

5-2024

## To Tip or Not to Tip: An Analysis into Prompted Tipping

Jared Dingman  
jareddingman@unomaha.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/university\\_honors\\_program](https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/university_honors_program)



Part of the [Behavioral Economics Commons](#), [Food and Beverage Management Commons](#), [Other Economics Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Please take our feedback survey at: [https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE](https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE)

---

### Recommended Citation

Dingman, Jared, "To Tip or Not to Tip: An Analysis into Prompted Tipping" (2024). *Theses/Capstones/Creative Projects*. 314.

[https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/university\\_honors\\_program/314](https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/university_honors_program/314)

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the University Honors Program at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses/Capstones/Creative Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).

**To Tip or Not to Tip: An Analysis into Prompted Tipping**

Jared Dingman

Honors Department, University of Nebraska at Omaha

May 11, 2024

Faculty Advisor:

Eduardo Cenci

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to extend my deep gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Eduardo Cenci. This work would not have been completed to the highest caliber without Dr. Cenci's constant guidance and encouragement.

Further, I would like to thank Dr. Ben Smith, Dr. Beth Lyon, Dr. Lucy Morrison, Dr. Adrian Duran, and Dr. Jessica Huff for their help in dispersing my work to more participants.

Lastly, I want to thank my friends and family. Their support and kindness were essential in completing this work.

**Abstract:**

Giving tips (or gratuities) in restaurants in the United States has been and is currently a hotly debated and discussed topic. Concerns regarding proper compensation have been raised, but there is a need for empirical evidence to investigate and solve potential issues of compensation. This honors thesis aimed to answer two questions: Whether restaurant patrons tip more when prompted with tipping percentages, and whether those who have worked in the tipping industry tip more than those who have not. I administered a brief survey with tipping scenarios to gauge prompted and unprompted tipping behaviors. With these scenarios, demographic information was also collected to perform later analyses. After 113 participants were gathered, I found no significant difference detected between participants who were exposed to a prompted tipping scenario when compared to an unprompted tipping scenario. Additionally, no significant difference was detected between participants who reported previous employment in a tipping industry when compared to those who reported no previous employment in a tipping industry. Potential reasons for these findings are discussed further in this work.

### **Introduction:**

Tipping in a restaurant is a ubiquitous experience for most people living in the United States. Deciding what amount/percent to give to a server can be fraught with variance and almost random patterning (Mentzer, 2021). This phenomenon has given rise to differing modalities of tipping and gratuities available to patrons at restaurants. One of these modalities is the introduction of a prompt of a “percent tip” option in restaurants and other service-based sectors. There have been numerous studies performed examining food quality, perception of service quality, etc. (Lynn, 2018, Lynn & McCall, 2000, Hoaas & Bigler, 2012, Lynn & Grassman, 1990). Yet, there seems to be a gaping hole in the food service literature regarding prompted tips and the potential outcomes of specifically prompted tipping. Because of this reason and other perceived benefits, it is necessary to examine the effects of a prompted tip on restaurant consumer behavior.

Before discussing where this study will be a unique addition to the food service literature, customer’s perceptions on tipping should be discussed to gauge driving forces behind these decisions. Firstly, it has been found that customers express irritation in some service-inclusive tipping circumstances. When patrons are prompted to a tip before receiving their food/service, more irritation ensues (Karabas, et al., 2020, Gössling, et al., 2021). The idea of tipping being a social norm also has a key role in the decision-making of patrons. It has been found, when asking patrons after they have tipped at a restaurant, societal pressure was a prime motivator to tip in any regard (Azar, 2003, Bodvarsson & Gibbson, 1997, Gössling, et al., 2021). It is important to note that these above-listed studies conducted their surveys after patrons have received their meal and experience. This might not be representative of a real-world tipping situation where tipping decisions are made at varying stages of the meal (Karabas, et al., 2020). Patrons may also

make their decisions based on social value perceived of tipping (Azar, 2003). Social utility gained from tipping may motivate patrons to tip (Azar, 2003). On a similar note, tipping has been marked as a method of “buying social approval” (Lynn & Grassman, 1990). Lynn & Grassman note that their findings are indicative of patrons behaving in ways that correspond to social approval (1990). These findings are contrasting with other analyses that find that “tipping... does not seem to improve social welfare and economic efficiency” (Azar, 2009).

