International Journal of Computer (IJC)

ISSN 2307-4523 (Print & Online)

https://ijcjournal.org/index.php/InternationalJournalOfComputer/index

Comparative Analysis of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods in Digital Product Design: Metrics, Data Validity, and Impact on Product Decisions

Volkodav Vladyslav*

Senior Product Designer, Betterme, Lithuania, Kaunas

Email:vvolkodav60@gmail.com

Abstract

The article is dedicated to examining how quantitative and qualitative research methods shape product decisions in digital design. The relevance lies in the growing pressure on teams to justify choices with evidence while navigating an abundance of data that often obscures user motivations. The novelty comes from treating these methods not as opposing paradigms but as interconnected ways of understanding experience, validity, and decision impact. The work describes how quantitative techniques frame behavior through measurable patterns and how qualitative approaches uncover interpretive depth, studied across multiple stages of the product lifecycle. Special attention is paid to the differences in how each method conceptualizes evidence and its uneven influence on strategic and operational choices. The work sets itself the task of clarifying their complementarities and the conditions under which they lead to more grounded decisions. Analytical and comparative methods are used to pursue this goal. A broad set of academic sources has been studied to reveal methodological contrasts and synthesis. The conclusion describes the benefits and limitations of integrating both approaches. The article will be useful for researchers, product designers, UX specialists, and analytics teams seeking more balanced methodological reasoning.

Keywords: quantitative research; qualitative research; digital product design; user behavior; data validity; mixed methods; decision-making; UX research; evidence-based design; product analytics.

Received: 10/25/2025
Accepted: 12/25/2025
Published: 1/3/2026

** Corresponding author.*

1. Introduction

Digital product teams often face a dilemma in choosing research methods: should decisions be guided by hard metrics or by human insights? The current landscape of product design highlights an uneasy tension between quantitative data analytics and qualitative user research [1,2]. Metrics from large user samples promise objectivity and scale, yet in practice, they can leave crucial context hidden in numbers. In contrast, interview-based studies and usability observations provide rich narratives behind user behavior, though their findings are sometimes dismissed as anecdotal.

The topic matters now because technology companies are awash in data but still risk misreading their users' needs – a paradox amplified by the push for data-driven product decisions. This article aims:

1) to explore how quantitative and qualitative methods differ in what they reveal (and conceal) about user experience,
2) to examine how each approach handles validity and evidence,
3) to assess their distinct impacts on product decisions.

The goal is not to advocate one over the other, but to better understand their interplay in real design scenarios. Such understanding is crucial as product teams seek reliable ways to balance metrics with meaning in making design choices.

2. Methods and materials

The section outlines the analytical foundation used to examine the interaction between quantitative and qualitative approaches in digital product design. The study draws on a set of academic contributions that explore validity, methodological assumptions, data-driven practice, and mixed-methods reasoning.The work of N. Pilcher and M. Cortazzi [1] investigates how quantitative and qualitative approaches reflect deeper assumptions about research values and disciplinary practices. The study of L. Leung [2] explores validity, reliability, and generalizability in qualitative analysis, offering criteria for assessing credibility in non-numeric evidence. The research of J. C. Quiñones-Gómez and his colleagues [3] examines data-driven design in product development and highlights tensions between analytical rigor and design intuition. The contribution of G. Winter [4] discusses contrasting notions of validity across methodological traditions. The work of T. Fessenden [5] illustrates how structured design knowledge influences decision-making processes. The study of A. Chhabra and S. Williams [6] analyze how organizations integrate data and design to strengthen innovation capabilities. The work of C. Fonseca [7] reflects on data-driven product growth practices. The study of Y. Liu [8] evaluates paradigmatic compatibility within mixed-methods research. The contribution of B. Lee and S. Ahmed-Kristensen [9] presents a data-driven design framework that connects evidence generation with product development processes.

To address the research goal, comparative analysis, source interpretation, synthesis of methodological concepts, and structural examination of mixed-methods integration were used. The section concludes that combining theoretical and empirical perspectives provides a grounded basis for understanding how metrics and meaning intersect in design practice.

