ISSN 3109-0427
Scientific English, Vol. 1, No. 2, 2025, pp. 97-107

The relevance of Tremaine McDowell's "Time and the Colleges" and "The Minnesota Program": Indonesian academics' commentary on American studies education model

Rifka Pratama[1,2*], Fajrul Falah[3,4], Eko Heriyanto[5] and Pramod Kumar Singh[6]

[1] Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Diponegoro, **Indonesia**
[2] Department of American Studies, Faculty of Cultural Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada, **Indonesia**
[3] Department of Indonesian Literature, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Diponegoro, **Indonesia**
[4] Department of Humanities, Faculty of Cultural Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada, **Indonesia**
[5] Department of English Education, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Humanities, Universitas Muhammadiyah Semarang, **Indonesia**
[6] Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Faculty of Students Welfare, Sharda University, **India**

*Corresponding Author: pratamarifka@live.undip.ac.id

Received: 28 June 2025; *Revised:* 25 September 2025; *Accepted:* 14 October 2025

https://doi.org/10.58712/se.v1i2.124

Abstract: American Studies has historically emphasized interdisciplinary inquiry as a means of integrating cultural, social, and historical perspectives within higher education. One of the foundational contributions to this tradition is Tremaine McDowell's American Studies (1948), particularly the chapters "Time and the Colleges" and "The Minnesota Program," which propose the integration of past, present, and future as a core educational principle. This article presents a qualitative conceptual analysis of McDowell's pedagogical framework, examining its relevance and adaptability within the context of Indonesian American Studies education. Drawing on close textual analysis of McDowell's writings and selected foundational literature in American Studies, the study identifies key themes including temporal integration, interdisciplinarity, experiential learning, and curriculum flexibility. The findings indicate that McDowell's framework remains conceptually valuable for promoting holistic learning and interdisciplinary collaboration, while also revealing limitations related to contextual differences between mid-twentieth-century American higher education and contemporary Indonesian academic settings. This study suggests that future research may extend this conceptual analysis through empirical investigation of curriculum implementation, classroom practices, and student learning outcomes, as well as comparative studies across non-Western American Studies programs. Such research would further clarify the applicability of classical American Studies frameworks in diverse educational contexts.

Keywords: American studies; Tremaine McDowell; time integration; Indonesian academics

1. Introduction

American Studies has long been recognized as an interdisciplinary field committed to understanding complex cultural, social, and historical phenomena by bridging multiple academic disciplines. Since its formal articulation in the mid-twentieth century, the field has sought to transcend the limitations of disciplinary silos in order to explore the multifaceted dimensions of national identity, ideology, and cultural narrative (Williams, 2011). This ethos of interdisciplinarity has positioned American Studies as a distinctive domain in the humanities and social sciences, one that insists on the integration of diverse methodological and epistemological orientations.

One of the foundational theorists in this integrative tradition was Tremaine McDowell, whose influential work American Studies: An Introduction to the Humanities (1948) articulated visionary ideas about the temporal and disciplinary organization of academic inquiry. In the chapter "Time and the Colleges," McDowell argued for the integration of past, present, and future as essential dimensions of knowledge rather than treating them as isolated categories. He maintained that an exclusive focus on any single temporal orientation leads to incomplete understanding and reinforces disciplinary fragmentation (McDowell, 1948). In "The Minnesota Program," McDowell further illustrated how such integrative principles could be institutionalized through curriculum design, collaborative scholarship, and experiential learning practices within higher education. While McDowell's work is rooted in the historical context of mid-twentieth-century American higher education, his emphasis on interdisciplinarity and holistic temporality has remained a point of reference throughout the field's development. Foundational overviews of American Studies have continued to cite McDowell's contributions as emblematic of the discipline's early intellectual commitments (Karaganis, 2001; Williams, 2011). At the same time, much of the scholarly conversation around these ideas remains situated within a United States–centric framework, with limited engagement in reframing or reinterpreting McDowell's pedagogical vision in non-Western academic contexts.

