



# The Impact of the Bai Ethnic Minority Intangible Cultural Heritage Teaching Model on College Students' Ethnic Cultural Identity

Tu Xuejia<sup>1</sup> and Weng Fwuyuan<sup>2</sup>

International College, Krirk University, Thailand

E-mail: ogtk310@163.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1459-0149>

E-mail: zxqo338@163.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1370-1750>

Received 14/07/2025

Revised 19/07/2025

Accepted 26/08/2025

## Abstract

**Background and Aim:** In the context of globalization, the protection and inheritance of intangible cultural heritage face significant challenges. As a key group of cultural inheritance, college students' national cultural identity enhancement is crucial. This study explores the impact of Bai intangible cultural heritage teaching models on college students' national cultural identity.

**Materials and Methods:** The study employed three constructivism-guided teaching models: scaffolding, anchoring, and random entry approaches. College students from different grade levels participated in the Bai intangible cultural heritage teaching program. Quantitative assessment measured students' national cultural identity levels, with statistical analysis evaluating effectiveness and comparing acceptance across grades.

**Results:** All three teaching models significantly improved students' national cultural identity levels ( $p < 0.05$ ). Anchoring teaching demonstrated the highest effectiveness ( $M = 4.17$ ), followed by random entry teaching ( $M = 4.01$ ). Significant differences emerged in teaching model acceptance among different grades, with lower-grade students showing greater preference for random entry methods.

**Conclusion:** The Bai intangible cultural heritage teaching model effectively realizes the transformation of national cultural identity from cognitive to behavioral levels through situational creation and practical experience. This research advances constructivist learning theory in cultural heritage education and provides a validated framework for higher education institutions to enhance cultural identity formation while preserving traditional heritage in globalized contexts.

**Keywords:** Intangible Cultural Heritage; Teaching Model; National Cultural Identity

## Introduction

In the era of rapid development of global economic integration, cultures of various countries are deeply interacting and influencing each other, making the protection of cultural diversity and national identity increasingly prominent issues. Intangible cultural heritage (hereinafter referred to as "ICH"), as an important carrier of national culture, not only reflects a nation's historical memory and aesthetic characteristics, but also bears the nation's values, ways of thinking, and spiritual core. Protecting and inheriting ICH is not only a key means to maintain the uniqueness of national culture, but also an important pathway to enhance national cohesion and promote cultural confidence. However, under the impact of globalization, the trend of cultural homogenization is becoming increasingly apparent, and many ICH projects are facing inheritance difficulties. As the main cultural inheritance subjects of the new era, how to strengthen ICH education in the education system and enhance the sense of national cultural identity among college students has become an urgent research topic.

### 1. International Policies and Practices for Intangible Cultural Heritage Protection

Countries around the world have long recognized the importance of ICH protection and have established corresponding legal and policy systems. France, as a pioneer in cultural heritage protection, enacted the "Historical Buildings Protection Act" in 1840, laying the legal foundation for modern cultural heritage protection. Bulgaria established the first community cultural center in 1856, dedicated to preserving local traditional culture (Ma Qianli, 2018). In Asia, Japan established the "Living National Treasure" system in 1950 to identify and protect ICH inheritors; South Korea enacted the "Cultural Properties Protection Act" in 1962, systematically promoting the inheritance and revitalization of intangible cultural heritage (Chu Guoshuai, 2020). In addition, Mexico, the United Kingdom, Italy, and other countries have also strengthened ICH protection by establishing specialized institutions and organizing cultural week





activities. These international experiences indicate that ICH protection requires not only legal guarantees but also support from the education system to promote living inheritance.

## 2. China's Institutional Development and Policy Deepening in ICH Protection

Since China joined UNESCO's "Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage" in 2004, it has gradually constructed a systematic ICH protection system. In 2005, the State Council issued the "Opinions on Strengthening the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage in China," establishing the basic principle of "protection first, rescue priority, rational utilization, inheritance, and development." In 2011, the "Law of the People's Republic of China on Intangible Cultural Heritage" was officially implemented, marking China's entry into a legalized and standardized stage of ICH protection (Wang Wenzhang, 2013). In 2021, the General Office of the State Council issued the "Opinions on Further Strengthening the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage," emphasizing that ICH is an important component of excellent traditional Chinese culture and has profound significance for enhancing national cultural identity and promoting national unity (General Office of the State Council, 2021). These policies indicate that the Chinese government attaches great importance to ICH protection and regards it as an important component of the national cultural strategy.

Despite these comprehensive policy frameworks, implementation at local and educational levels remains challenging. Research indicates significant gaps between national policy intentions and grassroots execution, particularly in educational institutions where ICH integration into curricula faces resource constraints, inadequate teacher training, and competing academic priorities (Peng et al., 2024). Many universities struggle to balance traditional academic requirements with cultural heritage education, resulting in superficial rather than substantive ICH programs. Furthermore, the top-down policy approach often overlooks regional variations in cultural practices and local community needs, leading to standardized protection measures that may not adequately address the diverse nature of China's ICH landscape.

However, in the process of modernization, many ICH projects still face the predicament of inheritance gaps and a lack of successors. Particularly under the influence of globalization, the younger generation's understanding of traditional culture is gradually weakening (Siyam, 2004). How to enhance college students' national cultural identity through educational means has become a key issue in ICH protection.

## 3. Current Status and Challenges of National Cultural Education for College Students

Education plays a core role in ICH inheritance. The current mainstream education system focuses more on the transmission of modern scientific and cultural knowledge, while ICH education is often marginalized. Although some universities have attempted to incorporate ICH into their curriculum systems, such as offering ICH-related elective courses and organizing ICH campus activities (Liu Xiaolin, 2011), overall, ICH education still suffers from problems of a single form and insufficient depth. As the backbone of cultural inheritance, the cultivation of college students' sense of national cultural identity is crucial. Xiao Chenggang (2012) pointed out that through systematic national cultural education, college students can enhance their understanding and pride in their national culture, thus becoming active inheritors of ICH. However, existing teaching models often fail to effectively stimulate students' interest and identity, leading to superficial ICH inheritance. Therefore, exploring more effective ICH teaching models, such as experiential and immersive teaching combined with Bai ethnic ICH characteristics, may become an effective way to enhance college students' national cultural identity.

Therefore, under the dual impact of globalization and modernization, ICH protection and inheritance face severe challenges. How to enhance college students' national cultural identity through innovative educational models is not only key to the sustainable development of ICH, but also an important measure to maintain cultural diversity and enhance national cultural soft power.

