strategies, segmentation redesign, product enhancement, onboarding processes, digital marketing, and performance evaluation systems.

Keywords: marketing strategy; integrated marketing communication; higher education information system (SIKAD); multicriteria decision making (MCDM).

priviet lab.
RESEARCH & PUBLISHING



1. INTRODUCTION

The digital transformation of higher education has become an increasingly urgent priority in Indonesia, as universities and colleges are required to adopt technology-based solutions to improve efficiency, transparency, and accountability in academic and administrative processes. This urgency is shaped not only by global trends in higher education digitalization but also by domestic regulatory pressures. The Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Technology (Kemendikti Ristek) has strengthened the demand for standardized data reporting, accreditation readiness, and regulatory compliance through centralized platforms such as Pangkalan Data Pendidikan Tinggi (PDDIKTI). Consequently, higher education institutions face growing expectations to implement integrated academic information systems to ensure accurate, consistent, and timely institutional reporting (Astuti et al, 2024).

Indonesia's higher education technology (EdTech) ecosystem remains relatively underdeveloped compared to other industries. The number of vendors providing comprehensive higher-education management systems is still limited, which reduces institutions' choices and can constrain the availability of affordable, scalable, and context-appropriate solutions. Simultaneously, these conditions create a strategic opening for providers capable of addressing institutional pain points with dependable and future-ready platforms. The COVID-19 pandemic further amplified this need, forcing institutions to shift rapidly to online learning and remote administration, and revealing that campus digitalization requires more than ad hoc tools. In the post-pandemic period, demand has increasingly moved toward integrated, cloud-based, and user-friendly systems that support the entire student lifecycle and enable institutions to operate effectively under dynamic conditions. However, the digitalization of higher education also introduces significant implementation challenges. One of the most persistent issues is the speed at which institutions must adapt to regulatory and accreditation changes. In Indonesia, policy instruments and compliance requirements can be updated frequently, creating operational risks for universities whose information systems are not designed for rapid configuration changes. Beyond regulatory adaptation, institutions often face internal barriers such as resistance to change, budget constraints, and unequal digital literacy among administrative staff, all of which can weaken the implementation quality, even when a system is technically sound. These realities underscore the importance of both technological capability and strategic communication in driving adoption and sustained use.

PT. Mataer Digital Nusantara operates as an information technology company specializing in software development and IT consulting, with a strategic focus on educational technology solutions for higher-education. Mataer Digital positions itself as a partner for institutional transformation through its flagship platform, Civitas Academic (SIKAD 4.0), which integrates academic administration, financial management, multi-campus support, e-learning, digital libraries, e-office functionality, and compliance-oriented reporting, all aligned with PDDIKTI requirements (Benadives et al., 2020). Supported by a cloud-based design, the platform aims to deliver continuous access, improved usability, and operational efficiencies that reduce the costs associated with paper-based workflows, bandwidth, and administrative workload. The company reports that its solutions have been implemented by more than 700 higher education institutions, recorded over 100,000 downloads on the Play Store, and facilitated transactions valued at IDR 846 billion, which are indicators of scale and relevance within the national education ecosystem. Nevertheless, the company faces a central business issue: client acquisition performance remains inconsistent relative to strategic targets. Internal data for 2021–2025 show year-to-year fluctuations, including 14 new clients (2021), 29 (2022), 23 (2023), 34 (2024), and 26 in 2025 (ongoing) (Table 1). Monthly acquisition performance in 2025 further illustrates a gap between outcomes and targets: across January to August, the company averaged 3.5 clients per month, substantially below the target of 8 clients per month (Table 2). This gap is particularly salient given the market potential. In 2023, Indonesia recorded 4,437 higher-education institutions, indicating a large and diverse addressable market. Mataer Digital's target of acquiring 100 new institutional clients annually represents less than 3% yearly penetration, suggesting feasibility; yet the instability in realized acquisition highlights the need to reassess strategic effectiveness.

This study focuses on analyzing and formulating integrated marketing communication and strategic approaches used by Mataer Digital to promote the SIAKAD platform, with the aim of understanding how these efforts influence adoption among higher education institutions in Indonesia. Building on the identified performance gap and market opportunity, this research develops questions and objectives centered on diagnosing the underlying causes of underperformance, evaluating current strategic practices, and identifying more effective approaches to support consistent growth and stronger market penetration.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Marketing strategy is widely understood as a structured and integrated plan that enables an organization to achieve its objectives by maximizing customer value while sustaining a competitive advantage. In the context of technology-based services, marketing strategy is inseparable from how firms translate technical capabilities into perceived institutional value, especially when products involve high switching costs, long-term contracts, and mission-critical operations. For education technology providers serving higher education, strategic success depends not only on product quality but also on the ability to communicate relevance, reduce perceived risk, and align offerings with the regulatory and operational realities faced by universities. Therefore, a coherent marketing strategy functions as an organizing logic that links market opportunities to value propositions and value propositions to concrete actions across product design, pricing, delivery, and promotion.

The literature on marketing strategy consistently emphasizes that strategy formation requires systematic diagnosis and structured choices. Market analysis clarifies demand conditions, buyer behavior, and competitive forces, whereas segmentation, targeting, and positioning convert market complexity into actionable priorities. The practical implication is that firms can rarely serve every potential customer effectively with a single approach. Higher education institutions are heterogeneous in terms of their size, governance structure, budget constraints, academic complexity, and digital maturity. A marketing strategy that treats them as a uniform market risks weak product–market fit and inefficient resource allocation. In contrast, a strategy built upon segmentation and targeting can focus organizational efforts on high-potential institutional profiles where adoption barriers can be managed and value can be demonstrated quickly. For Mataer Digital, the marketing strategy is closely tied to its mission of empowering higher-education institutions through a digital campus solution, with SIAKAD positioned as an integrated platform that supports academic and administrative processes.

A recurring theme in strategic marketing is the need to operationalize strategies through the marketing mix. The marketing mix translates strategic intent into coordinated decisions regarding products, prices, distribution, and promotion. In digital services, the “product” is not only the software itself but also the surrounding service system, including onboarding, training, customer support, security practices, integration services, and continuous updates. Pricing is not simply a monetary decision but a signal of value, affordability, and risk-sharing, particularly when institutions evaluate costs in relation to enrollment levels and budget cycles. In cloud-based models, distribution becomes a function of system accessibility, reliability, compliance readiness, and implementation capability, rather than physical channels. Promotion in business-to-business and institutional markets often relies heavily on relationship building, solution demonstration, trust signals, partnerships, and evidence-based messaging rather than mass advertising. For a provider like Mataer Digital, these elements are intertwined: the product’s integrated feature set supports the value proposition, pricing must align with institutional budgets and subscription logic, distribution is shaped by cloud delivery, and promotion depends on direct engagement with universities, partnerships, and digital channels (Steinhoff et al., 2025).