3. Results

Product research methods sit on fundamentally different assumptions, and this divergence shapes the type of evidence they produce. Quantitative approaches reduce user experience to numeric representations – click counts, conversion rates, and task completion times. These numbers can be aggregated, compared, and subjected to statistical tests. The implicit promise is one of precision and generality: a metric like "time on task" carries an aura of objectivity, suggesting that findings will hold broadly across a user base. Qualitative methods, by contrast, capture the texture of experience through words, observations, and open-ended responses. A usability interview might yield a vivid quote about frustration with a confusing interface element. Such data resists quantification but provides meaning and depth. The two approaches have been conventionally cast as opposites – sometimes even warring paradigms in older literature [1,2]. Quantitative data are often described as numbers isolated from context, gathered under controlled conditions, whereas qualitative data emerge as narrative and context-bound evidence derived from natural usage or dialogue. These contrasting forms of evidence carry different kinds of validity. A controlled experiment on a new feature might show an increase in task success rate, which is statistically significant. Yet it may not explain why users succeeded more often. An ethnographic field observation might reveal subtle workflow adaptations by users, rich with insight into their motivations, but it cannot claim to represent all users. The key tension is apparent: quantitative metrics excel at indicating what is happening and how often, while qualitative insights dig into why it is happening [3]. Below is a systematization of approaches (Table 1).

Table 1: Comparative features of quantitative and qualitative research in digital product design (compiled by the author on the basis of [1, 2, 3, 4])

Dimension of inquiry	**Quantitative research**	**Qualitative research**
Nature of collected evidence	Numeric indicators derived from controlled measurement	Narrative, situational, and interaction-based material
Typical goals	Detect patterns, estimate magnitude, compare variants, support large-scale decisions	Reveal meanings, uncover motivations, interpret situated user behavior
Form of output	Metrics, statistical tests, dashboards	Themes, conceptual categories, user stories, experiential sequences
Underlying assumptions	Stability, reproducibility, and generalizability of observed behavior	Context-dependence, interpretive depth, multiplicity of meanings
Strengths for product design	Highlights where issues arise and how frequently	Clarifies why patterns occur and how users experience them

This difference in focus manifests in how each method defines a "valid" finding. Quantitative research is grounded in a positivist tradition that prizes reproducibility and generalizability. A result gains credibility if it can be measured objectively and shown to persist across large samples with minimal error [2]. In digital product terms, this might mean an A/B test where variant A consistently yields higher engagement than variant B at $p<0.05$ – a result considered valid because the probability of it being a random fluke is low. Qualitative research operates on an entirely different notion of validity, often described as credibility or trustworthiness. Here, validity depends on whether the interpretation rings true and captures the essence of the user experience in context [4]. A series of user interviews might be deemed credible if the themes identified feel resonant and make sense to participants or other stakeholders. Importantly, qualitative findings acknowledge subjectivity openly: the researcher's perspective and the participants' context are part of the data, not biases to eliminate. In fact, elements considered biases in a quantitative experiment (like a user's emotions or an interviewer's personal rapport) are treated as valuable data in qualitative work. A designer conducting contextual inquiry may note the hesitations or facial expressions of users as critical clues – aspects that a strictly quantitative approach might discard as noise. Thus, each approach has its own internal logic of what constitutes a meaningful, valid result. Below is a conceptual differentiation of validity criteria (Table 2).

Table 2: Forms of validity in quantitative and qualitative product research (compiled by the author on the basis of [2, 4])

Validity dimension	Quantitative interpretation	Qualitative interpretation
Basis of credibility	Statistical significance, measurement accuracy, and sample size adequacy	Coherence of interpretation, resonance with participants, and contextual adequacy
Treatment of researcher influence	Treated as bias to be minimized	Viewed as part of the meaning-making process
View of user variability	Noise to be controlled through sampling and standardization	Source of insight revealing the diversity of experience
Evidence evaluation	Replicability and numerical robustness	Depth and authenticity of user accounts

Quantitative validity is rooted in alignment with "the truth" in a measurable sense – did we measure the right thing accurately? Qualitative validity is more about authenticity – did we really understand the user's reality in a coherent way?

