eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/01
Individual Research

Key Messages

- Candidates should produce two Individual Research (IR) reports with a question as a title for each report and sub-headings linked to the assessment criteria.
- Word documents are the favoured format for submissions so that word counts can be checked and adhered to.
- The questions for each IR should be written in the space provided on the Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRC) so that is clear which piece of work has received which marks.
- Assessors should write brief comments linked to the assessment criteria in the space provided on the ICRC to indicate how a particular mark was arrived at.
- For each candidate in the sample, Centres need to submit the work and the completed ICRC. The Centre needs to also include the MS1 for the component and the completed Coursework Assessment Summary Form (CASF) for all candidates entered for the component not just the sample.
- The total marks on the ICRCs, the MS1 and the CASF should be the same.
- Centres should submit the work of the candidate on the lowest non-zero mark and of the candidate on the highest mark and a range in between.

General comments

All Centres submitted work which complied with the requirements for the IR component in the 2013 syllabus. Moderators are once again pleased to report that candidates produced interesting Individual Research reports covering a variety of topics from the 20 topic areas. Popular topics included: climate change, poverty and inequality, law and criminality and conflict and peace. More candidates from the same Centre seem to be producing work on the same topic this year, which suggests that Centres are allowing candidates to select an issue from a given topic covered in class. This was a change from last year where it seemed that more Centres were allowing candidates a free choice in the topic. Both approaches have merit in different contexts.

Some candidates are using questions to focus their research and their reports, but some are still writing broad topic areas which do not allow them to produce the best work as they lose track of their focus.

Unfortunately, it is still evident that some candidates are exceeding the word count of 1500 – 2000 words as specified in the syllabus. Centres are asked to advise candidates to produce their work as word documents so this can be checked and that they monitor this situation and suggest corrective action where the word limit is exceeded. Where work is considerably less than the word count, candidates cannot do justice to the full mark scheme. Where there is considerably more, candidates put themselves at an unfair advantage and this needs to be addressed by the Centre.

Centres will appreciate that the work produced must reflect the assessment criteria and should be written in continuous prose. Some candidates are still providing primary evidence in the form of questionnaires and print screen images of face book pages and class work which is unnecessary and makes moderating more difficult. The only requirements for the Individual Research are that candidates produce and submit two Individual Research reports. There should also be a completed Individual Candidate Record Card for each candidate and a Coursework Summary Assessment Form and MS1 for each candidate within a Centre that has submitted work for this component.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Comments on specific questions

Teacher assessment

Many Centres are clear about what is expected for candidates to be awarded marks in different bands and can identify pieces of work that fall into Band 2 or Band 3. Centres should ensure that there is sufficient evidence to award a mark for a specific criterion. Where an IR report meets the assessment criteria fully, marks within Band 4 were awarded and where there is limited information for one of the criteria, candidates were given marks in Band 1, although it is very rare for a candidate who has produced a study to be given no marks for any of the criteria, as there is usually something of value that can be credited. Some Centres are still a little severe in their application of the mark scheme and some are a little generous.

Gather information representing different perspectives

The majority of candidates were able to gather and present a range of information linked to the topic area and research question and this usually came from a range of sources. Some candidates need to be reminded to include bibliographies but should not be penalised too severely if they forget to do so. Candidates still need to be concise in presenting this information so that it does not take up a disproportionate amount of the word count.

Centres should advise candidates that as well as mentioning other countries in their studies, they should also be considering the perspectives of individuals or groups related to the study. It is not enough for candidates to simply name countries, there should also be an indication of what these countries, groups and individuals think about the issue under investigation.

Analyse issues within the report

Analysis continues to get better, with causes, effects and current situations generally considered in some detail, although there is still some listing of points, which does not allow candidates to develop their thoughts. More successful reports continue to cover fewer issues in depth rather than simply presenting a lot of unrelated issues. Centres sometimes need to remind candidates that to analyse an issue, candidates should consider the conditions related to the question being discussed and the possible causes and effects of these conditions, as well as the current situations.

Identify and evaluate possible scenarios and formulate possible courses of action

This is the criterion that still causes a variety of problems. Some Centres misunderstand what is meant by possible scenarios and should explain to candidates that scenarios arise from answering the question: 'What if...?' This can be in relation to whether something continues or not and should be linked to the issue under discussion not made up; so becoming superficial to the rest of the work done. For example, what might happen to the landscape of a country if we continue to build wind farms or what might happen if we ignore the fact that we are eventually going to run out of fossil fuels. Where candidates had thought about possible scenarios, they sometimes considered the likelihood of these scenarios, and were awarded marks for evaluation. This is getting better, but is still not a regular feature of the work moderated.

It is important to point out that proposals developed in a logical way will score better marks than those listed randomly at the end of a study. In some cases, those who left possible courses of action to the end of a piece were suggesting that they had run out of time or words or has not structured their study in such a way as to allow for possible courses of action to be formulated and developed. Candidates should be reminded that courses of action should be in answer to the possible scenarios and should not already be happening. Credit can be given for courses of action that are happening, although it is unlikely that top marks for this criterion will be awarded if this is the case.