The strategic marketing literature also reinforces that an effective strategy must incorporate both internal and external perspectives. Internal alignment determines whether an organization has the resources and capabilities to deliver what it promises, whereas external fit determines whether the promise addresses real and urgent institutional problems. This is particularly important in regulated domains, such as higher education, where policy updates and compliance requirements can reshape buyer priorities. For digital campus solutions, the external environment does not merely “influence” market conditions; it can

directly set the minimum functional requirements for systems used by universities, thereby altering competitive advantages and shifting adoption criteria. Consequently, strategy formulation benefits from frameworks that systematically examine internal readiness and external pressures, ensuring that marketing plans reflect both organizational capacity and environmental realities.

Internal business analysis, as discussed in the strategic management and marketing planning literature, focuses on assessing factors within the organization that shape performance and competitive position. It typically involves evaluating resources, capabilities, routines, and execution quality to identify strengths that can be leveraged and weaknesses that require correction. In marketing-focused internal analysis, attention often turns to how well an organization understands its target market, how consistent its messaging is with its product and service delivery, and how effectively cross-functional teams support market-acquisition goals. For Mataer Digital, internal business analysis is essential because client acquisition outcomes are not determined only by market size or product features; they also depend on sales execution, customer engagement, decision-making speed, proposal quality, pricing consistency, and post-sale support. When client acquisition is unstable, internal analysis helps distinguish whether the problem stems from market selection, positioning clarity, value communication, operational bottlenecks or capability constraints.

The empirical assessment of internal conditions frequently relies on survey-based approaches that capture the perceptions and attitudes of employees or internal stakeholders. The Likert Scale, introduced by [Likert \(1932\)](#), remains one of the most widely used tools for measuring attitudes and perceptions in organizational research. Likert-type measures are valued because they transform qualitative judgments into quantitative indicators that can be compared across dimensions and summarized statistically. In typical applications, respondents indicate agreement with statements across ordered categories, often from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree, enabling researchers to compute mean scores and identify areas of relative strength or concern ([Joshi et al., 2015](#)). In a company context, such measures can help capture how employees perceive strategic clarity, operational effectiveness, marketing coordination, decision-making quality and customer orientation. When used carefully, Likert-based instruments support diagnostic insights because they reveal internal alignment gaps that might not be visible through financial results alone.

In strategic analysis, the usefulness of Likert-scale data lies in its ability to provide structured input for subsequent frameworks such as SWOT analysis. The mean scores and distribution patterns can indicate whether internal stakeholders perceive the organization as strong in innovation, service quality, responsiveness, marketing execution, or institutional relationships. Conversely, low scores can indicate issues such as unclear positioning, inconsistent value delivery, weak lead generation processes, or limited cross-functional integration. In marketing strategy contexts, internal perception matters because institutional buyers often evaluate vendors not only on product specifications but also on their reliability, responsiveness, and professionalism. If internal staff perceive weaknesses in these areas, it can lead to inconsistent client acquisition. Therefore, Likert-based assessments provide an empirical foundation for identifying internal strengths and weaknesses that will later inform strategic alternative generation.

Beyond measuring perceptions, internal marketing analysis often integrates segmentation, targeting, and positioning as a diagnostic lens for evaluating strategic focus. In markets characterized by diverse customer needs, STP functions not only as a marketing design tool but also as a discipline that forces strategic choices. Market segmentation recognizes heterogeneity by grouping customers based on shared characteristics. For higher education technology markets, segmentation may consider institutional type, size, financial capacity, digital maturity, accreditation pressure, program complexity, and geographic dispersion. The core logic is that these factors shape the institutional pain points and adoption criteria. Institutions with complex academic structures may prioritize integration and workflow automation, whereas smaller institutions may emphasize simplicity and affordability. Understanding these patterns enables a vendor to define segments where its offerings deliver the strongest value and where decision processes are most aligned with the vendor's selling approach.

Targeting determines where a firm should allocate scarce resources. In business-to-business and institutional markets, targeting is deeply connected to opportunity cost because sales cycles are long, and

relationship building is labor intensive. Selecting segments with the highest potential, such as institutions facing accreditation challenges or experiencing enrollment growth, can improve conversion probability and reduce acquisition volatility. In such contexts, targeting is also a risk management decision: it avoids segments where adoption barriers are too high, budget capacity is too low, or decision-making structures are too fragmented. For Mataer Digital, targeting logic is closely linked to how SIAKAD's capabilities match institutional constraints and goals and how the firm can most effectively demonstrate return on investment through operational efficiency, compliance readiness, and service reliability.

Positioning completes the STP chain by shaping how an offering is perceived relative to alternatives. Positioning is particularly critical in markets where functional differentiation is difficult to communicate to non-technical decision-makers. Universities may involve multiple stakeholders in purchasing decisions, including academic leadership, finance units, IT departments, and administrative staff. Therefore, a positioning statement must translate product features into clear institutional benefits, such as compliance assurance, operational efficiency, transparent reporting, or student-service improvement. Differentiation can be built around integration breadth, cloud reliability, security posture, ease of implementation, responsiveness to regulatory changes, and customer support strength. Effective positioning also reduces perceived risk by clarifying why a vendor is a safe, reliable, and long-term partner. In practice, positioning becomes the anchor for integrated marketing communication because it ensures that promotional messages, sales presentations, partnership narratives, and product demonstrations reinforce a consistent institutional value.

Internal analysis of marketing strategy is frequently complemented by the 7Ps marketing mix framework, which expands the original mix to include people, processes, and physical evidence in service contexts. For technology services, the "people" dimension is often a decisive determinant of adoption because institutional clients evaluate the competence of implementation teams, responsiveness of support, and credibility of sales consultants. The "Process" shapes user experience through onboarding steps, issue resolution routines, update cycles, and training delivery. "Physical evidence," although less tangible in digital services, emerges through interface design, documentation quality, service-level guarantees, case studies, and professional communication that signals reliability. For an integrated campus platform, these extended elements matter because the buyer's main fear is the disruption of academic operations. Consequently, internal marketing alignment must ensure that the company can deliver not only a feature set but also a stable service experience that reduces operational uncertainty for institutional clients. While internal analysis clarifies readiness and capability, external business analysis addresses the environmental forces that shape market opportunities and competitive risks. Strategic planning literature frequently recommends scanning the macro- and micro-competitive environments as complementary tasks. Macro-environmental analysis helps anticipate external shocks and structural trends, whereas competitor analysis explains how rivals might respond and how differentiation can be sustained. In the education technology sector, external conditions can shift rapidly because of policy reforms, changing accreditation requirements, digital infrastructure development, and evolving expectations of students and faculty. Therefore, a firm's marketing strategy is strengthened when it accounts for political, economic, sociocultural, technological, legal, and environmental forces that might influence institutional purchasing decisions and long-term platform adoption.