The divergence in method also leads to divergent insights for design decisions. Quantitative metrics often drive optimization decisions. If data shows that 60% of users drop off at a certain step in a mobile checkout flow, product managers gain a clear mandate to improve that step. The numbers flag an issue, though they leave open the question of why users drop off. Product teams frequently set target metrics (increase conversion by X%, reduce error rate to Y) and iterate on features to move those needles. The impact on decisions is typically toward measurable improvements: e.g., change a button color or placement if an experiment indicates a lift in clicks. One product example is the ubiquitous use of A/B testing in growth teams – small design tweaks are rolled out to a subset of users, and decisions are made by comparing metrics (click-through rates, retention) between variants. A statistically significant improvement means a "win," and the new design is adopted. This metric-driven approach yields incremental but objective gains. However, it also carries a risk: teams may prioritize what can be easily measured over what truly matters to user experience. There is a known tendency in data-driven cultures to focus on short-term numerical gains (like boosting a funnel conversion) while potentially overlooking qualitative feedback that the overall product concept is flawed or that users feel frustrated in ways not captured by metrics.

Qualitative research, on the other hand, tends to influence strategy and conceptual decisions more than fine-grained optimizations. Insights from user interviews or field studies might lead to a realization that the team has framed the wrong problem. For instance, a series of deep interviews might reveal that users don't understand the value proposition of a feature – a finding that no amount of UI metric tweaking will fix because the issue lies in the product concept or messaging. Such an insight can prompt a pivot or a fundamental redesign. Design personas and journey maps, common qualitative artifacts, help teams empathize with users, potentially shifting priorities (e.g., building trust features because users voiced concern about data privacy, even if usage metrics hadn't yet shown a problem). These types of decisions, influenced by qualitative understanding, often aim for long-term user satisfaction or alignment with user needs, which may not immediately reflect in any single metric. In essence, qualitative research impacts the direction of design (are we solving the right problem? Is this feature addressing a real user need?), whereas quantitative research fine-tunes the degree of success (how efficiently or frequently is the user able to do it?). Both impacts are crucial: one steers the ship, the other adjusts its speed [5].

Importantly, quantitative and qualitative methods each have blind spots where the other shines. Metrics can misleadingly suggest a design is performing well when, in truth, users might be dissatisfied. For example, a high engagement metric might look positive until qualitative feedback reveals that users are repeatedly clicking because they are confused (an outcome sometimes called the "quantitative trap" – assuming numbers mean what we think they mean). Conversely, qualitative studies can fall into the pit of compelling but isolated stories. A passionate user interview might convince designers of a widespread need that, in reality, only a niche group experiences. Without any supporting metrics, teams risk generalizing from a few voices that may not represent the majority. Many product failures can be traced to this misjudgment – either the team listened only to usage data and missed the underlying user sentiment, or they got carried away by anecdotal feedback and missed that the majority of behavior diverged from it. One famous internal motto in tech, "data beats opinion," captures the frustration engineers often feel when decisions seem swayed by the loudest user complaint rather than the bulk of behavioral data. Yet the inverse situation is equally problematic: for instance, a growth team might relentlessly optimize a signup flow to boost conversions by a few percentage points, only to later discover through usability sessions that users felt tricked or manipulated, eroding trust in the long run. Numbers alone did not capture that slow trust decay; it surfaced only when speaking to users face-to-face.

Recognizing these limitations, contemporary best practice in product design increasingly advocates a mixed-methods approach [6]. Rather than pitting quantitative against qualitative, savvy teams treat them as complementary. In one scenario, analytics data might flag an unexpected usage pattern – say, an unusually high drop-off on a settings page that was assumed to be straightforward. This quantitative signal becomes a starting hypothesis, and researchers then conduct follow-up qualitative inquiries to uncover the cause (perhaps the settings page uses jargon that users find confusing). Conversely, qualitative research might uncover a potential user need or pain point that hasn't yet been quantified. The team could then design a survey or instrument and some analytics to see how widespread that issue is. This interplay is essentially a form of triangulation, where multiple methods are applied to the same problem so that each method's weaknesses are offset by the others. In practical terms, many product decisions go through a cycle: explore with qual to generate hypotheses or ideas, validate at scale with quant, then explain or flesh out the numbers again with qual. Below is a synthesized representation of mixed-methods integration (Table 3).

