Article

Layered Transmission of the Hainan Miao Panhuang Dance under Industry–Education Integration: Restoring the Transmission Chain

Peier Mao[1,*]

[1] Hainan Vocational University of Science and Technology, Haikou, China
* Correspondence: Peier Mao, Hainan Vocational University of Science and Technology, Haikou, China

Abstract: Industry–education integration (IEI) is moving intangible cultural heritage (ICH) into Chinese vocational college curricula, yet the policy framework links only the education and industry chains, leaving no position for heritage-holding communities. Using the Panhuang Dance of the Hainan Miao as a case study, this article asks two questions: Which layer of the dance does each IEI party require? And before launching a systematic curriculum, what mechanism can prevent the staged form from displacing the ritual form? This study introduces a community-sustained transmission chain, distinguishing the dance's ritual, pedagogical, and performance layers. It diagnoses existing practices across four dimensions: participating actors, resource flows, collaboration modes, and benefit distribution. The diagnosis reveals that the transmission chain enters collaboration solely through individual inheritors; dance material leaves the ritual layer via successive selection rounds, circulating without source indication; and benefits remain confined to the pedagogical and performance layers. These breaks create a cycle where the staged form replaces the ritual form. In response, the article proposes a layered transmission mechanism linking schools, enterprises, and communities. This mechanism features layer-specific leadership with the community transmission group as a contracting party, curriculum modules matched to the three layers with source labelling, and benefit return. The study concludes that IEI can effectively serve heritage transmission only if the foundational transmission chain is first restored.

Keywords: vocational education; traditional dance; cultural transmission; heritage preservation; benefit sharing; cultural heritage

1. Introduction

In 2021, the Panhuang Dance of the Hainan Miao was inscribed on China's national list of representative items of intangible cultural heritage (China Intangible Cultural Heritage Network, 2021) In the same year, national guidance on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage required that vocational schools establish majors and courses related to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Hainan Vocational University of Science and Technology has since invited Chen Xiuxing, the representative inheritor of the dance, to deliver open classes on campus, although a systematic curriculum has not yet been launched.

Current policy frameworks for Industry-Education Integration (IEI) focus primarily on alignment between educational institutions and economic sectors. National policy guidance on industry–education integration emphasizes the importance of connecting the education chain and the talent chain with the industry chain and the innovation chain, underscoring its relevance to human resource development, employment expansion, and economic advancement. Heritage transmission, however, relies fundamentally on a living chain sustained by local communities and recognized inheritors—a dimension not explicitly addressed in current policy formulations. In the absence of formal recognition for this transmission chain, curriculum content tends to reflect sectoral priorities rather

Received: 29 August 2026
Revised: 05 October 2026
Accepted: 20 October 2026
Published: 27 October 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

than cultural continuity. This challenge is evident in the case of the Panhuang Dance, where differing understandings of its scope further complicate implementation. The national list entry describes it as a sacrificial collective dance passed down among the Miao people of Wuzhishan City, Hainan Province, also known as the 'Sanyuan Dance' (China Intangible Cultural Heritage Network, 2021). In contrast, Chen Xiuxing has clarified that the Panhuang Dance encompasses the Sanyuan Dance as one component. Government-led training initiatives had previously adapted the dance for staged presentation, resulting in a version documented as having no functional role in community ritual practice—specifically, it is not performed during actual Panhuang sacrifices [1].

This article addresses two interrelated questions: Which aspects of the Panhuang Dance are prioritized by the education system, the economic sector, and the community-based transmission process—and where do existing collaborative efforts fail to sustain coherence across these domains? Prior to launching a formal curriculum, what mechanisms can ensure articulation among these three dimensions without allowing performance-oriented adaptations to displace ritual significance? The article proposes that effective IEI in heritage contexts must begin with explicit recognition and support for the transmission chain. Within this framework, the transmission chain corresponds to the ritual dimension, the education chain to the pedagogical dimension, and the industry chain to the performance dimension—each led by its respective stakeholders.

