



National  
Qualifications  
2023

---

**2023 English**

**Reading for Understanding, Analysis and  
Evaluation**

**Higher**

**Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2023

These marking instructions have been prepared by examination teams for use by SQA appointed markers when marking external course assessments.

The information in this document may be reproduced in support of SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is reproduced, SQA must be clearly acknowledged as the source. If it is to be reproduced for any other purpose, written permission must be obtained from [permissions@sqa.org.uk](mailto:permissions@sqa.org.uk).



## General marking principles for Higher English: Reading for Understanding, Analysis and Evaluation

*Always apply these general principles. Use them in conjunction with the detailed marking instructions, which identify the key features required in candidates' responses.*

- (a) Always use positive marking. This means candidates accumulate marks for the demonstration of relevant skills, knowledge and understanding; marks are not deducted for errors or omissions.
- (b) If a candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed marking instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your team leader.
- (c) We use the term 'possible answers' to allow for any variation in candidate responses. Award marks according to the accuracy and relevance of the candidate's response.

Passage 1

Question		Expected response(s)	Max mark	Additional guidance
1.		<p>Candidates must attempt to use their own words. No marks for straight lifts from the passage.</p> <p>Award marks: 1+1</p>	2	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no public curiosity about a film character’s earlier life (‘without knowing . . . before’)</li> <li>• no public desire for prequels (‘demand . . . zero’)</li> <li>• prequels can make a lot of money (‘\$150 million’)</li> <li>• standard of prequels may be dull/repetitive (‘production line goods’, ‘bland biscuits’)</li> <li>• people watching these films does not show they want them (‘do not prove that there is appetite’)</li> <li>• public will watch these films simply because they are available (‘they will probably eat them’)</li> </ul>

Question	Expected response(s)	Max mark	Additional guidance
2.	<p>Award <b>2 marks</b> for detailed/insightful comment plus quotation/reference.</p> <p>Award <b>1 mark</b> for more basic comment plus quotation/reference.</p> <p>Award <b>0 marks</b> for quotation/reference alone.</p> <p>Award marks: 2+2, 2+1+1, 1+1+1+1</p>	4	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Next up’ suggests there is a conveyor belt of these films/they are churned out one after another</li> <li>• ‘there were songs and it ended happily’ suggests the original film was a fully-rounded story, requiring no further development</li> <li>• juxtaposition/repetition of ‘tale as old as time’ and ‘time needed updating’ suggests a clash between something deeply traditional/magical and something brashly modern</li> <li>• ‘time needed updating’ suggests the ridiculous, unnecessary nature of the enterprise</li> <li>• ‘someone’ suggests the person behind this was of no great standing/insignificant</li> <li>• parenthesis ‘- neither Beauty . . . blokes -’ emphasises the wide gap between the prequel and the original</li> <li>• ‘neither Beauty nor Beast’ emphasises how little these characters have to do with the original film</li> <li>• ‘just blokes’ suggests how insignificant/nondescript they are</li> <li>• ‘answers questions nobody asked’ suggests the irrelevance/pointlessness of the whole exercise</li> <li>• ‘nobody’ suggests total lack of people’s interest</li> <li>• ‘no kidding’ suggests how implausible/unbelievable this number of sequels is</li> </ul>

Question	Expected response(s)	Max mark	Additional guidance
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use of ‘possibly, maybe’ suggests there is some doubt when there is none</li> <li>• parenthesis ‘- and I do not want to be judgemental -’ emphasises his desire to cast himself as being entirely fair before delivering his damning verdict</li> <li>• ‘entirely (run out of ideas)’ suggests the total lack of imagination/creativity involved</li> <li>• ‘run out (of ideas)’ suggests creative ideas are depleted</li> <li>• use of rhetorical question ‘but have we . . . run out of ideas?’ suggests a shared understanding that recent productions are lacking innovation</li> </ul> <p>NB: in discussing some of these points, some candidates may choose to comment on the writer’s tone. Such comments may well prove profitable.</p>