Develop evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness

Some Centres are still submitting the self-evaluation form which is no longer needed and generally not very helpful in assessing this criterion. The evidence for this part of the assessment should be embedded within the report, and perhaps at the end, as was generally the practice. In this way candidates were able to fully engage with the question posed and the perspectives gathered, and there was meaningful personal involvement linked to the information gathered. Candidates successfully fulfilled this criterion if they could discuss what they had learnt from undertaking the research for the study that they had perhaps not thought

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

of before and how what they had learnt had changed their thinking (or not) about the issue and what they might do as a result. Personal responses should be linked to the research undertaken. To enable this, some candidates preferred to show their thinking as they considered causes, effects, current situations, possible scenario, likelihood of these and courses of action with a summation of possible action on their part or the part of their family or community at the end.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02
Group Project

Key Messages

- A detailed, clearly identifiable project plan is a compulsory element of the group submission. It can either be in the form of a separate document, or it can be incorporated into the group's write-up of their project.
- The project must lead to the actual production/carrying out of a concrete outcome, the purpose of which is to achieve the project aim(s) articulated in the project plan. Candidates should be actively discouraged from choosing passive outcomes such as case studies and research essays as these simply replicate on a group basis what has already been done for the Individual Research component. It is recommended that candidates confine themselves to one or two outcomes only in order to do them full justice.
- Candidates also need to consider at the outset how they might measure how far their outcome has achieved the project aims.
- The purpose of the group project report or write-up is to describe the processes undertaken in developing/producing the outcome; to provide evidence of cross-cultural collaboration and to describe the outcome itself, explaining how the research in general, and cross-cultural collaboration in particular, support and are reflected in the outcome.
- Cross-cultural collaboration should be undertaken purposefully in order to develop and support the project outcome. Candidates should be discouraged from relying solely on their international School community and Internet surveys for their cross-cultural collaboration. These methods of cross-cultural collaboration can be somewhat superficial and often need to be supplemented by more in-depth collaboration in order to be meaningful.
- Each member of the group must submit a single piece of work which comprises three distinct sections: an evaluation of the project plan and process; an evaluation of the successes and failures of the project outcome in achieving the project aim(s) and an evaluation of their own individual contribution to the project including the benefits and challenges of working as a group and their learning from cross-cultural collaboration.
- In awarding marks, teachers must ensure that the nature of the work produced by the group and individual candidates generally matches the description within the mark band for the mark that is being awarded.
- Teachers are strongly requested to ensure that they have included some comments justifying/supporting the marks awarded on each of the Individual Candidate Record Cards and that these completed record cards and the Coursework Assessment Summary Form are submitted with the sample of work.

General Comments

This examination session once again saw a wide variety of interesting topic choices and some very successful and worthwhile project outcomes. Some examples of these follow. Under the topic area of Conflict and Peace, one candidate group decided to explore the plight of prisoners of war across the world being held in inhumane conditions without trial. Their aim was to educate younger candidates about such prisoners and their outcome was a lesson and presentation, followed by a questionnaire to judge how much the candidates had learned. As part of the topic area of Education for All, another candidate group explored provision for the needs of children with learning difficulties and physical disability in their own, developing country. The group's outcome was a website aimed at providing information and resources about the issue to relocating international families who might need it. For Tradition, Culture and Identity, another group decided to educate fellow candidates about the importance of culture; the different cultures within their community and how to be part of a community where there are many different identities. The group's outcomes to achieve this aim consisted of an informative video documentary and a day of celebration of different cultures.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Comments on candidate response to assessment criteria

Production of a project plan
(Group assessment)

Most candidate groups produced sufficiently detailed plans. Weak plans tend to be characterised by vagueness and a lack of detail. In their plans, candidates must ensure they include the following: the rationale for the choice of topic/project; the aim(s) of the project (i.e. what they want to achieve by carrying out the project); the outcome of the project (i.e. what they intend to produce/do to achieve these aims); all the activities they need to carry out (including information gathering and cross-cultural collaboration), along with concrete time-frames and a breakdown of all roles and responsibilities of individual group members, with some reasoning given as to why roles have been allocated. Plans which provide **full** details of **all** these elements should be awarded the full mark for this assessment criterion.

Candidates should be discouraged from choosing to produce case studies or research essays as their project outcomes. These are passive, rather than active outcomes. They are more in keeping with the Individual Research component and are not appropriate for the project component.

It would help candidates if, as part of their planning, they were to not only identify their project outcome, but also to consider how they might judge the success of their outcome and make some provision for that in their plan (e.g. a quiz, or a pre/post event questionnaire etc.) in preparation for their individual evaluation of the outcome.

Representation of different viewpoints and perspectives (including cross-cultural)
(Group assessment)

Projects that scored well on this criterion were generally characterised by the careful thought that had clearly gone into planning the nature of the research and cross-cultural collaboration that would be required to develop and support an effective project outcome. Some candidate groups were very systematic in first deciding the broad areas of the topic area that needed to be researched, and then breaking these down into manageable sections for individual group members to take responsibility for. Often, though not always, the research for these sections also reflected global, national/local and personal perspectives, with different viewpoints being examined within these perspectives. Purposeful and meaningful cross-cultural collaboration was generally built in as part of the global perspective, although it could sometimes also be found within the national or local perspective, as well as the global. This kind of approach showed that the group had given very careful consideration to their project aims and the kind of outcome that would achieve those aims. Their research, including cross-cultural collaboration, was consistently directed at developing and supporting the project outcome. Generally, where groups adopted this kind of systematic and focused approach, the candidates scored well on the group and the individual assessment criteria because all the elements were in place to provide ample scope for group members to do themselves justice in their individual evaluations.

Projects scoring less well on this criterion tended to do so because information gathered was not used effectively to develop and support an appropriate outcome. Often candidates relied solely on peers from overseas in an international institution to gather information about the issue under investigation, or else they relied heavily on Internet surveys. While there is nothing wrong with using either of these as supplementary sources of information, used on their own, they are unlikely to provide the depth of viewpoints and perspectives that more direct collaboration with people in another country or from another culture can bring and which can provide a rich source for individual candidates to draw on in their evaluations of what they have learned from cross-cultural collaboration.

