Dynamic Dance: Technique, Performance, and Quality in College Dancers

Vanessa Mae R. Jaralve[a], Bryan L. Cancio[b]

vanessamae.jaralve@hcdc.edu.ph & bryan.cancio@hcdc.edu.ph

Holy Cross of Davao College, Sta. Ana Avenue,corner C. De Guzman Street, Barangay 14-b, Davao City, 8000, Philippines

Abstract

Dance, renowned for its expressive and vigorous movements, poses challenges for college dancers seeking mastery while avoiding injuries. This study delves into movement competency, injury prevention, and performance enhancement, scrutinizing dynamic movement among collegiate dancers. Challenges encompass technical dance elements and maintaining balance in static and dynamic settings. Despite progress in comprehension, further exploration of college dancers' dynamic movement remains imperative. This research scrutinizes dynamic movement among college dancers, analyzing age, gender, and year-level disparities. Employing a quantitative methodology with a descriptive-comparative design, the study involved thirty college dancers from public colleges in the Davao Region. Data were gathered using a modified "Dance Functional Outcome Survey" and subjected to statistical analysis. The findings indicate heightened levels of dynamic movement in overall performance, coupled with moderate scores in movement quality and dance technique. Noteworthy differences were observed across age groups, genders, and year levels, underscoring the impact of demographic factors on dynamic movement in dance. Recommendations include crafting age, gender, and year-level-specific training regimes, fostering diversity and inclusivity in dance pedagogy, and advocating for further exploration of demographic factors and dynamic movement in dance. These findings offer insights for future research and interventions, potentially refining injury prevention strategies, boosting performance outcomes, and enhancing well-being within the dance community.

Keywords: Dance;Collegiate dancers; Dynamic movement; Injury-prevention; Performance enhancement;

1. Introduction

Dance is a captivating art form that embodies expressive and lively movements characterized by fluidity and variations in velocity, orientation, and elevation (Bronner et al., 2015). College dancers, in their pursuit of mastering this art, encounter many challenges that can significantly impact their performance. These challenges include navigating the technical aspects of dance performance and addressing the risk of injuries, particularly evident in practices like dancing en pointe, where inadequate training can lead to significant harm (Russel et al., 2010). Moreover, maintaining static and dynamic balance poses a constant challenge for dancers, as research suggests that factors like closing the eyes or reducing the base of support can affect their ability to maintain stability (Imura et al., 2008; Perrin et al., 2002). Despite the growing understanding of these challenges, there remains a need to comprehensively explore dynamic movement in dance among college dancers. This study seeks to delve into the nuanced interactions between movement competency, injury prevention, and performance enhancement among college dancers, shedding light on the intricate nature of dynamic movement in this context.

In the United States, sprains and strains account for 44% of reported musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs). In 63% of cases, the source of injury was attributed to the worker's position or motion, to events or exposures involving bending,

climbing, crawling, reaching, or twisting, and to overexertion (Bronner et al., 2015). The absence of standardized rules for movement in Hungarian folk dance and other traditional forms complicates analysis. It hinders the development of effective training and injury prevention methods. In contrast, the specialized training focus on specific movements among professional folk dancers without attention to enhancing general abilities presents another significant challenge in the field (Palya et al., 2024).

In the Philippines, traditional dances such as Binislakan originating from Pangasinan exhibit a wealth of cultural importance by portraying distinct narratives and customs. Nevertheless, these dance forms, though lively and emotive, could potentially predispose individuals to harm as a result of their vigorous actions and recurring sequences, underscoring the necessity for additional investigation and evaluation to safeguard the well-being of performers and improve the caliber of their presentations (Pineda et al., 2018).

A research gap exists in collegiate dancers' movement competency, injury prevention, and performance enhancement. Current research highlights technical skill and balance issues but lacks investigation into unique dynamic movements. Traditional dance styles lack standardized movement assessment protocols, hindering the development of efficient training and injury prevention strategies. Additional research is crucial to understanding dynamic movement in collegiate dance.

