

2025 NCEA Assessment Report

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

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Commentary

The dance performance selection is important. It is essential for the teacher or school to send videos, outside of the recommended list in the assessment specifications, to NZQA. Candidates must write the name of the dance in the appropriate space provided in the assessment booklet. Candidates should understand the difference between the choreographers' inspirations, the choreographer's intentions or ideas seen in the dance, and their own opinions as a viewer.

Some candidates wrote about the same moment in dance for all three questions, repeating themselves, and limiting their ability to demonstrate understanding. Those who wrote about more than one repeated movement and different ways the sound is used in the dance better showcased their understanding of dance. Linking back to all parts of the question being asked assisted candidates to demonstrate a higher level of perception in their response.

Question One was generally well answered. The repeated movement and the way this contributed to their understanding was often clear and concisely explained with relevant evidence. Some candidates incorrectly discussed relationship or formation as opposed to the movement itself.

In Question Two, many candidates wrote about things that were not seen in the dance, but rather their interpretation of the music. To achieve highly, it was essential to discuss how sound and another aspect on stage worked together. Candidates who discussed the style of music, the background to the music, and the instruments or lyrics tended to link this to a movement or production technology well. Well-developed responses often linked the sound to the structure. Simply relating the tempo of the movements to the tempo of the music typically did not provide clear evidence or examples. Similarly, volume of the music relating to intensity of the movement tended to not provide strong evidence or examples.

Candidates rarely referenced the whole moment in Question Three and merely discussed a movement seen. Those who did well, included all aspects that we can see and hear, including production technologies and all dancers on stage. Many candidates wrote about their impression rather than the ideas being introduced.

Many responses appeared to be pre-prepared responses that did not respond to what was required by the question. Such responses showed some level of recall, but did not show perceptiveness required to achieve highly. Candidates who presented opinions in their own "voice" authentically tended to apply their knowledge concisely and directly to the task. It was observed that some opinions were shared across many candidates, perhaps taught in the classroom, and these tended to focus on length of response rather than authentic opinions in response to the task. Throw away

comments and irrelevant references that did not relate to the question suggested that the candidate was not prepared to respond to the task.

In general, excellence responses went beyond material in resource booklets to offer valid interpretations, and consistently used dance-specific language.

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 are encouraged to read the whole question carefully, to ensure they provide full responses. Referencing key words from the questions enables them to produce clearer, well thought out, and balanced responses. To provide an in-depth interpretation of the dance they linked the topic of the question (not just the dance in general) to their interpretation, with specific and relevant examples from the dance.

Some candidates took advantage of exemplary dance resources provided, and demonstrated sound understanding. Some dances selected did not provide candidates with the depth to achieve well.

Please note, as stated in the Assessment Specifications, it is essential performance videos, outside of the recommended list in the specifications, are sent in to NZQA.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided clear examples to support their answers
- used diagrams and labelled them clearly with relevant information
- addressed their interpretation / understanding, or response to the dance briefly
- provided details on things such as dates, quotes, specific movement vocabulary, and historical context facts
- named the title of the performance / choreographer / composer / set designer / costume designer, dancers
- responded to all parts of the question – some with limited knowledge and evidence, some with irrelevant information / examples
- showed an understanding of the dance performance
- included contradictory information.

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

- provided explanations for each point instead of just making statements
- addressed the 'how' and 'why' in their responses
- used detailed and fully explained examples to support interpretations
- made clear comments addressing their interpretation / understanding, or response to the dance
- judiciously used quotes correctly as supportive evidence to answering the question, rather than just a quote pertaining to the performance as a whole
- referenced the choreographer and other people with important roles who were involved in the creation of the dance

- explained their reasoning
- formulated answers using key words from the question, demonstrating that they fully understood, and addressed all aspects of the question
- used dance language such as pathway, focus and augmentation
- demonstrated a very good personal understanding of the dance performance and, where rote learned information may have been used, ALSO added their own personal interpretation of that information
- discussed, rather than described, with a deeper understanding, supported by relevant evidence.

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

- discussed their own opinions and reasoned arguments with supporting evidence
- provided depth to their answer with detail that supported the explanations
- provided more than one link and developed them into an insightful response
- provided additional contextual knowledge of the dance performance
- explained and demonstrated, with an authentic voice, a perceptive and personal connection to the dance
- related the dance to their own personal life and /or referenced other art works, world events, history, and culture with detail
- gave a unique interpretation of the dance with original connections that was not in the study / guide notes
- avoided repetition in answers or “overexplaining” the same point due to lack of personal connection/understanding of the dance piece
- discussed details of insights that were gained from watching the dance with a critical eye
- addressed each part of the question separately (this ensured all parts of the question were addressed and excluded irrelevant /rote learned information) with a well-formed conclusion to tie all the components together.

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

- addressed the title of the question such as “aural design”, but not all parts of the question
- demonstrated misunderstanding of the question or dancing terms, such as ‘moment’, or ‘seen’
- attempted only part of a question, or fewer than 3 questions were responded to
- gave short descriptions with little or no personal interpretation
- wrote superficial answers or provided broad generalisations
- supplied irrelevant or no examples
- made links that did not relate to the question, such as links relating to intention in question 2
- attempted to identify aspects of the dance.

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

Commentary

In general, the overall level of responses was of a lower quality compared to AS91211, with a few scripts unanswered, or only one or two questions answered. In some scripts the question was rewritten as the answer.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated an understanding of their chosen genre through clear descriptions, sometimes lacking in clear connections and/or evidence
- showed clear understanding of the context, albeit limited and implied in some cases.

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

- demonstrated a strong and clear understanding of the features and/or context of the genre
- gave examples and evidence that supported the descriptions/explanations and showed an in-depth understanding
- showed either physical experience of the genre or in-depth learning of the genre.

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

- showed a comprehensive understanding of the context/purpose and/or origins of the genre through perceptive statements and/or descriptions, explanations, and evidence that were relevant
- did not repeat the same evidence in the different answer to different questions
- gave concise and relevant answers, rather than a regurgitation of irrelevant information and facts about the genre, that did not answer the question.

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

- identified features but did not describe or explain these features further
 - gave answers without evidence from the dance genre or style
 - answered one or two out of the three questions
 - showed a limited understanding of the genre/style.
-