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ABSTRACT


This research analyzes an interview done by Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton led by Steve Kroft as the correspondent on January 27, 2013. The transcripts are written by online news website, Huffington.com CBS interactive Inc. published a day after the interview. The writer conveys the research by applying Relevance Theory proposed by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson and focusing on the relevance, irrelevant and implicit, explicit meaning produced from the interview.

The writer divides the analysis into two parts. First, it is the relevant answers given by Barack Obama and Hillary towards the questions delivered by Steve Kroft. The second, it is the irrelevant answers which appear from the interview. Both the relevance and irrelevance are not only determined by the explicit meaning (explicature), but also by the implicit meaning (implicature).

The result conveys that implicit meaning generally produced from the irrelevant utterance. The more irrelevant utterance one stated in a conversation, the more needed to be analyzed what is the true meaning beyond what has been said.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of Study

Barack Obama is the first African American president of the United State of America (USA) who represents the Democratic Party. During the campaign, he has been tightly competing with his party teammate, who has been being a First Lady of the United State, Hillary Clinton. The bitter rivalry happens from Obama and Hillary during the campaign. The enmity is shown by the campaign stuff the candidates say to each other.

In their campaign, they at-all-times vilify to each other. It is well known as one of the fiercest competition US has ever had. In almost each campaign done by the candidates, they often give speech against each other side. However, not only does Hillary the hard-pressed campaign statements towards Obama, but also Obama does critically-tactical-campaign speech.

In one of his speeches, Obama mentions about being minorities would be very difficult. He mentions that the minorities are underestimated and do not have the same treatment.

"It's not surprising, then, they get bitter, they cling to guns or religion or anti-pathy to people who aren't like them, or anti-immigrant sentiment or anti-trade sentiment as a way to explain their frustrations."
In a forum in Pittsburgh Clinton hits Obama for saying voters are bitter over their economic situation, suggesting that Obama is projecting his own political failings onto voters:

"I am well aware that at a fundraiser in San Francisco, he said some things that many people in Pennsylvania and beyond Pennsylvania have found offensive. He was explaining to a small group of his donors what people who live in small towns right here in Pennsylvania are like and why some of you aren't voting for him. But instead of looking at himself, he blamed them. He said that they cling to religion and guns and dislike people who are different from them. Well, I don't believe that. I believe that people don't cling to religion, they value their faith. You don't cling to guns, you enjoy hunting or collecting or sport shooting. I don't think he really gets it that people are looking for a president who stands up for you and not looks down on you.”

In this speech, Hillary clearly shows that the speech is meant for Obama. It is because the speech is referring to Obama’s previous speech. Hillary willingly states about Obama as improper presidential candidate.

Besides of Hillary and barack Obama, the rivalry is shown by the Obama’s and Hillary’s sympathizers. Both of the strongholds are showing the opposition by giving bitter statements towards each other. Gibbs’ statement said:

“It is also ironic that Senator Clinton lavished praise on Monday and is fully willing to accept today the support of South Carolina state Sen. Robert Ford, who said if Barack Obama were to win the nomination, he would drag down the rest of the Democratic Party because 'he's black,””

Nevertheless, a number of arguments tell that there is no competition between the two candidates. As described by Senator Kennedy that there is no cheating and jealousy that I see among the
candidates.¹ In fact, the rivalry certainly will still appear in whichever competitions.

As Senator Ron Wyden (D-Ore) argues towards the Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton opposition that he positively thinks everyone will be fighting to get oxygen at the high altitude.² It clearly describes that the more limited and highly demanded a position, the harder the competition will be created. Therefore, it will cause competition to accomplish and win the election. It shows that both Obama and Hillary have unbendable competition to get the highest position in the United States.

In this interview, Neither Obama nor Hillary certainly would show their opposition by paying attention to speech that they utter as well as their positions as the President and Secretary of the State; therefore, they are required to have a good and commendable behavior as stated by Yule, that conversation is influenced by relationship status of participants, based on the social value attached to it such power.³

Being a President and the Secretary of the State, both Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton have an important role in order to the State which will certainly need more polite words usage and there will be no word that could jeopardize their feelings and positions. Hence, they

---

² Ibid.
usually prefer safer approaches by providing the implicit meaning of their utterances.

By Applying Relevance Theory of conversational implicature will compose the interview to be more compulsive analyzing as we can acquire unstated meanings besides what has been said. The theory discusses about the implicit meaning of utterances of a person as well as on interviews conducted by Steve Kroft towards Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton in their interviews.

Yule states that when the speaker does not feel in a safe position, subsequently he/she would have an irrelevant conversation by flouting the four maxims which is known as Hedge.\textsuperscript{4} On the other hand Relevance Theory works more to the conversational relevance in order to advance hearer’s inferential strategy and assumption.

There are impacts in a communication process obtained by the listener, namely the impact of contextual effects and the impact of a contradiction. However, in conversational implicature and cooperative principle, the discussion is focused on the synchronization between the speaker’s utterances and the listener’s answers.

In Pragmatics, conversational implicature concept was first introduced by H. Paul Grice in William James lectures delivered at Harvard in 1967 and published in 1975. In his opinion every conversation both speakers and addressees are generally cooperative

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., pp. 17-18
with each other regarding the four maxims: quality, quantity, relevant, manner. In contrast to Grice, Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson only classify the four maxims to be a principle of relevance.

Therefore, this research aims to discuss about the U.S. President Barack Obama’s and Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton’s interview led by Steve Kroft on January 27\textsuperscript{th}, 2013. This is the first, sat side by side, interview done by Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton at the White House, USA.

B. Focus of The Research

Based on the topic that has been raised in the background of study, this research is limited to the analysis of the implicated meaning in Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton’s interview on \textit{60 Minutes} program video on January 27, 2013. It is placed at the White House. The video is retrieved from Youtube.com and the transcription is retrieved from \url{http://www.cbsnews.com/news/hillarys-first-joint-interview-next-to-bill-in-92/}.

The theory that will be used for this research is Relevance Theory proposed by Sperber and Wilson. The focus of the research will conclude whether Barack Obama or Hilary Clinton imply certain meaning more than what they say in the interview, as the theory
explains that implicated meaning comes from signs which speaker signals through conversation.⁵

C. Research Questions

This study is conducted to answer the following questions:

1. How relevance Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton’s answers towards Steve Kroft’s questions?
2. What are the implicit meanings of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton’s answer in the interview?

D. Significance of The Research

This research is generally expected to increase knowledge and insight into the study of Conversational Implicatures that researchers can develop the understanding through Relevance theory concept. Theoretical benefits are expected to contribute in any research that can develop new ideas towards Relevance theory for linguistic studies, and it is projected to present and give new information about related topic.

The practical benefits are hoped to give the development of the knowledge of language society especially for them who want to involve more in linguistics field. It is also hoped to be the first step in introducing linguistics to societies, especially in the study of contextual meaning through Relevance Theory.

E. Research Methodology

1. The Objectives of The Research

This study aims to find out:

1. The relevance between Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton’s answers towards Steve Kroft’s questions.
2. The implicit meanings occur from Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton’s interview

2. The Method of The Research

Given by the identification and the classification of the data which intricate details about the implicated meaning towards the interview, the writer applies the qualitative research. Hatch in Qualitative Research Introduction journal states that data analysis is a systematic search for meaning which it is away to process qualitative data therefore what has been learned can be communicated to others.⁶ Hence, the writer finds that qualitative research will positively appropriate to the research.

3. The Techniques of Data Analysis

This research will be examined by watching and examining the video, reading the transcription, identifying the utterances, underlining the words, phrases, clauses and sentences in the

---

⁶ *Qualitative Research Introduction*. Center for Teaching, Research & Learning Research Support Group at the Social Science Research Lab American University, Washington, D.C.
transcriptions, analyzing and interpreting the utterances, marking and indexing the data.

4. **The Instrument of The Research**

The instruments of this research are video and transcription of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton’s interview with the help of World Wide Web and internet to access Youtube page for the video and huffington post for the transcription. In addition, various sources for instance, books, journals, and mass media give important role as the instrument to strengthen the data and the research process.

5. **Time and Place of The Research**

The researcher will conduct the research in the main library of the Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta, the faculty library of Adab and Humanities Faculty, the researcher’s room which is found as a fine-quiet place and other places that can support the research. The researcher begins the research in August 2014 and will be finished in September 2014.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Previous Research

A number of previous researches have been existing in regard to research in Pragmatic field specifically in Relevance Theory (henceforth RT). It is used to avoid any similarity towards the analysis. The first research is done by William Turnbull and Jeremy I. M. Carpendale entitled A Social Pragmatic Model of Talk: Implication for Research Development of Children’s Social Understanding. The study is focused on the methodological implication and they illustrated the relevance of this social pragmatic model for theory and research on human development through an analysis of the role of talk in the development of children's social understanding.

A research on children's understanding of mind, known as children's theories of mind, was initially concerned with the cognitive transition of achieving an understanding of the possibility of false beliefs. The analysts use 15 captures of different casual conversations as their data analysis. In this research, all the data analysis show how implicit meaning occurs in a conversation and how the children understand what is implied from the utterances.

---

They argue by engaging with others in the shared activities of talk, by engaging in the culture, children are uncovered to the external criteria that together with their inner experiences, are required for an understanding of mind. They add in further that, the orderly practices by which talk is accomplished, including turn-taking and initiating, changing, repairing, and terminating exchanges, are practices that are used to accomplish all types of interaction.  

“Talk is an example par excellence of interaction, and an analysis of talk should, therefore, be highly informative about other forms of interaction. For example, joint attention in infancy appears to share many of the features that we have described, including turn-taking, responding to others’ turns, and repairing misunderstandings”.

