



Preparation Of Choreography and Artistry Evaluation in Women Artistic Gymnastics- Evolution Per FIG Code of Points Reforms

Dr. Dona Das Sengupta

Assistant Professor

Postgraduate Department of Education

St. Xavier college (Autonomous), Kolkata, India

Abstract: The International Gymnastics Federation (FIG) selects the evaluation of gymnastics skills at all levels of competitions in the Code of Points (COP) and directs training in Olympian cycles. This paper examines the most relevant literature on choreography planning in artistic gymnastics and its impact on the difficulty score of gymnasts, with the need to retain the beauty of the sport.

New FIG guidelines (2022-2024 and 2025-2028 cycles) further boost focus of artistry and choreography, and execution scores have been changed to be between -0.3 to 10.0 (also neutral with a score of 8.0) and the deductions on poor artistry have been increased (max possible deductions 1.0 per routine). This encourages acrobatization by rewarding fluid and musical combination of elements of dance, as observed in Paris 2024 routines where highest scores created a combination of acrobatics with expressive wolf turns and illusion leaps.

Index Terms: Code of Points updates, choreography, execution, artistry, Olympic cycles

INTRODUCTION

Newer COP versions (i.e. 2017-2022, 2022-2024, 2025-2028) put further emphasis on artistry, and necessitate routines to incorporate alternative gymnast specific move vocabularies combined with harmonized music to the choreography (FIG WAG COP 2025-2028, Section 13). This is the result of first training basis on technical and general result on the COP scoring system whereby young gymnasts mature as 10-12 years old start incorporating ballet-based aspects of performance in order to develop expressiveness in addition to acrobats.

Final scores are the sum of Difficulty (D, with a maximum of 10.00 when open-ended based on element values and connections), Execution (E; with a maximum of 10.00, since 2022; neutral of 8.00), as well as Artistry/Composition. D-score is given by panels based upon eight elements required (including three elements in dance groups: leaps, jumps, turns, balance) and grading the artistry is on the musicality (alignment of phrasing), expressiveness (demonstration of emotion) and novelty in linking (originality). Examples include that floor routines should occupy every corner of the floor with different directions and beam requires smooth flows with stability.

These reforms respond to the concerns that the act was excessively acrobat endowed after 2006 when the routines were dedicated more to the high-end difficulty tumbling routines over the beautiful flowing style, resulting to falls and losing audience attention. In 2024 Paris Olympics, up to 20% of the score variance was due to choreography, which is apparent in the score of floor exercises of Simone Biles (15.800 D + artistry bonus). Eastern European traditions also focus on choreography from 7 years of age as a key to all-around success (Borissenko, 2000).

Objective of the study: Summarize the existing literature on choreography preparation in artistic gymnastics and determine the dynamic role in the context of post-2020 COP reforms, and the effects of apparatus-specific in 2016-2028 cycles.

Historical background of COP Reforms

In 2006, the shift to the open-ended D-scores of the COP transformed WAG in the sense that it encouraged complexity, but in 2013-2016, the artistry was reinstated in order to bring elegance back. Poor body pose (e.g. -0.10 flexed knees) and flaws in choreography, such as incompatible music (-0.30) were deducted. This was based on 1996-2004 practices, in which Execution was at the forefront, whereas, Artistry was completely overlooked.

Critiques of Rio 2016 in 2017-2020 led to revising Artistry to 2.5 and requiring 3 or more elements of floor/beam dance to give full 3D-credit. The Tokyo 2020 (postponed until 2021) opened up discrepancies and saw the introduction of an Execution panels and inquiry system on form disputes in 2022-2024. The 2025-2028 cycle which was approved as part of the LA 2028 preparation is an answer to the surveys of FIG which found 70 percent of coaches to be supporting the artistry boosts.

These evolutions maintain the balletic tradition of WAG but with the adaptation to modern athletics and makes sure that the scores are assessed not only as a way of power but storyline integrity.

METHODOLOGY

The 2013-2016 COP introduced artistry, became the first to make deductions, utilizing a small (0.10) deduction in the case of minor choreography flaws (e.g., lack of fluidity) and a major (0.30) deduction in the case of major problems (e.g., poor musical phrasing). This was later refined 2022-2024 added Execution panels deducting by form breaks (e. g. flexed feet, -0.10 to -0.50), whereas 2025-2028 continues to push artistry analysis with neutral E capped at 8.0, incentivizing "creative choreography connections" (to +0.5 bonus).

Gymnasts are required to choose non-acrobatic elements of their style, where floor/beam needs to be 3 or more dance elements to be completely D-credited. Choreography is based on ballet, only modified to be efficient; gymnasts can meet the highest standards by the age of 16, whereas it takes dancers ten years to get the same level through the training (Gula, 1990; Lawson, 1984). Traditional ballet is about long adagio; gymnastics about explosive leaps (e.g. switch ring to sheep jump) set to tumbling sequence.

The choreography promotes the artistry, musicality and style (Savelieva, 1996) synthesizing technical (gymnastics ability), physical (rhythm, coordination), psychological (kinetic memory), and aesthetic training (Borissenko, 2000). It has been affirmed that it has an holistic effect by Eastern European studies (Lissitskaja, 1984; Morel, 1987; Lissitskaja and Zaglada, 1997) with statistics proving the choreographed routines have 0.5-1.0 greater E-scores.

