

APPENDIX

TABLE A1
Reasons for exclusion of participants

A-priori set reason for exclusion	Participants excluded	
	Control	LKM
Participant dropped out before starting the audio	53	
Participant dropped out during audio fragment	2	4
Participant did not complete the entire audio segment (9 minutes)	12	16
Participant remained on the audio page for more than 15 minutes	1	4
Participant failed to answer one of the two attention check questions correctly	0	1
Participant did not answer key questions (missing data)	2	7
Participant indicated that they were not able to listen to the audio due to technical problems	0	0
Total remaining (out of 189 who started the survey)	53	34

Note. Final sample retained for analysis is $n = 87$.

TABLE A2
Main results with covariates

Path	DV = Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure			
	BC 95% CI			
	Estimate	SE	Lower	Upper
Unique direct effect of LKM on Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure (c')	-.26	.21	-.67	.16
Unique indirect effect of LKM on Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure (ab)	-.36*	.14	-.66	-.12
Direct effect of LKM on Self-Compassion (a)	.33**	.10	.12	.54
Direct effect of Self-Compassion on Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure (b)	-1.08***	.21	-1.51	-.66
Total effect of LKM on Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure (c)	-.62*	.23	-1.07	-.17
<i>Effects of Covariates on Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure</i>				
Age	-.01	.01	-.03	.03
Gender (1 = female)	.50**	.19	.12	.90
Entrepreneurial Experience	-.35	.38	-1.11	.41
Optimism	.11	.13	-.14	.36
Mindfulness	-.16	.15	-.46	.13
Self-Efficacy	-.06	.15	-.36	.24

Note. The effects were tested by dummy coding two experimental conditions to represent the effect of LKM (coded 1) versus the control condition (coded 0); $n = 87$; BC 95% CI refers to the bias-corrected 95% confidence interval; Estimate refers to the effect estimate using 5,000 bootstrap samples; $R^2 = .48$; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

TABLE A3
Main results of exploratory gender-moderated mediation model

Path	DV = Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure			
	Estimate	SE	Lower	Upper
Unique direct effect of LKM on Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure (c')	-.12	.19	-.49	.26
Unique indirect conditional effect of LKM on Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure for males (ab)	-.20*	.12	-.47	-.01
Unique indirect conditional effect of LKM on Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure for females (ab)	-.39*	.18	-.75	-.03
Index of moderated mediation (<i>difference between conditional indirect effects</i>)	-.19	.13	-.50	.01
Direct effect of LKM on Self-Compassion (a)	.25*	.12	.01	.50
Direct effect of Self-Compassion on Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure (b)	-.79**	.24	-1.26	-.32
Direct effect of Gender on Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure	2.9**	1.02	.89	4.95
Gender x Self-compassion interaction effect	-.74*	.31	-1.35	-.12
Direct conditional effect of Self-Compassion on Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure for males (b)	-.79**	.24	-1.26	-.32
Direct conditional effect of Self-Compassion on Entrepreneurial Fear of Failure for females (b)	-1.53***	.21	-1.94	-1.12

Note. The effects were tested by dummy coding two experimental conditions to represent the effect of LKM (coded 1) versus the control condition (coded 0); Gender was coded as male = 0 and female = 1; $n = 87$; BC 95% CI refers to the bias-corrected 95% confidence interval; Estimate refers to the effect estimate using 5,000 bootstrap samples; $R^2 = .49$; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

