

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 \pm SD	N	Mean \pm SD
Gender				
Women	177		26	
Men	56		34	
Unspecified	3		-	
Age	236	19.32 \pm 1.77	60	39.87 \pm 13.10
Ethnicity				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2		-	
Asian	15		5	
Black/African American	5		7	
Hispanic	17		2	
White/European American	177		44	
Biracial/Multiracial	17		2	
Unspecified	3		-	

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 \pm SD	N	Mean \pm SD
Barista Condition				
Absent	235	0.33 \pm 0.33	32	0.47 \pm 0.38
Present	233	0.47 \pm 0.36	28	0.43 \pm 0.43
Payment Method				
Tip Screen	231	0.43 \pm 0.35	21	0.42 \pm 0.30
Receipt	234	0.39 \pm 0.38	20	0.46 \pm 0.45
Cash	235	0.38 \pm 0.39	19	0.47 \pm 0.45
Mean Empathy Score	213	2.73 \pm 0.57	60	3.10 \pm 0.73

Table S4. *Payment Method and Barista Presence Model Comparison for Study 1*

Model specification	Random effects	Fixed effects	Model fit				Likelihood ratio tests			
			AIC	BIC	logLik	df	χ^2	df	p-value	BF
Random effect models										
Participant	(1 subject_nr)	-	1034.31	1049.95	-514.15	3				
Participant + barista presence slope	(1 + barista subject_nr)	-	1026.44	1052.51	-508.22	5	11.87	2	0.003	
Participant + payment type slope	(1 + payment_type subject_nr)	-	995.53	1037.24	-489.77	8	36.91	3	0.000	
Participant + barista presence slope + payment type slope	(1 + barista subject_nr) + (1 + payment_type subject_nr)	-	957.44	1014.79	-467.72	11	44.09	3	0.000	
Fixed effect models										
RE only	(1 + barista subject_nr) + (1 + payment_type subject_nr)	-	957.44	1014.79	-467.72	11				
Barista presence	(1 + barista subject_nr) + (1 + payment_type subject_nr)	barista	899.30	961.86	-437.65	12	60.14	1	0.000	> 100
Payment type	(1 + barista subject_nr) + (1 + payment_type subject_nr)	payment_type	961.13	1028.91	-467.57	13	0.00	1	1.000	0.000
Barista presence * payment type	(1 + barista subject_nr) + (1 + payment_type subject_nr)	barista * payment_type	906.43	989.85	-437.21	16	60.71	3	0.000	> 100

Table S5. *Empathy and Barista Presence Model Comparison for Study 1*

Model specification	Random effects	Fixed effects	Model fit				Likelihood ratio tests			
			AIC	BIC	logLik	df	v²	df	p-value	BF
Random effect models										
Empty	1	-	297.51	305.62	-146.76	2				
Participant	(1 subject_nr)	-	176.27	188.44	-85.14	3	123.24	1	0.000	
Participant + EQ	(1 subject_nr) + (1 EQ_mean)	-	178.27	194.49	-85.14	4	0	1	1.000	
Fixed effect models										
RE only	(1 subject_nr)	-	176.27	188.44	-85.14	3				
Barista presence	(1 subject_nr)	barista	122.21	138.43	-57.11	4	56.06	1	0.000	> 100
EQ	(1 subject_nr)	EQ_mean	176.38	192.60	-84.19	4	0	0	1.000	0.125
Barista presence + EQ	(1 subject_nr)	barista + EQ_mean	122.32	142.59	-56.16	5	56.06	1	0.000	> 100
Barista presence * EQ	(1 subject_nr)	barista * EQ_mean	123.92	148.24	-55.96	6	0.40	1	0.525	> 100

Table S6. *Within-subjects ANOVA results for Study 1*

	ANOVA test of the effects of barista presence and payment type on tip size		
	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Barista presence	5.40	(1, 1346)	0.02
Payment type	0.02	(2, 1346)	0.98
Barista presence * payment type	0.05	(2, 1346)	0.95

Table S7. *Between-subjects ANOVA results for Study 1 (single tipping condition)*

	ANOVA test of the effects of barista presence and payment type on tip size		
	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Barista presence	0.28	(1, 221)	0.60
Payment type	1.44	(2, 221)	0.24
Barista presence * payment type	1.92	(2, 221)	0.15

Table S8. *Between-subjects ANOVA results for Study 2*

	ANOVA test of the effects of barista presence and payment type on tip size		
	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Barista presence	0.20	(1, 54)	0.66
Payment type	0.07	(2, 54)	0.93
Barista presence * payment type	5.02	(2, 54)	0.01