From “Ghostwriter” to “Digital Lens” — Study on the Reconstruction and Teaching Mechanism of Generative AI-Based Drama, Film and Television Literature Major

Jiawen Lai, Jinhe Liu
Inner Mongolia Arts University, Hohhot 010010, Inner Mongolia, China

Abstract: The emergence of generative artificial intelligence has caused a paradigm shift in drama and literature education, rendering the traditional “homework feedback” loop ineffective due to AI-assisted writing. This paper proposes to reconstruct AI from a “writing agent” into a “digital lens,” visualizing creative thinking through the design of human-computer dialogue archives. The paper systematically elaborates on the diagnostic value of three dimensions: prompts, modification sequences, and selection logic, constructing a three-level precise feedback model. By replacing result worship with assessment of the thought process, AI can become a lens reflecting students’ cognitive blind spots, re-establishing the humanistic value of drama education in the intelligent era.

***Keywords*:** generative AI; drama and literature education; digital lens; human-computer dialogue portfolio; mind visualization

1. Introduction: Technological Impact and Teaching Dilemmas

generative artificial intelligence technologies, exemplified by ChatGPT , the education field is experiencing an unprecedented paradigm shift. Drama and literature education, as a discipline emphasizing humanistic insight, emotional resonance, and personalized expression, was once considered one of the “last bastions” against technological intrusion. However, reality shows that generative AI’s capabilities in script structure building, dialogue generation, and even style imitation are sufficient to deeply intervene in and even replace the creative process of beginners. This technological reality has not only triggered a crisis of academic integrity but also profoundly undermined the core closed loop of “assignment-feedback” in traditional drama teaching. This article will start from the current predicament faced in teaching, explore why existing coping strategies are failing, and propose a reconstruction approach that transforms AI from a “ghostwriter” into a “digital lens.”

1.1 Problem Statement: From “Work Diagnosis” to “Thinking Black Box”

The core objective of teaching dramatic literature creation goes far beyond producing a standardized script. Its essence lies in guiding students to explore the subtleties of human nature through textual construction, weave dramatic conflicts, and cultivate the imagination to rehearse stage scenarios on paper. In traditional teaching models, student work is not only an assessment tool but also a basis for teachers’ diagnostic assessments. A poorly structured assignment, flat characters, or superficial dialogue often accurately reflects a student’s specific weaknesses in logical construction, empathy, or observation of life. It is through analyzing these “ flawed “ texts that teachers can gain insight into students’ thought processes and provide targeted guidance.

However, the widespread adoption of generative AI risks doubly failing this mechanism. On the one hand, if students use AI to “generate with a single click” or heavily rely on AI for writing assignments, their submissions may possess superficial structural integrity and linguistic fluency. However, this algorithm-generated “perfect facade” masks students’ real knowledge gaps and skill deficiencies, causing the assignments to lose their effectiveness as diagnostic tools. On the other hand, even with auxiliary use, without process recording, students’ brainstorming, struggles, and choices are completely hidden in the background of human-computer interaction, leading to the “black box” of creative thinking. The ease of generating text may lead to a decline in students’ originality. More fundamentally, their logical thinking and expression abilities may gradually weaken due to over-reliance on automated tools.[1]Faced with an assignment that may be deeply influenced by AI, teachers cannot verify its originality, nor can they determine the thought process behind the text. As a result, teaching feedback loses its precise target and becomes aimless rhetoric.

There are three main strategies to deal with this technological challenge :

Firstly, there’s the technical detection approach, relying on AI tools to verify the originality of assignments. However, existing detection algorithms have high false positive and false negative rates when faced with text that has been edited,

mixed with other texts, or translated. More importantly, this strategy distorts the teacher-student relationship into a "cat-and-mouse game" between regulators and those being regulated. It not only fails to fundamentally prevent the abuse of technology but may also induce students to spend their energy on "how to bypass detection" rather than "how to write a good script."

Secondly, there is the moral discipline approach, which involves emphasizing academic integrity and artistic conscience to discourage students from using AI. While ethics education is indispensable, in a society where "efficiency reigns supreme," mere preaching is insufficient to resist the allure of convenience offered by AI tools. This is especially true for students who do not aspire to become professional screenwriters and merely view assignments as a means to earn credits; the binding force of moral discipline is quite limited in these cases.

