

American Studies in Indonesia: Global or Local Content?

Riani E. Inkiriwang Winter*, Alfred F.I Inkiriwang

American Studies Graduate Program, School of Strategic and Global Studies, Universitas Indonesia.

*e-mail: riani.winter@gmail.com

Abstract

The curriculum of the American Studies Program at The School of Strategic and Global Studies of the University of Indonesia comprises conversations on American Philosophy, American Democracy, American Culture, American Politics, American Media and American Foreign Policy. An overall perspective of the discourse is to obtain the knowledge and the competence to critically analyze and abstract the role and influence of the United States in contemporary global as well as local affairs. However, in today's multi-media culture, concerns arise whether the curriculum is still appropriate to fulfill the above goals. Our paper discusses these issues in looking at what to include in an American Studies curriculum that would address its local stakeholders needs and wants, including Indonesia's vision of Higher Education, which is "to support the competitiveness of the nation." (DIKTI, 2015) In the American Studies context, a tension though might arise when the issues important to American Studies scholars in the USA, which we content are reflected in the themes of the 2017 and 2018 Annual Meetings of the American Studies Association on Pedagogies of Dissent and The State of Emergence, respectively, are blended into one local, i.e. Indonesian curriculum. We will explore the global, the main issues in the two above ASA conference themes reflecting on the contemporary theorization of American Studies scholars and the local, American Studies curriculum's stakeholders' concerns. The results hope to provide a discourse to be discussed among stakeholders of the American Studies curriculum in general, and this conference in particular.

Keywords

American Studies, curriculum, global, local

1 Introduction

Citation: Inkiriwang, R & Inkiriwang, A.F.I.: American Studies in Indonesia: Global or Local Content?. In. D. Ekawati, et al (eds.): Proceeding of The American Studies International Conference 2018, Vol. 2, pp. 111–123. UGM Digital Press Social Sciences and Humanities, Yogyakarta (2019).

Published: May, 2019

Taking up the question of American Studies in Indonesia: Global or Local is essentially a question surrounding the curriculum. The concerns brought about so far boils down to the what's and the how's, the content and the methods comprising an American Studies curriculum, in particular here in Indonesia. Since what we are familiar with is the curriculum of where we teach, we would like to bring into focus some points we consider significant drawn from our experience in developing and evaluating the American Studies curriculum of the *Kajian Amerika* Program at Universitas Indonesia (UI)'s School of Strategic and Global Studies (*Sekolah Kajian Strategik dan Global*)

In line with the transnational approach in American Studies as stated and acknowledged (and subsequently followed) at the American Studies Association 2004 conference (Fishkin, 2005), discussions and analyses in our American Studies curriculum concerns not only the country in question but also what, how and why issues and happenings in the USA would affect our country, Indonesia, as well. Students then are supposed to understand and interpret America's concerns with an Indonesian perspective, implementing an interdisciplinary approach. Our curriculum, so far, has included gender studies, race studies, class studies, women studies, ethnic, and other studies, all that have been referenced with economics, history, politics, culture, and social perspectives.

But in the last decade as we all realize, a phenomenal change has occurred in the world, due to, e.g., a worldwide financial crisis; a dramatic change in media production and distribution; an exponential and explosive growth in information and communication technology applications; mass migrations across continents, and global ideological tensions and confrontations. In all these issues, the presence and influence of America have been dominant. The question now arises, should an American Studies program in Indonesia adopt the international conversation, or follow the local discourse in developing their curriculum? Would topics that are highly relevant to issues on the bilateral relations between Indonesia and the USA in a global context, be the more relevant and to be more explored? The follow-up question would be to what extent would an international or local emphasize be an influencing factor to the satisfaction of the major stakeholders of the program? This then is the topic of conversation and core question in our paper.

2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Higher Education Curriculum and Stakeholders

Brady and Kennedy (2007, p. 3-9) in the opening chapter of their book, *Curriculum Construction*, chose a question as title "The School Curriculum and its Stakeholders: Who Owns the Curriculum?" Of the many definitions, they say, a school curriculum is, in very general terms, "an organized set of formal education and/or training intentions." They argue that the curriculum is "both a social and a personal construct" and identify stakeholders involved in the curriculum construction not only as students, parents, and teachers. The stakeholders "who own the curriculum" include the government, the business community, other educational institutions and agencies, and also community groups that have a "stake" in "what happens to young people at school." To the business society, for example, a curriculum "must be constructed in a particular way to deliver outcomes that are relevant to employment opportunities and the economic needs of society.

