

Spring 4-2016

Examining the Protective Effects of Self-Positivity on Information Avoidance

Amanda C. Ferrante
University of Dayton

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/uhp_theses



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

eCommons Citation

Ferrante, Amanda C., "Examining the Protective Effects of Self-Positivity on Information Avoidance" (2016). *Honors Theses*. 89.

https://ecommons.udayton.edu/uhp_theses/89

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the University Honors Program at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Examining the Protective Effects of Self-Positivity on Information Avoidance



Honors Thesis

Amanda C. Ferrante

Department: Psychology

Advisor: Erin O'Mara, Ph.D.

April 2016

Examining the Protective Effects of Self-Positivity on Information Avoidance

Honors Thesis

Amanda C. Ferrante

Department: Psychology

Advisor: Erin O'Mara, Ph.D.

April 2016

Abstract

Although information could provide insight, comfort, or opportunity, people are motivated to avoid information that challenges preexisting belief or cause unpleasant emotion. Previous research shows that affirming one's self-worth can reduce information avoidance. The present study measures whether self-enhancement, or exaggerating qualities to maintain a positive sense of self, can also reduce information avoidance. Self-enhancement is associated with positive mental health and reducing physiological stress symptoms if the exaggeration is within the same domain as threatening information. Participants in the self-enhancement category were asked to give examples of how they are better at maintaining social relationships than the average college student. They were then asked if they would like to see results of a personality test that could potentially show them they are not socially successful. The difference in information avoidance did not vary between those in the self-enhancement condition, those in the self-affirmation condition, and those control condition. Self-enhancement as a method of information avoidance could be more effective if the domain was more threatening like health information or career outlook.

Acknowledgements

The author sincerely thanks Dr. Erin O'Mara for her valuable guidance and support through every stage of the study. The author would also like to thank the Honors Department and the University of Dayton Department of Psychology for the opportunity to conduct research on an independent level and for the use of facilities.



Table of Contents

Abstract	Title Page
Introduction	1
Methods	5
Results	7
Discussion	8
References	10

Introduction

The phrase “ignorance is bliss” is an idiom frequently used to explain why people avoid information. While at times it might seem like bypassing available information would help avoid pain or conflict, one is also potentially bypassing insight, comfort, or an opportunity to make a change that would be beneficial in the future. Regardless, people choose to avoid information when they feel the information would demand a change in beliefs or cause unpleasant emotions (Sweeny, Melnyk, Miller & Shepperd, 2010).

When establishing attitudes or beliefs, people gravitate towards consistency. However, when one is presented with information that conflicts with their current attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs, he/she experiences cognitive dissonance, or psychological discomfort related to holding inconsistent thoughts simultaneously (Festinger, 1962). In order to reduce this discomfort, people are motivated to avoid information that conflicts with preexisting attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs (Sweeny, Melnyk, Miller & Shepperd, 2010). People would much rather hear information that validates them rather than information that encourages them to change their opinions (Hart et al., 2009). For example, a study by J. Stacy Adams (1961) asked 100 mothers whether they believed genetics or environment was more important in the development of a child. They then listened to what they believed to be a speech from an expert in the field explaining the opinion contrary to the one the mother just reported. After listening to the speech that blatantly opposed her reported opinion, the mothers were more likely to show interest in attending a talk from a speaker who held the same opinion she did. This information avoidance is even more prevalent if a person believes the conflicting information would be challenging to refute. They would be less likely to dismiss an article countering their opinions if that article came from a tabloid as opposed to a highly-

regarded news source (Lowin, 1969). In general, previous research shows that people are more interested in protecting themselves from cognitive dissonance than learning information that could give them a more accurate impression of reality.