Thus, whether one is interested in social interaction in its own right, interested in the impact of social interaction on some phenomenon, or interested in the impact of some phenomenon on social interaction, the social pragmatic model of talk is highly relevant and useful.

The second research is proposed by Gregory Warn and Laurence R. Horn entitled *Phatic Communication and Relevance Theory: A Reply To Žegarac &Clark.* The research studies about the correctness of RT which is assumed and an analysis of “phatic communication” proposed within that framework.

This research is aimed to constitute an advance in pragmatic theory, since until

---

9 Phatic Communication is a development of Malinowski’s earlier notion of ‘phatic communion’ which explains as language used for establishing an atmosphere or maintaining social contact rather than for exchanging information or ideas (according to Warn Gregory & Laurence R. Horn. 1999. *Phatic Communication and Relevance Theory: A Reply To Žegarac &Clark.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). p. 555)
recently there is no comprehensive all-inclusive within which certain pragmatic generalization could be stated. Besides, we found that RT suffers from one of the principal afflictions of the aforementioned work in GB/PP/Minimalism mainstream: a remarkable failure to address, come to terms with, and incorporate the extensive previous literature on the topic under current consideration.

The study concludes that phatic interpretations achieve relevance by suggesting something about the nature of social relationship between the speaker’s and the hearers’. Yet they are given no clues as to with social relationship involved or how phatic communication affects them. Until these issues are addressed, the utility of RT, or indeed any other frameworks, in describing and explaining the phenomenon remains in doubts.\(^\text{10}\)

The third research is proposed by Vanessa T. Vigil, Julia A. Eyer and W. Paul Hardee (2005) entitled Relevant Responding in Pragmatic Language Impairment: The Role of Language Variation in the Information-soliciting Utterance. It is concerned in the study of children’s pragmatic language difficulties to respond relevantly information-soliciting utterance (ISU) in relation to variations in ISU complexity. This research done by analyzing a school age child named Darrell, and the analysis focused conversations between a clinician or a graduate student clinician and a boy in treatment for pragmatic language difficulties.

\(^{10}\text{Ibid., p.563}\)
It is considered that a child who has pragmatic language difficulties will have trouble in understanding some meanings relevantly; therefore, it resulted two opinions. First, the child’s ability to entertain a large number of ideas at the same time may overwhelm comprehension performance leading to non-relevant responding. Secondly is some specific types of propositions could be particularly difficult to process. For example, the presence of implied propositions might require additional processing resources and thus be more likely to result in a non-relevant response.\footnote{T. Vigil, Vanessa. Et all..(2005). Relevant Responding in Pragmatic Language Impairment: The Role of Language Variation in the Information-soliciting Utterance.(USA).}

The forth research entitled *Shared Assumptions: Semantic Minimalism and Relevance Theory* is done by Daniel Wedgewood. The research is conducted to answer the Cappelen & Lepore argument that linguistic communication requires “shared content” and the argument that RT makes content sharing impossible through “radical contextualism”. In this research, the author finds that the arguments in regards to RT and its radical contextualism is as misdirection, they both absorbed just two theoretically and psychologically important levels of meaning and both asserted that these are: (i) that which is communicated by a given linguistic form independently of context and (2) that which is understood to be communicated in a particular context - which is an indeterminate number of propositions, among which implicatures and any sense of 'what is said' are derived by the same mechanisms.
In fact, the term of “content sharing” do not distinguish the two approaches which in particular there remain two differences. First, while Cappelen and Lepore leave it behind of attempting to characterize the process of deriving Speech Act meaning from encoded meaning, RT proposes a set of inferential principles to do just this. Second, while RT makes no a priori claims for encoded meaning, Cappelen and Lepore insist that minimal semantic content is proposition. It causes Cappelen and Lepore to include in minimal semantic content elements of meaning that would not enter into RT's encoded meaning, and consequently clashes with their own requirement that minimal semantic content be shared across different contexts.\textsuperscript{12}

The fifth analysis related to relevance theory entitled \textit{Analisis Wacana Humor Kemarahan Presiden Iraq Kepada Wartawan dengan Menggunakan Teori Relevansi} is done by Aprileny, a graduate student of University of Indonesia. In this research, the writer uses conversation of the President of Iraq and reporters in an interview as the data analysis which focuses on the humor created from unexpected implication of utterances. The writer claims that humor usually depends on the implicature although in fact humor is related to ones’ socio-cultural aspect.

The output of the research is by applying Relevance Theory humor could create exploitation of indeterminacy/under-specification up to reaching the specific signal (ostensive communication). The exploitation happens through

choosing the propositions consisted in implicature and explicature either from the speakers or the listeners which are not immediately verified them. The highest sense of humor is formed when the possibility of the proposition choices closed by uttering the explicature with a high possibility of relevance by one of the speaker in that discourse of humor.13

In this particular, there are a number of differences between this research and the five previous researches as such above. This research tries to attempting three points. First, it aims to study about the implicit meanings occur from Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton’s interview while in the previous ones that there were no research concerning in the implication term made by being irrelevant. Second, the way speaker imply their meaning was not a concern from those researches, moreover it was discussing about the form of RT, while this research aims to know the way Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton’s imply the meaning. The third is, it is to conduct the relevancy between the answers from Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton with their meanings where in the one hand it has little similarity with the previous researches in discussing the comprehension of understanding utterances, on the other hand, it has differences in the data analysis.

The previous researches mainly are done by graduate and post-graduate students on behalf of their theses and dissertations. Moreover, it is done by linguistic experts in order to assess the theory validity. In UIN Syarif

Hidayatullah Jakarta, specifically in English Language and Literature department, this is the first research discussing about Relevance Theory; therefore, there is no previous research to be considered.

B. Concept

1. Relevance Theory

Relevance theory (henceforth RT) is developed by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson in 1986 in their first book and the second book is in 1995, the book is discussed about cognitive theory of human communication in which they assume that people can have assumption towards utterances. The principle of this theory is that every act of ostensive communication communicates the presumption of optimal relevance. Sperber and Wilson describe ostensive communication is the situation (in regular communication) where there is interaction communicator wants signaling something and create a common understanding and intention is understood by the listener.

Sperber and Wilson add one more fundamental claim beside the ostensive communication regarding the cognition and communication in RT. They argue that human cognition tends to be geared to the maximization of relevance. However, Blackmore argues that Sperber and Wilson view communication from the point of view of the sub-personal

---

15 Ibid.,
cognitive processes which are involved in the human ability to entertain representations of other people’s thoughts and desires and ideas on the basis of public stimuli such as utterances or gestures.\(^\text{17}\)

This theory is a form of cognitive development of the theory of cooperative principle of conversational implicature Grice's maxims of conversation, a theory which discusses about how people use language in a conversation. The basis of principle of this theory is to emphasize the hearer to contribute as it is required in which conversation he or she is involved. Saeed argues that implicature is an intention that is made by speaker and is meant to be assumed by the hearer.\(^\text{18}\) It means that implicature is usually used for inferring what speaker wants to inform through the explicit meaning.

In RT, it provides a basis of understanding to the concept of:

a. Meaning of a sentence can be symbolized according to several different interpretations in the same context.

b. These Interpretations are graded in terms of accessibility;

c. The addressees rely on a strength criterion when selecting the most suitable interpretation; and

d. The criteria for making the listeners to choose one interpretation from array of appropriate interpretations, when

---


\(^\text{18}\) Saeed., Op., cit. 204
the listeners catch the first interpretation seemingly as the appropriate one, the interpreting process will be stopped at the point.

It is said that in interpreting a set of assumption will result three kinds of effects such as contextual effects, strengthening effects and contradictions effects. The idea of contextual effects is considered as a very important aspect of RT because it is usually related in processing an understanding of utterances. The contextual effect is gained when the listener interprets the speaker’s utterance which is usually known as listener’s assumptions. These assumptions gradually have led to form new information formed from the change of background knowledge.¹⁹ Sperber and Wilson add that in interpreting an utterance, it is not only identifying the assumptions expressed explicitly, but also it is adding the assumption that has been processed into the stored knowledge and experience that already exists.²⁰

The contextual effect certainly helps to explain two important characters of speech assumption: the interpreting includes processing a set of assumptions, and in the sequence of assumptions stand as newly presented information and is being processed in the context of previously

---

²⁰ Ibid., p. 175
processed information.\textsuperscript{21} The impact of contextual relevance is very important in characterizing the information being told.\textsuperscript{22}

Sperber and Wilson assume that people have an 'intuition relevance' that they can recognize and distinguish relevant information which is not relevant, or in some cases, to distinguish information that is more relevant and less relevant.\textsuperscript{23} The definition of relevant and irrelevant meaning are very subjective, where when one considers utterances issued is relevant but it is not necessarily considered relevant by the hearer.

Moreover, Sperber and Wilson describe that at each point in a discourse, the hearer has in the forefront of his or her mind a different set of assumptions, which he or she may never have processed together before, and may never process together again.\textsuperscript{24} By working out the synthetic implications of this set of assumptions, she or he can acquire new information which may be lost forever when that particular set is dismantled and its constituent assumptions are either forgotten or stored in their separate locations in the hearer’s encyclopedic memory. Thus, it is can be said that the information given by the speaker can bring up the hearer to strengthen his or her memories or it can cause him or her to restore the old stored memories to the new information gathered from speaker’s utterances.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{21} Sperber & Wilson., Op. Cit. p.176
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., p. 176
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., p. 177
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid.,}
Sperber and Wilson explain that it is not just the assumptions come together in the hearer’s mind for what may be the only time. They also come together in a certain sequence, and are presumably processed in that sequence, therefore, each new assumption is processed in the context of a set of assumptions many of which have themselves just been processed.\textsuperscript{25}

The two essential properties of utterance comprehension as it is one of the notion of a contextual effect are having a mutually role in helping to describe: comprehension involves the join processing of a set of assumptions \{I\}, and in that set some assumptions stand out as newly presented information being processed in the context of information that has itself been previously processed.\textsuperscript{26}

Sperber and Wilson argue that having contextual effects is a necessary condition for relevance; it is essential for characterization of relevance, and that other things being equal, the greater condition the contextual effects, the greater the relevance.\textsuperscript{27} In other words, the contextual effect is required in order to lead a hearer assumption to get the meaning of a speaker’s utterance, and the more cooperative the speaker in delivering the information, the more relevant the utterance will be created.