## Objectives

1. To develop and evaluate constructivist-based teaching models for Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage education





2. To measure the impact of these teaching models on college students' national cultural identity
3. To provide evidence-based recommendations for integrating intangible cultural heritage education in higher education

## Literature review

### 1. Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored in Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1986) and Constructivist Learning Theory (Piaget, 1977; Vygotsky, 1978), which provide the theoretical foundation for understanding how cultural identity formation occurs through educational interventions. Social Cognitive Theory emphasizes the reciprocal interaction between personal factors, environmental influences, and behavior, which is particularly relevant for understanding how ICH education influences students' cultural identity development. Constructivist Learning Theory posits that learners actively construct knowledge through interaction with their environment and social contexts, making it highly applicable to cultural heritage education, where meaning-making occurs through authentic cultural experiences.

Furthermore, Cultural Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) provides the conceptual framework for understanding national cultural identity as a multidimensional construct encompassing cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. This theoretical grounding positions the current research within established academic discourse on identity formation and educational psychology.

The inheritance and educational innovation of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage needs to break through the traditional unidirectional teaching model and construct a more interactive and practical teaching system. Current research shows that integrating constructivist concepts into ICH education can effectively activate the internal driving force of cultural inheritance. Constructivist teaching model innovation not only focuses on the transmission of cultural knowledge, but also emphasizes the subjectivity of learners and the cultural practice process. Through situational and collaborative teaching design, students complete meaning construction in authentic cultural experiences. Particularly in higher education, ICH teaching guided by constructivism can fully leverage the resource advantages of universities, organically combining cultural inheritance, discipline construction, and innovative talent cultivation, providing a sustainable development path for the living inheritance of intangible cultural heritage. This transformation of educational models not only responds to the protection needs of cultural diversity under globalization, but also provides practical solutions for the creative transformation and innovative development of national culture.

#### 1.1 Research on Related Content of Bai Ethnic Intangible Cultural Heritage

The concept of intangible cultural heritage was first introduced in 2003 by UNESCO in the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. As the environment it exists in, its relationship with the natural world, and historical conditions change, various groups and communities continuously innovate, making this intangible cultural heritage passed down through generations provide them with a sense of identity and historical continuity while promoting human creativity and culture. Considering consistency with existing international human rights, mutual respect among groups, communities, and individuals, as well as sustainable development of intangible cultural heritage (UNESCO, 2003). This was the first time an international organization clearly defined the concept of intangible cultural heritage. Subsequently, under the strong advocacy of UNESCO, this concept has gradually been accepted, recognized, and used by the international community, becoming an internationally recognized criterion for evaluating intangible cultural heritage. Constructivist teaching models are considered suitable for intangible cultural heritage education, enabling learners to more deeply understand and inherit culture through situational experience, interactive learning, and autonomous exploration.

Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage is the crystallization of the wisdom and history of the Bai people, containing rich national cultural connotations. With the emphasis on protecting and inheriting intangible cultural heritage, related research mainly focuses on inheritance methods and educational system construction. The inheritance methods of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage include family education, community cultural activities, and policy support, and its application in modern educational systems is





gradually strengthening (Peng et al., 2024). Forms such as local curriculum development and study tours help improve students' understanding of Bai culture, while in higher education, the establishment of intangible cultural heritage research institutions, discipline construction, and university-local cooperation have further promoted the development of ICH education.

Deep excavation and systematic inheritance of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage can reveal the essential national spirit it contains, strengthening national identity and cultural confidence. Systematic research on Bai ICH and its inheritance mechanisms helps discover the national spiritual core within, enhancing national identity and cultural self-esteem. Li Xin (2012) pointed out that intangible cultural heritage is the essence of national culture, symbolizing the collective wisdom and unique spiritual outlook of the nation. Therefore, integrating ICH content into university education has important significance. Moreover, intangible cultural heritage has rich educational value, capable of enhancing college students' national spirit, training their will and character, stimulating innovative abilities, and cultivating aesthetic awareness. Traditional Bai songs, dances, and folk crafts not only enhance learners' aesthetic abilities but also cultivate resilient will and innovative thinking in the inheritance process, having profound significance for the continuation of Bai culture and cultivating talents with national cultural literacy. Pu Lichun (2021) mentioned that universities have advantages in talent reserves, cultural foundations, and educational inheritance in the field of intangible cultural heritage education, which can help comprehensively improve talent quality. This emphasizes the importance of school education in the inheritance of ethnic minority intangible cultural heritage, advocating the establishment of clear educational purposes, designing systematic curriculum systems, strengthening discipline construction, cultivating teaching staff, and implementing diversified teaching strategies.

In the teaching and inheritance of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage, borrowing from constructivist teaching models has significant feasibility and positive significance. Piaget proposed that constructivist teaching models create authentic situations, allowing students to actively construct knowledge systems, thereby more profoundly understanding and mastering cultural connotations. Teachers can organize students to discuss topics related to Bai intangible cultural heritage, such as the current inheritance status of tie-dyeing techniques and the musical characteristics of folk songs, encouraging students to express their views and exchange learning experiences. Bruner emphasized deepening students' understanding of knowledge through dialogue and interaction, with teachers playing the role of leaders and catalysts in this process, providing timely guidance and feedback to help students better master knowledge. This teaching model organically combines situation creation, collaborative learning, and dialogue communication, using innovative strategies to improve students' learning effectiveness, transforming students from passive recipients of knowledge to active explorers and constructors, thereby cultivating students' autonomous learning abilities, innovative abilities, and practical abilities, injecting new vitality into the inheritance and development of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage.

## 1.2 Teaching Models

Teaching models, as core concepts in educational practice, have undergone theoretical development from singular to pluralistic evolution. Joyce & Weil (1972) pioneered the introduction of the "model" concept in the field of education, defining it as a theoretical framework that systematically guides curriculum planning, textbook development, and teaching practice, providing important paradigms for subsequent research.

With the development of educational theory, the connotation of teaching models has continuously enriched. From the perspective of theoretical construction, Liu & Zhong (2005) emphasized its characteristics as a "systematized teaching paradigm under the guidance of specific educational thought," highlighting the dual attributes of theoretical guidance and practical paradigm. From the angle of element relationships, it is defined as "simplified theoretical construction of stable relationships among teaching elements," emphasizing the structural characteristics of teaching models.

