

Unrealistic optimism in the eye of the storm: Positive bias towards the consequences of COVID-19 during the second and third waves of the pandemic.

Ada Maksim^{1¶}, Sławomir Śpiewak^{1¶}, Natalia Lipp^{1¶}, Natalia Dużmańska-Misiarczyk^{1¶},
Grzegorz Gustaw^{1¶} Krzysztof Rębilas^{1¶}, Paweł Strojny^{1¶}

¹ Institute of Applied Psychology, Faculty of Management and Social Communication,
Jagiellonian University in Kraków, ul. Prof. St. Łojasiewicza 4, 30-348 Kraków, Poland

*Corresponding author: e-mail: adatracz@gmail.com (AM)

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

Ada Maksim, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8762-0784>
Sławomir Śpiewak, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9107-1389>
Natalia Lipp, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5738-6771>
Natalia Dużmańska-Misiarczyk, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7769-968X>
Grzegorz Gustaw, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9153-3387>
Krzysztof Rębilas <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4637-2358>
Paweł Strojny, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6016-044X>

28

Abstract

29

Research conducted at the outset of the pandemic shows that people are vulnerable to
unrealistic optimism (UO). However, the Weinstein model suggests that this tendency may
not persist as the pandemic progresses. Our research aimed at verifying whether UO persists
during the second (Study 1) and the third wave (Study 2) of the pandemic in Poland, whether
it concerns the assessment of the chances of COVID-19 infection (Study 1 and Study 2), the
chances of severe course of the disease and adverse vaccine reactions (Study 2). We show that
UO towards contracting COVID-19 persists throughout the pandemic. However, in situations
where we have little influence on the occurrence of the event, the participants do not show
UO. The exceptions are those who have known personally someone who has died from a
coronavirus infection. These results are discussed in terms of self-esteem protection and the
psychological threat reduction mechanism.

Keywords: unrealistic optimism, positive bias, positive illusions, contracting COVID-19,
severe consequences of COVID-19

41

42

Unrealistic optimism in the eye of the storm: Positive bias towards the consequences of COVID-19 during the second and third waves of the pandemic.

It is common for people to make predictions about their future. While pessimists tend to contemplate the worst-case scenario, optimists believe that good things will happen to them (1). According to recent meta-analyses, optimism is believed to be associated with benefits of various types, including health and well-being (2,3). For example, optimism is associated with a lower risk of cardiovascular events and all-cause mortality (3). Some authors (3,4) suggest that future studies should be focused on evaluating the benefits of interventions that are aimed at reducing pessimism and promoting optimism. However, not all aspects of optimism are desirable or beneficial.

Dispositional optimism “is defined as the generalized positive expectancy that one will experience good outcomes” (5) and is mostly responsible for the above-mentioned benefits. Its dark side variant is so-called *unrealistic optimism*, a cognitive bias that makes people think that negative events are more likely to happen to others, and positive events are more likely to happen to them (6,7). Although some researchers (4) posit that unrealistic optimism functions as a positive illusion that helps people to cope with potentially threatening experiences by reducing anxiety, others (6,8–10) point to the maladaptive aspects of the optimistic bias. For example, unrealistic optimism may be related to developing some dire conditions such as coronary disease (5), alcoholism (9), breast cancer in women, and prostate cancer in men (6) as people have tendency to underestimate own risk of developing serious health problems. Unrealistic optimism is also correlated with risky and hazardous behaviours.

People who perceive themselves as better drivers than others admit to violating speed limits 64
(10), and young women who presume they are less likely than others to get pregnant are also 65
less likely to use effective contraception methods—such behaviour could result in an 66
unwanted pregnancy (8). 67

Unrealistic optimism during the COVID-19 pandemic 68

Being unrealistically optimistic about one’s chances of being infected by coronavirus 69
(and the ability to infect others) may lead to the illusion that obeying the strict policies 70
imposed by the government is simply unnecessary in one’s case (11). As a result, unrealistic 71
optimism could lead to reckless behaviours during the pandemic, such as ignoring the 72
protective measures recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO; keeping a social 73
distance, covering mouth and nose with a mask, avoiding crowded or indoor settings, etc.) 74
which could lead to spreading the disease (1). The issue of unrealistic optimism has grown in 75
importance in light of recent research on the perceived risk of infection during the COVID-19 76
pandemic. Dolinski and his colleagues (1) decided to verify if the imminent COVID-19 77
pandemic would stimulate the expression of unrealistic optimism. The researchers tested 78
whether subjects would perceive that they are exposed to the disease to the same extent as the 79
average person like themselves or if they would be affected by the unrealistic optimism (or 80
the opposite – unrealistic pessimism) bias. The research of Dolinski and colleagues (1) was 81
conducted in March 2020 when the media reported about the first people diagnosed with 82
coronavirus in Poland. In their study, the pattern of unrealistic optimism in the face of the 83
beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic emerged. Similar results were obtained in other 84

European countries (France, Great Britain, Switzerland, and Italy) in February 2020 before 85
the collapse of the healthcare system in Italy (12). People who were asked about their chances 86
of getting infected were generally optimistic and assessed the personal risk of contracting 87
coronavirus as lower than others. 88

Further research results also point to the implications of the positive bias for 89
health-related behaviours (13,14). According to Oljača and colleagues (15), the optimistic 90
bias may indeed influence attitudes towards compliance with restrictions. In a study 91
conducted in Serbia, the participants who scored higher on the UOS–NLE subscale 92
(measuring unrealistic optimism towards negative life events) assessed the risk connected 93
with COVID-19 infection as lower and declared lower compliance with the pandemic 94
restrictions. Similarly, Gordeeva and colleagues (16) found a positive link between defensive 95
optimism (the tendency to diminish the risk of the emergence of negative events) and failure 96
to comply with the stay-at-home rule in their study conducted in Russia in March and April 97
2020. 98