Table 3: Integrated use of quantitative and qualitative methods across the product lifecycle (compiled by the author on the basis of [6, 7, 8, 9])

Lifecycle stage	Role of quantitative methods	Role of qualitative methods
Early discovery	Limited instrumentation, preliminary surveys for magnitude sensing	Exploratory interviews, contextual inquiry, and experience mapping
Development & testing	A/B experiments, feature instrumentation, behavioral funnels	Usability testing, concept probes, narrative walkthroughs
Post-launch iteration	Analytics dashboards, retention, and drop-off tracking	Follow-up interviews, diary studies, and evaluation of user sentiment
Strategic reframing	Trend analysis, cohort comparisons over time	Deep dives into meaning-shifts, unmet needs, and emerging motivations

Each method supplies a piece of the full picture. A data analyst might observe "many users abandon at Step 3 of onboarding," and a UX researcher can then interview or test users to find out what happens at Step 3 – perhaps a confusing form or a trust issue with a permission request. The combined insight is far more actionable than either alone. In fact, organizations that deeply integrate data and design expertise report improved product outcomes precisely because they prevent blind spots. A McKinsey study noted that companies blending quantitative analytics with qualitative design input saw performance improvements in product success metrics on the order of tens of percentage points [6,7]. One reason is that cross-functional teams catch issues that siloed teams would miss: a pattern emerging in usage data can be promptly probed by designers in the field, and a surprising user story can be verified against the larger dataset.

Despite the clear benefits of mixing methods, achieving a true balance is challenging in practice. Teams and individual practitioners often have ingrained biases – the "data people" trust numbers and may view stories as fluff, while the "design people" trust their empathy and may view metrics as dehumanized abstractions. This cultural divide can lead to one form of evidence dominating the conversation. In some organizations, a statistically significant experiment result is considered the ultimate arbiter, and qualitative input is relegated to fine-tuning the user interface only after metrics goals are set. In others (often smaller startups or design-led firms), a strong vision or qualitative insight might drive the product direction with minimal quantitative validation, relying on intuition and qualitative understanding of users, at least in early stages. The healthiest approach appears when teams foster a mindset that neither type of evidence is sufficient alone. Recent research on research-methods integration argues that the old qualitative–quantitative binary is overly simplistic and that focusing on compatibility and coherence between methods is more important [8]. In other words, it's not a zero-sum game where one must choose sides;

instead, the aim is to ensure that the philosophical and practical approach of one method complements rather than contradicts the other in a given study. For example, if a team adopts a user-centered ethos from qualitative research, they can still impose the rigor of quantitative validation to avoid being misled by personal biases. The result is a hybrid reasoning process: exploratory and empathetic, yet evidence-grounded and generalizable.

Concrete case studies illustrate how combining methods leads to better product decisions. In one case, a banking app team noticed through analytics that a significant number of customers were visiting a particular feature but not completing any action. The product managers were concerned by the drop-off rate (a quantitative red flag), but couldn't diagnose the cause from numbers alone. A series of phone interviews with those customers revealed a simple but non-obvious truth: users visited that feature seeking information that wasn't there – essentially a unmet expectation that the analytics could not reveal. Thanks to this insight, the team updated the feature content. Subsequent metrics showed improved engagement, validating the qualitative finding at scale. In another example, a startup considered removing a complex onboarding step to improve conversion, as metrics showed many users quitting at that step. But before making the cut, they conducted a handful of user tests. Surprisingly, participants in the usability study indicated that the step, though somewhat tedious, gave them confidence in the service (for instance, a personalization survey that took time but made users feel the product would be tailored to them). Armed with this nuanced understanding, the startup chose to simplify the step rather than eliminate it, preserving the reassuring elements. This decision – informed by both a quantitative signal and a qualitative rationale – likely saved them from a knee-jerk change that could have undermined user trust. Such stories reinforce a broader point: metrics and meaning need each other. Quantitative methods excel at charting broad patterns and measuring progress, while qualitative methods ensure the team is asking the right questions and solving the right problems.