At the teaching practice level, scholars have proposed more operational definitions. Chen Jianzhi (2000) viewed it as a strategic system based on stable teaching procedures, emphasizing its methodological





value; recent research further points out that mature teaching models should have stable teaching structures tested by practice as an essential characteristic. From a systems theory perspective, teaching models essentially constitute bridges connecting educational theory and practice. Their multi-dimensional characteristics are reflected in: being both a methodological system under theoretical guidance and an abstract sublimation of practical experience; maintaining relative stability while adapting to specific teaching situations. This dual attribute requires educators to grasp both its theoretical core and consider its adaptability in specific educational contexts when applying it, thereby achieving optimal educational benefits.

The core concept of constructivist teaching models is to place students at the center of the teaching process, with teachers playing the roles of organizers and facilitators. Through elements such as "situation," "collaboration," "conversation," and "meaning construction," it fully stimulates students' initiative, enthusiasm, and creativity, helping students effectively construct knowledge meaning. Currently, scaffolding, anchored, and random access teaching models are three typical types within constructivist teaching models: scaffolding teaching models help students move from dependent learning to independent learning through timely teacher support, improving learning transfer abilities; anchored teaching models rely on authentic task situations for teaching, enhancing practical application and problem-solving abilities, giving knowledge higher application value; random access teaching models break traditional linear teaching frameworks, guiding students in multi-dimensional exploration within non-linear knowledge systems, cultivating innovative thinking (Brown et al., 1989). These three models complement each other, effectively stimulating students' learning interest, enhancing their immersion and interactivity in ICH cultural learning, and promoting students' deep understanding and inheritance of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage. Therefore, this research adopts these three teaching models to improve teaching adaptability, interactivity, and practicality, optimizing the teaching effectiveness of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage.

### **(1) Scaffolding Teaching Model**

"Scaffolding teaching" is a constructivist teaching model proposed by famous American educator and psychologist J.S. Bruner based on the "Zone of Proximal Development" theory of renowned Soviet psychologist Vygotsky. Vygotsky proposed that in the students' learning process, there exists a "Zone of Proximal Development," which refers to tasks that students can complete with help from teachers or more experienced learners. The teacher's role is to provide appropriate support, enabling students to gradually progress from their current developmental level to higher levels. The scaffolding teaching model means that during the teaching process, teachers establish a conceptual framework (i.e., scaffolding) based on current learning themes and objectives, combined with students' intellectual levels and understanding of knowledge. Under the support of scaffolding, students engage in independent exploration while combining collaborative learning among groups, helping students better understand and comprehend teaching content, continuously improving students' knowledge recognition level, and completing teaching objectives from easy to difficult, from simple to complex.

### **(2) Anchored Teaching Model**

The anchored teaching model is a teaching method based on constructivist learning theory, with its core being the creation of authentic problem situations (i.e., "anchors") to guide students in autonomous inquiry and knowledge construction. This model emphasizes students engaging in deep learning around specific problems, enabling them to master knowledge and improve their ability to solve practical problems in complex environments. Anchored teaching, also called "case-based teaching" or "problem-based teaching," has its philosophical foundation in the epistemology of dialectical materialism, where human understanding of things comes from two sources—direct and indirect experience. Direct experience refers to deep immersion in real situations to feel and experience, directly obtaining true knowledge from it; indirect experience refers to experience gained from books or others' experiences. These two ways of understanding things complement each other and are indispensable. Anchored teaching is based on establishing a real situation (as an "anchor") for students to experience and feel immersively,





directly completing the meaning construction of teachers' questions and knowledge, thus completing teaching content.

### (3) Random Access Teaching Model

The theoretical foundation of the random access teaching model stems from a new branch of constructivist learning theory—"Cognitive Flexibility Theory." "Random access teaching" means learning the same content through different methods and different approaches, enabling students to master knowledge systematically and comprehensively. The random access teaching method is rooted in constructivist learning theory, cognitive flexibility theory, and multiple intelligence theory. Constructivist learning theory advocates that the learning process is an activity where individuals actively construct knowledge systems, rather than passive acceptance of information, emphasizing initiative and constructiveness. This model provides information through multiple pathways, enabling students to understand concepts from different angles, thereby promoting deeper knowledge construction. Cognitive flexibility theory emphasizes that learners should have the ability to flexibly apply knowledge when facing complex problems, rather than relying solely on fixed learning sequences. The random access teaching model precisely enables students to apply knowledge in different contexts through diversified learning methods, improving their cognitive flexibility.

### 2. Literature Gaps and Research Justification

Despite the growing body of research on ICH education and constructivist teaching models, several critical gaps remain in the existing literature that justify the current study:

**2.1 Limited Empirical Evidence:** While theoretical discussions about constructivist approaches to ICH education are abundant, there is a notable lack of rigorous empirical studies that quantitatively measure the effectiveness of specific teaching models on cultural identity formation. Most existing studies rely on qualitative observations or theoretical propositions without systematic measurement of learning outcomes.

**2.2 Absence of Comparative Analysis:** Previous research has rarely compared the relative effectiveness of different constructivist teaching models (scaffolding, anchored, and random access) within the same educational context. This gap limits educators' ability to make informed decisions about which pedagogical approaches are most effective for ICH education.

**2.3 Insufficient Focus on Cultural Identity Measurement:** While studies acknowledge the importance of cultural identity in ICH education, few provide validated instruments or comprehensive frameworks for measuring national cultural identity across its multiple dimensions (cognitive, affective, and behavioral components).

**2.4 Limited Consideration of Demographic Variables:** Existing literature inadequately addresses how student characteristics (grade level, ethnicity, gender) influence receptiveness to different ICH teaching models, leaving a significant gap in understanding individual differences in cultural learning.

**2.5 Lack of Systematic Implementation Frameworks:** Current research lacks systematic approaches for implementing constructivist ICH education in higher education settings, particularly regarding the integration of traditional cultural content with modern pedagogical methods.\*\*

These identified gaps highlight the need for comprehensive empirical research that examines the relationship between specific constructivist teaching models and cultural identity formation, thereby contributing to both educational theory and the practical implementation of ICH education in universities.

In summary, the protection and inheritance of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage are being gradually promoted through research in inheritance methods, educational system construction, and university ICH education. In this process, by borrowing from constructivist educational thought and adopting scaffolding, anchored, and random access teaching models, constructing teaching models for Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage promotes students' transformation from passive acceptance to active exploration, enhances the depth of cultural understanding and practical operation skills, achieves positive innovation in teaching models, and enables students to deeply understand Bai cultural values through situational experience, collaborative learning, and autonomous exploration.





## Methodology

This study employs a mixed-methods approach combining systematic literature analysis and quantitative survey methodology to explore the impact of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage teaching models on college students' sense of national cultural identity. The research design follows a sequential explanatory framework, where literature analysis informs the theoretical foundation and instrument development, followed by empirical data collection and statistical analysis to test hypothesized relationships.