In some cases, there are thus three types of cases in which an assumption may lack of contextual effect and be irrelevant in a context. It is illustrated as such, (1), the assumption made may provide new

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid.,  
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.,  
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., p.119
information, but the information given does not have any relation to the information presented in the context. (2), the assumption is already given in the context and the newly presented information does not affect any change accordingly to the assumption have been being made; therefore, this newly given informative rather not informative. (3), there is inconsistent correlation between the assumption and the context and it is too weak to be upset; processing the assumption thus leaves the contexts unchanged.

Moreover, the word “Relevance” is an unclear term that it does not have certain meaning which is used differently by different people or by the same people at different times as some people can have a notion that something relevant is when it has related meaning to the context and some will say that to have a relevance it needed a deep digging to unveil the meaning. Sperber and Willson assume that people can consistently distinguish relevant from irrelevant information, or in some cases, more relevant from less relevant information.

The irrelevant information can be happened here because there is no contextual effect given by an utterance, which it utterly unrelated to the context in question. In other words, it intuitively will not be relevant as long as it has no contextual effect as in the present context. Sperber and Wilson explain that it is not the only assumption explicitly expressed by the utterance that lacks contextual effects and is irrelevant: the fact that

---

28 Ibid.,
someone chooses to express an irrelevant assumption may itself be highly relevant.\textsuperscript{29}

Sperber and Wilson give example towards the relevant or irrelevant assumptions of utterances, if you take a particular set of assumptions \{C\} and add to it some arbitrarily chosen assumption \(P\), there is little reason to expect \(P\) to be relevant at all in the context \{C\}, or to have any contextual effect in it either.\textsuperscript{30} In other words, an assumption is relevant in a context if and only if it has some contextual effect in that context. Another example Sperber and Wilson give has meaning that having contextual effect might not only be a necessary for a condition of relevance but also sufficient.

(1) \textit{Flag-seller}: would you like to buy a flag for the Royal National Lifeboat Institution?

\textit{Passer-by}: No thanks, I always spend my holidays with my sister in Birmingham.

It might seem irrelevant as the question from the flag-seller and the answer from the passer-by especially for hearers who do not know the background knowledge about the Royal National Lifeboat Institution and Birmingham, but to understand the relevance between the question and the answer, hearers should have something called premises.

(2) (a) Birmingham is inland.

(b) The Royal National Lifeboat Institution is a charity.

(c) Buying a flag is one way subscribing to a charity.

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., p. 121
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., p.120
(d) Someone who spends his holidays inland has no need of the services of the Royal National Lifeboat Institution.

(e) Someone who has no need of the services of a charity cannot be expected to subscribe to that charity.

(3) The passer-by cannot be expected to subscribe to the Royal National Lifeboat Institution.

Another example describes that the contextual effect will lead hearers to a relevant result.

(4) Man : Are you going to Indonesia?
Woman : No I’m not. I’m going to around the world except to Asia.

In this conversation, the woman’s answer seems irrelevant to the context in which the man asking about a country where she will be going. However, the relevance can be seen from the contextual effect that we get from the answer which lead to

(5) Indonesia is in Asia;

(6) The woman only go to four continents, she is not going to Asia;

(7) If the woman is not going to Asia;

(8) The woman is not going to Indonesia.

Sperber and Wilson, in this theory, make a distinction between implicated premises and implicated conclusion. Implicated premises are described as indirectly stated and therefore is implicated but it is provided as an inferential support for the final implicature which is describing the
implicated conclusion as the result or the conclusion of the implicated promises.\textsuperscript{31} In summary, in this theory one overarching principle of relevance is used to describe a whole range of inferential behavior. The theory stresses the under determination of meaning and its reliance on context and inference. Through the notion of implicature, Sperber and Wilson take the process of inference in understanding deep into traditional areas of semantics and reduce the importance of literal or context-free meaning.\textsuperscript{32}

2. The Principle of Relevance

A communication seemingly requires an attractive act of ostensive communication to gain the attention of the listener’s (Sperber and Wilson). The listener’s attention plays role in successful communication and it can be determined that the communication process can reach the relevance term. Speaker should be able to attract the audience/listener, because in communicating, it requires the listener’s interest. Sperber and Wilson explain why a communication should have good cooperation from both speaker and listeners, in this case the speaker that should attract the listener’s attention because an act of ostensive communication cannot be achieved when the listener is out of the speaker’s range.

In other words, an act of ostensive communication is a request for attention. According to Sperber and Wilson, the request of attention may be ill founded or made in bad faith, but it cannot wholly be cancelled. If a

\textsuperscript{31} I. Saheed, John., \textit{Loc., cit.} p.210
\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Ibid.}, p.210
request has been made at all, the requester must have assumed that the requestee would have some motive for complying with it.\textsuperscript{33} It is claimed that the request of paying attention should be given together with a good stimulus therefore the listener can draw the relevant assumption towards the request.

There is thus a substantial difference between the frame of mind in which the individual may approach an ostensive communication stimulus directed at him or her and frame of mind in which he or she approaches other phenomena. When attending to other phenomena, he or she may have hopes of relevance: if such hopes were totally unwarranted, there would be no point in attending to them at all.\textsuperscript{34}

Sperber and Wilson have illustrated towards the ostensive communication stimulus that yet a blackmailer need to make it look preferable for his or her victim to cooperate rather than to refuse; similarly, when a drowning man asks for helps, his chance is to hope there are some passer-by will find him, however physically inconvenient, to help him.\textsuperscript{35} Another example is like a salesperson has to make a good stimulus to get attention from his or her buyer, however, the more convenient he or she promote the product to the customers, the more chance he or she has to sell it. If there is lack of good stimulus given by the requester, the effect of the order could not be relevant as it is will be deliberately irrelevant.

\textsuperscript{33} Sperber and Wilson., \textit{Loc., cit.} p. 155
\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 156
\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 155
With an ostensive stimulus, nonetheless, the addressee can have not only hopes, but also fairly prices expectations of relevance.\textsuperscript{36} It is obvious that if the audience or the listener cannot pay attention to the stimulus consequently the ostensive communication cannot be success. Yus in Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics argues that humans are endowed with an ability to maximize the biological relevance of the incoming stimulus (including linguistic utterances and other communicative behaviors).\textsuperscript{37}

It can be mentioned that the listener or the audience, in fact, has the ability to gain the stimulus as long as the requester deliver a well-understood stimulus. As Sperber and Wilson argue regarding to the exact content of the presumption of relevance communicated by an act of ostensive communication that what is communicated is that to the best of communicator’s knowledge, the ostensive stimulus is relevant enough to be worth the listener’s attention.\textsuperscript{38}

We want to argue that the presumption of the relevance is different on the effect and effort sides. On the effect side, the presumption is that the level of effects achievable is never less than is needed to make the stimulus worth processing; on the effort side, it is that the level of effort required is never more than is needed to achieve these effects.

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 156
\textsuperscript{38}Sperber and Wilson., \textit{Op., cit.} p. 156
The level of relevance that will be presumed to exist takes into account the interest of both communicator and communicant or audience (it is called as a level of optimal relevance). Sperber and Wilson give the general explanation apropos the presumption of optimal relevance and the principle of relevance as below.

(9) Presumption of optimal relevance

(a) The set of assumption \( I \) which the communicator intends to make manifest to the addressee is relevance enough to make it worth the addressee’s while to process the ostensive stimulus.

(b) The ostensive stimulus is the most relevant on the communicator could have used to communicate \( I \).

And here is the principle of relevance:

(10) Principle of relevance

Every act of ostensive communication communicates the presumption of its own optimal relevance.

3. Meaning And Context

In understanding RT there is much of the comprehension involves reliance on meaning and context. To discuss about the comprehension in understanding context and meaning as well as it needs to understand the several aspects such as reference and context, knowledge as context, discourse as context, and background knowledge as context.

1. Reference and Context
According to Saeed the reliance on context in conversation usually happens together with some calculation on the part of the speaker and hearers. Saeed (according to Clark, 1978) appends that the clear example of this called as **short-hand**.

As he gives example towards a short-hand in a sentence:

(11) It’s a struggle keeping the barnacles from off the crops.

Saeed heard this sentence when he was listening to the radio, at first he did not recognize what *barnacles* here meant and after a while it became clear that it was a short-hand for *barnacle geese*.  

This simple example above is a characteristic of normal language use: successful references are made by speaker by calculating how much information their hearers need and when they can, they give less. In other words, the more hearers know and store the information, the less information they need to create successful reference, hence it will be easily to identify the speaker’s intention.

(12) I’m looking for the new wolf (i.e. Wolfe).

---
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where the speaker manifest felt that the new Wolfe was sufficient for the bookseller to identify the new book by Tom Wolfe.\textsuperscript{41}

(13) It is hard to drive an old Kijang (i.e. Toyota Kijang). In Indonesian context an old Kijang refers to a type of Toyota car called Kijang, if the hearers do not have previous information about it, Kijang could be parsimoniously referred to an animal in English namely antelope.