In addition to social approval and societal pressures contributing to tipping decisions, it is vital to assess other tipping factors that relate to this study. One factor that has been noted to play into tipping decisions is the quality of service (Fernandez, et al., 2024, Lynn & Grassman, 1990, Hoaas, & Bigler, 2012). These studies note that service quality has the potential to increase or decrease the tip amount that patrons make. Counterintuitively, there have been studies suggesting that service may not influence tipping decisions (Cho, 2014, Lynn & McCall 2000). Regardless, the present study will hold service quality constant to concentrate on the effects of only prompted tipping. In addition to quality of service, income is a determining factor of tipping decisions (Fernandez, et al., 2024, Artuger & Çetinsöz, 2013, Hoaas & Bigler, 2012). Interestingly, Artuger & Çetinsöz found that those who were regarded as a high-income group had vastly different tipping determinants than middle- or low-income groups (2012). Factors such as presentability and service quality wavered across these income groups. The present study did not ask for any information regarding income with the reasoning that income might take away from the primary focus of this study. A last consideration to make regarding patron perceptions of tipping is the server themselves. One metaanalysis found that server attractiveness has a significant effect on tipping amounts (Lynn & McCall, 2000). Additionally, server friendliness and social expectations had a significant effect on tipping amounts (Lynn & McCall, 2000, Cho, 2014). The

present study will not have any human-to-human interaction. The survey that will be conducted is completely online and devoid of any details regarding personality and appearance. One last note to make regarding patron's perceptions of tipping is the norm of reciprocity. It has been suggested that when patrons experience "extra" service in the form of work, or even candy, patrons tend to tip more (Strohmetz, et al., 2002). This factor should not play into the present study, but it is important nonetheless to create a more comprehensive image of tipping perceptions.

Given the variety of factors that play into a patron's decision to tip and the amount of a tip, I aim to answer one specific factor of tipping: Prompted tipping. A prompted tip is understood as a text-administered series where, either digitally or physically, there are precalculated percentages of gratuities along with their real-dollar amounts. Academic literature containing prompted tipping is lacking (Lynn & McCall, 2000). Given this discrepancy in the literature with specifically prompted tips, I decided to analyze online surveys separated from academic literature. One survey found that most people tip roughly the same when prompted with a "tip suggestion screen" (McCann, 2024). However, two other responses that were common among participants: people tip more, and people tip less when prompted with a tip suggestion screen (McCann 2024). These responses accounted for roughly 25% of the sample each. Given this array of inconclusive evidence, there is even more need to shed light on an overlooked facet of tipping.

This study is also designed to examine the tipping behaviors of consumers in the restaurant industry where tipping behaviors are common. The prime example of this behavior is the restaurant industry. Tipping has been seen as capricious, unfair, and contentious from the perspective of the public and servers earning these tips (Mentzer, 2021, McCann, 2024).

Furthermore, only seven U.S. states require that servers must be fully compensated by the “full state minimum wage before tips” (Minimum Wage, 2024). Regardless of these perspectives, tipping is still commonplace in the restaurant industry. Therefore, it is paramount to examine if these claims of inequity and random patterning, (Lipper, et al., 2023), that are rooted in anecdotal evidence from servers and public have empirical backing. Concrete evidence found in this study could be applied to managerial decisions regarding compensation actions for employees.

Gauging tipping behaviors from people who were once recipients of these variant tips could also glean better insight into how patrons at restaurants behave. In other words, are servers/other professions that rely on tips properly being compensated for their work? Although this examination is not a comprehensive answer to this question, by putting a lens on tipping prompts, this question will be one step closer to being answered.