Addressing knowledge gaps is crucial for collegiate dancers to prevent injuries and improve performance. Advancing understanding in this area can lead to better injury prevention tactics, enhanced performance outcomes, and improved well-being. Urgent action is necessary to fill research deficiencies and develop efficient training and injury prevention strategies in dance instruction.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to describe the level of Exploring Dynamic Movement in Dance in terms of General Performance, Movement Quality, and Dance Technique among college dancers. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following:

1. What is the profile of respondents in terms of?

1.1 Age;

1.2 Year level; and

1.3 Sex?

2. What is the level of exploring dynamic movement in dance in terms of:

1.1. General performance

1.2. Movement quality and;

1.3. Dance technique?

3. Is there a significant difference in the level of exploring dynamic movement in dance in terms of general performance, movement quality, and dance technique when analyzed across the profile of the respondents?

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on Rudolf Laban's Theory of Effort, a component of Laban Movement Analysis (LMA), which categorizes movement qualities based on Weight, Time, Space, and Flow. Understanding and applying this theory is crucial for college student dancers as it provides a structured framework for exploring movement qualities, and infusing performances with diversity, emotion, and intentional expression. Effort Theory serves as a roadmap for creating dynamic contrasts within movements, elevating performances, and conveying nuanced emotions to audiences, making it an invaluable tool for navigating the artistic landscape with intention and creativity.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The research will be conducted at public college-level institutions in the Davao Region and involve 30 dancers selected from multiple public colleges in the region.

Procedures

This study employs a quantitative research approach with a descriptive-comparative design to examine dynamic movement in dance. Quantitative research involves collecting and analyzing numerical data, systematically examining phenomena by gathering quantifiable data, and using statistical, mathematical, and computational techniques (Creswell, 2017). The descriptive-comparative design involves examining and evaluating the experiences and behaviors of designers in various realms and fields of study (Doyle et al., 2020).

Data will be gathered using an adapted and modified version of the "Dance Functional Outcome Survey" by Bronner and Urbano (2018), known for its reliability and validity. The gathered data will be analyzed using measures of central tendency (mean) to determine the level of dynamic movement. The T-test will be employed to compare male and female dancers and analyze their relationship. An ANOVA will be used to determine significant differences in the level of dynamic movement across the profiles of the respondents.

The measurement instrument utilized in this study, originating from the "Dance Functional Outcome Survey" by Bronner and Urbano (2018), is well-regarded for its established reliability and validity. Designed to assess Exploring Dynamic Movement in Dance across dimensions like General Performance, Movement Quality, and Dance Technique, the questionnaire underwent careful adaptation by the researcher to align with the study's goals. Cronbach's alpha calculations revealed a high level of internal consistency (r=0.74–0.99), with additional assessments indicating high test-retest repeatability and equivalence reliability. Adaptations made to the instrument were meticulously considered and documented for validity within the study's context. The survey consists of 27 items, distributed among General Performance (5 questions), Movement Quality (6 questions), and Dance Technique (16 questions, with sub-terms like Kneeling/Floorwork, Turning, Jumping, and Across the Floor/Traveling/Running). The Likert scale, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5), ensures a comprehensive understanding of participants' engagement with diverse aspects of dynamic movement in dance.

Scale	Descriptive Value	Interpretation
4.60-5.00	Very High	This indicates the Dynamic Movement in the Dance of the students is always evident.
3.70-4.59	High	This indicates the Dynamic Movement in the Dance of the students is often evident.
2.80-3.69	Moderate	This indicates the Dynamic Movement in the Dance of the students is sometimes evident.
1.90-2.79	Low	This indicates the Dynamic Movement in the Dance of the students is rarely evident.
1.00-1.89	Very Low	This indicates the Dynamic Movement in the Dance of the students is never evident at all.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results and analysis of data, addressing the research questions posed in Chapter 1. The data were analyzed using appropriate statistical tools to investigate the identified problems. The discussions are organized based on the sequence of the statement of the problem, and relevant literature is used to support the findings.

Profile of the Respondents

This section presents the profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, and year level.

In terms of age, the result shows that 18 to 20 years old obtained the highest percentage of 73.3, while the lowest percentage is garnered by 24 to 26 years old with 10%. "It means that the majority of respondents, more than half, are between 18 to 20 years old.

The next profile variable is sex. It is categorized as male and female. The result shows that 80 percent of the respondents are female, and 20 percent are male. It means that a higher number of the respondents surveyed are female.