In addition to avoiding cognitive dissonance, people avoid information that would cause unwanted and unpleasant emotions like sadness, fear, guilt, embarrassment, or shame. Many studies have indicated that a reason for avoiding the results of medical test, or avoid medical testing altogether, is the psychological impact that comes with a positive test result (Zapka, Stoddard, Zorn, McCusker & Mayer, 1991; Cutler & Hodgson, 2003; Thompson et al.,2002). In addition to avoiding health-related information, information avoidance to deter negative emotions presents itself in commonplace activities as well. A study of Belgian and Dutch soccer fans were less likely to visit the website of their favorite soccer team after a loss. They did not like to dwell in their disappointment, so they avoided reviews and news stories about the unsuccessful game (Boen, Vanbeselaere, & Feys, 2002).

Previous research has established two major ways to reduce information avoidance, metacognition and self-affirmation. Metacognition, or the evaluation of one's own thoughts, causes the brain to switch from quick, intuitive thinking to deliberate, analytical thinking (Simamura, 2000; Alter, Oppenheimer, Epley, & Eyre, 2007). Thinking analytically about why a person is choosing to act a certain way helps him/her move past initial emotions and make an informed decision (Howell & Shepperd, 2012). In addition to metacognition, previous studies show that self-affirmation can help reduce information avoidance. Having a person list real-life examples of how he/she is good at a certain skill or an overall good person increases a person's self-worth. This positive

feeling is used as a distraction and helps a person feel more comfortable hearing potentially threatening or conflicting information (Howell & Shepperd, 2012).

The present research examines whether self-enhancement, or the motivation to have and maintain a positive sense of self, has an effect on reducing information avoidance (Taylor & Brown, 1988). When someone self-enhances, they think of exaggerated examples of how they are better at a specific skill than others or an overall better person than others. Previous research shows that self-enhancement is helpful in making people feel good. It is associated with positive mental health, better quality of interpersonal relationships, and persistence (Taylor & Brown, 1988). It is also associated with alleviating psychological responses of stressful situations. Previous research shows that self-enhancing before a threatening situation can reduce heart rates during the threatening situation. However, this is only true if the domain of the threatening situation is the same as the domain of the self-enhancement (Gramzow, Willard, & Mendez, 2008). If self-enhancement can make people feel positively and less stressed, can it make people feel comfortable hearing potentially threatening information?

In the present study, participants decide whether or not they want to receive results of a personality test that could reveal their personality makes them vulnerable to being socially unsuccessful as they age. This domain was chosen because people value belongingness so greatly. Social attachment, or belongingness, is considered to be a fundamental human motivation because of the effects it has on a person's emotions and cognitive processes (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Experiencing rejection or a weakening of interpersonal ties can lead to negative feelings such as sadness, loneliness, hurt feelings, jealousy, embarrassment, and shame (Leary, Koch, & Hechenbleikner, 2001).

Overall, rejection make a person less confident on their own self-worth. In other words, rejection lowers self-esteem (Leary, Haupt, Strausser, & Chokel, 1998). Since social rejection would cause a person such unpleasant emotion, it is appropriate to use it as the domain of threatening information.

Two hypotheses were generated to potentially explain how self-enhancement may influence information avoidance: Self-enhancement could either act as a buffer or an exacerbater. If self-enhancement acts as a buffer, then increasing feelings of self-worth would protect the self from the threat. People would feel comfortable hearing potentially threatening information, as it would have a less harmful impact on feelings of self-worth. If self-enhancement acts as an exacerbater, then increasing feelings of self-worth would cause greater information avoidance. People would not want the potentially threatening information to diminish their positive feelings, so they would be more likely to avoid.

Methods

Participants

One hundred and twenty-four undergraduates from the University of Dayton participated in this study. The participants were made up of 54 males and 70 females ranging from 18-22 years old. The average age was 19.03 years old. Participants received course credit for an introduction to psychology course.

