2.1 World dance studies

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 25 marks**

KEY WORDS dance investigation • dance elements

World dance studies

Objective

Supported preparation: Compare two dance styles through the elements and their contexts; Write a formal investigation that explains similarities and differences. This is original rehearsal, not completion of the assessed task.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

Investigation toolkit. Two styles from different dance cultures or traditions, one familiar, one unfamiliar (contrast value; shared instruments). Compare on the elements: actions, space, dynamics, relationships. Explain through context: historical and current (who performs, where, for whom, how taught). Formal report: every claim evidenced, similarities AND differences analysed (not listed), sources attributed, physical engagement included. Worked: studio contemporary against hula kahiko.

2 Practice

2.1 What are the two required properties of the pairing of styles? [2]

2.2 Name the four dance elements the comparison runs on. [4]

2.3 What two contexts must each style be researched through? [2]

2.4 What distinguishes an analysed difference from a listed one? [2]

2.5 What must the report include beyond the written comparison of the two styles? [2]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 *(Pairing style.)* A student proposes comparing two styles so similar the comparison is decorative. Explain the failure, and recommend a fix or a re-pairing. [4]

3.2 *(Element style.)* Draft the element-and-context analysis for the worked pairing's torso finding: the similarity, the difference, the explanation. [6]

3.3 *(Conclusion style.)* What may a strong investigation's conclusion do that a catalogue cannot? [3]

Solutions

2.1 Contrast value (the styles differ enough that the comparison earns its place) (1); shared instruments (both offer communicative movement to compare fairly) (1).

2.2 Actions (1); space (1); dynamics (1); relationships (1).

2.3 The historical context (1); the current context (who performs it, where, for whom, how it is taught) (1).

2.4 An analysed difference is explained by context (training, function, transmission) (1); a listed one is only observed (1).

2.5 Sources attributed throughout (1); the student's physical engagement with the unfamiliar style included (1).

3.1 The failure: styles too alike give a comparison with nothing to explain; it reads as decorative, not analytic (2). Fix: keep one style and re-pair with a style from a genuinely different culture or tradition, or shift the comparison to an element where the two genuinely differ (2).

3.2 Similarity: both styles centre the torso as the primary communicator (2); difference: contemporary isolates the torso as trained mechanics watched by an audience, while hula kahiko's torso carries text, the hands speaking the chant inside a living ceremonial practice (2); explanation: function and transmission differ (performance for watching against practice with meaning) (2).

3.3 Weigh what the comparison taught (a connection, not a catalogue) (1); state what the engagement changed in the writer's own practice (1); keep the finding honest about limits (1).

Local review guidance: (R1) 3.1 argues analytic value; 3.2 evidences with described movement; 3.3 weighs, not summarises. Authored guidance.