Existing scholarship on the Panhuang Dance generally treats the transmitted form as self-evident [2,3]. Research on movement structure and teaching methodology commonly uses the Sanyuan Dance as foundational instructional material [1]. Critical analyses of safeguarding approaches present divergent interpretations: one perspective observes that government-supported versions have diverged from traditional community practice, while another, drawing on conceptual distinctions between public presentation and everyday practice, suggests that staged representation may help shield local forms from external pressures [4,5]. These seemingly contradictory conclusions may coexist if distinct layers—ritual and performance—are upheld by different groups. Studies examining implementation pathways or developmental models tend to frame the dance as an allocable cultural resource, with community actors consistently excluded from collaborative design [6,7]. Internationally, heritage discourse emphasizes community involvement in safeguarding (UNESCO, 2003), and research on university–industry collaboration (UIC) often identifies intellectual property arrangements as critical to deepening partnerships [8]. Yet neither strand systematically examines questions of ownership over embodied cultural knowledge or equity in benefit-sharing once such knowledge enters formal education or commercial contexts. As a result, three significant gaps remain: insufficient differentiation among transmission layers, marginalization of community stakeholders in collaborative frameworks, and absence of pre-curricular mechanism design.

The article centers on the IEI initiative undertaken by Hainan Vocational University of Science and Technology, structured as a pre-implementation study focused on mechanism design. Analytical insights are drawn from three established practices: government-organized training activities in Wuzhishan, intangible cultural heritage instruction in local primary and secondary schools, and choreographic and pedagogical work conducted at Hainan University. Evidence includes published ethnographic accounts, official policy documents, and media reports, analyzed through textual analysis and comparative case examination. All translations from Chinese-language sources are original to this study.

2. The Chain Structure of IEI and the Layering of the Panhuang Dance

To support heritage transmission, the transmission chain of IEI must first be reconstructed. Since the three chains necessitate distinct manifestations of the Panhuang Dance, both the transmission layers and analytical dimensions are defined separately for each chain.

2.1. The Chain-Articulation Logic of IEI and Its Gap

IEI aligns the education chain with industry demand. National policy guidance on industry–education integration emphasizes market supply-demand balance and graduate employment quality as key criteria for establishing and adjusting academic programs, while also reinforcing the central role of enterprises in educational implementation. Under this framework, articulation is purposefully oriented: the education chain responds to the industry chain, and enterprises actively participate in curriculum development and practice-oriented instruction.

Innovation system research has broadened the scope of collaborative actors, yet extended models continue to prioritize knowledge generation. One influential conceptualization, the triple helix, describes collaboration in the knowledge economy as a dynamic interplay among universities, industry, and government [9]. A further extension, the Quadruple Helix, incorporates civil society—including media, cultural institutions, arts practitioners, and artistic research—as a contributing dimension to innovation processes [10]. However, civil society's inclusion remains instrumental to advancing knowledge creation, whereas heritage transmission presents a distinct paradigm: the focus lies not on generating new knowledge, but on sustaining existing knowledge held by communities through ongoing practice.

Communities serve as the primary custodians of heritage knowledge, and their sustained practice forms a distinct transmission chain. As defined in international frameworks for intangible cultural heritage, such heritage encompasses practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills—and associated instruments, objects, artefacts, and cultural spaces—that communities, groups, or individuals recognize as integral to their cultural identity (UNESCO, 2003). This article adopts the term 'transmission chain' to denote the community-based process of enacting and transmitting heritage knowledge in response to ritual and everyday life requirements. Its core actors are the community and its knowledge bearers; its functionality depends on timely performance of rituals and successful intergenerational succession of ritual expertise. Once stabilized, the education chain is evaluated by talent development outcomes, the industry chain by market alignment, and the transmission chain by ritual continuity—leading each to require distinct operational forms and support mechanisms.

2.2. Three Layers of the Panhuang Dance

Ethnochoreological distinctions between modes of folk-dance existence provide a theoretical starting point for layering. One framework identifies the state in which folk dance continues as an integral part of community life as its 'first existence', and the state in which it is detached from that context and learned and displayed by others as its 'second existence' [11]. Another framework distinguishes participatory dance, which serves the dancers' own experience, from presentational dance, which faces an audience [12]. Both frameworks envisage only two primary sites—the community and the stage. In contrast, IEI takes the classroom as its central site. Dance in the classroom aims to train bodies, and its criteria differ from those of both ritual practice and staged performance. Once the Panhuang Dance enters IEI, it therefore splits into three distinct layers.

