Omission-Commission Asymmetries in Morality: Meta-analysis of Omission-Bias

INTRO
- Omission bias – preference (morality + blame + decision) for inaction (omission) over action (commission), given chance of harm

Mechanisms:

Key Motivations for the meta-analysis:
- Mixed findings - Connolly and Reb (2003) – Preference towards Vaccination (Commission)
- Sensitive / weakened to several moderating factors? – familiarity, responsibility (mixed findings), (no clear negative) outcome, weakened in-between-subject design?

METHODS
- Pre-registered in Open Science Framework

Search:
- Article search – Google Scholar + Contacting Authors

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:
- Clear contrast between omission and commission
- Familiarity, responsibility (mixed findings), (no clear negative) outcome, weakened in-between-subject design?
- Sample size >100
- Single target (NOT different people/groups, no trolley dilemma)
- Coding and verification by three authors

Analysis:
- Key R packages (RStudio Team, 2015): Metafor (Viechtbauer, 2010) and Metaforest for moderator analyses to address for high heterogeneity, small sample size and lack of power (van Lijsen, 2017)
- Effect sizes unavailable > descriptive statistics or inferential statistics used to calculate effect sizes
- Main-effects – random-effects model; Moderator Analyses – two-level fixed-effects model, multivariate three-level model (Article as third level), Metaforest
- Heterogeneity - Q-statistics, and I square statistic.
- Publication bias analyses - Published vs non-Published analysis, Funnel plots, trim and fill, rank test, Egger’s regression, p-uniform, p-curve, PET and PEESE, 3-Parameter Selection Model (3PSM), Henmi and Copas (2010)

DISCUSSION
- Support for the existence of omission bias effects remain medium to large after adjusting for publication bias
- Very high heterogeneity - some studies with minimal effect or even opposite effect (Connolly and Reb, 2005)
- No consistent in moderator results with two-level versus three-level models
- Limitations:
  - Mixed findings - Connolly and Reb (2003) – Preference towards Vaccination (Commission)
  - Sensitive / weakened to several moderating factors? – familiarity, responsibility (mixed findings), (no clear negative) outcome, weakened in-between-subject design?

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS:
- More studies on boundary conditions & reversal of Omission Effect in morality
- Meta-analyses of Omission-Bias
- Effects of Interest Findings

REFERENCES

Yeung Siu Kit, Tijen Yay, Gilad Feldman

This poster is adapted with reference to the template here: Better Scientific Poster (Portrait) - https://osf.io/bv4ji/