The above arguments by Brady and Kennedy are equally valid if they are projected into the university realms, although the characteristics of a higher education institution are more complex and multi-dimensional. Higher Education institutions not only have the responsibility of providing students education but also the preparation for having a full life in society (Barzun, 1968). To fulfill those obligations, Higher Education (HE) must have an ongoing dialogue with their internal and external stakeholders. The society as a major stakeholder become more demanding and critical to the performance of HE. Issues such as quality, accountability, and relevance of the education and curriculum offered are scrutinized, as is the university's accessibility to new students. The dominant question or issue in the society is whether HE institutions offer an education based on a curriculum that provides the graduates increased prospects for a job. To rephrase the above: "Does the education provided by the higher education institute, and curriculum constructed within the education satisfy the needs of its stakeholders?"

2.2 Stakeholders Theory

In his now classic book, *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*, Freeman (1984) states that an organization's stakeholder will be "any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives" (1984, p. 46). He lists organization stakeholders as, among others, customers, employees, suppliers, government, competitors, and owners. Since the conception of Freeman's stakeholder theory, numerous other stakeholder definitions were introduced. Mitchell et al (1997) compiled more than twenty definitions of stakeholders but argue mainly that in the concept of a stakeholder should include persons or groups that have a claim on the organization, and added that to identify the validity of this claim three attributes of a stakeholder have to be taken into account. First the

power, second the legitimacy and third the urgency of a stakeholder to their claims in the organization. Those attributes as owned, individual or in combination, by a stakeholder would define the salience and the level of importance of a stakeholder. The stakeholder typology created by Mitchell et al. (1997, p. 874) consists of seven types of stakeholders according to the attributes they possess.¹

In congruence with Mitchell, Agle and Wood's stakeholder typology, Clarkson (1995) classifies corporate stakeholders in two groups, primary and secondary. Primary stakeholders are those who are needed by a corporation or an organization. Without them, an organization will cease to exist. Corporate primary stakeholders are shareholders, employees, customers and suppliers, and also public stakeholders such as the government and society. Secondary stakeholders are individuals or groups stakeholders that have no direct interaction with a corporation or an organization but can influence and be influenced. But the latter is not essential for the sustainability of a corporation or organization. To take an example, media, non-government organizations, as well as special interest groups are not directly involved in the organization or corporation but can influence the society against the policies of a corporation.

2.3 Higher Education Stakeholders

Mainardas et al (2010) in their study on Portuguese university stakeholders reviewed the many studies which were done on HE stakeholders and provided an excellent table which shows the emphasis various researchers put on what they perceive as stakeholders in the context of higher education, as seen in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Studies Defining Higher Education Institutional Stakeholders

Research	Higher Education Institutional Stakeholders
Weaver (1976)	Government, institutional managers, teaching staff, consumers (students, their families, employers and society in general).
Smith & Cavusgil (1984)	Providers of financing and/or products and/or services, regulatory agencies, actors (such as the media and professional bodies that convey messages as to the university both to students and employers), student parents.
Conway et al (1994)	Primary – students, Secondary – paying entities, educational authorities, Tertiary – accreditation entities, former students, employees, parents.
Kotler & Fox (1995)	Foundations, former students, local community, the public in general, the mass media, potential students, registered students, supervisory bodies, student parents, managers, and technical staff, teaching staff, university bodies, competitors, suppliers, the business community and government entities.
Taylor & Reed (1995)	Teaching staff, education boards, university boards, competitors, suppliers, the business community, government agencies, foundations, former institutional members, the local community, the public in general, means of communication, potential students, current students, accreditation and supervisory institutions, student parents, managers and employees.
Sandison (1996)	Students or pupils, teaching staff, administrative personnel, service personnel, suppliers, parents, government, trade and industry, and other teaching systems.
Rowley (1997a)	Students, parents, and family, the local community, society, government, senior institutional management, local authorities, current, and future employers.
Reavill (1998)	Students and their families, employees and lecturers, suppliers of goods and services to the university, the secondary school sector, other universities, trade and industry, nation,

¹ Stakeholder Types: In the theory proposed by Mitchell et al (1997), there are seven types of stakeholders defined according to the attributes of the salience and importance they possess, which are : power, legitimacy, urgency. Three of these seven types of stakeholders possess only one attribute. These are called the Latent stakeholders : the dormant stakeholder, who has power but not legitimacy or urgency; the discretionary stakeholder that has legitimacy but not power or urgency; the demanding stakeholder who has urgency but not power or legitimacy. Three other types, called the Expectant stakeholders, are those who have two of the attributes : the dominant stakeholder has both power and legitimacy, but not urgency; the dependent stakeholder has both legitimacy and urgency but not power; the dangerous stakeholder has both power and urgency, but not legitimacy. The last stakeholder type, the Definite stakeholders, have all three of the attributes mentioned above. Expectant stakeholders can become a definitive stakeholder if they attain the missing attribute.

