



CASE STUDY

# Rewriting Fairy Tales: developing critical AI literacy through creative practice in higher education

India Lawton 

Southampton Solent University, UK

## ABSTRACT

This case study explores how generative artificial intelligence (genAI) can be used in higher education (HE) to examine creativity, bias, and representation through storytelling. Rewriting Fairy Tales was a workshop in which 11 students from diverse disciplines used AI tools to reinterpret narratives, enabling them to identify bias, question authorship, and reflect on ethical implications of AI. Delivered within a UK HE teaching initiative, the workshop used genAI software to generate and rework story summaries, images, and narrative continuations. Activities combined creative experimentation with discussion and reflection. Data were collected through surveys, student reflections, observations, and creative outputs, focusing on changes in confidence, ethical awareness, and engagement. Findings indicate that students became more confident and critically aware, recognising AI as a limited creative collaborator. Participants identified gendered and cultural biases and produced more inclusive narratives. The study highlights storytelling as an accessible framework for developing digital literacy and ethical awareness.

**KEYWORDS:** generative AI, digital storytelling, ethical creativity, bias and representation, learning development.

**ARTICLE HISTORY:** Received 16 December 2025. Accepted 20 April 2026.

## Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence (genAI) is increasingly shaping how students learn, create, and communicate within higher education. GenAI refers to large language and multimodal models

capable of producing novel text, images, or other media outputs based on patterns learned from vast datasets. While AI tools are often framed in terms of efficiency, productivity, or employability skills, their growing presence raises important learning development questions related to creativity, authorship, bias, and ethical judgement. Educators are therefore faced with the challenge of supporting students not only to use AI tools effectively, but also to engage with them critically, reflectively, and responsibly. Although research increasingly examines students' experiences of genAI, particularly in relation to authorship and integrity (Hadinejad et al., 2025), less attention has been given to creative, practice-led pedagogies that scaffold critical AI literacy.

This case responds to this gap through Rewriting Fairy Tales, a hands-on workshop designed to explore students' critical engagement with genAI through digital storytelling. The workshop involved 11 students from diverse academic backgrounds and levels of study, who used AI tools to reinterpret familiar fairy tales through text and image generation. By working with well-known narratives, students were encouraged to identify cultural assumptions, stereotypes, and omissions embedded in both traditional stories and AI-generated outputs, while reflecting on their own role in shaping, revising, and taking responsibility for these narratives.

The study was guided by three research questions:

1. How do students interpret and evaluate AI-generated storytelling outputs?
2. In what ways does creative engagement with genAI support the development of critical AI literacy?
3. How does storytelling function as a pedagogical scaffold for ethical and reflective AI engagement?

Fairy tales were selected as an accessible and symbolically rich learning scaffold, aligning with Eisner's (2002) argument that learning is most effective when it builds on what students already recognise and value. Feminist and cultural scholars have drawn attention to how fairy tales can reflect and reproduce societal norms around gender, power, and identity (Gilbert & Gubar, 2000; Zipes, 2012). In this paper, fairy tales are understood as narrative systems: structured cultural frameworks that generate and circulate recognisable plots, archetypes, and moral logics across time. Similarly, genAI participates in narrative production by recombining patterns drawn from large-scale training data, generating new outputs that often



reproduce dominant cultural assumptions embedded within those data (Whittaker et al., 2019). The workshop was designed on the premise that bringing these two narrative systems together would create a productive space for comparison, enabling students to explore how bias and ideology circulate across both historical and contemporary storytelling forms.

The workshop was also motivated by a pedagogical interest in understanding how students experience AI's expanding role in education and creative practice. Rather than positioning AI as a neutral tool or inevitable solution, the session encouraged students to consider when, why, and whether AI should be used. This approach aligns with emerging Learning Development scholarship that frames genAI as a tool for dialogue, development, and empowerment rather than solely as a site of assessment control (Hack, 2024). It also resonates with collaborative, student-centred approaches to AI guidance that prioritise critical awareness and integrity over punitive restriction (España & Bishopp-Martin, 2025). By combining creative experimentation with structured discussion and reflection, this project offers a practice-based contribution to learning development research, highlighting how critical digital literacy, ethical awareness, and student agency can be supported within AI-enhanced learning environments. In particular, students' attention to bias, ownership, and responsibility reflects the ethical dimension of AI literacy identified in recent multidimensional frameworks (Ranieri et al., 2025).