Predictors of unrealistic optimism in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic 99

So far, the most elaborated theoretical model of unrealistic optimism has been 100
formulated by Neil Weinstein (7). Below we refer to the five factors that, according to the 101
Weinstein model (7), may have the most significant impact on unrealistic optimism during the 102
pandemic. At least two factors should inhibit the tendency to the positive bias among people 103
at pandemic risk: (a) *the perceived probability of the event* and (b) *the ease of recalling a* 104
stereotypical victim of a given situation. The first one is inherently connected with the 105

pandemic's growth and increasing numbers of people contracting coronavirus. Higher 106
perceived frequency (i.e., probability) in the general population should affect personal 107
judgement of the risk but not necessarily others' judgement. Thus, when the event is more 108
frequent, the unrealistic bias may be weakened by a higher own risk rating. The second 109
predictor that works in a similar direction means that the assumption regarding stereotype 110
salience is based on the representativeness heuristic (17). Weinstein (7) assumes that the 111
harder it is to imagine a typical victim of a specific event, the weaker the optimistic bias will 112
be. As the pandemic spreads, individuals should be more aware that the severe consequences 113
of COVID-19 affect not only the elderly with significant health problems but also younger, 114
healthy people. With the increase in diversity and the number of victims of the pandemic, it 115
will be more difficult to create a stereotypical image of the person most exposed to 116
coronavirus, which should reduce the tendency to create cognitive illusions. 117

However, there are two other predictors that in our opinion would work in opposite 118
directions to enhance positive illusions: (c) *controllability of the situation*, (d) *the degree of* 119
desirability, and (e) *the personal experience* which the last one can work both ways. 120
Controllability of the situation refers to a human's sense that a situation's outcome is 121
dependent on their own actions. Therefore, people tend to overestimate their chances in 122
positive events and underestimate their risks in negative events. In our opinion, people at risk 123
during a pandemic may be vulnerable to the illusion of control through the availability of 124
preventive measures: wearing a mask, keeping their distance, disinfecting hands. Thus, they 125
can create the illusion of greater control of the situation and less chance of contracting the 126

virus. In our opinion, a sense of control can foster a positive bias when asking individuals 127
about the chances of contracting coronavirus. In this aspect, people seem more susceptible to 128
the illusion of their own preventive actions but not necessarily for other aspects such as 129
vulnerability to a severe course of COVID-19 or adverse vaccine reactions. The degree of 130
desirability refers to the severity of the consequences. It is assumed that the more desirable a 131
situation's outcome, the greater the optimistic bias. However, negative events induce a more 132
negative effect which leads to defensive strategies for protecting oneself and also results in 133
higher optimistic bias. People desire positive outcomes, and when they are faced with the risk 134
of losing their health or even their life they may be prone to reducing anxiety and protecting 135
their self-esteem. One such strategy may be by creating positive illusions, which allows 136
individuals to change their perception of a situation from threatening to less threatening. The 137
last moderator mentioned by Weinstein (7) is the assumption about personal experience which 138
is based on the availability heuristic (18). Previous experience with an event increases the 139
belief in its reoccurrence. Personal experience may, in a similar vein, change the personal 140
perception of the risk faced by an individual. However, two alternatives of these changes in 141
the perception of the risk may be taken into account according to the existing literature (10). 142
The first one is the shift in the perception of the situation to be more threatening and even 143
leads to the opposite unrealistic pessimism phenomenon (19) or to a lower level of unrealistic 144
optimism (10). Alternatively, personal experience may, in some cases, result in enhanced 145
self-protective motivation and may lead to an underestimation of the personal risk in relation 146
to others (9). 147

Aim of the studies 148

Considering the above, it seems important to examine the tendency to positive bias as 149
the COVID-19 pandemic develops, so we decided to explore the susceptibility to unrealistic 150
optimism during the second (Study 1) and the third wave of the pandemic in Poland (Study 2), 151
when the number of infections increased dramatically. If the tendency to unrealistic optimism 152
persists in the further stages of the pandemic, we expect to replicate the tendency to 153
underestimate one's own chance of contracting coronavirus despite the growth in the number 154
of infections in the population both during the second (Study 1) and third (Study 2) waves of 155
the pandemic in Poland. In addition, in Study 2, we decided to broaden the spectrum of 156
assessing the tendency to unrealistic optimism with two issues that seem to be of particular 157
importance as the pandemic develops: the severity of a potential COVID-19 infection and 158
adverse vaccine reactions. As far as we know, there is scarce evidence whether the optimistic 159
bias is limited only to the prediction of the chance of contracting COVID-19 or is related to 160
other important health-related topics. The positive bias toward coronavirus risk assessments 161
does not imply that people assume they are at risk of serious complications and at risk of 162
losing their health and even their lives. On the contrary, it can be assumed that such cognitive 163
bias may protect individuals from thinking about the serious consequences of contracting 164
COVID-19. Thus, the presence of the cognitive bias towards contracting COVID-19 does not 165
necessarily mean that people are positively biased towards assessment of the chances of a 166
severe course of the disease or adverse vaccine reactions. Those two seem to be beyond 167

individuals' ability to take their own actions that could create the illusion of control and lead to the positive bias.