This limitation is especially apparent in the case of Indonesian American Studies education, where the discipline has evolved under distinct institutional and cultural conditions. Within Indonesia, McDowell's ideas are often referenced as part of classical theoretical foundations, but systematic reflection on the relevance, adaptation, and limitations of his framework remains sparse. Concurrently, scholarly dialogues in American Studies have expanded to include comparative and global perspectives that challenge parochial approaches and emphasize the need to contextualize canonical theories across diverse intellectual environments (Cohn & Guterl, 2010; Stewart-Winter, 2015). These perspectives underscore the importance of revisiting early theoretical constructs, such as McDowell's, in ways that are responsive to non-Western academic traditions and educational challenges.

In response to this need, the present article offers a qualitative conceptual commentary on McDowell's framework from the perspective of Indonesian academics and doctoral researchers. The study aims to examine the continued relevance of McDowell's integration of temporal dimensions and his Minnesota Program as a model for interdisciplinary education, while critically reflecting on how these ideas resonate with and diverge from contemporary higher education priorities in Indonesia. Adopting a close textual analysis of McDowell's work and relevant secondary literature, this article situates his pedagogical vision within broader discussions of interdisciplinarity, curriculum design, and the role of experiential learning in American Studies curricula (Dubrow, 2011).

2. Methods

2.1 Research design

This study adopts a qualitative conceptual research design, employing critical textual analysis as its primary methodological approach. Rather than generating empirical data through surveys or experiments, the study focuses on the systematic interpretation of foundational texts and scholarly literature in order to examine theoretical concepts and pedagogical models within American Studies. Such an approach is appropriate for research that aims to reassess classical theoretical frameworks and explore their relevance across different educational and cultural contexts.

2.2 Data sources

The primary source of analysis is Tremaine McDowell's seminal work American Studies (1948), with particular attention given to the chapters "Time and the Colleges" and "The Minnesota Program." These

texts were selected because they articulate McDowell's core ideas on temporal integration, interdisciplinarity, and curriculum design, which constitute the central focus of this study. Secondary sources consist of peer-reviewed scholarly works on American Studies, interdisciplinarity, education, and experiential learning published more than ten years ago. These sources were selected to ensure historical depth and theoretical continuity, and to situate McDowell's ideas within broader disciplinary conversations. The literature includes foundational discussions of American Studies development, critiques of interdisciplinarity, and theoretical perspectives on curriculum and pedagogy.

2.3 Analytical procedure

The analysis was conducted through a close reading and thematic interpretation of the primary and secondary texts. First, McDowell's writings were examined to identify key conceptual categories, including the integration of past, present, and future; interdisciplinary collaboration; experiential learning; and curriculum flexibility. These categories were then used as analytical lenses to organize and interpret relevant passages from the texts. Second, the identified concepts were compared with discussions in secondary literature to assess areas of convergence, divergence, and critical tension. This comparative process enabled the study to situate McDowell's framework within the evolving discourse of American Studies and higher education. Attention was given to how these ideas may be reinterpreted or challenged when applied beyond their original United States–based institutional context. Finally, the analysis incorporated a contextual reflection informed by Indonesian higher education practices. While not empirical in nature, this reflective dimension draws on the authors' academic positioning as scholars engaged with American Studies education in Indonesia. This step allowed the study to critically evaluate the relevance, limitations, and adaptability of McDowell's framework within a non-Western academic environment.

2.4 Trustworthiness and analytical rigor

To enhance analytical rigor, the study applied conceptual triangulation by cross-referencing McDowell's arguments with multiple secondary sources representing different disciplinary perspectives. Consistency in interpretation was maintained by repeatedly revisiting the primary texts throughout the analytical process. Although the study does not claim generalizability in an empirical sense, its trustworthiness lies in transparent source selection, systematic interpretation, and alignment between research aims, analytical procedures, and conclusions.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Time and the colleges

Tremaine McDowell was an Associate Professor of English at the University of Minnesota. He was selected as one of 47 American scholars and artists to receive a 1935 fellowship award from the Guggenheim Memorial Foundation (da Silva et al., 2022). One of McDowell's chapters in his book "American Studies", titled "Time and the Colleges," contains ideas regarding the importance of reconciling the three dimensions of time, including past, present, and future, within academic studies and scientific research at universities. According to Karaganis (2001) and Williams (2011), American Studies emerged in the 1930s, initially focusing on the history of ideas and literature in the quest for national character and culture. McDowell argues that some academic disciplines have historically emphasized only a single dimension of time in their exploration. For instance, the humanities and history have focused exclusively on the past, while the sciences and social sciences have explored contemporary phenomena and facts. In the context of the American "war of words," Henry Ford once stated that history was "bunk" and unimportant (though he later revised this opinion). Ford focused solely on innovation, implying the importance of the present and the future.