In addition to examining tipping behaviors themselves, I also desired to examine the effects of the participant’s backgrounds when gauging tipping behaviors. The background of patrons has been shown to play a significant effect on tipping behaviors (Liu, 2008, Saayman, M., & Saayman, A., 2015). A few of the background questions that were mentioned in the survey included age, enrolment at UNO, and previous employment in the restaurant/hospitality industry. Firstly, the question of age is crucial to this study. There was a desire to see if the variable of age had any effect on tipping amounts in this survey. Some studies have mentioned that there might be effects of age regarding tipping decisions (Artuger & Çetinsöz, 2013, Saayman, M., & Saayman, A., 2015). However, this evidence was not conclusive. If it were true that one age bracket of the sample was tipping more or less than another age bracket, this is an important facet of the study that could lead to applications in other research. In addition to age, enrollment at UNO is an important indicator to examine how widely the findings in this survey could be



extended. For instance, if nearly everyone who took part in the survey was enrolled at UNO, then it would be more difficult to extrapolate the data to other more varied samples that could be more representative of the whole population of tipping customers. Additionally, the survey asked what the participant's preferred gender was. This was done due to previous research finding that both men and women have been shown to tip more than each other (Saayman, M. & Saayman, A., 2015, Hoas & Bigler, 2012). If there was any significant difference detected between gender, data collected in this survey could assist other research endeavors. Lastly, previous employment in the restaurant/hospitality industry where tips are common is perhaps the most interesting facet of the participant's background. By asking participants whether the participant work/worked in this sector, I intend to surmise whether there was an increased or decreased tipping amount between those who worked or were once recipients of tipping behaviors. People who were currently employed in a serving job have been shown to be more accurate and are prone to tip more (Liu, 2008). It is also important to note that it has been reported before that people tip more if they have worked in a job where they have received tips (Schaeffer, 2023). In contrast to these two studies, there has also been research suggesting that employment background may not have a significant effect on tipping behaviors (Lynn & McCall, 2000). Therefore, my survey will produce meaningful results that can contribute to this contradictory literature.

My study will provide new insight into prompted tipping behaviors of various patrons. By examining age, enrollment, and previous employment, more empirical research can be conducted after this study with greater detail than these initial findings. Giving empiricism to the subjective evidence already collected (Lynn & McCall, 2000), can provide more insight into the restaurant industry's decisions if tipping is a viable method of compensation for employees.

**Method:**

Participants were gathered from various means. The first method of recruitment was via flyers posted around the University of Nebraska at Omaha (UNO). The flyer contained a brief description of the survey and a QR code that participants could scan and complete their survey on (Figure 1). These flyers were also located in local businesses around the area of downtown Benson in Omaha, NE. The hope of dispersing many flyers in various locations not exclusive to a university was done to obtain a wider sample to perform statistical analyses. In addition to flyers, professors and instructors across the UNO campus were asked to distribute the survey to their classes. This included instructors posting the link to the survey in online class platforms (such as Canvas), weekly interest boards, and sending the survey directly via email to any person of their choosing. There were no restrictions given. The rationale behind this decision was to mitigate any potential barriers in collecting participants to provide a representative sample to collect data. Data was collected for a duration of three weeks.

There was a total of 113 participants in this study. 55 of these participants were placed in the control condition where there was no tipping prompt. The other 58 participants were placed in the treatment with tipping prompt scenarios. The demographics of the participants were as follows: 95 of the participants were presently enrolled at UNO and 14 were not, 68 of the participants had previous industry experience where 40 did not, and the participants included 75 female responses, 21 male responses, and 4 responses that preferred another gender identification. See Table 1 for more information.