Based on the research by Dolinski et al. (1), to determine the sample size, we expected *Cohen's d* effect sizes to be from $d = 0.238$ to $d = 0.491$. For the calculations, we adopted the average value of $d = 0.365$; expected power of .90 and $\alpha = .05$. The analysis of the power in G*Power (version 3.1.9.7; 20) for the difference between the two dependent means and the two-tailed t-test, showed that the required power is achieved by a sample of 81 individuals. In order to meet these assumptions, we determined a sample size of at least 81 people in each of the studies.

We report all manipulations, measures, and exclusions in these studies (supplementary materials for more details). No studies in this manuscript were preregistered. All statistical procedures were performed in IBM SPSS v.26.0 (21)

Study 1

We decided to conduct our first study in November 2020, during the spike of the very severe second wave of the pandemic in Poland. In 2020, 70,000 more people died in Poland than in previous years, which is nearly 20% more than in 2019 (and at the same time is the highest rate of death since World War II) (22). In November 2020 alone, 605,885 coronavirus cases were confirmed in Poland, and 11,494 people died as a result of the infection (23). Thus, the possible ramifications of excessive optimism became visible to every naive person. We expect to replicate the effect obtained by Dolinski and colleagues (1) who conducted their study at the beginning of the pandemic in Poland when people had not yet faced the

widespread traumatic experiences of the deaths of their relatives and friends due to 189

coronavirus. 190

Method 191

This study was part of a larger research plan concerning decision-making about resource 192

allocation during the coronavirus pandemic. In this report, we focus on the elements of the 193

procedure related to the measurement of unrealistic optimism (a full description of the 194

procedure and other measures used in the study can be found in the supplementary materials). 195

Detailed information on the materials and instructions for Study 1 can be found in the 196

repository: <https://zenodo.org/record/5984642>. 197

The study was approved by Research Ethics Committee at the Institute of Applied 198

Psychology, Faculty of Management and Social Communication Jagiellonian University in 199

Krakow. The participants were informed about the confidentiality of their data, the voluntary 200

nature of the study and the possibility of ceasing to complete the survey at any time. Their 201

answers were anonymized in the database. As the research was conducted online the consent to 202

participate in the study was obtained online by entering personal data and clicking on the 203

“continue” button. 204

Participants 205

The first study involved 111 participants (90 female and 21 male) aged 18 to 42 years (M 206

$= 22.23$, $SD = 3.53$). All of the participants were students of the Jagiellonian University in 207

Kraków. Of all the participants, two were quarantined during the study, and four had been, at 208

some point, diagnosed with COVID-19. The participants were assigned to the study conditions 209

on the basis of quasi-randomization. At the very beginning of the study, they were asked about 210
their day of birth. The numbers between 1 and 31 were divided into four intervals which were 211
used to redirect the participants to two different conditions (control and experimental) based on 212
their answers. 213

Materials 214

Pandemic and neutral context 215

The participants were assigned to one of two conditions related to one of two 216
contexts—pandemic vs non-pandemic—as a part of the larger research project mentioned 217
earlier. Four separate photos were used (i.e., two for the pandemic context and two for 218
non-pandemic). More information about the chosen photos can be found in the supplementary 219
materials. We had no theoretical predictions about the impact of manipulating the context (i.e., 220
pandemic vs. neutral), however, due to the fact that context can significantly change the 221
perception of the social situation, especially in people who are more or less exposed to the 222
effects of a pandemic, we decided to take it into account in our preliminary analyses. 223

Unrealistic optimism measurement 224

Our main dependent variable was the measure of how the participants were unrealistically 225
optimistic about the possibility of contracting coronavirus. To this end, we asked them two 226
questions: 227

1. How would you rate your chances of contracting coronavirus? 228
2. How would you rate the chances that someone else like you will contract coronavirus? 229

The participants answered both questions by estimating the chance of becoming infected as a percentage (from 0 to 100). It is suggested by Harris et al. (24) that such an indirect method of assessing the optimistic bias (by asking two separate questions) is more beneficial and informative than the classical, direct way introduced by Weinstein (7) which consists of only one item where participants are asked to compare themselves to an average other.

Procedure

The first study was conducted in November 2020 at the peak of the second wave of the coronavirus in Poland. Due to pandemic restrictions, the study was conducted online. Participants received an email invitation to take part in the study. If they clicked the link received in the email, they were redirected to an online survey. Firstly, they were informed about data privacy and gave active, informed consent. Then, after assignment to research conditions, they were asked two questions regarding the perceived chance of contracting coronavirus—by themselves and someone similar to them. Finally, the participants filled in demographic data and were thanked for participating in the study. Detailed information about all the additional materials and scales used in the study can be found in the supplementary materials.

Results

Due to the fact that being infected with COVID-19 at some point could influence the assessment of the risk of contracting coronavirus, participants who had been diagnosed with COVID-19 ($n = 4$) and participants who were in quarantine ($n = 2$) were excluded from the analysis. Preliminary analysis (general linear model with the assessment of the chance of

infection as a within-subject factor and sex, age, and condition as between-subject factors) 251

showed that the assessment of the chance of infection was not influenced by the experimental 252

condition (see pandemic vs neutral photos; $F(1, 79) = 0.07, p = 0.791$. There were also no 253

differences related to the age ($F(12, 107) = 1.53, p = 0.130$) and sex ($F(1, 79) = 0.03, p =$ 254