The ritual layer of the Panhuang Dance refers to the dances performed at each stage of the sacrifice to Panhuang. Fieldwork findings indicate that this term encompasses the various dances performed by Miao ritual practitioners during the sacrifice to Panhuang. The number of distinct dances corresponds to the number of ritual steps: each step entails a specific dance [1]. The ritual layer is evaluated based on the completeness and timeliness of the ritual; its practitioners include ritual practitioners and members of the village community, and it corresponds to the transmission chain.

The pedagogical layer consists of stylistic movement patterns distilled from ritual movement, evaluated according to their effectiveness in physical training. Two complementary approaches guide university-level handling of heritage dance: one focuses on distilling movement dynamics, posture, and stylistic features to cultivate bodily expression aligned with ethnic stylistic character—aiming at systematic

reconstruction; the other builds artistic expression upon that foundation, adapting material for creative purposes [3]. Teaching combinations draw on documented movement elements from the Sanyuan Dance as recorded in the *Anthology of Chinese Folk Dance: Hainan Volume* [2]. Among more than ten ritual dances, only movement elements from the Sanyuan Dance have been incorporated into classroom instruction. The pedagogical layer corresponds to the education chain, and its primary actors are universities, vocational colleges, and partner secondary schools.

The performance layer consists of stage works reassembled by choreographers, evaluated by their impact on audiences. Observations of festival galas indicate that the Panhuang Dance presented on stage is typically a composite drawn from movement elements across multiple ritual dances; no single unified version corresponding to that presentation exists within community practice [1]. The performance layer serves festival galas and tourism-oriented performances, corresponds to the industry chain, and is led by cultural-tourism enterprises and festival organizers.

Each layer serves a legitimate function; the principal risk to transmission arises from substitution among layers. Both the pedagogical and performance layers derive their material from the ritual layer, which thus functions as the foundational source. By designating the Sanyuan Dance as the representative entry under the name 'Panhuang Dance' in the national intangible cultural heritage list, institutional recognition effectively assigns the name of the ritual whole to a single component—thereby endorsing inter-layer substitution. Layering clarifies the distinct leading actors and evaluation criteria for each layer, enabling the pedagogical and performance layers to draw sustainably from the ritual layer without supplanting it (Table 1).

Table 1. Layers of the Panhuang Dance and the Chains of IEI

Layer	Chain	Leading actors	Form of the dance	Criteria
Ritual	Transmission chain	*Daogong*, village community, inheritors	More than ten dances performed across the stages of the sacrifice to Panhuang	Ritual complete and held on time
Pedagogical	Education chain	Universities, vocational colleges, partner secondary schools	Stylistic movement patterns and teaching combinations distilled from the Sanyuan Dance	Trains the body; stylistically accurate
Performance	Industry chain	Cultural-tourism enterprises, festival organisers	Stage works reassembled by choreographers	Audience appeal; repeatable performance

2.3. Analytical Dimensions

The analytical dimensions must be able to identify at which point of collaboration substitution occurs. The article borrows four observation points from UIC research and adds the transmission chain to each. The dimension of participating actors asks whether the leading actors of each layer are present and in what capacity they enter collaboration. UNESCO's Ethical Principles assign the judgement of value to heritage holders: "Each community, group or individual should assess the value of its own intangible cultural heritage and this intangible cultural heritage should not be subject to external judgements

of value or worth" (UNESCO, 2015, Principle 6). The dimension of resource flows traces the movement of material, people and funds, focusing on whether any resources return to the ritual layer. The dimension of collaboration modes asks whether collaboration rests on personal relations or institutional arrangements, whether there is a boundary-spanning coordinator, and which phase the collaboration has reached [8,13]. The dimension of benefit distribution asks to which layer degrees, works and performance income accrue, with reference to the requirement in Principle 7 that holders benefit from the use of their heritage (UNESCO, 2015). Together, the four dimensions describe the full process of substitution. If the actors of the transmission chain are absent, curriculum content is decided by schools and enterprises. If material is taken from the ritual layer without source labelling, it flows out in one direction. If benefits do not return, the practitioners of the ritual layer lose the conditions for sustaining the ritual.