Teachers are reminded that "Production of a project plan" and "Representation of different viewpoints and perspectives (including cross-cultural)" are both marked on a group basis and this means that all candidates in a group should be awarded the same mark for these two criteria.

Constructive participation in group work/activities
(Individual assessment)

Assessment of performance in this criterion must be based on concrete evidence recorded during teacher observations of group work in progress. Brief supporting comments may either be included on the form provided for this purpose on the Cambridge Teacher Support Site website, or directly on to the Individual Candidate Record Cards.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Evaluation of project plan and process
(Individual assessment)

Generally, candidates responded reasonably well to this element of the assessment, but where they did not, it was because their work was superficial in that it tended to focus on explaining what the group had done and how, rather than **critically examining** the strengths and weaknesses of what had been done and how. To score well on this criterion, candidates must ensure that they consider both the strengths **and** weaknesses of the project plan **and** the process of carrying out the project (i.e. all the different activities, including research that they engaged in while carrying out the project and developing the outcome). They also need to make considered suggestions as to how the plan and/or process could have been improved. Candidates should be reminded of the importance of critical judgment and consideration in all of their individual evaluations.

Evaluation of project outcome
(Individual assessment)

The quality of project outcome evaluations has been steadily improving, but there is still room for improvement. The strongest evaluations made explicit and ongoing links to the project aims throughout their evaluation and also gave careful consideration as to how success could be measured, either as a result of an activity that the group had put in place, or as an additional measure that the individual candidate had thought of. In weaker evaluations, project aims were not referred to at all or only briefly and the discussion of successes and failures was descriptive in nature and lacked critical thought.

Evaluation of Individual contribution (including what was learnt from cross-cultural collaboration)
(Individual assessment)

Most candidates provided full details of what they had contributed to the project, but they often did not do themselves justice because they tended to list what they had done rather than giving critical consideration to how they had done it (i.e. the quality of their contribution and where it might have been improved). Candidates who scored well on this criterion not only considered the quality of their contribution, but also reflected in some depth on the benefits and difficulties of working as a group. Teachers should advise candidates that if the do not reflect on what they have learnt from cross-cultural collaboration, their mark for this criterion cannot move above the lower bands. This is an area that all candidates would be well-advised to pay closer attention to since cross-cultural; collaboration is at the heart of the Project component of the Global Perspectives syllabus.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/31
Written Paper

Key Messages

- Candidates used the source materials with enthusiasm to explore global issues
- Candidates performed well in the analysis and interpretation of information and evidence
- Successful candidates were able to use reasons and evidence to justify their own views and perspectives
- Increased opportunity to develop evaluation skills within courses would be helpful, especially of reasoning and evidence
- Overall, candidates' performance continues to improve

General Comments

It is pleasing to report that the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good; candidates and centres are to be congratulated on their achievements.

The paper was based upon several contrasting pieces of source material related to the global use of rare earth metals in electronic equipment.

Primarily, within the context of global perspectives, the paper was designed to test candidates' ability to:

- identify and explore different perspectives on global issues
- analyse and interpret information and evidence
- identify gaps in evidence and suggest lines of enquiry
- develop a line of reasoning and justify their views
- evaluate evidence and arguments

Candidates respond enthusiastically to the source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates generally revealed an appreciation of different perspectives on global issues, particularly distinguishing between different courses of action and evaluating points of view.

From the evidence of candidate responses, the source material and questions were easily understood and accessible to candidates of all abilities. The vast majority of candidates were able to respond to the questions appropriately and demonstrate positive achievement. The paper also differentiated successfully.

In general, the questions were answered very well and there were some excellent responses to all of the questions. In particular, most candidates were able to demonstrate high levels of ability when analysing information and evidence from within the sources. Similarly candidates were able to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry to support decision making about how to respond to issues like the creation of mines for extracting rare earth metals. These skills were tested mainly in **Questions 1, 2, 3a** and **3b**.

However, the ability to evaluate other perspectives, evidence and reasoning was more challenging for many candidates and is a skill that would benefit from further development within IGCSE Global Perspectives courses. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating, well designed courses that were helpful in developing the skills to be tested.

Examination technique was generally very good. Candidates seemed to have sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- answer the question set carefully and refer back to the question regularly, particularly in the longer essay questions
- give clear reasons and evidence to support an opinion or argument
- evaluate reasoning and evidence by referring to both strengths and weaknesses
- avoid simple assertion, opinion and anecdotal evidence

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1a

Candidates were asked to identify one use of rare earth metals from the source material. Candidates usually identified the following:

- batteries
- electronics
- defence technology such as night vision goggles, guided missiles and armoured vehicles
- clean technology
- medical technology
- rare earth metals make very small gadgets possible.
- energy saving light bulbs
- laptops
- iPods
- cell phones
- DVDs
- flat screen TV
- wind turbines
- hybrid cars

Candidates were not awarded marks for uses that were not linked in some way to the source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two uses and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1b

Candidates were asked to identify one cause of the global shortage of rare earth metals from the source material. Candidates usually identified the following:

- the major producing country (China) needs its rare earth metals for its own industries
- use of rare earth metals exceeds mining (2010 figures)
- demand for rare earth metals is predicted to rise
- difficult to extract rare earths from the rocks
- environmental impact