The PESTLE analysis offers a structured approach to understanding these macro-environmental dimensions. Political factors include government policy direction on higher education digitalization, reporting requirements, taxation, procurement norms, and broader political stability, which influence institutional planning. For education technology providers, supportive digital transformation initiatives can create adoption incentives, whereas policy uncertainty can increase compliance risk. Economic factors, such as inflation, GDP growth, and currency dynamics, influence university spending capacity and student affordability, shaping whether institutions prioritize major digital investments or postpone them. Sociocultural factors include digital literacy levels, evolving norms toward online and hybrid learning, demographic changes in student populations, and stakeholder expectations regarding responsiveness and transparency of the program. These factors can increase the demand for integrated digital systems that simplify learning administration and institutional governance.

Technological factors are especially salient in cloud-based educational solutions. Advances in cloud computing, automation, AI, and cybersecurity create opportunities for product innovation and service differentiation; however, they also intensify competitive pressure by lowering barriers for new entrants and raising baseline expectations. To remain competitive, firms must continuously invest in research and development and ensure that their products integrate emerging technologies responsibly. Legal factors address compliance obligations, such as data privacy regulations, intellectual property concerns, and accreditation-related reporting standards. Legal changes can increase operating costs but also strengthen market integrity by discouraging noncompliant competitors. Environmental factors, increasingly discussed in the context of digital transformation, include sustainable IT practices, energy efficiency in data centers, and reputational considerations related to responsible technology operations. For institutional buyers, especially those sensitive to governance and accountability, environmental responsibility can become an additional trust signal that supports adoption decisions.

Competitor analysis complements PESTLE by focusing on the microenvironment: rival firms, substitute solutions, and competitive dynamics within the sector. Competitor analysis typically involves identifying direct and indirect competitors, assessing their objectives and strategic capabilities, and determining which competitors pose the most serious threats or offer opportunities for differentiation. This process is essential because marketing strategies are always relative: an institution evaluates a vendor's offering against alternative platforms, internal development options, or partial solutions cobbled together from multiple tools. Systematic competitor analysis examines product scope, pricing models, distribution or implementation approaches, and promotional tactics to understand how competitors attract institutional clients and where they are vulnerable. For a firm like Mataer Digital, competitor analysis helps clarify whether acquisition instability stems from external competitive moves, mismatched positioning, pricing pressure, or insufficient trust signals compared to market leaders.

Beyond diagnosing internal and external conditions, the literature emphasizes that strategic work must culminate in decision-making. Generating strategic alternatives is insufficient if organizations cannot select the most appropriate option under the constraints. Business decision-making is commonly framed as a structured managerial process of choosing the best alternative among multiple options to achieve organizational objectives. In strategic management, decision-making is critical because firms operate under uncertainty, limited resources, and competing priorities. The challenge is that strategic choices often involve multiple criteria that conflict with one another, such as maximizing market impact while minimizing costs and implementation risks. Radwan et al. (2021) highlighted that decision-making processes are closely tied to evaluating alternatives under multiple criteria, reinforcing the need for structured methods that can integrate diverse considerations into a coherent selection.

Multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) provides a theoretical foundation for addressing such complexities. MCDM refers to approaches designed to evaluate and prioritize alternatives when multiple criteria must be considered. In marketing and strategy contexts, MCDM is useful because decision-makers rarely select strategies based on a single indicator. Instead, strategies must be assessed based on feasibility, expected impact, resource requirements, time-to-implement, risk exposure, and alignment with organizational capabilities. Radwan et al. (2021) further illustrated how MCDM tools can combine criteria weighting and alternative ranking, supporting rational prioritization when criteria conflict. This perspective fits strategic planning problems in which organizations must choose among multiple plausible marketing strategies, each offering distinct benefits and trade-offs.

A key contribution of MCDM to strategic management is the enhancement of transparency, reproducibility, and accountability in decision-making processes. Wei (2025) argues that many traditional evaluation approaches remain overly qualitative and may lack transparency and sensitivity to differences among the criteria. When strategic decisions rely heavily on heuristic judgment, it becomes difficult to justify why one alternative was chosen over another and harder to learn from outcomes. MCDM approaches address this by making the evaluation criteria explicit, assigning weights to represent strategic priorities, and calculating scores that reveal how alternatives compare. This does not eliminate managerial judgment, but disciplines it by forcing clarity about priorities and documenting the logic of selection. In

organizational settings where multiple stakeholders influence decision outcomes, such transparency can improve internal alignment and strengthen the commitment to implementation.

Within the family of MCDM tools, the Weighted Scoring Model (WSM) is among the most widely used owing to its practicality and interpretability. The WSM evaluates alternatives by assigning weights to the criteria based on their importance and scoring each alternative against these criteria. The weighted scores were then aggregated to generate an overall ranking. This structure is especially relevant for marketing strategy selection because marketing strategies often compete along dimensions such as expected lead generation, conversion likelihood, resource intensity, implementation complexity, and compatibility with existing organizational processes. [Radwan et al. \(2021\)](#) reinforced the relevance of structured weighting and ranking methods by emphasizing that real-world decisions frequently require comparing alternatives under multiple conflicting criteria. In addition, WSM supports managerial accountability by providing a defensible rationale for prioritizing one strategy over another, addressing concerns regarding qualitative over-reliance in strategic evaluation ([Wei, 2025](#)).

In applied strategic research, WSM is often positioned as an extension of diagnostic tools such as SWOT and TOWS. SWOT and TOWS are valuable because they translate internal and external analyses into strategic alternatives by connecting strengths and weaknesses to opportunities and threats. However, these frameworks typically generate multiple options rather than selecting the single best strategy. Without a formal selection mechanism, organizations may choose strategies based on their preferences, politics, or incomplete evidence. Incorporating WSM enables researchers and practitioners to move from strategy generation to strategy prioritization by scoring alternatives against criteria that align with organizational objectives ([Porcu et al., 2017](#)). In the context of a firm seeking to stabilize and improve client acquisition performance, this step is critical because it ensures that the recommended strategies are not only plausible but also comparatively superior according to explicit strategic priorities.