The last profile variable is year level the data indicates that the majority of respondents are in their 2nd year, comprising over half of the total respondents at 56.7%. This suggests that the sample population is skewed towards 2nd-year students The smallest percentage of respondents belongs to the 4th-year level, with 10% of the total respondents. This distribution provides insights into the composition of the respondent population across different year levels. Overall, the respondents total 100, reflecting a balanced representation across the four-year levels.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Profile	Frequency	Percent
1.1 Age		
18-20 years old	22	73.3 %
21-23 years old	5	16.7 %
24-26 years old	3	10.0 %
27-30 years old	0	0
TOTAL	**30**	**100 %**
1.2 Sex		
Male	6	20.0 %
Female	24	80.0 %
TOTAL	**30**	**100 %**
1.3. Year level		
1st Year	6	20.0 %
2nd Year	17	56.7 %
3rd Year	4	13.3 %
4th Year	3	10.0%
TOTAL	30	100 %

Level of Exploring Dynamic Movement in Dance of College Dancers

The table below provides an overview of college students' exploration of dynamic movement in dance, assessing various dimensions such as general performance, movement quality, and dance technique.

Table 2: Summary Level of Dynamic Movement in Dance of College Students Dancers

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Level
General Performance	4.0	HIGH
Movement quality	3.55	MODERATE
Dance Technique	3.69	MODERATE
Overall Mean	**3.75**	**HIGH**

Among the indicators of Dynamic movement, the respondents' general performance as the highest indicator, it has a mean rating of 4.0, interpreted as high. This indicates that the Dynamic Movement in Dance of the students is often evident This suggests that the results show that students' dynamic movement in dance often indicates their ability to perform daily activities with occasional difficulties. This supports Athira's (2022) claim that many dance movements, particularly ballet techniques like the turnout of the hips and rising on the toes, test the limits of the human body's range of movement. Dance movements can place stress on the body when not performed correctly, and over-repetition can cause repetitive strain injury, highlighting the challenges associated with dance and dancers.

Next to the rank is dance technique with a mean rating of 3.69, interpreted as moderate. This indicates the Dynamic Movement in Dance of the students are sometimes evident. The results imply that they can perform floorwork or kneeling activities, with mild limitations. This aligns with the findings of Bronner et al.'s (2015), who reported high lower-extremity injury rates in hip-hop dancers. Their study on extreme kinematics in selected hip-hop dance sequences revealed excessive joint angles in these dancers, potentially explaining the high injury rates. These results indicate that hip-hop dancers may have limitations in performing activities like floorwork or kneeling due to the stresses encountered during these movements.

Finally, last in the rank is movement quality, which has a mean rating of 3.55, interpreted as moderate. This indicates that the dynamic movement in the dance of the students is sometimes evident. This suggests that there is room for improvement, but the focus on movement quality is just beginning. Specifically, the ability to articulate limbs with 100% certainty or clarity is not yet fully achieved. This aligns with the findings of Annemiek et al. (2018), who demonstrated that movement quality influences heart rate during the Dance-Specific Aerobic Fitness Test (DAFT) in preprofessional contemporary dancers. Their study emphasizes the importance of clear instructions about movement quality before
the test starts.

In Table 2, the findings revealed an overall mean rating of 3.75, indicating a high level of dynamic movements among the students. This suggests that the dynamic movements in a dance of the students' dancers are often evident. This consistency is particularly noteworthy in the context of the dynamic movement of college dancers, indicating a shared understanding or experience among the respondents in this regard. The results support the study by Masaki Matsumoto and Kenshow Yamamoto, which compared collegiate female dancers to age-matched non-dancers. They found that collegiate dancers had higher foot arches, greater toe flexor strength, and longer reach distances in the Y-Balance Test, all contributing to superior dynamic balance ability. Additionally, the study by Wanshu Luo and Bin Ning (2022) on high-dynamic dance motion recognition methods further supports this notion by highlighting the complex and dynamic nature of dance movements. These studies collectively provide evidence supporting the high level of dynamic movement described in the result.

Test of Difference in the Level of Dynamic Movement in Dance of College Students Dancers When Analyzed Across the Profile of the Respondents

The table below presents the test of difference in the level of dynamic movement in dance when analyzed across the profile of the respondents.