0.869) of the participants. Therefore, in further analysis, all results were considered jointly, 255

regardless of the manipulation of the pandemic vs the non-pandemic context, age, and gender 256

of the participants. The estimate of contracting coronavirus oneself was significantly different 257

from the estimate of it being contracted by someone else. The participants assessed their 258

chance of becoming infected ($M = 52.97, SD = 24.24$) as lower than the chance of someone 259

else becoming infected ($M = 61.18, SD = 23.26$). This difference is statistically significant and 260

effect size is of moderate strength ($t(103) = -4.69; p < 0.001, Cohen's d = -0.34$). 261

262

Table 1

Summary of self and others' chances assessments from the two studies

How do you assess the chances of... related to Covid-19	Self		Others		Paired-samples <i>t</i> -test					
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	95% <i>CI</i>		
								<i>Lower</i>	<i>Upper</i>	
Study 1	Contracting	52.97	24.24	61.18	23.26	4.69	103	<0.001	-11.68	-4.74
Study 2	Contracting	42.55	24.67	51.03	22.98	5.69	70	<0.001	-11.45	-5.51
	Serious complications	31.13	24.48	31.94	21.53	0.297	69	0.768	-6.28	4.65
	Developing adverse vaccine reactions	27.06	24.43	28.33	22.14	0.912	69	0.365	-4.05	1.51

Discussion

The results of our first study correspond with other reports confirming a tendency to unrealistic optimism in the context of the assessment of life- or health-threatening events (5,6,9). It can be argued that a similar relationship may occur in people's behaviour in response to the threat of the COVID-19 pandemic. Our study is in line with the few reports to date (1,12–15), that show that unrealistic optimism may bias those who are at risk of the coronavirus pandemic. For example, in the study by Dolinski and colleagues (1), which was carried out at the beginning of the pandemic in Poland, the same group of students was asked three times about their assessment of the chances of contracting coronavirus, and it was shown that the tendency to unrealistic optimism remained stable among men but actually intensified among women during the week after the first COVID-19 infection was announced. However, it is not clear—according to the Weinstein model (7) — whether the tendency to underestimate the chances of contracting coronavirus will continue over the long term. Our study initially confirmed that there was a continuing tendency to underestimate the chances of catching COVID-19 during an exacerbating pandemic in Poland.

Study 2

In our second study, we decided to extend the scope of the optimistic bias exploration to more specific aspects of pandemic risk. During the development of a pandemic, two aspects seem to be particularly important, and little known from the point of view of unrealistic optimism: (a) estimating the chances of serious complications as a consequence of a possible COVID-19 infection, and (b) the perceived risk of developing adverse vaccine reactions. There is strong evidence in the literature on unrealistic optimism suggesting that this effect occurs rather in the case of events that we assume we can control to some extent (1,7). According to Weinstein (7), in the case of events that people feel they can control it is easier

for them to visualise their own behaviour aimed at reducing the risk. Thus, they overestimate 287
their influence on the situation and are more susceptible to the optimistic bias. People may, to 288
some extent, try to minimise the risk of contracting COVID-19 through their behaviour, thus, 289
the possibility of becoming infected seems to be dependent on a person's actions and under 290
their control. However, people believe that they have no control over whether, as a result of 291
the infection, they will experience serious complications that may result in death or a serious 292
threat to life. Thus, we hypothesise that although people will underestimate the chances of 293
getting ill, at the same time they will not underestimate the chances of developing a serious 294
course of the disease as a consequence of a possible COVID-19 infection. 295

The chances of getting infected can be effectively reduced by following the 296
recommendations of the WHO: limiting social contacts, wearing a face mask, or disinfecting 297
hands. In the event of a severe course of COVID-19 infection, people do not have personal 298
control over how the disease develops. In a study by Asimakopoulou and colleagues (11), 299
participants showed lower unrealistic optimism when asked about the risk of hospitalisation, 300
being taken into the intensive care unit, and being ventilated due to COVID-19 (less 301
manageable situations) than when asked about the risk of contracting coronavirus or infecting 302
someone else (more manageable situations). Therefore, we assume that in the case of the risk 303
of a severe course of COVID-19, the effect of unrealistic optimism will be weaker. 304

We decided to include one more variable which was not included in previous studies as 305
they were conducted during a different stage of the pandemic. Our second study was 306
conducted in February 2021, after the second coronavirus wave in Poland, which turned out to 307

be much more severe than the first one. Between September and December 2020, 1,205,878 308
new cases of coronavirus infections were confirmed and 25,656 people died due to a 309
COVID-19 infection. At the peak of the second wave, COVID-19 patients occupied 20,000 310
hospital beds (23). 311

We assumed that, at this point, most of the participants will already have had their own 312
experiences related to coronavirus, and in particular, they might personally know someone for 313
whom contracting coronavirus had serious consequences. We decided to verify if the personal 314
experience of knowing someone who had developed a severe illness due to COVID-19 or 315
died from it would affect the unrealistic optimism of the participants. 316

In the literature on unrealistic optimism, we found mixed results related to the influence 317
of personal experience (9,10). In a study by McKenna and Albery (10), participants who were 318
involved in a car accident showed lower unrealistic optimism concerning their driving skills 319
than other participants, but only if they were hospitalised as a result of the accident. In 320
contrast, in a longitudinal study related to alcohol abuse (9), people who experienced negative 321
consequences related to alcohol consumption at subsequent stages of the study still rated their 322
own risk of developing serious problems related to alcohol abuse as lower than others. 323

Finally, since the date of the study coincided with the commencement of the vaccination 324
programme in Poland, we were also interested in the assessment of the chances of adverse 325
vaccination reactions – self versus others. We assumed that as the chances of adverse 326
vaccination reactions are beyond one's control, we will not observe optimistic bias in this 327
case. 328

Method

329

Participants

330

The second study involved 84 participants (57 female, 26 male, and 1 nonbinary), aged from 19

331

to 65 ($M = 35.42$, $SD = 9.07$). Eleven of the participants were at some point diagnosed with

332

COVID-19, two were quarantined while participating in the study. Out of 84 participants, 78

333

knew someone diagnosed with COVID-19, 47 knew someone who manifested severe

334

symptoms of COVID-19, and 30 participants knew someone who died due to COVID-19.