	government, local and national taxpayers, the professional orders.
Macfarlane & Lomas (1999)	Students, employers, professional associations, the government, the academic community and society in general.
Duderstadt (2000)	Internal: students, teaching staff, employees, management bodies, External: government, local communities, the public in general, the media, politicians.
Rosenberg (2000)	Students, former students, student parents, employers, governmental bodies, professors, employees, the local community.
Costin (2001)	Graduate and post-graduate students, former students, recruiters, executives, accreditation agencies, university management bodies.
Tam (2001)	Students, employees, teaching and other staff, government and their financing agencies, accreditation providers, auditors and evaluators (including professional organisms).
Amaral & Magalhães (2002)	Students, parents, employers, state, society, higher education institutions themselves (in relation to the system).
Baldwin (2002)	Current and potential students, management and academic staff, employers, government, families, accreditation agencies, foundations, professional companies, the local community, society in general.
Watty (2003)	Government, quality agencies, individual academics, students, employers, the country and society in general.
Zait (2006)	Middle school students (future university candidates), current university students, former students, university professors, employers and public opinion in general.
Giesecke (2007)	Ministry of education and accreditation authorities, main political parties, large non-governmental organizations.
Pachuashvili (2007)	Students and their parents, colleagues, international institutions, donor organizations, academic oligarchy, religious groups, the business community, accreditation organisms, political parties, and other interest groups.
Slantcheva (2007)	State authorities (accreditation agencies, government, legislators), professional and business groupings (trade unions and provincial councils, religious institutions), students (parents, role models), rival institutions, donors and foundations, international organisations and associations, the cultural framework (potential students, secondary school career guidance providers, students, parents, the media, neighbours, community).
Suspitsin (2007)	Students, employers, corporate sponsors, industrial and privately owned organizations, other educational organizations.
Blazey et al (2008)	Students, teaching staff, employers, professional associations, former students.
Jongbloed et al (2008)	Internally: students, employees, the research community and the management, Externally: the research community, former students, companies, social movements, consumer organizations, governments, and professional associations.
Matlay (2009)	Internal stakeholders: students, teaching and research staff, administrators and the management, External stakeholders: parents, students and business persons as well as various representatives of companies, trade, professional entities, government, and community.
Nishimura & Okamuro (2009)	Companies, other universities, research institutes, incubators, financial institutions.

Mainardes et al have come to the analysis that Higher Education stakeholders are perceived in many ways, in accordance with HE's mission. Three types of stakeholders' classifications prominent in their findings are "internal or external; individual or collective, and academic or non-academic." In conclusion, they assert that "identifying and categorizing university stakeholders is a complex task." Referring to multiple researchers on HE stakeholders, Mainardes et al (2010) content that "higher education has multiple stakeholders, simultaneously complementary and contradictory. Correspondingly, on occasion, the different desires and needs of distinct stakeholders may enter into conflict and hinder strategies designed to effectively meet needs (taking into consideration the expected results) and efficiently (with the minimum level of resources)." In their literature survey, they concluded that:

universities should, beyond identifying their stakeholders, recognize their respective different needs and demands. The authors divide up the demands and needs across three distinct levels: non-student demands and needs, such as the scientific fields, professional entities and employer associations and society as a whole, students as individuals demands and needs, and the demands and needs of target student groups with specific characteristics and who the university should provide with specific and carefully defined services. These are just some of the various proposals seeking to ascertain the stakeholders appropriate to universities. However, reality shows that traditionally, universities have focused their attention on a limited set of specific stakeholders, in particular, professors, managers, funding administrators, donors, accreditation agencies and students. These groups may be among the most important

participant actors within a university-level institution, an exclusive focus on these groups obscures other, and increasingly critical, circles.

Their contention is in line with the aim of this paper to inquire into the demands and needs of the major stakeholders of an American Studies program's curriculum content, in context to the local and global environment.

2.4 Curriculum Construction

In general, what is defined as a curriculum construction or development are the planning and implementation processes in developing or renewing a curriculum (Oliva, 2005). In the higher education environment, in the whirlwind of technological and global changes, the renewal of an area studies program curriculum like American Studies is almost an inescapability. The dynamics of American politics, American foreign policies and trade policies have seen a change following the establishment of a new administration and hence has also influenced the academic discourse on American Studies in America itself. The question arises whether the current American Studies curriculum in Indonesia can and/or will still address these observed changes. And the subsequent important question, whether this curriculum will satisfy the needs and demands of its major stakeholders.