TABLE A4
Main results for different sources of entrepreneurial fear of failure

Path	DV = EFF Opportunity Costs				DV = EFF Ability to fund the Venture			
	Estimate	SE	BC 95% CI		Estimate	SE	BC 95%CI	
			Lower	Upper			Lower	Upper
Unique direct effect of LKM on DV (c')	.10	.30	-.50	.71	-.06	.31	-.69	.57
Unique indirect effect of LKM on DV (ab)	-.28*	.15	-.61	-.03	-.30*	.16	-.70	-.05
Direct effect of LKM on Self-Compassion (a)	.25*	.12	<.01	.50	.25*	.12	<.01	.50
Direct effect of Self-Compassion on DV(b)	-1.10***	.25	-1.62	-.59	-1.19***	.32	-1.73	-.65
Total effect of LKM on DV (c)	-.18	.32	-.82	.47	-.36	.34	-1.04	.31
	DV = EFF Financial Security				DV = EFF Potential of the Idea			
Unique direct effect of LKM on DV (c')	.04	.30	-.56	.64	-.31	.32	-.94	.33
Unique indirect effect of LKM on DV (ab)	-.24*	.14	-.61	-.03	-.27*	.13	-.58	-.05
Direct effect of LKM on Self-Compassion (a)	.25*	.12	<.01	.50	.25*	.12	<.01	.50
Direct effect of Self-Compassion on DV (b)	-.94***	.26	-1.46	-.43	-1.05***	.27	-1.59	-.50
Total effect of LKM on DV (c)	-.20	.32	-.83	.43	-.57	.34	-1.24	.10
	DV = EFF Personal Ability				DV = EFF Threat to Social Esteem			
Unique direct effect of LKM on DV (c')	-.26	.27	-.81	.28	.41	.29	-.16	.99
Unique indirect effect of LKM on DV(ab)	-.35*	.18	-.75	-.04	-.41*	.21	-.88	-.03
Direct effect of LKM on Self-Compassion (a)	.25*	.12	<.01	.50	.25*	.12	.01	.50
Direct effect of Self-Compassion on DV(b)	-1.35***	.23	-1.82	-.89	-1.60***	.25	-2.10	-1.11
Total effect of LKM on DV (c)	-.61	.31	-1.23	.02	<.01	.34	-.68	.69

Note. The effects were tested by dummy coding two experimental conditions to represent the effect of LKM (coded 1) versus the control condition (coded 0); $n = 87$; BC 95% CI refers to the bias-corrected 95% confidence interval; Estimate refers to the effect estimate using 5,000 bootstrap samples; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

TABLE A5
Reasons for exclusion of participants (additional prolific-based study)

A-priori set reason for exclusion	Participants excluded	
	Control	LKM
Participant did not confirm entrepreneurial status	8	
Participant did not work on their venture at least 20 hours per week	56	
Participant dropped out before starting the audio	5	
Participant dropped out during audio fragment	0	0
Participant did not complete the entire audio segment (9 minutes)	2	5
Participant remained on the audio page for more than 15 minutes	7	3
Participant failed to answer one of the two attention check questions correctly	0	0
Participant already meditate daily	7	4
Participant did not answer key questions (missing data)	0	0
Participant indicated that they were not able to listen to the audio due to technical problems	0	2
Total remaining (out of 197 who started the survey)	47	51

Note. We first used multiple pre-screening criteria on the prolific platform itself by recruiting only participants over 18 years of age who were fluent in English and currently running their own business in the United States. Participants were compensated in line with the prolific requirement at an effective hourly rate of £5. Final sample retained for analysis is $n = 98$.

TABLE A6
Means, standard deviations, and randomization checks (additional prolific-based study)

Variable	<i>M (SD)</i>		Welch's t-test	Df
	Control ^a	LKM ^b		
Manipulation Check	3.52 (1.41)	5.58 (0.86)	-8.635***	75.2
Self-Compassion (pre)	4.61 (0.81)	4.47 (0.92)	0.793	95.9
Self-Compassion (post)	4.59 (0.85)	5.12 (0.83)	-3.094**	95
Self-Compassion (end)	4.50 (0.95)	4.88 (0.87)	-2.032*	93.1
Age (Years)	39.98 (12.90)	36.24 (11.15)	1.531	91.3
Entrepreneurial Experience (# of ventures)	2.21 (1.876)	1.27 (0.90)	3.117**	64.8
Firm Age (Years)	7.85 (7.91)	6.41 (8.417)	0.873	96
			χ^2-test	
Gender (Woman)	1.53 (0.50)	1.51 (0.50)	.048	1
Education (1 = College)	0.94 (0.25)	0.90 (0.30)	0.382	1
Nationality (1= American)	1.04 (0.29)	1.00 (0.00)	1.10	1
Country of Birth (1= USA)	0.96 (0.20)	0.98 (0.14)	.434	1
Ethnicity (1 = White/Caucasian)	0.62 (0.49)	0.67 (0.48)	0.263	1
Prior Meditation Experience ^c	3.43 (2.16)	3.35 (1.87)	7.41	6
Firm Size (in FTE) ^d	1.94 (1.31)	2.24 (1.74)	6.13	7

Note. The effects were tested by dummy coding two experimental conditions to represent the effect of LKM (coded 1) versus the control condition (coded 0), $n = 98$, ^a $n = 47$, ^b $n = 51$; ^cMeditation Experience is measured in seven ordinal categories ranging from 'Never' to '2-3 times a week'; ^dFirm size is measured in eight ordinal categories ranging from 0 to 101-500; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

FIGURE A1
Estimated marginal means – time by condition (additional prolific-based study);
Error bars represent standard errors of the mean