335

Materials

336

Pandemic and neutral context

337

Similarly, as in Study 1, we used the manipulation of the context of the unrealistic

338

optimism assessment. Before the assessment, half of the participants were presented with

339

pandemic-associated, death-related pictures whereas the other half were presented with - the

340

same as in Study 1 - neutral images. The materials were chosen based on the separate pilot

341

study. The stimuli used in the second study can be found in the supplementary materials.

342

Detailed information on the materials and instructions for study 2 can be found in the repository:

343

<https://zenodo.org/record/5984642>.

344

Unrealistic optimism measurement

345

As we wanted to verify whether unrealistic optimism would also apply to other aspects

346

related to the coronavirus pandemic (apart from the assessment of the chances of being

347

infected), we additionally asked the participants the following questions:

348

1. How would you rate your chances of a severe course of the disease if you contract coronavirus?	349
	350
2. How would you rate the chances of someone else becoming severely ill if they contract coronavirus?	351
	352
These questions related to the possible unrealistic optimism about a severe course of coronavirus disease. As the coronavirus vaccination programme was already underway during the second study, we also wanted to check if there were some differences in the assessment of the possible side effects of a vaccination:	353
	354
	355
	356
1. How would you rate your chances of developing severe side effects after a coronavirus vaccination?	357
	358
2. How would you rate the chances of someone else developing severe side effects after a coronavirus vaccination?	359
	360
<i>Personal experience of COVID-19</i>	361
The second study was conducted on the verge of the third wave of the coronavirus pandemic in Poland. Thus, we assumed that the participants may have had some personal experience of COVID-19 at this point, which might have influenced the way they assessed their chances of getting infected and developing severe symptoms of COVID-19. At the end of the study, participants reported if they personally knew someone diagnosed with COVID-19, if they personally knew someone who developed severe symptoms of COVID-19, and if they personally knew someone who died due to a COVID-19 infection.	362
	363
	364
	365
	366
	367
	368
Procedure	369

Again, due to the pandemic restrictions, the study was conducted online. Participants 370
received an email invitation to take part in the study. If they clicked on the link received in the 371
email, they were redirected to the online survey. Firstly, they were informed about data privacy 372
and gave active, informed consent. Similar to the first study, participants were assigned to the 373
research condition quasi-randomly, based on their day of birth. Depending on the condition, 374
participants saw either neutral photos (control conditions) or photos related to the coronavirus 375
pandemic (experimental conditions). 376

In the next step, they were asked to estimate their perceived chances of being infected with 377
COVID-19, developing severe symptoms of COVID-19, and suffering severe side effects of 378
vaccination against COVID-19. To assess the tendency to the optimistic bias, they also 379
answered the same questions regarding their co-workers/other students. Finally, the 380
participants filled in demographic data and information about their personal experience of 381
COVID-19. More detailed information about the other measures used in the study can be found 382
in the supplementary materials. 383

Results 384

As in the first study, we excluded participants who declared that they had tested positive 385
for the presence of coronavirus ($n = 11$) and participants who were in quarantine ($n = 2$) as 386
their answers may have biased the results. Since during the second study, vaccination against 387
coronavirus was already underway in Poland, we also excluded participants who had been 388
vaccinated with at least one dose ($n = 2$). First, in the preliminary analysis, we checked if 389
there were any differences in unrealistic optimism measures due to different experimental 390

conditions (pandemic vs neutral photos). As we found none ($F(1,15) = 0.13, p = .726$), we 391
decided to analyse all the data together. There were also no differences concerning unrealistic 392
optimism due to the gender ($F(1,15) = 0.13, p = .865$) and age ($F(32,15) = 0.71, p = .795$) of 393
the participants. The effect of unrealistic optimism related to the chances of contracting 394
coronavirus has been successfully replicated ($t(70) = -5.69, p < .001, Cohen's d = -0.37$). The 395
respondents assessed their chances of becoming infected lower ($M = 42.55, SD = 24.67$) than 396
the chances of other people ($M = 51.03, SD = 22.98$). 397

There was no effect of unrealistic optimism related to a severe course of COVID-19 398
infection (see Table 1). However, when assessing the chances of a severe course of the 399
disease, personal experience related to coronavirus turned out to be an important factor. There 400
was an interaction effect between unrealistic optimism and personal acquaintance with 401
someone who died from a COVID-19 infection ($F(1,68) = 6.50, p = .013, Cohen's d = 0.58$). 402
Participants who knew someone who died as a result of COVID-19 infection estimated their 403
chances of a severe course of coronavirus infection significantly lower ($M = 26.29, SD =$ 404
 19.74) than the chances of substantial side effects of COVID-19 infection for other people (M 405
 $= 36.41, SD = 19.27; p = .028$). This effect did not appear in the case of participants who did 406
not personally know any victims of COVID-19 infection ($M_{self} = 33.65, SD_{self} = 26.47$ 407
comparing to $M_{other} = 29.61, SD_{other} = 22.47; p = .218$). 408

