



**LPEM-FEBUI Working Paper - 049**  
**May 2020**

ISSN 2356-4008

**INDONESIA'S AID MESSAGING:  
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM DISCOURSE  
ANALYSIS**

Aditya Alta

Chief Editor : Riatu M. Qibthiyah  
Editors : Kiki Verico  
Setting : Rini Budiastuti

© 2020, May  
Institute for Economic and Social Research  
Faculty of Economics and Business  
Universitas Indonesia (LPEM-FEB UI)

Salemba Raya 4, Salemba UI Campus Jakarta, Indonesia 10430  
Phone : +62-21-3143177  
Fax : +62-21-31934310  
Email : [lpem@lpem-feui.org](mailto:lpem@lpem-feui.org)  
Web : [www.lpem.org](http://www.lpem.org)

# Indonesia's Aid Messaging: Recommendations from Discourse Analysis

Aditya Alta<sup>1,★</sup>

## Abstract

Development aid always sends a message about development problem(s) that it wishes to solve. Using discourse analysis and interviews, this paper attempts to clarify which problem(s) Indonesia wants to address with its South-South and triangular cooperation and finds a lack of them. Instead, messages found in the communication of Indonesia's aid are diplomatic, supported by the principles of demand-driven, solidarity, and ownership. The lack of indication of development objects and expected aid quality combined with an emphasis on these principles may lead policymakers and aid practitioners to prioritize the maintenance of good relationships with recipients and donor partners over actual development impact. This paper illustrates this tendency through the case of Strengthening Gender Mainstreaming (SGM), a triangular program conducted with USAID and Fiji. Despite drastic change in design and a brief tension among the stakeholders, SGM was "successfully" conducted. Vague messaging on program goals contributed to this "success" as preservation of good relationships and attainment of direct diplomatic objectives were more important. Taking the new regulations on business process into account, the paper concludes with policy recommendations.

**JEL Classification:** F50; O22; Z13

## Keywords

discourse analysis — development aid — South-South cooperation — triangular cooperation — Indonesia

<sup>1</sup> *Institute for Economic and Social Research, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Indonesia (LPEM FEB UI)*

**★Corresponding address:** Institute for Economic and Social Research (LPEM) Universitas Indonesia. Campus UI Salemba, Salemba Raya St., No. 4, Jakarta, 10430, Indonesia. Email: [aditya@lpem-feui.org](mailto:aditya@lpem-feui.org).

## 1. Introduction

Development aid has always been envisioned with different purposes and messages throughout history. Since its birth as part of the American postwar reconstruction efforts, the way an international development program is communicated tells a lot about the meanings around development: what measures to use to gauge (under)development, which areas to develop, which countries and regions deserve help. Above all, aid messages would also tell about the provider and its motivations. When Harry Truman assumed United States presidency in 1949, marking the supposed end of international antagonism and the start of a new era of freedom, his inaugural speech depicts the rest of the world united by "hunger and thirst" and the United States' vantage point of scientific and economic advancements:

More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas. . . . The United States is pre-eminent among nations in the development of industrial and scientific techniques. . . . I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life. And, in cooperation with other nations, we should foster capital investment in areas needing development. (Truman, 1949)

The so-called "development gaze" (Escobar, 1995) created a new socioeconomic category of people—the economically underdeveloped—and set course to free them with industrialization. The objects of the gaze would change across the history—at one juncture it is poverty and famine, at another it is the environment, women, and climate change. The discourse used not always renders the objects helpless, as exemplified in Amartya Sen's ideas of development which hinge on human's capability and agency (Fukuda-Parr, 2003). However, it remains the case that every development discourse carries a message about its objects, how to improve their condition, and to what end. As an emerging donor in the aid arena, what messages does Indonesia carry in its programs?

This paper reviews the messages contained in the communication of Indonesia's aid programs to the public. First, an overview of discourse analysis, especially contents analysis, employed in analyzing the texts of Indonesia's aid is discussed. Second, we present the stated objectives, purpose, priority areas or programs, and other official information found in reports and policy papers—what general message(s) are contained in them? Afterwards, we further examine the underlying discourse within the messages. Comparison with development discourse found in the texts of USAID and JICA is also made. It then discusses whether Indonesia's aid messages—both the official and subtle, underlying ones—have been clearly articulated in the interactions with other stakeholders such as development partners, recipient countries, business entities, and line ministries during program implementation. The paper concludes with recommendations.