The previous view contrasted with the great writer Walt Whitman, who stated, "I fully accept (the three contexts) of time." For Whitman, these three temporal contexts were meant to constitute a single synthesis, interconnected with one another. As McDowell notes, "he reconciles past, present, and future not by erroneously making them identical, in the manner of certain of the ancients and certain of the neoclassicists, but by stressing their similarity and, most of all, their continuity in an open universe" (1948). This perspective subsequently inspired McDowell to formulate his theory of the integration of the Past, Present, and Future in education, particularly in American Studies. Whitman affirms this. Through the poem, he writes, *"The law of the past cannot be eluded, the law of the present and the future cannot be eluded. The law of the living cannot be eluded, it is eternal"*.

In his writing, McDowell also cites a statement by Neville Chamberlain that rejects a scholarly focus on the present. He grounded his stance in the past, asserting that it was solely based on past experience that he was able to make peace with Hitler. On the other hand, Oswald Spengler, in *The Decline of the West*, expressed a pessimistic outlook on the future. He believed that Western civilization had reached its peak (at that time) and was therefore merely awaiting its destruction. Regarding these three perspectives, Whitman optimistically underscored that the past provides the strength that drives change in the present and the future. In other words, progress occurs due to a series of processes unfolding across diverse time dimensions. In this case, according to McDowell, academic studies and science must cease their "cult worship" of one specific time.

To reinforce his view, McDowell cited Mark Van Doren, who emphasized the significance of integrating the past and the present in liberal education. Doren believed that ideal education must connect the past and the present. Nevertheless, he was an admirer of the Greek and Roman classical heritage regarding the excavation of knowledge. A similar view was shared by figures such as Norman Foerster and the Adler-Hutchins group at the University of Chicago. They tended to favor the "past," believing it held the pinnacle of knowledge. McDowell, of course, disapproved of this since it might limit the room for innovation and change. He states, "the same pressure is forcing our colleges to put into execution… [t]hat a major function of education is to synthesize the relevant experience of yesterday with that of today" (McDowell, 1948).

At this point, McDowell has offered a variety of viewpoints on time from notable individuals and scholarly schools of thought, which he believed lacked a comprehensive approach to the temporal dimension. According to McDowell, a university education should be an interdisciplinary synthesis of disciplines and temporal dimensions. This is very helpful when dealing with a world that is constantly changing. To provide students with scientific knowledge that is both historical and future-oriented, McDowell proposed that universities build a bridge between the past and the future, grounded in the present, drawing on the ideas of Whitman and Emerson.

Critically speaking, we view McDowell's idea as highly idealistic, especially the claim that science needs to be motivated by values. What we mean by "value" in this context is that science has a humanistic purpose. It is there to help people avoid making the same mistakes twice or to prepare for future hardships. Such values cannot be maximized without integrating these three temporal dimensions. In "Leaves of Grass," Whitman said that the past, present, and future flow like a river. In our opinion, this river flow has both advantages and drawbacks for the places it flows through. For instance, the religious persecution that used to take place in Europe serves as a warning to America both now and in the future. This supports Whitman's claim. Whitman's claim that the present is the "acme of things accomplished" (preserving the future) is consistent with this.

Through a teaching approach based on the three temporal contexts, knowledge can be directed and shaped as a moral force. In this regard, McDowell asserts that, whether consciously or unconsciously,

a university curriculum is frequently rooted in the ideological preferences of its era, which constitutes an effort to construct a specific "morality." In our view, the adage "History is written by the victors" aptly illustrates this phenomenon. Historical narratives written by the victors of war, for instance, are directed toward shaping a specific image in the present and the future. The interconnectedness of the three temporal dimensions, therefore, plays a significant role here. This may resonate with Whitman's thought. For Whitman, optimism and romanticism about the future must be rooted in the past. To a certain extent, it is possible that this claim is political in nature, as it involves the promotion of a specific ideology in practice.