As the discussion above concerns 'the global' part of this paper, what we discuss below is, in essence, the core concern/question of this paper, i.e. what then, would be the needs of our, the American Studies in Indonesia's stakeholders? What then, would be 'the local' relevant content of an American Studies curriculum. As mentioned before, stakeholders of HE, in our case the School of Strategic and Global Studies, comprised of those who have a stake, a claim in the output of the university, our graduates and their competence as a result of their education. Matkovic (2014) argues that those stakeholders are divided into two distinct groups, curriculum, and professional stakeholders. These stakeholders are the future and potential employers of our graduates. How then do we assess the major stakeholders' needs and demands of our American Studies curriculum content, and the study approach.

2.5 Needs Assessment

The first stage of a curriculum development is conducting a thorough needs assessment from the already defined primary and possible secondary stakeholders. Brady and Kennedy (2007) state that "the development of a curriculum involves the developer in making decisions about the nature and appropriateness of the substantive elements: the objectives, content, method, and assessment strategies. The decisions are made in relation to the context in which the curriculum will operate." (p. 176). Informing the decisions is the situation, the context in which the curriculum will be used. A situational analysis is not only a first step in curriculum planning, but it is also necessary throughout the process of development and implementation. As proposed by Brady and Kennedy, the situational analysis comprises of a couple of factors, namely a needs assessment and an institutional audit. In the process of planning a curriculum, carrying on an audit we think goes without saying, simply for its being a 'natural' part in school management generally. A needs assessment, in contrast, is not necessarily taken into consideration in this process, not to mention administered. Needs assessment, according to them, involves "defining educational needs and determining priorities on the basis of these needs" (p. 177). They further quote McNeil et al (2005) who define needs assessment as "the process of collecting information that indicates the nature of the program that will be implemented. If it involves changing an existing program, the information is the discrepancy between what should and what is." (p. 177)

In the case of SKSG's American Studies program, a thorough needs assessment in constructing the curriculum historically have not been conducted. Decisions on curriculum were based on the knowledge of an input from faculty involved in lecturing, besides an institutional audit. The process of curriculum construction has always been a supply-side exercise. In the current hyper dynamics as an impact of globalization covering all aspects of society, the likes of what Arjun Appadurai (1996) stipulated as the "divergence and differences" of five 'scapes' (ethnoscape, financescape, technoscape, mediascape, and ideoscape) flowing across a seemingly 'no-border globe', the supply-side curriculum construction would not be applicable or relevant anymore. A thorough stakeholder needs assessment in constructing an American Studies is a must, taking into consideration of the vision and mission of the School of Strategic and Global Studies where the Universitas Indonesia's American Studies is located.

3. Findings and Discussions

With the above theoretical framework as guidance into our efforts in seeking the answers to the question which trajectory the American Studies Program at SKSG, and in Indonesia in general, would be taking, and to what extent would the curriculum be constructed with global or local content. And in subsequent considerations, would “American Studies,” the pursuit of knowledge about America be only in the context of the USA? Or would the area of study be expanded to include North, Central, and South America? To answer these questions, we explored a limited number of various American Studies curricula in ‘global’ and ‘local’ contexts. Global here is a glance at trends in curricula concerns in Asia, and in the United States. ‘Local’ is a quick look at an Indonesian curriculum of American Studies, in particular, that of the University of Indonesia, the HE institution the writers are involved with.

3.1 Trends of American Studies in the Asian Area

The aim of having a brief look into American Studies available in the Asian area was to have an understanding of the many programs which were offered or registered in this region that carries the label of American Studies. The outcome shows that in studies that operate under the name of American Studies, different types of courses or programs were offered with various contents. The American Studies programs were not necessary for an undergraduate or graduate program. In many cases, they were American Studies Centers, research centers doing research on America.

Although we recognize that American Studies programs exist in other continents, such as Europe, Latin America, Africa, and Australia, here we limit our discussion to a few countries in Asia. We also put focus only on American Studies programs that provide courses as part of a university curriculum.

In Singapore, the National University of Singapore offers an American Studies program with the basic foundation that identifies globalization synonymous to Americanization. The objective of the program is “to equip students with the breadth of knowledge and critical frame of mind to understand both what constitutes America and American identity. And the extent of America’s influence on the world.” The NUS American Studies offers modules on American history, culture, politics, law, business and economics with an inter-disciplinary approach. The unique character of this program is that it does not have an undergraduate or graduate program, and so does not provide any majors. The program also does not issue degrees or diplomas but provide modules on America that are available to all students and are run by the NUS Office of Program (2018).

Thailand has only one British and American Studies (BAS) International Program available, which offers an undergraduate degree and is provided by the Thammasat University. The four-year undergraduate degree (BAS, 2015) combines the study of British and American culture, literature, history and political dynamics of the United States and the United Kingdom. The objective to combine the study of the two countries is in the recognition of the dominance of Britain and America for the last 200 years. In this program an emphasis is put on the global impact of British and American literature, art, cinema, and popular music. It also acknowledges the British decline and United States ascendancy to become a superpower and significance of their historical relation in this process. English is the medium of instruction, and with an interdisciplinary approach, the program includes also discourses on issues as race, class, nationalism, immigration, multiculturalism, and identity.

