



## #20 Contrast effect

The recent updates have not contrasted with the previous ones. If we expect users to distinguish between monotonous updates/events, we are most likely to be disappointed.

## #22 Framing effect, #62 Illusion of transparency

We haven't bothered to provide a nice wrapper for our updates. The "wrapper" refers to any element of our communication with users. These include mailing lists, alerts, release notes, images, etc.

## #28 Selective perception

Our updates did not meet user expectations.

## #80 Appeal to novelty

Our main argument in support of changes was their novelty. Users, in turn, were interested in other things.

## #88 Endowment effect, #83 Loss aversion

Our updates mean that users will completely or partially abandon the part of the product in which they have invested a lot of time and energy.

## #7 Mood-congruent memory bias

Our updates fall on that period of our user's life cycle in which he has a gloomy mood. Consequently, the user makes judgments based on emotional impulses rather than logical judgment (#9 Empathy gap).

## #61 The Magical Number 7+2

We presented the updates by breaking them into too many parts and thus "diluted" their impression. As a result, users became indifferent to the information that we wanted to convey through the release notes.

## #68 Pro-innovation bias

We have exaggerated the significance of what we have created. We may have become a victim of the #69 Overconfidence effect.

## #74 Dunning-Kruger effect

Our users' competence and knowledge do not allow them to assess the significance of our updates objectively. Our mistake is that we didn't take care of a convenient "wrapper" for updates.

## #72 Consensus bias, #63 Curse of knowledge

We misinterpreted our users' feedback, and the system updates were not as interesting as we thought.