Candidates were not awarded marks for causes that were not linked in some way to the Source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified a cause and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1c

Candidates were asked to identify two consequences of the global shortage of rare earth metals from the source material. Candidates usually identified the following:

- not enough rare earth metals for high tech industries in Japan, US, Europe.
- have to do without i-pods and phones
- have to reduce the number of gadgets we own
- keep gadgets for longer
- need to find a new source of rare earth metals
- need more rare earth metal mines in more countries.
- our way of life will be threatened
- slower development
- environmental impact

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Candidates were not awarded marks for consequences that were not linked in some way to the Source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two of these consequences and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1d

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which consequence of the global shortage of rare earth metals was the most important. They were expected to give several reasons or some evidence for their choice. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- nature of consequence – how severe
- the range of impacts on other aspects of the human and natural world
- urgency or time factors
- degree of impact/seriousness/magnitude
- how many people/groups/countries are affected
- increasing cycle of difficulty e.g. from pollution

The strongest answers provided several clearly reasoned explanations of why one consequence is more important than others; this often directly compared the selected consequence with one or more other consequences. Weaker responses often simply stated the consequence or did not link the reasons to the global shortage of rare earth metals explicitly.

Most candidates answered this question well.

Question 1e

Candidates were expected to discuss to what extent the supply of rare earth minerals is a global problem and justify the answer. The question was testing candidates' ability to evaluate global issues and develop reasoning to support a view.

- the benefits/consequences for individuals
- the benefits/consequences for communities/countries
- the benefits/consequences for global society
- issues of equal opportunities/fairness – impact on inequality/poverty
- access to jobs in the industry affected
- in response to government/united nations and humanitarian aims and goals e.g. millennium goals
- interdependence – we are all affected

Stronger responses were supported by clear reasoning and explanation justifying why the issue was of global importance. These responses contained a range of reasoned arguments and evidence to support the views expressed, clearly and explicitly related to the global dimension.

Weaker responses tended to give asserted statements about the significance of the issue but tended to ignore the global dimension. Arguments were often partial or generalised, or simply repeated source material.

Question 2a

Candidates were expected to make suggestions about what type of further information they would need to help them be sure that people in Greenland would definitely benefit from the introduction of modern industries and ways of life. This was designed to test candidates' ability to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry about global issues.

The strongest responses tended to suggest information that was clearly related to the issue. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about current ways of life rather than about potential impacts of change on local culture and ways of life.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information:

- what the life expectancy of people in Greenland is now – is it significantly higher?
- the levels of poverty in Greenland now and in the past – are people better off?
- What are the disadvantages of the introduction of modern industries – for example if people are a lot less happy working in a mine than they were as hunters

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- the current levels of general well being and happiness – have they improved?
- the impact on the environment.

Question 2b

Candidates were expected to make and explain suggestions about what type of further information they would need to help them to make a decision about whether or not to support a proposal to transport and process rare earth raw material across their country. This is designed to test candidates' ability to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry to support decision making about how to respond to issues.

The strongest responses tended to suggest information that was clearly related to the issue of transporting and processing rare earth raw material; for example about the effects on the environment and dangers from radioactive material. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about the length of time to transport materials.

Candidates were also asked to explain how the information gained from the answer to the question would help them to make a decision about supporting the proposed development. The strongest responses tended to clearly describe the way that the information linked to rare earths would help them in the decision-making process. Weaker responses tended to simply describe the type of information in more detail and not link the information to decision-making, or simply to describe their own opinion in an asserted way.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information:

- viability of the project
- size and plan – to help assess its general impact on the locality and people in the area
- distance – potential fuel and other costs
- economic benefits
- cost – how expensive to build and who will pay
- profits – who will benefit from the profits and are they likely to be very high
- incentives - is there going to be any compensation for loss of amenity or impact on the visual environment
- public views - the opinion of other local people about this type of project
- impact of the building project - possible disruption that creating the plant is going to cause and for how long
- impact of possible radiation and other pollutants from the transport and processing plants
- benefits to the environment - possible positive impact on the environment in general due to reduction in fuel emissions from more efficient gadgets or other benefit

Question 3a

Candidates were asked to evaluate a statement from the source material to assess the reasonableness of a perspective about the impact of rare earth shortages on access to electronic gadgets in the future. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to make value judgments about arguments or claims.

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the assertion in the source being reasonable:

- it's reasonable to some extent, because there will be a shortage of goods such as iPods which are made with rare earth metals if the supply runs out
- other uses may be more important, for example in medical equipment that can save lives
- we have no other choice

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the assertion in the source being unreasonable:

- it's unreasonable because it suggests only two extreme alternatives
- a false alternative
- there are other solutions - our existing iPods and cell phones will keep working for quite a while
- we could recycle
- we could buy gadgets made in China

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

The strongest responses tended to clearly discuss the reasonableness of the claim and its liklihood. Coherent, structured evaluation of the perspective was offered with several developed evaluative points. These responses were usually balanced with a clear assessment or conclusion reached.

Weaker responses tended to give limited discussion and assert an opinion without reason or explanation.

The majority of candidates were able to discuss some aspects of the perspective with confidence.

Question 3b

Candidates were asked to evaluate a statement from the source material to assess the reasonableness of the view that our way of life is more important than other people's. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to make value judgments about arguments or claims.