One of the foremost American Studies program in Taiwan is located at the Tamkang University’s Division of American Studies at the Graduate Institute of the Americans. American Study is designed for graduates to get into teaching and professional jobs related to American Studies. This program offers master degrees and Ph.D. degrees with an interdisciplinary approach. Classes and seminars are mostly taught in the English language and provide a broad range of courses on American history, literature, politics, law, culture, economy, diplomacy, education, mass communications, foreign and defense policy, social issues, and also an in-depth training in modern social-science methodology.

Korea has relatively many undergraduate American Studies. Pyeongtaek University even has an undergraduate and a graduate program. A particular character of the American Studies in Korea is brought up by Nam Gyun Kim (2015) below.

Korean higher education often values many specialists, such as American economists, American political scientists, and American law experts. However, the importance of the generalist, who knows the United States as a whole, is not appreciated. In addition, undergraduate programs in American studies are hard pressed to educate students beyond the broader view of US law, economy, culture, literature, and so on. There are gaps between thorough American studies education and the social demand for specific American subject matter specialists (p. 16).

Nam also content that many American Studies in Korea are merged with other area studies. Due to the declining birthrate in Korea, there is a shortage of high school students entering the universities and the upcoming road for American Studies undergraduate program will be difficult.

The most advanced country in Asia providing American studies program in China. According to the US-China Education Trust (USCET, 2017), there is 53 HE institution which has an American studies program and are members of the American Studies Network, a consortium of Chinese academic institutions that offer American Studies programs. These programs, in order to provide students a wide perspective and in-depth understanding of America, use three different approaches (Renyi & Jinzhao, 2015).

The first approach is that one center offers all courses dealing with different aspects of American society, a great variety of courses provided to graduate and undergraduate students, covering American history, culture, society, politics, economic development, foreign policy, literature, the American constitution, and American religion. This is the approach adopted by the Beijing Foreign Studies University, and a few other universities. Many research institutions also opt for this approach. There are two research institutions that use this approach, according to Renyi and Jinzhao. The Institute of American Studies under the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences that studies American politics, economy, foreign policy, and society and culture, and The China Institute of Contemporary International Relations which has an Institute of American Studies, focusing their research in American strategy, American foreign policy, and American politics.

The second approach taken in the Chinese American Studies centers is where American Studies is run as a course distribution platform. Professors from the other departments such as law, education, economy, international relations, literature, religion, and philosophy give courses on America producing a combined introductory course of American Studies to undergraduate students. This second approach to American Studies will provide students a broad and general perspective of the United States.

The third approach is a more dispersed American Studies program. Courses on America are offered within their respective discipline departments, such as "American politics in the school of political science, American history in the history department, and American society in the department of sociology." Renyi and Jinzhao (2012) argue that this approach is not productive because attention is focused on the discipline itself. Such an approach is not as productive as the first two because not enough thought is given as to the discipline as part of American Studies. The lack of coordination between different departments prevents a coordinated approach to American Studies. Unfortunately, say Renyi and Jinzhao this situation is the common set up in many Chinese universities.

Under the label of American Studies in Asia, we found that there are undergraduate & graduate programs in American Studies and the English Language as well as American Studies Research Institutions. In general, the common approach in American Studies programs in Asia is to provide the undergraduate students, graduate students and researchers a broad perspective of America or more specific the U.S.A. The only country where American Studies programs are thriving and are in demand in China. The emphasis in China's American Studies programs is on the English language and American literature or Sino-American relations focusing on diplomatic history and policy studies. In all Asian countries, the low level of the English language proficiency from students is a very high barrier in understanding American Studies. The usage of the local language as the language of instructions often misses the underlying nuances of the course or seminar topics discussed. Each country, based on their historic and present relations with America, will focus the curriculum of American Studies on particular issues that are relevant to the knowledge of America needed in context to that country. This is also partly the discourse in this paper that seeks the answer to the question what the needs of the stakeholders from an American Studies program are, and how those needs could be satisfied? In that context, how deep local or global should an American Studies curriculum be?

3.2 Trends in American Studies in America.

For the last two decades, the trend in the American Studies curriculum has heavily been influenced by the directions set out by the American Studies Associations (ASA). The said directions were conveyed in the content of ASA President's speeches at their Annual Meetings. Although many critiques and debates emerged as reactions to those speeches and which then were reflected in many variations in the American Studies curricula of United States universities, in general, the theme of the Annual Meeting and the President's speech content were considered the contemporary reflections, directions, and approaches of American Studies of the time.

