

**TURN TAKING STRATEGIES USED BY BARACK OBAMA AND MITT
ROMNEY IN THE FIRST PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE 2012**

THESIS

Presented to:

Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University of Malang
to fulfill requirement for the degree of Sarjana Sastra (S.S)

INDAH SITI NUR AINIAH LESTARI

12320047

Advisor

Dr. H. Langgeng Budianto, M.Pd.

NIP 197110142003121001



ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LETTERS DEPARTMENT

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

MAULANA MALIK STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF MALANG

2016

APPROVAL SHEET

This is to certify that Indah Siti's thesis entitled **Turn Taking Strategies Used by Barack Obama and Mitt Romney in First Presidential Debate 2012** has been approved by The Thesis Advisor for further approval by the Board of Examiners.

Malang, Juni , 2016

Approved by
The Advisor

Dr. H. Langgeng Budianto, M.Pd.
NIP 197110142003121001

Acknowledge by
The Head of the English Language and
Letters Department

Dr. Syamsuddin, M.Hum.
NIP 196911222006041001

The Dean of Humanities Faculty

Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University, Malang

Dr. H. Istiadah, M.A
NIP. 196703131992032002

LEGITIMATION SHEET

This is to certify that Indah Siti's thesis **Turn Taking Strategies Used by Barack Obama and Mitt Romney in First Presidential Debate 2012**, has been approved by the board of examiners as the requirement for the degree of Sarjana Sastra (S.S) in English Language and Letters Department, Faculty of Humanities Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University of Malang.

The Board of Examiners

1. Agus Eko Cahyono, M.Pd. (main examiner)
NIP. 19820811 2011 01 1 008
2. Deny Efitia Nur Rakhmawati, M.Pd. (chairman)
NIP. 19850530 2009 12 2 006
3. Dr. H. Langgeng Budiarto, M.Pd. (advisor)
NIP. 19711014 2003 12 1 001

Signatures


.....


.....


.....

The Dean of Humanities Faculty

Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University, Malang



Dr. H. Istiadah, M.A
NIP. 196703131992032002

STATEMENT OF THE AUTHENTICITY

The undersigned,

Name : Indah Siti Nur Ainiah Lestari

Reg Number : 12320047

Faculty : Humanities

Department : English language and Letters

Declare that this thesis I wrote to fulfill the requirement for the degree of Sarjana Sastra (S.S) in English Language and Letters Department, Faculty of Humanities Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University of Malang entitled "*Turn Taking Strategies Used by Barack Obama and Mitt Romney in First Presidential Debate 2012*" is truly my original work. It does not incorporate any materials previously written or published by another person except those indicated in quotations and references. Due to this fact, I am the only person responsible for the thesis if there is any objection or claims from others.

Malang, Juni ,2016

The writer,



Indah Siti Nur Ainiah Lestari

MOTTO

Do it now or nothing



DEDICATION

This thesis is especially dedicated to

My beloved father (Muhlisin) and mother (Mufaroha)

My beloved brother (Kholilul)

My big Family (H.Slamet Ariyadi and Hj.Cicik Farida)



ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Alhamdulillah, I thank to Allah SWT for all his marching, blessing and guidance in accomplishing the thesis entitled “*Turn Taking Strategies Used by Barack Obama and Mitt Romney in First Presidential Debate 2012*”. *Sholawat and Salam* are also delivered to the prophet Muhammad SAW who has brought Islam as *rahmatan lil al-amin*. On this occasion the deepest gratitude coming from the very deep of heart is given to:

1. Prof. Dr. H. Mudjia Raharjo, M.Si as the Rector of Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University of Malang.
2. The Dean of the Faculty of Humanities (Dr. Hj. Istiadah, M.A).
3. The Head of English Language and Letters Departement (Dr. Syamsuddin, M.Hum).
4. My Advisor (Dr. H. Langgeng Budianto, M.Pd) who has done his very best and excellent in guiding, encouraging and criticizing the writer so that this thesis can be accomplished successfully.
5. My beloved parents (Muhlisin and Mufaroha) who always give support and great motivation both materials and spirituals during my study until completing this thesis, also a lot of thanks to H. Slamet Ariyadi and Hj. Cicik Farida, S.Pdi.
6. My beloved brother (Muhammad Nur Kholilul Firdaus) thanks for your motivation, support and togetherness.
7. My Dearly (Drei Herba Ta’abudi) who always give me a great support, much love also motivations.

8. My friends (Mulyono's 29 Boarding House: Nurul Farida, Atika Prabawati, Leni Thaharah, Afrita Ayu Sri Hartanti, and Laily Mufaroahah).

I am as the writer, fully aware that this work is far from the perfection.

Therefore, constructive suggestion or criticisms are welcome for the better following works. Finally, I do that this thesis will be useful for any one reading it.

Malang, Juni , 2016

Writer

Indah Siti Nur Ainiah Lestari

ABSTRACT

Lestari, Indah Siti N.A.L. 2016. *Turn Taking Strategies Used by Barack Obama and Mitt Romney in the First Presidential Debate 2012*. Thesis, English Language and Letters Department, Faculty of Humanity. Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University of Malang. Advisor: Dr. H. Langgeng Budianto, M.Pd.

Keywords: Turn Taking, debate, Federal News Service

Conversation is an activity which happened between two or more people take turn at speaking. Naturally, one people speak at the time and another tends to be an evasion of silence between speaking turn. If more than one participant tries to talk at the same time, one of them usually stops. For instance is in a debate situation.

Turn taking is a condition in which the speakers who are involved in conversation take turn to speak. When people having a conversation they should understand about the strategy or how they manage the technique of conversation in order to run well and smoothly. Therefore, the first presidential debate between Obama and Mitt Romney is taken as the object of this study.

There are two problems in this study. First is kind of turn taking strategies which are applied in debaters, and second is how of debaters applied those turn taking strategies. The purpose of this study is to describe the answer of the research problems in this study.

To get the answer for the research problems, this study used some theory which formulated by Stenstrom (1994) about turn taking strategies that categorized into three kinds those are taking the turn strategy, holding the turn strategy and yielding the turn strategy. This study was use descriptive qualitative method which is applied in this study. The source of this study is from the presidential debate transcription which taken from federal news service.

The researcher found 29 data which categorized as turn taking strategies. All of the data are divided into three types or parts. There are 15 data in taking the turn strategy were found (starting up, taking over, and interrupting). Holding the turn strategy was found 11 data (filled pause and verbal filler, lexical repetition, and starting all over again). In yielding the turn strategy were found 3 data (prompting, appealing, and giving up). Not a lot of sub part is categorize as turn taking strategies, such as *starting up*, *silent pause*, *start all over again* and *giving up*.

المستخلص

إنّدة سني نور عينية لسري. ٢٠١٦. طريقة تبديل المحدثّة عند مناظرة لرئيس الجمهورية أمريكية بين بارك أوبامي (Barack Obama) وميت رومني (Mitt Romney) ٢٠١٢. البحث الجامعي. قسم اللغة الإنجليزية وأدبها، كلية الإنسانية، جامعة مولانا مالك إبراهيم الإسلامية الحكومية بمالانج، تحت الاشراف: الدكتور الحج لنجنيق بودينتو، الماجستير.

الكلمة الرئيسية: تبديل المحدثّة، المناظرة، Federal News Service.

كانت محادثة هي عملية بين متكلمان أو متكلمون، في عاقبة يتناولون المتكلم ابين فكرته وهناك عملية متبادل بين المتكلم والمستمع، عندما يتكلم المتكلم كان الآخر يكون المستمع الذي يستمع ويهتم المتكلم. أما تبديل المحدثّة هو حال المتكلم لأخذ الفرصة في التكلّم. فلذلك، لابدّ لمتكلم أن يفهم الطريقة لينظّم في محادثته. من هذه خلفية البحث، أخذت الباحثة مناظرة لرئيس الجمهورية أمريكية بين بارك أوبامي (Barack Obama) وميت رومني (Mitt Romney).

في هذا البحث سؤالان، الأول، كيف شكل الطريقة لتبديل المحدثّة لبارك أوبامي وميت رومني. والثاني، كيف أخذ المتكلم عن تبديل المحدثّة لبارك أوبامي وميت رومني. أما أهداف من هذا البحث، لتجوب ويصف كل أسئلة البحث التي قد ظهرت الباحثة.

كان هذا البحث نوع من منهج الوصفي والكيفي. واتخذت الباحثة النظرية ستيستروم (Stenstrom) في السنة ١٩٩٤. كانت فيها تنقسم تبديل المحدثّة على ثلاثة أنواع، الأول لأخذ المتكلم كلاما في المحدثّة (taking the turn)، والثاني عندما يتكلم المتكلم في المحدثّة (holding the turn)، والثالث عندما تجاوب المتكلم بلحظة (yielding the turn). ويكون نسخة مناظرة لرئيس الجمهورية أمريكية بين بارك أوبامي وميت رومني من الشركة المتراجمي فيدرل نوس سرفيس (Federal News Service) مصدر رئيسا فيه.

وأما نتائج البحث فيمكن أن تلخص الباحثة فيمايلي: وجدت الباحثة ٢٩ البيانات من تبديل المحدثّة ثم تجمعت على ثلاث الفراق. هناك ١٥ البيانات من طريقة لأخذ المتكلم كلاما في المحدثّة (taking the turn)، و١١ البيانات من طريقة عندما يتكلم المتكلم في المحدثّة (holding the turn)، وثلاث البيانات من طريقة تجاوب المتكلم بلحظة (yielding the turn).

ABSTRAK

Lestari, Indah Siti N.A.L. 2016. Strategi Pergantian Berbicara dalam Debat Presiden Barack Obama dan Mitt Romney 2012. Skripsi. Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Humaniora. Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Pembimbing: Dr. H. Langgeng Budianto, M.Pd.

Kata Kunci: Pergantian Berbicara, Debat, Federal News Service

Percakapan adalah sebuah aktifitas yang terjadi antara dua orang atau lebih, biasanya dilakukan secara bergantian dalam menyampaikan pikirannya. Ketika seorang berbicara, lawan bicaranya akan diam dan mendengarkan pembicaraannya. Begitupun sebaliknya, ketika terdapat lebih dari satu orang mencoba untuk berbicara pada waktu yang sama, salah satu dari mereka akan berusaha diam dan mendengarkan.

Sementara pergantian bicara adalah suatu kondisi dimana pembicara yang bersangkutan dalam pembicaraannya mengambil giliran berbicara. Oleh karena itu, ketika seseorang berbicara mereka harus paham tentang strategi atau tata cara mengatur teknik percakapan sehingga berjalan lancar. Oleh sebab itu, debat presiden antara Barack Obama dan Mitt Romney adalah objek pada penelitian ini.

Terdapat dua permasalahan dalam penelitian ini, pertama, bentuk strategi dari pergantian bicara dalam debat presiden yang digunakan oleh Barack Obama dan Mitt Romney. Kedua, bagaimana kedua pendebat menggunakan bentuk pergantian bicara. Sementara tujuan dari penelitian ini untuk mendeskripsikan jawaban dari permasalahan yang ada.

Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif-kualitatif, lalu menggunakan teori Stenstrom (1994) untuk menjawab rumusan masalah yang ada. Menurut Stenstrom strategi pergantian bicara dikategorikan menjadi tiga macam strategi, yaitu: *taking the turn*, *holding the turn* dan *yielding the turn*. Adapun sumber dari penelitian ini adalah transkrip debat yang diambil dari sebuah lembaga translate yaitu Federal News Service.

Adapun hasil dari penelitian ini, peneliti menemukan 29 data yang dikategorikan sebagai strategi pergantian berbicara, kemudian data tersebut dikelompokkan menjadi tiga bagian, yaitu: terdapat lima belas data pada strategi *turn taking*, sementara pada strategi *holding the turn* terdapat sebelas data, sedangkan pada strategi *yielding the turn* terdapat tiga data. Tidak semua bagian terdapat data yang dapat dikategorikan sebagai strategi pergantian berbicara, seperti pada *starting up*, *silient pause*, *start all over again* maupun *giving up*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER	i
APPROVAL SHEET	ii
LEGITIMATION SHEET	iii
STATEMENT OF THE AUTHENTICITY	iv
MOTTO	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vii
ABSTRACT	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Problems of the Study	4
1.3 Objectives of the Study	5
1.4 Significance of the Study	5
1.5 Scope and Limitation of the Study	5
1.6 Definition of the Key Terms	6
1.7 Research Method	7
1.7.1 Research design	7
1.7.2 Data sources	7
1.7.3 Research Instrument	8
1.7.4 Data Collection	8
1.7.5 Data Analysis	8
CHAPTER II: REVIEW RELATED LITERATURE	
2.1 Conversational Analysis	9
2.1 Turn Taking	10
2.2.1 Overlapping Talk	10

2.2.2 Repairs.....	11
2.3 Turn Taking Strategies Based on Stenstromm’s (1994) Theory	13
2.3.1 Taking the Turn Strategy	13
2.3.2 Holding the Turn Strategy	16
2.3.3 Yielding the Turn	17
2.3.4 Gesture.....	18
2.4 Previous Studies.....	20
CHAPTER III: FINDING AND DISCUSSION	
3.1 Finding	24
3.1.1 Taking the Turn Strategies	24
3.1.2 Holding the Turn Strategies.....	34
3.1.3 Yielding the Turn Strategies.....	39
3.2 Discussion.....	37
CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION	
4.1 Conclusion.....	46
4.2 Suggestion	47
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	48
APPENDIX	49

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents background of study, research problems, objectives of the study, significances of the study, scope and limitation, definition of key terms and research method includes research design, data source, research instrument, data collection and data analysis.

1.1 Background of the Study

In simple terms, English conversation can be described as an activity in which, for the most part, two or more people take turn at speaking. Typically, only one person speaks at a time and there tends to be an avoidance of silence between speaking turns. If more than one participant tries to talk at the same time, one of them usually stops.

For the most part, participants wait until one speaker indicates that he or she has finished, usually by signaling a completion point. Speaker can mark their turns as complete in a number of ways: by asking question, for example, or by pausing at the end of a completed syntactic structure like phrase or sentence. Other participants can indicate that they want to take the speaking turn, also in a number of ways. They can start to make short sounds, usually repeated, while the speaker is talking, and often use body shifts or facial expressions to signal that they have something to say.

This study examines the process of turn taking occurring in a debate. The exchange turn of the speaker and the listener or one person take the turn of an

interaction which happens unsimultaneously is commonly called as turn taking (Brown & Yule, 1979).