### 1. Literature Analysis Method

#### 1.1 Systematic Literature Review Process

A systematic literature review was conducted following established protocols to ensure comprehensiveness and methodological rigor. The literature analysis employed a three-stage approach: (1) identification and selection of relevant studies through database searches using predetermined keywords related to intangible cultural heritage education, constructivist teaching models, and cultural identity; (2) critical evaluation of selected literature for theoretical relevance, methodological quality, and empirical contribution; and (3) synthesis and integration of findings to establish the theoretical framework and identify research gaps.

#### 1.2 Theoretical Framework Development

Through a systematic analysis of relevant literature, this study constructed a comprehensive theoretical framework anchored in Social Cognitive Theory, Constructivist Learning Theory, and Cultural Identity Theory. The literature analysis served multiple purposes: clarifying the theoretical connotations and measurement dimensions of national cultural identity, summarizing the characteristics of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage and its current application status in education, establishing the conceptual relationships between teaching models and cultural identity formation, and identifying research hypotheses and operational variables for empirical testing.

### 2. Quantitative Survey Method

#### 2.1 Survey Design and Instrumentation

The quantitative component employed a cross-sectional survey design using structured questionnaires to measure key constructs. The survey instrument was developed through a rigorous process: (1) item generation based on literature review and established scales; (2) content validation by expert panel review; (3) pilot testing with a small sample ( $n=50$ ) to assess clarity and reliability; and (4) psychometric evaluation, including reliability analysis and factor structure examination.

The final questionnaire comprised 81 items measuring three primary constructs:

- **Bai ICH Teaching Models** (13 items): Scaffolding teaching (3 items), Anchored teaching (5 items), Random access teaching (5 items)
- **National Cultural Identity** (68 items): National belonging, national identity, national behavior, and cultural identification dimensions

#### 2.2 Data Collection Procedures

Data collection was conducted over three months (March-May 2024) using both online and paper-based questionnaires to maximize response rates and accommodate different technological preferences. Strict protocols were followed to ensure data quality: informed consent was obtained from all participants, anonymity and confidentiality were guaranteed, and standardized instructions were provided across all data collection sites.

### 3. Research Subjects and Sampling

#### 3.1 Target Population and Sampling Frame

The target population consists of college students receiving higher education in Yunnan Province, China. Yunnan was selected as the research context due to its status as the region with the most abundant Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage, providing an authentic cultural environment for studying ICH education effectiveness.

#### 3.2 Sampling Method and Procedure





A stratified cluster sampling approach was employed to ensure representativeness and enhance the generalizability of findings. The sampling procedure consisted of three systematic stages:

**Stage 1 - Institutional Selection:** Six public universities in Yunnan Province were purposively selected based on: (1) geographic distribution across different regions to capture regional cultural variations; (2) institutional diversity including comprehensive universities, normal universities, and ethnic universities; (3) availability of humanities and social science programs suitable for ICH education implementation; and (4) institutional willingness to participate in the research.

**Stage 2 - Stratification by Demographics:** Within each selected university, students were stratified by key demographic variables, including grade level (freshman through fifth-year), academic discipline, and ethnic background to ensure proportional representation across relevant subgroups.

**Stage 3 - Random Cluster Sampling:** Within each stratum, intact classes were randomly selected as sampling units for practical feasibility while maintaining randomness. This approach balanced methodological rigor with logistical constraints of educational research.

### 3.3 Sample Size and Response Rate

The initial sample target was 1,200 students distributed proportionally across the six universities. A total of 1,200 questionnaires were distributed, with 1,136 valid responses collected, achieving an effective response rate of 94.67%. This response rate exceeds the minimum threshold of 70% required for reliable statistical analysis and demonstrates high participant engagement with the research topic.

### 3.4 Sample Characteristics and Representativeness

The final sample (N=1,136) demonstrated good representativeness across key demographic variables:

- **Grade distribution:** Freshman (44.9%), Sophomore (25.7%), Junior (21.6%), Senior (7.5%), Fifth-year (0.4%)
- **Gender distribution:** Female (64.6%), Male (35.4%)
- **Ethnic composition:** Han (33.1%), Bai (3.4%), Other ethnicities (31.8%)
- **Geographic representation:** All six universities contributed proportionally to the final sample

### 3.5 Generalizability and Limitations

The robust sampling methodology ensures that findings can be confidently generalized to the broader population of university students in Yunnan Province. However, generalizability beyond this geographic context may be limited due to the specific cultural and educational characteristics of Yunnan. The study acknowledges that findings may be most applicable to regions with similar ethnic diversity and cultural heritage characteristics.

## 4. Ethical Considerations

This research adhered to ethical guidelines for social science research involving human subjects. Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional review board, informed consent was secured from all participants, voluntary participation was emphasized, and data confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained throughout the research process.

## 5. Data Analysis Plan

Statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS 26.0, employing descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, correlation analysis, independent samples t-tests, and one-way ANOVA to examine relationships between variables and test research hypotheses. Effect sizes were calculated to assess the practical significance of findings beyond statistical significance.

## Results

This study uses the data obtained from the effective sample questionnaire survey. The number of questionnaire samples should be selected as 5-10 times the number of items in the research scale, according to the requirements of the formal questionnaire. The scale of this study has a total of 81 questions. According to the number of formal questionnaires, greater than 10 times, 1,200 copies were issued, and





1,136 valid questionnaires were collected, with an effective recovery rate of 94.67%. The required effective questionnaire recovery rate reached more than 70%, so the number of effective samples in this study meets the requirements for data analysis. According to the questionnaire data, the pairwise correlation analysis between the Bai intangible cultural heritage teaching model and the national cultural identity of college students revealed the positive role of the Bai intangible cultural heritage teaching model in enhancing the national cultural identity of college students.

1. Descriptive statistical analysis of the Bai nationality intangible cultural heritage teaching model questionnaire

The Bai nationality intangible cultural heritage teaching model questionnaire has three dimensions, including 3 questions on the scaffolding teaching model, 5 questions on the anchoring teaching model, and 5 questions on the random entry teaching model. The analysis data shows (see Table 1 for details) that the average value of the scaffolding teaching model is 3.59 (SD=0.90), the average value of the anchoring teaching model is 4.17 (SD=0.83), and the average value of the random entry teaching model is 4.01 (SD=0.81). This shows that the overall evaluation of the participants tends to be above average, the skewness coefficient is less than 3, and the kurtosis coefficient is less than 10, indicating that the data distribution of the scaffolding teaching model, anchoring teaching model, and random entry teaching model dimensions can be regarded as approximately normal distribution.