## 2. Methodological Overview

We turn into discourse analysis to discover underlying messages embedded in the communication of Indonesian aid to the public—messages which might be subtle and subconsciously conveyed within the texts of Indonesian aid. Following Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach propounded by van Dijk (2009), the analysis proceeds in two steps. First, macrostructure of the text, including its genre and key propositions, is clarified. Second, analysis of local meanings is run at sentence- and word-level. For this, we turn to content analysis, specifically as practiced by Alexander (2009) where overall discursive trend in the documents is explored via word frequency analysis, collocation (co-occurring words) analysis, and concordance (or Key Word in Context (KWIC)) analysis. The content analysis is facilitated with AntConc.

In this paper, we mainly analyze the Annual Reports of Indonesia's SSC which "record significant accomplishments of works/programs... and as a way of achieving accountability, while promoting Indonesia's SSC to both the international and domestic publics" (Government of Indonesia, 2017: ii). Therefore, the Annual Reports are perhaps the flagship documents of Indonesian aid comparable to United States Agency for International Development (USAID)'s Policy Framework or Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)'s Annual Reports (which we use in our analysis as comparison). However, unlike USAID's Policy Framework which "articulates USAID's approach to providing development and humanitarian assistance" (USAID, 2019: 6) and serves to guide future actions, the Annual Reports look back at activities and achievements in the previous year. Four volumes of the reports are used: the 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 editions—each about 60-page long. Meanwhile, USAID's "Policy Framework" is available in two editions: the 2011–2015 Policy Framework and the current 2019 Policy Framework. A second comparison comes from JICA's Annual Reports, latest four editions of which (2015–2018) are used. In terms of genre, JICA's documents are more similar to Indonesia's in which they describe past activities and directions rather than provide framework for future aid policies.

## 3. Purpose, Objectives, and Principles of Indonesia's Aid: A Rhetoric of Unity?

Information about the purpose, principles, priority areas or programs of Indonesian aid—from which we may analyze the messages of the aid—is found in a number of documents, including planning document (RPJMN), Annual Reports, and various policy papers. The 2015–2019 National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN)—the latest RPJMN officially available—lists Indonesia's aid programs under Agenda 1: Bringing the State Back to Protect the Whole Nation and Provide Security to All Citizens. Furthermore, the statement about the aid ("To improve the performance of South-South and Triangular development cooperation") is found in the sub-agenda "Strengthening the Role in Global and Regional Cooperation." It implies that the conduct of Indonesian aid is primarily a political affair,

the goal of which is to strengthen Indonesia's international position and indirectly contribute to the security of Indonesian people. This framing is supported by the terms used in RPJMN to describe the aid programs: "aid" is seldom used; instead, "cooperation" is more dominant. This usage of "cooperation" to replace "aid" is also found in other documents on Indonesian aid.

Meanwhile, information about the purpose of Indonesian aid may be understood from the principles of Indonesian aid. The policy paper "South-South Cooperation as Instrument of Indonesian Foreign Policy" mentions the following principles:

mutual respect for national sovereignty; equality; independence and non-conditionality; solidarity; national ownership; non-interference; mutual opportunity, mutual benefit; demand-driven; comprehensive, transparent, and sustainable; contributing to the achievement of global development agenda; and mutually beneficial economic relationship. (Cassidy et al., 2016: 43)

The policy paper also states that Indonesian aid is rooted in foreign policy and that the principles serve to "help each other achieve mutual independence, promote development, and strengthen solidarity between developing countries" (Cassidy et al., 2016: 43). On the other hand, the Annual Reports of Indonesia SSTC mention three priority areas of cooperation: development issue, economic issue, and good governance and peacebuilding issue (Government of Indonesia, 2017: 3). Further discussion about the Annual Reports is provided in the next section. For the meantime, we shall explain that the principles mostly serve a rhetoric purpose. This is markedly so in the Annual Reports, which is understandable since the Reports have a promotional function. The kind of rhetoric that is being promoted through principles such as demand-driven, solidarity, and ownership is the one about the unity of experience and history between developing countries. Consider this passage, for example, which displays the use of "solidarity" to support the rhetoric by evoking the image of Indonesian aid as rooted in the larger historical narrative of South-South cooperation:

