

Online Appendix A: Details on the Method of Analysis

We tested Hypothesis 1 by regressing entrepreneurial learning (measured at T+1) on the control variables (measured at T0), entrepreneurial learning (measured at T), and the interaction term between problems (measured at T) and error mastery orientation (measured at T0). The interaction term thus reflects a cross-level interaction with error mastery orientation modelled on Level 2 and problems modelled on Level 1 (Aguinis, Gottfredson, & Culpepper, 2013). We tested Hypothesis 2 by regressing venture progress (measured at T+1) on the control variables (measured at T0), venture progress (measured at T), and entrepreneurial learning (measured at T). Hypothesis 3 describes a moderated mediation model. This means that the mediation effect depends on levels of the moderator. More specifically, the effect of problems on venture progress through entrepreneurial learning depends on levels of error mastery orientation. We conducted a moderated mediation analysis by using the approach by Tein et al. (2004). This approach requires rescaling the independent variable for different levels of the moderator (one standard deviation below the mean [-1SD] and one standard deviation above the mean [+1SD]). Then, we ran separate mediation analyses for each level of the rescaled independent variable. Monte Carlo method was used to obtain confidence intervals for the indirect effects of the mediation analyses (MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004).

References

Aguinis, H., Gottfredson, R. K., & Culpepper, S. A. (2013). Best-practice recommendations for estimating cross-level interaction effects using multilevel modeling. *Journal of Management*, 39(6), 1490–1528.

MacKinnon, D. P., Lockwood, C. M., & Williams, J. (2004). Confidence limits for the indirect effect: Distribution of the product and resampling methods. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39(1), 99–128.

Tein, J.-Y., Sandler, I. N., MacKinnon, D. P., & Wolchik, S. A. (2004). How did it work? Who did it work for? Mediation in the context of a moderated prevention effect for children of divorce. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 72(4), 617–624.

Online Appendix B: Results of the Internal Replication with the two subsamples

Prediction model of problems and error mastery orientation on entrepreneurial learning and venture progress in the Kenyan and Ugandan subsamples

	Kenya				Uganda			
	Entrepreneurial learning (T+1)		Venture progress (T+1)		Entrepreneurial learning (T+1)		Venture progress (T+1)	
	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE
Wave	0.04**	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01
Entrepreneurial experience	0.02	0.08	-0.05	0.13	0.04	0.18	0.03	0.20
Gender ^a	-0.11	0.09	-0.09	0.15	0.10	0.15	-0.13	0.16
Entrepreneur in the family ^b	0.02	0.08	0.01	0.14	-0.02	0.19	-0.04	0.21
Business course taken ^b	-0.01	0.08	-0.11	0.13	-0.29	0.19	-0.50*	0.20
Team size	-0.01	0.03	-0.03	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.10
Entrepreneurial self-efficacy	0.22**	0.07	0.25*	0.12	0.50**	0.13	0.26†	0.14
Negative emotions (T)	-0.01	0.03	0.01	0.05	-0.03	0.05	-0.02	0.06
Entrepreneurial learning (T)	0.46**	0.03			0.33**	0.05		
Venture progress (T)			0.34**	0.04			0.41**	0.05
Problems (T)	0.01	0.03	-0.03	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.09†	0.05
Error mastery orientation	0.03	0.09	0.02	0.14	0.30†	0.17	-0.07	0.17
Problems (T) * Error mastery orientation	0.08†	0.05	-0.09	0.08	0.17*	0.08	0.22*	0.09
Entrepreneurial learning (T)			0.11†	0.06			0.19**	0.07
Variance components								
Level 3: Teams		.02		.09		.04		.39
Level 2: Participants		.07		.22		.17		.10
Level 1: Observations		.44		.89		.48		.60
Conditional R ²		.47		.44		.60		.68
Deviance (-2*LogLik)		1450.36		1950.53		846.10		929.42
Highest VIF ^c		1.32		1.72		2.10		2.21

Note: Regression coefficients are unstandardized; Number of participants in Kenya = 109, in Uganda = 59, number of observations in Kenya = 661, in Uganda = 355; ^a 0 = female, 1 = male; ^b 0 = no, 1 = yes; ^c Highest variance inflation factor out of all predictors in the model; † p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01.