Throughout a product's lifecycle, the dominance of one method often shifts. Early design stages may lean towards qualitative: ethnographic studies, field observations, and open-ended surveys to discover user needs and define the problem space. During development and testing, a more quantitative mindset prevails: instrumentation of beta features, A/B tests, and performance metrics to ensure reliability at scale. Post-launch, teams might oscillate between the two: analyzing user behavior logs (quant) to identify friction points, then conducting follow-up user interviews (qual) for deeper diagnosis. This dynamic interplay has become a hallmark of mature product organizations. Indeed, research into mixed-methods practice in software development suggests that clinging to a purely quantitative or purely qualitative paradigm is limiting and that effective innovation arises from pragmatic combination. There is an evolving recognition that methodological pluralism – being fluent in multiple ways of knowing – is a competitive advantage in product design and management [9]. It guards against the blind faith in "the number says so" just as it guards against the HiPPO (Highest Paid Person's Opinion) or the persuasive anecdote that lacks broader evidence.

In summary, quantitative and qualitative research methods contribute different strengths to digital product design. Quantitative techniques provide scale, objectivity, and clear benchmarks that drive optimization, but they can miss context and user sentiment. Qualitative techniques offer depth, context, and empathy that guide strategic alignment with user needs, but they risk subjectivity and limited generalizability. Each alone gives an incomplete view. The impact on product decisions is most positive when the two are used in concert: metrics identifying what to focus on and measuring improvements, and qualitative insights explaining why issues occur and how users feel about them. Modern product teams that integrate both find that their decisions are more robust and user-centered than those grounded in a single method. Rather than a rivalry, the relationship between data and insight is increasingly seen as a symbiosis – a necessary dialogue where numbers inform narratives and narratives give meaning to numbers. This comparative analysis underscores that embracing the complementary nature of quantitative and qualitative methods, while being mindful of their respective limitations, leads to more valid knowledge and wiser product decisions.

4. Discussion

Stepping back from the details, a more nuanced picture emerges of how knowledge is constructed in product design. The journey through metrics and interviews above was not a linear march toward a tidy answer but an exploratory zigzag. This irregular reasoning is, in a sense, a reflection of how human-centered design actually progresses – with false starts, sudden realizations, and continuous reframing. It is worth pondering how the human element in research complicates the neat narratives we sometimes try to impose on method choices. One might expect that simply combining quant and qual yields the best of both, yet in practice, this integration can surface new contradictions. For instance, what should a team do when a statistically robust metric suggests success but verbatim user feedback is negative? This is not a hypothetical scenario; it occurs with products that are efficient yet unsatisfying. In discussion, tensions like these become apparent as more than just technical problems – they are fundamentally about interpretation and values. A quantitatively minded analyst might question the importance of a complaint that isn't reflected in usage numbers ("If users truly hated it, wouldn't engagement drop?"). A qualitatively attuned designer might counter that the metric being tracked isn't capturing the aspect of experience that matters ("Engagement stayed high, but what about trust or brand perception, which we aren't measuring?"). Thus, even when both methods are employed, teams face the challenge of reconciling divergent stories told by the data. It calls for interpretive judgment – a somewhat messy human process of weighing evidence, context, and the risk of various errors. This discussion is not a clean resolution of the earlier results but a reflection on their complexity. It underscores that methodological pluralism introduces a need for methodological diplomacy: negotiating between different kinds of truth. Researchers must be willing to hold contradictory findings in tension without rushing to resolve them prematurely. In practice, this might mean acknowledging that both the metric and the feedback are right in their own domains – perhaps users perform tasks quickly (quantitative success) but feel anxious or annoyed (qualitative insight), a dual reality that requires a creative design response rather than a simple fix.