In a debate, turn taking almost always occurs, moreover when the participants of the debate are involved in a big controversy or fascinating issue for instance in the presidential debate between Barack Obama (American president also Democratic nominee) and Governor Mitt Romney (Republican nominee) in Denver.

There are reasons why turn taking is analyzed. Firstly, turn taking is related to the use of language in discourse since turn taking is part of spoken discourse which is related to the use of language which refers to the way in which language used in conversation on certain context, purpose or certain person. This is reason that it is suitable to be searched. Secondly, the researcher wants to show the readers about turn taking strategies in debate, so they can understand more and apply it not only in debate but also in a conversation with people. Thirdly, the researcher tries to discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talks with a central focus on how sequences of utterance are generated.

The reason why the researcher examines turn taking are because this the important things to be learnt deeper, especially for people who intend to communicate or having interaction with other people in order not to hurt someone's feeling and to avoid misunderstanding between them. Afterwards, they will be able to respect the interlocutor, and make him understand on what the speaker is saying and relates to the purpose of the debate, especially in debate

situation, people have to know how to state their opinion to the interlocutor in order to make his utterance arranged well, put the turn taking in the suitable spot, and make someone understand with utterance with the result that he or she agreed with us. Then if they have exchanged their position from listener into speaker, by knowing turn taking will make their utterances spoken in suitable way, so they can avoid the offensiveness between them, because it can cause someone's anger.

The previous studies have some of differences from the focus of the case being researched. Sholikhah (2009) analyzed turn taking strategies used in Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix movie using Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson's theory on turn taking strategy. He analyzed the several conversational turn taking strategies in Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix movie. They are address term, adjacency pair, post completor, utterance in-completor, incompletion marker, overlap, repair techniques, tag question and natural next turn-taker; Komalasari (2010) focused on analyzing turn taking strategies used by the characters of "2012" movie.

The findings in this research show that the character of "2012" movies used all types of turn taking strategies proposed by Stenstrom, those are: taking the turn strategy involve starting up which is divided into uptakes and links, and interrupting which is divided into alert and meta comment; holding the turn includes filled pause/verbal filler/silent pause, lexical repetition and new start; yielding the turn divided into prompting, appealing, and giving up; Sulistyowati (2009) analyzed about turn taking strategies used by the characters of "The

Pursuit of The Happiness” movie by using Stenstrom theory; they are taking the turn, holding the turn and yielding the turn.

Thus, the researcher found out that three turn taking strategies were correlated each other. Yet, those researchers do not take debate as the object, therefore this study provide updated research and breakthrough for the next researchers which take turn taking as their topic also debate as the objet.

In this case, the researcher focuses on turn taking strategies used by Barack Obama and Governor Mitt Romney. The researcher took this debate as the object because this is one of the longest duration of the debate and it becomes the favorite performance from the other debates in the year. In some parts of debate, there are a lot of turn-taking which is occurred. We can take the good objects to research, also with the participation of the important native speaker in this debate are authentically accepted or obtained. Therefore, in this case the researcher try to answer one problem which is occurs in the debate on how the turn-taking is applied by the debaters and also the moderator. The researcher also uses Stenstrom’s theory to analyze the debate conversation.

1.2 Problems of the Study

The research is conducted to find out the answers of the research problems, as follows:

1. What kinds of turn taking strategies are used by the debaters?
2. How the debaters are used those turn taking strategies?

1.3 Objectives of Study

Based on the problems above, the objectives of the study are:

1. To find out the kinds of turn-taking used by the debaters
2. To describe the turn-taking strategies which used by the debaters

1.4 Significance of the Study

The purpose of this research is to explain the importance role of turn taking strategies in the conversation used by debaters. Therefore, the significance of this study is to give a scientific description about how turn taking operates in debate. The researcher also hopes that the readers of this paper will understand about how the people take and manage the turn in a conversation.

Furthermore, the readers can achieve a data of turn taking and it also give an explanation about the turn taking strategies that used to analyze in debate. The readers also can explore some information about what are the functions of turn taking strategies that is used by debaters. Hopefully, this thesis can be an inspiration for the students in the English Department to conduct a research for their thesis.

1.5 Scope and Limitation

This research is regarded as conversational analysis study because researcher analyzed the data using theory of Stenstroom (1994). This theory used to analyze the process of applying turn taking by debaters, the type of the turn taking strategies used by the debaters, and also the function of the turn taking used by the debaters. The data in this study obtained from the transcription of the

debate between Barack Obama and Governor Mitt Romney on Oct. 3, 2012 from Federal Service News in Denver.

Due to my limited time, the researcher only focuses on economic segment about 45:32 minutes because in the transcription there are a lot of segments which allowed in the transcription.

1.6 Definition of the Key Terms

To avoid ambiguity and misunderstanding on the terms used in this research, the researcher defines some key terms as follows:

1.6.1 Turn taking

Conditions in which the speakers who are involved in conversation take turn to speak.

1.6.2 Debate

Debate is contention in argument; dispute; discussions; especially the discussion of questions of public interest in Parliament or in any assembly. Debate is also the method of interactive and representational argument. Debate is broader form of argument than deductive reasoning, which only examines whether a conclusion is a consequence of premises, and factual argument, which only examines what is or is not the case, or rhetoric, which is a technique of persuasion.

1.6.3 Federal News Service

Federal News Service (FNS) is a company which providing transcription service in Washington, D.C (America). FNS produces on-demand verbatim

transcripts of newsworthy even in DC which includes: speeches, congressional hearings, and interview. And FNS is one of the chief sources of transcripts from presidential appearances and Capitol Hill events.

1.7 Research Method

This chapter presents the method which is used in this research. It consists of some sub chapters. They are research design, research subjects, data sources, research instrument, data collection, and data analysis.

1.7.1 Research Design

To analyze the turn taking in conversation of debate, the researcher applied descriptive qualitative research. At this point, this study uses theory proposed by Stenstrom (1994). This method was used because of some reasons. First, the data are in the form of words or utterances from the object's debate. Second, this study uses human instrument: the researcher herself as the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. Third, the purpose of this study is to get a better understanding and deep information on what types and why certain type of turn taking strategy are used in Barack Obama and Mitt Romney debate using Stenstrom's theory.

1.7.2 Data Sources

The sources of the data are taken from the debate conversation which is showed at Federal News Service in Denver. The data in this research is a video uploaded on youtube website published on Oct 3, 2012. The transcripts of the data were taken from Federal Service News website.

1.7.3 Research Instrument

In this study, the main instrument of this study is the researcher herself in order to collect the data and analyze it. She defines instrument as a tool or a mean that the researcher used to collect the data. The data is analyzed based on the theory applied. This makes qualitative method different from other method, and this is one qualitative method characteristic.

1.7.4 Data Collection

In collecting the data, there are several steps which done. First, the researcher gathered data from the internet or youtube about 45:32. Second, the researcher watched the video and read the transcripts. Third, the researcher checked and identified the dialogue by Stenstroom's theory and fourth, the researcher identified the problems which are related with the research.

1.7.5 Data Analysis

To analyze the data, there are some steps to analyze them: (1) finding out the context to understand the condition of the debate, (2) classifying the data into three categories and some sub-categories based on Stenstroom's theory including taking the turn strategy (starting up, taking over, and interrupting), holding the turn (verbal filler and filled pause, lexical repetition, and starting all over again), and yielding the turn (prompting, appealing, and giving up), (3) explaining and interpreting them which is aimed to answer the research question of what types of turn taking strategies which they used, and also how and why the debaters apply those turn taking strategies which they used, and the last is (4) drawing the general conclusion based on the research finding to answer the research problems.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, the researcher will discuss about theories dealing with this study. It involves conversation analysis, turn taking, and turn taking strategies based on Stenstrom theory.

2.1 Conversation Analysis

Before going to know more about turn taking features, it is better to know what an approach that is used to analyze turn taking features. One of an approach to analyze turn taking features is conversation analysis approach. Conversation analysis is the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: talk in interaction. (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998:13). From that statement, we can conclude that CA is an analysis in talk that is produced by human being when they have interaction with others. CA uses ethno methodologists as its main frame work because they try to see how participants in interaction handle conversation, how they judge who can speak and when (Cook, 1989:52).

According to Hutchby an Woffitt (1989: 14) “the aim of CA is to discover how participants understand and response to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus being on how sequences of actions are generated.” By studying CA, it is hoped that it can help human being, when they do ‘talk-in interaction’, is more easily as an orderly accomplishment.

2.2 Turn Taking

In order to know the turn taking strategies in conversation, it is good for us to know about turn taking itself first. Turn taking is a foundational study in conversation analysis. According to Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 47) stated that there are three basic facts about conversation are turn taking occurs, one speaker tends to talk at a time, and turns are taken with as little gap or overlap between them as possible.

According to Stenstrom (1994: 4), a turn is everything the current speaker says before the next speaker takes over. Turn taking means that the speaker gives a chance to the listener, who will be the next speaker, to give a comment of what the speaker said and this is repeating process in the conversation (Levinson, 1983: 292). From those explanations, we can conclude that turn taking is the changing role of the speaker and the listener.

There are two features of the turn taking process in conversation. Those are overlapping talk and repair.

2.2.1. Overlapping Talk

One of the examples of features which are breakdown in turn taking is when there are two people attempt to speak at the same time. It deals with Yule's statement that overlap is when both speakers trying to speak at the same time (Yule, 1996: 72). Overlap between turns it has some particular significance: signaling annoyance, urgency, or desire to correct what is being said (Cook, 1989: 52). While, overlapping talk when the speaker may either yielding the turn by making no further attempt to speak, or take the turn by continuing to speak more loudly. For example:

A: “After finish studying. I want to go to play football in the field”

B: “I want- I want- to join-...”

[]

A: “What- What- time you will come back here?”

When the first speaker makes no choice, the next speaker generally selects him/herself by beginning the turn. Generally, participants try to resolve such completion quickly and smoothly with phrases such as ‘go ahead’, ‘I’m sorry’, ‘pardon me’ etc. In other words, overlapping talk occurs if both speakers talk at the same time. Usually, if overlap takes place, one of the speakers give away to the next speaker to continue his/her speaking. So, the one speaker stops speaking or relinquish the turn without asking other party to continue his/her speaking. It is caused by the speaker who selects his/herself to take the turn. Other way to avoid overlap between participants is by asking other speaker to take the turn.

2.2.2. **Repairs**

There is a wide problem in conversation, such as incorrect word selection, slips of the tongue, mis-hearings, misunderstandings and so on. To deal with those problems, the speaker sometimes modifies, change, repeat a turn or not take up a turn that is called repair. Repair is the way speaker correct things that have been said in conversation (Paltridge, 2000: 95). When someone fails to take the floor, the speaker generally pauses and someone else begins to speak. Yet another option is to reopen the opportunity by pausing and repeating what was said to give the intended speaker

another opportunity in case they did not hear or did not understand the intention the first time. For example:

A: "Do you want to dance now?"

[pause]

A: "Do you want to dance with me now?"

B: "No, I'm not in the mood to do that."

Repair is also done often through self-repair and other repair (Paltridge, 2004:95). For example the self-repair: "I'm gone tell you that case only later... I mean, after this class." Then the example of other repair:

A: "I saw him at the Bread Talk bakery in MOG"

B: "Is it Bread Story bakery, isn't it?"

A: "Yeah, that's what I mean! Bread Story bakery."

From the explanation above, we can conclude that overlapping talk and repair are having close relationship with turn taking. Overlapping talk and repair influences to the turn taking process. Our conversation goes smoothly or not is influence by them.

2.3 Turn taking Strategies based on Stenstroom Theory (1994)

Stenstroom theory (1994: 68) state that there are three types of turn taking strategies, those are: taking the turn strategy, holding the turn strategy, and yielding the turn strategy.

2.3.1. Taking the Turn Strategy

When the conversation begins, it means that someone has an initiative to talk. There must be cooperation between the speaker and the listener in order to the conversation goes on smoothly. For the first time, the speaker/the first speaker begin to talk with someone who is invited (the listener/ the second speaker) to talk. After finishing his/her talking, the listener gives a comment or an answer to him/her (the first speaker).

This condition is called taking the turn strategy. This taking the turn happen all the time until there is no more conversation. Stenstroom (1994: 68) states that taking the turn can be complicated because the speaker who responds the current speaker may not have preparation well. Therefore, Stenstroom divides taking the turn strategy into three parts. Those are: starting up strategy, taking over strategy, and interrupting strategy. Each of them is explained below.

a. Starting up strategy

The first thing that people have to do in the conversation is making the environment from silence to speech. There has to be someone who initiates the talk first. Starting to talk can be a difficult thing. Sometimes, a speaker has not a good

preparation at the beginning of the conversation. It makes the speaker uses a hesitant start, such as filled pauses, for example: am, a; m and verbal fillers, for example:

A: Well, I mean, you know, to give a little bit time for the speaker to prepare what she/he is going to speak

If the speaker often prepare before she/he will take the turn, usually word 'well or w=ell' come up at the beginning of the utterance and it makes a clean start. Sometimes, a speaker also tries to attract the attention of the listener at the beginning of the conversation in order to keep the conversation on. The speaker uses opening such as Guess what?... What I got a surprise for you!, Something strange happened today, etc. Therefore, starting up is important in the conversation.

b. Taking Over Strategy

After the first speaker started a conversation also there is some responses from the listeners. S/he gives comments to answers of what the speaker has stated or asked. If the listener responds to the speaker, it is called as taking over in the conversation. There are so many ways that is used to force the other speakers to speak or give comment on the current speaker's statements. According to Stenstrom (1994: 71) taking over involve whether uptakes or links. By making uptake, the listener acknowledges receipt of what the speaker says and evaluates it before going on. The uptake like: yeah and oh, often come after by appealer like: you know? In the previous turn. Another uptake that is usually uses are well, ah, no, and yes. Another strategy of taking over is links, means that the listener or the next speaker takes the turn by using connecting words, such as: and, but, because, and so. For example:

A: "I don't know anything about that."

B: " And then, what should I do now?"

In this strategy, the speaker can use uptakes or links. Uptakes are used by the speaker to give respond to the current speaker's utterance as showing his/her agreement. Links are used by the speaker to take turn in order to continue his/her speaking as showing understanding , continuing, and giving reason or disagreement of previous utterance.

c. Interrupting Strategy

Interrupting strategy is divided into alert and Meta comment. Alert is done by the listener to interrupt the current speaker by speaking louder than other participant in order to attract the attention. They usually use words like: hey, listen, and look. For example:

A: "I'm so sorry about you father kid..."

B: "Look- that is my father!"