Table 3. Test of Difference in the Level of Dynamic Movement in Dance of College Students Dancers When Analyzed Across the Profile of the Respondents

Profile	F/t-value	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Age	**3.8**	**.000**	**REJECT HO**	**SIGNIFICANT**
Gender	**2.0**	**.000**	**REJECT HO**	**SIGNIFICANT**
Year Level	**2.1**	**.000**	**REJECT HO**	**SIGNIFICANT**

In terms of age, the F-value of 3.8 with a p-value of .000, which is less than .05 at the level of significance, indicates a significant difference. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected, suggesting that the level of dynamic movement varies significantly across different age groups.

These results support the findings of Meyer and Ayalon (2006), who focused on dynamic stability in older adults and found that differences in movement patterns between older and younger adults can affect balance function and increase the risk of falls. Additionally, the study by Waugh et al. (2017) investigated the differences in muscle and tendon excursion between children and adults during vertical hopping and found that adults utilized energy-saving mechanisms more effectively than children, providing recent insights into age-related differences in dynamic movement strategies Regarding sex, the F-value is 2.0 with a p-value of .000, indicating a significant difference. The null hypothesis is rejected, suggesting that the level of dynamic movement in dance differs between male and female students. This aligns with the finding by S., K., and Pawar (2014) that the level of interest in physical activity differs between young boys and girls. In static postural balance, young male dancers showed relationships between head and lumbar movements in all directions, while young female dancers only showed relationships in the anteroposterior direction. Nili et al. (2017) found differences in correlation between static and dynamic postural balance in male and female dancers, with females having stronger associations in head movements and males in lumbar movements. These findings support the claim that dynamic movement in dance varies between male and female students. Additionally, in terms of year level, it marks an F-value of 2.1 with a p-value of .000 which is less than .05 in the level of significance. The null hypothesis is rejected, indicating that the level of dynamic movement does significantly vary among different year levels of college students from first year to fourth year.

These findings indicate that age, sex, and year level significantly influence the dynamic movement in dance among college dancers. Williams et al. (2020) compared professional ballet dancers and collegiate dance majors, revealing that professional dancers were significantly stronger than collegiate dancers for most muscle groups tested, highlighting variations in strength, a component of dynamic movement, among different levels of dancers. The findings of Müller et al. (2020) suggest that long-term dancing intervention in healthy elderly individuals may induce neuroplasticity in the aging brain, with the simultaneous training of cognitive and physical abilities offering greater benefits in daily life functioning. Although not directly related to the study on dynamic movement in young male and female dancers, this supports the broader idea that dance can have significant effects on movement and health across different age groups. The findings of Steinberg et al. (2017) are supported by the results of this study, which demonstrate that among female dancers, static postural balance ability is correlated with their dynamic ability. In contrast, among male dancers, there is no relationship

between static and dynamic postural balance in the anteroposterior (AP) direction. This suggests that factors such as dance experience, wider dance positions practiced, increased ankle flexibility, and advanced pubertal development may contribute to the better balance performance observed in female dancers compared to male dancers. This study suggests that female dancers have better coordination between static and dynamic postural balance, possibly due to factors such as dance experience, practice of wider dance positions, increased ankle flexibility, and advanced pubertal development. On the other hand, male dancers showed coordination in static postural balance movements, which could be related to their intersegmental coordination resembling that of expert dancers. However, neither gender showed coordination in the AP direction for dynamic postural balance, indicating a need for further practice and skill development in this area. This supports the broader idea that dance training can improve coordination and postural control, but the specific effects may vary between genders. They suggest that these demographic factors play a crucial role in determining the level of proficiency and expression in dance performance. Younger dancers may exhibit different movement qualities compared to older dancers, while male and female dancers may demonstrate varying styles or approaches to movement. Additionally, dancers in different year levels of college may have diverse levels of experience and training, influencing their dynamic movement capabilities. Overall, these factors contribute to the rich diversity and individuality seen in the world of dance.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The chapter provides conclusions and recommendations based on the study's findings. Conclusions address research questions and recommendations focus on advancing understanding of the topic. The study revealed high-performance levels of dynamic movement in dance among college student dancers, with opportunities for improvement in movement quality and technique. Significant differences in dynamic movement were found across demographic factors like age, gender, and college year levels, emphasizing their impact on dance proficiency.