The conceptual logic emerging from this literature supports an integrated research framework that begins with internal and external diagnosis, generates strategic alternatives, and selects the most appropriate option through structured decision tools. Internal analysis, supported by Likert-scale measurement and marketing alignment lenses such as STP and the marketing mix, clarifies organizational strengths and weaknesses and reveals gaps in execution that may contribute to inconsistent acquisition outcomes. The Likert Scale's ability to quantify perceptions and attitudes provides empirical grounding for internal capability assessment, consistent with its role in converting qualitative judgments into quantitative indicators ([Joshi et al., 2015](#)) and its foundational development ([Likert, 1932](#)). External analysis, structured through PESTLE and competitor analysis, clarifies how macro forces and competitive dynamics shape adoption drivers, risks, and differentiation opportunities. Together, these analyses enable the robust identification of strategic alternatives via SWOT and TOWS, ensuring that options reflect both internal capability and external fit. The final step, grounded in business decision-making theory and MCDM, addresses the core strategic challenge of selecting among multiple alternatives under constraints. By recognizing that strategy selection involves balancing conflicting criteria and requires structured evaluation, the literature justifies the use of MCDM and tools such as the WSM. The emphasis on multi-criteria evaluation in real decision environments ([Radwan et al., 2021](#)) and the critique of overly qualitative, non-reproducible evaluation practices ([Wei, 2025](#)) collectively support a decision framework that is transparent, systematic, and aligned with organizational priorities. In practical terms, this approach enables a company to justify why one marketing strategy is prioritized, align internal stakeholders around clear criteria, and reduce the likelihood that strategy selection becomes disconnected from measurable objectives, such as client acquisition consistency and market penetration.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design and Framework

This study employs a mixed-method case study design to develop strategic recommendations for PT Mataer Digital Nusantara (MDN). The research process began by defining the focal business problem: inconsistent sales performance and persistent difficulty in meeting targeted client acquisition. Based on this problem definition, this study formulates research objectives and questions to guide the selection of

data sources, analytical frameworks, and expected strategic outputs. The overall framework integrates internal and external strategic diagnoses, strategy formulation, and strategy selection. Internal and external findings are consolidated into SWOT to generate strategic alternatives through TOWS, which are then prioritized using a multi-criteria decision-making approach via a Weighted Scoring Model (WSM).

3.2. Data Sources and Collection Procedures

Data collection combined primary and secondary sources to ensure contextual depth and analytical rigor. Primary data were collected through interviews and a structured internal questionnaire to capture employees' perspectives on marketing execution, strategic alignment, and organizational readiness. The questionnaire used a 1–5 Likert scale to measure perceptions across seven domains: understanding and communication of strategy, strategy implementation, strategy performance evaluation, internal factors, external factors, strategic decision making, and general perceptions and recommendations. Open-ended questions were included to obtain qualitative insights on strengths, pricing versus value, areas for improvement, and suggested future directions. Secondary data were obtained from internal company reports and supporting documentation, official higher education databases (including PDDIKTI demographic and geographic information), policy and regulatory documents (Kemendikbudristek, LLDIKTI, BANPT), competitor websites and public product documentation, and relevant market and industry reports. These sources support market mapping, external scanning and competitor benchmarking.

3.3. Population and Sampling

The internal population consisted of MDN employees directly involved in marketing, sales, product development, and client management activities. The internal sample included 15 respondents, selected because their roles provided direct exposure to strategy execution and client acquisition processes. The external population comprises higher education institutions (HEIs) in Indonesia, including decision-making units typically involved in academic information system adoption, such as academic affairs, admissions, public relations, cooperation/partnership offices, finance units, and institutional leadership. External analysis is primarily conducted at the institutional level using secondary datasets and company records rather than direct surveys of HEI representatives. Particular analytical attention is directed to mid-tier and lower-ranked institutions that have not yet implemented integrated academic information systems, as they represent the core prospective adopter segment for the MDN's SIAKAD platform.

3.4. Analytical Methods

Quantitative and qualitative analyses were conducted in parallel and then integrated to support strategy formulation and selection. Quantitative analysis was applied to the Likert-scale survey data by calculating the mean scores for each item and aggregating the results into predefined assessment categories. Perception levels were interpreted using the following mean score ranges: 4.21–5.00 (Very Good), 3.41–4.20 (good), 2.61–3.40 (fair), 1.81–2.60 (poor), and 1.00–1.80 (Very Poor). These results provide measurable indicators of internal strategic performance, marketing execution quality, product and pricing perception, and organizational readiness. Quantitative outputs are also used as evidence to support the identification of internal strengths and weaknesses for the SWOT analysis.

Qualitative analysis was conducted through thematic interpretation of interview notes, open-ended survey responses, internal documents, and external secondary sources. Thematic coding was used to extract recurring patterns related to product value, pricing logic, marketing communication, organizational capability, and strategic direction. External qualitative analysis is structured through PESTLE and competitor analyses. PESTLE examines the political, economic, social, technological, legal, and environmental factors influencing EdTech adoption in Indonesian higher education. Competitor analysis benchmarks rival offerings by comparing product features, pricing models, positioning messages, and promotional tactics based on publicly available information and market reports.

3.5. Strategy Formulation and Selection

Internal and external findings are integrated into a SWOT framework to map the MDN's strengths and weaknesses against opportunities and threats in the higher education digital solutions market. The

SWOT results are then translated into strategic alternatives using a TOWS matrix, producing options that leverage strengths to exploit opportunities, use strengths to mitigate threats, address weaknesses by exploiting opportunities, and minimize weaknesses to avoid threats. To move beyond strategy generation toward strategy prioritization, this study applies a Weighted Scoring Model (WSM) in the final decision stage. Evaluation criteria are defined (e.g., expected impact, feasibility, resource requirements, implementation complexity, and risk exposure), weights are assigned to reflect their relative importance, and each strategic alternative is scored based on the criteria. Weighted totals were calculated to rank the alternatives objectively. The strategy with the highest overall score was selected as the recommended approach and subsequently translated into implementation steps to improve client acquisition performance and support sustainable growth in the Indonesian higher-education technology sector.

3.6. Ethical and Practical Considerations

Primary data collection was limited to internal respondents and focused on perceptions of strategy and execution rather than sensitive personal information. Secondary data were drawn from official databases, policy documents, and publicly accessible competitor materials to support reproducibility and reduce bias.

4. RESULT

This section reports the findings from the internal and external strategic analyses of PT Mataer Digital Nusantara (MDN) and synthesizes them into SWOT, TOWS, and strategy prioritization outcomes. The results are presented in sequence from internal diagnosis (7Ps, STP, and internal survey), external diagnosis (competitors and PESTLE), integrated strategic position (SWOT with IFAS–EFAS), and strategy selection using a Weighted Scoring Model.

4.1. Internal analysis results

4.1.1. Marketing mix performance (7Ps)

The 7Ps assessment indicates that the MDN’s marketing execution for the SIAKAD platform is generally strong. All dimensions recorded mean scores above 4.00, placing them in the “Good” to “Very Good” categories. The highest score was for Physical Evidence (4.55), followed by Price (4.45), reflecting strong perceived credibility and cost competitiveness. (See [Table 1](#))

Table 1. Results of Marketing Mix (7Ps) Analysis at PT Mataer Digital Nusantara

No	Marketing Mix Variable (7Ps)	Questionnaire Item	Mean Score	Category
1	Product	Q18	4.27	Good
2	Price	Q19, Q40	4.45	Very Good
3	Place (Distribution)	Q11	4.18	Good
4	Promotion	Q2, Q23	4.27	Very Good
5	People	Q17, Q8	4.18	Good
6	Process	Q7, Q9	4.23	Very Good
7	Physical Evidence	Q23	4.55	Very Good

Source: Processed by the Researcher (2026)

4.1.2. Segmentation, targeting, and positioning (STP)

The STP results show a stronger performance for Targeting than Segmentation and Positioning. Targeting achieved a “Very Good” mean score (4.34), indicating a clear prioritization of market segments with strong adoption potential. Segmentation is comparatively weaker (3.87), suggesting that market grouping criteria may not fully reflect differences in institutional digital readiness and capacity.