Other experiences with the coronavirus pandemic (i.e., knowing people who have 409
become infected or who have been severely ill) did not contribute to the effect of unrealistic 410
optimism concerning a severe course of COVID-19 disease. There was no interactional effect 411

in the case of a personal acquaintance with someone who has been severely ill ($F(1,68) = 2.03$, 412
 $p = .158$, *Cohen's d* = 0.31). Additionally, we decided not to perform analysis on a personal 413
acquaintance with someone who has been infected as a between-subject factor since 78 of 84 414
participants knew someone who has been ill. 415

There was also no effect of unrealistic optimism concerning potential adverse reactions of 416
the COVID-19 vaccination (see Table 1). Overall, respondents rated the chances of 417
experiencing vaccination side effects as low for themselves ($M = 27.06$; $SD = 24.43$) as for 418
others ($M = 28.33$, $SD = 22.14$). Any type of personal experiences with the coronavirus 419
pandemic were of no importance in this case (knowing someone who has been severely ill: 420
 $F(1,68) = 0.32$, $p = .573$; *Cohen's d* = 0.14; knowing someone who died from COVID-19 421
infection: $F(1,68) = 1.97$, $p = .166$; *Cohen's d* = 0.33). 422

Discussion 423

The evidence presented in our research supports the assumption that the optimistic bias 424
is maintained as the COVID-19 pandemic progresses and is not limited to the initial stages of 425
a pandemic outbreak. Bottemanne and colleagues (25) suggest that the optimism bias may 426
diminish as coronavirus spreads around the world. They argue that in face of an inevitable 427
threat people tend to use unfavourable information more likely to update their beliefs. At first, 428
the coronavirus pandemic was rather distant and novel but with more and more cases the risk 429
of infection was getting higher and, as a result, this might have updated people's beliefs about 430
their personal chances of getting ill and weakened the optimistic bias. In contrast to the 431
assumptions of Bottemanne and colleagues (25), our data, collected in two studies conducted 432

during the second and third waves of the pandemic in Poland, confirm the existence of 433
unrealistic optimism regarding the assessment of the chances of contracting coronavirus. 434
Moreover, as the pandemic progressed, not only did the optimism not diminish, but the 435
strength of the effect appears to be stable (i.e., *Cohen's d* in Study 1 vs. Study 2 is 0.34 and 436
0.37, respectively). In both studies, the pandemic and non-pandemic contexts did not affect 437
the assessment of any aspects of pandemic risk. This may be an argument for the high 438
availability of information about the pandemic and relative insensitivity to additional 439
information that would change the perception of reality during the second and third waves of 440
the pandemic in Poland. 441

Interestingly, in the second study, people assessed both their own likelihood of 442
becoming infected and of others as lower than in the first study (i.e., 52.97 vs 42.10 for one's 443
own assessment and 61.18 vs 51.00 for others). However, it is difficult to draw conclusions 444
about the differences in the estimates of absolute values on that basis, because the results 445
come from different groups of respondents at different stages of the pandemic's development. 446
We do not know whether this result indicates the opposite trend to that observed in the studies 447
by Dolinski et al. (1) or whether it represents differences in the perceived probability of 448
infection of various groups of people. 449

Nevertheless, maintaining the illusion of the lower vulnerability to infection that 450
accompanies the sharp increase in the number of infected people — as we are dealing with in 451
the second and third waves of the pandemic — indicates a strong cognitive bias that does not 452
seem to have been reduced by the incoming information. According to Weinstein's 453

assumption of *the perceived probability of the event* (7), in March 2020, in Poland, there were 454
a dozen new COVID-19 cases a day, while in the second half of the year, the numbers were 455
oscillating around several thousand cases a day and more. As the incidence of the disease 456
increases with the duration of the pandemic, individuals are supposed to make more realistic 457
estimations of the chances of their own illness and should make those assessments similar to 458
others, thus one would expect that the tendency to unrealistic optimism should decrease. 459
However, the above argumentation assumes that people rationally evaluate the chances of 460
positive and negative events in their lives, which, as we know from the many studies in the 461
field about decision making and judgement, is no longer true (18,26). Likewise, the 462
assumption that a growing number of infections should change the stereotypical image of a 463
typical victim (7), which in turn should inhibit the tendency to the positive bias also turned 464
out not to be valid in our studies. While people in our research showed positive illusions 465
about coronavirus infection, the attempt to explain this phenomenon should focus on the role 466
of factors that, from the theoretical point of view, could contribute to their maintenance. 467

One reason why individuals may be motivated to maintain a positive illusion is when 468
they are trying to control an unpredictable situation (27). The outbreak of a pandemic is 469
undoubtedly a factor that increases the unpredictability and uncertainty of actions and raises 470
many risks related to the consequences of the decisions that individuals are making. There is a 471
growing body of literature suggesting that the experience of uncontrollability increases 472
uncertainty (28) and leads to the experience of lack of control which is challenging for 473
various aspects of human functioning (29). In the context of our research, the most interesting 474

seems the self-protection motivation (30,31) and regaining control when people are facing 475

unpredictable situations (32). The positive illusion may be a form of self-protection and 476

cognitive bias can serve as promoting positivity in one's self-views. Following this argument, 477

it can be expected that the growing number of infections will not only reduce the positive bias 478

but will foster uncertainty about the future and enhance motivation to regain control of the 479

situation, especially in terms of those aspects that may be perceived as controllable. We 480

expected, according to Weinstein's model (7), that the positive illusion will be especially 481