Question	Expected response(s)	Max mark	Additional guidance
3.	<p>Award <b>2 marks</b> for detailed/insightful comment plus quotation/reference.</p> <p>Award <b>1 mark</b> for more basic comment plus quotation/reference.</p> <p>Award <b>0 marks</b> for quotation/reference alone.</p> <p>Award marks: 2+2, 2+1+1 or 1+1+1+1</p>	4	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• contrast between ‘icon’ and ‘buffoon’ suggests Darth Vader has been reduced from revered hero to laughable has-been</li> <li>• contrast between ‘heavy-breath horror’ and ‘yelling ‘Nooo!’ suggests Darth Vader’s ludicrous transformation from a genuinely terrifying figure to a pantomime villain</li> <li>• ‘wobbly (buffoon)’ suggests Darth Vader has become weakened/a broken figure</li> <li>• ‘(wobbly) buffoon’ suggests Darth Vader has become a figure of ridicule</li> <li>• ‘yelling (Nooo!)’ suggests Darth Vader has become more melodramatic</li> <li>• ‘(yelling) Nooo!’ suggests Darth Vader has become a cartoonish, comic figure</li> <li>• ‘more machine than man’ suggests Darth Vader has been reduced to a mere object</li> <li>• ‘nostalgia massacre’ suggests our memories of much-loved characters are being brutally destroyed</li> <li>• ‘mystique will be lost’ suggests formerly charismatic, enigmatic characters reduced to the mundane, obvious</li> <li>• ‘over-explanation’ suggests the audience is denied any opportunity to imagine characters’ back-stories/the detail is tedious, unnecessary</li> <li>• ‘just another (relic)’ suggests established characters have lost their individual significance</li> <li>• ‘relic’ suggests established characters are considered outmoded/past their best</li> <li>• ‘revamp’ suggests established characters are not considered worthy in their original state</li> <li>• ‘costumes (to be filled with cash)’ suggests these characters are now devoid of personality/one-dimensional</li> <li>• ‘filled with cash’ suggests characters exist merely to make money, not for any higher purpose</li> </ul>

Question		Expected response(s)	Max mark	Additional guidance
4.		<p>Candidates must use their own words. No marks for straight lifts from the passage.</p> <p>Award <b>2 marks</b> for detailed/insightful comment.</p> <p>Award <b>1 mark</b> for more basic comment.</p> <p>Award <b>0 marks</b> for reference alone.</p> <p>Award marks: 2+1 or 1+1+1</p>	<b>3</b>	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• our cherished nostalgia is ruined by these new films ('necessary escapism and comfort', 'fond memories')</li> <li>• they destroy the audience's opportunity to create their own worlds for the characters they love ('death of imagination', 'where your individual creativity . . . once lay')</li> <li>• people have no interest in characters' lives before the original film ('If - and it's a big if - you . . . you saw them in.')</li> <li>• these films replace people's imagination with an imposed/contrived narrative ('manufactured explanation')</li> </ul>

Question	Expected response(s)	Max mark	Additional guidance
5.	<p>Candidates must use their own words. No marks for straight lifts from the passage.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates can focus exclusively on streaming networks, exclusively on film studios or make points on both.</p> <p>Award <b>2 marks</b> for detailed/insightful comment.</p> <p>Award <b>1 mark</b> for more basic comment.</p> <p>Award <b>0 marks</b> for reference alone.</p> <p>Award marks: 2+1 or 1+1+1</p>	3	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <p><b>Streaming services:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they believe using familiar material will make them the preferred provider ('of choice')</li> <li>• this strategy guarantees they won't go out of business ('one day . . . old and popular')</li> <li>• introducing/creating new content is challenging/a lot of work ('it takes effort')</li> <li>• introducing new content does not guarantee success ('always a chance . . . not catch on')</li> </ul> <p><b>Film studios:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (in these less profitable times) film studios are cautious ('no longer . . . take risks')</li> <li>• this content offers guaranteed financial success ('little more surefire')</li> <li>• this content can now be exploited in a new way ('it changed the idea . . . done with blockbusters')</li> <li>• this allows film studios the opportunity to use this content many times over ('titles piled on to each other')</li> <li>• churning out this material offers film studios the opportunity to dominate/swamp their competitors ('block out rivals')</li> </ul>