Meta comment is actually give a comment on the talk itself, which allow the listener to come up with objections without appearing to straight forward and without offending the current speaker. In other words, it has face-saving effect. And this strategy is called as the polite on in interrupting the current speaker, like: can I say something?, Can I just tell?, Let me just...etc. for example:

A: "No more objections, you have to do all this assignments. Don't be lazy"

B: "Sir, could I say something about this? I've done all this assignments Sir, I suggest you to check your e-mail again".

2.3.2 Holding the Turn Strategy

Holding the turn means to carry on talking. It happens when the speaker cannot control or hold the turns all the time because it is quite difficult to plan what to say at the same time. S/he has to stop talking and start planning halfway through the turn. Silence should be avoided, unless is strategically placed, because the listener mistakes it for a takeover the signal. In other words, the speaker has to play for time.

There are some ways for holding the turn to avoid a breakdown or takeover, those are: filled pause and verbal fillers, silent pause, lexical repetition and new start in a conversation. Filled pause and verbal fillers are used to indicate that the speaker is trying to think what he/she is going to say and it is only used in the short time. For example:and all this was done- - by - - kind of letting- a: - -. Sort of a-...

Silent pause is used as the turn holder and tried to keep the listener wait until the current speaker finish his/her talking. In silent pause the speaker produces pause where it is placed in syntactically and semantically strategic place. For example: there are .some .candle .in .the rooms. Next is lexical repetition. It is used by repeating the words because the speaker wants to go on speaking. For example: ...I mean if if if you sell your house, you youyou will get a lot of profit. And the last is a new start.

When the speaker cannot use his/her ideas by using lexical repetition, silent way, filled pause and verbal fillers, and the only way is to start all over again. For example:... and I think a: - - it does not matter for me to...

2.3.3 Yielding the Turn

The last strategy is yielding the turn strategy. sometimes, the speaker has to give away the turn rather reluctantly, but usually the speaker yield the turn without much protesting. The speaker appeals to the listener for a response (Stenstroom, 1994 :79). Yielding the turn strategy is divided into prompting strategy, appealing strategy, and giving up strategy.

a. Prompting Strategy

In yielding the turn, the speaker can make prompting in order to incite the participant to respond more others so that it turns them automatically into turn-yielders. Moreover, the speaker can make a prompting in order to invite, greeting, offer, question, request, object, and apologize. For example:

A: “Andre”

B:” Yes”

A:” What are you doing?”

B:” I’m writing my homework”.

b. Appealing Strategy

Appealing means the speaker gives an explicit signal for the listener to make some kind of feedback, like: question tags, all right, ok, you know, you see are being wait by the current speaker.

A:” Manchester United is signing Robin Van Persie you know”

B:”Yes, I’ve heard about it”

c. Giving up Strategy

Giving up is the last strategy in yielding the turn. Here, the speaker realizes that s/he has no more to say or that s/he thinks it is time to the listener to give responses. Usually, this strategy is conducted when the speaker cannot share the information that he/she has in his/her minds, as a result, there is a pause and a longer the pause, the stronger the pressure on the listener to say something. For example:

A:”I think if you want to a- - a:m-“

B:”Yes, I already know about something you gonna say”.

2.3.4 Gesture

Communication is not only produced by verbal, but it also produced by nonverbal. In the process of verbal communication, the message is delivered by using utterances. Whereas, in nonverbal communication the participants use gesture to communicate each other, such as: move their hand, their head, their arms or their whole body. Supported by Duncan (1972) stated that in a communication, there are signals that speaker and hearer send to each other in order indicate their state

with regard to the turn. The signals have the important role in direct communication.

The one of the signals is gesture.

Gesture is a body movement that appears to contribute to the meaning of an utterance. It can help the listeners get an understanding about the speaker's say, such as pointing gestures are regarded as indicating an object, a location, or a direction a place. Supported by Alibali et al. (2000) stated that the action of gesturing helps speakers to organize spatial information and in this way, gesture plays a role in conceptualizing the message to be verbalized.

According to McNeill (Cited in Tellier, 2000) there are four categories of gestures: iconic, metaphoric, deictic and beats. Iconic gesture represents images in the shapes of objects or people. For instance, someone holding a steering wheel while saying "drive" while showing a width with both hands open and facing; Metaphoric gestures emphasis in abstract concept rather than concrete objects. If the speaker holds one cup in his hands and then he says the word "concept" for instance, it is a metaphoric gesture because the cup acts as a symbolic image for the idea of a "concept"; Deictic gestures refer to things by pointing with the hand, the finger, the chin, etc. they can be either concrete pointing to someone, something or somewhere, like when one says "your glasses are here on the table" while point towards the table and the glasses. But it can also be abstract pointing when referring to something or someone absent or even a moment in time, for instance one points to the right to mean China or their back to refer to the past.

Deictics can be shaped by cultural characteristics as geographical and time references differ between language and cultures.

Beats is the movements that no semantic connection to the speech they accompany. They rather stress important words or phrases. A typical beat would be a flick of the finger or of the hand, it has two movements phases-in or out and up or down.

2.2 Previous Studies

Studies on turn taking have been done by several researchers (e.g. movie dialogue Sholikhah, (2009); Komalasari, (2010), Sulistyowati, (2009), Kharis, (2010), and Al Fatah, (2015). Sholikhah (2009) analyzed turn taking strategies used in Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix movie using Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson's theory on turn taking strategy. She analyzed the several conversational turn taking strategies in Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix movie. They are; address term, adjacency pair, post completor, utterance in-completor, incompletion marker, overlap, repair techniques, tag question and natural next turn-taker. Adjacency pair is the most dominant kind of conversational turn taking strategy used in the movie with thirty seven times used. Then the functions of conversational turn taking strategies used in the movie are to take and relinquish the turn. Address term is used by the speaker to take, hold, and relinquish the turn; adjacency pair is used to take and relinquish the turn; post completor is used to take and relinquish the turn; utterances in-completor is chose to hold the turn; incompletion marker is used to hold and take the turn; tag question is used to hold the turn; then natural next turn taker is used to take the turn. (Sholikhah, Maratus. 2009. Turn Taking Strategies Used in Harry Potter and The Order of Phoenix Movie. Unpublished thesis. Malang: UIN Malang).

Komalasari (2010) focused on analyzing turn taking strategies used by the character of “2012” movie. The findings in this research show that the character of “2012” movie used all types of turn taking strategies proposed by Stenstroom, those are: Taking the turn strategy involve starting up which is divided into hesitant and clean start, taking over which is divided into uptakes and links, and interrupting which is divided into alert and meta comment; holding the turn includes filled pause/verbal filler/silent pause, lexical repetition and new start; and yielding the turn divided into prompting, appealing, and giving up. Then the functions of turn taking strategies used in the movie are to take, hold, and yield or relinquish the turn; Starting up, taking over, and interrupting by the speaker to take the turn; pause/verbal filler/silent pause, lexical repetition and new start are used to hold the turn; and prompting, appealing, and giving up are used to yield and relinquish the turn. The common type which is used by the character is interrupting strategy especially alert type (Komalasari, Imas. 2010. Turn taking Strategies Used by The Characters of “2010”. Unpublished Thesis. Malang: UIN Malang)

Sulistiyowati (2009) analyzed about turn taking strategies used by the characters of “The Pursuit of The Happiness” movie by using Stenstroom theory; they are taking the turn strategies, holding the turn strategies, and yielding the turn strategies. The researcher found out that three turn taking strategies were correlated each other. Those strategies found in every conversation. In taking the turn strategy, the main character used starting up strategy, taking over strategy, and interrupting strategy. Starting up strategy is used when he wants to take the turn. Taking over strategy is used when he wants to give a respond. Interrupting strategy is used when

he thinks that he has got the message or he wants to speak up at particular point in the ongoing talk, before it is too late. Holding the turn strategy is used when he wants to carry on talking. Yielding the turn strategy is used when he wants to give away the turn to the listener. In give away the turn, the main character used prompting strategy, appealing strategy, and giving up strategy. Prompting strategy is used to prompt the listener to respond more strongly. Appealing strategy is used to serve an explicit signal to the listener that some kind of feedback would be appropriate. Giving up strategy is used when he realized that no more to say or he thinks that it is time to the listener to say something and gives a respond. (Sulistyowati, Dwi. 2009. Turn Taking Strategies Used by The Main Characters in “The Pursuit of Happiness”. Unpublished Thesis. Malang: UIN Malang).

Kharis (2010) investigated turn taking strategies used by the interviewer of Metro TV “Indonesia This Morning” using the theory of Stenstrom. Based on the analysis of the research, the interviewer used three kinds of strategies, those are: Taking, holding, and yielding the turn. The interviewer used taking the turn strategies when he wants to start the conversation or initiate conversation, he used holding the turn when he wants to carry out speaking, and he used yielding the turn when he has nothing to say again in conversation or he has said the complete sentences. The interviewer used questions to take and yield the turn in the process of interview. However, the interviewer did not directly give questions to take and yield the turn. The interviewer usually delivered new statement first before giving question. It was proposed to the interviewee in order the interviewee could focus on every sub-topic question delivered by the interviewer. In delivering statements itself, three kinds of

turn taking strategy had been used. (Fauzi, Kharis. 2010. Turn Taking Strategies Used by The Interviewer in “Indonesia This Morning”. Unpublished Thesis. Malang: UIN Malang).



CHAPTER III

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents findings and discussions. In this chapter, the researcher presents the analysis of all data. This chapter is the most significant part of the whole study because through the analysis of the data. The researcher found some data containing turn taking strategies based on Stenstrom's (1994) theory on first of 2012 presidential debates between Barack Obama (The democratic nominee) and Former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney (Republican nominee) in Denver, Colorado. In this research Lehrer become the mediator is not taken as the analysis of the data. He becomes a connector of the conversation between Obama and Mitt Romney.

3.1 Findings

This study finds types of turn taking applied by debaters: taking the turn, holding the turn, and yielding the turn.

3.1.1 Taking the Turn Strategies

The data of the taking the turn strategy are divided into taking over strategy and interrupting. The data of taking over strategy itself are divided in two areas: uptakes and links; while interrupting divided also in two areas: alert and Meta comment. From those data is elaborated and discussed below.

a. Taking Over Strategy

As mentioned above, this strategy consists of uptakes and links. The researcher finds six data of uptakes strategy four data of links strategy, however the two data of uptakes and links strategy will be taken as analysis. Each of the data presented below.

- **Uptakes (datum 1.4, 1.7, 1.9, 1.11, 1.23 and 1.32)**

Datum 1.4:

Lehrer : Mr. President, please respond directly to what the governor just said about trickle-down — his trickle-down approach. He's — as he said yours is.

Obama : *Well*, let me talk specifically about what I think we need to do.

First, we've got to improve our education system. And we've made enormous progress drawing on ideas both from Democrats and Republicans that are already starting to show gains in some of the toughest-to- deal-with schools. We've got a program called Race to the Top that has prompted reforms in 46 states around the country, raising standards, improving how we train teachers. So now I want to hire another hundred thousand new math and science teachers and create 2 million more [slots](#) in our community colleges so that people can get trained for the jobs that are out there right now. And I want to make sure that we keep tuition low for our young people.

This datum occurred when the debaters discussed about Romney's scheme on his tickle-down approach which questioned by Lehrer and Obama gives the statement about that. The situation was still conducive, because debaters were still in the beginning of the debate.

Analysis:

Obama applied the taking over strategy which contains uptakes expression. It showed by Obama when used “well” in the beginning of his statement. He took the moderator (Lehrer) turn because he knew that Lehrer had finished his statement. Although , he used “well” in the beginning of the conversation it was not classified as starting up, because Obama still discussed the similar theme which continued from Romney’s statements. In other hand, Obama states his statement or taking speaking turn directly after Lehrer finished his speaking turn, not from silence to speaking. Therefore by this expression using well utterances, Obama applied some of turn taking strategies which in taking over in the part of uptakes strategies.

Datum 1.7:

Lehrer : Both of you have spoken about a lot of different things, and we're going to try to get through them in as specific a way as we possibly can. But first, Governor Romney, do you have a question that you'd like to ask the president directly about something he just said?

Romney : *Well, sure.* I'd like to clear up the record and go through it piece by piece. First of all, I don't have a \$5 trillion tax cut. I don't have a tax cut of a scale that you're talking about. My view is that we ought to provide tax relief to people in the middle class. But I'm not going to reduce the share of taxes paid by high- income people. High-income people are doing just fine in this economy. They'll do fine whether you're president or I am.

This datum occurred when the debaters discussed about tax cut which explained by Obama. This datum was continued by Lehrer questions about how to get trough of them in specific way as possible. The situation was a little bit raising up, and the debaters were still in their mood.

Analysis:

Romney applied taking over strategy, which indicates in uptakes. It showed by Romney begun his expression with “*well sure*”. It was same as datum 1.3, he took over Lehrer speaking turn, because Lehrer has finished his statement. This expression similar with datum 1.3 too, both used utterances by saying “well”. Although, he used “well” in the beginning of the debate, it was not categorized as starting up strategy, because Romney still discussed in the same theme. Also Romney spoke directly after taking over Lehrer speaking turn not starting from silence to speak. The using utterance “well” by Romney’s in his conversation of the debate is the kind of turn taking strategies in taking over in the part of uptakes.

Datum 1.9:

Obama : *Well*, I think — let's talk about taxes because I think it's instructive. Now, four years ago when I stood on this stage I said that I would cut taxes for middle-class families. And that's exactly what I did. We cut taxes for middle-class families by about \$3,600. And the reason is because I believe we do best when the middle class is doing well.

This datum happened when the debaters discussed about taxes which questioned by the moderator of the debate, Lehrer. This was also the beginning of

Obama answer about the taxes. The situation in this debate was still conducive. The debaters also were still in their good mood because it was still in the beginning of the debate.

Analysis:

Obama applied the taking over strategies which contains in uptakes expression. It explained by “Obama” when he used “well” in the beginning of his statement. He took the moderator or Lehrer speaking turn because Obama knew that Lehrer had finished his statement. Obama attempted to explain about the taxes which he thinks that taxes were instructive. Although, Obama used “well” in the beginning of his statement it was not classified as starting up, because he still discussed in the similar theme which questioned by Lehrer. In the other hand, Obama states his statement or taking speaking turn directly after the moderator finished his speaking turns , it was categorize as turn taking strategy in taking over in the part of uptakes expression.

- **Links (datum 1.10, 1.12, 1.26 and 1.31)**

Datum 1.26:

Obama : That's what we've done, made some adjustments to it; and we're putting it forward before Congress right now, a \$4 trillion plan, (a balanced ?)