Another point of reflection revolves around the context of decision-making. The comparative analysis assumed, perhaps implicitly, that product decisions are made rationally by weighing evidence. But real-world decisions in companies are also influenced by timelines, organizational culture, and power dynamics. Quantitative data often carry a veneer of certainty that can be persuasive in executive discussions; qualitative findings may be more vulnerable to dismissal as "just anecdotes" unless championed effectively. This power imbalance means the integration of methods isn't just about methodological soundness, but about storytelling and influence within the team. How findings are communicated can tilt the balance. A vivid user quote can sometimes sway a meeting more than a dry statistic, even if the latter is more representative. Conversely, a single number on a dashboard can summarily kill a proposed feature that users loved qualitatively ("only 2% of users tried it, moving on"). The discussion here acknowledges that elevating the role of qualitative insight in a metric-driven environment (or vice versa) often requires strategic advocacy. It might involve translating one mode of evidence into the terms of the other – for instance, quantifying how many users echoed a particular complaint to give it weight, or narrating a statistical result as a user story ("X% drop-off – imagine 500 people confused at that screen"). The framing of evidence becomes as crucial as the evidence itself in multidisciplinary teams. This is not a failure of either method per se, but a reminder that research does not speak for itself. Humans interpret and prioritize it.

The earlier results championed mixed methods as an ideal, yet a discussion of potential limitations is necessary to temper that idealism. One limitation is practical: doing both quant and qual research is resource-intensive. Small startups or rapid product cycles may not have the luxury of lengthy exploratory studies and thorough metric analysis for every decision. They must choose their battles, which reintroduces the very binary we hoped to transcend. There is also a cognitive load on teams asked to be fluent in both paradigms. Context-switching between analytical mindsets can be nontrivial. A team might do an excellent job with analytics but stumble in conducting unbiased interviews, or excel in empathetic research but misinterpret p-values and significance. Each domain has its own rigor, and achieving high competence in both is challenging. Thus, while conceptually harmonious, in practice, a mixed approach might lead to mediocre execution of each method if the team stretches beyond its expertise. This raises an alternative view: methodological specialization might still be needed, with close collaboration bridging specialists rather than trying to make everyone do everything. Some organizations address this by pairing data scientists and UX researchers as a tandem, rather than attempting to create hybrid "unicorn" researchers proficient in all methods. The discussion here doesn't settle that debate but highlights it: even if we accept that multiple methods are ideal, how to implement that ideal—either through individual versatility or team diversity—remains a strategic choice with its own trade-offs.

Additionally, philosophical purists might argue that quant and qual are incommensurable at a deep level. The results section touched on paradigmatic differences: one rooted in positivism, the other in interpretivism. In discussion, one could push this further: Are we truly combining them, or simply alternating between fundamentally incompatible worldviews when convenient? Some scholars have pointed out that mixing methods without a coherent epistemology can lead to conceptual muddle. For example, if one person on the team believes "reality is objective and measurable" and another believes "reality is constructed and context-dependent," when they get conflicting results, they might each default to their own belief to dismiss the other's evidence. This hints that successful integration might require a third stance – perhaps pragmatism – that values outcomes and uses whatever works, philosophically agnostic. Embracing pragmatism can dissolve the purity of either paradigm, which not everyone is comfortable with. It involves a form of intellectual humility: accepting that all methods are partial and that the truth we seek in product design is multifaceted. This perspective aligns with recent calls in research methodology to view quant vs. qual not as a dichotomy but as a false duality. The discussion here resonates with that view, yet also cautions that adopting it is easier said than done. It requires team alignment, not just on procedures but on a mindset that is open to complexity and contradiction. The discussion demonstrates that integrating methods requires not only technical compatibility but also organizational alignment and shared interpretive practices.

Ultimately, reflecting on comparative methods in digital product design brings us back to the nature of decision-making under uncertainty. Product teams rarely have the luxury of complete information. There is always a leap of faith somewhere – be it trusting a metric that can only approximate user success, or trusting a user narrative that might not generalize. The wisest teams seem to be those aware of where they are taking that leap. If they must decide on a design change with only analytics in hand, they do so cognizant of what they might be missing (the human story), and plan to verify later qualitatively. If they go with a gut feeling based on user interviews, they keep an eye on the quantitative signals after rollout to ensure it indeed addresses a widespread need. This kind of self-awareness in method use is a recurrent theme when experienced practitioners discuss their work. It suggests that perhaps the true expertise in research-driven design lies not only in executing methods but in dancing between them – knowing when to zoom out from the numbers and listen, when to zoom out from the anecdotes and measure, and when to embrace a bit of uncertainty because contradictory evidence is simply reflecting a complex reality. In this discussion, we circle around that realization without landing squarely, mirroring the way product decisions themselves often circle around the unknowable before finally committing to an action.