## Literature review

Fairy tales have been widely recognised as cultural texts that reflect and reproduce social norms and power structures. Scholars note that traditional tales often encode gendered expectations and dominant ideologies, even as they remain open to reinterpretation across time (Gilbert & Gubar, 2000; Zipes, 2012). Their familiarity and symbolic clarity make them a productive site for critical inquiry in education, particularly when exploring questions of representation, identity, and power. Within Learning Development and broader educational scholarship, narrative forms have been positioned as pedagogical tools capable of prompting reflective and critical re-evaluation of assumptions (Eisner, 2002; Rooney, 2019). When combined with creative practice, storytelling can therefore function not merely as content but as a catalyst for critique.



Recent scholarship positions genAI as a participant in contemporary narrative production, where meaning emerges through interaction between human users and computational systems (Gupta & Srivastava, 2024). However, these systems are shaped by training data and design assumptions that can reproduce and amplify existing hierarchies of gender, race, and class under the appearance of neutrality (Whittaker et al., 2019). Building on this critique, Bates (2025) argues that large language models recombine dominant social narratives while presenting outputs as impartial, often obscuring embedded structural bias. Emerging qualitative research highlights students' concerns around authorship, originality, and ethical responsibility when using genAI. Hadinejad, Sperling and McGrath (2025) found that students actively negotiate issues of voice, ownership, and intellectual integrity, valuing AI as a creative support while also worrying about its impact on originality and independent thinking. These findings suggest that students are already grappling with questions central to critical AI literacy, though pedagogical frameworks to support this development remain underexplored.

Recent research in higher education further highlights the urgency of this concern. Studies of UK undergraduates suggest that while genAI tools are already widely used by students, many lack confidence in understanding their limitations, including issues of bias, hallucination, and ethical responsibility (Freeman, 2023, as cited in Baylis et al., 2025). Baylis et al. (2025) argue that this gap between use and understanding represents a learning development challenge, particularly where institutional responses have focused on policy or assessment control rather than critical engagement. Similarly, Uddin (2024) contends that while the integration of AI in academia may offer significant benefits, it requires robust AI literacy and ethical frameworks to mitigate risks. Together, these perspectives suggest that the question is not whether AI should be used, but how students can be supported to engage with it critically and responsibly. They emphasise the need for structured, reflective educational interventions that allow students to experience, question, and evaluate AI-generated outputs within supportive learning environments. This aligns with critical AI literacy frameworks that position the evaluation of bias, reliability, and ethical implications as central competencies for responsible AI engagement (Ranieri et al., 2025).

This case study builds on and extends emerging work in critical AI literacy by exploring how creative narrative engagement with AI can scaffold students' evaluative judgement, interrogation of authorship, and ethical awareness within higher education.



## Methods: case study approach

This study adopts a qualitative, practice-based case study approach to examine how students engage with genAI within a creative learning development context. Case study methodology was selected to enable an in-depth, contextualised exploration of student experiences, perceptions, and learning processes as they interacted with AI tools through structured creative practice.

The case centres on Rewriting Fairy Tales, a hands-on workshop delivered in March 2025 at a UK higher education institution as part of the institution's Education Innovation Project scheme. The workshop was designed as an exploratory and formative learning intervention rather than a summative assessment, with an emphasis on reflection, dialogue, and ethical inquiry. This design aligned with creative-critical pedagogies in higher education that use narrative and imaginative forms to prompt reflective interrogation of assumptions (Eisner, 2002; Rooney, 2019). Its aim was to support students in critically examining AI's role in storytelling, representation, and authorship, rather than focusing on technical proficiency alone.

Participants comprised 11 students from a range of disciplines, including Fine Art, Psychology, Law, Music, and Digital Marketing, and from study levels spanning foundation to PhD. Participation was voluntary and recruitment took place through an open call circulated across student representatives. While students brought varied experiences and confidence levels, most reported limited prior use of AI in creative contexts. Ethical approval was granted by the university's ethics committee, and all participants provided informed consent for the use of anonymised survey data, reflections, and creative outputs within this research.

The workshop was structured around a sequence of guided activities using Microsoft Copilot and Adobe Express. Students prompted AI tools to summarise, extend, and visually reinterpret familiar fairy tales. These outputs were then critically compared with human-authored versions, with facilitated discussion focusing on bias, representation, narrative omission, and ethical responsibility. Students were encouraged to creatively rework AI-generated material using their own prompts, values, and lived experiences, positioning themselves as active co-authors rather than passive users.