Romney : *But* you've been — but you've been president four years. You've been president four years. You said you'd cut the deficit in half. It's now four years later. We still have trillion-dollar deficits.

Lehrer : let's let him answer the taxes thing for a moment, OK?

This datum occurred when the debaters discussed about Obama's scheme that he has done and made some adjustment to Simpson – Bowles before Congress. This discussion was the result of Lehrer question about Simpson – Bowles.

Analysis:

In this datum, Romney used the expression which included in taking over strategy especially in links strategy because he began his statement using some conjunction “But” in beginning of the debate. This strategy aimed to take over Obama's speaking turn because he gave away or finished his speaking turn. After took over Obama's speaking turn, he stated that he disagree with Obama's statement about adjustment to Simpson – Bowles, and Romney thought that was adding up everything. Therefore from his expression in using “But” utterances is categorized as taking over strategies in the part of links strategy.

Datum 1.31:

Obama : It's time to end it.

Romney : *And* — and in one year, you provided \$90 billion in breaks to the green energy world. Now, I like green energy as well, but that's about 50 years' worth of what oil and gas receives, and you say Exxon and Mobil — actually, this \$2.8 billion goes largely to small companies, to drilling operators and so forth. But you know, if we get that tax rate from 35 percent down to 25 percent, why, that \$2.8 billion is on the table. Of course it's on the table. That's probably not going to survive, you get that rate down to 25 percent.

Lehrer : Let's have.....

In this datum, the debaters discussed about Obama's statement got to take a revenue balanced and responsible approach. The situation was a little bit raising up, because the discussion's theme was Obama's scheme about to shift Medicaid revenue, however the debaters still in their mood.

Analysis:

Romney applied taking over strategy, which indicates in links, because he began his statement using conjunction "And". Romney took over Obama's speaking turn, because he had finished his statement or speaking turn. He took over Obama's speaking turn after he finished explaining was agreed by The Parliamentary Budget Office with that conjunction, and then he emphasizes again where the cut Romney intended too. In this strategies, Romney use the some strategies as datum above in using conjunction "And" as his utterances is categorize as taking over strategies in the part of links strategy.

b. Interrupting

As mentioned before, this strategy consists of alert and meta comment. This research found one of alert and four datum of meta comment. The two data of interrupting will be taken as analysis. Each of which is discussed as follows.

- **Alert (datum 1.29)**

Datum 1.29:

Obama : There has to be revenue in addition to cuts. Now, Governor Romney has ruled out revenue. He's — he's ruled out revenue.

Romney : **LOOK**, the revenue I get is by more people working, getting higher pay, paying more taxes. That's how we get growth and how we balance the budget. But the idea of taxing people more, putting more people out of work — you'll never get there. You never balance the budget by raising taxes.

The condition of this datum considered by the researcher was a climax which happened in the middle of the debate, and this datum showed the most fascinating part of the debate. Romney felt a little bit annoyed because Obama still concerning about his rule out revenue, so he decided to interrupt him.

Analysis:

In this datum, Romney showed one of the interrupting types by using raising intonation to take Obama's speaking turn because he felt annoyed. He felt annoyed because Obama still discussed about Romney's cut plan in revenue. Certainly, his utterances began with rising intonation and stated the expression "LOOK" which means to make Obama stop talking. In result with that, Obama felt annoyed and stooped talking for a moment although he was not use the example of alert expressions. Romney interruption could not make Obama stopped his speaking turn due to high intonation usage. Romney used an inappropriate word to interrupt

someone with rising intonation. Therefore, when he interrupts Obama's speaking by Using "LOOK" utterances is the kind of turn taking strategies in the kind of interrupting strategies in the part of alert strategies.

- **Meta Comment (datum 1.29, 1.5, 1.8, 1.19, and 1.21))**

Datum 1.8:

Lehrer : Both of you have spoken about a lot of different things, and we're going to try to get through them in as specific a way as we possibly can. But first, Governor Romney, do you have a question that you'd like to ask the president directly about something he just said?

Romney : Well, sure. *I'd like to clear up* the record and go through it piece by piece.

The situation of the debate was little bit rising up, because the discussion theme was about Romney's scheme that would clear up the record and fixed some scheme that considered no longer need to continue.

Analysis:

In this datum, Romney applied expression of Meta comment by saying "I'd like to" in the beginning of his statement in order to make Lehrer stopped or finished his talking, and give away his speaking turn. Romney used this strategy because he wanted to explain that his scheme was agreed by the tax cut. By stating polite expression, Romney could make the interlocutor felt respected, whereas his speaking

turn was interrupted. The interrupting strategies are applied by Romney in using “I’d like to” utterance in this conversation.

Datum 1.21:

Lehrer : That's not how it works.

Romney : *Let me* — let me repeat — let me repeat what I said — (inaudible). I'm not in favor of a \$5 trillion tax cut. That's not my plan. My plan is not to put in place any tax cut that will add to the deficit. That's point one. So you may keep referring to it as a \$5 trillion tax cut, but that's not my plan.

The situation of this debate was little bit rising up, because the conversation theme was about tax plan that Romney has planed not to put any kind of tax cut will add their deficit. In this he attempt to appoint again about his plane will be fixed.

Analysis:

In this datum, Romney using utterance by said saying “Let me” in the beginning of his statement so that it make Leher stopped or finishing his talking, and give away his speaking turn. He (Romney) used this strategy because he wanted to explain that his plan was acceptable. with saying polite utterance, Romney could make the interlocutor respected. This was the some categorize as datum before when Romney use some polite expression in using “Let me” is the kind of turn taking strategies in interrupting strategies in the part of meta comment.

3.1.2 Holding the turn strategy

This research finds eleven data contained in this strategy. The data of holding the turn strategy are divided into nine data of filled pause and verbal filler and two data of lexical repetition. Yet, two data of both types will be taken as analysis. Each of these types is elaborated and discussed below.

- **Filled pause and verbal filler (datum 1.1, 1.3, 1.6, 1.18, 1.20, 1.22, 1.24, 1.30 and 1.32)**

Datum (1.1):

Obama : Well, thank you very much, Jim, for this opportunity. I want to thank Governor Romney and the University of Denver for your hospitality .*hh e::* There are a lot of points that I want to make tonight, but the most important one is that 20 years ago I became the luckiest man on earth because Michelle Obama agreed to marry me. *hh* (Laughter.) And so I just want to wish, *e::* Sweetie, *e::* you happy anniversary and let you know that a year from now, we will not be celebrating it in front of 40 million people. (Laughter.)

e:: You know, four years ago we went through the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. Millions of jobs were lost. The auto industry was on the brink of collapse. *e::* The financial system had frozen up. And because of the resilience and the determination of the American people, we've begun to fight our way back.

The situation considered fine, because it was still in the first or in beginning of the debate. In this datum Obama discussed about the financial crisis worst such million jobs were lost. He answered the moderator question smoothly, because he still on their good mood.

Analysis:

In this datum Obama stated one statement that contained some filled pauses and verbal fillers in order to hold his speaking turn and let him finished his talking. He used two filled paused to take a breath at the beginning of his statement because he intended to stated some statement in “I want to thank Governor Romney and the University of Denver for your hospitality .hh and but the most important one is that 20 years ago I became the luckiest man on earth because Michelle Obama agreed to marry me. hh. However, in this statement the verbal filler was dominant, Obama used some verbal filler at some moment that he needed to thinks about what he going to speak. He used five times of verbal filler in his statement. Therefore his utterances are called by turn taking strategies which categorize as holding the turn strategies in the part of filled pause and herbal filler.

Datum (1.3):

Romney : Thank you, Jim. It's an honor to be here with you, and I appreciate the chance to be with the president. I am pleased to be at the University of Denver, appreciate their welcome .*hh* and also the presidential commission on these debates. And congratulations to you, Mr. President, on your anniversary. I'm sure this was the most romantic place you could imagine here — here with me, so I *e::*— (laughter) — congratulations.

This is obviously a very tender topic. I've had the occasion over the last couple of years of meeting people across the country. I was in Dayton, Ohio, and a woman grabbed my arm, and she said, I've been out of work since May. Can you help me? Ann yesterday was a rally in Denver, and a woman came up to her with a baby in her arms and said, Ann, my husband

has had four jobs in three years, part-time jobs. He's lost his most recent job, and we've now just lost our home. Can you help us? And the answer is yes, we can help, but it's going to take a different path, not the one we've been on, not the one the president describes as a top-down, *e::* cut taxes for the rich. That's not what I'm going to do.

My plan has five basic parts. One, get us energy independent, North American energy independent. That creates about four million jobs. Number two, open up more trade, particularly in Latin America; crack down on China if and when they cheat. Number three, make sure our people have the skills they need to succeed and the best schools in the world. We're far away from that now. Number four, get us to a balanced budget. Number five, champion small business.

The situation of this datum was rising up, due to discussion theme about the major differences between Obama and Romney how they would go to create a new job. Romney has five part basic plans such: get us energy independent, open up more trade, skills to succeed and best school, get a balance budget and the last is champion small business.

Analysis:

In this datum, Romney stated one long statement that contained some filled pauses and verbal fillers in order to hold his speaking turn and let him finished his talking. He used one of the filled paused to take a breath at beginning because he intended to stated long statement in “I am pleased to be at the University of Denver, appreciate their welcome *.hh*”. However, in this long statement the verbal filler allowed more dominant than filled paused. Romney used some verbal viler at some

moment that he needed to think what he going to speak. He used twice verbal filler in his statement. However, compared with Obama, the researcher thoughts that Romney's speaks is faster than Obama, although there are some verbal filler. Therefore, with his style of speaking faster, he seemed to be more prepared than Obama. Probably, because he had become republican that made the more confident to speak in front of public and he had more experiences. As mentioned of his utterances Obama applied some turn taking strategies in the kind of holding the turn strategies in the part of filled pause and verbal filler.

- **Lexical Repetition (datum 1.13 and 1.27)**

Datum 1.13:

- Lehrer** : OK. Yeah, just — let's just stay on *taxes* for a moment.
- Romney** : Yeah. Well, but — but —
- Lehrer** : What is the difference?
- Romney** : — virtually every — virtually everything he just said about my *tax plan* is inaccurate.
- Lehrer** : All right, go —

Romney : So — so if — if the *tax plan* he described were a *tax plan* I was asked to support, I'd say absolutely not. I'm not looking for a \$5 trillion tax cut. What I've said is I won't put in place a tax cut that adds to the deficit. That's part one. So there's no economist can say Mitt Romney's *tax plan* adds 5 trillion (dollars) if I say I will not add to the deficit with my *tax plan*.

This datum occurred in the beginning of the statement debate. So that, the conditions of the debate was conducive. Both of them still in their good mood, they discussed about the tax plan. Finally, Romney stated that he will not add the deficit of his tax plan.

Analysis:

In this datum, Romney used lexical repetition to hold his speaking turn after being taken or interrupted by Lehrer. After he state “tax plan” Lehrer interrupted him and make him stooped talking for a while, then he relinquish his speaking turn again by repeating again those word three times. Here, Romney stated again and he did not want to discuss the tax plan that he stated at the last time, he wanted the discussion still based on the fact. Therefore he wants to hold his speaking turn until the statement become clearly. In repeating the word which applied by Romney in his conversation of his debate is categorize as holding the turn strategies in the part of lexical repetition strategies.

Datum 1.27:

Obama : That's what we've done, made some adjustments to it; and we're putting it forward before Congress right now, a \$4 trillion plan, (a balanced ?) —

Romney : But *you've been* — but *you've been president* four years. *You've been president* four years. You said you'd cut the deficit in half. It's now four years later. We still have trillion-dollar deficits. The CBO says we'll have a trillion-dollar deficit each of the next four years. If you're re-elected, we'll get to a trillion-dollar debt. You have said before you'd cut the deficit

in half. And this four — I love this idea of 4 trillion (dollars) in cuts. You've found \$4 trillion of ways to reduce or to get closer to a balanced budget, except we still show trillion dollar deficits every year. That doesn't get the job done.

The condition of this datum is still in raising up of the debate. The strategy occurred when they discussed about some adjustment that Obama would cut the deficit in half. This datum was the result of Romney interruption which considered about the adjustment.

Analysis:

This datum was similar with the previous datum 2.4.2. Romney applied some lexical repetition to hold his speaking turn and continue his speaking until finished it. It was happened also after his statement interrupted by Obama considered his adjustment. He stated the utterances “you have been” three times and “president” twice. It means that he was really intended to hold his speaking turn after being interrupted by Obama. From his repeating words which mentioned before, Obama use some turn taking strategies in holding the turn in the part of lexical repetition.

3.1.3 Yielding the turn strategies

This research found three data containing this strategy. The data of yielding the turn strategy are divided into two data of prompting and one data of appealing, however two data of both prompting and appealing will be taken as analysis. Each of these data is elaborated and discussed below.

- **Prompting (datum 1.2 and 1.25)**

Datum 1.2:

Obama : Now, it ultimately is going to be up to the voters, to you, which path we should take. *Are we going to double down on the top-down economic policies that helped to get us into this mess, or do we embrace a new economic patriotism that says, America does best when the middle class does best?* And I'm looking forward to having that debate.

This datum occurred when the debaters discussed about economy how creating a new jobs. Obama considered that which part will be chosen by us according to economic policies or economic patriotism. The situation of the debate was starting up, due to the theme of the discussion.

Analysis:

In this datum, Obama used yielding the turn strategy especially prompting to end or finish his statement. He applied prompting by using question to Romney what would be chosen to get new job. He knew that his speaking turn should be ended and he decided to ask again about the path which should take for us. Therefore he used prompting to end his speaking turn which becomes a question that asked Romney to answer that.

Datum 1.25:

Romney : What things would I cut from spending? Well, first of all, I will eliminate all programs by this test — if they don't pass it:

Is the program so critical it's worth borrowing money from China to pay for it? And if not, I'll get rid of it. "Obamacare" is on my list. *I apologize*, Mr. President. I use that term with all respect.

This datum occurred when the debater's discussed about tackling the deficit problem in America. Romney considered will eliminate the program by testing it. This situation was still starting to rise up, due to the theme of the discussion.

Analysis:

In this datum, Romney used the turn taking strategy especially prompting to end or finish his statement. He applied prompting by using apologize utterance to Obama . He decided to end his statement with apologize, because he understood that he had to end speaking turn. However, he used apologize utterance in order to incite Obama to respond his statement so that apologize turn automatically.

- **Appealing strategy (datum 1.28)**

Datum 1.28:

Lehrer : Let's let him answer the taxes thing for a moment, **OK?**

Romney : **OK.**

Lehrer : Mr. President.