5. Conclusion

The study achieved a structured comparison of quantitative and qualitative research methods as they function within digital product design, moving beyond a simplistic opposition between metrics and human insight. Through analytical synthesis of prior academic work and conceptual comparison, the article clarified how each methodological tradition produces distinct forms of evidence, relies on different validity logics, and exerts uneven influence on product decisions across the lifecycle. Quantitative techniques were shown to support scalable assessment, optimization, and performance tracking, while qualitative approaches were demonstrated to support interpretive understanding, problem reframing, and alignment with user experience. The research task of identifying their complementarities was addressed by outlining how these methods interact in practice, particularly through iterative cycles of hypothesis generation, validation, and explanation.

At the same time, the analysis revealed unresolved tensions that limit the effectiveness of current research practice in product teams. One persistent limitation concerns the asymmetry of influence between methods: numerical indicators often dominate decision-making forums, even in cases where they fail to capture experiential or ethical dimensions of use. Another shortcoming lies in execution capacity. Many teams lack either methodological literacy or organizational structures that allow qualitative and quantitative evidence to be interpreted jointly rather than sequentially or selectively. As a result, integration frequently remains procedural rather than epistemic, with methods coexisting without genuinely informing one another.

From the author's perspective, the main area requiring further development lies in cultivating interpretive competence rather than adding new tools. Product organizations already possess abundant data and well-established research techniques. What remains insufficiently developed is a shared reasoning framework for weighing conflicting signals, articulating uncertainty, and justifying decisions when evidence points in different directions. Progress in this area depends less on methodological innovation and more on institutional learning: clearer norms for evidence arbitration, stronger collaboration between analytical and design specialists, and greater tolerance for ambiguity in early decision phases.

Further work would benefit from empirical investigation of how mixed-method reasoning operates inside real product teams, including how evidence is translated, contested, or ignored in decision meetings. Such studies would help move the discussion from normative prescriptions toward observable practices. Overall, the article establishes that methodological plurality in digital product design already exists in theory, but its effective realization remains uneven. Advancing from coexistence to genuine integration remains the primary task for both researchers and practitioners.

References

[1]. Pilcher, N., & Cortazzi, M. (2024). 'Qualitative' and 'quantitative' methods and approaches across subject fields: Implications for research values, assumptions, and practices. *Quality & Quantity, 58*, 2357–2387. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-023-01734-4

[2]. Leung, L. (2015). Validity, reliability, and generalizability in qualitative research. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care, 4*(3), 324–327. https://doi.org/10.4103/2249-4863.161306

[3]. Quiñones-Gómez, J. C., Mor, E., & Chacón, J. (2024). Data-driven design in the design process: A systematic literature review on challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 41*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2024.2318060

[4]. Winter, G. (2000). A comparative discussion of the notion of 'validity' in qualitative and quantitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 4*(3), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2000.2078

[5]. Fessenden, T. (2021, April 11). *Design systems 101*. Nielsen Norman Group. https://www.nngroup.com/articles/design-systems-101

[6]. Chhabra, A., & Williams, S. (2019). *Fusing data and design to supercharge innovation — in products and processes*. McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/fusing-data-and-design-to-supercharge-innovation-in-products-and-processes

[7]. Fonseca, C. D. Q. (2024). *Data-driven design: The booster of product-led growth*. https://comum.rcaap.pt/entities/publication/34055175-1e64-400a-9a0d-30d86ce18c67

[8]. Liu, Y. (2022). Paradigmatic compatibility matters: A critical review of qualitative–quantitative debate in mixed methods research. *SAGE Open, 12*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221079922

[9]. Lee, B., & Ahmed-Kristensen, S. (2025). D3 framework: An evidence-based data-driven design framework for new product service development. *Computers in Industry, 164*, Article 104206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2024.104206