Tables for: **Cognitive influences shaping grade decision making**

Variable number	Variable	Proposed Decision Making Position	Associated Latent Variable
1	EGDP	Pre-Assessment Decision	PD
2	CUPR	Pre-Assessment Decision	GN
3	POW0	Pre-Assessment Decision	PC
4	POW1 and POW2	Pre-Assessment Decision	PD
5	AFH1	During - Assessment Decision	AE
6	AVHE	During - Assessment Decision	PD
7	SBHE	During - Assessment Decision	PD
8	ACRE	During – Assessment Decision	SN - SI
9	ACRU	During – Assessment Decision	PC
10	ASPT	During- Assessment Decision	PD
11	SECO	During- Assessment Decision	PC
12	ANCO	During - Assessment Decision	AE
13	FORM	During- Assessment Decision	AE
14	ALRA	During- Assessment Decision	AE

Table 1: Proposed conceptual relationships between Table 1 manifest variables and the factors in TPB

Institution	Level of data collection	Sample Size
A	4,5,6,7	126
B	5,6	31
	Total sample size (N)	**157**

Table 2: Details of the convenience sample

Latent Construct	Beliefs in manifest variable	Weights for manifest variable
Attitude & Engagement (AE)	Behavioural beliefs scored +1 to +10	Outcomes scored -3 to +3
Subjective Norm (SN) including GN, SO, SI.	Normative beliefs scored -3 to +3	Motivation to comply scored +1 to +10
PBC (PD and PC)	Control strength beliefs scored +1 to +10	Control power belief scored -3 to +3

Table 3: Weightings and scales used for different direct and indirect intentional questions.

Code	Question	Beliefs Scale	Weighting Scale	Latent Variable
EGDP	I gave the assessed script the same amount of time as the preceding script	+1 to +10	-3 to +3	PBC
POW0	The assessed script is towards the start of this assessment period	+1 to +10	-3 to +3	PBC
POW1	The assessed script is towards the middle of the assessment period	+1 to +10	-3 to +3	PBC
POW2	The assessed script is towards the end of the assessment period	+1 to +10	-3 to +3	PBC
AFH1	I personally engaged with the response of the assessed submission to the set task, finding it interesting.	+1 to +10	-3 to +3	AE
FORM	I personally identified and have commented formatively upon this assessed response to the set task.	+1 to +10	-3 to +3	AE
AVHE	In generating the assessment grade, I considered all the presented information and argument regardless of its layout.	+1 to +10	-3 to +3	PBC
SBHE	In generating the assessment grade I found it difficult to determine a grade as the previous submission was of very similar quality	+1 to +10	-3 to +3	PBC
ACRU	During the assessment grading, I actively reviewed the assessment criteria	+1 to +10	-3 to +3	PBC
ANCO	In determining the grade for the assessed script, I considered the meaning intended by the writer	+1 to +10	-3 to +3	AE
ALRA	In allocating the mark for the assessed submission I reflected on the number of first class and upper second class marks already allocated	-3 to +3	+1 to +10	SN
POR1	The assessed script has followed a poorly graded preceding script	Yes or no	NA	AE
POR2	The assessed script has followed a highly graded preceding script	Yes or no	NA	AE
POR3	The assessed script has followed an averagely graded script	Yes or no	NA	AE
ACRE	I assessed the script for it use of academic register and ensuring conventions were adhered to	Yes or no	NA	SN

Table 4 – Coding constructs for data collection

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.343	30.390	30.390	3.343	30.390	30.390	2.435	22.133	22.133
2	1.826	16.596	46.986	1.826	16.596	46.986	2.303	20.932	43.066
3	1.380	12.546	59.532	1.380	12.546	59.532	1.392	12.652	55.718
4	1.272	11.562	71.095	1.272	11.562	71.095	1.387	12.605	68.323
5	1.060	9.636	80.730	1.060	9.636	80.730	1.365	12.407	80.730
6	.572	5.198	85.928						
7	.556	5.051	90.979						
8	.412	3.749	94.728						
9	.261	2.369	97.097						
10	.182	1.655	98.752						
11	.137	1.248	100.000						

Table 5: – PCA Component Factor Analysis (limited to eigenvalues >1)

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
EGDP	.901	-.018	.134	.009	.056
POW0	-.056	.339	.274	-.616	-.564
POW1	.092	.142	.042	.962	-.088
POW2	.154	.138	.049	-.061	.941
AFH1	-.012	.796	-.020	.071	.140
FORM	.865	.214	-.097	.105	.157
AVHE	.596	.635	-.145	.154	.090
ACRU	.058	.821	.131	-.071	-.049
SBHE	.353	.016	.760	-.147	-.206
ANCO	.450	.623	-.237	.023	-.102
ALRA	-.392	-.049	.783	.110	.206

Table 6 – Component Analysis by manifest variable

Component	Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha)	Outcome
1	0.823	Acceptable
2	0.765	Acceptable
3	0.355	Not Acceptable
4	NA	NA
5	NA	NA

Table 7 – Reliability measures for component construction by manifest variable