Obama : *Well, we've had this discussion before.*

The situation of this datum was rising up, due to the discussion theme about taxes. This datum occurred when Romney finishes his statement but Lehrer asked Obama to answer about the taxes thing.

Analysis:

In this datum Obama applied appealing strategy. It means that Lehrer asked Obama to answer his question. Lehrer used some kind of feed back in utterance “Ok”. He used this because he wants to give a code or signal to Obama for give some feedback about previous statement.

3.2 Discussions

Turn-taking strategies is one of the language phenomena which can found out in our environment. The people need the language as the tool of communicate in the society. In the case of communication, turn taking strategies as the language phenomena is used to make interaction with the interlocutor especially in debate. For this case, this research presents the result of the data analysis which based on debate of first presidential debate between Obama and Mitt Romney and answer the problems of the study mention it previously. Meanwhile, the researcher find out the kinds of turn-taking strategies and how do convey the utterances of turn taking strategies in that used in the script of the debate in the first of the 2012 presidential debate between President Obama and Mitt Romney based on Stenstrom (1994). Further, the researcher tries to obtain data, analyzed the data and identified the data based on Turn-taking strategies.

According to Stenstroom (1994), he divide the turn taking strategies into three types such : taking the turn strategy, holding the turn strategy and yielding the turn strategy. If the participant uses taking the turn taking strategies, it's mean that some one has an iniatiative to talk. when that the speaker or the first speaker begin to talk with someone who is invited (the second speaker/the listener) to talk then after finishing the talking, the listener gives a comment or answer to him/her (first speaker), If the participant uses holding the turn strategy means that to carry on talking; it happends when the speaker cannot control or hold the turn all the time because it is difficult to plan what to say at the same time, and if the participant uses yielding the turn means that the speaker has to give away turn rather reluctantly, but usually the speaker yield the turn without much comment. From the finding, the debaters used turntaking strategies. They have different characteristics to convey their opinion and critical by their ways.

3.2.1 Taking the Turn Strategy

This strategy shows that someone has initiative to talk in begin the talking. It means that the first speaker begin to talk with someone who invited then the second speaker gives comment or answer the first speaker question after finishing his/her talking. Taking the turn strategy, which are used by the debaters are showing in taking over strategies (uptake and links) and interrupting (Alert and Meta comment). First, The debaters often uses taking over starategies in part of uptake in his utterances. For example the utterances (1,4), (1.7), (1.9), (1.11), (1.23), and (1.32), these strategies are used by the debaters which the listener acknowledges receipt of

what the speaker says and evaluates the statement before going on their debate. Second, the debaters uses taking over strategy in interrupting in the part of Meta comment which allowed in (1.5), (1.8), (1.10), and (1.21), these strategy are used by the debaters to give a comment in the talk itself which permit the listener or second speaker to come up with the objections without offending the current speaker and it begin by polite utterances. Third, that debaters uses the taking over strategy in the part of links in (1.10), (1.12), (1.26), and 1.31), these strategies are used by the debaters to give respond to the current speaker's utterances after showing his agreement and disagreement and it begin by connecting words. The last is the debaters uses the taking over strategy in interrupting in the part of alert which only allowed in (1.29), this strategy is used by the debater to interrupt the current speaker by speaking louder and the speaker used LOOK to attract the attention. Based on findings, the use of taking the turn strategies is much influenced in formal context. It could be seen from how the speaker close to the listener and the topic discussed is serious.

Another reason why the debaters used taking the turn strategy is because the speaker wants to give respect to the hearer. It seems simple; however, it is not easy to do. He or the speaker who responds the current speaker does not has preparation well to answer, he must to keep his emotion stay cool down although his rival gives the critical which can feel uncomfortable. The debaters or the speaker used this strategy because he wants to make the situation more comfortable during the debate, and also he stated his statement in beginning of his talking.

3.2.2 Holding the Turn Strategy

Holding the turn strategy shows that the listener carries on talking it means that the listener holds the speaker's talk. It happened when the speaker cannot hold the turn since the speaker talk all the time, because it was difficult to responds or to answer how and what to say exactly in the same time.

The utterances (1.1), (1.3), (1.6), (1.18), (1.20), (1.22), (1.24), (1.30), and (1.30) show holding the turn strategies in the part of filled pause and verbal filler strategy. These utterances are used by the debaters to hold and carry on talking. The reason why the speaker used these utterances are because to point out which the speaker demanding or trying to think what he going to speaks and it was happened in short time. For the next the utterances in (1.13) and (1.27) show holding the turn strategies in the part of lexical repetition. These utterances are used by the debaters also to hold and carry on talking too. The reason is why the debaters used these utterances because the speaker wants to go on speaking or debate.

Based on the findings, it can be stated that Obama and Mitt Romney applied those are turn taking strategies especially in the kinds of holding the turn strategy. The using of those strategies by them is much influenced in the formal situation. The context where the debate took place influences the choice of turn taking strategies. The listener tends to use filled pause/ verbal filler and lexical repetition as the strategy to close relationship and to carry on talking.

3.2.3 Yielding the Turn Strategy

In the further section, the researcher discussed the turn taking strategies in the kinds of yielding the turn strategy. The debaters used this strategy because the speaker wants to give away the turn more reluctantly, but generally the speaker yield the turn without any comment or much protesting.

The strategy of yielding the turn which used by Obama and Mitt Romney in their debate are shows in the utterances (1.2), and (1.25) These utterances show turn taking strategies in the kind of yielding the turn in the part of prompting strategy. These utterances were used by the debaters because the speaker wants to provoke the listener in order to respond more so that it turns them automatically. Generally they used utterances in prompting by greeting, offer, apologize or question. In (1.28) utterances the debaters used yielding the turn strategy in the part of appealing strategy. He used this utterance because the speaker wants to give a signal to the listener to give some feedback. Generally they used some utterances such: ok, question tag, and you know those are being wait by the current speaker.

Based on the findings, it can be stated that Obama and Mitt Romney applied turn taking strategy in kinds of yielding the turn in the part of prompting. The use of this strategy is influenced by the debaters that the speaker appeals to the listener for some responses.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter focuses on the conclusions and suggestions. The conclusions based on analyzing the data and the statement of problems. Moreover, the suggestions are given to the next researcher who is interested in doing similar research in the same field.

4.1 Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher tries to analyze and discuss the research problem about turn-taking strategies. The researcher found out that there are many turn taking strategies in the first of 2012 presidential debate between Obama and Mitt Romney. This study concludes that the most occurring type of turn taking was holding the turn strategy especially in filled pause and verbal filler. In this research, the debaters applied most this type of holding the turn strategy because the debaters want to declare the speaker's statements which going to say. The utterances which found in the conversation are about nine times. The second strategy is found in taking the turn strategy especially in taking over in the part of uptake is the debaters uses six times utterances. The third is in interrupting about five times utterances which once in vice versa, the type interrupting of alert strategy and the four times in meta comment strategy. The fourth strategy is found in taking over in link strategy about four times and the

following strategies are found in yielding the turn in prompting and appealing about three times, and the last is in lexical repetition about twice.

The type of starting up strategy including hesitant, filled pause, and verbal filler are not found in the entire of the data, the other category of holding the turn especially silent pause and start all over again does not occur in the data, and the last is yielding the turn in giving up strategy also does not occur in the data. Moreover, from this research I can conclude that not all the participants use turn taking strategies in debate because the duration of the debate, the topic and the personality can affect in the debate.

In short, after doing this research the researcher find some benefits such as understanding how the natives applied turn taking strategies especially in formal condition for instance in first presidential debate of Obama and Mitt Romney, knowing to choose the appropriate turn taking strategies, finding out the reasons in using those strategies, and how to put the turn taking strategies in the right time and in the right place.

4.2 Suggestions

This study focuses on turn-taking strategies used by debate between Obama and Mitt Romney. So, it will become enrich the knowledge for the next researcher by giving benefits and more information about the study of discourse analysis especially in turn-taking strategies. Furthermore, this study is expected as

reference and comparison that might be relevant to the subject of the researcher who interested in conducting the same field.

In addition, the further researcher is expected to investigate more deep and more spesific each category used, such as in every strategies of turn taking. The researcher hopes for the next researcher who interested in this term and the same research to study well gives the details of each strategy because this term is quite difficult and need much more understanding from the researcher itself. Because turn-taking strategies in political language (utterance) is very interesting to investigate the hidden meaning or the purpose of the political language in order to achieve their goals and interrupt their partner.

Furthermore, the researcher is fully aware that this study is still far from excellence and perfection on its methodology, theories provided, procedures of analyzing, and data interpretation then the researcher knows well if there are so many weaknesses found in this study. In short, this study is hopefully being useful as the additional references for those who want to conduct studies in the same field.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alibali, M.W., Kita, S., & Young, A. (2000). *Gesture and the process of speech production: We think, therefore we gesture. Language and Cognitive Processes, 15* , 593–613
- Brown, P and Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Cook, Guy. 1989. *Discourse*. Oxford University press. Coulthard, Malcolm. 1997. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. New York. Longman Inc.
- Duncan, S. (1972). *Some Signals and Rules for Taking Speaking Turns in Conversations, 23*, 283-292.
- Fauzi, Kharis. 2010. *Turn Taking Strategies Used by The Interviewer in "Indonesia This Morning"*. Unpublished Thesis. Malang: UIN Malang.
- Hutchby, Ian & Wooffitt, Robin. 1998. *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1978. *A Simplest Systematic for The Organization of Turn Taking Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Komalasari, Imas. 2010. *Turn taking Strategies Used by The Characters of "2010"*. Unpublished Thesis. Malang: UIN Malang.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paltridge, Brian. 2000. *Making Sense of Discourse Analysis*. Jill Burton (Ed.). Queensland: Gerd Stabler.
- Stenstrom, Anna Brita. 1994. *An Introduction to Spoken Interaction*. London and New York: Longman.
- Sholikhah, Maratus. 2009. *Turn Taking Strategies Used in Harry Potter and The Order of Phoenix Movie*. Unpublished thesis. Malang: UIN Malang.
- Sulistiyowati, Dwi. 2009. *Turn Taking Strategies Used by The Main Characters in "The Pursuit of Happiness"*. Unpublished Thesis. Malang: UIN Malang.

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=aYKKsRxhcro>

<https://www.google.co.id/#q=first+presidential+debate+obama+vs.+romney+trans>

cript



APPENDIX

Turn-Taking Strategies Met by Debaters

No	TURN TAKING STRATEGIES			DATUM	
1	TAKING THE TURN	STARTING UP	HESITANT	-	
			FILLED PAUSE & VERBAL FILLER	-	
		TAKING OVER	UPTAKES		(1.4), (1.7), (1.9), (1.11), (1.23), (1.32)
			LINK		(1.10), (1.12) (1.26), (1.31)
			INTERRUPTING	ALERT	(1.29)
	META COMMENT	(1.5), (1.8), (1.10) (1.21)			
2.	HOLDING THE TURN	FILLED PAUSE & VERBAL FILLER		(1.1), (1.2), (1.6), (1.18) (1.20), (1.22), (1.24), (1.30) (1.32)	
		SILLENT PAUSE		-	

		LEXICAL REPETITION	(1.13) (1.27)
		START ALL OVER AGAIN	-
3	YIEDING THE TURN	PROMPTING	(1.2) (1.25)
		APPEALING	(1.28)
		GIVING UP	-
		TOTAL	29

Transcript of the first presidential debate between President Obama and Republican nominee Mitt Romney, moderated by Jim Lehrer of PBS, Oct. 3, 2012, in Denver. Source: [Federal News Service](#)

JIM LEHRER: Good evening from the Magness Arena at the University of Denver in Denver, Colorado. I'm Jim Lehrer of the PBS NewsHour, and I welcome you to the first of the 2012 presidential debates between President Barack Obama, the Democratic nominee, and former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney, the Republican nominee.

This debate and the next three — two presidential, one vice-presidential — are sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates.

Tonight's 90 minutes will be about domestic issues, and will follow a format designed by the commission. There will be six roughly 15-minute segments, with two-minute answers for the first question, then open discussion for the remainder of each segment.

Thousands of people offered suggestions on segment subjects of questions via the Internet and other means, but I made the final selections, and for the record, they were not submitted for approval to the commission or the candidates.

The segments, as I announced in advance, will be three on the economy and one each on health care, the role of government, and governing, with an emphasis throughout on differences, specifics and choices. Both candidates will also have two-minute closing statements.

The audience here in the hall has promised to remain silent. No cheers, applause, boos, hisses — among other noisy distracting things — so we may all concentrate on what the candidates have to say. There is a noise exception right now, though, as we welcome President Obama and Governor Romney. (Cheers, applause.)

Gentlemen, welcome to you both.

Let's start the economy, segment one. And let's begin with jobs. What are the major differences between the two of you about how you would go about creating new jobs? You have two minutes — each of you have two minutes to start. The coin toss has determined, Mr. President, you go first.

PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA: Well, thank you very much, Jim, for this opportunity. I want to thank Governor Romney and the University of Denver for your hospitality.

There are a lot of points that I want to make tonight, but the most important one is that 20 years ago I became the luckiest man on earth because Michelle Obama agreed to marry me. (Laughter.) And so I just want to wish, Sweetie, you happy anniversary and let you know that a year from now, we will not be celebrating it in front of 40 million people. (Laughter.)

You know, four years ago we went through the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. Millions of jobs were lost. The auto industry was on the brink of collapse. The financial system had frozen up. And because of the resilience and the determination of the American people, we've begun to fight our way back.

Over the last 30 months, we've seen 5 million jobs in the private sector created. The auto industry has come roaring back and housing has begun to rise. But we all know that we've still got a lot of work to do. And so the question here tonight is not where we've been but where we're going. Governor Romney has a perspective that says if we cut taxes, skewed towards the wealthy, and roll back regulations that we'll be better off.

I've got a different view. I think we've got to invest in education and training. I think it's important for us to develop new sources of energy here in America, that we change our tax code to make sure that we're helping small businesses and companies that are investing here in the United States, that we take some of the money that we're saving as we wind down two wars to rebuild America and that we reduce our deficit in a balanced way that allows us to make these critical investments.

Now, it ultimately is going to be up to the voters, to you, which path we should take. Are we going to double down on the top-down economic policies that helped to get us into this mess, or do we embrace a new economic patriotism that says, America does best when the middle class does best? And I'm looking forward to having that debate.

MR. LEHRER: Governor Romney, two minutes.

MR. ROMNEY: Thank you, Jim. It's an honor to be here with you, and I appreciate the chance to be with the president. I am pleased to be at the University of Denver, appreciate their welcome and also the presidential commission on these debates.