South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC) has come as an initiative and act of solidarity from developing countries since 1960s. The main focus of SSTC is development cooperation to produce development solutions including on infrastructure, economic development, governance, social protection, education and health services, food and energy, environment and climate change, and others. Entering the 21st century, SSTC has become an important forum for developing countries to exchange information and experience, and to improve knowledge on development. (Government of Indonesia, 2016: 13)

While it is not wrong to display such messages and rhetoric, the emphasis on principles such as demand-driven, solidarity, and ownership runs the risk of becoming the goal,

instead of only means, of the aid programs. Such discourse may distract the attention of Indonesia's aid policymakers and practitioners from striving for development impact by concentrating instead on building good relationship with other developing countries. We shall explain this argument further below.

#### 4. Underlying Discourse of Indonesian Aid and Comparison with USAID and JICA

As discussed in the introduction, development discourse always looks for deficiencies in a given time or society which would then be addressed with development theories or assistance. Through content analysis, we can see which development objects are represented in the words that dominate Indonesia's Annual Reports. Surprisingly, there is a lack of such words. As seen in Table 1, words which indicate development problems, or areas, or topics do not appear at the top of the list. Among the top 100 words, these terms start to appear only on the 32<sup>nd</sup> with "economic." Recipient countries or regions are mentioned more, starting with "Timor" (indicating Timor-Leste) on the 22<sup>nd</sup> and followed by "Myanmar," "Fiji," "Pacific," and so on.

**Table 1. Most Frequent Words in Indonesia's Annual Reports<sup>1</sup>**

Rank	Frequency	Word
1	1,221	Indonesia
2	835	development
3	703	cooperation
4	560	South
5	489	countries
6	456	Training
7	449	SSTC
8	437	Was
9	391	ministry
10	348	international
11	319	program
12	301	is
13	289	this
14	272	national
15	253	SSC

It is also interesting to see "was" and "were" displayed prominently as the 8<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> most prominent words, respectively. On one hand, past description formed with these words supports the genre of the documents, which reports events or activities in the past. On the other, they are also used to invoke the historic Asian-African cooperation of the 1950s–1960s. Consider this passage, for example:

South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC) has come as an initiative and act of solidarity from developing countries since 1960s. The main focus of SSTC is development cooperation to produce development solutions including on infrastructure, economic development, governance, social protection, education and health services, food and energy, environment and climate change, and others. Entering the

21st century, SSTC has become an important forum for developing countries to exchange information and experience, and to improve knowledge on development. (Government of Indonesia, 2016: 13)

The passage comes from a section called "Indonesia's SSTC at a Glance" and functions to add credibility while painting a picture of solidarity among developing countries as Southern providers. The historical discourse seems to pervade other Southern providers' communication material, as conceded by the Bogota Statement: "SSC is a historical process, with unique characteristics, which reflects solidarity" (OECD, 2010: 1).

Meanwhile, terms indicating objects of the aid programs appear more in USAID's Policy Framework, starting with "growth" in the top 15 (Table 2). Unlike Indonesia's, recipient countries or regions are not mentioned individually; they are instead homogenized collectively as "countries," "many countries," or "some countries." In discourse analysis literature, this lexical pattern is called "Bankspeak." The term is derived from the language used by World Bank in its reports and connotes its generalizing discussion of development policies: solutions "are the same for everybody, everywhere" (Moretti & Pestre, 2015: 87).

**Table 2. Most Frequent Words in USAID's Policy Framework**

Rank	Frequency	Word
1	523	we
2	466	USAID
3	399	development
4	349	will
5	341	our
6	286	are
7	258	countries
8	227	more
9	218	is
10	189	world
11	185	policy
12	163	assistance
13	163	self
14	162	have
15	153	Growth

In JICA's Annual Reports, development areas are not as frequently mentioned as in USAID's. Instead, there are more mentions of technical terms which describe its means of aid, such as "project," "management," "training," and "risk" (Table 3). This seems to be the hallmark of development discourse in JICA's reports, where provision of aid is immediately equivalent to technical and managerial intervention. Although some of these terms such as "training" and "management" are also found in Indonesia's reports, they are used mostly in activity description and do not form a backbone of the storytelling. Although JICA's documents describe past activities, they do not employ past tense as much as in Indonesia's reports. Instead, similar to the USAID's documents, uses of present and present perfect tenses are more dominant. This might again suggest the use of narratives which emphasize on results (rather than individual programs/activities) and generalize them across different countries and time periods. This pattern is also supported by lexical choice which favors mentioning of recipients as a

<sup>1</sup> All the word frequency tables in this paper are generated with AntConc and exclude stop words such as "the," "and," "an."

collective rather than acknowledging each country or region individually. Finally, documents from USAID and JICA are also markedly different from Indonesia's due to their inclusion of terms that indicate expected aid quality—such as “inclusive,” “effective,” “impact,” and “sustainable.” These words are sorely missing in Indonesia's Annual Reports.