The survey's construction was done with the online survey platform Qualtrics. There was no monetary or academic incentive for participants to complete the survey. When the

participant first opened the survey, a brief consent agreement was displayed before the participant could start the survey. The consent form included descriptions of known risks and benefits to the study, a rudimentary description of the randomized nature of the study, statements indicating that the participant can quit the survey at any time without having to provide a reason, what the collected data will be used for, etc. Then, the survey asked participants for demographic information. This includes age, preferred gender, UNO enrolment status, which undergraduate program the participant is enrolled in, and if the participant has previously or was currently employed in a restaurant/hospitality job where tipping was commonplace. Demographic information was optional for the participant to provide. After this section of the survey, the participants were evenly and randomly split to be in one of two conditions. The first condition was the control condition. Participants in this group were exposed to three identical scenarios in the same order (Figure 2). These scenarios included a “high”, a “low”, and a “medium” bill. It could be said that determining a “high” and “low” bill amount could be considered arbitrary and not representative of what all people or businesses determine to be a high or low bill amount. In this survey, the high and low bill amounts were built in mind to be a reference point with one another. In other words, it was intended that the participant would acknowledge that some of the bills would be noticeably different in price from other bills seen. This was done to determine relative percentages at which participants tipped rather than real dollar amounts. All scenarios in this study were implemented with uneven bill amounts. An uneven bill is where the dollar and cents of the bill are not an “easy” amount to calculate tipping amounts. For example, an uneven bill amount could be \$19.61 whereas an even bill amount would be \$20.00. This was done to evoke more realistic tipping responses. In these scenarios, there was also an instruction to format the answers of the participants in a decimal format to increase the specificity of tips

obtained from participants. Additionally, each of the scenarios provided in this survey purposely eschewed details about the type of restaurant and what the server looked like or acted like to decrease the potential bias of participants. Furthermore, all scenarios did not differentiate on the service or quality of food that was at the restaurant. All scenarios were listed to have “good” service and quality of food. Participants were placed in either the unprompted tipping scenario group or the prompted tipping scenario group. The placement into these groups was randomly performed by computer software.

The random assignment of treatment group was done intentionally. The rationale behind this decision was that by randomly assigning treatment conditions, causal claims could be made about the findings discovered by the study. This methodology of finding causal claims has been tested and formulated before (Gertler, et al., 2016). If this survey were done via a self-selection basis, only simple correlations could be made. By controlling for these factors, more legitimate findings were garnered from the survey data.

Some participants were removed from survey analysis. The criteria for removal of the study included incomplete responses and unrealistic responses. The first criterion for removal dictated whether the response received from the participant was fully filled. Although the decision to include demographic information was optional, not including tipping amounts when asked in the survey resulted in the removal of that participant. This occurred five times throughout the duration of the study. Further, participants with at least one of the tipping questions answered were not removed from the study. The second criterion for removal was an unrealistic response. An unrealistic response was defined as a tipping response that was greater than or equal to the amount of the total bill. The rationale behind this benchmark was that tipping

has been seen to range around 10%-20% of the bill (Maynard & Mupandawana, 2009). This benchmark is certainly up for heated debate, but this is a legitimate standard. There were two responses removed because of this reason. Lastly, there was one instance where a respondent labeled their response as a conditional statement with two possible options. This response was removed.

Minimum detectable effect (MDE) equations were used to estimate the number of participants needed for this survey to gauge the confidence in results obtained from the survey. The formula used was  $N = \frac{(t_{1-k} + t_{\alpha})^2 \sigma^2}{P(1-P)MDE^2}$ . The critical value ( $t_{(1-k)}$ ) used was 0.84. The critical value of the confidence interval ( $t_{\alpha}$ ) was 1.96 where the alpha value was set to 5%. P is denoted as the proportion of units to a given treatment group.  $\sigma^2$  is the variance of the population that was set to 25. The variance was obtained from  $\sigma = (\max - \min)/4$ , and the maximum and minimum amounts were derived from previous research with rounded values (Maynard & Mupandawana, 2009). I selected a \$2.32 MDE to determine that I needed 146 participants in my survey. This number was derived in conjunction with examinations of previous work (Maynard & Mupandawana, 2009). This MDE equation was also used after obtaining the participants for the survey. The implications of this second MDE test will be analyzed in the discussion.

