



#74 Dunning-Kruger effect

Confident statements of our incompetent team members mask their professional qualification ([#69 Overconfidence effect](#)).

#26 Congruence bias

A common mistake in evaluating the effectiveness of any campaign is the congruence bias. An error occurs when one or more team members assess the situation as a whole, taking into account only the data they have directly impacted. As a result, third-party events that could have the same, and sometimes more impact on the results are ignored.

#29 Observer-expectancy effect

Colleagues responsible for analyzing the results unconsciously manipulated or misinterpreted the data.

#59 Survival bias

We were wrong in our conclusions because we analyzed the results obtained only in one of several categories. In fact, the data we did not receive has distorted our understanding of the whole situation.

#18 Anchoring effect

From the very beginning, we were "tied" to some numbers. As a result, we created incorrect expectations, KPIs, etc.

#20 Contrast effect

We unconsciously changed our data analysis methodology because of the high contrast of the latest results in relation to the previous ones.

#35 Insensitivity to sample size

At one of the previous stages of the analysis, we did not correctly determine the correct sample size (the minimum number of participants in our experiment). As a result, by extrapolating the data from the sample to the general group of users, we got an incorrect picture of reality.

#67 Planning fallacy

We did not correctly calculate the time required to obtain the desired result. There are two possible options here:

1. The promotion campaign itself was shorter than the time necessary;
2. We did not wait for the right time to evaluate its results.

#70 Social desirability bias

We relied on the respondents' responses, which were given following the effect of social desirability. As a result, they did not reflect the real picture that interested us.