Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Interdisciplinary Humanities and Communication Studies
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7064/2026.38646

Technological Empowerment and Subject Integrity: Fostering Originality and Constructing Ethical Norms in AI-Assisted Dance Choreography Pedagogy

Yin Lyu

Department of Dance, School of Dance, Taipei National University of the Arts, Taipei, China
17289557@qq.com

Abstract. Artificial intelligence is deeply involved in dance choreography, and it has impacted the traditional logic of creation and brought about problems such as the dissolution of student subjectivity, originality problems, and ethical anomie. This study aims to explore how to hold on to creative subjectivity under technological empowerment, to cultivate original ability, and to construct ethical norms. The study uses a method that combines literature review, classroom observation, and action research; it defines the boundaries of concepts, diagnoses the typical problems of AI involvement in teaching, and revises the teaching plan through pilot iteration. The results show that although AI has expanded the boundaries of creation, it has also led to "prompt-first," the homogenization of works, and integrity risks. On this basis, this study proposes three results: first, reconstructing the "three-stage progressive" teaching model and establishing the order of bodily experience first, AI placed later, and reverse verification; second, designing a "four-node" embedded ethics module that covers the key links of the whole creation process; third, building a process-based evaluation system in which the human-machine division of labor is visible, and bringing the personal character of body vocabulary and the critical handling of AI output into scoring. The conclusion holds that the core issue lies in "how to use" rather than "whether to use." Only when technology and the subject constrain each other can compound choreography talents be cultivated. The course system proposed in this paper can provide a promotable model for the "AI+" teaching reform of the dance major.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, dance major, teaching reform, technological empowerment

1. Introduction

With the rapid spread of large language models, image and video generation models, and movement generation technology, artificial intelligence has changed from an auxiliary information tool into a "co-creator" that can directly take part in artistic production. In the field of dance, AI is used in many links such as movement material generation, suggestions for structural arrangement, stage visual and lighting design, and music generation and editing [1], and it has formed a deep impact on the traditional creation logic that takes bodily experience, improvisational exploration, and master-apprentice transmission as its core.

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7064/2026.38646

This impact shows itself in a particularly concentrated way in the creation courses of university dance majors. In the past two years, general large models have spread rapidly among dance teachers and students, and phenomena worth being alert to have appeared in links such as undergraduate graduation creation: some students with a weak professional foundation hand over the creative conception, the textual explanation, and even the movement structure directly to AI, and their works show an obvious tendency toward homogenization and "de-corporealization"[1]; academic ethics problems such as the blurring of the determination of the creative subject, the difficulty of judging the originality of works, and the undisclosed use of AI have become increasingly prominent. At the same time, the education authorities have clearly put forward action requirements for promoting the deep integration of artificial intelligence and higher education [2], and art schools at home and abroad have also opened courses and workshops related to "AI creation and ethics" one after another, emphasizing cross-media collaboration and technical literacy; but for dance, an art category that takes the body as its ontology, there is still a lack of systematic course guidance, ethical framework, and evaluation mechanism.

The core question that this paper tries to answer is: under the background of AI being deeply involved in creation, how should the creation teaching of the dance major, while making full use of technological empowerment, hold on to creative subjectivity, cultivate the students' original ability and artistic judgment, and construct creation ethics norms that are operable and assessable. This paper takes the pair of categories "technological empowerment" and "holding to the subject," which are both in tension with each other and dependent on each other, as its framework, and develops the discussion from three levels: the teaching path, ethical norms, and the teaching model.

2. The dual effects of AI involvement in dance choreography teaching

2.1. Technological empowerment

The empowerment of dance choreography teaching by AI shows itself first in the expansion of creation efficiency and the space for trial and error. In traditional dance choreography courses, when a student conceives a work he or she often needs to go through a long period of material accumulation and structural repetition, while AI can quickly generate multiple thematic explanations and structural schemes on the text level, provide stage atmosphere and costume sketches on the visual level, and generate usable music fragments on the auditory level, so that students can compare multiple possibilities in a shorter time and concentrate the limited class hours on bodily practice and artistic judgment.