The researchers shall develop focused interventions to improve dance technique and movement quality, with an emphasis on precisely and clearly articulating limbs. The goal of training programs is to maximize dynamic movement in dance while taking into account the special demands and features of various age groups, genders, and college year levels. Working together with educators and dance professionals can help create inclusive and varied dance training programs that encourage innovation and creativity in dance performance. The effects of age, gender, and college year levels on dynamic movement in dance may be investigated further in the future, with longitudinal studies being used to monitor changes over time. Subsequent studies could examine the efficaciousness of particular dance methods and approaches in enhancing dynamic movement, offering evidence-based suggestions for dance education initiatives. To inform future practice and policy decisions, the researchers will encourage the distribution of study findings to pertinent stakeholders, such as dance teachers, educators, and policymakers.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Bryan Cancio, my research supervisor, for his guidance, support, and valuable feedback throughout this research project. His expertise and insights have been invaluable in shaping the direction and scope of this study.

I would also like to thank all the individuals who assisted in data collection and analysis. Their contributions have greatly enriched the quality of this research.

Additionally, I am grateful for the encouragement and support provided during this research endeavor. Their words of wisdom and encouragement have kept me motivated during challenging times.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my family for their unwavering support and understanding throughout this research journey. Their love and encouragement have been my source of strength. Most importantly, I acknowledge the guidance and strength provided by our almighty God. Even when I felt incapable of completing or succeeding in these endeavors, His presence made everything easier and successful.

References

Annemiek, Tiemens., Rogier, M, van, Rijn., Matthew, A., Wyon., Emma, Redding., Janine, H., Stubbe. (2018). Influence of Movement Quality on Heart Rate While Performing the Dance-Specific Aerobic Fitness Test (DAFT) in Preprofessional Contemporary Dancers. Medical Problems of Performing Artists, 33(2):77-81 doi: 10.21091/MPPA.2018.2012

Athira, K. (2022). Challenges Associated With Dance And Dancers.

Bronner, S., & Urbano, I. R. (2018). Dance Functional Outcome Survey: Development and Preliminary Analyses. Sports Medicine International Open, 2(6), E191–E199. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-0729-3000

Bronner, S., Ojofeitimi, S., & Woo, H. (2015). Extreme Kinematics in Selected Hip Hop Dance Sequences. Medical problems of performing artists, 30(3), 126–134. https://doi.org/10.21091/mppa.2015.3026

Bronner, S., Ojofeitimi, S., & Woo, H. (2015). Extreme kinematics in selected hip-hop dance sequences. Medical problems of performing artists, 30(3), 126-134.

Charlie, M., Waugh., Charlie, M., Waugh., Thomas, Korff., Anthony, J., Blazevich., Anthony, J., Blazevich. (2017). Developmental differences in dynamic muscle-tendon behavior: implications for movement efficiency. The Journal of Experimental Biology, Doi: 10.1242/JEB.127951

Dance Movement Analysis of Philippine Folk Dance Binislakan. (2018, April 5). Dance Movement Analysis of Philippine Folk Dance Binislakan. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/JonarMartin/publication/344411522_Dance_Movement_Analysis_of_Philippine_Folk_Dance_Binislakan_FULL _LENGTH_AR

TICLE/links/5f72a64f299bf1b53efc910e/Dance- Movement-Analysis-of-Philippine-Folk-Dance-Binislakan-FULL-LENGTH- ARTICLE.pdf

Fronczek–Wojciechowska, M., Padula, G., Kowalska, J., Galli, M., Livatino, S., & Kopacz, K. (2016). Static balance and dynamic balance related to rotational movement in ballet dance students. International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport, 16(3), 801-816.

G., Meyer., Moshe, Ayalon. (2006). Biomechanical aspects of dynamic stability. European Review of Aging and Physical Activity, doi: 10.1007/S11556-006-0006-6

Heather, R., Deja., Cheyenne, Smith., Joshua, St., Peter., Lori, J., Tuttle., Mitchell, J., Rauh. (2020). Health Characteristics of Competitive Collegiate Dancers. Journal of women's health physical therapy, doi: 10.1097/JWH.0000000000000122

Misegades, J., Rasimowicz, M., Cabrera, J., Vaccaro, K., Kenar, T., DeLuccio, J., & Stapleton, D. (2020). FUNCTIONAL MOVEMENT AND DYNAMIC BALANCE IN ENTRY-LEVEL UNIVERSITY DANCERS. International journal of sports physical therapy, 15(4), 548–556.