The 2017 ASA Annual Meeting brought forward the theme of Pedagogies of Dissent (ASA, 2017). An interesting theme, as from what we observed the Trump administration has brought changes in the

themes carried by most of the American Universities' Academy. Themes and contents were seen as expressing dissent to policies of the Trump administration, compared to previous years, themes that have almost consistently focused on diversity in America's society. ASA explained its 2017 theme, "Pedagogies of Dissent" as the constructing of oppositional pedagogies in the context of gender, race, power, coloniality, capitalism, material relations, sexuality, and body diversity. Dissent is needed not only in educational political but also in the political-economic field, at all levels of education as well as in formal and informal settings. The organizers of the 2017 ASA Annual Meeting content that:

contemporary conditions are cause for critical pause in considerations of dissent, its precipitating grounds, its consequences, its aspirations . . . in proliferating attention to the multiple and variegated sites through which pedagogies of dissent emerge and operate . . . How does the online saturation of social, political, and cultural life shift how we understand the possibilities of pedagogies of dissent? What forms does dissent take now that are not pedagogical, and what might that tell us about both past and present conditions?"

The theme reflects the underlying thoughts of the ASA organization which is to create dissent through all levels of education using oppositional pedagogies of dissent in the American Studies programs. To sum it up, a statement in the invitation to participate in this event stating the objective of the 2017 ASA Annual Meeting: "What forms of pedagogy is associated with revolution and resistance, and what political economic and socio-: cultural structures induce and necessitate them?"

At the 2018 ASA Annual Meeting with States of Emergence as the theme (ASA, 2018), the organizers argued that the US and the World are in a state of Emergency and Crisis. The reason for this condition is the constant enlargement and centralization of power. They also contend that the world has become a battlefield where centralization has been met with political, intellectual and cultural productions in protests and critique in an attempt to create a better world. They ask questions involving how to effectively challenge these powers that created the emergency and crisis. How do we analyze the emergency? What is history? Is the emergency transnational? What social structures and formations are created? Are there any critical political, intellectual and cultural resistance movements? The basic theorizations of the American Studies scholars, in the organizers' opinion, are based on approaches of "ethnic, indigenous, queer, Marxist, disability, postcolonial and feminist studies." Some of the themes suggested for proposals of were "Histories, politics, and aesthetics of emergency and emergence, and the relationships among them; Theories of emergence, crisis, and emergency; The social life of emergence; The (re)emergence of white supremacy; Protest traditions and culture as emergence; The role of religious and spiritual traditions in states of emergence."

Reading ASA's 2017 and 2018 Annual Meeting themes, "Pedagogies of Dissent" and "State of Emergency" respectively, including the discussions on these themes in the organizers' invitations to participate, it appears then that within the ASA organization there is a feeling of despair on the state of the US in particular and The World in general. The conditions are in a state of emergency and crisis and must be challenged and be improved. The 2017 theme suggests in creating pedagogies of dissent, even to the extent of revolution and resistance. The 2018 theme provides an evenly dire situation of the USA and The World, a state of emergency in the context of power that has become centralized and enlarged to an extent that those movements of enlargement and centralization of power must be resisted.

If the ASA Meetings' themes of 2017 and 2018, are understood as the cues to American Studies curricula, then what was needed is a curriculum with the content of dissent and resistance and the commitment to an emergency and crisis mode. The curriculum should then draw from contemporary American Studies approaches in the US, providing "ethnic, indigenous, queer, Marxist, disability, postcolonial and feminist studies. In a way, from observation of various American Studies curricula in the US, contents show a highly critical thread towards US's dominance in the world; to the history of oppression and contemporary forms of oppression towards minority groups and society, as well as to traditional values of the US. An example is Brown University's curriculum which offers courses on race studies; border studies; ethnicity and belonging; queer and gender studies; ecocriticism and environmental studies; and activism and social justice (Brown, 2018). At Williams College, the American Studies program courses are based on an interdisciplinary approach to "develop student's understanding of the complexity of culture(s) usually labeled 'American'. Examining history, literature and other forms of expression, we explore the process of cultural definition as contested by diverse individuals and groups." (Williams, 2017) Both the above HE American Studies programs are in line with the 2017 and 2018 themes of ASA Annual Meetings.

3.3 American Studies in Indonesia

The American Studies at SKSG at Universitas Indonesia defines the American nation as a nation full of paradoxes, winning two World Wars and the Cold War; a country owning leading-edge technology; and having become an inspiration to the world, but on the other hand also often considered as a source of global dominance and hegemony in economics and politics. The courses offered at the American Studies at the School of Strategic and Global Studies are discourses and explorations on questions such as: What really makes Americans so strong and productive? Why do they dominate other nations? How are they democratic? How religious is their society? In answering the above questions, the American Studies program at the School of Strategic and Global Studies has constructed a curriculum providing a critical understanding of the American Society.