3. Diagnosing IEI Practice Around the Panhuang Dance

The three existing practices occurred at different times and were initiated by distinct actors, yet they share a common structural pattern. The composition of collaborating participants determines which aspect of the dance is emphasized and how benefits are allocated. Accordingly, the diagnostic analysis prioritizes examination of involved actors and collaborative configurations, followed by assessment of resource flows and benefit distribution.

3.1. Breaks in Participation and Collaboration

In all current implementation models, the transmission chain engages with collaborative efforts solely through individual bearers of intangible cultural heritage. Government-organized training sessions invite such bearers to instruct participants but assign them no formal responsibility for sustaining the ritual practice itself. Field interviews indicate that regular financial support has not been provided to the bearer responsible for the Panhuang Dance in Hainan, nor has any formal mandate been issued for transmitting this folk tradition [1]. Similarly, intangible cultural heritage education programs in primary and secondary schools follow an individual assignment model: at the start of each academic year, schools develop course plans aligned with their teaching objectives and student needs, while local cultural authorities designate representative bearers to deliver instruction (Hainan Daily, 2025). At Hainan University, video recordings substitute for live bearers and community members, and students assume the role of *daogong*—the ritual officiant—in simulated classroom settings [2]. Notably, none of these arrangements formally include the village community as a collaborative partner.

When bearers enter school settings, they become integrated into the formal education system; the traditional transmission chain does not accompany them. School-based curriculum planning is grounded in pedagogical frameworks and learner requirements, and institutions further support bearers by providing professional development: dedicated teaching spaces, necessary equipment, and training in foundational classroom instruction techniques to enhance communication with students and improve instructional effectiveness. This adaptation in school–locality cooperation proceeds unidirectionally—bearers adjust to institutional norms, while the educational environment does not adapt to accommodate the ritual's structural or procedural requirements. Because transmission remains anchored to a single individual, responsibilities across governmental, institutional, and community levels converge upon that person alone [1]. Government training initiatives rely exclusively on one bearer, identified as the most proficient contemporary practitioner of the Panhuang Dance; he has been consistently invited to lead all such sessions. Over a decade later, the same bearer continues to teach the Panhuang Dance at Nansheng Central School (Hainan Daily, 2025). Consequently, the continuity of the ritual practice remains contingent upon the availability and capacity of a single individual.

Collaborative mechanisms are event-based and administratively assigned, with no formal agreement established between schools and local communities. Training sessions

lack standardized scheduling, and remuneration is negotiated anew for each instance. According to interview records, three such sessions were held in successive years, with compensation varying significantly across editions [1]. School-based instruction follows an annual calendar, yet coordination occurs exclusively between cultural administrative bodies and educational institutions—not with community representatives. Applying the phase-based framework for partnership development, existing initiatives remain confined to the initiation stage, triggered solely by external funding allocation or administrative directives [8]. Their continuation therefore depends entirely on subsequent rounds of fiscal support or policy mandates. Once a standardized curriculum is implemented, its content will be determined by educational institutions and sectoral stakeholders, leaving no designated role for representatives from the ritual practice community in curricular decision-making.

3.2. Breaks in Resource Flows and Benefit Distribution

Material leaving the ritual layer passes through repeated rounds of selection, each of which narrows the scope of the dance. Government training classes teach only selected elements: in recent years, the Wuzhishan municipal government has held an annual Panhuang Dance training class, taught by a recognized inheritor, in which participants learn certain elements of the Panhuang Dance and the Miao drum [5]. Teaching combinations developed at Hainan University are based on archival records of the Sanyuan Dance and do not involve fieldwork in source villages [2]. After cataloguing the various dances within the Panhuang complex, a representative stage work ultimately incorporated just two basic elements of the Xiayuan Dance [3]. From more than ten ritual dances to two basic elements, the material narrows continuously as it flows.

The criteria for selection derive from the practical needs of learners and audiences. Training content reflects this orientation: what is taught in such classes corresponds to gala-style performances—choreographed adaptations that extract movements from diverse folk versions and refine them through professional artistic intervention. Inheritors have explained that the full folk version is rarely adopted due to its technical complexity and the limited time and motivation of trainees [1]. Tourism-oriented performance follows the same logic of simplification and adaptation [2]. Ultimately, selection is governed by standards embedded in education and cultural industry frameworks; ritual function and context play no role in determining what is retained or transmitted.