The second is the expansion of expressiveness and the boundaries of media. Motion capture and generation models can turn body movement into editable data and form new stage vocabulary together with image, sound, and interactive installation, and this provides a technical basis for creation teaching in directions such as new media dance and cross-media theater. The third is the cultivation of the consciousness of interdisciplinary collaboration. The use of AI tools naturally requires students to understand the basic logic of data, algorithms, and media, and to form collaboration with majors such as computer science, music, and visual design, and this is consistent with the direction in which current university aesthetic education emphasizes comprehensive

[1] The "de-corporealization" referred to in this paper means that in the creation process the links of bodily perception, improvisation, and rehearsal verification are replaced by the links of text or image generation, and the movement vocabulary of the work is no longer generated from the creator's bodily experience, but is an external execution of the generated content.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7064/2026.38646

literacy and innovative ability [3]. What needs to be emphasized is that the application of artificial intelligence in the educational field should hold to a "human-centered" orientation, that is, taking the promotion of the learner's development rather than the replacement of his or her thinking as the fundamental aim [4], and this orientation is especially critical for dance choreography teaching, which takes the body as its ontology.

2.2. Dissolution of the subject

The other side of technological empowerment is the potential dissolution of subjectivity. The uniqueness of dance choreography lies in its taking the body as its ontology: the motivation comes from the body's perception and memory, the vocabulary is generated in the body's improvisational exploration, and the structure is verified in repetition in the rehearsal room [5]. When students skip this process and directly take AI-generated text or images as the starting point of the work, creation degenerates from "body first" to "concept first" and even "prompt first," and the work looks rich on the surface but is empty in bodily content.

The dilution of originality is the direct consequence of the dissolution of the subject. Generation models produce output on the basis of the statistical regularities of existing corpora, and their "creation" belongs to a large extent to the combination and reconstruction of existing style elements, not to a breakthrough of the conceptual space itself [6]; even if some models pursue novelty by deliberately deviating from existing style norms, their novelty still takes the existing style distribution as its frame of reference [7]. When large numbers of students use the same tools and similar ways of prompting, works tend toward homogenization in thematic explanation, structural logic, and even aesthetic taste—this fading of uniqueness brought by reproducibility has a structural similarity to the weakening of the "authenticity" of artworks in the age of mechanical reproduction [8]. A deeper problem lies in the handing over of artistic judgment: students gradually get used to AI giving the "reasonable answer," and no longer go through the process of self-questioning, comparison, and choice, and this process is exactly the most irreplaceable part of art education—because the value of art is generated in the experience of the subject's continuous interaction with the material [9].

In addition, technological dependence also brings risks on the level of academic integrity. In the absence of clear norms, students lack a common understanding of what is "reasonable use" and what is "academic misconduct"; teachers also find it hard to make fair judgments because they lack detection means and evaluation standards. It can be seen that the problem of AI involvement in dance choreography teaching is not a purely technical problem, but a systematic problem that concerns the concept of creation, the teaching structure, and the ethical mechanism.

3. Holding to the subject: the path of cultivating originality in AI-assisted choreography teaching

"Holding to the subject" is not a rejection of technology, but a re-confirmation of the position of the creative subject in a technological environment. The cultivation of originality in dance choreography teaching should take the body as its anchor, and through design on three levels—teaching order, evaluation mechanism, and course structure—make AI always an extension of the subject rather than a replacement.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7064/2026.38646

3.1. The choreography teaching order of bodily experience first and AI tools placed later

The first design of choreography teaching is to establish the order principle of "body before tools." In the stage of conceiving the work, students should be required first to form the creative motivation through improvisation, observation, life experience, and bodily memory, and to record it in forms such as body sketches and movement logs; only after the motivation and the preliminary vocabulary have been formed is AI introduced for thematic expansion, structural comparison, or the generation of audio-visual material. This order is not a formal sequence of before and after, but ensures that the core of the work comes from the student's bodily experience, and that what AI handles is the "peripheral" questions around the core.

On this basis, a "de-AI-ization" contrast link[2] can be further set up: students are required, after obtaining the AI scheme, to re-verify and rewrite it with the body, and to explain which content was adopted, which was rejected, and the reasons. This link turns AI output into an object of criticism rather than a direct finished product, and trains the students' ability of comparison and choice.

3.2. Process-based evaluation that makes the human-machine division of labor visible

Originality cannot be judged only from the final work; it must return to the creation process. Therefore, the evaluation of creation courses should move from "result evaluation" to "process evaluation," and the core is to make the human-machine division of labor visible. Concrete practices include: establishing a creation archive that records the whole process from motivation, material, and structure to the finished work; setting up an AI use description form that requires students to mark item by item the links in which AI took part, the tools, the way of prompting, and the degree of adoption; and adding "creation explanation and defense" to the end-of-term report, in which the student explains the bodily logic and personal judgment in the work.

The evaluation indicators are adjusted accordingly, bringing "the personal character of body vocabulary," "the autonomy of structural decisions," and "the critical handling of AI output" into the scoring dimensions, and placing them side by side with traditional indicators such as the degree of completion of the work and stage presentation. This is both a protection of originality and a way to give the judgment of academic integrity something to rely on.