Data collection drew on multiple qualitative sources, including pre- and post-workshop surveys, written reflections, group discussions, facilitator observations, and student-produced creative work. This triangulated approach supported a richer understanding of student learning, shifts in confidence, and ethical awareness. Analysis focused on identifying patterns of critical engagement, changes in how students perceived AI's role in creativity, and the pedagogical value of storytelling as a scaffold for developing critical digital literacy.

As a small-scale, exploratory case study, the findings are not intended to be generalisable, but they offer transferable insights for learning developers and educators seeking to integrate genAI into interdisciplinary and creative learning environments.

### ***Workshop activities***

The workshop consisted of scaffolded activities designed to prompt critical, creative, and ethical engagement with genAI. Each activity was adaptable across disciplines and levels of study.

- AI vs. human story summaries: students selected a familiar fairy tale and used Microsoft Copilot to generate a 100-word summary. They compared this with a human-written version, noting differences in tone, omissions, simplifications, and meaning. This introduced discussion of narrative authority, bias, and what AI prioritises or excludes.
- Visualising stories with AI: students described or sketched a key scene before prompting AI to generate an image of the same moment. Comparing outputs prompted reflection on representation, body norms, gender roles, cultural assumptions, and training data influences.
- Extending the narrative: students generated a 250-word continuation of their fairy tale and examined whether AI reproduced predictable arcs, moral framing, or stereotypes in contrast to their own intentions.
- Bias and ethics discussion: group discussion addressed bias in traditional tales and AI outputs, including gender representation, cultural assumptions, authorship, and ethical responsibility.
- Creative reinterpretation: students revised AI-generated text and images to challenge bias and foreground human judgement within AI collaboration.



- Sharing and reflection: students shared work, completed short written reflections, and contributed to an online discussion capturing questions, insights, and ethical considerations.

Collectively, these activities positioned AI as a shared object of inquiry, encouraging students to test ideas, negotiate meaning, and reflect collaboratively on when, why, and whether AI should be used.

### ***Key observations***

Analysis of pre- and post-workshop survey data, alongside student reflections and discussion, suggests a shift in how participants understood and evaluated genAI. Prior to the workshop, only 9.1% of participants described themselves as 'very aware' of storytelling bias, while 36.4% reported being 'not aware'. Following the session, 100% of participants indicated that they could recognise bias in AI-generated outputs, and all respondents rated ethical considerations in AI use as 'very important'. In addition, 100% reported feeling more comfortable using AI tools after the workshop.

Given the small, self-selecting cohort (n=11), these findings should be interpreted as indicative rather than statistically representative. However, the pattern suggests movement from limited awareness towards more confident and critically informed engagement. Notably, increased comfort with AI did not appear to correspond with uncritical acceptance; rather, it was accompanied by heightened attention to bias and ethical responsibility. This combination of confidence and evaluative judgement reflects development across both operational and critical dimensions of AI literacy (Ranieri et al., 2025), aligning with learning development's emphasis on supporting informed, reflective use of emerging technologies.

### ***AI as a limited but productive creative partner***

Students consistently described AI as a useful *supportive* tool rather than a replacement for human creativity. Many valued its ability to generate ideas quickly, particularly when experiencing creative blocks. One student reflected, 'When I got stuck, the AI suggested plot twists and character directions that I wouldn't have thought of on my own' (Participant 3). However, this was frequently accompanied by frustration with AI's lack of emotional depth and originality. As Participant 4 noted, '[t]he real heart of the story—the emotions, the meaning, and the direction—I felt they were missing'.



### ***Technical constraints and creative friction***

Participants encountered practical limitations when using tools such as Bing Copilot and Adobe Express. Word limits, content filters, and restrictive image generation often constrained creative intent. Several students described the process as ‘temperamental’ or frustrating, Participant 1 commenting that it ‘felt like trying to get blood out of a stone’. Notably, these moments of friction became productive discussion points, prompting reflection on how AI systems prioritise certain narratives and aesthetics.