The program objective is producing an output of graduates with the following competencies: “Able to manage research, and develop critical thinking about United States phenomena related to global issues with an intercultural perspective and interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches; able to analyze the development of American society and culture related to issues of Race, Class, Gender and Religion with intercultural perspectives; able to analyze the thoughts and development of economic politics of the United States in a global context able to analyze the development of American political and legal dialectics in theory and practice.” (Kajian Wilayah Amerika, 2017)

The Graduate Profile is a Master of Science who is capable of formulating critical thinking about various United States phenomena related to contemporary global issues with an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approach. A graduate can play a role in various international networks in the capacity as Researchers, Public Intellectuals, and Organizational Managers.

The American Studies program of SKSG-UI currently offers the following subjects in its curriculum, subjects that aim at outcomes in congruence with the university’s Competence-based Curriculum (*Kurikulum Berdasarkan Kompetensi*).

Table 2. Subjects offered in American Studies Program SKSG – UI

No	Course
1	The Development of American People and Culture
2	Theories and Methods in American Studies
3	American Democracy
4	Media and Global Politics
5	Information Technology and Global Space
6	America & the Muslim World
7	Global Capitalism
8	Proposal Seminar
9	Thesis
10	Security and Transnationalism
11	U.S Diplomacy
12	Capita Selecta
13	Gender and Ethnicity
14	Philosophy of Science and Multidisciplinary Studies
15	Academic Writing

With changes globally as well as locally occurring at a fast speed, another question arises, namely whether the content of the American Studies curriculum currently in operation is still relevant to the various stakeholders? A concern in the context of the evolvement of American Studies in Indonesia, proposed in particular in this conference.

The findings of the American Studies trends suggest that the curriculum content or courses in Asia have the objective to have a “panoramic” view of the USA, providing a comprehensive understanding of the American way. Many times, discourses are geared to the questions why and how America became a hegemonic superpower, and what the possible consequences of America’s global actions toward other countries are, is there a way to diminish America’s influence in other countries culture?

In this context of world dynamics where the USA is still the dominant player, we propose the

conduction of a needs analysis with at least the most prominent, or, as said by Savage et al, (1991) the most potential stakeholders, the prospective or potential students. As with the case of American Studies program's curriculum development, so far the stakeholders that have been taken into consideration mainly were first, the American Studies program itself; second, the institution (UI) and third the faculty. The program's curriculum would follow the institution's vision, mission, philosophy, system, etc., which is a norm in curricula as developed in Indonesia. UI's American Studies is one of the graduate school's programs utilizing a multi-disciplinary approach that comprises of, among others, area studies such as European, Middle Eastern, and American studies. The needs then were focused more on what the program thought was needed to be given to potential students interested in a program offering area studies in a post-graduate setting. Curriculum development meetings by teaching and administrative staff would together, in the words of Brady & Kennedy (2007, p. 177), define educational needs with a focus on the USA, and determine priorities on the basis of these needs, the priorities of which were primarily the available teaching staff and their interests. The process of collecting information as defined by McNeil et al (2005) and stipulated by numerous needs assessment writers (Print, 1993; Ornstein & Hunkins, 2009; Christison & Murray, 2014) has yet to be applied.

Recently, with the institutional change in the post-graduate program at UI, which is the establishment of the School of Strategic and Global Studies (Sekolah Kajian Strategik dan Global), the changing of the school's programs curricula has become one of the top priorities. The American Studies program, for instance, is exploring the potentials of studies into the Americas, covering Canadian and Latin American studies, bringing to the program a much wider scope. The question is, whether the plan would be in accordance with the needs of the students in the program's target. And as a subsequence to this, what would the content of the curriculum consist of? How would what is offered to be relevant to the students recruited? Would the program use 'the global' as a reference, or would 'the local' be the preference? To answer these questions, a needs assessment, at the very least, as theorized above would be of utmost importance.

4 Conclusions

In the last two years American Studies in America has shifted to towards an approach or culture of dissent and protest, and as of late, stating that America is in a state emergency. In the call for papers at the ASA 2018 Annual meeting the topics of interest were among others: Theories of emergence, crisis, and emergency; Protest traditions and culture as emergence; The (re)emergence of white supremacy; The effectiveness of particular interventions and their weaknesses; Creative political practices; Non-participation; and Fascism and authoritarianism. The objective was to create states of emergence to inequality and injustice, franchise colonialism, neocolonialism, militarization, hetero-patriarchy, ableism, labor exploitation, and society concerns and apprehension on the enlargement and the centralization of the means of power—in economic, in political, and in military institutions which encroached America and the world. It reflects the response of HE in America to the election of Donald Trump as the President of the USA, implicitly insinuating a revolution against the Trump administration.