strong in the case of the relatively controllable aspect of the pandemic situation (the chances 482

of contracting of COVID-19) but not for those aspects that are beyond control (a severe 483

course of COVID-19, adverse vaccine reactions). The results of Study 2 are consistent with 484

the above assumptions and other studies suggesting the existence of the positive illusion for 485

manageable rather than unmanageable situations (11). We predicted that in the case of the 486

chances of infection, such an illusion of control is more likely to occur than for other aspects 487

of assessment. Hand disinfection, self-isolation, and wearing a mask are actions that an 488

individual can take at any time because they depend solely on their will. There is, however, an 489

interesting contradiction in this aspect. Paradoxically, research shows that unrealistically 490

optimistic people less often follow the rules and respect limitations. In fact, they tend to 491

ignore protective measures and thus contribute to the spread of the virus. A positive illusion 492

can therefore be a knife that cuts both sides: from an individual's perspective, the belief that 493

preventive measures are readily available strengthens the illusion of control, but it actually 494

leads to the ignoring of limitations, which not only does not reduce the risk but also seriously increases it.

We did not expect to report the unrealistic optimism in regard to a severe course of COVID-19. The degree of desirability which refers to the severity of the consequences according to the Weinstein model (7) increases the pressure for a more realistic risk assessment. As the risk of a wrong and inadequate assessment of the situation increases, individuals pay higher costs for their wrong decisions. The results obtained are consistent with our assumptions that an individual will not be prone to unrealistic optimism when assessing a serious course of the disease. However, there is an interesting exception regarding people who knew someone who died from a COVID-19 infection. The results obtained in Study 2 show that people who experienced the death of a person they knew are unrealistically optimistic in regards to the assessment their own chances of a severe course of COVID-19. Knowing a person who died of COVID-19 may indicate the role of personal experience in the development of the positive illusion. The existing literature does not allow for conclusive assumptions about the influence of personal experience in the development of the positive bias. Rather, our results may suggest that personal experience enhances the positive illusion, however, there is another important factor that one cannot ignore. There is a considerable number of empirical findings suggesting the consequences of mortality salience evoke a psychological defence mechanism to protect self-esteem and reduce the psychological threat and anxiety (33,34). The personal experience in our study took a specific form beyond knowing someone infected with COVID-19. During the third wave of the pandemic, almost

all respondents knew someone who had already been infected with coronavirus and our 516
results suggest that those kinds of experiences are not sufficient to enhance the positive bias 517
towards a severe course of the disease. The experience of COVID-19 does not necessarily 518
imply its seriousness. In the case of death, we are dealing not only with the experience of 519
severe complications but, above all, with mortality salience which bears far more 520
psychological consequences (35) than only the experience of a severe course of coronavirus 521
infection. Unfortunately, our study does not allow us to make a conclusion about the role of 522
the specificity of these kinds of personal experiences. More research is needed to verify the 523
role of assessing the consequences of infecting others in creating a positive illusion about the 524
seriousness of the disease. It cannot be ruled out that unrealistic optimism may be a specific 525
consequence of the awareness of one's own mortality, which has not been verified in the 526
empirical research so far. 527

In our research, we refer to the predictions based on the Weinstein model (7), which we 528
consider to be the most elaborated theoretical framework in the literature explaining the 529
predictors of unrealistic optimism. We are aware that the inference about the relationship to 530
risk assessment in our research was indirect rather than direct. Further efforts should be made 531
to better demonstrate the direct relationship of factors in the Weinstein model (7) with the 532
development of the positive illusions regarding the assessment of various aspects of pandemic 533
risk (contagion risk, risk of a severe course, risk of unexpected vaccine reactions) and the role 534
of mortality salience in upholding positive illusions. 535

References

- 537
1. Dolinski D, Dolinska B, Zmaczynska-Witek B, Banach M, Kulesza W. Unrealistic Optimism in the Time of Coronavirus Pandemic: May It Help to Kill, If So—Whom: Disease or the Person? *JCM*. 2020 May 13;9(5):1464. 538
539
540
 2. Nes LS, Segerstrom SC. Dispositional Optimism and Coping: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev*. 2006 Aug;10(3):235–51. 541
542
 3. Rozanski A, Bavishi C, Kubzansky LD, Cohen R. Association of Optimism With Cardiovascular Events and All-Cause Mortality: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019 Sep 27;2(9):e1912200. 543
544
545
 4. Taylor SE, Brown JD. Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1988;103(2):193–210. 546
547
 5. Radcliffe NM, Klein WMP. Dispositional, Unrealistic, and Comparative Optimism: Differential Relations with the Knowledge and Processing of Risk Information and Beliefs about Personal Risk. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*. 2002 Jun;28(6):836–46. 548
549
550
 6. Clarke VA, Lovegrove H, Williams A, Machperson M. Unrealistic Optimism and the Health Belief Model. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*. 2000;23(4):367–76. 551
552
 7. Weinstein ND. Unrealistic optimism about future life events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1980;39(5):806–20. 553
554
 8. Burger JM, Burns L. The Illusion of Unique Invulnerability and the Use of Effective Contraception. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*. 1988 Jun;14(2):264–70. 555
556
 9. Dillard AJ, Midboe AM, Klein WMP. The Dark Side of Optimism: Unrealistic Optimism About Problems With Alcohol Predicts Subsequent Negative Event Experiences. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*. 2009 Nov;35(11):1540–50. 557
558
559
 10. McKenna FP, Albery IP. Does Unrealistic Optimism Change Following a Negative Experience? *J Appl Social Psychol*. 2001 Jun;31(6):1146–57. 560
561
 11. Asimakopoulou K, Hoorens V, Speed E, Coulson NS, Antoniszczak D, Collyer F, et al. Comparative optimism about infection and recovery from COVID-19; Implications for adherence with lockdown advice. *Health Expect*. 2020 Dec;23(6):1502–11. 562
563
564
 12. Raude J, Debin M, Souty C, Guerrisi C, Turbelin C, Falchi A, et al. Are people excessively pessimistic about the risk of coronavirus infection? [Internet]. *PsyArXiv*; 2020 Mar [cited 2022 Jan 14]. Available from: <https://osf.io/364qj> 565
566
567
-