Procedure

Participants arrived at the study individually. They were under the impression that the study was examining college students' personalities and their experiences in college. After reviewing and signing an informed consent sheet, the participant was instructed to select one of five folders. In order to increase validity and mask the actual purpose of the study, participants were falsely told that each folder contained a different question about some aspect of college life. In reality, each folder contained the same question, which varied depending on their randomly assigned condition: self-affirmation, self-enhancement, or control. Participants in the self-affirmation condition were asked to identify their most important trait and asked to give examples of how this trait is characteristic of him/her (O'Mara, Gaertner, Sedikides, Zhou, & Liu, 2012). Participants in the self-enhancement condition were asked to describe how he/she is better at maintaining social relationships than other college students. Participants in the control condition were asked to describe his/her typical Tuesday schedule.

The participant was then told he/she was going to complete a series of personality assessments, starting with the Keirsey Temperament Sorter II (Keirsey, Milner, & Wood, 2004). The Keirsey Temperament Sorter II, a commonly used personality assessment,

was taken on traditional UD scantrons to increase the likelihood that participants would believe their responses could be easily scored. After the Kerisey Temperament Sorter was completed, the participant was told he/she has the opportunity to have the responses scored while he/she finishes the study and the results will be handed back at the end of the study. To provide each participant with a potential threat, the experimenter then explained that many students have been receiving scores much lower than anticipated in the social relationships domain, indicating that they will not be very successful with long-term relationships. The participant then indicated whether he/she would like to see the results on a sheet of paper. Lastly, the participant answers suspicion and demographic questions before being debriefed.

Results

Data was collected from 124 participants; however, four participants admitted to knowing information about the study prior to their participation and their data were excluded from the analyses. The effective sample size was 120. A logistic regression was conducted to test whether participants avoided threatening information about the personality differentially across conditions. Decision to hear results of the personality test (Yes/No) was regressed onto condition (control, self-affirmation, self-enhancement). Selecting “no” to the personality test results would indicate a desire to avoid potentially threatening feedback information. For those in the self-affirmation condition ($n = 43$), 81.4% of participants chose to see their personality assessment results. For those in the self-enhancement condition ($n = 39$), 87.2% of participants chose to see their personality assessment results. For those in the control condition ($n = 38$), 89.5% of participants chose to see their personality assessment results. Accordingly, there was no effect between conditions, $X^2(2, N = 120) = 0.6085, p = .7377$. This suggests that people were equally likely to see their results regardless of what condition they were assigned to.

Discussion

The present study proposed and tested two hypotheses: self-enhancement as a buffer or an exacerbator to information avoidance. The findings from the present study were inconsistent with either hypothesis, finding that overall people were unlikely to avoid information and information was avoided equally across conditions. In other words, the results suggest that the information was not threatening to participants as participants felt comfortable seeing their results regardless of their assigned condition. In addition to failing to support either hypothesis, this study did not replicate the previously found notion that self-assessment can deter information avoidance by acting as a distractor from the threatening information (Howell & Shepperd, 2012)

Several possibilities may account for the present findings. One possible reason for the present findings is that the participants did not view the feedback as potentially threatening. This could be because of the prevalence of personality assessments on the Internet. Websites like Facebook.com and Buzzfeed.com are filled with free and fun personality assessments that people take to fill time or procrastinate from work or school. Since people are taking these personality assessments so frequently and lightheartedly, there is a high chance that they have previously received results that were either unpleasant and they have acclimated to such results. Alternatively, they may have received positive information prior and anticipated that the results from the present study would be consistent with their previous, positive results.

A second possible explanation for the findings from the present study, given that people tend to view themselves positively on socially desirable traits (Edwards, 1953) and they tend to be unrealistically optimistic about positive events and feedback happening to themselves (Weinstein, 1980) is that people may have assumed that their

results would be positive. Although participants were presented with information suggesting that they would be very likely to receive positive results, tendencies toward unrealistic optimism would prevent them from believe that they would be among the people who receive negative information.