3.3. The "technology—art—ethics" three-in-one course structure

The cultivation of originality needs the support of the course structure. It is suggested that the creation courses of the dance major be reconstructed into three mutually nested modules: the technology module teaches the principles, the ability boundaries, and the operation methods of AI tools, so that students "know what it is and also know why it is so," and avoid mystifying AI or treating it as all-powerful; the art module takes choreography practice as its core and emphasizes the body as ontology, personal style, and artistic judgment; the ethics module runs through from beginning to end and turns the questions of creative subject, originality, and academic integrity into concrete teaching situations and discussion topics. The three are not three parallel courses, but three

[2] The "de-AI-ization" contrast link does not require deleting all AI-generated content, but re-checks it with bodily practice: anything that cannot pass bodily verification or is incompatible with the personal vocabulary is discarded, and for what is kept, the extent of rewriting and the reason for adoption must be explained.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7064/2026.38646

dimensions of the same creation process, and they are developed at the same time in case teaching, project-based learning, and interdisciplinary collaboration.

4. Construction of ethical norms for AI-assisted dance choreography

The goal of constructing ethical norms is to provide teachers and students with behavioral boundaries that are understandable, executable, and assessable. At the national level, overall requirements for the governance of science and technology ethics have already been put forward [10], and ethical norms facing the whole life cycle of artificial intelligence have been issued [11]; the international academic community has also formed a relatively concentrated consensus framework on the basic principles of the social application of artificial intelligence [12]. Combining the characteristics of dance choreography, the above principles can be turned into clauses executable in the classroom from the following four dimensions.

4.1. Determination of the creative subject

The subject of a dance work is the person who undertakes the creative decisions and the presentation with the body. The text, images, or movement sequences generated by AI do not in themselves constitute a work; they become part of a work only after the creator's selection, transformation, and embodiment. On this basis, teaching should make clear: the signing subject of the work must bear actual decision responsibility for the core conception and the body vocabulary of the work; AI must not be listed as a creator, but its use should be explained in an appropriate way.

4.2. Judgment of originality

The judgment of originality should distinguish two levels, the "source of material" and the "creative decision." Using AI-generated material does not in itself necessarily deny originality; the key lies in whether the creator has carried out substantive transformation and integration of the material, and whether the core expression of the work comes from the creator's bodily experience and artistic judgment—this line of thinking has something in common with the discussion formed in the music field on the ownership of copyright in AI-generated content [13]. In teaching, the standard of "substantive transformation"[3] can be used: if, after removing the AI-generated content, the bodily logic and structure of the work still hold, then AI is auxiliary use; if the core conception, structure, and main vocabulary of the work are all generated by AI and the creator only executes, then it should be determined that originality is insufficient.

4.3. Disclosure of tool use

Disclosure is a basic requirement of academic integrity, and also the institutional basis for making the human-machine division of labor visible. It is suggested that an AI use statement be uniformly adopted in course assignments, graduation creation, and theses, with content including the tools used, the links in which they were used, the adoption of the generated content, and the creator's description of modifications. Disclosure is not punitive; it makes reasonable use gain institutional recognition, and at the same time draws a boundary for improper use. Teachers should explain to

[3] The standard of "substantive transformation" here is an operational definition for teaching, used to judge the degree of AI involvement; it is not equivalent to the determination of substantive similarity or transformative use in the sense of copyright law.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7064/2026.38646

students: undisclosed AI use is similar in nature to plagiarism and ghostwriting, and belongs to academic misconduct.

4.4. Humanistic reflection and responsibility consciousness

The ethics of dance choreography is not limited to compliance; it concerns the creator's conscious reflection on the relation between technology and the body and between the human and the machine. Ethics education should guide students to think: when movement can be generated, where does the meaning of the body lie? When style can be imitated, where does the value of personal expression lie? The impact of technology on the humanistic spirit is not an abstract proposition, but a concrete question in every creative choice. Through case discussion, creation explanation, and interdisciplinary dialogue, students are helped to form a prudent attitude toward technology and a sense of responsibility for their own creation.

5. Design and implementation mechanism of the teaching model

5.1. Embedded ethics education module

Ethics education should not be opened in isolation as an independent theory course, but should be embedded in the key nodes of choreography practice. Four embedding points can be designed: in the stage of creative motivation, a special discussion on "body and technology" is carried out; in the stage of introducing AI tools, an explanation of the principles and boundaries of the tools is given and a use commitment is signed; in the stage of the work taking shape, peer evaluation and case analysis of "human-machine division of labor" are organized; in the stage of reporting results, creation explanation and an ethics defense are carried out. Each embedding point is equipped with typical cases, including different types such as reasonable use, over-dependence, and undisclosed use, so that students distinguish the boundaries in concrete situations.