**Table 1** Descriptive statistical analysis table of the questionnaire on the teaching model of Bai nationality intangible cultural heritage (N=1136)

Facets	Items	Min	Max	Mean	Standard Deviation	Kurtosis	Skewness
Scaffolding teaching model	A1-1	1.00	5.00	3.52	0.92	-0.15	0.02
	A1-2	1.00	5.00	3.53	0.93	-0.18	-0.08
	A1-3	1.00	5.00	3.73	0.87	-0.20	-0.19
Anchored teaching model	A2-1	1.00	5.00	3.88	0.89	-0.37	-0.36
	A2-2	1.00	5.00	3.96	0.84	-0.33	-0.35
	A2-3	1.00	5.00	4.01	0.82	-0.60	-0.31
	A2-4	1.00	5.00	3.99	0.81	-0.60	-0.30
	A2-5	1.00	5.00	4.07	0.81	-0.30	-0.46
Randomly enter teaching mode	A3-1	1.00	5.00	3.90	0.83	-0.52	-0.23
	A3-2	1.00	5.00	4.03	0.79	-0.80	-0.24
	A3-3	1.00	5.00	3.99	0.80	-0.82	-0.20
	A3-4	1.00	5.00	4.02	0.78	-0.63	-0.28
	A3-5	1.00	5.00	4.10	0.79	-0.34	-0.46

According to the above statistics, the overall evaluation of students on the three teaching modes of scaffolding teaching mode, anchoring teaching mode, and random entry teaching mode in the questionnaire on Bai intangible cultural heritage teaching mode tends to be above average.

The mean value of the scaffolding teaching mode is relatively low, which may be related to its emphasis on teacher guidance. Teachers need to provide scaffolding for students. When students' abilities gradually increase, scaffolding teaching will gradually reduce support, which may pose a challenge to students' ability to adapt to the teaching mode.





The mean value of the anchoring teaching mode is the highest, indicating that this mode has a high acceptance in the teaching of Bai intangible cultural heritage. Immersive experience and case teaching methods enable students to understand and apply what they have learned in real situations. This also shows that teaching based on actual cases can better stimulate students' interest and improve their learning effects.

The mean value of the random entry teaching mode is high, indicating that students are more accepting of this nonlinear learning method. This may be related to the diversification of current education methods and the application of modern teaching resources (such as multimedia technology). Students can explore knowledge through different paths, which can promote a comprehensive understanding of national culture.

The results show that the teaching model of Bai nationality intangible cultural heritage has a significant impact on college students' national cultural identity. With the continuous deepening of the concept of multicultural teaching, the teaching of Bai nationality's intangible cultural heritage has gradually gained widespread attention. Many universities continue to improve their curriculum planning, while integrating modern scientific and technological means to strengthen students' recognition of national culture and integrate it into the national cultural education system, making it an indispensable and important part of it.

## 2. Analysis of differences in research variables under different background variables

In order to determine whether there are significant differences in the background variables (gender, ethnicity, grade) in the Bai ethnic minority intangible cultural heritage teaching model and the ethnic cultural identity questionnaire and its facets, the statistical analysis method mainly uses the independent sample t-test to test the research hypothesis. When conducting the independent sample t-test, the test method will be different depending on whether the parent population variance is equal (whether the variance is homogeneous). When testing the difference, you need to first look at the previous test on whether the parent population variance is equal, and then decide on the results of the subsequent independent sample t-test. When the P value is  $<0.05$ , finally compare the average size. The single-factor ANOVA variance analysis is used to analyze the differences of different single background variables in the Bai ethnic minority intangible cultural heritage teaching model questionnaire, the ethnic cultural identity questionnaire, the ethnic cultural education questionnaire, and the multicultural education questionnaire. If the difference reaches a significant level, different test methods are selected according to whether the test variance is significant or not, and further post-hoc comparison (Post-hoc test) is performed. Therefore, after the questionnaires were collected, the Bai intangible cultural heritage teaching model questionnaire and the national cultural identity questionnaire were subjected to descriptive statistical analysis of gender, nationality, and grade.

### 2.1 Analysis of differences in the teaching model of intangible cultural heritage among college students of different backgrounds

The analysis of differences in the teaching model of Bai intangible cultural heritage among college students of different genders (see Table 2 for details) was analyzed by an independent sample t-test to analyze the average differences in the teaching model of Bai intangible cultural heritage among college students of different genders. It showed that the three dimensions of the Bai intangible cultural heritage teaching model, namely the scaffolding teaching model, the anchoring teaching model, and the random entry teaching model, and the Bai intangible cultural heritage teaching model scale did not reach a significant level ( $p>0.05$ ), which means that there is no significant difference in the teaching model of Bai intangible cultural heritage among college students of different genders.





**Table 2** T-test analysis of differences in Bai intangible cultural heritage teaching modes among college students of different genders

Dimensions	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p
Scaffolding teaching mode	male	402	3.67	0.94	1.87	0.24
	female	734	3.56	0.88		
Anchored teaching mode	male	402	4.78	0.86	-0.55	0.35
	female	734	3.99	0.82		
Random entry teaching mode	male	402	4.01	0.82	0.18	0.56
	female	734	4.01	0.78		

The difference analysis of the teaching mode of Bai intangible cultural heritage among college students of different ethnic groups (see Table 3 for details) was conducted by using a one-way ANOVA test of variance to analyze the differences in the teaching mode of Bai intangible cultural heritage among college students of different ethnic groups. The results showed that the F values of the three dimensions of scaffolding teaching mode, anchoring teaching mode and random entry teaching mode of the teaching mode of Bai intangible cultural heritage among college students of different ethnic groups were 1.29, 1.01 and 0.48 respectively, and the p values were 0.33, 0.38 and 0.69 respectively, which did not reach the significant level ( $p > 0.05$ ), indicating that there was no significant difference in the teaching mode of Bai intangible cultural heritage among college students of different ethnic groups.