The internal synthesis classifies most of the evaluated dimensions as strengths. The strongest dimensions were Physical Evidence (4.55), Price (4.45), and Targeting (4.34). Two dimensions were classified as weaknesses: Segmentation (3.87) and General Perception (3.90), indicating the need to refine segmentation criteria and strengthen shared internal confidence/consistency regarding strategic direction and outcomes.

4.1.3. Internal strategic survey results

The internal strategic survey produced an overall mean score of 4.17 (“Good”). The strongest dimensions are Strategy Implementation (4.32), Strategic Decision-Making (4.31), and External Factors (4.24), all categorized as “Very Good.” General Perception and Recommendations were the lowest (3.93), signaling the need to improve internal alignment on strategic evaluation and follow-through.

4.2. External analysis results

4.2.1. Competitor comparison

The competitor comparison highlights MDN’s relative advantages of MDN in terms of flexible pricing, intensive implementation support, automation of PDDIKTI/Neo Feeder reporting, customization, UI/UX simplicity, mobile availability, open API integration, microservices architecture, and free continuous updates. Competitors demonstrate limitations in flexibility (Ecampuz) or rely more on package-based pricing and restricted features (SEVIMA), while also benefiting from an established market presence (See Table 2)

Table 2. Competitor Comparison Analysis of Academic Information Systems

Analysis Aspect	Mataer Digital (SIKAD 4.0)	SEVIMA (Siakadcloud)	Ecampuz (UGM Group)
Pricing Scheme	Flexible pricing based on active students; installment payment options; highly suitable for small–medium institutions	Package-based pricing; relatively higher cost depending on student volume	Affordable pricing; limited modules and basic features
Implementation & Training	Direct implementation by internal technical team; intensive assistance via Zoom, WhatsApp, and live training	Standard implementation and training provided by technical team	Initial training only at early contract stage
PDDIKTI Reporting	Fully integrated with Neo Feeder; automatic validation and data import provided free of charge	Integrated with Neo Feeder; manual validation still required	Integrated with Neo Feeder; manual synchronization process
Service & Support	Dedicated campus coordination groups; daily support via chat, WhatsApp, and Zoom	Live chat and consultation forum; formal service structure	Basic WhatsApp support during working hours
System Flexibility	Highly customizable based on campus-specific needs	Customization limited to additional paid modules	Very limited customization
User Interface (UI/UX)	Modern, simple, and user-friendly for operators, lecturers, students, and parents	Complex and formal interface; less intuitive for new users	Classic and outdated interface design
Mobile Application	Available on Android and iOS; supports notifications and academic activities	Available on Android only	Available on Android and iOS
Open API Integration	Available; supports integration with ERP, LMS, and financial systems	Not available	Not available
System Infrastructure	Microservices architecture; isolated module failure does not affect entire system	Monolithic architecture; system-wide impact during errors	Monolithic architecture
Learning Community	Exclusive training programs and active user community	Periodic webinars; limited user community	Initial training without continuous community
Continuous Development	Free regular updates and maintenance	Updates require additional packages	Updates not included
Customization	Fully customizable including campus branding	Limited customization	Almost no customization

Feature Limitation	No feature restriction; full access for all clients	Features restricted based on subscription package	Many features available as add-ons
Day-to-Day Technical Support	Daily direct technical assistance	Support based on SLA	Basic support for active clients
Technology Architecture	Microservices-based	Monolithic-based	Monolithic-based
Average Cost per Student / Month	IDR 3,000	IDR 4,500 – 25,000	IDR 10,000
Mobile Application Rating	4.7 / 5	4.2 / 5	4.0 / 5

Source: Processed by the researcher (2026)

4.2.2. PESTLE conditions

The PESTLE analysis indicates a generally favorable macroenvironment driven by government digitalization initiatives and mandatory reporting requirements. The key constraints are regulatory volatility, procurement bureaucracy (especially in public universities), uneven institutional IT capability, and cultural resistance among senior stakeholders. Technology trends (AI, cloud, API integration) create feature development opportunities while intensifying competition (See [Table 3](#))

Table 3. PESTLE Analysis of Academic Information System Industry in Indonesia

Factor	Key Environmental Issues
Political	Government policies issued by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology and LLDIKTI strongly promote campus digitalization, in line with Industry 4.0 initiatives. Academic reporting and accreditation processes are increasingly conducted through digital platforms, encouraging universities to adopt the SIAKAD system. However, frequent changes in government regulations and accreditation standards require rapid system adaptation by vendors. In public universities, lengthy bureaucratic procedures and internal campus politics often slow down purchasing decisions. In addition, unclear internal regulations and decrees related to digital workflows may delay the implementation of the system.
Economic	University financial capacity varies significantly, with many institutions operating on limited budgets. Despite this condition, the subscription-based pricing of Mataer SIAKAD remains relatively affordable for schools. National economic fluctuations, such as inflation, IT costs, and exchange rates, have a limited impact on subscription pricing. Financing partnerships with financial institutions enable broader market penetration. However, limited campus IT staff and financial resources increase the dependence on intensive after-sales support.
Social	Students generally adapt quickly to digital academic systems, whereas senior lecturers and top management tend to resist transitioning from manual processes. Hierarchical and administrative campus cultures often slow down digital transformation without strong internal policies. Universities aiming to become world-class institutions show greater openness to innovation. Data security concerns remain an important consideration for institutions. In addition, limited proactive communication from campuses regarding system issues may reduce the effectiveness of the implementation.

Technological	Rapid technological development in artificial intelligence, cloud computing, APIs, and big data creates opportunities for advanced SIAKAD feature enhancements. Most universities possess adequate Internet infrastructure and basic digital capabilities, enabling cloud-based system adoption without complex installation. Cybersecurity risks remain, although Mataer systems apply encryption standards appropriate for institutional use. Competitors offering integrated LMS, ERP, and AI-based solutions influence the direction of product development. Nevertheless, many campuses still prefer human-based technical support to fully automated systems.
Legal	The enactment of the Personal Data Protection Law (UU PDP) has increased compliance requirements for academic data management systems. Cooperation agreements, such as MoUs and PKS, regulate the rights and obligations of vendors and institutions. Accreditation standards established by BAN-PT and LAM must be reflected in academic system features. Inconsistent regulatory updates from higher education authorities pose operational challenges. PT Mataer Digital Nusantara continuously adjusts system security and licensing to comply with the prevailing regulations.
Environmental	The adoption of paperless academic administration supports operational efficiency and reduces paper consumption on campuses. The implementation of cloud-based servers does not significantly increase carbon emissions. Digital academic systems contribute to the application of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles. However, universities rarely communicate environmental benefits strategically and often limit them to basic paperless claims.