## Results:

Throughout each of the scenarios, the response rate for each scenario varied. Both conditions displayed a decreasing number of responses. In the unprompted (or control) condition, the response rate for the three scenarios given were 55, 54, and 53 for each question respectively. In the prompted (or treatment) condition, the response rates for the first, second, and third scenarios were 57, 56, and 54 respectively. Although this decrease in response rate could be attributed to having to throw out data due to incompleteness, it is more likely that the survey displayed some semblance of attrition.

Responses were recorded from the Qualtrics link and analyses were performed with partially completed responses. Unranked t tests were performed with both the raw value of the tip and the calculated percentages of each tip separately. All answers were formatted in dollar amounts in 00.00 format. Two hypotheses were tested from the data obtained from the survey.

The first hypothesis was that participants who were exposed to a prompted tipping bill would tip more than those who were not exposed to a prompted tipping bill. An analysis was performed for the three scenarios independently (the low, medium, and high bills). There was no significant difference detected between those who were exposed to the tipping prompt and those who were not exposed to the tipping prompt. In the medium bill scenario, participants with unprompted tipping scenarios ( $M = 7.52, SD = 1.79$ ) did not tip significantly more than those with prompted tipping scenarios ( $M = 7.66, SD = 2.21$ ). In the low bill scenario, no significant difference was detected between those with unprompted tipping scenarios ( $M = 4.28, SD = 1.25$ ) and those with prompted tipping scenarios ( $M = 3.97, SD = 0.97$ ). Lastly, in the high bill scenario, there was no significant difference detected between the unprompted scenario

participants ( $M = 12.93$ ,  $SD = 3.04$ ) and the prompted scenario participants ( $M = 13.25$ ,  $SD = 3.00$ ).

The second hypothesis concerned the effect of previous industry experience on tipping behaviors. Analyses were broken up based on treatment group and then totaled to have two effect groups: One with previous tipping industry experience and one without. It was anticipated that those who had worked in the service industry before would tip more, on average, than those who had not worked in the service industry. A significant difference between those who had worked in the service industry before ( $M = 8.48$ ,  $SD = 1.2$ ) and those who had not ( $M = 8.22$ ,  $SD = 2.0$ ).

### **Discussion:**

I hypothesized that participants would tip more when exposed to tipping prompts. No significant difference was detected between participants who were exposed to a tipping prompt and participants who were not exposed to a tipping prompt. This finding came as a surprise to me. Although there were limitations of study, the data appears to be sound. Future research should be performed into this subject matter with more resources and more intensive research methods that could be applied more broadly to the American consumer base.

The first hypothesis was unable to be corroborated with the data collected. This prompted additional data analysis into the factors that make a patron more likely to tip. The second hypothesis formed was that those who have worked in the restaurant industry, where tipping was common, tip more than those who have not. I was unable to detect a significant difference between these two groups. This finding is contrary to other studies performed prior (Schaeffer, 2023, Liu, 2008). A possible reason for detecting no difference between the two groups was the similar ages and enrollment statuses of those who were and were not employed in an industry where tipping was common. However, this explanation could be seen as contrasting previous studies, which state that younger people are more likely to tip (Saayman, M., & Saayman, A., 2015). Regardless, garnering a wider and more varied sample might produce different results as opposed to the data collected in this survey.

A facet of this study that was successfully performed were the constants included in the survey. It has been stated that service quality may or may not play a role in tipping decisions (Fernandez, et al., 2024, Artuger & Çetinsöz, 2013, Hoaas & Bigler, 2012). This survey successfully eliminated the possibility of service quality being a factor in tipping decisions made



by participants. By stating that service quality was sufficient in every scenario presented to participants, service quality was not a factor in tipping decisions made by participants.