McDowell calls for American Studies to become a discipline examined through a three-dimensional temporal approach: past, present, and future. In its implementation, beyond adherence to the formulated concepts, stakeholders must also be oriented toward a philosophy of interdisciplinary collaboration. This interdisciplinary approach is expected to assist scholars and students alike in understanding events across disciplines, each with its own distinct propensity for temporal exploration. American Studies grounds its inquiry in a variety of methodologies, including history, literature, sociology, and anthropology, to analyze the United States and its cultural phenomena. This approach enables Americanists to address complex issues regarding national identity, power structures, and cultural narratives (Rubens, 2019; Stewart--Winter, 2015). To achieve this end, balance and collaboration are required among the humanities, social sciences, sciences, history, and literature, so that there exists an interconnection between the past and the present, as well as the capacity of science to predict and embrace the future. According to McDowell, "but if a program is to unite the tenses completely, it cannot safely be centered in either or both of these departments [history and literature] … Rather it must strike a balance between all the relevant humanities and all the relevant social sciences" (1948). Consequently, scholars and students gain an understanding of the interrelationships between events across eras and are equipped to navigate existing social changes.

We believe that an interdisciplinary approach will help learners obtain a comprehensive analysis. Quoting McDowell, the curriculum structure must serve two functions simultaneously: being the "acme of things accomplished" and the "encloser of things to come." Knowledge must reflect the pinnacle of achievement and serve as a gateway to guiding future innovation. This can relate, for example, to the current climate crisis. To comprehend this situation, academics would seemingly need to understand it through the three temporal contexts theorized by McDowell. Science should not function solely to address current issues or merely to document and archive the past, but also to offer innovative ideas for a better future.

Regardless of its objectives or ideal implications, the implementation of the concept of integrating the three temporal dimensions is liable to face challenges. The first challenge, for instance, relates to the positioning of education as a component of modern industrial commodities. In this regard, the necessity for the educational sphere to align with market demands and trends can constitute a distinct challenge. In the current era, for example, the university sector is required to "produce" alumni who are workforce-ready and highly adaptive. In this situation, temporal integration is certainly not easily achieved when aligned with the demands of the professional world, which tend to be practical and pragmatic. Certain disciplines may be able to focus on only a single temporal dimension amid these demands for rapid results. Technically, there is no specific formula for applying three-dimensional time integration. This represents another challenge. Absent a specific formulation or a grand theory, the application of the three dimensions of time in American Studies can introduce inconsistencies into study models, particularly if the focal point is the Western epistemological framework. Meanwhile, American Studies has currently expanded significantly beyond the United States, including in Indonesia. However, the absence of specific formulations could also open the door to variations in

American Studies models, ensuring that the perspectives which emerge are not hegemonic to Western thought.

3.2 The Minnesota program as an ideal model

McDowell's writing regarding the integration of time in the teaching of American Studies is subsequently reinforced by him through another piece titled "The Minnesota Program." In this instance, McDowell elucidates how the American Studies educational model operated at the University of Minnesota during his tenure as chair. The programs presented there were highly compelling. Indeed, these programs were pioneers in American Studies in their time. We view this as a model that could serve as a guide, particularly for the teaching of American Studies in Indonesia and other countries.

Although it suggests a context from quite some time ago, the projection of adopting McDowell's views into the current context can, in fact, serve as proof of the integration of the three-time concepts as theorized previously. Furthermore, McDowell's expositions in the chapter "The Minnesota Program" are relatively comprehensive, covering the curriculum, teaching staff, and academic development activities both directly and indirectly. The interdisciplinary condition of the curriculum in American Studies at the University of Minnesota at that time further strengthened the soul of American Studies. In my view, this strength of American Studies must be continuously echoed so that it becomes a form of branding and a factor in shaping the age.