4.3. Integrated strategic position

4.3.1. SWOT synthesis

The SWOT analysis consolidates internal strengths in pricing flexibility, professional platform credibility, and cross-division strategy execution with external opportunities from government digitalization and financing partnerships. Weaknesses are concentrated in segmentation adaptiveness and inconsistent internal strategic perception/evaluation issues. Primary threats include procurement bureaucracy, limited campus IT resources, and competitors with stronger brand recognition and institutional networks (Gürel & Tat, 2017). (See Table 4)

Table 4. SWOT Analysis of PT Mataer Digital Nusantara

Category	Key Factors	Source
Strengths	S1 – Competitive and flexible pricing adjusted to the number of active students, supporting small- and medium-sized institutions.	Marketing Mix (Price)
	S2: Professional corporate image and system appearance reflecting high service quality.	Marketing Mix (Physical Evidence)
	S3 – Consistent strategy execution across divisions, supported by effective leadership and operational systems.	STP Analysis
Weaknesses	W1 – Internal perceptions regarding strategic direction and outcomes remain inconsistent, indicating the need for periodic strategy evaluation.	Internal Survey (General Perception)
	W2 – The market segmentation strategy has not fully adapted to changes in campus readiness and market dynamics.	STP Analysis (Segmentation)
	W3 – Strategic performance evaluation has not been optimally utilized as a basis for decision-making, resulting in inconsistent outcomes.	Internal Survey

Opportunities	O1 – Government support for campus digitalization increases demand for academic information systems.	PESTLE Analysis
	O2 – Financing partnerships with financial institutions facilitate system adoption among budget-limited universities.	PESTLE Analysis
	O3 – Competitive pricing enables market penetration into small- and medium-sized institutions despite domination by major vendors.	Competitor Analysis
Threats	T1 – Campus bureaucracy and internal political dynamics delay purchasing and digital transformation decisions.	PESTLE Analysis
	T2 – Limited campus IT staff and preference for manual assistance reduce system-implementation efficiency.	PESTLE Analysis
	T3 – Strong competitors possess extensive networks and brand recognition, particularly in large and publicly funded universities.	Competitor Analysis

Source: Processed by the Researcher (2026)

4.3.2. IFAS and EFAS outcomes

The IFAS results show a high internal capability profile with a total IFAS score of 6.02, indicating that strengths outweigh weaknesses (Table 5)

Table 5. Internal Factor Analysis Summary (IFAS)

Code	Internal Factors	Rating	Weight	Weighted Score
Strengths				
S1	Competitive and flexible pricing strategy (7P – Price)	4.55	0.1	0.46
S2	Effective strategy implementation across departments	4.45	0.1	0.45
S3	Strong product features and functionality (7P – Product)	4.34	0.1	0.43
S4	Professional system appearance and corporate image (7P – Physical Evidence)	4.31	0.1	0.43
S5	Accurate targeting strategy (STP)	4.3	0.1	0.43
S6	Effective strategic decision-making process	4.27	0.1	0.43
S7	Strong promotional activities (7P – Promotion)	4.27	0.1	0.43
S8	Positive perception of external strategic awareness	4.23	0.1	0.42
S9	Efficient operational processes (7P – Process)	4.22	0.1	0.42
S10	Supportive internal organizational factors	4.2	0.1	0.42
	Total Strength Score			4.32
Weaknesses				
W1	Limited distribution channels (7P – Place)	4.18	0.06	0.25
W2	Human resource capability gaps (7P – People)	4.18	0.06	0.25
W3	Positioning clarity requires improvement (STP)	4.12	0.06	0.25
W4	Inconsistent strategy communication	4.12	0.06	0.25
W5	Strategy performance evaluation not fully optimized	4.05	0.06	0.24
W6	Segmentation accuracy requires refinement	3.87	0.06	0.23
W7	General perception and recommendation consistency	3.9	0.06	0.23
	Total Weakness Score			1.7

Total IFAS Score				6.02
------------------	--	--	--	------

Source: Processed by the Researcher (2026)

The EFAS results show an even more favorable external landscape with a total EFAS score of 6.76, indicating that opportunities outweigh threats. (See Table 6)

Table 6. External Factor Analysis Summary (EFAS)

Code	External Factors	Weight	Rating	Weighted Score
Opportunities				
O1	Government support for campus digitalization (Industry 4.0)	0.1	4.5	0.45
O2	Mandatory digital academic reporting and accreditation	0.1	4.4	0.44
O3	Financing partnerships supporting market penetration	0.1	4.35	0.44
O4	Openness of world-class universities to innovation	0.08	4.2	0.34
O5	Advancement of AI, cloud, API, and big data technologies	0.1	4.5	0.45
O6	Paperless campus initiative supporting ESG implementation	0.07	4.1	0.29
O7	Competitive pricing enabling SME university penetration	0.1	4.4	0.44
O8	Competitors' limited flexibility creates differentiation opportunity	0.1	4.3	0.43
O9	Cross-platform integration trend	0.08	4.2	0.34
O10	High mobile application rating supports testimonial-based promotion	0.07	4.1	0.29
Total Opportunity Score				4.31
Threats				
T1	Frequent regulatory and accreditation changes	0.08	3.8	0.3
T2	Campus bureaucracy and internal politics	0.08	3.7	0.3
T3	Unclear internal campus regulations	0.07	3.6	0.25
T4	Limited campus IT human resources	0.08	3.8	0.3
T5	Intensive after-sales service dependency	0.07	3.6	0.25
T6	Hierarchical organizational culture	0.07	3.5	0.25
T7	Competitors imitating system innovations	0.07	3.6	0.25
T8	Strong competitors with extensive institutional networks	0.08	3.8	0.3
T9	Resistance from senior lecturers and management	0.07	3.5	0.25
Total Threat Score				2.45
Total EFAS Score				6.76

Source: Processed by the Researcher (2026)

4.3.3. Strategy formulation results (TOWS) and proposed business solutions

The TOWS analysis produced four groups of strategic alternatives by combining internal strengths and weaknesses with external opportunities and threats. Overall, the matrix indicates that MDN can increase the adoption of SIAKAD by simultaneously leveraging its pricing and platform credibility, correcting segmentation and internal alignment gaps, differentiating its technology and onboarding model

against competitors and institutional barriers, and strengthening governance routines to reduce execution risk.