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the assertion in the source being reasonable:

- it is natural to see our way of life as more important than others' – just as our families, friends and communities are more important to us than strangers - in some situations it is natural to place our own way of life first
- people tend to look after their own interests
- survival of our culture and way of life has as much value as others

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the assertion in the source being unreasonable:

- others' ways of life are important in terms of general human rights and equality
- others should not be endangered for trivial things
- it's not morally acceptable to exploit others and threaten their way of life just so that we can have gadgets

The strongest responses tended to clearly discuss the reasonableness of the claim, often referring to values as well as pragmatic issues. Coherent, structured evaluation of the perspective was offered with several developed evaluative points. These responses were usually balanced with a clear assessment or conclusion reached.

Weaker responses tended to give limited discussion and assert an opinion without reason or explanation.

The majority of candidates were able to discuss some aspects of the perspective with confidence.

Question 3c

Candidates were expected to evaluate the reasoning in the two statements about nuclear power and compare their effectiveness. They were expected to make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person had the most effective reasoning.

Candidates tended to consider the following types of issue:

- quality of the argument
  - clarity
  - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
  - language
  - balance
- quality of the evidence
  - relevance
  - sufficiency – range/type/depth/detail
  - source
  - date – how recent
  - factual, opinion, value, anecdote
  - testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- sources of bias
- likelihood of claims and consequences of their ideas

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- acceptability of their values to others
  - how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view

Responses at the highest levels contained very good, well supported judgements about which reasoning worked best with a clear assessment of the relative value of each statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the reasoning worked for each blogger with a focus on evaluation of issues, with a range of points about knowledge claims, evidence, consequences and values. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion.

At the lower levels of response the discussion was unlikely to be supported and mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Candidates found this question quite challenging. Centres are encouraged to give candidates opportunities to evaluate argument and evidence for a range of purposes during their courses in order to prepare for this type of question. Some key concepts in the evaluation of evidence and argument to consider would be:

- Validity
- Reliability
- Bias
- Authority
- Expertise
- Source of evidence
- Sufficiency of evidence
- Facts
- Opinion
- Assertion
- Values
- Beliefs
- Quality of reasoning/argument

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to prioritise different forms of action to reduce energy usage in a crisis, making a judgment about which types and level(s) of action are the most likely to succeed. The candidates were expected to use the material found in the Sources, but go beyond simply repeating or recycling without further development. Other material may also have been introduced but it was not necessary to gain full marks.

The arguments used by candidates to consider different levels of response tended to include:

- amount of impact - how much difference can be made
- extent of impact – how far a difference can be made within and across countries
- how long it takes to make a difference
- the effects of culture and values on criteria for decision making e.g. value attached to saving lives
- barriers to fuel reduction
- consequences of fuel reduction
- ease of action and difficulties in reducing fuel use
- the influence of individuals and groups
- the role of vested interests and power differences
- potential conflict
- long term and short term factors

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about which type/level of action to prioritise; this included coherent, structured argument and evaluation with at least two types/levels of action compared. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and focus on issues of fuel usage rather than an explanation of why a type/level of should be prioritised; or provide a list of ways to reduce fuel use without explanation of why these actions are most likely to succeed. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/32
Written Paper

Key Messages

- Candidates used the source materials with enthusiasm to explore global issues
- Candidates performed well in the analysis and interpretation of information and evidence
- Successful candidates are able to use reasons and evidence to justify their own views and perspectives
- Increased opportunity to develop evaluation skills within courses would be helpful, especially of reasoning and evidence
- Overall, candidates' performance continues to improve

General Comments

It is pleasing to report that the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good; candidates and centres are to be congratulated on their achievements.

The paper was based upon several contrasting pieces of source material related to the global issue of fuel and energy.

Primarily, within the context of global perspectives, the paper was designed to test candidates' ability to:

- identify and explore different perspectives on global issues
- analyse and interpret information and evidence
- identify gaps in evidence and suggest lines of enquiry
- distinguish between different types of statement – fact, opinion, prediction and value judgements
- develop a line of reasoning and justify their views
- evaluate evidence and arguments

Candidates respond enthusiastically to the source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates generally revealed an appreciation of different perspectives on global issues, particularly distinguishing between different courses of action and evaluating points of view.

From the evidence of candidate responses, the source material and questions were easily understood and accessible to candidates of all abilities. The vast majority of candidates were able to respond to the questions appropriately and demonstrate positive achievement. The paper also differentiated successfully.

In general, the questions were answered very well and there were some excellent responses to all of the questions. In particular, most candidates were able to demonstrate high levels of ability when analysing information and evidence from within the sources. Similarly candidates were able to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry to support decision making about how to respond to issues like the building of proposed wind farms. These skills were tested mainly in **Questions 1, 2** and **3a**.

However the ability to evaluate other perspectives, evidence and reasoning was more challenging for many candidates and is a skill that would benefit from further development within IGCSE Global Perspectives courses. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating, well designed courses that were helpful in developing the skills to be tested.

Examination technique was generally very good. Candidates seemed to have sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were hardly any rubric errors.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- answer the question set carefully and refer back to the question regularly, particularly in the longer essay questions
- give clear reasons and evidence to support an opinion or argument
- evaluate reasoning and evidence by referring to both strengths and weaknesses
- avoid simple assertion, opinion and anecdotal evidence

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1a

Candidates were asked to identify two uses of fuel from the source material. Candidates usually identified the following:

- heating
- cooking
- appliances
- lighting
- transport
- TVs and computer power
- to run cars and buses

Candidates were not awarded marks for uses that were not linked in some way to the source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two uses and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1b

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which use of fuels was the most important. They were expected to give several reasons or some evidence for their choice. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- possible consequences
- urgency or time factors
- degree of impact/seriousness/magnitude
- how many people/groups/countries are affected
- increasing cycle of effect on different aspects of life

The strongest answers provided several clearly reasoned explanations of why one use is more important than others; this often directly compared the selected cause with one or more other causes. Weaker responses often simply stated the cause or did not link the reasons explicitly to fuel use.