In finding research that measures potential patron rationales for tipping decisions, one study became very germane to the background research of this study. In the genesis of this study, I wanted to examine the effects of bill size on tipping behaviors to gain more knowledge on what to include or remove from my survey. One study found that bill size at a restaurant behaved the same way a normal good does (Saayman, M., & Saayman, A., 2015). If this were held true, my survey would see a similar degree of change comparing higher and lower bill sizes. This is contrary to my findings in the survey. There was a noticeable increase in dollars tipped in the “low” bill scenario. A possible explanation could be that respondents wanted to tip more for a lower bill to better compensate their server knowing that tips are a large portion of a server’s compensation. This rationale also aligns with the aforementioned study that explains that people who feel it is their responsibility to support their server financially, on average, tip more. (Saayman, M., & Saayman, A., 2015). It is important to note that this study was also conducted in South Africa. So, it is possible that the findings in this study are not representative of perceptions held in the United States. Regardless, if this explanation holds, then this would corroborate other studies detailing social norms (Azar, 2003, Fernandez, et al., 2024). This phenomenon should be studied separately. A study investigating whether patrons tip more proportionately based on a lower-sized bill would be interesting to examine. The idea of social norms does not pertain to this study’s survey format. Considering that the survey administered was done on an individual basis, presumably without peers or others around the participant at the time of taking the survey, social norms would not have a heavy influence on the participant. However, social norms still have a myriad of consequences on the patron (Fernandez, et al.,

2024). It cannot be ruled out that there was entirely no effect of social norms on the participant even if there were no other people directly involved.

Although sufficient participants and participants' responses were garnered from this study, there are multiple limitations experienced that had the potential to interfere with findings. Firstly, participants were not using real money. Although the survey was designed to mimic a real-world tipping scenario, the scope of this study and the limitation of resources possibly played a factor in data collection. Participants were asked to give as much of a tip as they desired. Having "unlimited" money to tip a server is not representative of a real-world tipping scenario. This limitation could have been remedied in the experiment design. Perhaps using observational data of prompted tipping behaviors could change the results found. In addition to no money being used in this experiment, time could have been a limiting factor. This study did not have a time limit of any sort. In restaurants and other tip-based firms, a tipping prompt is shown rapidly and is not always intuitive to navigate (Karabas, et al., 2020). This combined with whether other patrons waiting for an individual to tip, prompted tipping behaviors could potentially shift to a sizable degree. A last limitation that should be noted in this study is the number of participants who completed the survey. Although 113 participants completed this survey, this did not meet the minimum detectable effect (MDE) desired for a 95% confidence interval, which was  $n = 146$ . Not reaching the desired participant number of 146 indicates that the effect size may have not been detected. It is possible that this study may have been underpowered. MDE calculations were made after participants were gathered to gauge

intervention impact. The formula used for finding MDE was  $MDE = (t_{(1-k)} + t_{\alpha}) * \sqrt{\frac{1}{P(1-P)}} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{N}}$ .

The critical value ( $t_{(1-k)}$ ) used was 0.84. The critical value of the confidence interval ( $t_{\alpha}$ ) was 1.96 where the alpha value was set to 5%. P is marked as the proportion of units to a given treatment

group.  $\sigma^2$  is the variance of the population, and  $N$  is the sample size. The variance was obtained from this sample. The final calculation yielded a MDE of 707.5. What this means is that this study was possibly underpowered, and it is possible that a type II error was committed. Temporal limitations prevented me from obtaining the desired number of participants.

An aspect of this survey that might stray from a real-world tipping scenario is the fact that the data was collected from a survey. There was no person shown to participants. It has been found that server friendliness and appearance play a role in tipping decisions (Lynn & McCall, 2000, Cho, 2014). Although this survey controlled for server friendliness and appearance to focus on prompted tipping, providing a person, or an interaction with a person, may be a factor that makes survey responses more emblematic of a real-world tipping scenario. Furthermore, by presenting participants with a person to interact with, there might be a humanizing effect on the patron tipping. If the patron were faced with a person, people might tip more knowing that people tip more when they feel as though their tip directly relates to their server's financial well-being (Saayman, M. & Saayman, A., 2015). Moreover, interpersonal interaction has been shown to increase tips received by servers (Azar, 2007). It has been suggested that this interpersonal interaction influences patrons to "feel more uncomfortable to tip poorly" (Azar, 2007). In addition to the lack of person-to-person interaction, the survey conducted could also be framed as a service-inclusive tip. A service-inclusive tip is defined as a tip prompted before the food or service is received. It has been shown that service-inclusive tips can lead to irritation and skewed tipping results (Karabas, et al., 2020). Although this was not the intention of the survey, no actual food or service was given to the participants. Therefore, tipping results might have been skewed.