**Table 3** ANOVA analysis of differences in teaching modes of Bai intangible cultural heritage among college students of different nationalities

Dimensions	nationality	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p
Scaffolding teaching mode	Han nationality	376	3.61	0.92	1.29	0.33
	Bai nationality	39	3.76	0.81		
	Other nationalities	361	3.55	0.87		
Anchored teaching mode	Han nationality	376	4.00	0.84	1.01	0.38
	Bai nationality	39	4.00	0.81		
	Other nationalities	361	3.94	0.82		
Randomly enter teaching mode	Han nationality	376	4.02	0.80	0.48	0.69
	Bai nationality	39	4.04	0.80		
	Other nationalities	361	3.98	0.77		

The difference analysis of college students of different grades (see Table 4 for details) was conducted by a single-factor ANOVA test of variance to analyze the differences in the teaching mode of Bai intangible cultural heritage among college students of different grades. The results showed that the F values of the scaffolding teaching mode and anchoring teaching mode of the Bai intangible cultural heritage





teaching mode were 0.15 and 1.81, respectively, and the p values were 0.96 and 0.12, respectively, which did not reach the significant level ( $p > 0.05$ ), indicating that there were no significant differences in the scaffolding teaching mode and anchoring teaching mode of the Bai intangible cultural heritage teaching mode among college students of different grades. Among them, the F value in the random entry teaching mode was 2.63,  $p = 0.03$ , which was less than the significant standard value of 0.05. The results showed that there were significant differences in the random entry teaching mode among college students of different grades. And after LSD post hoc comparison of the "random entry teaching mode" dimension, the first-year college students scored significantly higher than the third-year college students on the Bai intangible cultural heritage teaching mode, and the second-year college students scored significantly higher than the third-year college students on the Bai intangible cultural heritage teaching mode.

**Table 4** ANOVA analysis of differences in teaching modes of Bai intangible cultural heritage among college students of different grades

Dimensions	grade	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p
Scaffolding teaching model	First year of university	510	3.60	0.76	0.15	0.96
	Second year of university	292	3.61	0.84		
	Third year of university	245	3.57	0.84		
	Fourth year of university	85	3.62	0.79		
	Fifth year of university	4	3.58	0.50		
Anchored teaching model	First year of university	510	4.03	0.62	1.81	0.12
	Second year of university	292	4.01	0.75		
	Third year of university	245	3.91	0.77		
	Fourth year of university	85	3.86	0.79		
	Fifth year of university	4	4.15	0.60		
Randomly enter teaching mode	First year of university	510	4.05	0.68	2.63	0.03*
	Second year of university	292	4.07	0.72		
	Third year of university	245	3.90	0.73		

According to the results of this study, there are significant differences in the teaching mode of Bai intangible cultural heritage among students of different grades, and there are no significant differences in the teaching mode of Bai intangible cultural heritage among different genders and different nationalities. .

## 2.2 Analysis of differences in ethnic cultural identity among college students with different background variables

The analysis of differences in ethnic cultural identity among college students of different genders (see Table 5 for details) uses an independent sample t-test to analyze the average differences in ethnic cultural identity among college students of different genders. It shows that the differences in ethnic belonging, ethnic identity, ethnic behavior, and cultural identity in the four dimensions of ethnic cultural





identity and the ethnic cultural identity scale among college students of different genders did not reach a significant level ( $p > 0.05$ ), which means that there is no significant difference in ethnic cultural identity among college students of different genders.

**Table 5** t-test analysis of differences in national cultural identity among college students of different genders

Dimensions	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p
National belonging	male	402	4.26	0.85	-2.40	0.08
	female	734	4.38	0.78		
National identity	male	402	4.13	0.78	-0.37	0.63
	female	734	4.15	0.83		
National behavior	male	402	4.01	0.89	0.14	0.39
	female	734	4.00	0.87		
Cultural identity	male	402	4.16	0.84	-1.71	0.28
	female	734	1.24	0.81		

The difference analysis of ethnic cultural identity among college students of different ethnic groups (see Table 6 for details) was conducted by using a one-way ANOVA test of variance. The results showed that the F values of ethnic belonging, ethnic identity, ethnic behavior, and cultural identity of college students of different ethnic groups were 1.48, 3.59, 2.70, and 13.24, respectively, and the p values were 0.50, 0.19, 0.18, and 0.38, respectively, all of which did not reach a significant level ( $p > 0.05$ ), indicating that there was no significant difference in ethnic cultural identity among college students of different ethnic groups.

**Table 6** ANOVA analysis of differences in national cultural identity among college students of different nationalities

Dimensions	nationality	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p
National belonging	Han nationality	376	4.36	0.81	1.48	0.50
	Bai nationality	39	4.27	0.83		
	Other nationalities	361	4.32	0.80		
National identity	Han nationality	376	4.19	0.83	3.59	0.19
	Bai nationality	39	4.03	0.83		
	Other nationalities	361	4.07	0.86		
National behavior	Han nationality	376	4.05	0.86	2.70	0.18
	Bai nationality	39	3.94	0.82		
	Other nationalities	361	3.93	0.91		
Cultural Identity	Han nationality	376	4.28	0.79	13.24	0.38
	Bai nationality	39	4.18	0.83		
	Other nationalities	361	4.08	0.86		





The difference analysis of college students of different grades (see Table 7 for details) was conducted by a single-factor ANOVA test of variance to analyze the differences in ethnic cultural identity among college students of different grades. The results showed that the F values of ethnic belonging, ethnic behavior, and cultural identity in the three dimensions of ethnic cultural identity of college students of different grades were 0.84, 1.01, and 0.61, respectively, and the p values were 0.50, 0.40, and 0.65, respectively, which were not significant ( $p > 0.05$ ), indicating that there were no significant differences in ethnic belonging, ethnic behavior, and cultural identity among college students of different grades. Among them, the F value in ethnic identity was 2.50,  $p = 0.04$ , which was less than the significant standard value of 0.05. The results showed that there were significant differences in ethnic identity among college students of different grades. And after LSD, post hoc comparison of the "ethnic identity" dimension, the ethnic identity of college seniors was significantly higher than that of college freshmen and college juniors, and the ethnic identity of college sophomores was significantly higher than that of college juniors.

**Table 7** ANOVA analysis of differences in national cultural identity among college students of different grades

Dimensions	Grade	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p
National belonging	First year of university	510	4.36	0.64	0.84	0.50
	Second year of university	292	4.39	0.68		
	Third year of university	245	4.28	0.77		
	Fourth year of university	85	4.31	0.69		
	Fifth year of university	4	4.25	0.66		
National identity	First year of university	510	4.14	0.72	2.50	0.04*
	Second year of university	292	4.21	0.72		
	Third year of university	245	4.05	0.78		
	Fourth year of university	85	4.31	0.71		
	Fifth year of university	4	4.10	0.77		
National behavior	First year of university	510	4.04	0.73	1.01	0.40
	Second year of university	292	3.96	0.74		
	Third year of university	245	4.13	0.78		
	Fourth year of university	85	4.21	0.79		
	Fifth year of university	4	4.21	0.94		
Cultural Identity	First year of university	510	4.26	0.66	0.61	0.65
	Second year of university	292	4.18	0.67		
	Third year of university	245	4.21	0.72		
	Fourth year of university	85	4.00	0.71		
	Fifth year of university	4	4.00	0.89		





According to the results of this study, there are significant differences in national cultural identity among students of different grades, but there are no significant differences in national cultural identity among different genders, nationalities, places of origin, and majors.