The material that flows outward carries no explicit attribution to its original ritual context, and the selected forms circulate under the unified designation 'Panhuang Dance'. Field observations indicate that dance professionals from performing troupes, after brief exposure to folk artists' presentations, often adopt what they observe as representative of the entire tradition, learn it, and perform it widely under that name—sometimes with substantial creative modification [5]. The official intangible cultural heritage listing reinforces this conflation by lending institutional legitimacy to the aggregated label, leading students and audiences alike to equate a fragmentary, staged representation with the full, historically grounded tradition.

Benefits accrue primarily to the pedagogical and performance layers, while the ritual layer receives no commensurate return. Academic theses and professional stage works constitute outputs of these upper layers [2,3]. Tourism development research prioritizes industrial competitiveness; local residents benefit mainly as service providers in the tourism sector, whereas ritual practice remains excluded from formal benefit-sharing arrangements [6]. The sole documented return to the transmission chain consists of nominal per-class fees; no existing documentation indicates financial support, capacity-building resources, or scholarly outputs flowing back to sustain village-level ritual practice.

Because benefits do not return, the ritual layer's capacity for intergenerational reproduction weakens, and substitution becomes self-perpetuating. The experience of Naxi Dongba culture shows that graduates of training classes seldom return to ritual work, because the tourism market pays far better than ritual service [1]. When ritual practice

lacks active successors, the staged form becomes the only visible Panhuang Dance, and subsequent teaching and creative work can therefore draw only on this mediated form. The one-way flow of cultural material and the absence of reciprocal benefit thus mutually reinforce one another, requiring any effective intervention to address both dimensions simultaneously.

4. A Layered Transmission Mechanism Linking School, Enterprise and Community

The cycle identified in Section 3 comprises three interdependent links; addressing only one link permits the cycle to persist through the others. The organisational mechanism coordinates school, enterprise, and community actors as an integrated transmission chain; the articulation mechanism defines the conditions governing cross-layer exchange of resources and information; and the return mechanism ensures that benefits flow back to the foundational educational layer.

4.1. Organisational Mechanism: Layer-Specific Leadership and Independent Coordination

The first task of the organisational mechanism is to integrate the transmission chain into structured collaboration. A foundational principle affirms that communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals hold primary responsibility for identifying threats to their intangible cultural heritage—including decontextualisation, commodification and misrepresentation—and for determining appropriate preventive and mitigating measures (UNESCO, 2015). These three phenomena align directly with the observed narrowing of material selection driven by industrial priorities and the unregulated circulation of names identified in Section 3. The article proposes establishing a transmission group at the village level, composed of ritual practitioners, recognised bearers of the tradition, and elected village representatives, to serve as a formal contracting party. This arrangement is supported by national guidance on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, which encourages the exploration of representative transmission groups [14].

Each functional layer operates under the leadership of its respective stakeholders. The transmission group determines which ritual knowledge may be adapted for classroom instruction; the school governs curriculum design and pedagogical approaches; enterprises define the artistic format and commercial implementation of stage-based adaptations. Any incorporation of ritual material into educational or performance contexts—and any use of the designation 'Panhuang Dance' for staged works—requires prior authorisation from the transmission group. Coordination must remain institutionally independent. A full-time coordinator, based at the university's research centre, convenes tripartite consultations, maintains a formal register of material usage, and oversees agreement implementation; this role is no longer assumed by tradition bearers. Routine instruction is delivered by school personnel, while the transmission group nominates young villagers as trainees. Binding written agreements replace ad hoc arrangements, clearly defining decision rights for each party, procedures for cross-layer material use, and mechanisms for equitable benefit sharing—enabling collaboration to progress beyond initial engagement.

4.2. Articulation Mechanism: Matched Modules and Source Labelling

The systematic curriculum is divided into three modules, each aligned with a distinct layer of practice [6]. In the ritual-study module, students visit village ritual sites with the full consent of the transmission community, where ritual practitioners explain how ritual sequences correspond to dance movements. All interaction adheres strictly to the principles of free, prior, sustained, and informed consent, and certain ritual stages may remain closed to external observation at the community's discretion. Community-led training initiatives in the Hangui cultural tradition of the Pumi ethnic group demonstrate that comprehensive transmission of ritual knowledge is achievable under local stewardship. The skills module employs a contemporary apprenticeship model conducted in professional practice spaces, co-facilitated by recognized heritage bearers and institutional educators; instructional content integrates insights from ritual study and is formally endorsed by the transmission community. The performance-practice module

places students with collaborating cultural enterprises to engage in choreographic development and staged performance. As the modules are delivered sequentially, learners can systematically trace each movement to its originating ritual context.