Assessment COP criteria

The system developed by Borissenko (2000) divides the performance into technical (quality of dances, performance quality) and aesthetic (expressiveness, originality, showmanship). Expressiveness is been used

as a communication of emotion through the lines and theme; originality provides a fresh take on the connections/use of apparatus; showmanship attracts the audiences (Borissenko, 2000; Plehanova, 2006).

Key Recent COP Changes (2016-2028):

Cycle	Artistry/Composition Changes	Execution Updates	Impact on Choreography
2016-2020	Artistry max 2.5; deductions 0.10-0.30	-0.5 to 10.0	Emphasized dance elements in D-score (min. 3/8)
2021-2024	Merged to 8.0 total (Artistry 4.0 + Choreo 4.0)	Inquiry system refined	+0.5 bonuses for creative links; -0.50 poor phrasing
2025-2028	10.0 total (Artistry 5.0 + Choreo/Elements 5.0); neutral E=8.0	-0.3 to 10.0; amplitude/form deductions	Rewards "harmonious musical flow," penalizes repetition

Details of apparatus: Floor poor coverage penalizes (-0.30); stable turns on beam rewards (e.g. +0.1 CV wolf turn series); bars/vault emphasis form over dance.

Apparatus Specific Choreography Requirements

Floor Exercise: Requires the full-area presentation with dynamism, and 2025-2028 finalizes the prohibition on repetition (-0.30), increasing the score for Biles-like illusions (Paris 2024: 4.4/5 artistry).

Balance Beam: Stability combines leaps/turns (min. 3, $\geq C$ -value); new deductions (-0.50 low splits) go in favour of Andrade's 2024 Europeans routine (15.633 total).

Uneven Bars/Vault: Low involvement in direct choreography; bars focus on flowing giants (-0.30 flexes), vault rewards on both artistry (-0.10 poor approach).

As per 2012- 2024 analysis, dance passages distinguish elites (30-45% D- contribution aspect).

DISCUSSION

Choreography training in systematic manner allows quality performance and perfects elements such as leaps and turns which are essential to score. Elite routines have been noted with contributions of elements in dance routines that rated 32-45% to D-scores (2012-2013 data), and this has continued; 2024 Olympics in Paris featured top floor scores (e.g., Biles 15.800 D) incorporating high acrobatic elements with creative choreography (e.g., wolf turns, illusion leaps), and the scores received +0.4 artistry bonuses.

2016 reforms decelerate acrobationization: beam encourages stability in dance (e.g., 2024 Europeans, Andrade's 15.633 with perfect turns). 2025-2028 increases it further making artistry specified to half of non-D score, promoting personalized, aesthetic routines (as per FIG surveys 20% variation in scores is from choreography and artistry).

Floor Artistry Scores (Top 3); Paris Olympics 2024:

Gymnast	D-Score	E-Score	Artistry	Total
S. Biles	15.800	7.900	4.4	28.100
R. Andrade	15.600	8.233	4.3	28.133
B. Jessee	14.466	8.033	4.2	26.699

This conserves aesthetics, as observed in the new originality scores (e.g. 2023 Worlds floor finals score an average of 4.2/5 artistry). The difficulties exist: time constraints take away the huge portions of time to practise ballet, but the COP incentives facilitate the practise and increase longevity and injury prevention through balanced preparation (Zatsiorski, 1995).

Amendments for LA 2028: Versatile gymnasts will take over, and the version of choreography will become the determinant of margins by 0.10.

CONCLUSION

The COP evolutions validate the centrality of choreography, and remake WAG into artistic narratives from power display. Through raising the weights and deductions of A/C, FIG can guarantee the continuation of elegance and holistic development of the participants and for the audience with attractive performances.

REFERENCES

Code of Points Women's Artistic Gymnastics (WAG), 2013-2016, FIG.

Gula, D.A. (1990). *Dance choreography for competitive gymnastics*. Leisure Press.

Savelieva, L.A. (1996). *Coaches choreographers' preparation*. St. Petersburg: Lesgaft.

Borissenko, S.I. (2000). *Improvement of gymnasts' executional skill*. St. Petersburg: Lesgaft.

Lissitskaja, T.S. & Zaglada, B.E. (1997). *Gymnastics All-Around*. Moscow.

Plehanova, M.E. (2006). *Aesthetic aspects*. Russian Institute.

Karpenko, L.A. (2003). *Rhythmic Gymnastics*. St. Petersburg: Lesgaft.

Lawson, J. (1984). *Ballet class*. London: A&C Black.

FIG Code of Points WAG 2022-2024 (2021). [FIG website].[gymnastics](https://www.fig.gymnastics)

FIG Code of Points WAG 2025-2028 (2024). [FIG website].[gymnastics](https://www.fig.gymnastics)

Paris 2024 Olympic Results (2024). [Olympics.com].[reddit](https://olympics.com)

FIG Technical Updates (2023-2025). FIG Congress reports.[magnastics.wordpress](https://magnastics.wordpress.com)

1. https://www.gymnastics.sport/publicdir/rules/files/en_1.1%20-%20WAG%20COP%202025-2028.pdf
2. https://www.reddit.com/r/Gymnastics/comments/onuri0/has_wag_changed_how_they_score_uneven_bars_since/
3. https://www.reddit.com/r/Gymnastics/comments/1fcjm6z/changes_in_the_upcoming_cop_code_of_points_for_wag/
4. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Code_of_Points_\(gymnastics\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Code_of_Points_(gymnastics))
5. <https://magnastics.wordpress.com/2024/08/30/changes-in-the-2025-28-code-of-points/>
6. <https://gymnasticscoaching.com/2025/02/14/fig-womens-code-changes/>