And congratulations to you, Mr. President, on your anniversary. I'm sure this was the most romantic place you could imagine here — here with me, so I — (laughter) — congratulations.

This is obviously a very tender topic. I've had the occasion over the last couple of years of meeting people across the country. I was in Dayton, Ohio, and a woman

grabbed my arm, and she said, I've been out of work since May. Can you help me?

Ann yesterday was a rally in Denver, and a woman came up to her with a baby in her arms and said, Ann, my husband has had four jobs in three years, part-time jobs. He's lost his most recent job, and we've now just lost our home. Can you help us?

And the answer is yes, we can help, but it's going to take a different path, not the one we've been on, not the one the president describes as a top-down, cut taxes for the rich. That's not what I'm going to do.

My plan has five basic parts. One, get us energy independent, North American energy independent. That creates about four million jobs. Number two, open up more trade, particularly in Latin America; crack down on China if and when they cheat. Number three, make sure our people have the skills they need to succeed and the best schools in the world. We're far away from that now. Number four, get us to a balanced budget. Number five, champion small business.

It's small business that creates the jobs in America. And over the last four years small-business people have decided that America may not be the place to open a new business, because new business startups are down to a 30-year low. I know what it takes to get small business growing again, to hire people.

Now, I'm concerned that the path that we're on has just been unsuccessful. The president has a view very similar to the view he had when he ran four years ago, that a bigger government, spending more, taxing more, regulating more — if you will, trickle-down government would work. That's not the right answer for America. I'll restore the vitality that gets America working again.

Thank you.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President, please respond directly to what the governor just said about trickle-down — his trickle-down approach. He's — as he said yours is.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, let me talk specifically about what I think we need to do.

First, we've got to improve our education system. And we've made enormous progress drawing on ideas both from Democrats and Republicans that are already starting to show gains in some of the toughest-to-deal-with schools. We've got a program called Race to the Top that has prompted reforms in 46 states around the country, raising standards, improving how we train teachers. So now I want to hire another hundred thousand new math and science teachers and create 2 million more [slots](#) in our community colleges so that people can get trained for the jobs

that are out there right now. And I want to make sure that we keep tuition low for our young people.

When it comes to our tax code, Governor Romney and I both agree that our corporate tax rate is too high. So I want to lower it, particularly for manufacturing, taking it down to 25 percent. But I also want to close those loopholes that are giving incentives for companies that are shipping jobs overseas. I want to provide tax breaks for companies that are investing here in the United States.

On energy, Governor Romney and I, we both agree that we've got to boost American energy production.

And oil and natural gas production are higher than they've been in years. But I also believe that we've got to look at the energy source of the future, like wind and solar and biofuels, and make those investments.

So, all of this is possible. Now, in order for us to do it, we do have to close our deficit, and one of the things I'm sure we'll be discussing tonight is, how do we deal with our tax code, and how do we make sure that we are reducing spending in a responsible way, but also how do we have enough revenue to make those investments? And this is where there's a difference because Governor Romney's central economic plan calls for a \$5 trillion tax cut, on top of the extension of the Bush tax cuts, so that's another \$2 trillion, and \$2 trillion in additional military spending that the military hasn't asked for. That's \$8 trillion. How we pay for that, reduce the deficit and make the investments that we need to make without dumping those costs on the middle-class Americans I think is one of the central questions of this campaign.

MR. LEHRER: Both of you have spoken about a lot of different things, and we're going to try to get through them in as specific a way as we possibly can.

But first, Governor Romney, do you have a question that you'd like to ask the president directly about something he just said?

MR. ROMNEY: Well, sure. I'd like to clear up the record and go through it piece by piece. First of all, I don't have a \$5 trillion tax cut. I don't have a tax cut of a scale that you're talking about. My view is that we ought to provide tax relief to people in the middle class. But I'm not going to reduce the share of taxes paid by high-income people. High-income people are doing just fine in this economy. They'll do fine whether you're president or I am.

The people who are having the hard time right now are middle-income Americans. Under the president's policies, middle-income Americans have been buried. They're — they're just being crushed. Middle-income Americans have seen their income come down by \$4,300. This is a — this is a tax in and of itself. I'll call it the economy tax. It's been crushing. The same time, gasoline prices have

doubled under the president, electric rates are up, food prices are up, health care costs have gone up by \$2,500 a family.

Middle-income families are being crushed. And so the question is how to get them going again, and I've described it. It's energy and trade, the right kind of training programs, balancing our budget and helping small business. Those are the — the cornerstones of my plan.

But the president mentioned a couple of other ideas, and I'll just note: first, education. I agree, education is key, particularly the future of our economy. But our training programs right now, we got 47 of them housed in the federal government, reporting to eight different agencies. Overhead is overwhelming. We got to get those dollars back to the states and go to the workers so they can create their own pathways to getting the training they need for jobs that will really help them.

The second area: taxation. We agree; we ought to bring the tax rates down, and I do, both for corporations and for individuals. But in order for us not to lose revenue, have the government run out of money, I also lower deductions and credits and exemptions so that we keep taking in the same money when you also [account](#) for growth.

The third area: energy. Energy is critical, and the president pointed out correctly that production of oil and gas in the U.S. is up. But not due to his policies. In spite of his policies. Mr. President, all of the increase in natural gas and oil has happened on private land, not on government land. On government land, your administration has cut the number of permits and license in half. If I'm president, I'll double them. And also get the — the oil from offshore and Alaska. And I'll bring that pipeline in from Canada.

And by the way, I like coal. I'm going to make sure we continue to burn clean coal. People in the coal industry feel like it's getting crushed by your policies. I want to get America and North America energy independent, so we can create those jobs.

And finally, with regards to that tax cut, look, I'm not looking to cut massive taxes and to reduce the — the revenues going to the government. My — my number one principle is there'll be no tax cut that adds to the deficit.

I want to underline that — no tax cut that adds to the deficit. But I do want to reduce the burden being paid by middle-income Americans. And I — and to do that that also means that I cannot reduce the burden paid by high-income Americans. So any — any language to the contrary is simply not accurate.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, I think — let's talk about taxes because I think it's instructive. Now, four years ago when I stood on this stage I said that I would cut taxes for middle-class families. And that's exactly what I did. We cut taxes for middle-class families by about \$3,600. And the reason is because I believe we do best when the middle class is doing well.

And by giving them those tax cuts, they had a little more money in their pocket and so maybe they can buy a new car. They are certainly in a better position to weather the extraordinary recession that we went through. They can buy a computer for their kid who's going off to college, which means they're spending more money, businesses have more customers, businesses make more profits and then hire more workers.

Now, Governor Romney's proposal that he has been promoting for 18 months calls for a \$5 trillion tax cut on top of \$2 trillion of additional spending for our military. And he is saying that he is going to pay for it by closing loopholes and deductions. The problem is that he's been asked a — over a hundred times how you would close those deductions and loopholes and he hasn't been able to identify them.

But I'm going to make an important point here, Jim.

MR. LEHRER: All right.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: When you add up all the loopholes and deductions that upper income individuals can — are currently taking advantage of — if you take those all away — you don't come close to paying for \$5 trillion in tax cuts and \$2 trillion in additional military spending. And that's why independent studies looking at this said the only way to meet Governor Romney's pledge of not reducing the deficit — or — or — or not adding to the deficit, is by burdening middle-class families.

The average middle-class family with children would pay about \$2,000 more. Now, that's not my analysis; that's the analysis of economists who have looked at this. And — and that kind of top — top-down economics, where folks at the top are doing well so the average person making 3 million bucks is getting a \$250,000 tax break while middle-class families are burdened further, that's not what I believe is a recipe for economic growth.

MR. LEHRER: All right. What is the difference?

MR. ROMNEY: Well —

MR. LEHRER: Let's just stay on taxes for —

MR. ROMNEY: But I — but I — right, right.

MR. LEHRER: OK. Yeah, just — let's just stay on taxes for a moment.

MR. ROMNEY: Yeah. Well, but — but —

MR. LEHRER: What is the difference?

MR. ROMNEY: — virtually every — virtually everything he just said about my tax plan is inaccurate.

MR. LEHRER: All right, go —

MR. ROMNEY: So — so if — if the tax plan he described were a tax plan I was asked to support, I'd say absolutely not. I'm not looking for a \$5 trillion tax cut. What I've said is I won't put in place a tax cut that adds to the deficit. That's part one. So there's no economist can say Mitt Romney's tax plan adds 5 trillion (dollars) if I say I will not add to the deficit with my tax plan.

Number two, I will not reduce the share paid by high-income individuals. I — I know that you and your running mate keep saying that, and I know it's a popular thing to say with a lot of people, but it's just not the case. Look, I got five boys. I'm used to people saying something that's not always true, but just keep on repeating it and ultimately hoping I'll believe it — (scattered laughter) — but that — that is not the case, all right? I will not reduce the taxes paid by high-income Americans.

And number three, I will not, under any circumstances, raise taxes on middle-income families. I will lower taxes on middle-income families. Now, you cite a study. There are six other studies that looked at the study you describe and say it's completely wrong. I saw a study that came out today that said you're going to raise taxes by 3,000 (dollars) to \$4,000 on — on middle-income families. There are all these studies out there.

But let's get to the bottom line. That is, I want to bring down rates. I want to bring down the rates down, at the same time lower deductions and exemptions and credits and so forth so we keep getting the revenue we need.

And you think, well, then why lower the rates? And the reason is because small business pays that individual rate. Fifty-four percent of America's workers work in businesses that are taxed not at the corporate tax rate but at the individual tax rate. And if we lower that rate, they will be able to hire more people.

For me, this is about jobs.

MR. LEHRER: All right. That's where we started.

MR. ROMNEY: This is about getting jobs for the American people.

MR. LEHRER: Yeah.

Do you challenge what the governor just said about his own plan?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, for 18 months he's been running on this tax plan. And now, five weeks before the election, he's saying that his big, bold idea is "never mind." And the fact is that if you are lowering the rates the way you describe, Governor, then it is not possible to come up with enough deductions and loopholes that only affect high-income individuals to avoid either raising the deficit or burdening the middle class. It's — it's math. It's arithmetic.

Now, Governor Romney and I do share a deep interest in encouraging small-business growth. So at the same time that my tax plan has already lowered taxes for 98 percent of families, I also lowered taxes for small businesses 18 times. And what I want to do is continue the tax rates — the tax cuts that we put into place for small businesses and families.

But I have said that for incomes over \$250,000 a year that we should go back to the rates that we had when Bill Clinton was president, when we created 23 million new jobs, went from deficit to surplus and created a whole lot of millionaires to boot.

And the reason this is important is because by doing that, we can not only reduce the deficit, we can not only encourage job growth through small businesses, but we're also able to make the investments that are necessary in education or in energy.

And we do have a difference, though, when it comes to definitions of small business. Now, under — under my plan, 97 percent of small businesses would not see their income taxes go up. Governor Romney says, well, those top 3 percent, they're the job creators. They'd be burdened.

But under Governor Romney's definition, there are a whole bunch of millionaires and billionaires who are small businesses. Donald Trump is a small business. And I know Donald Trump doesn't like to think of himself as small anything, but — but that's how you define small businesses if you're getting business income. And that kind of approach, I believe, will not grow our economy because the only way to pay for it without either burdening the middle class or blowing up our deficit is to make drastic cuts in things like education, making sure that we are continuing to invest in basic science and research, all the things that are helping America grow. And I think that would be a mistake.

MR. LEHRER: All right.

MR. ROMNEY: Jim, let me just come back on that — on that point.

MR. LEHRER: Just for the — just for the record —

MR. ROMNEY: These small businesses we're talking about —

MR. LEHRER: Excuse me. Just so everybody understands —

MR. ROMNEY: Yeah.

MR. LEHRER: — we're way over our first 15 minutes.

MR. ROMNEY: It's fun, isn't it?

MR. LEHRER: It's OK. It's great.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: That's OK.

MR. LEHRER: No problem. No, you don't have — you don't have a problem, I don't have a problem, because we're still on the economy, but we're going to come back to taxes and we're going to move on to the deficit and a lot of other things, too.

OK, but go ahead, sir.

MR. ROMNEY: You bet.

Well, President, you're — Mr. President, you're absolutely right, which is that with regards to 97 percent of the businesses are not — not taxed at the 35 percent tax rate, they're taxed at a lower rate. But those businesses that are in the last 3 percent of businesses happen to employ half — half — of all of the people who work in small business. Those are the businesses that employ one quarter of all the workers in America. And your plan is take their tax rate from 35 percent to 40 percent.

Now, I talked to a guy who has a very small business. He's in the electronics business in — in St. Louis. He has four employees.

He said he and his son calculated how much they pay in taxes. Federal income tax, federal payroll tax, state income tax, state sales tax, state property tax, gasoline tax — it added up to well over 50 percent of what they earned.

And your plan is to take the tax rate on successful small businesses from 35 percent to 40 percent. The National Federation of Independent Businesses has said that will cost 700,000 jobs. I don't want to cost jobs. My priority is jobs. And so what I do is I bring down the tax rates, lower deductions and exemptions — the same idea behind Bowles-Simpson, by the way. Get the rates down, lower deductions and exemptions to create more jobs, because there's nothing better for

getting us to a balanced budget than having more people working, earning more money, paying — (chuckles) — more taxes. That's by far the most effective and efficient way to get this budget balanced.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Jim, I — you may want to move on to another topic, but I would just say this to the American people. If you believe that we can cut taxes by \$5 trillion and add \$2 trillion in additional spending that the military is not asking for — \$7 trillion, just to give you a sense, over 10 years that's more than our entire defense budget — and you think that by closing loopholes and deductions for the well-to-do, somehow you will not end up picking up the tab, then Governor Romney's plan may work for you.

But I think math, common sense and our history shows us that's not a recipe for job growth.

Look, we've tried this — we've tried both approaches. The approach that Governor Romney's talking about is the same sales pitch that was made in 2001 and 2003. And we ended up with the slowest job growth in 50 years. We ended up moving from surplus to deficits. And it all culminated in the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression.

Bill Clinton tried the approach that I'm talking about. We created 23 million new jobs. We went from deficit to surplus, and businesses did very well.

So in some ways, we've got some data on which approach is more likely to create jobs and opportunity for Americans, and I believe that the economy works best when middle-class families are getting tax breaks so that they've got some money in their pockets and those of us who have done extraordinarily well because of this magnificent country that we live in, that we can afford to do a little bit more to make sure we're not blowing up the deficit.

MR. LEHRER: OK. (Inaudible) —

MR. ROMNEY: Jim, the president began this segment, so I think I get the last word, so I'm going to take it. All right?(Chuckles.)