Question	Expected response(s)	Max mark	Additional guidance
6.	<p>For full marks, candidates must deal with both imagery and sentence structure, but not necessarily in equal measure.</p> <p>Award <b>2 marks</b> for detailed/insightful comment plus quotation/reference.</p> <p>Award <b>1 mark</b> for more basic comment plus quotation/reference.</p> <p>Award <b>0 marks</b> for quotation/reference alone.</p> <p>Award marks: 2+2, 2+1+1 or 1+1+1+1</p>	4	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <p><b>Imagery:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘plodding parade’ suggests these films come along one after another and are all rather stodgy/unexciting</li> <li>• ‘production line’ suggests the mechanical, repetitive, predictable nature of the way these films are made</li> <li>• ‘commodities’ suggests the films are made entirely as money-making products/lack creativity</li> <li>• ‘like hamburgers’ suggests they are very basic, commonplace items/not very good for people/give only passing satisfaction</li> </ul> <p><b>Sentence structure:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• parenthesis ‘- that all look . . . next movie -’ emphasises his point about the repetitive nature of these films</li> <li>• use of rhetorical question ‘ . . . is it really great . . . every other Marvel film?’ suggests a shared understanding that such movies are a misuse of talent/time</li> <li>• parallel structure ‘not too much of a good thing, rather too much of the same thing’ suggests the films’ repetitive nature</li> <li>• repetition ‘over and over and over’ emphasises predictability/sterility of viewing experience</li> <li>• list of ‘it’s no longer about communicating . . . sharing our imagination’ suggests scale/variety of higher pleasures films no longer provide</li> <li>• ‘or’ repetition emphasises the number of good qualities missing from these films</li> </ul> <p>NB: answers on “fans will shout: ‘You hate popular things!’” should be awarded 0 marks</p>

Question		Expected response(s)	Max mark	Additional guidance
7.		<p>Candidates must use their own words. No marks for straight lifts from the passage.</p> <p>Award <b>2 marks</b> for detailed/insightful comment.</p> <p>Award <b>1 mark</b> for more basic comment.</p> <p>Award <b>0 marks</b> for reference alone.</p> <p>Award marks: 2+1 or 1+1+1</p>	3	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• less variety in roles on offer to actors ('not as many choices')</li> <li>• much narrower range of films being made ('superhero movie or an independent movie. That's it!', 'small, and getting smaller')</li> <li>• film companies now less wealthy ('when studios had cash')</li> <li>• film companies rely on the tried and trusted ('familiar material')</li> <li>• films now aimed at an established worldwide grouping/network of fans ('built-in global fanbase')</li> <li>• film studios are less particular about the quality of the work ('toss out a film')</li> <li>• films are easy to publicise because the brand is already familiar ('all its marketing in the title')</li> </ul>
8.		<p>Award <b>2 marks</b> for detailed/insightful comment plus quotation/reference.</p> <p>Award <b>1 mark</b> for more basic comment plus quotation/reference.</p> <p>Award <b>0 marks</b> for quotation/reference alone.</p> <p>Award marks: 2 or 1+1</p>	2	<p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use of snappy, summative opening sentence emphasises his contemptuous dismissal/verdict</li> <li>• exclamatory opening sentence emphasises the writer's incredulity about the absence of ambition and creativity</li> <li>• 'total lack of daring and ideas' suggests non-existence of ambition and creativity</li> <li>• 'And what did Pattinson do next?' suggests the weary inevitability of what is about to be revealed</li> <li>• single word sentence 'Batman.' suggests dismissal of a predictable choice/Pattinson's hypocrisy in making a career choice he previously criticised</li> <li>• 'The third new one in 16 years' sums up his contempt for yet another re-boot in such a short space of time</li> </ul>