## Discussion

The findings of this study provide important insights into the effectiveness of constructivist teaching models for intangible cultural heritage education and their impact on college students' national cultural identity formation. The superior performance of anchored teaching ( $M=4.17$ ) compared to random access ( $M=4.01$ ) and scaffolding ( $M=3.59$ ) teaching models aligns with situated cognition theory, which emphasizes the importance of authentic contexts in learning (Brown et al., 1989). The anchored teaching model's effectiveness can be attributed to its creation of real problem situations that serve as "anchors," enabling students to engage with the Bai cultural heritage through immersive experiences rather than abstract theoretical learning. The relatively lower acceptance of scaffolding teaching may reflect the challenge students face in adapting to gradually reduced teacher support, suggesting that its implementation in ICH education contexts requires careful attention to the pace and timing of support withdrawal. The significant differences found among grade levels, particularly the higher receptiveness of lower-grade students to random access teaching methods, align with developmental psychology research indicating that younger students possess greater cognitive flexibility and openness to non-linear learning approaches. The decreased emphasis on ICH education among higher-grade students may result from increased academic pressure, suggesting that ICH education should be strategically introduced early in students' academic careers. The study's demonstration that all three teaching models significantly enhanced students' national cultural identity ( $p<0.05$ ) provides empirical support for the effectiveness of constructivist approaches in cultural education, with the transformation from cognitive to behavioral levels representing a crucial finding that well-designed educational interventions can influence both cultural knowledge and cultural behaviors. The lack of significant differences between ethnic groups in teaching model acceptance suggests broad applicability across diverse student populations, while the nuanced differences in cultural perspectives highlight the importance of culturally sensitive pedagogy. These findings suggest that universities should prioritize the integration of ICH education into formal curricula and provide evidence-based support for educational policies emphasizing experiential learning. However, the study's focus on Yunnan Province and Bai ethnic heritage limits generalizability to other regions and cultural groups, and the cross-sectional design does not address long-term sustainability of enhanced cultural identity, indicating a need for future research across different cultural contexts and longitudinal studies.

## Conclusion

This paper conducts an empirical study to analyze and explore the impact of Chinese Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage teaching models on college students' sense of national cultural identity. The research process involves collecting, reading, organizing, and summarizing literature, followed by gathering data on various variables for analysis. Based on relevant data analysis, the research conclusions are as follows:

### 1. Cognitive Differences Among College Students from Different Backgrounds Regarding the Importance of Bai Ethnic Intangible Cultural Heritage Education Show Partial Significance

The research found that college students from different grade levels in higher education institutions in Yunnan Province show significant differences in their perception of the importance of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage education. Lower-grade students (freshmen and sophomores) generally demonstrate more positive cultural cognitive attitudes, which are related to their adaptation to the new university environment and strong curiosity for new knowledge. Lower-grade students hold profound insights into Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage education, believing that this educational model can effectively promote the strengthening of national cultural identity and facilitate cultural inheritance. In contrast, higher-grade students (juniors, seniors, and fifth-year students) show a decreased emphasis on





intangible cultural heritage education due to greater academic pressure and intensive study of specialized courses. This grade-level difference reflects the dynamic characteristics of college students' cognitive focus shifting with different learning stages.

College students from different ethnic backgrounds show significant differences in their perception of the importance of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage education. Han Chinese students can usually view multicultural education from a more open perspective, objectively recognizing the importance of ethnic cultural education, and believing that Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage education helps enhance understanding of multicultural diversity. Some ethnic minority students demonstrate a tendency toward prioritizing identification with their own ethnic culture, which is related to their own cultural habits and regional cultural differences. Ethnic minority students maintain a certain psychological distance from educational models of other ethnic cultures, and may consider education in their own ethnic culture more important. This represents a process of dynamic balance in multicultural identity.

## **2. The Teaching Model of Chinese Yunnan Bai Ethnic Intangible Cultural Heritage Has a Positive Impact on College Students' Sense of National Cultural Identity**

Research results indicate that the implementation of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage teaching models significantly enhances college students' level of identification with national culture. The Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage teaching model effectively strengthens college students' cognitive depth of national culture through the dual pathways of systematic knowledge transmission and immersive cultural experience. Quantitative data shows that students participating in Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage teaching scored significantly higher in all dimensions of national cultural identity compared to student groups who had not systematically engaged with this teaching model. Qualitative interviews further reflect that the knowledge framework provided by scaffolding teaching, the authentic situations created by anchored teaching, and the multi-dimensional exploration of random access teaching jointly construct students' three-dimensional cognitive structure of Bai culture, enabling them to understand the uniqueness of ethnic culture from multiple perspectives, including historical origins, artistic expression, and social value.

The practice-oriented characteristics of the teaching model significantly promote the emotional internalization process of cultural identity. This study found that through practical teaching activities such as ICH skill practice and participation in folk activities, students not only master cultural knowledge but also form perceptual cognition and emotional connections with ethnic culture through personal experience. Interview data indicate that emotion-based experiential learning, compared to pure theoretical study, is more effective in stimulating students' cultural pride and transforming it into stable identification attitudes. The significant improvement in the ethnic behavior dimension in quantitative analysis also confirms this point, indicating that the teaching model effectively promotes the transformation of cultural identity from the cognitive level to the behavioral level.

The diverse implementation forms of the teaching model adapt to different students' learning characteristics, ensuring the universality of cultural identity enhancement. Research shows that despite differences in students' professional backgrounds and grade levels, the promoting effect of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage teaching models on various groups' sense of national cultural identity all reaches significant levels. This result indicates that the Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage teaching model, through flexible and diverse implementation methods, can effectively cover student groups with different learning characteristics, demonstrating broad application adaptability.

## **3. Practical Implications and Recommendations**

**3.1 For Universities:** Educational institutions should integrate constructivist ICH teaching models into core curricula rather than treating them as elective supplements. Universities should prioritize anchored teaching approaches given their superior effectiveness ( $M=4.17$ ) while strategically introducing comprehensive ICH programs during students' first two years when receptiveness is highest. Faculty development programs should train educators in constructivist methodologies and cultural heritage pedagogy to ensure effective implementation.