### ***Bias and representation***

Students were quick to identify bias in both AI-generated text and images. Common observations included Eurocentric beauty standards, idealised protagonists, and persistent gender stereotypes. Attempts to diversify characters were often ignored or distorted. Participant 2 explained, ‘I wanted Red Riding Hood to be a strong, plus-sized wolf hunter, but the AI just kept giving me slim, “perfect” little girls’. This reinforced awareness of how training data shapes representation and limits creative diversity.

### ***Ethical awareness and responsibility***

Ethical concerns featured strongly across responses. Students emphasised transparency, authorship, and the need for human oversight. As Participant 7 stated, ‘AI shouldn’t replace human creativity—the heart of good storytelling comes from the person behind the work’. Many called for greater AI literacy education to help users understand bias, ownership, and appropriate use.

### ***Learning through experimentation***

Despite its limitations, AI was commonly understood by students as a useful tool for experimentation and exploration. Participants valued its ability to generate multiple variations quickly and, in doing so, to make visible the cultural norms and assumptions embedded within its outputs. Engaging with these patterns supported the development of critical digital



literacy, prompting students to consider not only how AI can be used, but when, why, and whether its use is appropriate in creative and educational contexts.

Overall, the workshop suggested that reflective and critical engagement, rather than technical mastery alone, played an important role in supporting ethical and imaginative collaboration with AI.

### ***Student creative outcomes***

Figures 1–3 (see Appendix) present selected creative outcomes from the Rewriting Fairy Tales workshop. Each example includes a student-generated title, an AI-generated summary of the original fairy tale, a student–AI co-written continuation story, and a co-created AI image. Together, these illustrate how students used AI as a starting point to tell stories they felt were missing, overlooked, or constrained by traditional and algorithmic narratives. Through rewriting and re-illustration, students moved beyond AI-generated outputs to assert their own creative priorities, values, and perspectives.

### **Discussion**

This case study suggests that creative, practice-led engagement with genAI can support students in developing critical digital literacy, ethical awareness, and reflective creative practice. As AI becomes increasingly embedded in higher education and the future employment landscape, learning development faces a key challenge: how to move students beyond instrumental or efficiency-driven uses of technology towards more thoughtful, evaluative, and responsible engagement. The Rewriting Fairy Tales workshop addressed this challenge by positioning AI not simply as a tool to be mastered, but as an object of inquiry to be questioned, tested, and interpreted.

A significant finding was how students' initial uncertainty and frustration became productive learning moments rather than barriers. Participants encountered limitations in AI-generated storytelling and imagery, including generic outputs, reinforced stereotypes, and prompt restrictions, which prompted critical questioning. As a result, engagement shifted from basic tool use towards evaluative judgement. Rather than treating AI as a neutral generator of content, students began asking why certain narratives were produced, whose perspectives were prioritised, and what forms of knowledge were absent. Through comparison, discussion,



and rewriting, they increasingly selected, rejected, revised, or resisted AI outputs, demonstrating movement beyond operational competence towards the critical digital literacy dimensions of AI literacy (Ranieri et al., 2025). In doing so, they positioned AI as a flawed collaborator—useful for ideation or speed, but lacking emotional nuance and ethical judgement unless guided by human values. This evaluative stance aligns with Hadinejad, Sperling and McGrath's (2025) findings that students actively modify AI-generated content to preserve authorship and intellectual ownership, suggesting the development of more critically informed digital literacy.

The use of fairy tales as a scaffold played a crucial role in supporting this shift. Because the narratives were familiar, students could more easily identify distortions, omissions, and stereotypes introduced by AI. This familiarity reduced cognitive load and allowed attention to be focused on interpretation, critique, and meaning-making rather than comprehension alone. By juxtaposing traditional fairy tales, AI-generated versions, and student reinterpretations, the workshop made visible how stories, and technologies, carry cultural assumptions. This supported deeper reflection on authorship, representation, and responsibility in digital creativity.

Social learning was another key factor in students' development. The workshop prioritised discussion, peer exchange, and collective reflection, ensuring that AI engagement was not an isolated interaction between student and system. Instead, meaning was co-constructed through dialogue. Students articulated concerns about bias, ownership, and originality, often building on one another's observations. These exchanges allowed students to refine their thinking, test ideas, and develop more nuanced positions. Notably, students did not adopt polarised views of AI as either inherently good or harmful; rather, they articulated conditional, reflective perspectives that acknowledged both potential and risk. In this sense, students' responses reflect not only functional engagement with AI tools but emerging critical digital literacy. Their questioning of authorship, bias, and responsibility aligns with recent conceptualisations of AI literacy as encompassing knowledge, operational, critical, and moral dimensions (Ranieri et al., 2025). The creative outcomes further suggest this progression towards judgement and agency. Students' rewritten fairy tales moved beyond surface-level changes, embedding ethical concerns, inclusive representation, and personal values. AI outputs were treated as starting points rather than endpoints. This reinforces the importance



of maintaining space for imagination, interpretation, and authorship in AI-enhanced learning, rather than allowing automation to dominate creative decision-making.