By encompassing three academic levels, covering the B.A. (Bachelor's), M.A. (Master's), and Ph.D. (Doctorate) degrees, the American Studies program at the University of Minnesota demonstrated its seriousness. The courses offered, in our opinion, remain relevant in the discourse of American Studies today. Some of those mentioned by McDowell include history, literature, philosophy, fine arts, and social sciences. Additionally, there was one introductory course, "American Life," which taught several key concepts, including unity in diversity, nationalism, regionalism, democracy, minority issues, work ethic, happiness, and the pursuit of a better life, that are highly applicable in the context of reading about the United States up to the present. He mentions, "the central theme of American Life is the unity within diversity, the diversity within unity which characterizes life in the United States" (McDowell, 1948).

McDowell notes that the program in Minnesota at that time relied on flexibility in studies. In this regard, students had the autonomy to design their own studies whilst remaining under the guidance of lecturers. McDowell refers to this concept as "maximum flexibility within a four-dimensional curriculum framework". Its implementation was reflected in a variety of activities that strengthened understanding of American Studies, including public lectures, concerts, art exhibitions, film screenings, and radio broadcasts. In addition to academic consumption, these activities had great potential to reach the public and, in turn, to promote the American Studies program while simultaneously strengthening the university's positive impact.

Collaboration and cooperation between departments at the University of Minnesota became a crucial part of the program's development. McDowell, furthermore, stated that "The Minnesota Program is currently the most extensive in the country, yet it is not presented here as an ideal… built to fit Minnesota, this program will not necessarily fit elsewhere" (1948). The programs offered were expected to be reflective and contextual, and to contribute to creating a positive and productive learning environment.

It is important to note, in the context of education in the United States and worldwide, that the Minnesota Program at that time was highly revolutionary. Amidst the multitude of universities

maintaining rigid curricular and organizational systems, the Minnesota program broke through this by promoting a collaborative approach. In his book chapter, McDowell notes that, from 1947 to 1948, approximately 45 faculty members from 11 departments in American Studies at the University of Minnesota served. He writes, "…instruction was supplied by forty-five teachers from eleven departments: history seven, English seven, sociology six, journalism six, economics five, philosophy four, political science three, geography two, philosophy of education two, art two, anthropology one" (McDowell, 1948).

Learning from the system described by McDowell, changes to the curriculum must always be considered to create a more relevant and modern educational epistemology. In the context of education, an interdisciplinary approach will strengthen understanding and foster the formation of culture and national identity. In this regard, the Minnesota Program's curriculum already includes education on moral awareness, democracy, freedom, and diversity. Nevertheless, we are certain that changes to the curriculum and educational practices will require careful consideration that is contextual to the prevailing traditions. To this day, resource constraints, the challenge of effective coordination, and commitment remain classic issues. Regardless of this, the Minnesota program deserves to be called an innovative and progressive pioneer in the field of area studies and culture. We have several comments regarding the issues discussed in this article by McDowell.

3.3 Empirical experiences in learning

The existence of non-classroom academic activities, such as film screenings, concerts, dance performances, poetry readings, and the like, provides students with direct experience with scientific material. Therefore, American culture is not only studied through books and classical classes. Empirically, students experience "American" learning directly. Through intensive sensory experiences, students are expected to acquire a deeper understanding of American issues. Direct experience in learning, also known as experiential learning, has emerged as a significant theory in education. By involving artists, musicians, and filmmakers in campus educational environments, students will gain authentic, direct experiences. This is certainly a very positive matter in terms of increasing academic capacity. It is possible that some learning on campus thus far has focused too heavily on textual material, with an emphasis on written sources rather than direct interaction with relevant experts. In this regard, there may be a bias in understanding. The experiential learning model encompasses concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation, all of which enable students to engage actively with the material, reflect on their experiences, and apply their insights to new situations (Kolb & Kolb, 2018; Yoon & Coble, 2024).

3.4 Study topics and social reality

The American Studies teaching program at Minnesota was oriented toward contemporary issues and realities. This demonstrates that the university is not forever an isolated institution. The instruction of topics such as nationalism, regionalism, democracy, minority issues, work ethic, and even the pursuit of happiness would significantly help students understand their country's socio-political environment. This, in turn, could encourage them to implement various positive changes within society. Furthermore, discussions regarding issues of democracy in America would also stimulate the participation of academics and students in national political contests, though not necessarily in practical politics. For instance, during the 1940s, racism was a prominent issue in the United States. At that time, the American Studies program at Minnesota offered students the opportunity to acquire a more comprehensive understanding of issues related to racism and social problems. Given that the field of American Studies has received considerable criticism due to the difficulty of its practical application in

the professional world, it is regarded as vulnerable, particularly in an era of budget constraints (Cohn & Guterl, 2010).