For the Strength–Opportunity (SO) set, the strategies focus on scaling market penetration by capitalizing on favorable external conditions, particularly the national momentum for campus digitalization. First, the MDN can expand its penetration among small- and medium-sized higher education institutions by leveraging flexible and competitive pricing structures that match institutional budget realities while aligning with digitalization policy requirements (SO1). Second, the MDN can strengthen institutional trust by emphasizing the platform’s professional appearance, reliability, and proven compliance with academic reporting standards—factors that are highly influential in institutional decision-making (SO2). Third, the MDN can optimize financing partnerships with banking and educational funding institutions to reduce adoption barriers for budget-constrained campuses and accelerate conversion rates (SO3).

For the Weakness–Opportunity (WO) set, the strategies aim to correct internal limitations by using external policy momentum as a catalyst for improvement. The MDN can redesign its segmentation model based on institutional size, digital readiness, accreditation requirements, and financial capacity to improve targeting accuracy and reduce wasted marketing efforts (WO1). In addition, the MDN can strengthen internal strategic communication by aligning messaging and objectives with government-driven digital transformation initiatives, thereby improving employee understanding and consistency across teams (WO2). Finally, the MDN can use the current national push for digital education to reinforce strategic performance evaluation mechanisms, ensuring that learning from implementation outcomes is converted into better decisions and more stable acquisition performance (WO3).

For the Strength–Threat (ST) set, the strategies use the MDN’s existing capabilities to counter competitive pressure and institutional barriers to adoption. MDN can differentiate the SIAKAD platform by highlighting its high customization capacity, open API integration, and microservices-based architecture, positioning these as advantages over stronger competitors and more rigid systems (ST1). MDN can also strengthen personalized technical assistance and intensive onboarding support to navigate campus bureaucracy and address resistance to digital transformation, which often slows down implementation and reduces satisfaction (ST2). In addition, MDN can emphasize full-feature access and cost efficiency as a competitive advantage over package-based pricing models that restrict features and increase the effective total cost of ownership (ST3).

For the Weakness–Threat (WT) set, strategies concentrate on reducing vulnerability by improving internal governance and operational efficiency. MDN can institutionalize periodic strategic reviews to keep the organizational direction aligned with market dynamics and regulatory changes, preventing drift and reactive decision-making (WT1). MDN can also focus on market development in private and mid-tier universities to avoid the strongest competitive pressure, which is typically concentrated in large public institutions dominated by established vendors (WT2). Finally, the MDN can improve internal operational efficiency and cross-functional coordination to reduce dependency on highly personalized support models, which can be difficult to scale and may constrain growth when resources are limited (WT3).

4.3.4. Business solutions derived from strategic analysis

Based on the strategic issues identified, the proposed business solutions concentrate on five priorities: accelerating penetration in the small and medium higher-education institution segment through pricing and financing mechanisms; improving targeting accuracy through segmentation redesign; strengthening differentiation through platform architecture and integration capability; reducing operational burden through scalable onboarding; and reinforcing strategic governance through KPI-based evaluation.

First, limited market penetration among small and medium universities is addressed by focusing on the barriers to adoption. The strategic objective is to increase the adoption rate in the SME-university segment. To achieve this, MDN should implement flexible subscription packages and pair them with financing partnerships, enabling budget-constrained campuses to adopt SIAKAD with lower upfront costs. This recommendation is grounded in the integrated findings from SWOT, IFAS, EFAS, and the TOWS SO strategy set.

Second, the results indicate that the MDN's segmentation strategy is not yet sufficiently adaptive to institutional diversity in terms of readiness and constraints. Its objective is to improve the accuracy of customer targeting. The proposed solution is to redesign the segmentation model using clearer criteria, such as institutional size, accreditation level, and digital readiness, so that targeting and value propositions can be matched more precisely to each segment's needs. This direction is supported by the SWOT, IFAS, and TOWS WO strategy sets.

Third, strong competition from established vendors requires the MDN to strengthen its competitive differentiation beyond pricing. The objective is to create a more defensible differentiation in the market. The proposed solution is to enhance platform customization, expand open API integration, and reinforce the microservices-based architecture so that the system is perceived as more flexible, scalable, and integration-ready than competing platforms. This recommendation is derived from competitor analysis and the TOWS ST strategy.

Fourth, the MDN's growth is constrained by its high dependency on intensive after-sales support, which can be difficult to scale as the client base expands. The objective of this study is to improve operational efficiency without reducing service quality. The proposed solution is to develop a structured onboarding system complemented by knowledge-based support modules (e.g., standardized onboarding roadmaps, documentation, tutorials, and self-service troubleshooting), allowing support to become more scalable and less dependent on continuous, manual intervention. This solution is informed by the EFAS and TOWS WT strategy set.

Fifth, the analysis highlights inconsistent internal strategy evaluation, which contributes to uneven outcomes over time. The objective of this study is to strengthen strategic governance. The proposed solution is to implement periodic strategy reviews and KPI-based performance evaluations, ensuring that strategy execution is monitored systematically and adjusted using measurable evidence rather than ad hoc judgments. This recommendation is grounded in the IFAS and TOWS WT strategy sets.

Overall, these results align with prior studies emphasizing that digital transformation and digital marketing capabilities play central roles in strengthening competitiveness and supporting market expansion (Syahrani and Fasa, 2025; Wijayanto et al., 2024; Rawat et al., 2022; Fuadiy et al., 2025).

4.3.5. Strategy selection results using Weighted Scoring Model

Five criteria were applied to prioritize the proposed strategies using a weighted-scoring approach. The highest weight was assigned to the impact on client acquisition (0.30), followed by the feasibility of implementation (0.25) and resource requirement/cost efficiency (0.20). Strategic alignment with company goals was weighted at 0.15, and risk exposure received the lowest weight (0.10). The weighting structure reflects a decision emphasis on strategies that can most directly improve acquisition outcomes while remaining implementable and cost effective.

The weighted scoring results ranked SO1 as the highest-priority strategy, with a total score of 4.35, followed by SO2, with a total score of 4.05. WO1 (3.75) and ST1 (3.55) were positioned as secondary priorities. Overall, the ranking supports a primary focus on market penetration that leverages flexible pricing and aligns with national digitalization momentum while still recognizing the importance of strengthening trust signals (SO2) and improving segmentation and differentiation as complementary efforts. The use of a structured multi-criteria evaluation aligns with the decision-making rationale emphasized by Radwan et al. (2021) and Wei (2025).