5.2. Case teaching and interdisciplinary collaboration

Case teaching is an effective way to connect technology, art, and ethics. Typical practices of AI participation in dance choreography at home and abroad can be selected [1], and analyzed from three angles—the technical path, the artistic effect, and the ethical controversy—to guide students to understand the different meanings of technology in different contexts. Interdisciplinary collaboration, through joint projects with majors such as music, visual design, and computer science, lets students understand the ability boundaries and the division-of-labor logic of AI tools in real collaboration, and at the same time confirm the ontological value of dance itself from multiple perspectives.

5.3. Iterative optimization in the manner of action research

Teaching reform should adopt the manner of action research, practicing and optimizing at the same time in real teaching scenes. The concrete path is: first, through literature research, questionnaires, and interviews, understand the current situation and needs of teachers and students regarding AI use and ethics education; on this basis, build the first draft of the course modules and ethical norms; carry out at least one round of teaching pilot in creation courses, and collect student creation archives, AI use statements, work results, and feedback data; then revise the course structure, evaluation indicators, and ethics clauses according to the feedback, and form teaching guidelines

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7064/2026.38646

and course resource packages that can be copied and promoted. The assessment pays attention not only to the quality of the works, but even more to the changes in the students' originality consciousness, critical thinking, and ethical cognition.

6. Conclusion

AI involvement in dance choreography is already an irreversible trend, and the real question facing the creation teaching of the dance major is not "whether to use" but "how to use." The framework of "technological empowerment and holding to the subject" proposed in this paper tries to find a balance between two extremes: neither rejecting technology because of ethical risk, nor giving up the body as ontology and artistic judgment because of the temptation of efficiency. The key to cultivating originality lies in establishing a teaching order with the body first, an evaluation mechanism in which the human-machine division of labor is visible, and a course structure integrating technology, art, and ethics; the key to constructing ethical norms lies in making clear the creative subject, the standard for judging originality, the disclosure system for use, and the orientation of humanistic reflection. The two support each other and together point to cultivating compound dance talents who have technical understanding, artistic creativity, and ethical responsibility.

The limitation of this study is that the teaching pilot is still at the starting stage, the sample is concentrated in a single institution and a single major direction, and the evaluation indicators proposed still need to be tested with data on a larger scale. Future research should, on the basis of the teaching pilot, further test the effectiveness of this framework, and explore its adaptability in different institutions and major directions.

References

[1] Berman, A., & James, V. (2015). Kinetic imaginations: Exploring the possibilities of combining AI and dance. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)* (pp. 2431–2437). Buenos Aires.

[2] Ministry of Education. (2018, April 2). Artificial intelligence innovation action plan for higher education institutions [Z]. Jiaoji [2018] No. 3.

[3] General Office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, & General Office of the State Council. (2020, October 15). Opinions on comprehensively strengthening and improving school aesthetic education in the new era [Z].

[4] Zhu, Z., Han, Z., & Huang, C. (2021). Educational artificial intelligence (eAI): A new paradigm of human-centered artificial intelligence. *e-Education Research, 42*(1), 5–15.

[5] Lyu, Y. (2003). *Introduction to dance studies*. Shanghai Music Publishing House. Shanghai.

[6] Boden, M. A. (2004). *The creative mind: Myths and mechanisms* (2nd ed.). Routledge. London.

[7] Elgammal, A., Liu, B., Elhoseiny, M., et al. (2017). CAN: Creative adversarial networks, generating "art" by learning about styles and deviating from style norms. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Computational Creativity (ICCC)*. Atlanta.

[8] Benjamin, W. (2002). *The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction* (Caiyong Wang, Trans.). China City Press. Beijing.

[9] Dewey, J. (2005). *Art as experience* (Jianping Gao, Trans.). The Commercial Press. Beijing.

[10] General Office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, & General Office of the State Council. (2022, March 20). *Opinions on strengthening the governance of science and technology ethics*.

[11] National Expert Committee on the Governance of New Generation Artificial Intelligence. (2021, September 25). Ethical norms for new generation artificial intelligence.

[12] Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review, 1*(1).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7064/2026.38646

[13] Sturm, B. L. T., Iglesias, M., Ben-Tal, O., et al. (2019). Artificial intelligence and music: Open questions of copyright law and engineering praxis. *Arts, 8*(3), 115.