MR. LEHRER: Well, you're going to get the first word in the next segment.

MR. ROMNEY: Well, but — but he gets the first word of that segment. I get the last word of that segment, I hope. Let me just make this comment.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: (Chuckles.) He can — you can have it. He can —

MR. ROMNEY: First of all —

MR. LEHRER: That's not how it works.

MR. ROMNEY: Let me — let me repeat — let me repeat what I said — (inaudible). I'm not in favor of a \$5 trillion tax cut. That's not my plan. My plan is not to put in place any tax cut that will add to the deficit. That's point one. So you may keep referring to it as a \$5 trillion tax cut, but that's not my plan.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: OK.

MR. ROMNEY: Number two, let's look at history. My plan is not like anything that's been tried before. My plan is to bring down rates but also bring down deductions and exemptions and credits at the same time so the revenue stays in, but that we bring down rates to get more people working. My priority is putting people back to work in America. They're suffering in this country. And we talk about evidence — look at the evidence of the last four years. It's absolutely extraordinary. We've got 23 million people out of work or stop looking for work in this country.

MR. LEHRER: All right.

MR. ROMNEY: It's just — it's — we've got — we got — when the president took office, 32 million people on food stamps; 47 million on food stamps today. Economic growth this year slower than last year, and last year slower than the year before. Going forward with the status quo is not going to cut it for the American people who are struggling today.

MR. LEHRER: All right. Let's talk — we're still on the economy. This is, theoretically now, a second segment still on the economy, and specifically on what do about the federal deficit, the federal debt. And the question — you each have two minutes on this — and, Governor Romney you go first because the president went first on segment one. And the question is this: What are the differences between the two of you as to how you would go about tackling the deficit problem in this country?

MR. ROMNEY: Well, good. I'm glad you raised that. And it's a — it's a critical issue. I think it's not just an economic issue. I think it's a moral issue. I think it's, frankly, not moral for my generation to keep spending massively more than we take in, knowing those burdens are going to be passed on to the next generation. And they're going to be paying the interest and the principle all their lives. And the amount of debt we're adding, at a trillion a year, is simply not moral.

So how do we deal with it? Well, mathematically there are — there are three ways that you can cut a deficit. One, of course, is to raise taxes. Number two is to cut spending. And number three is to grow the economy because if more people work in a growing economy they're paying taxes and you can get the job done that way.

The presidents would — president would prefer raising taxes. I understand. The problem with raising taxes is that it slows down the rate of growth and you could

never quite get the job done. I want to lower spending and encourage economic growth at the same time.

What things would I cut from spending? Well, first of all, I will eliminate all programs by this test — if they don't pass it: Is the program so critical it's worth borrowing money from China to pay for it? And if not, I'll get rid of it. "Obamacare" is on my list. I apologize, Mr. President. I use that term with all respect.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: I like it.

MR. ROMNEY: Good. OK, good. (Laughter.) So I'll get rid of that. I'm sorry, Jim. I'm going to stop the subsidy to PBS. I'm going to stop other things. I like PBS. I love Big Bird. I actually like you too. But I'm not going to — I'm not going to keep on spending money on things to borrow money from China to pay for it. That's number one.

Number two, I'll take programs that are currently good programs but I think could be run more efficiently at the state level and send them to state.

Number three, I'll make government more efficient, and to cut back the number of employees, combine some agencies and departments. My cutbacks will be done through attrition, by the way.

This is the approach we have to take to get America to a balanced budget. The president said he'd cut the deficit in half. Unfortunately, he doubled it. Trillion-dollar deficits for the last four years. The president's put it in place as much public debt — almost as much debt held by the public as all prior presidents combined.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President. two minutes.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: When I walked in the Oval Office, I had more than a trillion dollar deficit greeting me, and we know where it came from. Two wars that were paid for on a credit card. Two tax cuts that were not paid for, and a whole bunch of programs that were not paid for. And then a massive economic crisis.

And despite that, what we've said is, yes, we had to take some initial emergency measures to make sure we didn't slip into a Great Depression. But what we've also said is, let's make sure that we are cutting out those things that are not helping us grow.

So, 77 government programs — everything from aircrafts that the Air Force had ordered but weren't working very well. Eighteen government — 18 government programs for education that were well- intentioned but weren't helping kids learn.

We went after medical fraud in Medicare and Medicaid very aggressively — more aggressively than ever before, and have saved tens of billions of dollars. Fifty billion dollars of waste taken out of the system.

And I worked with Democrats and Republicans to cut a trillion dollars out of our discretionary domestic budget. That's the largest cut in the discretionary domestic budget since Dwight Eisenhower.

Now, we all know that we've got to do more. And so I've put forward a specific \$4 trillion deficit-reduction plan.

It's on a website. You can look at all the numbers, what cuts we make and what revenue we raise.

And the way we do it is \$2.50 for every cut, we ask for a dollar of additional revenue, paid for, as I indicated earlier, by asking those of us who have done very well in this country to contribute a little bit more to reduce the deficit.

And Governor Romney earlier mentioned the Bowles-Simpson commission. Well, that's how the commission — bipartisan commission that talked about how we should move forward suggested we have to do it — in a balanced way with some revenue and some spending cuts. And this is a major difference that Governor Romney and I have.

Let — let me just finish this point because you're looking for contrast. You know, when Governor Romney stood on a stage with other Republican candidates for the nomination, and he was asked, would you take \$10 of spending cuts for just \$1 of revenue, and he said no. Now, if you take such an unbalanced approach, then that means you are going to be gutting our investments in schools and education. It means that — Governor Romney talked about Medicaid and how we could send it back to the states, but effectively this means a 30 percent cut in the primary program we help for seniors who are in nursing homes, for kids who are with disabilities —

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President, I'm sorry —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: And that is not a right strategy for us to move forward.

MR. LEHRER: Way over the two minutes.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Sorry.

MR. LEHRER: Governor, what about Simpson-Bowles. Will you support Simpson-Bowles?

MR. ROMNEY: Simpson-Bowles, the president should have grabbed that.

MR. LEHRER: No, I mean do you support Simpson-Bowles?

MR. ROMNEY: I have my own plan. It's not the same as Simpson- Bowles. But in my view, the president should have grabbed it. If you wanted to make some adjustments to it, take it, go to Congress, fight for it.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: That's what we've done, made some adjustments to it; and we're putting it forward before Congress right now, a \$4 trillion plan, (a balanced ?) —

MR. ROMNEY: But you've been — but you've been president four years. You've been president four years. You said you'd cut the deficit in half. It's now four years later. We still have trillion- dollar deficits.

The CBO says we'll have a trillion-dollar deficit each of the next four years. If you're re-elected, we'll get to a trillion-dollar debt. You have said before you'd cut the deficit in half. And this four — I love this idea of 4 trillion (dollars) in cuts. You've found \$4 trillion of ways to reduce or to get closer to a balanced budget, except we still show trillion dollar deficits every year. That doesn't get the job done.

Let me come back and say, why is that I don't want to raise taxes? Why don't I want to raise taxes on people? And actually, you said it back in 2010. You said, look, I'm going to extend the tax policies that we have. Now, I'm not going to raise taxes on anyone because when the economy's growing slow like this, when we're in recession you shouldn't raise taxes on anyone.

Well, the economy is still growing slow. As a matter of fact, it's growing much more slowly now than when you made that statement. And so if you believe the same thing, you just don't want to raise taxes on people. And the reality is it's not just wealthy people — you mentioned Donald Trump — it's not just Donald Trump you're taxing; it's all those businesses that employ one-quarter of the workers in America. These small businesses that are taxed as individuals. You raise taxes and you kill jobs. That's why the National Federation of Independent Businesses said your plan will kill 700,000 jobs. I don't want to kill jobs in this environment.

Let me make one more point. And that's — and that —

MR. LEHRER: Let's let him answer the taxes thing for a moment, OK?

MR. ROMNEY: OK.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, we've had this discussion before.

MR. LEHRER: No, about the idea that in order to reduce the deficit there has to be revenue in addition to cuts.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: There has to be revenue in addition to cuts. Now, Governor Romney has ruled out revenue. He's — he's ruled out revenue.

MR. LEHRER: That's true, right?

MR. ROMNEY: Absolutely.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: OK, so —

MR. LEHRER: Completely?

MR. ROMNEY: LOOK, the revenue I get is by more people working, getting higher pay, paying more taxes. That's how we get growth and how we balance the budget. But the idea of taxing people more, putting more people out of work — you'll never get there. You never balance the budget by raising taxes.

Spain — Spain spends 42 percent of their total economy on government. We're now spending 42 percent of our economy on government.

I don't want to go down the path to Spain. I want to go down the path of growth that puts Americans to work, with more money coming in because they're working.

MR. LEHRER: Yeah.

But Mr. President, you're saying in order to get it — the job done, it's got to be balanced. You've got to have —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: If we're serious, we've got to take a balanced, responsible approach. And by the way, this is not just when it comes to individual taxes.

Let's talk about corporate taxes. Now, I've identified areas where we can, right away, make a change that I believe would actually help the economy. The — the oil industry gets \$4 billion a year in corporate welfare. Basically, they get deductions that those small businesses that Governor Romney refers to, they don't get. Now, does anybody think that ExxonMobil needs some extra money when they're making money every time you go to the pump? Why wouldn't we want to eliminate that?

Why wouldn't we eliminate tax breaks for corporate jets? My attitude is if you got a corporate jet, you can probably afford to pay full freight, not get a special break for it.

When it comes to corporate taxes, Governor Romney has said he wants to, in a revenue-neutral way, close loopholes, deductions — he hasn't identified which ones they are — but thereby bring down the corporate rate. Well, I want to do the same thing, but I've actually identified how we can do that.

And part of the way to do it is to not give tax breaks to companies that are shipping jobs overseas. Right now you can actually take a deduction for moving a plant overseas. I think most Americans would say that doesn't make sense. And all that raises revenue.

And so if we take a balanced approach, what that then allows us to do is also to help young people, the way we already have during my administration, make sure that they can afford to go to college. It means that the teacher that I met in Las Vegas, wonderful young lady, who describes to me — she's got 42 kids in her class.

The first two weeks, she's got them — some of them sitting on the floor until finally they get reassigned. They're using textbooks that are 10 years old. That is not a recipe for growth; that's not how America was built.

And so budgets reflect choices. Ultimately we're going to have to make some decisions. And if we're asking for no revenue, then that means that we've got to get rid of a whole bunch of stuff, and the magnitude of the tax cuts that you're talking about, Governor, would end up resulting in severe hardship for people, but more importantly, would not help us grow.

As I indicated before, when you talk about shifting Medicaid to states, we're talking about potentially a — a 30 — a 30 percent cut in Medicaid over time. Now, you know, that may not seem like a big deal when it just is — you know, numbers on a sheet of paper, but if we're talking about a family who's got an autistic kid and is depending on that Medicaid, that's a big problem. And governors are creative. There's no doubt about it. But they're not creative enough to make up for 30 percent of revenue on something like Medicaid. What ends up happening is some people end up not getting help.

MR. ROMNEY: Jim, let's — we — we've gone on a lot of topics there, and — so I've got to take — it's going to take a minute to go from Medicaid to schools to —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: (Inaudible.)

MR. LEHRER: Come back to Medicaid, here, yeah, yeah, right.


MR. ROMNEY: — oil to tax breaks and companies overseas. So let's go through them one by one. First of all, the Department of Energy has said the tax break for oil companies is \$2.8 billion a year. And it's actually an [accounting](#) treatment, as you know, that's been in place for a hundred years. Now —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: It's time to end it.

MR. ROMNEY: And — and in one year, you provided \$90 billion in breaks to the green energy world. Now, I like green energy as well, but that's about 50 years' worth of what oil and gas receives, and you say Exxon and Mobil — actually, this \$2.8 billion goes largely to small companies, to drilling operators and so forth.

But you know, if we get that tax rate from 35 percent down to 25 percent, why, that \$2.8 billion is on the table. Of course it's on the table. That's probably not going to survive, you get that rate down to 25 percent.

But — but don't forget, you put \$90 billion — like 50 years worth of breaks — into solar and wind, to — to Solyndra and Fisker and Tesla and Ener1. I mean, I — I had a friend who said, you don't just pick the winners and losers; you pick the losers. All right? So — so this is not — this is not the kind of policy you want to have if you want to get America energy-secure.

The second topic, which is you said you get a deduction for getting a plant overseas. Look, I've been in business for 25 years. I have no idea what you're talking about. I maybe need to get a new [accountant](#) .

MR. LEHRER: Let's —

MR. ROMNEY: But the — the idea that you get a break for shipping jobs overseas is simply not the case.

MR. LEHRER: Let's have —

MR. ROMNEY: What we do have right now is a setting —

MR. LEHRER: Excuse me.

MR. ROMNEY: — where I'd like to bring money from overseas back to this country.

And finally, Medicaid to states, I'm not quite sure where that came in, except this, which is, I would like to take the Medicaid dollars that go to states and say to a state, you're going to get what you got last year plus inflation — inflation — plus 1 percent. And then you're going to manage your care for your poor in the way you think best.

And I remember as a governor, when this idea was floated by Tommy Thompson, the governors, Republican and Democrats, said, please let us do that. We can care for our own poor in so much better and more effective a way than having the federal government tell us how to care for our poor.

So let states — one of the magnificent things about this country is the whole idea that states are the laboratories of democracy. Don't have the federal government tell everybody what kind of training programs they have to have and what kind of Medicaid they have to have. Let states do this.

And by the way, if a states get — gets in trouble, why, we could step in and see if we could find a way to help them. But —

MR. LEHRER: Let's go.

MR. ROMNEY: But — but the right — the right approach is one which relies on the brilliance —

MR. LEHRER: Two seconds.

MR. ROMNEY: — of our people and states, not the federal government.

MR. LEHRER: Two seconds and we're going on, still on the economy on another — but another part of it.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: OK.

MR. LEHRER: All right? All right, this is this is segment three, the economy, entitlements.

First answer goes to you. It's two minutes. Mr. President, do you see a major difference between the two of you on Social Security?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: You know, I suspect that on Social Security, we've got a somewhat similar position. Social Security is structurally sound. It's going to have to be tweaked the way it was by Ronald Reagan and Speaker — Democratic Speaker Tip O'Neill. But it is — the basic structure is sound. But — but I want to talk about the values behind Social Security and Medicare and then talk about Medicare, because that's the big driver —

MR. LEHRER: Sure — it — you bet.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: — of our deficits right now.