Short-hands are sometimes used together with the rhetorical devices metonymy and synecdoche. There exist a disadvantages created by the use of technical terms like short-hands, metonymy and synecdoche that it suggests that in regard to special use of language there are rhetorical devices whereas they are just specific examples of the routine calculation involved in making reference.\textsuperscript{42}

Clark (1978, in Saeed) explains in regard to the use of context and calculation in a parallel example with a hypothetical situation where someone wants to buy two bottles of Heinken larger. “In a pub, they might say Two bottles of Heinken, please! In a theater bar, when only bottled beer is available, their request might be: Two Heinken, please! At a sponsor’s stall at an open-air concert, which only serves

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., P.189
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid.,
Heinken beer, in bottle and on draught, they could say: *Two bottles, please!* If the stall only sold bottles, they might say just *Two please!* It concludes that here is that the ordinary use of referring involves calculations of retrievability, which the account of contextual information.\(^{44}\)

2. Knowledge as Context

A speaker estimating how to make reference to a certain entity by concerning to what the hearers know; therefore, the calculations of retrievability are in actual fact guessing about knowledge. It is helpful to divide knowledge into several different categories to ease the discussion about it. This is not scientific classification but it is only meant to organizing the discussion.\(^{45}\) We might, for example, distinguish between three different sources for the knowledge a speaker has to estimate:

1. The computable from the physical context;
2. The available from what has already been said;
3. The available from background or common knowledge.

3. Background Knowledge as Context

The third type of knowledge has been called in many terms, including background, common-sense, encyclopedic, socio-cultural, and real-world knowledge. What is usually meant is

\(^{43}\) Ibid.,
\(^{44}\) Ibid.,
\(^{45}\) Ibid.,
the knowledge a speaker might estimate others would possibly have in the previous, or independently of, a particular conversation, by virtue of membership in a community.\textsuperscript{46}

As human beings, we all are, engage not only in one community, but also there are other communities that we might involve in. It is opposite to what Chomsky (1965 p.3-4 in Wardhaugh) proposes that human beings are ‘completely homogeneous speech community’.\textsuperscript{47} In fact the human social activities showing that we all might have a number of overlapping communities such as speakers of our native language, students of the same class, members of the same party, employee of the same company and so on; therefore, the knowledge ones’ have might be different from others whether it is more or less.

Every society ones involved in certainly might give a number different types of knowledge which might be shared deliberately with other member and which conversationalist must seek to calculate as they interact.\textsuperscript{48}

4. Discourse and Context

The term of Discourse or Discourse Analysis used to describe activities at the intersection of disciplines as diverse as

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, philosophical linguistics and computational linguistics. The origins of discourse analysis are to be found not only in linguistics and the philosophy of language, but also in social anthropology and theoretical sociology.

Discourse itself signals the particular view of language in use as an element of social life which is closely interconnected with other elements. The unifying insight is that discourse organizes important aspect of our social lives, whether in the moment-to-moment social interchanges of everyday talk or, more abstractly, in the beliefs, understanding and principles (‘discourse’) that structure our lives. In other words, discourse is used to analyze the use of language both in written and spoken forms which has significant role towards the analysis of language in use either conversational and or conventional analysis.

In regards of its work, discourse divides conversation into two terms, transactional and interactional. The transactional communication regarding to Yule has function involved in expressing social relations and personal attitudes, while interactional has function to serve in the expression of content.

Yule’s distinction about transactional and interactional stands in general to the correspondence to the functional dichotomies. Suppose the

---

51 Brown., Op., Cit., p. 3
53 *Ibid.*,
transactional language the speaker or the writer primarily has in mind is the efficient transference of information which the language used in such a situation is message oriented. Furthermore, the interactional conversation used to describe as a conversation either face-to-face as spoken conversation or through media such as phone calls, correspondences and or email.

Yule summarizes from Labov, 1972a; Brown and Levinson, 1978; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974; Lakoff, 1973 that conversation analysis have been particularly concerned with the use of language to negotiate role-relationships, peer-solidarity, the exchange of turns in a conversation, the saving of face of both speaker and hear.

Regarding to the explanation, it is clearly the case that a great deal of everyday human interaction is characterized by the primarily interpersonal rather than primarily transactional use of language.

Context comes in various shapes and operates at various levels, from the infinitely small to the infinitely big. The infinitely small would be the fact that every sentence produced by people occurs in a unique environment of preceding and subsequent sentences, and consequently derives part of its meaning from these other sentences. The infinitely small can also pertain to one single sound becoming a very meaningful thing -- ‘yes’ pronounced with a falling intonation is declarative and

---

54 Ibid.,
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affirmative; spoken with a rising intonation it becomes a question or an expression of amazement or disbelief.\textsuperscript{57}

The infinitely big would be the level of universals of human communication and of human societies -- the fact that humanity is divided into women and men, young and old people, and so on.\textsuperscript{58} Context is potentially everything and contextualization is potentially infinite, but, remarkably, in actual practice it appears to be to some extent predictable. \textsuperscript{59}

People seem to have rather clear (though not necessarily accurate) ideas about how they have to make language fit into activities and how they have to create meaning out of this blending.\textsuperscript{60}

Gumperz in Blommaert explains about the development of the notion of contextualisation to account for the ways in which people ‘make sense’ in interactions and, taking on board both broad ethnographic concerns as well as narrower conversation-analytic ones, he observed that people pick up quite a few ‘unsaid’ meanings in such interaction.\textsuperscript{61} These are the indexical meanings mentioned in chapter 1: the connections between language form and social and cultural patterns. People detect these indexical meanings because speakers provide verbal and nonverbal, behavioral ‘cues’ that suggest a fit between utterances and contextual spaces in which they become meaningful:

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid.,  
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid.,  
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.,  
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid.,  
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., p.42
I argue that conversational interpretation is cued by empirically detectable signs, contextualization cues, and that the recognition of what these signs are, how they relate to grammatical signs, how they draw on socio-cultural knowledge and how they affect understanding, is essential for creating and sustaining conversational involvement and therefore to communication as such.\textsuperscript{62}

We may view the talk itself as a kind of context often called the discourse which the interpretation of sentence fragments is one clear example of it. Fragments such as \textit{No, I didn’t} or \textit{Either did I}, in separation, cannot be interpreted, but in the right conversational context they are meaningful:

1. a: Did you bring the Heinken last night?
   
   b: No, I didn’t

2. a: I forgot to bring my homework
   
   b: Either did I

the hearer would have no difficulties interpreting \textit{No, I didn’t} as \textit{I didn’t bring the Heinken last night}; or \textit{Either did I} as \textit{I forgot to bring my homework too}. Clearly the preceding discourse licenses these interpretations. The notion of what the discourse is about – a kind of current topic seems clearly constructed by the participants or the hearers in conversing.

\textsuperscript{62} \textit{Ibid.}, p.42
CHAPTER III

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

A. Data Descriptions

The data are classified partly into chopping dialogues between the correspondent, Steve Kroft, and the President and The Secretary of United State of America (USA), Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton. The texts are retrieved from online news CBSNews.com. The interview mainly discusses about the roles of Secretary Clinton towards USA and the world during her position as Secretary of State in last four years.

The data the writer taken from the transcript are likely to have implicated meaning from the conversation whether they can be relevant or irrelevant in implicit or explicit understanding. Therefore, the writer has 13 data which will be analyzed both the relevance and the implicit meaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Dialogues</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Irrelevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>01:49 - 02:48</td>
<td>Steve: “There’s no political tea leaves to be read here?” Hillary: “We don’t have any tea. We’ve got some water here is the best I can tell. …..”</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>03:06 - 3:18</td>
<td>Steve: “…. Why were you so insistent about wanting her to be secretary of state?” Obama: “Well, I was a big admirer of Hillary’s before our primary battles and the general election. …..”</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steve: "You've been quoted as thinking or telling people that there was no way you were going to take this job and you weren't going to let anybody talk you into it."

Hillary: "Well, I would—"

Steve: "What did he say that night that made you—"

Hillary: "Well, I was so surprised, because, you know, after I ended my campaign, I immediately did everything I could to help the president get elected, because despite our hard-fought primary, we had such agreement on what needed to be done for our country."

Barack: "Made for tough debates, by the way, 'cause we—"

Hillary: "It did. We could never figure out what we were different on. Yeah, we worked at that pretty hard. …."

Steve: "What did he promise you? And has he kept the promises?"

Hillary: "It was going to be hard. But, you know—"

Steve: "Has she had much influence—"

Obama: "Well, I—"

Steve: "in this administration?"

Obama: "I think everybody understands that Hillary's been, you know, one of the most important advisors that I've had on a whole range of issues. ……"

Steve: "How would you characterize your relationship right now?"

Obama: "I consider Hillary a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:38 - 11:40</td>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td>“I mean, very warm, close.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:38 - 11:40</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>“It’s one thing to have disagreements between cabinet people. I spent time with both of you in the 2008 campaign. That was a very tough, bitter race. And I'm going to spare you reading some of the things that you said about each other during that campaign.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:38 - 11:40</td>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td>“Please do.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:38 - 11:40</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>“But how long did it take you to get over that? And when did it happen?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:38 - 11:40</td>
<td>Obama</td>
<td>“You know, the-- it didn't take as long as I think people would perceive it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:41 - 12:35</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>“You said the staff took a little longer to ignore, to forget the campaign stuff. What about the spouses? Is that an impertinent question?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:41 - 12:35</td>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td>“What I was going to say, Steve, is having been a spouse, having been a candidate, I think spouses take it much harder.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:36 - 13:38</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>“….. What do you think the biggest success has been, foreign policy success, of the first term?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12:36 - 13:38 | Obama  | “For us to be able to wind down one war, to be on the path of ending a second war, to do that in a way that honors the enormous sacrifices our troops have made, to sustain the pressure on al Qaeda and terrorist organizations so that not only did we avoid a
significant terrorist attack on the homeland, but we're able to dismantle the core leadership of al Qaeda...."