Morgan, Raquel, Sicklick. (2013). An Exploration of Self-Empowerment and Truthful Expression through Movement and Rudolf Laban's Theory of Effort

Nili, Steinberg., Roger, Adams., Gordon, Waddington., Janet, Karin., Oren, Tirosh. (2017). Is There a Correlation Between Static and Dynamic Postural Balance Among Young Male and Female Dancers. Journal of Motor Behavior, doi: 10.1080/00222895.2016.1161595

Pálya, Z., & Kiss, R. M. (2024). Comprehensive linear and nonlinear analysis of the effects of spinning on dynamic balancing ability in Hungarian folk dancers. BMC Sports Science, Medicine & Rehabilitation, 16, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13102-024-00850-4

S., K., Pawar. (2014). Gender issues in physical education.

Steinberg, N., Adams, R., Waddington, G., Karin, J., & Tirosh, O. (2017). Is There a correlation between static and dynamic postural balance among young male and female dancers?. Journal of motor behavior, 49(2), 163-171.

Wanshu, Luo., Bin, Ning. (2022). High-Dynamic Dance Motion Recognition Method Based on Video Visual Analysis. Scientific Programming, doi: 10.1155/2022/6724892

Appendix A. Survey Tool

III. Research Tool: ADAPTED SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Exploring Dynamic Movement in Dance across dimensions such as General Performance, Movement Quality, and Dance Technique.

Survey Instructions:

Dear Participants,

Thank you for participating in our study on Exploring Dynamic Movement in Dance. Your feedback is invaluable. Please follow the instructions below while responding to the survey.

General Instructions:

Carefully read each statement in the survey. Evaluate your current situation honestly based on your experiences and abilities related to dance. Use the provided Likert scale (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree) to indicate the extent to which each statement applies to you:

5: Strongly Agree - This indicates that you strongly agree with the statement.
4: Agree - This indicates that you agree with the statement.
3: Neutral - This indicates a neutral stance or neither agreement nor disagreement.
2: Disagree - This indicates that you disagree with the statement.
1: Strongly Disagree - This indicates that you strongly disagree with the statement.

Select the number that best reflects your feelings or opinions about each statement. Thank you for your valuable input!

a. Respondents Profile:

Name (Optional)_____ Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

Age: Put a check in the box.

☐ 16-20 years old ☐ 21-25 years old ☐ 26-30 years old

Year Level: Put a check in the corresponding box.

☐ First Year
☐ Second Year
☐ Third Year
☐ Fourth Year

a. General Performance	5	4	3	2	1
1. I have no limitations. I can do everything, including strenuous dancing and exercise.					
2. I can dance, but at a lower level. I must guard myself and limit the amount of heavy dancing.					
3. Light dancing is possible with occasional problems. I must avoid certain movements.					
4. No dancing is possible. Daily activities are possible with occasional problems.					
5. Daily activities cause moderate problems. **b. Movement Quality**					
6. I feel confident that I can perform at the same level and quality as prior to my injury. I am able to articulate my limbs with 100% certainty or clarity.					
7. I feel confident that I am almost at the same level and quality of performance as prior to my injury. I am able to articulate my limbs with 80% certainty or clarity.					
8. I am improving but have a way to go before I am back to the level and quality I was prior to my injury. I am able to articulate my limbs with 60% certainty or clarity.					
9. I am improving but can only control my movement quality some of the time. I am able to articulate my limbs with 40% certainty or clarity.					
10. I am improving but only beginning to focus on movement quality. I am able to articulate my limbs with 20% certainty or clarity.					
11. I am improving but am working on basics and not able to focus on quality at this time.					
c. Dance Technique					
Kneeling / Floorwork					
12. Able to fully perform floorwork or kneeling activities, without limitations.					
13. Able to perform floorwork or kneeling activities, with mild limitations.					
14. Able to perform floorwork or kneeling activities, with moderate limitations.					
15. Able to perform floorwork or kneeling activities, with more moderate limitations: may require less repetitions or slight modification					
Turning					
16. Able to fully perform unlimited multiple turns of all kinds, on either leg (to the extent you were able prior to your injury).					
17. Able to perform, but not quite fully, turns of all kinds, on either leg (to the extent you were able prior to your injury).					
18. Able to perform with slight problems, turns of most kinds, on either leg. I have to be careful about placement.					
19. I have moderate problems with turning. I am able to do single inside and outside turns on the involved side.					
Jumping					
20. Able to fully perform everything: all grand and petit allegro (big and small jumping) combinations, including beats (to the extent you were able prior to your injury). Take off power is normal and unlimited. Able maintain my balance when landing from a jump or hop.					
21. Able to perform, but not quite fully, grand and petit allegro (big and small jumping) combinations (to the extent you were able prior to your injury). Take-off power and ability to maintain my balance when landing is pretty good.					
22. Able to perform with slight problems and some guarding: grand and petit allegro, and balance when landing from jumps or hops. I avoid most difficult jumps. Unable to do repeated jumps.					
23. I have moderate problems with jumping. I am only doing simple jumps in the center.					
Across the Floor / Traveling / Running					
24. Able to fully perform all traveling combinations (change of direction, pivots, quick stops and					