Passage 2

Question	Expected response(s)	Max mark	Additional guidance
9.	Key areas of agreement are shown in the grid.	5	<p>Candidates can use bullet points in this final question or write a number of linked statements.</p> <p>The following guidelines should be used:</p> <p><b>Award 5 marks</b> for identification of three key areas of agreement with detailed/insightful use of supporting evidence.</p> <p><b>Award 4 marks</b> for identification of three key areas of agreement with appropriate use of supporting evidence.</p> <p><b>Award 3 marks</b> for identification of three key areas of agreement.</p> <p><b>Award 2 marks</b> for identification of two key areas of agreement.</p> <p><b>Award 1 mark</b> for identification of one key area of agreement.</p> <p><b>Award 0 marks</b> for failure to identify any key areas of agreement and/or misunderstanding of the task.</p>

Question	Expected response(s)	Max mark	Additional guidance
			<p>NB: A candidate who identifies only two key areas of agreement may be awarded up to a <b>maximum of four marks</b>, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• two marks for identification of two key areas of agreement plus:</li> </ul> <p><b>either</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a further mark for appropriate use of supporting evidence to a total of three marks</li> </ul> <p><b>or</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a further two marks for detailed/insightful use of supporting evidence to a total of four marks</li> </ul> <p>A candidate who identifies only one key area of agreement may be awarded up to a maximum of two marks, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• one mark for identification of one key area of agreement, plus a further mark for use of supporting evidence to a total of two marks</li> </ul>

Area of Agreement		Passage 1	Passage 2
1	little demand/antipathy from public	little public interest in the characters outwith the original film ('people lived happily without knowing or thinking about', 'clamour for a prequel . . . precisely zero', 'answer questions nobody asked in the first place')	public view these films with suspicion/scepticism ('unsurprisingly critical', 'suspicious', 'resist the idea')
2	financially motivated	they are all about making money ('\$150 million at the box office', 'little more surefire than a title that has already taken billions', 'costumes to be filled with cash')	they are all about making money ('nothing other than a way for film companies to make more money', 'capitalise on their original investment', 'cash in on a franchise')
3	lack of quality/creativity	no great quality in these films ('bland biscuits', 'total lack of daring and ideas', 'have we . . . entirely run out of ideas?', 'plodding parade', 'all look the same and never go anywhere', 'too much of the same thing', 'toss out a film')	they can be very poor quality/lack creative ambition ('useless, empty corporate product', 'rather than a film striving for an original moment or unknown destination', 'We all know where the Willy Wonka story ends up.')
4	prequels damage characters from the original films	Darth Vader's movement from a frightening figure to a comic figure ('icon . . . wobbly buffoon')	original characters are spoiled ('a prequel will only tarnish or ruin the character')
5	huge, overwhelming number of these films	there are more and more of these films ('Every week something you thought was dead comes back')	film industry has come to rely on these films ('Hollywood's favourite story to tell')
6	prequels negatively affect our personal relationship with original film	they damage our very personal relationship with the original ('nostalgia massacre', 'mystique will be lost to over-explanation', 'prequels are the death of imagination', 'manufactured explanation where . . . creativity and fond memories once lay')	they affect our nostalgic relationship with the original ('betrayal of one's original experience', 'not be satisfied that . . . this matches . . . your own emotions and experience')
7	only make sense when considered alongside original/essentially parasitic	they are very dependent on the legacy of the original ('relic ready for a revamp', 'new shows based on something old', 'brand extension', 'all its marketing in the title')	they are dependent on original ('a pre-tale tacked onto an existing character')

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]