11 13:39 - 13:45

Steve: “What's the, I have to ask you, what's the date of expiration on this endorsement?”

Hillary: “Oh, Steve, what-- you know--”

Steve: “No, no, I have to ask that question. I mean, come on. You're-- I mean, you're sitting here together”

12 13:46 - 14:48

Steve: “No, no, I have to ask that question. I mean, come on. You're-- I mean, you're sitting here together. Everybody in town is talking about it already and the inter-- and this is-- it's taking place”

Obama: “You know, Steve, I gotta tell you, the-- you guys in the press are incorrigible. I was literally inaugurated four days ago. And you're talking about elections four years from now”

Hillary: “Yeah, and I am, as you know, Steve, I am still secretary of state. So I'm out of politics.”
B. Data Analysis

The analysis will be divided into two parts. First, it is the relevance conversation answered by Obama and Hillary and the second is the irrelevant conversation. It is done to abridge the readers. These analyses, the writer thinks the dialogues below appertain to the relevant conversation produced by Obama and Hillary. The dialogues are classified by analyzing the question and the answer given by the interviewer and interviewees. Therefore, the video and the transcripts analyzed by the written results seven relevant conversation and five irrelevant conversations.

1. Relevance

The notion of relevance might be a single issue which should be determined: we cannot have the same definition about relevance. It is fuzzy term that may be some people think one’s utterance is relevance on the other hand some people think it is not. Sperber and Wilson assume that people have intuition of relevance: that people can consistently distinguish relevant from irrelevant information, or in some cases, more relevant from less relevant information.46

1 (Minute 01:49 – 02:48)
Steve : There’s no political tea leaves to be read here?
Hillary : “We don’t have any tea.
Obama : .hnhh

46 Sperber and Wilson, Relevance Theory, Page 119
Hillary: “We've got some water here the best I can tell. But you know, this has been just the most extraordinary honor. … .”

Based on the question, the answer of Hillary Clinton “We don’t have any tea. We’ve got some water here the best I can tell.” explicitly might seem irrelevant regarding to the tea word, yet it becomes such a humor concerning the three of them know what has been essentially talking about. The question seems rather periphrastic and requires the hearer to have common background knowledge about the metaphor, but it is intended to avoid inappropriate behavior towards a President and a Secretary of State.

While it is contextually not discussing about the tea in general as it explicitly appears in the question, it is rather to discuss about the political intention they might have by doing the interview regarding to the history of the rivalry between Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton during the bitter campaign four years ago.

In this conversation, the correspondent metaphorically asks Hillary Clinton whether there is any political involvement in this interview indirectly stated by uttering “political tea leaves to be read”. On its own literal meaning, tea leaves word usually is not used together with the word political. In fact, it is commonly related to drinks and beverages based on its usages and functions.
Furthermore, Steve Kroft, the correspondent also says the words “to be read” which basically it is related to books, texts, and any other reading sources both in hard printed and soft copy form as well as either it is read online or offline. Either Steve, Hillary or Obama has known what the words mean. Steve will not deliver the metaphorically worded question in case of Hillary and Obama do not have the common knowledge.

However, the conversation is relevant because the words “tea leaves” and “to be read” here metaphorically explain about the political involvement which can be seen and felt towards the change of the interview's real intention. Hillary knows the context Steve made; therefore, she answers the metaphoric question by stating “we don’t have any tea here” which means there is no political belongings from the interview. She delivers the message that the interview is purely done for her farewell as she has signed out from Obama’s administration by stating “We’ve got some water the best I can tell” which metaphorically means that the interview is as purely clear as water. 47

2. (03:06 – 04:06)
   Steve: “It's no secret that your aides cautioned you against-- actually were against you offering Secretary Clinton this job. And you were just as

---
47 Hillary fluently explains her statement regarding the question about the political purposes of the interview. It shows that she does not hesitate about the answer. She makes sure that the interview done because Obama wants to thank her for what she has done for the past four years in his administration. However, she knows that if she shows some hesitance, it certainly will make her statement rather fetched.
determined not to take it. And you avoided taking her phone calls for awhile because you were afraid she was going to say no. Why were you so insistent about wanting her to be secretary of state?”

Obama : “Well, I was a big admirer of Hillary's before our primary battles and the general election. You know, her discipline, her stamina, her thoughtfulness, … .”

Obama explains regarding the reason why he is dreadfully determined to have Hillary as his secretary of state in his cabinet. The answer given by Obama towards the question has relevance concerning to the reason that he is a big admirer of Hillary. The assumptions implied from the answer show that Obama knows the experiences of Hillary’s will be very beneficial for his administration.

However, from the answer, Obama shows implying some assumptions by stating the words “before”. The word “before” described as something happens at or during a time earlier than the thing mentioned. In other words, it is used to explain something happens in the past. “Before the general election” words imply that it does not happen after the election.

Moreover, Obama hesitantly explains his statement showing that he does not really know what he is saying. Hesitance in conversation appears when someone does not understand what has been talking about or when someone does not know what statement should he/she deliver.
The hesitance is shown from several of the sentences Obama willing to explain, such as when he is explaining about the strengths of Hillary’s. Moreover, he needs one minute and periphrastic words to answer the simple question asking about why he wants Hillary to be his secretary of state.

3. (04:35 - 05:35)

Obama : “Made for tough debates, by the way, 'cause we—"

Hillary : “It did.

Obama : “We could never figure out what we were different on”

Hillary : “Yeah, we worked at that pretty hard. And so I really thought I’d be going back to the Senate, where I would be supporting the president on all of the issues. And what surprised me is he said, "Well, I want you to come to Chicago." And honestly, at the time, I thought, Well, you know, that's a very nice gesture. ....”

This is the continuation of the third dialogues. In this context, Obama explains about how he can convince Hillary to take the position. It is explained by stating that Hillary and he have tough debate in order to get Hillary to be in his cabinet. Although the question is meant for Hillary, but Obama has the rights to contribute to answer regarding the question is about him and Hillary.

Obama, from his answer, tries to convinces Steve and audiences that Hillary does not take the offer effortlessly, either does Obama, he does not easily to offer people an important position except he has know the records of the person. Hillary
explains that she is surprised when she gets the offer; therefore, she
does not accept it straightforwardly. She is unsure about being
Obama’s secretary of state, thus she tells Obama that there are
some other names she could suggest.

She gives the audience assumptions that Obama does it
superbly in having the argument with her. She mentions that
Obama is a very persuasive person which means she has been
persuasively asked to take the offer by giving a parable that if she
is elected as the president of the state, she would do the same thing
towards Obama, that is wanting him to be in her cabinet. In other
words, she tries to tell that Obama is a good leader and he has good
quality and experiences.

4.  (06:35 - 08:12)
Steve   : "Has she had much influence--“
Obama   : “Well, I--”
Steve   : ”--in this administration?”
Obama   : “I think everybody understands that Hillary's been,
you know, one of the most important advisors that
I've had on a whole range of issues. Hillary's
capacity to travel around the world, to lay the
groundwork for a new way of doing things, ... .”

The dialogue discusses about Hillary’s influence in
Obama’s administration. In this conversation, Obama explains
circumvented answer because explicitly he does not answer
whether Hillary has much influence in the government. It is
implicitly relevant regarding the whole statement delivered by
Obama. The relevance is shown by explaining about the work that Hillary has done in the last four years.

He intricately tries to tell the audience that Hillary does have much influence towards the administration by stating that Hillary is one of the most important advisors and she also has capacity to travel around the world on behalf of her country in strengthening and solving the international relation and policy problems.

On the other hand, Obama tries to elaborate that not only he has Hillary as an influential advisor who has made the US strong administration, but also the integration from Bob Gates who was holdover from George Bush Administration and Leon Panetta who takes over the CIA give contribution towards the government.48

5. (08:13 – 09:37)

Steve: “How would you characterize your relationship right now?”
Obama: “I consider Hillary a strong friend.”
Hillary: “yeah., I mean, very warm, close. I think there's a sense of understanding that, you know, sometimes doesn't even take words because we have similar views. We have similar experiences that I think provide a bond that may seem unlikely to some, but has been really at a core of our relationship over the last four years. …”

In this conversation, they, both Hillary and Obama are asked about how they characterize their relationship towards each

---

48 Obama stutteringly explains his answer. He is digressing and being indirect in elaborating the influences Hillary has towards his cabinet. Furthermore, he is not only mention about Hillary’s influence, but also he speaks other people who have contributed to the successful administration. It shows that he is unsure and does not really know about what he is talking about. He spends one minute and 37 seconds in conveying the answer.
other after she has resigned from the administration. It is explicitly relevant regarding to the question is talking about the character of Obama and Hillary’s relationship.

Hillary at first agrees towards Obama’s statement that she is a strong friend by saying “yeah”. Hillary afterward shows disagreement with Obama’s opinion by repairing the statement with the words “I mean”. The words “I mean” is classified as repairing words which are used in order to re-establishing inter-subjectivity in statement or intention. She rather explains that their relation is very warm and close; meanwhile, Obama describes it as a strong friend.

6. (09:38 – 11:40)

Steve: “It's one thing to have disagreements between cabinet people. I spent time with both of you in the 2008 campaign. That was a very tough, bitter race. And I'm going to spare you reading some of the things that you said about each other during that campaign.”

Hillary: “Please do”

Steve: “But how long did it take you to get over that? And when did it happen?”

Obama: “You know, the-- it didn't take as long as I think people would perceive it. As I said, once the primary was over, Hillary worked very hard for me. Bill worked very hard for me. So we were interacting on a fairly regular basis. I think it was harder for the staffs, which is understandable. Because, you know, they get invested in this stuff in ways that I think the candidates maybe don't. … .”