From a learning development standpoint, the workshop demonstrates the value of pedagogies that foreground reflection, uncertainty, and critique. Rather than teaching students how to use AI 'correctly', the session invited them to consider when, why, and whether AI should be used at all—capacities aligned with the critical and ethical dimensions of AI literacy (Ranieri et al., 2025). Students' movement from viewing AI as a neutral productivity tool to recognising its embedded bias and ethical complexity suggests a threshold-like shift (Meyer & Land, 2003, as cited in White, 2023), where moments of frustration and questioning become transformative rather than obstructive. While this small-scale intervention cannot establish a formal threshold concept, it indicates that critical AI literacy may function as a significant conceptual shift within learning development practice. Framed as a subject of inquiry rather than a shortcut to production, genAI can therefore act as a catalyst for deeper learning, strengthening judgement, ethical awareness, and student agency.

## Conclusion and recommendations

To consider how this conceptual shift plays out in practice, the student works produced in the workshop offer insight not only into students' creative processes, but also into how they understand storytelling in an AI-influenced future. Many narratives challenged familiar fairy-tale conventions, questioned simplistic moral frameworks, and foregrounded more inclusive representations of identity, care, and agency. In doing so, students positioned themselves as active authors rather than passive users of technology, engaging with AI as something to be shaped, resisted, and questioned.

Collectively, the stories reflect students' ethical concerns, imaginative ambitions, and emerging views on the role AI might play in creative practice. They suggest a desire for storytelling that remains emotionally resonant, socially responsible, and human-centred, even when produced in collaboration with generative technologies. In this sense, the workshop functioned not simply as a creative exercise, but as a space of dialogue—between student and system, between narrative and critique, and between individual voice and collective cultural forms. As Rooney (2019) suggests, storytelling can prompt learners to confront 'troubling imaginative choices' (p. 6); here, rewriting became a mode of critical repositioning.



This case study demonstrates how genAI can be integrated into higher education in ways that foreground critical thinking, ethical awareness, and creative agency. Using familiar narratives as an accessible scaffold, the workshop supported students in interrogating bias, representation, and authorship, positioning AI not as a shortcut but as a limited collaborator requiring interpretation and judgement. From a learning development perspective, this highlights the value of dialogic, reflective approaches to AI literacy, approaches that centre human agency and responsibility within increasingly AI-mediated creative practice.

Suggested strategies for educators include:

- Using familiar cultural or disciplinary texts to support critical comparison with AI outputs.
- Embedding structured reflection and peer dialogue within AI-based tasks.
- Encouraging comparison between human- and AI-generated content.
- Supporting informed, ethical decision-making around AI use.

Overall, framing genAI as a subject of inquiry rather than a tool of convenience can support the development of reflective, ethically aware learners equipped to navigate AI-influenced academic and professional environments.

## **Acknowledgements**

The author gratefully acknowledges the support of the Education Office at Southampton Solent University through a Teaching Innovation Grant, which supported the delivery of this workshop. Thanks, are also extended to the students who participated and contributed so thoughtfully to the project. The author would like to thank Carina Buckley for her support with the writing and development of this paper.

## **Disclosure statement**

The author used the following generative AI tool in the preparation of this manuscript: Grammarly. The use of Grammarly was limited to the editorial stage to improve the clarity of the final manuscript. No generative AI tools were used to create any research content, analysis or findings. The author takes full responsibility for the content of the article and has complied with the JLDHE's principles of AI use.



## Funding

This project received internal funding in 2025 from Southampton Solent University Education Innovation Grant, which supported student participation and the production of workshop materials.

The author reports there are no competing interests to declare.

