Supplementary Materials

Pro tip: Screen-based payment methods increase negative feelings in consumers but do not increase tip sizes

Francine W. Goh, Alexandria C. Jungck, & Jeffrey R. Stevens

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Table S1. *Participant Demographic Information*

	Study 1		Study 2	
	N	Mean ± SD	N	Mean ± SD
Gender				
Women	177		54	
Men	56		67	
Unspecified	2		1	
Age	235	19.32 ± 1.77	122	40.75 ± 12.64
Ethnicity				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2		-	
Asian	15		13	
Black/African American	5		9	
Hispanic	17		6	
White/European American	177		85	
Biracial/Multiracial	13		8	
Unspecified	6		1	

Table S2. *Bayes Factor Interpretations According to Wagenmakers et al. (2018)*

Bayes factor	**Interpretation**
> 100	Extreme evidence for H_1
30 - 100	Very strong evidence for H_1
10 - 30	Strong evidence for H_1
3 - 10	Moderate evidence for H_1
1 - 3	Anecdotal evidence for H_1
1/3 - 1	Anecdotal evidence for H_0
1/10 - 1/3	Moderate evidence for H_0
1/30 - 1/10	Strong evidence for H_0
1/100 - 1/30	Very strong evidence for H_0
< 1/100	Extreme evidence for H_0

Table S3. *Descriptive Statistics for Tip Sizes*

	Study 1		Study 2	
	N	Mean ± SD	N	Mean ± SD
Barista Condition				
Absent	231	0.34 ± 0.33	59	0.46 ± 0.41
Present	229	0.47 ± 0.36	63	0.51 ± 0.45
Payment Method				
Tip Screen	230	0.43 ± 0.35	37	0.47 ± 0.36
Receipt	230	0.39 ± 0.39	42	0.52 ± 0.47
Cash	231	0.38 ± 0.39	43	0.47 ± 0.46
Mean Empathy Score	213	2.73 ± 0.57	122	3.20 ± 0.79

Table S4. *ANOVA results for effect of payment method and barista presence on tipping behavior for Study 1*

Effect	$\hat{\eta}_p^2$	95% CI	F	df^{i}	df_{res}^{i}	p
Payment Method	.019	[.002, > .999]	4.21	1.75	371.10	.020
Barista Presence	.231	[.154, > .999]	63.83	1	212	< .001
Payment Method x Barista Presence	.002	[.000, > .999]	0.47	1.95	412.58	.621

Table S5. *ANOVA results for effect of payment method and barista presence on tipping behavior (first condition) for Study 1*

Effect	$\hat{\eta}_p^2$	95% CI	F	df^{i}	df_{res}^{i}	p
Payment Method	.012	[.000, > .999]	1.29	2	221	.276
Barista Presence	.001	[.000, > .999]	0.22	1	221	.640
Payment Method x Barista Presence	.017	[.000, > .999]	1.92	2	221	.150

Table S6. *Linear mixed modeling results for effect of empathy on barista presence for Study 1*

Term	$\hat{\beta}$	95% CI	t	df	p
Intercept	.580	[.360, .800]	5.15	275.64	< .001
Barista Presence x Empathy	.020	[-.040, .080]	0.63	211	.527
Empathy	-.060	[-.140, .020]	-1.51	275.64	.132

Table S7. *Linear modeling results for effect of empathy on barista presence (first condition) for Study 1*

Predictor	b	95% CI	$t(223)$	p
Intercept	.520	[.150, .890]	2.75	.006
Barista Presence x Empathy	.010	[-.190, .220]	0.10	.920
Empathy	-.030	[-.170, .100]	-0.49	.626

Table S8. *ANOVA results for effect of payment method and barista presence on tipping behavior for Study 2*

Effect	$\hat{\eta}^2_p$	95% CI	F	df^{i}	df^{i}_{res}	p
Payment Method	.008	[.000, > .999]	0.45	2	116	.641
Barista Presence	.005	[.000, > .999]	0.54	1	116	.463
Payment Method x Barista Presence	.090	[.018, > .999]	5.73	2	116	.004

Table S9. *Linear modeling results for effect of empathy on barista presence for Study 2*

Predictor	b	95% CI	$t(118)$	p
Intercept	.600	[.170, 1.03]	2.77	.007
Barista Presence x Empathy	-.010	[-.210, .200]	-0.06	.954
Empathy	-.040	[-.180, .090]	-0.65	.520