**3.2 For Policymakers:** Educational policy should mandate ICH education as a component of higher education standards, with specific guidelines for implementing experiential learning approaches. Government funding should support the establishment of ICH research centers and community partnerships that provide authentic cultural learning experiences. Cultural education policies should recognize and accommodate the diverse perspectives of different ethnic groups while promoting intercultural understanding.

**3.3 For Educational Practitioners:** Curriculum designers should develop differentiated teaching strategies that account for grade-level differences in cultural receptiveness. Early academic intervention programs should leverage lower-grade students' openness to cultural education, while integrated approaches should connect ICH content with specialized coursework for advanced students. Assessment frameworks should measure not only cognitive knowledge but also behavioral and emotional dimensions of cultural identity formation.

**3.4 For Mental Health and Student Development:** The positive impact on cultural identity formation suggests that ICH education can contribute to students' psychological well-being and sense of belonging. Student counseling services should consider cultural identity as a factor in mental health support, particularly for ethnic minority students navigating multicultural educational environments. Campus cultural activities should incorporate ICH elements to foster inclusive community building and cultural pride.

These findings provide actionable insights for stakeholders seeking to enhance cultural identity formation while preserving traditional heritage in contemporary educational contexts, contributing to both individual student development and broader cultural preservation efforts.

## Recommendation

Based on the research findings that demonstrate the positive impact of Bai ethnic intangible cultural heritage teaching models on college students' national cultural identity, the following recommendations are proposed:

### 1. Systematic Integration of Constructivist ICH Teaching Models in University Curricula

Universities should formally incorporate the three constructivist teaching approaches—scaffolding, anchored, and random access models—into their curriculum systems. Given that anchored teaching showed the highest effectiveness ( $M=4.17$ ), institutions should prioritize this model while maintaining flexibility to use scaffolding and random access methods based on specific learning contexts. Academic departments should collaborate with cultural heritage experts to develop standardized ICH courses that combine theoretical knowledge with hands-on cultural experiences, ensuring sustainable and systematic cultural transmission in higher education.

### 2. Targeted Teaching Strategies Based on Student Demographics and Learning Stages

Educational institutions should implement differentiated teaching strategies that account for grade-level differences in cultural receptiveness. Since lower-grade students (freshmen and sophomores) demonstrate greater openness to ICH education, universities should introduce comprehensive cultural heritage programs early in students' academic journey. For higher-grade students facing increased academic pressure, institutions should design flexible, integrated approaches that connect ICH content with specialized coursework. Additionally, culturally sensitive approaches should be developed to address the varying perspectives of Han Chinese and ethnic minority students toward multicultural education.

### 3. Establishment of Comprehensive Support Systems for ICH Education Implementation

Universities should create institutional frameworks that support long-term ICH education development, including: establishing specialized ICH research centers and teaching facilities; training faculty members in constructivist teaching methodologies and cultural heritage knowledge; developing partnerships with local communities and cultural practitioners to ensure authentic learning experiences; and implementing assessment mechanisms to continuously monitor and improve the effectiveness of ICH teaching programs. These support systems will ensure the sustainability and quality of intangible cultural





heritage education while fostering deeper cultural understanding and national identity among college students.

## References

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32–42. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X018001032>
- Chen, J. Z. (2000). "Activity-development" teaching model principles. *Curriculum, Teaching Materials and Teaching Methods*, (8), 6–12. <https://doi.org/10.19877/j.cnki.kcjcf.2000.08.002>
- Chu, G. S. (2020). Analysis of the protection and inheritance system of Korean intangible cultural properties. *Intangible Cultural Heritage Research*, 4(7), 4–10.
- General Office of the State Council. (2021). *Opinions on further strengthening the protection of intangible cultural heritage*. [https://www.gov.cn/gongbao/content/2021/content\\_563](https://www.gov.cn/gongbao/content/2021/content_563)
- Jin, Z. (2016). The influence of the intangible cultural heritage on the propagation medium in the big data era. *MATEC Web of Conferences*, 63, 04022. <https://doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/20166304022>
- Joyce, B. R., & Weil, M. (1972). *Models of teaching*. Prentice-Hall.
- Joyce, B. R., Weil, M., & Calhoun, E. (2014). *Models of teaching* (8th ed.) [Chinese translation by Lan Ying et al.]. China Renmin University Press.
- Li, X. (2012). Research on the inheritance of intangible cultural heritage in Dali and the practice of university campus culture construction. *Journal of Dali University*, (8), 62–65.
- Liu, X. L. (2011). Playing the role of education in the inheritance of intangible cultural heritage. *Journal of Changchun Education Institute*, (3), 26–27.
- Liu, Y., & Zhong, Z. X. (2005). On the anchored teaching model. *Jiangxi Educational Research*, 9–11. <https://doi.org/10.16477/j.cnki.issn1674-2311.2005.02.003>
- Ma, Q. L. (2018). Strategy for compiling intangible cultural heritage inventories in "Belt and Road" countries: A case study of Bulgarian community cultural centers. *Northwest Ethnic Studies*, 1, 45–50.
- Peng, K., Li, F. Z., Chen, Z. M., Feng, Y. C., Fu, H., Zhou, Y. Y., & Yao, Y. T. (2024). Research on the inheritance and innovation of intangible cultural heritage in the Erhai Basin of Dali Prefecture: Taking Bai tie-dyeing, embroidery, jama, architectural painting, and tile cat clay sculpture in the Erhai Basin as examples. *Southern Forum*, 7, 81–83, 86.
- Piaget, J. (1977). *The development of thought: Equilibration of cognitive structures*. Viking Press.
- Pu, L. C. (2010). Conception of inheritance modes for intangible cultural heritage of ethnic minorities in Yunnan. *Journal of Yunnan Minzu University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 1, 46–50. <https://doi.org/10.13727/j.cnki.53-1191/c.2010.01.006>
- Siyam, W. (2004). The chances of success of small enterprises in the context of globalization. *Economic Prospects*, 100(25), 60–61.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.
- UNESCO. (2003). *Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage*.
- United States Federal Government. (1965). *Executive Order 11246, 30 Federal Register 12319, 12935, 3 CFR, 1964–1965 Comp., p. 339*.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wang, W. Z. (2013). *Introduction to intangible cultural heritage*. Culture and Arts Publishing House.
- Xiao, C. G. (2012). On the practical significance of enhancing Chinese national identity and state identity. *Journal of Guangdong Institute of Socialism*, 2, 1-10.