Finally, several participants recalled during the study that they had previously taken the Myers-Briggs Personality Assessment in an introductory psychology course (Briggs & Myers, 1977). If participants had recently taken a test similar to the test used in the study, they may have been given information that their results were positive, and therefore had nothing to fear from the results of the study's personality test. Future studies should provide participants with more objective threatening information like academic performance in a course or health status.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1961). Reduction of cognitive dissonance by seeking consonant information. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62(1), 74.
- Alter, A. L., Oppenheimer, D. M., Epley, N., & Eyre, R. N. (2007). Overcoming intuition: metacognitive difficulty activates analytic reasoning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 136(4), 569.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological bulletin*, 117(3), 497.
- Boen, F., Vanbeselaere, N., & Feys, J. (2002). Behavioral consequences of fluctuating group success: An Internet study of soccer-team fans. *The Journal of social psychology*, 142(6), 769-781.
- Briggs, K. C., & Myers, I. B. (1977). *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Form G*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Cutler, S. J., & Hodgson, L. G. (2003). To test or not to test: Interest in genetic testing for Alzheimer's disease among middle-aged adults. *American journal of Alzheimer's disease and other dementias*, 18(1), 9-20.
- Edwards, A. L. (1953). The relationship between the judged desirability of a trait and the probability that the trait will be endorsed. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 37(2), 90.
- Festinger, L. (1962). Cognitive dissonance. *Scientific American*.
- Gramzow, R. H., Willard, G., & Mendes, W. B. (2008). Big tales and cool heads: academic exaggeration is related to cardiac vagal reactivity. *Emotion*, 8(1), 138.

Hart, W., Albarracín, D., Eagly, A. H., Brechan, I., Lindberg, M. J., & Merrill, L. (2009).

Feeling validated versus being correct: a meta-analysis of selective exposure to information. *Psychological bulletin*, *135*(4), 555.

Howell, J. L., & Shepperd, J. A. (2012). Reducing information avoidance through affirmation. *Psychological science*, *23*(2), 141-145.

Keirsey, D. M., Milner, R., & Wood, V. (2004). Keirsey temperament sorter II.

Leary, M. R., Haupt, A. L., Strausser, K. S., & Chokel, J. T. (1998). Calibrating the sociometer: The relationship between interpersonal appraisals and the state self-esteem. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *74*(5), 1290.

Leary, M. R., Koch, E. J., & Hechenbleikner, N. R. (2001). Emotional responses to interpersonal rejection. *Interpersonal rejection*, 145-166.

Lowin, A. (1969). Further evidence for an approach-avoidance interpretation of selective exposure. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *5*(3), 265-271.

O'Mara, E. M., Gaertner, L., Sedikides, C., Zhou, X., & Liu, Y. (2012). A longitudinal-experimental test of the panculturality of self-enhancement: Self-enhancement promotes psychological well-being both in the West and the East. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *46*(2), 157-163.

Shimamura, A. P. (2000). The role of the prefrontal cortex in dynamic filtering. *Psychobiology*, *28*(2), 207-218.

Sweeny, K., Melnyk, D., Miller, W., & Shepperd, J. A. (2010). Information avoidance: Who, what, when, and why. *Review of General Psychology*, *14*(4), 340.

Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: a social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological bulletin*, *103*(2), 193.

Thompson, H. S., Valdimarsdottir, H. B., Duteau-Buck, C., Guevarra, J., Bovbjerg, D.

H., Richmond-Avellaneda, C., ... & Offit, K. (2002). Psychosocial predictors of
BRCA counseling and testing decisions among urban African-American
women. *Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers & Prevention*, *11*(12), 1579-1585.

Weinstein, N. D. (1980). Unrealistic optimism about future life events. *Journal of
personality and social psychology*, *39*(5), 806.

Zapka, J. G., Stoddard, A., Zorn, M., McCusker, J., & Mayer, K. H. (1991). HIV
antibody test result knowledge, risk perceptions and behavior among
homosexually active men. *Patient Education and Counseling*, *18*(1), 9-17.