Internal factor weighting further indicates that MDN's strengths of the MDN are more dominant than its weaknesses. The total weighted strength score is 2.94, driven by consistently high ratings across key capability areas, including pricing (7P), strategy implementation, product capability (7P), physical evidence (7P), targeting (STP), and strategic decision-making. Additional strength contributions come from promotion (7P), external factor awareness, process (7P), and internal factors, suggesting that the organization has a strong operational and marketing foundation for executing growth-oriented strategies. In comparison, the total weighted weakness score was 1.68, indicating that weaknesses were present but were less influential overall than strengths. The weaknesses are distributed across place/distribution, people/human resources, positioning and segmentation (STP), strategy communication, strategy performance evaluation, and general perception and recommendations. This pattern suggests that the

primary improvement needs are not in core product value or pricing, but in sharpening market definition, strengthening communication consistency, and improving evaluation routines to stabilize the outcomes. Following strategy selection, the study translates the top strategic direction (SO1 as the main priority) into an implementation roadmap using the 5W+1H framework. The plan operationalizes the strategy through seven programs: a flexible pricing and financing program (Q1–Q2 2026) to reduce adoption barriers; a market segmentation redesign (Q1 2026) to improve targeting accuracy; product customization and API enhancement (Q2–Q3 2026) to strengthen differentiation and integration readiness; a structured client onboarding program (Q2–Q4 2026) to reduce dependence on intensive manual support; and a digital marketing and testimonial campaign (Q2–Q4 2026) to strengthen visibility and institutional trust. To ensure sustainability and internal alignment, the roadmap also includes a quarterly strategic performance review system supported by KPI dashboards and management reviews, as well as an internal capability development program throughout 2026, focusing on training, product knowledge, and cross-functional coordination.

5. CONCLUSION

This study examined how PT Mataer Digital Nusantara (MDN) can strengthen integrated marketing communication and strategic decision-making to address inconsistent client acquisition for the SIAKAD 4.0 platform in Indonesia's rapidly digitalizing higher-education sector. Using a mixed-method case study design, the research combined internal diagnostics (Likert-based internal survey, STP, and the 7Ps marketing mix) with external scanning (PESTLE and competitor analysis) and synthesized the evidence through SWOT and TOWS to generate strategic alternatives (Gürel & Tat, 2017). To move beyond strategy generation and ensure an accountable choice under constraints, this study applied a multi-criteria decision-making approach using a Weighted Scoring Model, reflecting the need to evaluate alternatives under multiple competing criteria (Radwan et al., 2021; Wei, 2025).

The results indicate that MDN's internal foundation is largely strong, particularly in terms of pricing competitiveness, professional platform credibility, and the ability to execute strategy across divisions. Targeting performance is also favorable, suggesting that the MDN prioritizes segments with adoption potential. However, two internal gaps are consistently visible: segmentation remains insufficiently adaptive to differences in institutional readiness, and internal strategic evaluation and shared perceptions require strengthening to reduce the volatility of execution outcomes. Externally, the macro-environment is broadly supportive because of government-driven digitalization and mandatory reporting pressures, while the main obstacles are regulatory volatility, procurement bureaucracy, uneven campus IT capacity, and competitors with stronger branding and institutional networks.

Based on TOWS and weighted prioritization, the most robust strategic direction is market penetration among small and medium institutions through flexible pricing aligned with national digitalization momentum, reinforced by trust-building messages regarding compliance and reliability. Complementary priorities include redesigning segmentation criteria, strengthening differentiation through customization and open API/microservices positioning, standardizing onboarding to reduce dependence on intensive support, and institutionalizing KPI-based strategic reviews. Practically, these directions translate into an actionable 5W+1H roadmap covering pricing and financing programs, segmentation redesign, product/API enhancement, onboarding standardization, testimonial-driven digital marketing, governance routines and capability development.

Ethical Approval

Not Applicable

Informed Consent Statement

Not Applicable

Authors' Contributions

Not Applicable

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Data Availability Statement

The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author due to privacy reasons.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Notes on Contributors

Dini Fallah

Dini Fallah is affiliated with School of Business and Management, Institute Teknologi Bandung

Pri Hermawan

Pri Hermawan is affiliated with School of Business and Management, Institute Teknologi Bandung

REFERENCES

- Astuti, H. M., Wibowo, R. P., & Herdiyanti, A. (2024). Towards the national higher education database in Indonesia: Challenges to data governance implementation from the perspective of a public university. *Procedia Computer Science*, 234, 1322–1331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2024.03.130>
- Benavides, L. M. C., Tamayo Arias, J. A., Arango Serna, M. D., Branch Bedoya, J. W., & Burgos, D. (2020). Digital transformation in higher education institutions: A systematic literature review. *Sensors*, 20(11), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s20113291>
- Cortez, R. M., Clarke, A. H., & Freytag, P. V. (2021). B2B market segmentation: A systematic review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 126, 415–428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.12.070>
- Fuadiy, M. R., Rozi, M. A. F., Arafah, N. N., Kamal, L., & Sunoko, A. (2025). Mapping the digital transformation of education in Indonesia from 2012 to early 2025: A bibliometric analysis of Scopus-indexed publications. *Journal of Education Research and Policy*, 3(2), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.70376/jerp.v3i2.390>
- Gürel, E., & Tat, M. (2017). SWOT analysis: A theoretical review. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 10(51), 994–1006. <https://doi.org/10.17719/jisr.2017.1832>
- Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D. K. (2015). Likert scale: Explored and explained. *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 7(4), 396–403. <https://doi.org/10.9734/BJAST/2015/14975>
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 1–55. https://legacy.voteview.com/pdf/Likert_1932.pdf
- Porcu, L., del Barrio-García, S., & Kitchen, P. J. (2017). Measuring integrated marketing communication by taking a broad organisational approach: The firm-wide IMC scale. *European Journal of Marketing*, 51(3), 692–718. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-08-2015-0587>

- Radwan, N. M., Elstohy, R., & Hanna, W. K. (2021). A proposed method for multi-criteria group decision making: An application to site selection. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, 35(7), 505–519. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08839514.2021.1901031>
- Rawat, B., Sunarya, P. A., & Devana, V. T. (2022). Digital marketing as a strategy to improve higher education promotion during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Upneur Business Digital (SABDA)*, 1(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.34306/sabda.v1i2.105>
- Steinhoff, L., et al. (2025). Subscription/bundling (add-on) strategies and customer outcomes. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-025-01088-3>
- Syahrani, S., & Fasa, M. I. (2025). Transformasi digital dalam pemasaran: Peran digital marketing dalam meningkatkan daya saing e-business. *Jurnal Media Akademik (JMA)*, 3(4), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.62281>
- Tang, Y., & Mantrala, M. K. (2024). B2B segmentation: A systematic review and research agenda. *Industrial Marketing Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2024.04.005>
- Wei, Y.-M. (2025). A hybrid multi-criteria decision-making framework for the strategic evaluation of business development models. *Information*, 16(6), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info16060454>
- Wijayanto, H., Nursyamsi, I., Wahab, A., & Sultan, Z. (2024). Educational technology for digital transformation of higher education institutions into entrepreneurial universities. *Policy & Governance Review*, 8(3), 303–322. <https://doi.org/10.30589/pgr.v8i3.1019>