## References

- Bates, L. (2025). *The new age of sexism: How the AI revolution is reinventing misogyny*. Simon & Schuster UK.
- Baylis, R., Helikum, L., & Jones, S. (2025). Exploring AI-generated output through assessment in a university setting: A case study. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, (38), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi38.1386>
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The enlightened eye: Quality inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. Macmillan.
- España, C., & Bishopp-Martin, S. (2025). Student AI guidance: A collaborative approach. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, (37), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi37.1751>
- Gilbert, S. M., & Gubar, S. (2000). *The madwoman in the attic: The woman writer and the nineteenth-century literary imagination* (2nd ed.). Yale University Press.
- Gupta, D., & Srivastava, A. (2024). *The potential of generative AI: Transforming technology, business and art through innovative AI applications*. BPB Publications.
- Hack, S. (2024). ChatGPT: A force for good? Using the I.D.E.As framework to ‘develop and empower’ students. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, (32), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi32.1443>
- Hadinejad, N., Sperling, K., & McGrath, C. (2025). Generative AI chatbots in higher education: Student experiences and perceived ethical challenges. *Computers and Education Open*, 9, Article 100311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2025.100311>



- Ranieri, M., Biagini, G., & Cuomo, S. (2025). AI literacy in higher education: A systematic approach to questionnaire development and validation. *International Journal of Digital Literacy and Digital Competence*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJDLDC.388469>
- Rooney, S. (2019). 'Once there was a learning developer...': The potential of parables to stimulate critique. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, (16), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.v0i16.496>
- Uddin, M. M. (2024). Rejection or integration of AI in academia: Determining the best choice through the opportunity cost theoretical formula. *Discover Education*, 3, Article 249. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00349-7>
- White, S. (2023). Generating threshold concepts for impactful learning development: Exploring a new perspective on our work. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, (29), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi29.1101>
- Whittaker, M., West, S. M., & Crawford, K. (2019). *Discriminating systems: Gender, race and power in AI*. AI Now Institute. <https://ainowinstitute.org/publication/discriminating-systems-gender-race-and-power-in-ai-2>
- Zipes, J. (2012). *The irresistible fairy tale: The cultural and social history of a genre*. Princeton University Press.

## Author details

India Lawton is a Senior Lecturer at Southampton Solent University, where she leads and coordinates modules and the Art and Design Foundation within the School of Creative Industries. She has previously served as Interim Deputy Head (Education), is a Senior Fellow of the Higher Education Academy, and acts as School Lead for Outreach, Recruitment, and External Engagement. She holds a Postgraduate Certificate in Education and a Master's in Education. Her teaching and research focus on creative pedagogy, digital literacy, and ethical engagement with emerging technologies. She is currently undertaking a practice-based PhD alongside her academic role.

## ORCID

India Lawton  <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-5687-5654>



## Appendix

**Figure 1. Student creative outcome from the Rewriting Fairy Tales workshop (2025).**

### Sweet Transformations: The Tale of Hansel, Gretel, and Wanda the Witch

Hansel and Gretel, siblings, are abandoned in a forest by their stepmother. They find a house made of candy, owned by a witch who plans to eat them. The witch imprisons Hansel and forces Gretel to do chores. Gretel outsmarts the witch by pushing her into an oven, freeing Hansel. They find treasure in the witch's house and return home to their father, who has since lost the stepmother.

**What happens next...**

After escaping the witch, Hansel and Gretel returned home with the treasure, transforming their lives. They discovered a passion for desserts and began sharing their creations on social media, quickly becoming popular food influencers known for their innovative and delicious treats.

Meanwhile, the witch miraculously survived the oven incident. Reflecting on her life choices, she decided to change her ways. She started a support group for witches who ate children, helping them transition to veganism. The group, 'Witches for Ethical Eating,' gained a following, promoting kindness and healthy living.


One day, Hansel and Gretel received a surprising message from the witch, now reformed and known as Wanda. She proposed a social media cookery collaboration to promote vegan desserts. Intrigued, Hansel and Gretel agreed, seeing it as an opportunity to spread positivity and forgiveness.

The collaboration was a hit. Hansel and Gretel showcased their dessert-making skills, while Wanda shared her vegan recipes and tips. Their followers loved the unique blend of traditional and vegan treats, and the trio's chemistry was undeniable.

Through their collaboration, Hansel, Gretel, and Wanda inspired many to explore new culinary horizons and embrace compassion. Their story of transformation and unity resonated with people worldwide, proving that even the darkest pasts could lead to bright futures.