**Table 3. Most Frequent Words in JICA's Annual Reports**

Rank	Frequency	Word
1	5534	JICA
2	3194	development
3	2572	is
4	2145	countries
5	1938	cooperation
6	1708	Japan
7	1602	are
8	1275	developing
9	1231	project
10	1130	will
11	1089	international
12	1042	this
13	1039	at
14	1014	has
15	996	such

These findings imply that there has not been a clear message about development priorities to be pursued by the Indonesian aid. This is shown by the lack of development objects as an overarching goal of the programs and activities discussed in the Annual Reports. The Reports do mention about three flagship programs of Indonesia SSC—development, economy, and good governance and peacebuilding—but they never explain how each activity serves to achieve these three priorities. Instead, the dominant message embedded in the Annual Reports revolves around the rhetoric of unity among developing countries. This message is facilitated through principles such as demand-driven, ownership, and solidarity, as well as an appeal to the long history of cooperation. With such messaging, it might appear to the public that Indonesian aid programs are more intended to serve diplomatic purposes rather than to contribute to development as a global public goods. Frequent mentioning of individual countries such as Timor-Leste and Fiji (rather than calling them collectively as “countries” or “recipients” as USAID and JICA do) might also serve this diplomatic undertone by emphasizing which countries or regions have developed close cooperation with Indonesia. The lack of terms related to expected aid quality (such as “effective” and “sustainable”) further exacerbates the messaging by indicating that Indonesia has not concentrated on long-term impact of its programs.

### 5. Indonesia's Aid Messaging in Practice: The Case of Strengthening Gender Mainstreaming (SGM)

With a combination of formal messages and underlying discourse explained above, what effect(s) do they pose to Indonesia's aid practice? This question is particularly interesting since Indonesia's programs are sometimes conducted trilaterally, which means different agenda and messages can be found in a single program. This section turns to the case of Strengthening Gender Mainstreaming (SGM)—a trian-

gular program between Indonesia, USAID, and Fiji—for an answer.

The SGM ran from 2017 to 2019 and aimed to proliferate gender-responsive planning and budgeting (GRPB) in the Fijian government. The program follows a whole-of-government approach and positions Fiji's Ministry of Women, Children, and Poverty Alleviation (MWCPA) as “national gender machinery.” The first phase of the program in 2017 produced as its outputs training curriculum and modules and a training of trainers for MWCPA staffs. Subsequently in the second phase (2018), Fiji's MWCPA staffs were interned for one month at the Indonesian Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection (MWECP). In mid-2019, the third phase of the program was designed with the initial goal of advocating GRPB implementation in seven Fijian ministries and parliament. This goal would represent the main purpose of SGM, i.e., mainstreaming of gender-responsive policies in Fiji's system. However, during the negotiation in August 2019, Fiji called for a significant change in the program design by removing the interministerial advocacy and limiting the participants to only three ministries (from the initial seven). This effectively limited SGM to capacity building trainings and thereby also limiting the achievement of its “mainstreaming” goal. Later, Fiji was known to be engaging in similar cooperation with the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the Canadian government, therefore confirming that the change was necessary to give room for the other donors. Although there were early tensions because of the change, the SGM continued with only capacity building trainings and each actor was surprisingly content enough with the results. Remarkably, the implementation of SGM Phase III also shows the power of re-interpretation in triangular cooperation and the central role of Indonesia's development discourse in enabling it.

In terms of project documentation, the change of program's purpose from mainstreaming to “institutional capacity building” was resolved by a revision in the Program Design Matrix (PDM). However, such a big change was made possible in the first place due to Indonesia's reluctance to impose a strict expectation on its program. Our interview with an MWECP official reveals that Indonesia was reluctant to push Fiji to keep their participants' commitment for the program since doing so might be translated as too interfering. It also means that the decision about which Fijian agencies to train and engage with was fully made by Fiji, where the participants were dominated by government officials. This, in addition to the difficulty in communication with Fiji, would later contribute to Fiji striking other commitments with ADB and Canada.