starts, or run) at full speed.					
25. Able to perform, but not quite fully, all traveling combinations (change of direction, pivots, quick stops and starts, or run).					
26. Able to perform, with slight problems, traveling combinations (change of direction, pivots, quick stops and starts, or run) at reduced speed.					
27. I have moderate problems, and must move slowly and carefully in traveling combinations (change of direction, pivots, quick stops and starts, or run).					

Reference: Bronner, S., & Urbano, I. R. (2018). Dance Functional Outcome Survey: Development and Preliminary Analyses. *Sports medicine international open*, *2*(6), E191–E199. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-0729-3000

ANALYZED DATA WITH INTERPRETATION IN QUANTITATIVE

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to describe the level of Exploring Dynamic Movement in Dance in terms of General Performance, Movement Quality and Dance technique". Specifically, this study sought to answer the following:

1. What is the profile of respondents in terms of?
   1.1 age;
   1.2 year level; and
   1.3 sex?

Table 1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Profile	Frequency	Percent
1.1 Age		
18-20 years old	22	73.3 %
21-23 years old	5	16.7 %
24-26 years old	3	10.0 %
27-30 years old	0	0
TOTAL	**30**	**100 %**
1.2 Sex		
Male	6	20.0 %
Female	24	80.0 %
TOTAL	**30**	**100 %**
1.3. Year level		
1st Year	6	20.0 %
2nd Year	17	56.7 %
3rd Year	4	13.3 %
4th Year	3	10.0%
TOTAL	30	100 %

2. What is the level of Exploring Dynamic Movement in Dance in terms of?

1.1. general performance
1.2. movement quality and;
1.3. dance technique?

Table 2: Summary Level of Dynamic Movement in Dance of College Students Dancers

Indicators	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
General Performance	1.00	4.0	HIGH
Movement quality	0.98	3.55	MODERATE
Dance Technique	0.83	3.69	MODERATE
Overall Mean	**0.94**	**3.75**	**HIGH**

Table 2.1 Level of Dynamic Movement in Dance of College Students Dancers in terms of Movement Quality

General Performance	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
1.I have no limitations. I can do everything, including strenuous dancing and exercise.	**.93**	**3.63**	**HIGH**
2.I can dance, but at a lower level. I must guard myself and limit the amount of heavy dancing.	**1.01**	**3.73**	**HIGH**
3.I must avoid certain movements. Light dancing is possible with occasional problems.	**1.00**	**3.37**	**MODERATE**
4."I find that no dancing is possible for me. However, I can still perform daily activities with occasional problems."	**1.07**	**3.47**	**MODERATE**
5."I experience moderate problems with daily activities."	**.97**	**3.47**	**MODERATE**
Overall Mean	**1.00**	**4.0**	**HIGH**

Table 2.2. Level of Dynamic Movement in Dance of College Students Dancers in terms of General Performance