Every instructional combination and stage work must include a source statement specifying its ritual origin, the nature of any adaptations applied, and the individuals or groups responsible for those adaptations. Source labelling serves solely to document provenance and does not assess or imply authenticity. International safeguarding guidelines affirm that intangible cultural heritage is inherently dynamic and living; criteria of authenticity or exclusivity are neither appropriate nor constructive for its protection (UNESCO, 2015). Consequently, adapted works may continue to draw upon the Panhuang Dance as source material; once properly labelled, they circulate explicitly as interpretations of specific ritual stages rather than representations of the dance in its entirety.

4.3. Return and Evaluation Mechanism: Benefit-Sharing and Three-Chain Indicators

The return mechanism is grounded in the national framework for access and benefit-sharing, and operates through three complementary pathways. Attribution requires that textbooks, theses, and stage works explicitly identify the transmission group and ritual context from which source material is drawn, and recognize inheritors who contribute to the development of teaching combinations as co-authors. Financial return allocates a fixed portion of project funding and performance income to a village ritual fund, dedicated to sustaining ritual practice and supporting *daogong* in apprentice training. Archival return ensures that audio, video, and drum notation generated during ritual study are jointly owned by the transmission group and the educational institution, with physical or digital copies formally returned to the village. Intellectual property rights must be defined through a collaborative, inclusive, continuous, and conclusive process [8].

Evaluation prioritizes the continuity of the ritual layer as its foundational criterion; progress in education or industry chains cannot compensate for deterioration in ritual practice. Indicators span all three chains, with those measuring transmission chain outcomes carrying veto power (Table 2). Their validity will be empirically verified following curriculum implementation, using course tracking, structured interviews, and longitudinal learning records.

Table 2. Evaluation Indicators for the Layered Transmission Mechanism

Chain	Indicators	Data sources
Transmission chain (veto)	Annual rituals held on time; number of apprentices under *daogong* and inheritors; receipt and use of returned funds	Village ritual records; reports of the transmission group
Education chain	Delivery and hours of the three modules; time students spend in ritual study; share of teaching combinations with source statements	Course archives; learning records
Industry chain	Share of stage works with source statements; share of performance income returned to the ritual fund	Performance contracts; financial records

5. Conclusion

The parties involved in Industry–Education Integration (IEI) require the Panhuang Dance at different layers. The transmission chain requires the complete dances performed with the ritual, the education chain requires stylistic movement patterns that train the

body, and the industry chain requires stage works that can be performed repeatedly. Existing collaboration breaks down at three links: the transmission chain enters only through an individual inheritor, material flows out after selection without source labelling, and benefits do not return to the ritual layer. The three links reinforce one another until the staged form becomes the only visible Panhuang Dance. The article therefore proposes three mechanisms: layer-specific leadership, matched modules and benefit return.

This study advances three theoretical contributions. First, the chain-articulation logic commonly applied to IEI lacks an explicit transmission chain when adapted to intangible heritage contexts; unlike innovation frameworks that treat civil society as a driver of novelty, heritage transmission must safeguard existing, practitioner-held knowledge. Second, prevailing distinctions—such as those between first and second existence, or participatory and presentational dance—frame only community-based practice and theatrical performance, overlooking the classroom as a distinct pedagogical layer governed by its own epistemic criteria. Third, stage performance can contribute to ritual preservation only when the stage and ritual layers are enacted by separate actors, enabling a unified analytical framework for seemingly contradictory positions on authenticity and adaptation.

The study has several limitations: the proposed mechanisms were designed prior to curriculum implementation, the core case centers on a single institution, and comparative analysis draws solely on published sources. Once the systematic curriculum is launched, longitudinal research—including course tracking, structured interviews, and learning record analysis—can empirically validate the proposed evaluation indicators for each chain.