Two decades ago, topics at all ASA Annual Meetings would be duly accepted as contemporary issues to be considered in the curricula of American Studies outside America, for example as said before, the Transnational turn of American Studies. This effectively had created a cultural hegemony of American Studies programs in America on the outside America programs. Presently, this is not the case anymore. What we have seen in the findings, American Studies in Asia and Indonesia follow their own vision, mission, and objectives. The current concern is, to what extent should the American Studies at Universitas Indonesia include the contemporary attitudes of dissent and protests, and the present national discourse on American prominent issues, which is the current conversation in American Studies classes in America. Would those attitudes and issues be beneficial and relevant to the primary stakeholders of the American Studies in UI, the prospective students, and those that haven't been determined yet? Does the knowledge of these attitudes and issues fit in Universitas Indonesia's American Studies epistemology? Or would the Asian universities' approach, the panoramic view, be more relevant?

The question of how global or how local should be the content in the American Studies curriculum is not easy to answer. If we look at Appadurai's (1996) theory of globalization as flowing scapes the distinction between local and global becomes fuzzy. Only a thorough stakeholder analysis and curriculum needs assessment in American and global dynamics setting will provide the answers.

References

1. American Studies Association. 2017 Annual Meeting Theme, Pedagogies of Dissent. <https://convention2.allacademic.com/one/theasa/theasa17/>
2. American Studies. 2018. Annual Meeting Theme, States of Emergence. https://www.theasa.net/annual-meeting/years_meeting/years-theme
3. Appadurai, Arjun (1996). "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy" in *Modernity at Large* (pp 27-47). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
4. Brady, Laurie and Kerry Kennedy. 2006. *Curriculum construction* (1st ed.). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson
5. Brown University-American Studies, 2017. Providence, Rhode Island, <https://www.brown.edu/academics/american-studies/ma>
6. Christison, M.A and Murray, D.E (2014). *Designing Curriculum*. New York: Routledge
7. Clarkson, M.B.E (1995) "A Stakeholder Framework for Analyzing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performances." *The Academy of Management Review*. Vol 20 No. 1 pp. 92-117
8. Fishkin, S. E. (2005). Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies Association. Nov. 12, 2004. *American Quarterly* 57 (1), 17-57, 2005.
9. Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*
10. Kim, N. G. (2015). A History of American Studies in Korea. *The Japanese Journal of American Studies*, (26), 7-17. Retrieved from http://www.jaas.gr.jp/jjas/pdf/2015/A_History_of_American_Studies_in_Korea.pdf
11. Matkovic, P, et al. (2014) University stakeholders in the analysis phase of curriculum development process model. Proceedings of ICERI2014 Conference, Nov. 2014, Seville, Spain. University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Economics Subotica, Serbia
12. Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B.R and Donna J. Wood. (1994). "Towards a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts." *The Academy of Management Review*. <http://proquest.umi.com/pgdweb?did=18328737&sid=12&Fmt=2&clientid=45625&RQT309&VName=PQD>
13. Mainardes, M., Alves, H and Mario Raposo (2010). "Identifying Stakeholders in a Portuguese university: a case study". http://www.revistaeducacion.educacion.es/doi/362_167.pdf
14. McNeil, K., Newman, I. & Steinhauser, J. 2005. *How to Be Involved in Program Evaluation: What Every Administrator Needs to Know*. Maryland: Scarecrow
15. Renyi, Mei & Li Jinzhao, L. (2012). 30 Years of American Studies in China: An Overview and A Case Study. Beijing Foreign Studies University. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/302892700_Mei_Renyi_and_Li_Jinzhao_Thirty_Years_of_American_Studies_in_China_An_Overview_and_a_Case_Study_American_Studies_352_2012_30-45
16. National University of Singapore American Studies. 2018. http://www.fas.nus.edu.sg/oop/as/as_index.htm
17. Oliva, Peter F. (2005). *Developing the Curriculum* (6th ed.) Boston: Pearson
18. Ornstein, A. C., Hunkins, F.P (2009). *Curriculum: Foundations, Principles, and Issues*, Fifth ed. Boston: Pearson
19. Print, M. (1993). *Curriculum Development and Design*. Crow's Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin
20. Savage, G. T. et al. (1991). "Strategies for Assessing and Managing Organizational Stakeholders." *The Executive*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 61-75, Academy of Management, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4165008>
21. Tamkang University's Division of American Studies, Graduate Institute of the Americans. 2018. <http://www2.tku.edu.tw/~tiax/eindex.htm>
22. The British and American Studies (BAS) International Programme at Thammasat University. 2018. <http://basthammasat.org/over-view/>
23. Williams- American Studies, 2018. <http://american-studies-williams.edu>