Finally, there's the simplistic approach of completely banning AI tools in the curriculum. This "throwing the baby out with the bathwater" approach ignores the real trend of technology普及 (popularization/expansion). With professional screenwriters and the creative industries already exploring human-machine collaboration, completely shutting out AI essentially cuts off students' opportunities to practice core future skills, creating a disconnect between education and industry practice.

Given the aforementioned dilemmas, this article argues that the key to addressing the challenges of AI in drama and literature education lies not in simple defense or prohibition, but in a fundamental restructuring of the logic behind assignment design. We should attempt to reposition AI from a "potential cheating tool" as a "digital lens" for teaching feedback.

The term "digital lens" refers to using the data traces left by the AI interaction process itself to make students' implicit creative thinking explicit. The core proposition of this paper is: how to design adversarial assignments with process recording requirements to force students to expose their instruction strategies, aesthetic selection, and modification logic when using AI. Through the mandatory submission of "human-computer dialogue files," teachers can see students' knowledge gaps through prompts, observe their aesthetic judgments through multiple rounds of revisions, and discern their value orientations through the final choice.

This article will explore in depth how to construct this new assignment model, and through a visual thinking assessment framework, demonstrate how to utilize the information gaps and logical chains in the AI generation process to achieve more precise individualized teaching feedback than traditional teaching, thereby re-establishing the humanistic value of drama education in the intelligent era.

2. Theoretical Framework: The Pedagogical Value of AI as a "Digital Lens"

Before discussing specific assignment design, it is essential to clarify the underlying logic of introducing AI technology. If AI is merely viewed as a "super typewriter" capable of generating text, educators will forever remain in a passive position of preventing cheating. This chapter attempts to establish a new theoretical perspective: viewing AI-generated tools as a "digital lens" capable of externalizing thinking and amplifying cognition. This metaphor is rooted in constructivist learning theory and closely aligns with the essential attribute of dramatic art that cannot be replaced by algorithms.

2.1 Externalization of thought as a prerequisite for learning intervention

Knowledge is not passively received through teacher instruction, but rather actively constructed by learners based on their existing experience within a specific socio-cultural context. In traditional drama writing instruction, this "construction process" is often hidden within the student's cerebral cortex — from the flash of inspiration to the building of the structure, and then to the refinement of the lines, it is a highly implicit psychological activity.

In the "pre-AI era," teachers could only deduce students' construction process from the final script. This was a "black box" assessment, and teachers often found it difficult to distinguish whether a bad script was due to students' lack of life experience, poor aesthetic judgment, or simply a lack of mastery of playwriting techniques.

The intervention of generative AI provides an unprecedented opportunity to break down this "black box." When students use AI to assist in creation, they must transform vague ideas into explicit natural language instructions and undergo multiple rounds of revision and iteration in the face of unsatisfactory results. This process is essentially the forced externalization of thinking. Instructional intervention is most effective only when it occurs in areas where students cannot complete tasks independently but can with assistance. The interaction records between students and AI precisely depict the boundaries of this area: prompts reveal the student's current cognitive level, while modification instructions demonstrate their thought processes in attempting to break through the status quo. Therefore, using AI to visualize the thought process is a prerequisite for achieving precise instructional intervention.

2.2 Three Dimensions of the Non-Automation of Dramatic Art

Human literary creation tends to be descriptive creation, while AI follows the logic of judging and executing commands, making it an instructional creation process. The core of AI creation lies in the setting of keywords and subsequent

debugging.[2]Having established the tool value of AI, its boundaries within the field of drama must be defined. While AI can generate grammatically correct dialogue and even mimic Shakespeare's style, it still suffers from fundamental deficiencies in the core dimensions of dramatic art. These deficiencies constitute the focus of teaching and are areas that the "digital lens" needs to closely observe:

First , drama is an art form that takes place in a specific time and space and is performed by living, breathing bodies. AI, on the other hand, is a large language model based on probability and statistics. It lacks a body and cannot perceive the physical tension inherent in "silence on stage," nor can it understand how an actor's physical movements (such as a trembling gesture) can be more explosive than a thousand words. AI-generated scripts are often filled with textual logic that is "speaking for the sake of speaking," lacking an imagination of stage direction, physical space, and physical energy.