13. Gassen J, Nowak TJ, Henderson AD, Weaver SP, Baker EJ, Muehlenbein MP. Unrealistic Optimism and Risk for COVID-19 Disease. *Front Psychol.* 2021 Jun 4;12:647461. 568
569
570
 14. Salgado S, Berntsen D. “It Won’t Happen to Us”: Unrealistic Optimism Affects COVID-19 Risk Assessments and Attitudes Regarding Protective Behaviour. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition.* 2021 Sep;10(3):368–80. 571
572
573
 15. Oljača M, Sadiković S, Branovački B, Pajić D, Smederevac S, Mitrović D. Unrealistic optimism and HEXACO traits as predictors of risk perception and compliance with COVID-19 preventive measures during the first wave of pandemic. *PP.* 1970 Jan 1;13(4):405–25. 574
575
576
577
 16. Gordeeva TO, Sychev OA, Semenov YI. Constructive Optimism, Defensive Optimism, and Gender as Predictors of Autonomous Motivation to Follow Stay-at-Home Recommendations during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Psych Rus.* 2020;13(4):38–54. 578
579
580
 17. Kahneman D, Tversky A. Subjective probability: A judgment of representativeness. *Cognitive Psychology.* 1972 Jul;3(3):430–54. 581
582
 18. Tversky A, Kahneman D. Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. *Cognitive Psychology.* 1973 Sep;5(2):207–32. 583
584
 19. Dolinski D, Gromski W, Zawisza E. Unrealistic Pessimism. *The Journal of Social Psychology.* 1987 Oct;127(5):511–6. 585
586
 20. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Buchner A, Lang AG. Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods.* 2009 Nov;41(4):1149–60. 587
588
589
 21. IBM Corp. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp; 2019. 590
 22. Pawłowska D. Zgony w czasie pandemii w Polsce i innych krajach. Rok 2021 też zaczął się rekordowo. *Gazeta Wyborcza* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Mar 31]; Available from: <https://biqdata.wyborcza.pl/biqdata/7,159116,26747678,zgony-w-czasie-pandemii-w-polsce-i-innych-krajach-rok-2021.html> 591
592
593
594
 23. Polish Ministry of Health. Data published by the Ministry of Health in Poland concerning the number of infections, hospitalizations and deaths caused by the coronavirus on government website. 2020. 595
596
597
 24. Harris PR, Griffin DW, Murray S. Testing the limits of optimistic bias: Event and person moderators in a multilevel framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 2008;95(5):1225–37. 598
599
600
-

25. Botteman H, Morlaàs O, Fossati P, Schmidt L. Does the Coronavirus Epidemic Take Advantage of Human Optimism Bias? *Front Psychol.* 2020 Aug 26;11:2001. 601 602
26. Thaler R. Toward a positive theory of consumer choice. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization.* 1980 Mar;1(1):39–60. 603 604
27. Makridakis S, Moleskis A. The costs and benefits of positive illusions. *Front Psychol* [Internet]. 2015 Jun 30 [cited 2022 Jan 14];6. Available from: <http://journal.frontiersin.org/Article/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00859/abstract> 605 606 607
28. Kofta M, Sedek G. Uncontrollability as irreducible uncertainty. *Eur J Soc Psychol.* 1999 Aug;29(5–6):577–90. 608 609
29. Kofta M, Sèdek G. Repeated failure: A source of helplessness or a factor irrelevant to its emergence? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General.* 1989;118(1):3–12. 610 611
30. Agostinelli G, Sherman SJ, Presson CC, Chain L. Self-Protection and Self-Enhancement Biases in Estimates of Population Prevalence. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull.* 1992 Oct;18(5):631–42. 612 613 614
31. Alicke MD, Sedikides C. Self-enhancement and self-protection: What they are and what they do. *European Review of Social Psychology.* 2009 Feb;20(1):1–48. 615 616
32. Greenaway KH, Philipp MC, Storrs KR. The motivation for control: Loss of control promotes energy, effort, and action. In: *Coping with lack of control in a social world.* New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group; 2017. p. 35–48. (Current issues in social psychology.). 617 618 619 620
33. Greenberg J, Pyszczynski T, Solomon S. The Causes and Consequences of a Need for Self-Esteem: A Terror Management Theory. In: Baumeister RF, editor. *Public Self and Private Self* [Internet]. New York, NY: Springer New York; 1986 [cited 2022 Jan 14]. p. 189–212. Available from: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4613-9564-5_10 621 622 623 624
34. Pyszczynski T, Solomon S, Greenberg J. Thirty Years of Terror Management Theory. In: *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* [Internet]. Elsevier; 2015 [cited 2022 Jan 14]. p. 1–70. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0065260115000052> 625 626 627 628
35. Pyszczynski T, Lockett M, Greenberg J, Solomon S. Terror Management Theory and the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology.* 2021 Mar;61(2):173–89. 629 630