3.5 Academic commitment

The establishment of the American Studies program at three levels, covering the B.A., M.A., and Ph.D., reflects the Minnesota Program's commitment to preserving this discipline. The continuity of these three programs ensures that the initial values and design remain on track from the lowest to the highest levels. Furthermore, students, particularly those pursuing the Ph.D. level, were required to demonstrate proficiency in at least two foreign languages, pass comprehensive exams in five fields, and write an interdisciplinary dissertation. This constitutes a manifestation and proof of the institution's commitment to developing academic competence among its graduates.

3.6 Interdisciplinary collaboration and related challenges

The engagement of interdisciplinary figures and practitioners within the Minnesota Program enriched perspectives and broadened students' access to direct interaction with experts in their respective fields. Distinguished figures such as Sterling A. Brown (African-American cultural critic), James T. Farrell (realist novelist), Arthur Bestor (historian), and Alfred Kazin (literary critic) are cited by McDowell as references for students in the program during that period. Nevertheless, amidst this richness of interdisciplinary scholarship, a question arises: was American Studies at that time merely a meeting ground for distinct departments, or could it be regarded as a new, academically synthesized discipline? In this regard, the department's identity posed a distinct challenge. Consequently, how should a new discipline and interdisciplinary collaboration be categorized?

3.7 Flexibility: Academic freedom and intellectual dissemination

The Minnesota Program articulated the principles of academic freedom and collaboration in a relevant and strategic manner. However, this may raise questions given the inherent flexibility of such collaboration. In this regard, we consider it crucial to ensure that learners within the American Studies program possess a comprehensive intellectual framework. McDowell points out, “the integration of this interdepartmental curriculum is the personal responsibility of each student” (1948). Flexibility regarding topics or learning materials, along with the interdisciplinary approach, could potentially result in mere fragmentation of unsynthesized knowledge. The interdisciplinarity of American Studies can raise ideological conflicts. For instance, conflicts may arise between sociology and American Studies due to methodological differences: sociology is regarded as a science, while American Studies is considered a subset of history and literature (Dubrow, 2011). Nevertheless, it appears that the comprehensive examination program and the final-level pro-seminar were intended to integrate the students' knowledge. Furthermore, the Minnesota program also achieved a breakthrough in dismantling this tradition. Public radio stations such as KUOM broadcast numerous American Studies topics in a popular format, bringing American issues closer to the community. In the context of contemporary media, social media can serve as an analogy. In this case, McDowell argues, “…it is not presented here as ideal either for Minnesota (it is now and will continue to be under constant revision) or for any other institution (built to fit Minnesota, it would be equally appropriate nowhere else)” (1948).

4. Conclusion

In our view, integrating three temporal contexts is crucial in the fields of area and cultural studies to achieve comprehensive knowledge, one that is neither partial nor insular. In a pedagogical context,

insight into the past significantly aids scholars in projecting and addressing both contemporary and future challenges. While the three temporal contexts may remain technically distinct, they must be interconnected. An orientation toward a single temporal context carries the potential for intellectual imbalance, which, in turn, risks detachment from the traditional roots that helped birth the knowledge under study. Empirically, the Minnesota Program, as elucidated by McDowell, serves as a viable educational model, particularly for American Studies. In its implementation, this program adopted a structurally adaptive approach, emphasizing interdisciplinary collaboration and bridging the gap between academia and the public. Academic collaboration and practical field experiences, such as art performances, radio broadcasts, and community engagement as educational subjects, constitute a tangible manifestation of the balance between theory and practice. Courses within the study program were not merely theoretical constructs; they actively engaged students. Conversely, through the "American Life" course mentioned in the book chapter, scholars were expected to be both insightful and contributive to society. McDowell's observations should be applied and contextualized within Indonesian education, particularly in the areas of area and cultural studies. With a strong theoretical foundation and contributory field practice, the university, specifically in the fields of area and cultural studies, will not remain a mere ivory tower. This approach can also serve as a promotional medium for study programs in the area and in cultural studies of specific nations that may lack the spotlight compared to more widely recognized programs. Furthermore, the trans-nationalist approach is increasingly prevalent today, a development that facilitates learning about other nations without necessitating the "sacrifice" of the scholar's national identity. Transnationalism enables a more multivocal and diverse understanding of American Studies, no longer oriented toward a monolithic culture.