Second, AI models, based on averages from massive amounts of data, tend to generate "mediocre correctness" or "stereotypes." Excellent dramas, however, often arise from a rebellion against universality, stemming from the author's unique life experiences, regional culture, or marginal perspectives. AI cannot simulate the author's deepest traumas, secrets, or unique cultural memories.

Third, AI can provide a hundred possible plot developments, but ultimately, it is humans who decide whether to "let the protagonist die" or "let the protagonist survive." Behind this choice lies artistic judgment, ethical stance, and value projection. AI is the provider of possibilities, while humans are the final arbiters. In human-machine collaboration, this "decision-making power" is more crucial than "generative power."

Based on the above analysis, this paper proposes the core metaphor of "digital lens" in order to reconstruct the relationship between humans, machines, and teaching.

In traditional teaching models, the process is linear:

Input (assignment requirements) → Black box (student's thinking process) → Output (final script) Teacher's dilemma: can only evaluate the result, but find it difficult to diagnose the process.

In the restructured teaching model, the process becomes:

Input → Human-computer interaction process (prompt words/iteration/filtering) → Visualized mind heatmap → Precise intervention for the new role of teachers: understanding the thinking process and diagnosing decision-making logic.

In this model, AI is no longer a simple "ghostwriter," but a lens:

(1) Amplification Function: It amplifies students' subtle cognitive gaps. For example, if a student doesn't understand the concept of "subtext," they might directly ask the AI to "let the character say what they really think." This cognitive bias might be masked in traditional self-writing, but it will be exposed when interacting with AI commands.

(2) Developing Function: Like film developing, it records the struggles and trial and error during the creative process. The ten revisions a student makes to achieve a satisfactory paragraph better reflect their aesthetic pursuit than the final text itself.

Through this "lens", teachers can see through the surface of the text and directly observe students' true level in embodied imagination, context construction, and value decision-making, thus shifting the focus of evaluation from "how well it is written" to "how deeply they think."

3. Visualization Mechanism of Creative Thinking

In the redesigned assignments, students no longer submit merely the final script, but must include a complete "human-computer dialogue archive." This archive is not simply a screenshot of chat logs, but a well-organized interaction log with student self-annotations. It constitutes a new entity for teaching assessment. Through structured analysis of this archive, teachers can focus on three core dimensions: prompts, modification instructions, and filtering logic, thereby gaining a comprehensive understanding of students' creative thinking.

The prompts are the first signals students send to the AI; they are not only generated instructions but also "slices" of the student's current knowledge structure and aesthetic cognition. In the initial interaction with the AI, students must draw upon their understanding of drama to define the task, a process that forcibly exposes the granularity of their knowledge reserves.

How students describe a theatrical scene directly reflects their level of internalization of theatrical terminology.

Vague prompts (such as: "Write about two people arguing intensely, and the female protagonist crying in the end") often reveal that students are in the "pre-drama" stage, lacking professional understanding of conflict levels and action logic, and their thinking is still at the naturalistic level of everyday life.

Professional prompts (such as: "Write a scene of interaction between two people, including 'subtext.' On the surface, they are discussing what to eat for dinner, but in reality, they are vying for control of the household.") clearly demonstrate that students have grasped the core concepts of dramatic structure and are attempting to translate them into concrete creative

instructions. This difference allows teachers to accurately assess students' theoretical foundation within the first minute of reading the assignment, without waiting to read the final text.

Besides the "what they want," the instructions regarding "what they don't want" in the prompts are also valuable for diagnosis. When students specifically emphasize "don't write too obscurely," "the ending should be a happy one," or "the language should be beautiful and ornate," this actually reveals their aesthetic preferences and value assumptions. Teachers can use this to observe: Are students avoiding the cruelty of drama? Are they excessively pursuing rhetoric while neglecting action? This early exposure of aesthetics provides the best opportunity for teachers to intervene and correct the common misconception that "writing style outweighs dramatic context."