Most candidates answered this question well.

Question 1c

Candidates were asked to identify two consequences of people overusing fuel from the source material. Candidates usually identified the following:

- black outs
- more use of candles/torches
- less/lack of transport
- less hours worked/less hours at School
- fewer jobs
- less TV use
- less computer use
- less street lightening
- lack of petrol/diesel
- queues for fuel
- riots
- more broken down vehicles

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- work done by candlelight
- fewer private vehicles/more public transport and fuller buses/trains
- increased costs

Candidates were not awarded marks for consequences that were not linked in some way to the Source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two of these consequences and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1d

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which consequence of fuel overuse was the most important. They were expected to give several reasons or some evidence for their choice. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- nature of consequence – how severe
- range of impacts on other aspects of the human and natural world
- urgency or time factors
- degree of impact/seriousness/magnitude
- how many people/groups/countries are affected
- increasing cycle of difficulty e.g. from pollution causing global warming

The strongest answers provided several clearly reasoned explanations of why one consequence is more important than others; this often directly compared the selected consequence with one or more other consequences. Weaker responses often simply stated the consequence or did not link the reasons to deforestation explicitly.

Most candidates answered this question well.

Question 2a and 2b

Candidates were expected to make suggestions about what type of further information they would need to help them to make a decision about whether or not to support the building of a wind farm near to their home. This is designed to test candidates' ability to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry to support decision making about how to respond to issues.

The strongest responses tended to suggest information that was clearly related to the issue of building a wind farm close to homes; for example about the effects of the wind farm on the local environment, including noise and visual impact. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about the amount of energy produced by a wind farm.

Candidates were also asked to explain how the information gained from the answer to the question would help them to make a decision about supporting the proposed development. The strongest responses tended to clearly describe the way that the information linked to wind farms would help them in the decision-making process. Weaker responses tended to simply describe the type of information in more detail and not link the information to decision-making, or simply to describe their own opinion in an asserted way.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information:

- viability of the project - if it was windy enough in the area as it would not be worth supporting the wind farm if there was not enough wind
- affect on animals and wildlife
- size and plan of the wind farm – to help assess its general impact on the locality and people in the area
- distance - how near it was and whether they'd be any noise or impact on light that might be a nuisance or cause problems to wildlife
- economic - is there likely to be any reduction in the cost of electricity or reduced fuel bills as you would live next to a wind farm; better supply for local or industrial use
- cost – how expensive will the wind farm be to build and who will pay
- profits – who will benefit from the profits and are they likely to be very high
- incentives - is there going to be any compensation for loss of amenity or impact on the visual environment
- public views - the opinion of other local people about this type of project

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- impact of the building project - possible disruption that creating the building it is going to cause and for how long
- benefits to the environment - possible positive impact on the environment in general due to reduction in fuel emissions or other benefit

Question 3a

Candidates were expected to identify whether or not the statement in the question was a prediction and/or an opinion, and explain their interpretation.

The statement was both an opinion and a prediction. The person gave an opinion that fossil fuels are going to run out but did not provide any concrete evidence to support the view. The statement is also a prediction based on suggesting that this is going to happen in the future.

The strongest responses gave clear explanation of why the statement was both an opinion and a prediction, showing understanding of both types of argument. Weaker responses tended to simply assert the answer without giving reasons.

Question 3b

Candidates were asked to evaluate a statement from the source material to assess the reasonableness of a perspective about fuel sources in developing countries. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to make value judgments.

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the assertion in the source being reasonable:

- developing countries are poor and cannot afford expensive fuels
- improving economies helps developing countries to become more wealthy so that they can afford other types of fuel
- saving money on fuel makes more available for other purposes like health, education and reducing poverty
- there should be greater equality and this helps to achieve it
- more expensive fuels can be used in the future when they can be afforded

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the assertion in the source being unreasonable:

- countries are interdependent and should not exploit each other
- fair trade works both ways and some profits are needed for other countries
- developing countries should not be selfish
- there are other factors to think about like pollution and effects on the environment when choosing fuels

The strongest responses tended to clearly discuss the reasonableness of developing countries using only cheap fuel. Coherent, structured evaluation of the perspective was offered with several developed evaluative points. These responses were usually balanced with a clear assessment or conclusion reached.

Weaker responses tended to give limited discussion and assert an opinion without reason or explanation.

The majority of candidates were able to discuss some aspects of the perspective with confidence.

Question 3c

Candidates were expected to evaluate the reasoning in the two statements about nuclear power and compare their effectiveness. They were expected to make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person had the most effective reasoning.

Candidates tended to consider the following types of issue:

- quality of the argument
  - clarity
  - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

  - language
  - balance
- quality of the evidence
  - relevance
  - sufficiency – range/type/depth/detail
  - source
  - date – how recent
  - factual, opinion, value, anecdote
  - testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- sources of bias
- likelihood of claims and consequences of their ideas
- acceptability of their values to others
  - how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view

Responses at the highest levels contained very good, well supported judgements about which reasoning worked best with a clear assessment of the relative value of each statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the reasoning worked for each blogger with a focus on evaluation of issues, with a range of points about knowledge claims, evidence, consequences and values. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion.