Together, they continued to create delightful desserts, spreading joy and kindness with every post. Their journey showed that change was possible, and that love and forgiveness could heal even the deepest wounds.

### Sweet Transformations: The Tale of Hansel, Gretel, and Wanda the Witch



*Sweet Transformations: The Tale of Hansel, Gretel, and Wanda the Witch*—narrative and illustration created by a student in collaboration with genAI tools (Bing Copilot and Adobe Express).

**Figure 2. Student creative outcome from the Rewriting Fairy Tales workshop (2025).**

### Beauty and the Beast

A cursed prince, transformed into a beast, must find true love to break the spell. Belle, a kind and brave young woman, becomes his prisoner to save her father. Despite initial fear, Belle discovers the Beast's kind heart, and the two grow close. As love blossoms, Belle returns home but hurries back when the Beast is in danger. Her declaration of love breaks the curse, transforming him back into a prince. They live happily ever after, proving love sees beyond appearances.

**What happens next...**

After the spell was broken, the Beast remained in his monstrous form, but Belle's love for him never wavered. Instead of transforming back into a prince, the enchantress's magic spread across the land, turning all humans into various monsters and animals. The world became a place where everyone had to adapt to their new forms and find harmony in their differences.


Belle and the Beast, now content with their lives, decided to leave the grand castle behind. They moved to a quaint estate with a charming, normal house. The estate was surrounded by a lush garden where Belle could tend to her flowers, and the Beast could roam free without fear of judgment.

The enchantress, who had cast the original spell, took residence in the large castle. She watched over the land, ensuring that magic remained balanced and that the new inhabitants learned to live together peacefully. The castle, once a place of sorrow, became a symbol of hope and unity.

In their new home, Belle and the Beast embraced their new life. They hosted gatherings for their neighbors, who were now a diverse mix of creatures. Belle continued to share her love of books, teaching the young and old alike. The Beast with his strength wisdom, became a protector and leader in their community.

Together, they built a life filled with love, acceptance, and understanding. Their story became legend, reminding everyone that true beauty lies within and that harmony can be found even in the most unexpected circumstances.

### Beauty and the Beast



*Beauty and the Beast* — narrative and illustration created by a student in collaboration with genAI tools (Bing Copilot and Adobe Express).

**Figure 3. Student creative outcome from the Rewriting Fairy Tales workshop (2025).**

### Little Red Riding Hood: The Wolf Hunter

Little Red Riding Hood sets off to visit her sick grandmother, carrying a basket of goodies. On her way, she meets a cunning wolf who tricks her into revealing her destination. The wolf reaches Grandma's house first, eats her, and disguises himself as Grandma. When Red arrives, she notices something's off. Just as the wolf is about to pounce, a brave woodsman bursts in and saves Red and her grandmother. They learn to be cautious and live happily ever after.

**What happens next...**

Little Red Riding Hood was no ordinary girl. She was a skilled wolf hunter, known for her bravery and cunning. She wore her red cloak not just as a symbol of her innocence, but as a lure for the wolves that roamed the forest. Her mission was to protect the village and build a home for lost children with the fur she sold.

One day, as she set off to visit her grandmother, she sensed she was being followed. She knew it was a wolf, and she was ready. Her grandmother, a wise and resourceful woman, was part of the plan. She had set up a trap at her cottage, waiting for Red to lead the wolf straight into it.


As Red approached the cottage, the wolf, thinking he was clever, rushed ahead to get there first. But Grandma was prepared. She welcomed the wolf in, pretending to be frightened and weak. The wolf, eager to devour her, didn't notice the hidden trap.

Just as the wolf was about to pounce, Red burst through the door, her bow drawn. The trap sprung, capturing the wolf. Red swiftly ended the threat, and they skinned the wolf, adding to their collection of furs.

Meanwhile, the woodsman, a kind and emotionally intelligent man, was busy in the village. He used his wisdom to nurture the emotional well-being of other men, teaching them the importance of empathy and support. He also helped care for the children at the home Red and her grandmother were building.

Together, they created a safe haven for lost children, teaching them skills and providing them with love and care. The village thrived under their protection, and the legend of Little Red Riding Hood, the wolf hunter, spread far and wide.

### Little Red Riding Hood: The Wolf Hunter



*Little Red Riding Hood: The Wolf Hunter*—narrative and illustration created by a student in collaboration with genAI tools (Bing Copilot and Adobe Express).