The scope of this study had some limitations of time and analyses. One area that I wish to examine more in the future is the potential effects of income on tipping behaviors. Income has

been shown to have an extremely varied impact on tipping behaviors (Saayman, M. & Saayman, A., 2015, Artuger & Çetinsöz, 2013, Fernandez, et al., 2024). That is where my study could be improved in the future to account for income difference in tipping behaviors. In the demographic section of the survey, categorical statistics could be utilized to determine effects of income.

Lastly, one important note about this work is that this is a work in progress. I intend to refine the methodology and the coverage of this survey. Hopefully, this study will be performed with more funding and more time allotted. Regardless, this thesis is a culmination of one semester's work and effort. Important data was still collected, and findings were still acquired. This work is a steppingstone in a sequence of more polished and more exhaustive results.

**References:**

- Artuger, S., & Çetinsöz, B. C. (2013). Factors influencing the tipping propensity of restaurant customers: A study in 5 star hotels a la carte restaurants. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(17).
- Azar, O. H. (2003). The implications of tipping for economics and management. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30(10), 1084-1094.
- Azar, O. H. (2009). Incentives and service quality in the restaurant industry: the tipping–service puzzle. *Applied Economics*, 41(15), 1917-1927.
- Azar, O. H. (2007). The social norm of tipping: A review 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(2), 380-402.
- Bodvarsson, Ö. B., & Gibson, W. A. (1997). Economics and restaurant gratuities: Determining tip rates. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 56(2), 187-203.
- Cho, S. B. (2014). Factors Affecting Restaurant Consumers' Tipping Behavior. *Journal of the Korean Society for Quality Management*, 42(1), 15-32.
- Gertler, P. & World Bank. (2016) *Impact Evaluation in Practice*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Gössling, S., Fernandez, S., Martin-Rios, C., Reyes, S. P., Fointiat, V., Isaac, R. K., & Lunde, M. (2021). Restaurant tipping in Europe: a comparative assessment. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 24(6), 811-823.
- Hoas, D. J., & Bigler, L. (2012). The relationship between tipping and service quality: The other side of the equation. *Southwestern Economic Proceedings*, 32(3), 17-26.

- Lippert, D. D. and J. (2023, November 9). Tipping culture in america: Public sees a changed landscape. *Pew Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/2023/11/09/tipping-culture-in-america-public-sees-a-changed-landscape/>
- Liu, C. M. (2008). The perceptions of waiters and customers on restaurant tipping. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 22(2), 95-103.
- Lynn, M. (2018). The Effects of Tipping on Consumers' Satisfaction with Restaurants. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 52(3), 746–755. <https://doi-org.leo.lib.unomaha.edu/10.1111/joca.12171>
- Lynn, M., & Grassman, A. (1990). Restaurant tipping: an examination of three 'rational' explanations. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 11(2), 169-181.
- Lynn, M., & Graves, J. (1996). Tipping: an incentive/reward for service?. *Hospitality Research Journal*, 20(1), 1-14.
- Lynn, M., & McCall, M. (2000). Beyond gratitude and gratuity: A meta-analytic review of the predictors of restaurant tipping.
- McCann, Adam. (2024, March 13). *Tipping survey: Nearly 3 in 4 americans think tipping is out of control*. WalletHub. Retrieved April 1, 2024, from <https://wallethub.com/blog/tipping-survey/135092>
- Mentzer, M. S. (2021). The Tipping Dilemma: Restaurant Gratuities in Canada. *Journal of Tourism & Leisure Studies*, 6(2), 1–10. <https://doi-org.leo.lib.unomaha.edu/10.18848/2470-9336/CGP/v06i02/1-10>
- Minimum wages for tipped employees. (2024, January 1). DOL. Retrieved April 1, 2024, from <http://www.dol.gov/agencies/whd/state/minimum-wage/tipped>