Movement Quality	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
1.I feel confident that I can perform at the same level and quality as before my injury. I can articulate my limbs with 100% certainty or clarity.	**.97**	**3.60**	**MODERATE**
2.I feel confident that I am almost at the same level and quality of performance as before my injury. I can articulate my limbs with 80% certainty or clarity.	**.82**	**3.57**	**MODERATE**
3.I am improving but have a way to go before I am back to the level and quality I was before my injury. I can articulate my limbs with 60% certainty or clarity.	**.86**	**3.60**	**MODERATE**
4.I am improving but can only control my movement quality some of the time. I can articulate my limbs with 40% certainty or clarity.	**.97**	**3.47**	**MODERATE**

5.I am improving but only beginning to focus on movement quality. I can articulate my limbs with 20% certainty or clarity.	**1.17**	**3.43**	**MODERATE**
6.I am improving but I am working on basics and am not able to focus on quality at this time	**1.07**	**3.60**	**MODERATE**
Overall Mean	**0.98**	**3.55**	**MODERATE**

Table 2.3. Level of Dynamic Movement in Dance of College Students Dancers in terms of Dance Technique

Dance Technique	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
1.I Am Able to fully perform floorwork or kneeling activities, without limitations.	**.83**	**3.73**	**HIGH**
2.I Am Able to perform floorwork or kneeling activities, with mild limitations.	**.73**	**4.13**	**HIGH**
3.I Am Able to perform floorwork or kneeling activities, with moderate limitations.	**.79**	**3.83**	**HIGH**
4.I Am Able to perform floorwork or kneeling activities, with more moderate limitations: may require less repetitions or slight modification	**.87**	**3.83**	**HIGH**
5.I am, Able to fully perform unlimited multiple turns of all kinds, on either leg (to the extent you were able prior to your injury).	**.76**	**3.33**	**MODERATE**
6.I am Able to perform, but not quite fully, turns of all kinds, on either leg (to the extent you were able prior to your injury).	**.78**	**3.50**	**MODERATE**
7.I am Able to perform with slight problems, turns of most kinds, on either leg. I have to be careful about placement.	**.90**	**3.57**	**MODERATE**
8.I have moderate problems with turning. I am able to do single inside and outside turns on the involved side.	**.86**	**3.40**	**MODERATE**
*9.*I am Able to fully perform everything: all grand and petit allegro (big and small jumping) combinations, including beats (to the extent you were able prior to your injury). Take off power is normal and unlimited. Able maintain my balance when landing from a jump or hop.	**.88**	**3.67**	**MODERATE**
10.I am Able to perform, but not quite fully, grand and petit allegro (big and small jumping) combinations (to the extent you were able prior to your injury). Take-off power and ability to maintain my balance when landing is pretty good.	**.78**	**3.73**	**HIGH**
11.I am Able to perform with slight problems and some guarding: grand and petit allegro, and balance when landing from jumps or hops. I avoid most difficult jumps. Unable to do repeated jumps.	**.71**	**3.80**	**HIGH**
12.I have moderate problems with jumping. I am only doing simple jumps in the center.	**1.07**	**3.53**	**MODERATE**
*13.*I am Able to fully perform all traveling combinations (change of direction, pivots, quick stops and starts, or run) at full speed.	**.71**	**3.90**	**HIGH**

14.I am Able to perform, but not quite fully, all traveling combinations (change of direction, pivots, quick stops and starts, or run).	**.73**	**3.77**	**HIGH**
15.I am Able to perform, with slight problems, traveling combinations (change of direction, pivots, quick stops and starts, or run) at reduced speed.	**.76**	**3.67**	**MODERATE**
16.I have moderate problems, and must move slowly and carefully in traveling combinations (change of direction, pivots, quick stops and starts, or run).	**1.17**	**3.57**	**MODERATE**
OVERALL MEAN	**0.83**	**3.69**	**MODERATE**

3. Is there a significant difference on the level of Exploring Dynamic Movement in Dance in terms of General Performance, Movement Quality and Dance technique when analyzed across the profile of the respondents?

Table 3. Test of Difference in the Level of Dynamic Movement in Dance of College Students Dancers When Analyzed Across the Profile of the Respondents

Profile	F/t-value	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Age	**3.8**	**.000**	**REJECT HO**	**SIGNIFICANT**
Gender	**2.0**	**.000**	**REJECT HO**	**SIGNIFICANT**
Year Level	**2.1**	**.000**	**REJECT HO**	**SIGNIFICANT**