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*

	N	Mean ± SD
Gender		
Women	177	
Men	56	
Unspecified	3	
Age	236	19.32 ± 1.77
Ethnicity		
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	
Asian	15	
Black/African American	5	
Hispanic	17	
White/European American	177	
Biracial/Multiracial	17	
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*

	N	Mean ± SD
Barista Condition		
Absent	235	0.33 ± 0.33
Present	233	0.47 ± 0.36
Payment Method		
Tip Screen	231	0.43 ± 0.35
Receipt	234	0.39 ± 0.38
Cash	235	0.38 ± 0.39
Mean Empathy Score	213	2.73 ± 0.57

Table S4. *Payment Method and Barista Presence Model Comparison*

			Model fit				Likelihood ratio tests			
Model specification	**Random effects**	**Fixed effects**	**AIC**	**BIC**	**logLik**	**df**	**χ^2**	**df**	**p-value**	**BF**
Random effect models										
Participant	(1 | subject_nr)	-	1051.23	1066.91	-522.61	3				
Participant + barista presence slope	(1 + barista | subject_nr)	-	1044.53	1070.67	-517.27	5	10.70	2	0.005	
Participant + payment type slope	(1 + payment_type | subject_nr)	-	1013.35	1055.16	-498.67	8	37.18	3	0.000	
Participant + barista presence slope + payment type slope	(1 + barista | subject_nr) + (1 + payment_type | subject_nr)	-	979.28	1036.78	-478.64	11	40.06	3	0.000	
Fixed effect models										
RE only	(1 + barista | subject_nr) + (1 + payment_type | subject_nr)	-	979.28	1036.78	-478.64	11				
Barista presence	(1 + barista | subject_nr) + (1 + payment_type | subject_nr)	barista	921.29	984.01	-448.65	12	59.99	1	0.000	> 100
Payment type	(1 + barista | subject_nr) + (1 + payment_type | subject_nr)	payment_type	982.63	1050.58	-478.31	13	0.00	1	1.000	0.001
Barista presence * payment type	(1 + barista | subject_nr) + (1 + payment_type | subject_nr)	barista * payment_type	928.01	1011.64	-448.00	16	60.62	3	0.000	> 100

Table S5. *Empathy and Barista Presence Model Comparison*

Model specification	Random effects	Fixed effects	Model fit				Likelihood ratio tests			
			AIC	BIC	logLik	df	χ^2	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