However, such a deviation from the initial program goal was not understood as a failure. Instead, to some extent it may be publicly communicated as a “success.” There are two ways in which this interpretation of “success” may come about. First is the underlying discourse of Indonesia's aid which emphasizes diplomatic goals such as ownership and solidarity and de-emphasizes developmental objectives as explained above. It is a known fact that Indonesia's small aid budget and no local office in the recipient countries have played a huge role in limiting the ability to keep recipient's commitment to the aid programs. However, in the absence of these resources it is easy to exaggerate the

principles of Indonesia's aid such as demand-driven and ownership. All too often Indonesia would label its response following the recipients' demands as a representation of the demand-driven or ownership quality of its aid, and in doing so hinders the achievement of development goals that are more measured and transparent.

Second, Indonesia's "real" aid purpose might be achieved regardless of the achievements of the aid programs. The "real" or indirect purposes of aid are "evident not only in what [donors] said the goals of their aid were but in the decisions they made on its amount, country allocation, and use;" they include "diplomatic, developmental, humanitarian relief, and commercial" purposes (Lancaster, 2007: 13). From interviews and document analysis, the "real" purpose of Indonesian aid is related to diplomatic and commercial purposes. There are mentions about the aid being directed to expand the market for Indonesian firms, and in one interview with the State Secretariat it was mentioned that there has been (limited) engagement with state-owned enterprises as providers of goods and services procured through aid. On the other hand, some aid programs are intended to support Indonesia's agenda in the United Nations Security Council, General Assembly, and other international organizations. In the case of the cooperation with Fiji and other Pacific countries, the assistance might form part of Indonesia's attempt to gain votes for a non-permanent Security Council seat in 2018. As an instrument of foreign policy, an aid program having supplementary agenda or attempting to create win-win situations is not a new thing. However, these benefits for the aid provider usually come indirectly and in the long run in the form of favorable attitudes in the recipient country toward the donor. If these benefits and agenda are achievable without the need to demonstrate effective aid outcome, then the aid programs present the risk of falling into elite capture without necessarily improving conditions on the field.

The shortcoming of SGM and, despite of that, the acceptance of the triangular actors of the results illustrates the detrimental possibility Indonesia's aid messaging could bring when it comes to collaboration under the triangular scheme. The vagueness in the messaging of aid purpose facilitates not only reinterpretation by Indonesia—as explained above—but also by its triangular partners. In the absence of clear developmental measures, USAID as Indonesia's partner in SGM had to come up with convincing story to report, because it was simply not possible to say that the program failed to achieve its original goal. A US-AID Case Study on SGM emphasizes that the cooperation with ADB and Canada shows Fiji's growing commitment to gender equality; we can expect similar portrayal from the Fijian government as well. In other words, the lack of strict developmental targets in Indonesian aid has resulted in less conflictual relationships with its triangular partners as each actor is able to re-interpret the program to fit its agenda. However, this benefit comes at the expense of pursuing impactful programs.

## 6. Recommendations

What benefit is there in learning about the underlying discourse of aid? One benefit that easily comes to mind is re-

lated to branding—understanding what different messages mean to different groups of audience and comparing them with the messages from other donors certainly serves to create a more favorable brand of aid. However, discourse study and its use go deeper than that. According to van Dijk (2009), there is a triangular relation between discourse, cognition, and society. Discourse, or the meanings that we give to a phenomenon, structures our conduct in society, but the relation between them is mediated by our cognition (knowledge, or the process of understanding). To put it simply, our understanding of something determines our social treatment of that thing. Therefore, to improve Indonesia's aid programs, it is important to pay attention to the terms and concepts used in them since the meanings in those terms and concepts implicitly shape the practice resulted from them. In order to do that, we give our recommendations as follows.