At the lower levels of response the discussion was unlikely to be supported and mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Candidates found this question quite challenging. Centres are encouraged to give candidates opportunities to evaluate argument and evidence for a range of purposes during their courses in order to prepare for this type of question. Some key concepts in the evaluation of evidence and argument to consider would be:

- Validity
- Reliability
- Bias
- Authority
- Expertise
- Source of evidence
- Sufficiency of evidence
- Facts
- Opinion
- Assertion
- Values
- Beliefs
- Quality of reasoning/argument

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to prioritise different forms of action to reduce energy usage in a crisis, making a judgment about which types and level(s) of action are the most likely to succeed. The candidates were expected to use the material found in the Sources, but go beyond simply repeating or recycling without further development. Other material may also have been introduced but it was not necessary to gain full marks.

The arguments used by candidates to consider different levels of response tended to include:

- amount of impact - how much difference can be made
- extent of impact – how far a difference can be made within and across countries
- how long it takes to make a difference
- the effects of culture and values on criteria for decision making e.g. value attached to saving lives
- barriers to fuel reduction
- consequences of fuel reduction
- ease of action and difficulties in reducing fuel use
- the influence of individuals and groups
- the role of vested interests and power differences
- potential conflict

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- long term and short term factors

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about which type/level of action to prioritise; this included coherent, structured argument and evaluation with at least two types/levels of action compared. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and focus on issues of fuel usage rather than an explanation of why a type/level of should be prioritised; or provide a list of ways to reduce fuel use without explanation of why these actions are most likely to succeed. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted.

eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/33
Written Paper

Key Messages

- Candidates used the source materials with enthusiasm to explore global issues
- Candidates performed well in the analysis and interpretation of information and evidence
- Successful candidates are able to use reasons and evidence to justify their own views and perspectives
- Increased opportunity to develop evaluation skills within courses would be helpful, especially of reasoning and evidence
- Overall, candidates' performance continues to improve

General Comments

It is pleasing to report that the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good; candidates and centres are to be congratulated on their achievements.

The paper was based upon several contrasting pieces of source material related to the global issue of fuel and energy.

Primarily, within the context of global perspectives, the paper was designed to test candidates' ability to:

- identify and explore different perspectives on global issues
- analyse and interpret information and evidence
- identify gaps in evidence and suggest lines of enquiry
- distinguish between different types of statement – fact, opinion, prediction and value judgements
- develop a line of reasoning and justify their views
- evaluate evidence and arguments

Candidates respond enthusiastically to the source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates generally revealed an appreciation of different perspectives on global issues, particularly distinguishing between different courses of action and evaluating points of view.

From the evidence of candidate responses, the source material and questions were easily understood and accessible to candidates of all abilities. The vast majority of candidates were able to respond to the questions appropriately and demonstrate positive achievement. The paper also differentiated successfully.

In general, the questions were answered very well and there were some excellent responses to all of the questions. In particular, most candidates were able to demonstrate high levels of ability when analysing information and evidence from within the sources. Similarly candidates were able to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry to support decision making about how to respond to issues like the building of proposed wind farms. These skills were tested mainly in **Questions 1, 2** and **3a**.

However the ability to evaluate other perspectives, evidence and reasoning was more challenging for many candidates and is a skill that would benefit from further development within IGCSE Global Perspectives courses. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating, well designed courses that were helpful in developing the skills to be tested.

Examination technique was generally very good. Candidates seemed to have sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were hardly any rubric errors.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- answer the question set carefully and refer back to the question regularly, particularly in the longer essay questions
- give clear reasons and evidence to support an opinion or argument
- evaluate reasoning and evidence by referring to both strengths and weaknesses
- avoid simple assertion, opinion and anecdotal evidence

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1a

Candidates were asked to identify two uses of fuel from the source material. Candidates usually identified the following:

- heating
- cooking
- appliances
- lighting
- transport
- TVs and computer power
- to run cars and buses

Candidates were not awarded marks for uses that were not linked in some way to the source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two uses and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1b

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which use of fuels was the most important. They were expected to give several reasons or some evidence for their choice. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- possible consequences
- urgency or time factors
- degree of impact/seriousness/magnitude
- how many people/groups/countries are affected
- increasing cycle of effect on different aspects of life

The strongest answers provided several clearly reasoned explanations of why one use is more important than others; this often directly compared the selected cause with one or more other causes. Weaker responses often simply stated the cause or did not link the reasons explicitly to fuel use.

Most candidates answered this question well.

Question 1c

Candidates were asked to identify two consequences of people overusing fuel from the source material. Candidates usually identified the following:

- black outs
- more use of candles/torches
- less/lack of transport
- less hours worked/less hours at School
- fewer jobs
- less TV use
- less computer use
- less street lightening
- lack of petrol/diesel
- queues for fuel
- riots
- more broken down vehicles

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- work done by candlelight
- fewer private vehicles/more public transport and fuller buses/trains
- increased costs

Candidates were not awarded marks for consequences that were not linked in some way to the Source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two of these consequences and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1d

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which consequence of fuel overuse was the most important. They were expected to give several reasons or some evidence for their choice. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- nature of consequence – how severe
- range of impacts on other aspects of the human and natural world
- urgency or time factors
- degree of impact/seriousness/magnitude
- how many people/groups/countries are affected
- increasing cycle of difficulty e.g. from pollution causing global warming

The strongest answers provided several clearly reasoned explanations of why one consequence is more important than others; this often directly compared the selected consequence with one or more other consequences. Weaker responses often simply stated the consequence or did not link the reasons to deforestation explicitly.

Most candidates answered this question well.