AI-generated drafts are usually mediocre and formulaic. How students are dissatisfied, why they are dissatisfied, and how to revise — this series of "modification instructions" constitutes the dynamic trajectory of the evolution of thought. This is the most prominent area of the "digital lens" function.

In the files, the teachers focused not on whether the AI's modifications were good or bad, but on how the students directed the dialogue. Problem identification ability: Did the students simply say "it doesn't feel right," or could they specifically point out "the pacing is too slow" or "the character's motivation is untenable"? The former shows intuition still exists but theoretical knowledge is lacking, while the latter shows rational analytical ability. Another example is solution-solving ability: Faced with AI-generated "straightforward dialogue," did the students ask for "a different word"? Or did they ask for "an additional physical action"? This distinguishes between rhetorical modifications and modifications at the level of the dramatic subject matter.

By analyzing the selection logic, teachers can guide students to reflect on why we tend to favor a certain narrative. Is it because it is safe and familiar, or because it is challenging? The ultimate goal of drama education is to cultivate creators with independent creative thinking , and dissecting their selection logic with AI assistance is a shortcut to this goal.

4. Core Strategy: Precise Instructional Feedback Based on Visual Thinking

As the focus of assignments shifts from "submitting scripts" to "submitting human-computer dialogue files," teachers' feedback mechanisms must also undergo a fundamental transformation. Traditional grading methods often involve "red pen rhetoric" — circling typos, marking structural flaws, or writing vague comments on the text. However, in the era of generative AI, this feedback is outdated and inefficient. A feedback mechanism based on a "digital lens" requires teachers to transform from "final judges of scripts" to "creative thinking coaches," utilizing visualized thought process data to implement evidence-based, precise interventions.

4.1 From "Final Script Reviewer" to "Thinking Coach": The Transformation of the Teacher's Role

In the traditional model, teachers are faced with a completed text, and their diagnoses are often based on conjecture. For example, upon seeing a stiff dialogue, a teacher might guess, "This student may lack life experience." However, in the context of AI assistance, teachers are faced with a file containing interactive processes, and diagnosis becomes confirmation. For example, seeing a student repeatedly instruct the AI to "make the dialogue more moving" without providing a specific context, a teacher can confirm: "This student's problem is not a lack of life experience, but a lack of technical ability to translate emotions into 'dramatic action'."

This shift frees teachers from the burden of text correction (as AI has solved basic grammar and formatting issues), allowing them to focus on guiding higher-order thinking. Teachers will no longer tell students "how to write," but rather guide them to reflect on "how to think."The limitations of AI technology are just like a clear mirror, reflecting the irreplaceability of real-life experience in writing. When algorithms can generate well-structured texts but fail to infuse them with genuine life experience, such technical flaws reverse-prove the decisive role of the real world in literary creation.[3]

To make the feedback actionable, this paper constructs a three-level progressive feedback model, which aims to provide tiered intervention for thinking problems of different depths.

4.2 Group profiling and identification of common problems

In addition to individual feedback, "Digital Lens" can also support data-driven analysis of the overall learning situation of a class.

By extracting high-frequency vocabulary from the prompts used by the whole class, teachers may discover that 80% of the students frequently use adjectives but rarely use verbs to describe scenes. This directly points to a blind spot in group teaching that emphasizes literary style over action, suggesting that teachers should adjust the focus of the next stage of the course to "action-based writing."

If the data shows that the vast majority of students interacted 20 times in the "beginning" section but only interacted twice in the "climax" section before hastily ending, this indicates that students generally have a common problem of "starting strong but finishing weak" or lacking patience in building the climax, and need to conduct special workshop training on "climax building".

Through this data-driven group profiling, teaching feedback is no longer fragmented, but rather has a systematic and forward-looking function for curriculum adjustment.

Reconstructing AI from a "writing agent" into a "digital lens" represents not only an innovation in assignment format but also a profound transformation involving teaching philosophy, assessment systems, and teacher-student relationships. While this model theoretically possesses significant educational value, its practical implementation inevitably faces multiple challenges, including technological hurdles, psychological resistance, and institutional lag. This chapter will analyze these potential risks and propose corresponding countermeasures.