*First*, the principles of demand-driven, solidarity, and ownership should be understood as principles, not goals. As discussed above, the use of these principles goes hand in hand with the diplomatic discourse underlying the aid programs and has distracted implementers from delivering programs with better impact. However, we do not recommend replacing the principles in Indonesia's aid communication since their position resembles a distinctive brand identity of South-South cooperation. Instead, we suggest presenting them only as the spirit of cooperation at the global level. At the technical, program level, aid implementers should formulate goals which represent the expected impact or effect for the recipient's development. The principles should guide the formulation of these goals, but not become them. Moreover, these principles cannot be used as an indicator with which to evaluate program's achievement. They may be used as a basis in program design, but more specific indicators are needed for evaluation. For example, ownership may be translated into the more measurable indicator of number of training modules designed by participants. Again, however, this is only an output-level indicator, not a goal- or impact-level indicator.

*Second*, it is also important to formulate goals which are achievable and measurable within the financial and institutional capacity of Indonesia's aid. This means not only that the expected program design and goals should be in line with the aid budget, they should also consider the capacity for monitoring and evaluation.

*Third*, clearer communication of developmental objectives in the programs will also help Indonesian government and triangular partners to agree on a single interpretation of achievement. This eventually will help reduce the fragmentation in the reporting of triangular cooperation. Today, there are a number of reports on program achievement from the NCT, implementing ministries, donors, and even consultants, each sometimes employing different measures of achievement.

We should expect better opportunity to implement these recommendations due to the new business process of aid funds allocation under Government Regulation 48/2018 and Government Regulation 57/2019. The new process will see technical ministries applying for foreign grants by submitting a proposal to the NCT Working Groups, who will then assess the application and decide on grants allocation. It

has the potential of streamlining program design by ensuring that proposed programs adhere to the same targets and priorities. With regard to the first two recommendations, it means that the Working Groups will have greater control over program's design and monitoring and evaluation plan and therefore should be able to ensure that goals, objectives, and evaluation indicators are impact-driven, measurable, and achievable. However, the implementation of the third recommendation is less clear at the moment since the Government Regulations do not state how triangular donor partners should interact with the new process. We do hope that the so-called "one gate" also applies to donors by centralizing donors' interaction with the Working Groups.

## References

- Alexander, R. J. (2009). *Framing discourse on the environment: A critical discourse approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Cassidy, F., Roedyati, J., Arby, R. A. E., Gultom, W. P., Prameswari, S. R., Dewi, E. D., Prasetyo, E. W., Widodo, B. D., Dewi, A. R., & Saptaningtyas, A. (2016). *Kerja sama selatan-selatan sebagai instrumen kebijakan luar negeri Indonesia [South-south cooperation as instrument of Indonesian foreign policy]*. Jakarta: Policy Research and Development Agency Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia.
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the third world*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.
- Fukuda-Parr, S. (2003). The human development paradigm: operationalizing Sen's ideas on capabilities. *Feminist Economics*, 9(2-3), 301-317. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1354570022000077980>.
- Government of Indonesia. (2017). *Annual Report of Indonesia South-South Cooperation 2017*. Jakarta.
- Government of Indonesia. (2016). *Annual Report of Indonesia's South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC) 2016*. State Secretariat The Republic of Indonesia. <https://isstc.setneg.go.id/index.php/component/content/article/7-newsletter/228-annual-report-of-indonesias-south-south-and-triangular-cooperation-sstc-2016>.
- Lancaster, C. (2007). *Foreign aid: Diplomacy, development, domestic politics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Moretti, F., & Pestre, D. (2015). Bankspeak: the language of World Bank reports. *New Left Review*, 92(2), 75-99.
- OECD. (2010). *Bogota Statement Towards Effective and Inclusive Development Partnerships*. The High Level Event on South-South Cooperation and Capacity Development. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/45497536.pdf>.
- Truman, H. (1949, January 20). *Inaugural address*. Harry S. Truman Library & Museum. Accessed April 4, 2020. <https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/library/public-papers/19/inaugural-address>.
- USAID. (2019). *USAID policy framework: Ending the need for foreign assistance*. United States Agency for International Development. [https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/Web\\_PF-MINI-BOOKLET\\_10APRIL2019.pdf](https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/Web_PF-MINI-BOOKLET_10APRIL2019.pdf).
- van Dijk, T. (2009). Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of critical discourse studies*, pp. 62-86. London: Sage.



Gedung LPEM FEB UI

Jl. Salemba Raya No. 4, Jakarta 10430

Phone : +62-21 3143177 ext. 621/623;

Fax : +62-21 3907235/31934310

Web : <http://www.lpem.org/category/publikasi/workingppers/>



9 772356 400001