2024 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Dance
Level:	2
Achievement standard(s):	91211, 91212

General commentary

Questions in both examinations were written clearly, reflected the standards and were answered well by the candidates. This year's examinations were structured differently in that candidates were restricted to answering three compulsory questions instead of selecting three out of four. Despite this change, candidates performed well overall. There were minor issues with responses using pre-prepared answers that did not respond to the questions in the examination, candidate writing legibility and superfluous answers.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 91211: Provide an interpretation of a dance performance with supporting evidence

Assessment

In 2024 candidates were required to respond to the three examination questions provided, as opposed to having to select three out of four questions. The questions provided prompts to key aspects and contexts from the 2024 Assessment Specifications which included visual design, closing moment, element of space and contrast. Candidates had the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge at all grade levels.

Commentary

The dance performance selection by candidates and/or the school/teacher is important. Ensuring videos, outside of the recommended list in the specifications, are sent to NZQA is essential. It is also important that all candidates write the name of their selected dance on page 2.

Most candidates answered Question One well as it was familiar, clear and accessible to all learners. Only a few candidates selected the bullet point "Other", but the visual design they used, was not a visual design; such as "Facial Expression". The meaning communicated through visual design was often answered with clarity and was concisely explained with relevant evidence.

- In Question Two candidates had to select a single moment and needed to clearly describe the use of the element of space, not relationships, tempo and choreographic devices. Candidates who emphasised other aspects of the moment that did not relate to space in their answer, did not really address the contribution of the use of space itself. Sometimes links were made in candidates' answers that were not relevant to the question, such as linking their understanding to the use of tempo.

Successful candidates introduced a key moment, then identified how the element of space was used in that moment, and finally, explained how this contributed to their understanding of the work.

Candidates needed to clearly state how two contrasting aspects together created impact in Question Three. Impact of the contrast was not always stated in answers, but individual impacts of the two contrasting aspects were discussed instead. Candidates who gave examples of specific moments in the dance where this occurred achieved at Merit or Excellence level. There were some inaccurate interpretations of contrast, for example, some candidates confused contrast with genre fusion.

The standard itself states that candidates must show perceptiveness, as opposed to recall. As stipulated by the standard title, candidates should form their own interpretations and reasoned arguments with supporting evidence. Candidates would benefit by answering questions with greater depth as opposed to breadth.

Candidates are reminded that the standard has TWO parts:

- providing an interpretation
- providing supporting evidence – this evidence involves using specific and relevant details from the dance performance to support an interpretation and may also include reference to:
  - reviews of the dance
  - comments from the choreographer
  - programme notes.

Candidates who referenced key words from the questions tended to produce clearer, carefully considered, and balanced responses.

Candidates who took advantage of the exemplary resources that companies have produced (RNZB, NZDC, Rambert dance), were able to successfully demonstrate a sound understanding. Responses relating to the Argentinian Tango achieved lower as it was very focussed on the sexual themes, instead of answering the question. There were a few new dance performances selected for study this year that lacked in-depth resourcing support.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified aspects of the dance accurately, such as the choreographer's name
- paraphrased words from the question into their answer
- attempted all parts of all three questions.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- read the question and showed an accurate understanding of the key words from the question in their answers
- linked the topic of the question to their interpretation, with specific and relevant examples from the dance
- utilised dance-specific language in their response.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- offered personal interpretations that went beyond the resource booklets or pre-prepared answers available online
- included carefully selected evidence
- used personal voice to provide their own interpretation of their chosen dance
- linked all aspects of the question together.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- answered only a part of the question
- answered one or two of the three questions required
- provided examples that were not relevant to the question itself.

Achievement standard 91212: Demonstrate understanding of a dance genre or style in context

Assessment

In 2024 candidates were required to respond to the three examination questions provided, as opposed to having to select three out of four questions. The questions provided prompts to key aspects and contexts from the 2024 Assessment Specifications which included a significant person and/or group, movement, sound and technology. Candidates had the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding at all grade levels.

Commentary

This year's responses were more succinct and clearer in addressing the questions. Candidates' answers had an assuredness in demonstrating an understanding of the chosen genre/style.

Some candidates demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the historical context of the style and how it connected to or showed a relationship to the features of the dance style. In these responses the candidates were familiar with the dance style in that they may have practically experienced learning movement vocabulary from the style or performed the style. These responses provided detailed explanations, demonstrated personal interpretations, and confidently addressed the significance/changes/purpose and development of the style.

Connections and links between the facts/dates and the purpose/changes/developments/influences contribute to overall higher results. Detailed explanations with supportive evidence, rather than basic identification or descriptions demonstrate a deeper, all-inclusive understanding.

In Question One, most candidates described characteristic movements but did not explain how the movements reflected the purpose of the genre. At times a purpose was described but not connected to the movements.

Most candidates identified a significant person or group in Question Two, and how the person or group contributed to the genre. However, they did not connect the person or group top how they contributed to changes with relevant evidence.

In Question Three candidates described and explained technology but some did not address the development of technology and how it influenced the chosen style. Conversely, there were instances where the development of technology was described, but the influence it had on the style, was not addressed successfully.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- used basic descriptions with limited/implied examples and evidence to support the descriptions
- referred to historical context, ie. dates, names, but did not necessarily make links/connections between the descriptions and the historical context
- described the first part of the question, characteristic movements/significant person and/or group/technology, but could only link it to the second part of the question.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- demonstrated an in-depth understanding through clear and concise explanations supported by evidence relevant to the explanations
- addressed both parts of the question equally and were able to justify explanations through explaining how and why
- made clear connections between the movement and the purpose, the significant person/group and how they contributed to changes and the how the development of technology influenced the chosen style
- demonstrated a sound knowledge of the historical context of the style and/or had personal experience in the movement vocabulary or performance of the style.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- paraphrased words from the question throughout the answer, which kept the answers clear and concise and allowed the candidate to address both parts of the question
- demonstrated a comprehensive and extensive understanding that went beyond the historical content, facts, dates and names
- demonstrated some personal knowledge of the style, potentially through learning movement vocabulary and physically performing the style
- used annotated supportive sketches and provided relevant evidence
- demonstrated a perceptive understanding of the purpose and significance of the style, the growth, development and influences of the style, significant people/groups as well as changes and the consequences of the changes to the style
- provided detailed connections and explained significant relationships that went beyond the basic information, history, dates and names of the style – for example, connecting the influence of technology in breaking gender stereotypes.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- identified or attempted to identify one part of the question, without description and/or explanation
- used incorrect information/historical context/dates or names as examples, or examples irrelevant to the question
- answered less than 3 questions.
- did not demonstrate understaning of the terminology, such as "purpose", "influences", "person/group"
- made limited links between the two parts of the question, e.g. between characteristic movement and purpose.