Funding: "Layered Transmission of the Hainan Miao Panhuang Dance under Industry–Education Integration: Restoring the Transmission Chain" (Project No.: HKKY2025-16)

References

1. X.-D. Wu, "Hainan Miaozu Panhuang wu de chuancheng yu baohu diaocha" [An investigation into the transmission and safeguarding of the Hainan Miao Panhuang Dance], *Guangxi Minzu Shifan Xueyuan Xuebao* [Journal of Guangxi Normal University for Nationalities], vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 6–11, 2012.
2. Z. Pan, "Wudao shengtaixue xingtai fenxi shiyu xia Hainan Miaozu Panhuang wu de jiaoxue shijian yanjiu" [Teaching practice of the Hainan Miao Panhuang Dance from the perspective of morphological analysis in dance ecology], Master's thesis, Hainan University, 2025.
3. M. Zhang, "Wutai chuangzuo shiyu xia Qiong Miao yu Gui Miao jisi wudao fengge de duibi yanjiu: Yi Panhuang wu he mugu wu wei li" [A comparative study of the sacrificial dance styles of the Hainan and Guizhou Miao from the perspective of stage creation: The Panhuang Dance and the Wooden Drum Dance], Master's thesis, Hainan University, 2019.
4. Q. Mao, "Feiwuzhi wenhua yichan shiyu xia de minzu chuantong wenhua de baohu yu fazhan: Yi Hainan Lizu Miaozu 'Sanyuesan' jie wei li" [The safeguarding and development of ethnic traditional culture from the perspective of intangible cultural heritage: The Sanyuesan Festival of the Hainan Li and Miao], *Wenhua Yichan* [Cultural Heritage], no. 4, pp. 46–52, 2012.
5. M. Zhang, "Lun Hainan Miaozu Panhuang wu de shengcun yu fazhan" [On the survival and development of the Hainan Miao Panhuang Dance], *Yishu Jiaoyu* [Art Education], no. 4, pp. 87–88, 2019.
6. S. Hou and B. Li, "Jiyu chanye ronghe de tiyu wenhua yu tiyu chanye chuangxin fazhan: Yi Hainan Miaozu Panhuang wu tiyu lüyou kaifa moshi yanjiu wei li" [Innovative development of sports culture and the sports industry based on industrial integration: The sports-tourism development model of the Hainan Miao Panhuang Dance], in *Proc. Abstracts First Forum Inheritance Development Traditional Chinese Sports Culture: Thematic Reports (III)*, 2023, pp. 27–28.
7. X.-Y. Wu, "'Shuangjian' beijing xia Hainan Miaozu Panhuang wu jin xiaoyuan lujing yanjiu" [Pathways for bringing the Hainan Miao Panhuang Dance into schools under the "double reduction" policy], *Yishu Daguan* [Art Panorama], no. 32, pp. 127–129, 2022.
8. M. O'Dwyer, R. Filieri, and L. O'Malley, "Establishing successful university–industry collaborations: Barriers and enablers deconstructed," *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 900–931, 2023, doi: 10.1007/s10961-022-09932-2.
9. H. Etzkowitz and L. Leydesdorff, "The dynamics of innovation: From National Systems and 'Mode 2' to a Triple Helix of university–industry–government relations," *Research Policy*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 109–123, 2000.
10. E. G. Carayannis and D. F. J. Campbell, "Developed democracies versus emerging autocracies: Arts, democracy, and innovation in Quadruple Helix innovation systems," *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, vol. 3, Art. no. 12, 2014, doi: 10.1186/s13731-014-0012-2.
11. F. Hoerburger, "Once again: On the concept of 'folk dance'," *Journal of the International Folk Music Council*, vol. 20, pp. 30–32, 1968.

12. A. Nahachewsky, "Participatory and presentational dance as ethnochoreological categories," *Dance Research Journal*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 1995.
13. R. Awasthy, S. Flint, R. Sankarnarayana, and R. L. Jones, "A framework to improve university–industry collaboration," *Journal of Industry-University Collaboration*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 49–62, 2020, doi: 10.1108/JIUC-09-2019-0016.
14. R. Kurin, "Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention: A critical appraisal," *Museum International*, vol. 56, no. 1–2, pp. 66–77, 2004.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of Publisher and/or the editor(s). Publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.