---

The conversation discusses about the campaign stuff that they have had to bring down each other. The assumption gained from the background of the question given by Steve, that is about the disagreement that the cabinet people shown. Steve also states that he has spent the time with both of them in 2008. In his opinion, the campaign was a very tough and bitter race.

It is reinforced by Steve’s statement “I’m going to spare you reading some of the things that you said each other during that campaign”. The utterances delivered by Steve implicitly tell that it is true that the campaign has been being phenomenal and remarkable. In fact, the background of the question aims to direct the Obama and Hillary to a topic about how long they can get over the campaign stuff and makes them can work together as a team.

In his answer, Obama confesses that there was a rivalry between Hillary and him. However, Obama explains that after the campaign was over, he and Hillary do not have any more opposition among the Democratic Party people. He clarifies that after he won the campaign, Hillary’s side has helped him in the presidential election. He also thinks that people in the USA perceived the rivalry would be last longer because USA people still have the ideals of the past.

7. (11:41 – 12:35)
Steve: “You said the staff took a little longer to ignore, to forget the campaign stuff. What about the spouses? Is that an impertinent question?”
Hillary: “What I was going to say, Steve, is having been a spouse, having been a candidate, I think spouses take it much harder. You know, in a way-- just as the president said, we're out there. And we're responding minute by minute. And you just don't have time to sit around and, you know, think about what, you know, some insult that you've-- felt you've suffered. . . .”

Besides the opponent behavior shown by the Stuff of Obama, Steve; moreover, asks about the reaction of Bill Clinton, Hillary’s spouse, towards the offer that Hillary accepts of being the secretary of state. In the question, Steve uses the words “is that an impertinent question” which means that he thinks that the question directing to a private life of Hillary’s.

Steve initially asks about the Obama’s stuff who still cannot forget about the campaign stuff as a background of question. It is done to make the question sounded to be more polite and to make the private sided question sounds as a general question. It is also done to open the topic question about the reaction of Bill.

It is interesting that there is one different statement against what Obama has said. Once from another question Obama has stated that after the campaign was over, Hillary and Bill worked for him. In fact, Hillary’s opinion tells that Bill has taken the lost experience as one of a serious thing.
8. (12:36 – 13:38)
Steve : “... What do you think the biggest success has been, foreign policy success, of the first term?”
Obama : “For us to be able to wind down one war, to be on the path of ending a second war, to do that in a way that honors the enormous sacrifices our troops have made, to sustain the pressure on al Qaeda and terrorist organizations so that not only did we avoid a significant terrorist attack on the homeland, but we're able to dismantle the core leadership of al Qaeda. ...”

In this context, Steve asks about the succession of foreign policy that Obama has implemented. Steve, before he questions Obama about the topic, he delivers a statement

“This administration, I mean, you've generally gotten high marks. You've generally gotten very high marks, particularly from the voters for your handling of foreign policy. But there's no big, singular achievement that-- in the first four years-- that you can put your names on. What do you think the biggest success has been, foreign policy success, of the first term?”

It is meant to appreciate Obama about the policy that he has made for the country. However, the question implies that Steve assumes that Obama has not had a single achievement which he got personally. Therefore, Steve asks to Obama about the achievement which he thinks he has gotten personally in the first four years.

Obama implicitly admits that he has not gotten any big singular achievement himself. It is proved by his statement which he says “for us”. It is shown that the achievement that US has gotten because of the team work rather than Obama himself. The
assumption given by the statement shows that Obama has strong cabinet in order to win down the foreign policy together.

2. Irrelevance

The irrelevant term can be seen by invoking intuitions of relevance. We claim that one assumption is intuitively relevant and another not, or that one assumption is more relevant than another, it merely expect to perceive some difference; whether it would be ordinarily used as relevance to describe or it is described beside the point.50

In this dialogue, Hillary changes her intention from saying “well, I would” to be “well I was so surprised”. The first assumption given by Hillary is she is going to tell about her issues that she will not take the Secretary of State position proposed by

50 Sperben and Wilson., Op., cit., p. 119
Obama. The intention is changed after she got the additional question about what Obama say towards her that can make her accept the offer.

Hillary’s utterances do not give certain answer towards Steve’s question; however, she rather gives the reason why she takes the position. She does not explain about what Obama says to make her accept the offer. At glance, the conversation seems relevant; otherwise, the information given by Hillary does not have relation towards the question given by Steve. However, Hillary’s answer can be accepted and presumed has relevance by hearers, yet the assumptions given are Hillary accepted the position as Secretary of State because she wants to do something for her country.

2. (05:49 - 06:34)

Steve Kroft
Hillary Clinton : “What did he promise you? And has he kept the promises?”
Barack Obama : “It was going to be hard. But, you know…”
Hillary Clinton : “And I kept that promise”
Hillary Clinton : “Welcome to hard times. I mean, because the one thing he did mention was he basically said, "You know, we've got this major economic crisis that may push us into a depression. … .”

In this dialogue, Steve is asking about what Obama promises to make her accept the position. Hillary answers that it was going to be hard which is seemingly less relevance regarding the question. She ought to answer something related to Steve
utterance in order to give relevant response. She supposed to explain about what did Obama promise her in order to ask her as secretary of state as well as she should mention whether Obama has kept the promise.

On the other hand, the answer can be slightly relevant if we look at the context and what she describes through the next answer. Hillary still does not reveal what the promise is; she explains what did Obama says instead. But, if we analyze more into the words, it implies that Obama promises Hillary that she will have a great work to be done in order to fix the problems USA has. Otherwise, it implicitly still conceals what Obama has said to her, regarding to Obama’s utterance agreeing that he keeps the promise.51

Steve Kroft : “What’s the, I have to ask you, what’s the date of expiration on this endorsement?”
Hillary Clinton : “Oh, Steve, what-- you know--“

In this conversation, Steve tries to redirect the topic of the conversation. He at first discusses about the achievement which Obama’s first cabinet has accomplished. He afterwards tries to ask about an issue which is well spoken by people in USA, the expiration between Obama and Hillary.

51 Hillary laughs when she hears about the question. It seems like Obama has told her something that she could not forget. She explains the answer by telling what Obama says when he tries to get her to be the secretary of state.
From the text above, Steve at first tries to ask about it directly, but he changes his words from “what’s the” to be “I have to ask you”. It is producing an assumption that the question is not meant for his information himself, but it is something that he needs to do.

Steve has a necessary to ask the question due to his job as a person who works in media business or as well as he has the chance to ask directly to both of them. It surprises Hillary and it seems she rather to avoid the question. She does not want to answer any political question. It is shown by the first analysis that she deflects in answering the question. She also does not want to answer it because it is still a discourse to be realized. By the answer, it seems like the assumption shared by Hillary that it is true that there will be expiration endorsement between her and Obama.

4. (13:46 – 14:48)

Steve Kroft : “No, no, I have to ask that question. I mean, come on. You're-- I mean, you're sitting here together. Everybody in town is talking about it already and the inter-- and this is-- it's taking place”

Barack Obama : “You know, Steve, I gotta tell you, the-- you guys in the press are incorrigible. I was literally inaugurated four days ago. And you're talking about elections four years from now”

Hillary Clinton : “Yeah, and I am, as you know, Steve, I am still secretary of state. So I'm out of politics.”
In this dialogue, the relevance of the context is strong. It is done because Obama and Hillary do not want people misleading about the political cooperation between him and Hillary. The question is asking about the date of aspiration of Hillary and Obama. It is said that Hillary will possibly be one of the candidates for the next US Presidential election; therefore, it triggers Steve to ask about it.

Steve reasons that he asks the question because of it is a good occasion meeting both of the most known politicians in USA. It is also one of the issues people in the USA have discussion about. As a person who works in media, to be able to receive first information or clarification from people who have an issue is a great work.

Neither Obama nor Hillary wants the issues to be mentioned in the interview. The rejection is shown by the statement “I was literally inaugurated four days ago, and you're talking about elections four years from now”. He does not want to discuss about the political issues which is adequately being sensitive to be mentioned publicly.

Hillary does avoid the question by stating that she agrees with Obama’s statement. In addition, she adds some statements to steer clear of the question by saying “Yeah, and I am, as you know, Steve, I am still secretary of state. So I'm out of politics”. 
Therefore, both of the statements do not give the related answer towards Steve question which implicitly gives an assumption that it is likely true both of them will have work together for the next election.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

A. CONCLUSIONS

The relevance concept, in fact, is not only given by the explicit utterances, but also the relevance can be achieved from implicit meaning. Furthermore, in general, the implicit meaning is gained from irrelevance communication. It is because the more irrelevant the utterance explicitly, the more needed to understand the speaker intention towards it. It is done because the speaker has some information that he/she thinks it is certainly rather private to share publicly.

Thus the interview done by Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton correspondent by Steve Kroft, in the interview has eight relevant communications and five irrelevant communications. Furthermore, there are several implicit meanings. Those are because they perceive the information delivered by them is not general public information. Moreover, the discussion is directing to something general by stating indirect answers. Nevertheless, the new information can be gained by analyzing the implicit meaning from what has been said.

An interview, either aired or published publicly, basically has been set before it broadcasted. Both the interviewer and the interviewee have met and discuss about the question questioned in the interview; therefore,
the interviewee has chance to prepare which answer can be shared. In fact, a conversation does produce some information.

Therefore, the audience makes those assumptions to be new information which gained from the interview. The interview itself has produced new information for public; however, the information gained beyond what has been uttered becomes one of the important information because the speakers have never prepared to share it publicly.

B. SUGGESTIONS

The theory does not explain elaborately about the irrelevant term of communication. Sperber and Wilson; however, explaining the relevance term is fuzzy term which cannot be explained on an average whether an utterance is relevant or irrelevant.