Author's declaration

Author contribution

Rifka Pratama: Conceptualization, Resources, and Writing-original draft. **Fajrul Falah**: Methodology, analysis, and writing-review & editing. **Eko Heriyanto**: Analysis, and writing-review & editing. **Pramod Kumar Singh**: Supervision, and result validation.

Funding statement

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Data availability

The core analysis in this paper is based on Tremaine McDowell's seminal work, *American Studies*, available via JSTOR.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the Doctoral Program in American Studies at Universitas Gadjah Mada, with special thanks to Dr. Nur Saktiningrum, S.S., M.Hum., the instructor of the Humanities Studies course. Her productive and inspiring teaching, particularly on American Studies theories, has been instrumental in shaping the conceptual framework of this article.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they are NOT affiliated with or involved in any organization or entity that has a financial interest (such as honoraria; educational grants; participation in speakers' bureaus; membership, employment, consulting, stock ownership, or other equity interests; and expert testimony or patent licensing arrangements), or non-financial interest (such as personal or professional relationships, affiliations, knowledge, or beliefs) in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

Ethical clearance

This study does not involve humans as subjects.

AI statement

This article utilized Gemini AI primarily for translation, grammatical verification, and idea brainstorming. Meanwhile, Grammarly is used to check grammatical structure and suggest necessary changes to diction. However, the overall construction of the text and the core ideas from the original language are the authentic work of the human authors. Furthermore, the authors employed the Sci-Space application for literature review purposes and citation generation.

Publisher's and Journal's Note

Researcher and Lecturer Society as the publisher, and the editor of Scientific English state that there is no conflict of interest towards this article publication.

References

Cohn, D., & Guterl, M. P. (2010). Ghosts of the American Century: The Intellectual, Programmatic, and Institutional Challenges for Transnational/Hemispheric American Studies. In *Teaching and Studying the Americas* (pp. 243–262). Palgrave Macmillan US. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230114432_13

da Silva, E., Vale de Gato, M., Avelar, M., Blayer, I. M. F., Scott, D. M., & McGowan, T. (2022). *American Studies Over_Seas 1: Narrating Multiple America(s)*. Peter Lang Verlag. https://doi.org/10.3726/b18363

Dubrow, J. K. (2011). Sociology and American Studies: A Case Study in the Limits of Interdisciplinarity. *The American Sociologist*, *42*(4), 303–315. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-011-9138-x

Karaganis, J. (2001). American Studies: Culture. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 434–439). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/03313-1

Kolb, A., & Kolb, D. A. (2018). Eight important things to know about The Experiential Learning Cycle. *Australian Educational Leader*, *40*(3), 8–14. https://www.acel.org.au/ACELWEB/Publications/AEL/2018/3/Lead_Article_1.aspx

McDowell, T. (1948). *American Studies*. University of Minnesota Press.

Rubens, A. (2019). American Studies. In C. M. Klugman & E. G. Lamb (Eds.), *Research Methods in Health Humanities* (pp. 165–181). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780190918514.003.0011

Stewart-Winter, T. (2015). *Introduction American Studies: Interdisciplinary Methods in the Study of Nation, Culture, Power*. Rutgers University--Newark. https://sasn.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/2023-10/Stewart-Winter%20Intro%20to%20American%20Studies.pdf

Williams, M. (2011). Redrawing the Boundaries of American Studies. In *創価大学一般教育部,* (Vols. 2011-09–08, pp. 25–48). https://soka.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/38799

Yoon, J., & Coble, C. (2024). Experiential learning. In *Encyclopedia of Sport Management* (pp. 345–346). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035317189.ch200