4.3 New Requirements and Adaptation Mechanisms

Requiring students to submit a complete record of their creative process is tantamount to asking them to expose the immaturity, confusion, or even folly of their thinking. This "naked exposure" may trigger feelings of shame and defensiveness in students, leading them to fabricate interaction records to make their "portfolios look good," thus falling back into formalism. Possible solutions include : reshaping the assessment orientation — shifting from "assessment results" to "rewarding growth." Clearly inform students that the assessment standard is not how perfect the script generated by AI is, but how profound their thinking and revision abilities are demonstrated during the interaction. A portfolio that "finded its direction after 20 failed attempts" should receive a higher score than one that "was generated once but is mediocre." Establish a safe and inclusive classroom atmosphere, emphasizing that trial and error is an essential part of artistic creation.

In addition, there is the risk of alienation through tool dependence. Although the aim is to use AI as a lens, we must be wary that students may gradually lose their ability to write independently through long-term interaction, developing an AI dependency where they "cannot write without input." Teachers can retain a certain proportion of "writing without electronic devices" sessions (such as impromptu writing in class or handwritten script ideas) to force students to "warm up their minds" without any assistance. At the same time, a "de-AI-driven" monologue writing assignment can be set at the end of the semester to assess the degree to which students have internalized the knowledge.

4.4 Institutional Support Needs

Challenge 1: The Blurred Definition of Academic Integrity Current academic norms have not fully clarified the boundaries between "fair use" and "academic misconduct." Without clear institutional support, teachers' encouragement of AI use may face compliance risks. Furthermore, current teaching evaluations often focus on the presentation of final results (such as a final script performance). If the weight of process evaluation is too low, students will inevitably lean towards the outcome and neglect the process documentation. If the weight of process evaluation could be increased to over 50%, establishing an "Best Prompt Design Award" or "Best Thinking Iteration Award" would guide students to value the intellectual engagement during the creative process at the institutional level.

5. Conclusion

The wave of generative AI has irreversibly swept across the shores of drama and literature education. Faced with this technological upheaval, simply "blocking" it is futile, while ignoring it is dereliction of duty. The reconstruction scheme proposed in this article, from "ghostwriter" to "digital lens," is essentially an attempt to return to the essence of education.

By mandating mind visualization, we are actually using cutting-edge technology to revive the oldest tradition of apprenticeship teaching — the meticulous guidance that focuses on the arising and ceasing of every thought, every hesitation in writing. In this model, AI is no longer a killer of creativity, but rather a mirror reflecting the blind spots in students' thinking, and a scalpel assisting teachers in performing precise surgical interventions.

The future of drama and literature education will no longer be a zero-sum game between humans and AI, but a game between "human + AI" and "old creative limitations." Through this reconstruction of teaching, we can not only cultivate a new generation of creators who can master intelligent tools, but also reaffirm the irreplaceable presence of the human soul in artistic creation in this era of rampant algorithms.

Acknowledgments

This paper is the final deliverable of the 2024 Inner Mongolia University of Arts Educational Teaching Reform Research Enhancement Project titled "Teaching Strategies for Cultivating 'Cultural Confidence' in the Opera Literature Major

under the Framework of ‘Civilizational Mutual Learning’”.

References

[1] Jin L. AI + Innovative Practice of the “College Writing” Course at Zhejiang University[J]. China University Teaching, 2025, (12):21-27.

[2] Liu Y H, Wang Q L. From AI Writing to AI Creation: A Comparative Analysis of AI Literary Production and Human Creation[J]. Journal of News Lovers, 2025, (12):26-29.

[3] Liu Y R. A Study on the Literariness and Subjectivity of AI Writing[D]. Yantai University, 2025.

Author Bio

Jiawen Lai, male, Master of Drama, full-time teacher in the Department of Dramatic Literature, School of Drama and Film, Inner Mongolia Arts University.

Jinhe Liu (1992.8--) Male, Mongolian nationality, Chifeng City, Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, Master’s degree candidate, lecturer.