Therefore, for further research, the interview technique directly to the informants will result more objective outcome. The next research can be focused on analyzing about what is the speaker intention in implying the meaning.

Moreover, the data analysis can be used for another type of analysis with different approaches. To mention some of them are by applying the Conversation Analysis (CA), Grice Conversational Cooperative Principle, and Discourse Analysis and/or Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approaches. The data contain some corpuses which can be analyzed through CDA and CA, such as repair, backchannel, turn taking, and overlapping.
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Obama and Clinton: The 60 Minutes interview

The following script is from "The President and the Secretary of State" which aired on Jan. 27, 2013. Steve Kroft is the correspondent. Michael Radutzky, Maria Gavrilovic and L. Franklin Devine, producers.

60 Minutes Overtime

Hillary's first joint interview »

There are few people we think we know more about than President Barack Obama and outgoing Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and everyone has an opinion about their politics, their marriages and a rivalry that is one of the richest in American history.

On Friday, we had the opportunity to sit down with the two of them side by side. The White House offered us 30 minutes, barely enough time to scratch the surface of their complicated personal and professional relationship, let alone discuss their policies on Iran and Israel, Russia and China, Egypt and Libya. There has been
much speculation about their evolution from bitter opponents to partners in the corridors of power and the motivation for doing this interview. Now, you can be the judge.

Steve Kroft : This is very improbable. This is not an interview I ever expected to be doing. But I understand, Mr. President, this was your idea. Why did you want to do this together, a joint interview?

President Obama : Well, the main thing is I just wanted to have a chance to publicly say thank you, because I think Hillary will go down as one of the finest secretary of states we've had. It has been a great collaboration over the last four years. I'm going to miss her. Wish she was sticking around. But she has logged in so many miles, I can't begrudge her wanting to take it easy for a little bit. But I want the country to appreciate just what an extraordinary role she's played during the course of my administration and a lot of the successes we've had internationally have been because of her hard work.

Steve Kroft : There's no political tea leaves to be read here?

Secretary Clinton : We don't have any tea. We've got some water here is the best I can tell. But you know, this has been just the most extraordinary honor. And, yes, I mean, a few years ago it would have been seen as improbable because we had that very long, hard primary campaign. But, you know, I've gone around the world on behalf of the president and our country. And one of the things that I say to people, because I think it helps them understand, I say, "Look, in politics and in democracy, sometimes you win elections, sometimes you lose elections. And I worked very hard, but I lost. And then President Obama asked me to be secretary of state and I said yes." And so this has been just an extraordinary opportunity to work with him as a partner and friend, to do our very best on behalf of this country we both love. And it's something I'm going to miss a great deal.

Steve Kroft : It's no secret that your aides cautioned you against--actually were against you offering Secretary Clinton this job. And you were just as determined not to take it. And you avoided taking her phone calls for awhile because you were afraid she was going to say no. Why were you so insistent about wanting her to be secretary of state?
President Obama: Well, I was a big admirer of Hillary's before our primary battles and the general election. You know, her discipline, her stamina, her thoughtfulness, her ability to project, I think, and make clear issues that are important to the American people, I thought made her an extraordinary talent. She also was already a world figure. And I thought that somebody stepping into that position of secretary of state at a time when, keep in mind, we were still in Iraq. Afghanistan was still an enormous challenge. There was great uncertainty in terms of how we would reset our relations around the world, to have somebody who could serve as that effective ambassador in her own right without having to earn her stripes, so to speak, on the international stage, I thought would be hugely important.

Steve Kroft: You've been quoted as thinking or telling people that there was no way you were going to take this job and you weren't going to let anybody talk you into it.

Secretary Clinton: Well, I would--

Steve Kroft: What did he say that night that made you--

Secretary Clinton: Well, I was so surprised, because, you know, after I ended my campaign, I immediately did everything I could to help the president get elected, because despite our hard-fought primary, we had such agreement on what needed to be done for our country.

President Obama: Made for tough debates, by the way, 'cause we--

Secretary Clinton: It did. We could never figure out what we were different on. Yeah, we worked at that pretty hard. And so I really thought I'd be going back to the Senate, where I would be supporting the president on all of the issues. And what surprised me is he said, "Well, I want you to come to Chicago." And honestly, at the time, I thought, "Well, you know, that's a very nice gesture. And maybe he wants to ask me about some people that might serve in the administration." So when I got to Chicago and he asked me if I would consider being his secretary of state, I immediately said, "Oh, Mr. President, there's so many other people. Let me give you some other names." Because it just took me by surprise. But he is pretty persuasive, I'll tell you that much. And he kept saying, "Well, I want you to think about it again. I want you to-- wait a minute, don't make--
don't give me a final answer." I'll tell you what I finally thought. I thought, "You know, if the roles had been reversed. And I had ended up winning, I would have desperately wanted him to be in my cabinet. So if I'm saying I would have wanted him to say yes to me, how am I going to justify saying no to my president?" And it was a great decision, despite my hesitancy about it.

Steve Kroft : What did he promise you? And has he kept the promises?

Secretary Clinton : It was going to be hard. But, you know--

President Obama : And I kept that promise.

Secretary Clinton : --welcome to hard times. I mean, because the one thing he did mention was he basically said, "You know, we've got this major economic crisis that may push us into a depression. I'm not going to be able to do a lot to satisfy the built-up expectations for our role around the world. So you're going to have to get out there and, you know, really represent us while I deal with, you know, the economic catastrophe I inherited." But, you know, we're both gluttons for punishment. And, you know, my assessment was, "Look, we are in a terrible fix." And, you know, I felt like this president was going to get us out of it, but it wasn't going to be easy. And it was going to need everybody, you know, pulling together.

Steve Kroft : Has she had much influence--

President Obama : Well, I--

Steve Kroft : --in this administration?

President Obama : I think everybody understands that Hillary's been, you know, one of the most important advisors that I've had on a whole range of issues. Hillary's capacity to travel around the world, to lay the groundwork for a new way of doing things, to establish a sense of engagement that, you know, our foreign policy was not going to be defined solely by Iraq, that we were going to be vigilant about terrorism, but we were going to make sure that we deployed all elements of American power, diplomacy, our economic and cultural and social capital, in order to bring about the kinds of international solutions that we wanted to see. I had confidence that Hillary could do that. And, you know, one
of the things that I will always be grateful for is—yeah, it wasn't just that she and I had to integrate. I mean, we had Bob Gates, who was a holdover from the Bush administration. You know Leon Panetta to take over the CIA. And so we had a lot of very strong personalities around the table. And, you know, I think one of the things that Hillary did was establish a standard in terms of professionalism and teamwork in our cabinet, in our foreign policy making that said, "We're going to have an open discussion. We're going to push each other hard. There are going to be times where we have some vigorous disagreements. Once the president makes a decision though we're going to go out there and execute."

Steve Kroft : How would you characterize your relationship right now?

President Obama : I consider Hillary a strong friend.

Secretary Clinton : I mean, very warm, close. I think there's a sense of understanding that, you know, sometimes doesn't even take words because we have similar views. We have similar experiences that I think provide a bond that may seem unlikely to some, but has been really at a core of our relationship over the last four years. I mean, I've read a lot about other presidents. And I've, you know, been in the White House as a first lady. And I was a senator in the time of 9/11 and spent time in the White House under the Bush administration. And I know how critical it is to really forge that sense of discipline that the president is referring to. Are there going to be differences? Yeah. Deep differences? Of course. You had a lot of strong-willed, minded people. But the president deserves our best judgment, our advice, and then he deserves us to stand with him and to execute. Now I've watched other administrations, where there was pitched warfare between this cabinet secretary and another or this member of the White House. That's not good for the country. And, it's not something that would have served this president.

Steve Kroft : It's one thing to have disagreements between cabinet people. I spent time with both of you in the 2008 campaign. That was a very tough, bitter race. And I'm going to spare you reading some of the things that you said about each other during that campaign.

Secretary Clinton : Please do.
Steve Kroft: But how long did it take you to get over that? And when did it happen?

President Obama: You know, the-- it didn't take as long as I think people would perceive it. As I said, once the primary was over, Hillary worked very hard for me. Bill worked very hard for me. So we were interacting on a fairly regular basis. I think it was harder for the staffs, which is understandable. Because, you know, they get invested in this stuff in ways that I think the candidates maybe don't. You know, Hillary mentioned, you know, part of our bond is we've been through a lot of the same stuff. And part of being through the same stuff is getting whacked around in political campaigns, being criticized in the press. You know, we've both built some pretty thick skins. And you know, sometimes our staffs don't go through that so they are taking umbrage and offense. And, they're reading every blog and every tweet. And, you know, and most of the time, you know, Hillary, I suspect, you know, handles this the same way I do, you know? We kind of have a block-- a screen from a lot of the silliness that happens during presidential campaigns. And so for me at least, you know, by the time Hillary joined the administration, I felt very confident and comfortable in our working relationship. I think what did evolve was a friendship as opposed to just a professional relationship. It be--friendships involve a sense of trust and being in the foxhole together. And that emerged during the course of months when we were making some very tough decisions.

Steve Kroft: You said the staff took a little longer to ignore, to forget the campaign stuff. What about the spouses? Is that an impertinent question?

Secretary Clinton: What I was going to say, Steve, is having been a spouse, having been a candidate, I think spouses take it much harder. You know, in a way-- just as the president said, we're out there. And we're responding minute by minute. And you just don't have time to sit around and, you know, think about what, you know, some insult that you've-- felt you've suffered. I can remember, you know, watching my husband do debates. And I mean, I was like this. And he was relaxed and everything like that. And then when the shoes were on the other feet, all of a sudden, you know, this calm, cool guy who never was upset by anything is all of a sudden watching me. So look, but that is just ancient
history now. And it's ancient history because of who-- the kind of people we all are, but also we're professionals.