Question 2a and 2b

Candidates were expected to make suggestions about what type of further information they would need to help them to make a decision about whether or not to support the building of a wind farm near to their home. This is designed to test candidates' ability to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry to support decision making about how to respond to issues.

The strongest responses tended to suggest information that was clearly related to the issue of building a wind farm close to homes; for example about the effects of the wind farm on the local environment, including noise and visual impact. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about the amount of energy produced by a wind farm.

Candidates were also asked to explain how the information gained from the answer to the question would help them to make a decision about supporting the proposed development. The strongest responses tended to clearly describe the way that the information linked to wind farms would help them in the decision-making process. Weaker responses tended to simply describe the type of information in more detail and not link the information to decision-making, or simply to describe their own opinion in an asserted way.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information:

- viability of the project - if it was windy enough in the area as it would not be worth supporting the wind farm if there was not enough wind
- affect on animals and wildlife
- size and plan of the wind farm – to help assess its general impact on the locality and people in the area
- distance - how near it was and whether they'd be any noise or impact on light that might be a nuisance or cause problems to wildlife
- economic - is there likely to be any reduction in the cost of electricity or reduced fuel bills as you would live next to a wind farm; better supply for local or industrial use
- cost – how expensive will the wind farm be to build and who will pay
- profits – who will benefit from the profits and are they likely to be very high
- incentives - is there going to be any compensation for loss of amenity or impact on the visual environment
- public views - the opinion of other local people about this type of project

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- impact of the building project - possible disruption that creating the building it is going to cause and for how long
- benefits to the environment - possible positive impact on the environment in general due to reduction in fuel emissions or other benefit

Question 3a

Candidates were expected to identify whether or not the statement in the question was a prediction and/or an opinion, and explain their interpretation.

The statement was both an opinion and a prediction. The person gave an opinion that fossil fuels are going to run out but did not provide any concrete evidence to support the view. The statement is also a prediction based on suggesting that this is going to happen in the future.

The strongest responses gave clear explanation of why the statement was both an opinion and a prediction, showing understanding of both types of argument. Weaker responses tended to simply assert the answer without giving reasons.

Question 3b

Candidates were asked to evaluate a statement from the source material to assess the reasonableness of a perspective about fuel sources in developing countries. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to make value judgments.

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the assertion in the source being reasonable:

- developing countries are poor and cannot afford expensive fuels
- improving economies helps developing countries to become more wealthy so that they can afford other types of fuel
- saving money on fuel makes more available for other purposes like health, education and reducing poverty
- there should be greater equality and this helps to achieve it
- more expensive fuels can be used in the future when they can be afforded

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the assertion in the source being unreasonable:

- countries are interdependent and should not exploit each other
- fair trade works both ways and some profits are needed for other countries
- developing countries should not be selfish
- there are other factors to think about like pollution and effects on the environment when choosing fuels

The strongest responses tended to clearly discuss the reasonableness of developing countries using only cheap fuel. Coherent, structured evaluation of the perspective was offered with several developed evaluative points. These responses were usually balanced with a clear assessment or conclusion reached.

Weaker responses tended to give limited discussion and assert an opinion without reason or explanation.

The majority of candidates were able to discuss some aspects of the perspective with confidence.

Question 3c

Candidates were expected to evaluate the reasoning in the two statements about nuclear power and compare their effectiveness. They were expected to make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person had the most effective reasoning.

Candidates tended to consider the following types of issue:

- quality of the argument
  - clarity
  - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

  - language
  - balance
- quality of the evidence
  - relevance
  - sufficiency – range/type/depth/detail
  - source
  - date – how recent
  - factual, opinion, value, anecdote
  - testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- sources of bias
- likelihood of claims and consequences of their ideas
- acceptability of their values to others
  - how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view

Responses at the highest levels contained very good, well supported judgements about which reasoning worked best with a clear assessment of the relative value of each statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the reasoning worked for each blogger with a focus on evaluation of issues, with a range of points about knowledge claims, evidence, consequences and values. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion.

At the lower levels of response the discussion was unlikely to be supported and mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Candidates found this question quite challenging. Centres are encouraged to give candidates opportunities to evaluate argument and evidence for a range of purposes during their courses in order to prepare for this type of question. Some key concepts in the evaluation of evidence and argument to consider would be:

- Validity
- Reliability
- Bias
- Authority
- Expertise
- Source of evidence
- Sufficiency of evidence
- Facts
- Opinion
- Assertion
- Values
- Beliefs
- Quality of reasoning/argument

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to prioritise different forms of action to reduce energy usage in a crisis, making a judgment about which types and level(s) of action are the most likely to succeed. The candidates were expected to use the material found in the Sources, but go beyond simply repeating or recycling without further development. Other material may also have been introduced but it was not necessary to gain full marks.

The arguments used by candidates to consider different levels of response tended to include:

- amount of impact - how much difference can be made
- extent of impact – how far a difference can be made within and across countries
- how long it takes to make a difference
- the effects of culture and values on criteria for decision making e.g. value attached to saving lives
- barriers to fuel reduction
- consequences of fuel reduction
- ease of action and difficulties in reducing fuel use
- the influence of individuals and groups
- the role of vested interests and power differences
- potential conflict

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- long term and short term factors

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about which type/level of action to prioritise; this included coherent, structured argument and evaluation with at least two types/levels of action compared. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and focus on issues of fuel usage rather than an explanation of why a type/level of should be prioritised; or provide a list of ways to reduce fuel use without explanation of why these actions are most likely to succeed. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013