- Saayman, M., & Saayman, A. (2015). Understanding Tipping Behaviour—An Economic Perspective. *Tourism Economics*, 21(2), 247-265.
- Schaeffer, K. (2023, November 13). *Americans who have worked for tips themselves are usually more likely to leave one*. Pew Research Center.
- Segrave, K. (1998). *Tipping: An American social history of gratuities*. McFarland.
- Strohmetz, D. B., Rind, B., Fisher, R., & Lynn, M. (2002). Sweetening the till: the use of candy to increase restaurant tipping 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(2), 300-309.
- Tipping | dashew center. (2023). Retrieved April 1, 2024, from <https://internationalcenter.ucla.edu/resources/tipping>
- Yongxiang Wang, Clifford, W., Markham, C., & Deegan, C. (2021). Examination of Driver Visual and Cognitive Responses to Billboard Elicited Passive Distraction Using Eye-Fixation Related Potential. *Sensors* (14248220), 21(4), 1–20. <https://doi-org.leo.lib.unomaha.edu/10.3390/s21041471>

## Figures

**Figure 1**

*Flyer used in participant recruitment*





**Figure 2**

*Example prompt*

**Prompted Tipping Scenario #2**

On a free afternoon, you decide to go out to a restaurant to get sit down and grab a quick bite to eat. Everything at the restaurant went smoothly with no apparent issues in food or service. The

bill at the end of the meal was **\$19.61**. How much will you tip your server?

Note: You do not have to follow the below-listed percentages for tipping, they are simply included to assist in your decision making.

15% - 2.94

20% - 3.92

25% - 4.90

Please enter your answer in 00.00 format without a \$ symbol

**Table 1***Demographic Information*

Characteristic				
Age		<i>M (SD)</i>		
	Unprompted Tipping Amounts	24.15 (7.71)		
	Prompted Tipping Amounts	25.79 (10.54)		
Enrollment		Student	Non-student	
	Unprompted Tipping Amounts	51	4	
	Prompted Tipping Amounts	44	10	
Service experience		Yes	No	
	Unprompted Tipping Amounts	27	28	
	Prompted Tipping Amounts	41	12	
Gender		Female	Male	Other

---

Unprompted	40	15	0
Tipping			
Amounts			
Prompted	35	16	4
Tipping			

*Note.* The total number of participants was N ( $N = 113$ ).

**Table 2***Survey Information*

Analysis Performed			
Bill Amount		<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	Unpaired <i>t</i> test
Medium	Unprompted Tipping	7.52 (1.79)	<i>t</i> = .3676
	Amounts		
	Prompted Tipping	7.66 (2.21)	
	Amounts		
Low	Unprompted Tipping	4.28 (1.25)	<i>t</i> = 1.4562
	Amounts		
	Prompted Tipping	3.97 (.97)	
	Amounts		
High	Unprompted Tipping	12.93 (3.04)	<i>t</i> = .5480
	Amounts		
	Prompted Tipping	13.25 (3.00)	
	Amounts		
Previous Industry Experience		<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	Unpaired <i>t</i> test
Yes	Unprompted Tipping	8.48 (1.2)	<i>t</i> = 0.2882
	Amounts		
	Prompted Tipping	8.60 (1.8)	
	Amounts		

	Total	8.6 (1.6)	
No	Unprompted Tipping	7.99 (2.1)	$t = 1.3289$
	Amounts		
	Prompted Tipping	8.65 (1.5)	
	Amounts		
	Total	8.22 (2.0)	$t^* = 1.1228$

*Note.*  $t^*$  depicts an unranked t test performed between the total of “Yes” respondents and “No” respondents.