Steve Kroft: This administration, I mean, you've generally gotten high marks. You've generally gotten very high marks, particularly from the voters for your handling of foreign policy. But there's no big, singular achievement that-- in the first four years-- that you can put your names on. What do you think the biggest success has been, foreign policy success, of the first term?

President Obama: For us to be able to wind down one war, to be on the path of ending a second war, to do that in a way that honors the enormous sacrifices our troops have made, to sustain the pressure on al Qaeda and terrorist organizations so that not only did we avoid a significant terrorist attack on the homeland, but we're able to dismantle the core leadership of al Qaeda. That's all a consequence of the great work that Hillary did and her team did and the State Department did in conjunction with our national security team.

Steve Kroft: What's the-- I have to ask you, what's the date of expiration on this endorsement?

Secretary Clinton: Oh, Steve, what-- you know--

Steve Kroft: No, no, I have to ask that question. I mean, come on. You're-- I mean, you're sitting here together. Everybody in town is talking about it already and the inter-- and this is-- it's taking place.

President Obama: You know, Steve, I gotta tell you, the-- you guys in the press are incorrigible. I was literally inaugurated four days ago. And you're talking about elections four years from now.

Secretary Clinton: Yeah, and I am, as you know, Steve, I am still secretary of state. So I'm out of politics. And I'm forbidden from even hearing these questions. I think that, you know, look, obviously the president and I care deeply about what's going to happen for our country in the future. And I don't think, you know, either he or I can make predictions about what's going to happen tomorrow or the next year. What we've tried to do over the last four years is get up every day, have a clear-eyed view of what's going on in the world. And I'm really proud of where we are.
When we come back, the president and Secretary Clinton discuss the disaster in
Benghazi and the state of her health.

Hillary Clinton's final days as secretary of state included one of her most difficult.
On Wednesday, she spent more than five hours being grilled on Capitol Hill for
the security failures in Benghazi that led to the deaths of U.S. Ambassador Chris
Stevens and three other Americans; the biggest diplomatic disaster of this
administration. The Accountability Review led by Admiral Mike Mullen and
Ambassador Thomas Pickering found, among many failures, that Stevens' repeated
requests for better security never made it to Clinton's desk. And representatives and
senators pressed her on whether the administration covered up the nature of the terrorist attack.

[Secretary Clinton: We have four dead Americans, was it because of a protest or
was it because of guys going out for a walk and deciding they'll go kill some
Americans. What difference-- at this point, what difference does it make? It is our
job to figure out what happened and do everything we can to prevent it from
happening again, senator.]

Steve Kroft: I want to talk about the hearings this week. You had a
very long day. Also, how is your health?

Secretary Clinton: Oh, it's great. It's great. Now, you know, I still have some
lingering effects from falling on my head and having the
blood clot. But, you know, the doctors tell me that that will
all recede. And so thankfully I'm, you know, looking
forward to being at full speed.

Steve Kroft: Right, I noticed your glasses are--

Secretary Clinton: Yeah, I have some lingering effects from the concussion
that are decreasing and will disappear. But I have a lot of
sympathy now when I pick up the paper and read about an
athlete or one of our soldiers whose had traumatic brain
injury. I'd never had anything like that in my family. And
so, you know, I'm very conscious of how lucky I was.

Steve Kroft: You said during the hearings, I mean, you've accepted
responsibility. You've accepted the very critical findings of
Admiral Mullen and Ambassador Pickering.

As the New York Times put it, you accepted responsibility, but not blame. Do you
feel guilty in any way, in-- at a personal level? Do you blame yourself that you
didn't know or that you should have known?
Secretary Clinton: Well, Steve, obviously, I deeply regret what happened, as I've said many times. I knew Chris Stevens. I sent him there originally. It was a great personal loss to lose him and three other brave Americans. But I also have looked back and tried to figure out what we could do so that nobody, insofar is possible, would be in this position again. And as the Accountability Review Board pointed out, we did fix responsibility appropriately. And we're taking steps to implement that. But we also live in a dangerous world. And, you know, the people I'm proud to serve and work with in our diplomatic and development personnel ranks, they know it's a dangerous and risky world. We just have to do everything we can to try to make it as secure as possible for them.

President Obama: I think, you know, one of the things that humbles you as president, I'm sure Hillary feels the same way as secretary of state, is that you realize that all you can do every single day is to figure out a direction, make sure that you are working as hard as you can to put people in place where they can succeed, ask the right questions, shape the right strategy. But it's going to be a team that both succeeds and fails. And it's a process of constant improvement, because the world is big and it is chaotic. You know, I remember Bob Gates, you know, first thing he said to me, I think maybe first week or two that I was there and we were meeting in the Oval Office and he, obviously, been through seven presidents or something. And he says, "Mr. President, one thing I can guarantee you is that at this moment, somewhere, somehow, somebody in the federal government is screwing up." And, you know you're-- and so part of what you're trying to do is to constantly improve systems and accountability and transparency to minimize those mistakes and ensure success. It is a dangerous world. And that's part of the reason why we have to continue to get better.

Steve Kroft: The biggest criticism of this team in the U.S. foreign policy from your political opposition has been what they say is an abdication of the United States on the world stage, sort of a reluctance to become involved in another entanglement, an unwillingness or what seems/appears to be an unwillingness to gauge big issues. Syria, for example.

President Obama: Yeah, well--
Steve Kroft : I mean, that--

President Obama : Well, Muammar Qaddafi probably does not agree with that assessment, or at least if he was around, he wouldn't agree with that assessment. Obviously, you know, we helped to put together and lay the groundwork for liberating Libya. You know, when it comes to Egypt, I think, had it not been for the leadership we showed, you might have seen a different outcome there. But also understanding that we do nobody a service when we leap before we look. Where we, you know, take on things without having thought through all the consequences of it. And Syria's a classic example of where our involvement, we want to make sure that not only does it enhance U.S. security, but also that it is doing right by the people of Syria and neighbors like Israel that are going to be profoundly affected by it. And so it's true sometimes that we don't just shoot from the hip.

Secretary Clinton : We live not only in a dangerous, but an incredibly complicated world right now with many different forces at work, both state-based and non-state, technology, and communications. And, you know, I'm older than the president. I don't want to surprise anybody by saying that. But not by much.

President Obama : But, you know, I remember, you know, some of the speeches of Eisenhower as a young girl, you know? You've got to be careful. You have to be thoughtful. You can't rush in, especially now, where it's more complex than it's been in decades. So yes, are there what we call wicked problems like Syria, which is the one you named? Absolutely. And we are on the side of American values, We're on the side of freedom. We're on the side of the aspirations of all people, to have a better life, have the opportunities that we are fortunate to have here. But it's not always easy to perceive exactly what must be done in order to get to that outcome. So you know, I certainly am grateful for the president's steady hand and hard questions and thoughtful analysis as to what we should and shouldn't do.

President Obama : You know, there are transitions and transformations taking place all around the world. We are not going to be able to control every aspect of every transition and transformation. Sometimes they're going to go sideways.
Sometimes, you know, there'll be unintended consequences. And our job is to, number one, look after America's security and national interest. But number two, find where are those opportunities where our intervention, our engagement can really make a difference? And to be opportunistic about that. And that's something that I think Hillary has done consistently. I think the team at the State Department's done consistently. And that's what I intend to continue to do over the next four years.

Steve Kroft: Thank you very much.

Barack Obama: All right.
Curriculum Vitae

Personal Details

Name : Muhamad Sazali
Address : Jl. Lingkar Timur No. 23 RT. 001/001
           Desa Pengasinan
           Kecamatan Gunungsindur
           Kabupaten Bogor
Postal Code : 16340
Phone : +6281296362124
Email : sazalimuhamad92@gmail.com
Gender : Male
Date of Birth : Bogor, 25 April 1992
Marital Status : Single
Nationality : Indonesian
Religion : Islam

Educational and Professional Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periode</th>
<th>School / Institution / University</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998 – 2004</td>
<td>SDN II Pengasinan</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 – 2007</td>
<td>MTs Daarul Khior</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 – 2010</td>
<td>MA Al–Falah</td>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 – 2014</td>
<td>UIN Syarif Hidayatullah</td>
<td>English Language and Literature</td>
<td>4 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non Formal / Training – Seminar

1. French Language training in Institut Francais Indonesie – May 2014 – present
4. The International Seminar on Cultural Values As A Basis For Character Building – October 30th–3rd, 2013
5. Turkish language course in Fetullah Gulen Chair Turkce Kursu
8. International Workshop in “Academic Writing”
9. English Curriculum Review Waikato University
10. International Workshop “Presenting News in English”
11. Legislative election – April 9th, 2014
14. Malam Ramah Tamah with Tun Mahatir Muhammad and Master Ching Kung – 2014
15. International Seminar “How To Pass Job Interview Successfully” – April 12th, 2014
Summary of Working Experience

1
Year : 2013 – present
Institution/ Company : Center for International Cooperation
Position : Internship

2
Year : 2013
Institution / Company : Social Trust Fund UIN Syarif Hidayatullah
Position : Fund raiser

3
Year : 2011 – Present
Institution / Company : Gypsy Youth Empowerment Volunteer
Position : Teacher, fund raiser and event organizer

4
Year : 2013 – present
Institution / Company : PNPM (National Program for Village and Community Empowerment) Mandiri Perdesaan
Position : Secretary of Team Management

5
Year : 2013 – 2014
Institution / Company : Pengasinan Youth Organization
Position : Chief of organization

Language Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Reading Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Fluent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Beginner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>A.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Beginner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References
References are available if needed