You know, my grandmother, some of you know, helped to raise me. My grandparents did. My grandfather died awhile back. My grandmother died three days before I was elected president. And she was fiercely independent. She worked her way up, only had a high school education, started as a secretary, ended up being the vice president of a local bank. And she ended up living alone by choice. And the reason she could be independent was because of Social Security

and Medicare. She had worked all her life, put in this money and understood that there was a basic guarantee, a floor under which she could not go.

And that's the perspective I bring when I think about what's called entitlements. You know, the name itself implies some sense of dependency on the part of these folks. These are folks who've worked hard, like my grandmother. And there are millions of people out there who are counting on this.

So my approach is to say, how do we strengthen the system over the long term? And in Medicare, what we did was we said, we are going to have to bring down the costs if we're going to deal with our long-term deficits, but to do that, let's look where some of the money is going. Seven hundred and sixteen billion dollars we were able to save from the Medicare program by no longer overpaying insurance companies, by making sure that we weren't overpaying providers.

And using that money, we were actually able to lower prescription drug costs for seniors by an average of \$600, and we were also able to make a — make a significant dent in providing them the kind of preventive care that will ultimately save money through the — throughout the system.

So the way for us to deal with Medicare in particular is to lower health care costs. But when it comes to Social Security, as I said, you don't need a major structural change in order to make sure that Social Security is there for the future.

MR. LEHRER: We'll follow up on this.

First, Governor Romney, you have two minutes on Social Security and entitlements.

MR. ROMNEY: Well, Jim, our seniors depend on these programs. And I know any time we talk about entitlements, people become concerned that something's going to happen that's going to change their life for the worst, and the answer is, neither the president nor I are proposing any changes for any current retirees or near retirees, either to Social Security or Medicare. So if you're 60 or around 60 or older, you don't need to listen any further.

But for younger people, we need to talk about what changes are going to be occurring.

Oh, I just thought about one, and that is in fact I was wrong when I said the president isn't proposing any changes for current retirees. In fact, he is on Medicare. On Social Security, he's not.

But on Medicare, for current retirees he's cutting \$716 billion from the program. Now, he says by not overpaying hospitals and providers, actually just going to them and saying we're going to reduce the rates you get paid across the board,

everybody's going to get a lower rate. That's not just going after places where there's abuse, that's saying we're cutting the rates. Some 15 percent of hospitals and nursing homes say they won't take anymore Medicare patients under that scenario.

We also have 50 percent of doctors who say they won't take more Medicare patients. This — we have 4 million people on Medicare Advantage that will lose Medicare Advantage because of those \$716 billion in cuts. I can't understand how you can cut Medicare \$716 billion for current recipients of Medicare.

Now, you point out, well, we're putting some back; we're going to give a better prescription program. That's one — that's \$1 for every 15 (dollars) you've cut. They're smart enough to know that's not a good trade.

I want to take that \$716 billion you've cut and put it back into Medicare. By the way, we can include a prescription program if we need to improve it, but the idea of cutting \$716 billion from Medicare to be able to balance the additional cost of "Obamacare" is, in my opinion, a mistake. And with regards to young people coming along, I've got proposals to make sure Medicare and Social Security are there for them without any question.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: First of all, I think it's important for Governor Romney to present this plan that he says will only affect folks in the future. And the essence of the plan is that he would turn Medicare into a voucher program. It's called premium support, but it's understood to be a voucher program. His running mate —

MR. LEHRER: And you — and you don't support that?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: I don't. And — and let me explain why.

MR. ROMNEY: Again, that's for future people —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: I understand.

MR. ROMNEY: — right, not for current retirees.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: For — for — so if you're — if you — you're 54 or 55, you might want to listen, because this — this will affect you. The idea, which was originally presented by Congressman Ryan, your running mate, is that we would give a voucher to seniors, and they could go out in the private marketplace and buy their own health insurance. The problem is that because the voucher wouldn't necessarily keep up with health care inflation, it was estimated that this would cost the average senior about \$6,000 a year.

Now, in fairness, what Governor Romney has now said is he'll maintain traditional Medicare alongside it. But there's still a problem, because what happens is those insurance companies are pretty clever at figuring out who are the younger and healthier seniors.

They recruit them leaving the older, sicker seniors in Medicare. And every health care economist who looks at it says over time what'll happen is the traditional Medicare system will collapse. And then what you've got is folks like my grandmother at the mercy of the private insurance system, precisely at the time when they are most in need of decent health care.

So I don't think vouchers are the right way to go. And this is not my own — only my opinion. AARP thinks that the — the savings that we obtained from Medicare bolster the system, lengthen the Medicare trust fund by 8 years. Benefits were not affected at all and ironically if you repeal "Obamacare" — and I have become fond of this term, "Obamacare" — (laughter) — if you repeal it, what happens is those seniors right away are going to be paying \$600 more in prescription care. They're now going to have to be paying copays for basic check-ups that can keep them healthier.

And the primary beneficiary of that repeal are insurance companies that are estimated to gain billions of dollars back when they aren't making seniors any healthier. And I — I don't think that's right approach when it comes to making sure that Medicare is stronger over the long term.

MR. LEHRER: We'll talk about — specifically about health care in a moment, but what is — do you support the voucher system, Governor?

MR. ROMNEY: What I support is no change for current retirees and near-retirees to Medicare and the president supports taking \$716 billion out of that program.

MR. LEHRER: What about the vouchers?

MR. ROMNEY: So that's — that's number one.

MR. LEHRER: OK. All right.

MR. ROMNEY: Number two is for people coming along that are young. What I'd do to make sure that we can keep Medicare in place for them is to allow them either to choose the current Medicare program or a private plan — their choice. They get to — and they'll have at least two plans that will be entirely at no cost to them. So they don't have to pay additional money, no additional \$6,000. That's not going to happen.

They'll have at least two plans.

And by the way, if the government can be as efficient as the private sector and offer premiums that are as low as the private sector, people will be happy to get traditional Medicare, or they'll be able to get a private plan. I know my own view is I'd rather have a private plan. I — I'd just as soon not have the government telling me what kind of health care I get. I'd rather be able to have an insurance company. If I don't like them, I can get rid of them and find a different insurance company. But people will make their own choice.

The other thing we have to do to save Medicare, we have to have the benefits high for those that are low-income, but for higher-income people, we're going to have to lower some of the benefits. We have to make sure this program is there for the long term. That's the plan that I've put forward.

And by the way, the idea came not even from Paul Ryan or — or Senator Wyden, who's a co-author of the bill with — with Paul Ryan in the Senate, but also it came from Bill Clinton's — Bill Clinton's chief of staff. This is an idea that's been around a long time, which is saying, hey, let's see if we can't get competition into the Medicare world so that people can get the choice of different plans at lower cost, better quality. I believe in competition.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Jim, if I — if I can just respond very quickly, first of all, every study has shown that Medicare has lower administrative cost than private insurance does, which is why seniors are generally pretty happy with it. And private insurers have to make a profit. Nothing wrong with that; that's what they do. And so you've got higher administrative costs, plus profit on top of that, and if you are going to save any money through what Governor Romney's proposing, what has to happen is that the money has to come from somewhere.

And when you move to a voucher system, you are putting seniors at the mercy of those insurance companies. And over time, if traditional Medicare has decayed or fallen apart, then they're stuck. And this is the reason why AARP has said that your plan would weaken Medicare substantially, and that's why they were supportive of the approach that we took.

One last point I want to make. We do have to lower the cost of health care. Not just in Medicare and —

MR. LEHRER: We'll talk about that in a minute.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: — but — but overall.

MR. LEHRER: Go. OK.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: And so —

MR. ROMNEY: That's — that's a big topic. Could we — could we stay on Medicare?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Is that a — is that a separate topic? I'm sorry.

MR. LEHRER: Yeah, we're going to — yeah. I want to get to it, but all I want to do is very quickly —

MR. ROMNEY: Let's get back to Medicare.

MR. LEHRER: — before we leave the economy —

MR. ROMNEY: Let's get back to Medicare.

MR. LEHRER: No, no, no, no —

MR. ROMNEY: The president said that the government can provide the service at lower —

MR. LEHRER: No.

MR. ROMNEY: — cost and without a profit.

MR. LEHRER: All right.

MR. ROMNEY: If that's the case, then it will always be the best product that people can purchase. But my experience —

MR. LEHRER: Wait a minute, Governor.

MR. ROMNEY: My experience is the private sector typically is able to provide a better product at a lower cost.

MR. LEHRER: Can we — can the two of you agree that the voters have a choice, a clear choice between the two of you —

MR. ROMNEY: Absolutely.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Yes.

MR. LEHRER: — on Medicare?

MR. ROMNEY: Absolutely.

MR. LEHRER: All right. So, to finish quickly, briefly, on the economy, what is your view about the level of federal regulation of the economy right now? Is there

too much, and in your case, Mr. President, is there — should there be more? Beginning with you — this is not a new two-minute segment — to start, and we'll go for a few minutes and then we're going to go to health care. OK?

MR. ROMNEY: Regulation is essential. You can't have a free market work if you don't have regulation. As a business person, I had to have — I needed to know the regulations. I needed them there. You couldn't have people opening up banks in their — in their garage and making loans. I mean, you have to have regulations so that you can have an economy work. Every free economy has good regulation.

At the same time, regulation can become excessive.

MR. LEHRER: Is it excessive now, do you think?

MR. ROMNEY: In some places, yes, in other places, no.

MR. LEHRER: Like where?

MR. ROMNEY: It can become out of date. And what's happened in — with some of the legislation that's been passed during the president's term, you've seen regulation become excessive and it's hurt the — it's hurt the economy. Let me give you an example. Dodd- Frank was passed, and it includes within it a number of provisions that I think have some unintended consequences that are harmful to the economy. One is it designates a number of banks as too big to fail, and they're effectively guaranteed by the federal government.

This is the biggest kiss that's been given to — to New York banks I've ever seen. This is an enormous boon for them. There's been — 122 community and small banks have closed since Dodd-Frank. So there's one example.

Here's another. In Dodd-Frank, it says that —

MR. LEHRER: You want to repeal Dodd-Frank?

MR. ROMNEY: Well, I would repeal it and replace it. You — we're not going to get rid of all regulation. You have to have regulation. And there's some parts of Dodd-Frank that make all the sense in the world. You need transparency, you need to have leverage limits for institutes —

MR. LEHRER: Well, here's a specific — let's — excuse me —

MR. ROMNEY: Let me mention the other one. Let's talk the —

MR. LEHRER: No, no, let's do — right now, let's not. Let's let him respond.

MR. ROMNEY: OK.

MR. LEHRER: Let's let him respond to this specific on Dodd-Frank and what the governor just said.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, I think this is a great example. The reason we have been in such a enormous economic crisis was prompted by reckless behavior across the board. Now, it wasn't just on Wall Street. You had — loan officers were — they were giving loans and mortgages that really shouldn't have been given, because they're — the folks didn't qualify. You had people who were borrowing money to buy a house that they couldn't afford. You had credit agencies that were stamping these as A-1 (ph) great investments when they weren't. But you also had banks making money hand-over-fist, churning out products that the bankers themselves didn't even understand in order to make big profits, but knowing that it made the entire system vulnerable.

So what did we do? We stepped in and had the toughest reforms on Wall Street since the 1930s. We said you've got — banks, you've got to raise your capital requirements. You can't engage in some of this risky behavior that is putting Main Street at risk. We're going to make sure that you've got to have a living will, so — so we can know how you're going to wind things down if you make a bad bet so we don't have other taxpayer bailouts.

In the meantime, by the way, we also made sure that all the help that we provided those banks was paid back, every single dime, with interest.

Now, Governor Romney has said he wants to repeal Dodd-Frank, and, you know, I appreciate, and it appears we've got some agreement that a marketplace to work has to have some regulation, but in the past, Governor Romney has said he just wants to repeal Dodd-Frank, roll it back. And so the question is does anybody out there think that the big problem we had is that there was too much oversight and regulation of Wall Street? Because if you do, then Governor Romney is your candidate. But that's not what I believe.

MR. ROMNEY: (Inaudible) — sorry, Jim. That — that's just not — that's just not the facts. Look, we have to have regulation of Wall Street.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Yeah.

MR. ROMNEY: That — that's why I'd have regulation. But I wouldn't designate five banks as too big to fail and give them a blank check. That's one of the unintended consequences of Dodd-Frank. It wasn't thought through properly. We need to get rid of that provision, because it's killing regional and small banks. They're getting hurt.

Let me mention another regulation of Dodd-Frank. You say we were giving mortgages to people who weren't qualified. That's exactly right. It's one of the reasons for the great financial calamity we had. And so Dodd-Frank correctly says we need to —

MR. LEHRER: All right.

MR. ROMNEY: — have qualified mortgages, and if you give a mortgage that's not qualified, there are big penalties. Except they didn't ever go on to define what a qualified mortgage was.

MR. LEHRER: All right.

MR. ROMNEY: It's been two years. We don't know what a qualified mortgage is yet. So banks are reluctant to make loans, mortgages. Try and get a mortgage these days. It's hurt the housing market —

MR. LEHRER: All right —

MR. ROMNEY: — because Dodd-Frank didn't anticipate putting in place the kinds of regulations you have to have. It's not that Dodd-Frank always was wrong with too much regulation. Sometimes they didn't come out with a clear regulation.

MR. LEHRER: OK.

MR. ROMNEY: I will make sure we don't hurt the functioning of our — of our marketplace and our businesses, because I want to bring back housing and get good jobs.

MR. LEHRER: All right, I think we have another clear difference between the two of you. Now let's move to health care, where I know there is a clear difference — (laughter) — and that has to do with the Affordable Care Act, "Obamacare."

And it's a two-minute new segment, and it's — that means two minutes each. And you go first, Governor Romney. You wanted repeal. You want the Affordable Care Act repealed. Why?

MR. ROMNEY: I sure do. Well, in part, it comes, again, from my experience. I was in New Hampshire. A woman came to me, and she said, look, I can't afford insurance for myself or my son. I met a couple in Appleton, Wisconsin, and they said, we're thinking of dropping our insurance; we can't afford it. And the number of small businesses I've gone to that are saying they're dropping insurance because they can't afford it — the cost of health care is just prohibitive. And — and we've got to deal with cost.

And unfortunately, when — when you look at "Obamacare," the Congressional Budget Office has said it will cost \$2,500 a year more than traditional insurance. So it's adding to cost. And as a matter of fact, when the president ran for office, he said that by this year he would have brought down the cost of insurance for each family by \$2,500 a family. Instead, it's gone up by that amount. So it's expensive. Expensive things hurt families. So that's one reason I don't want it.

Second reason, it cuts \$716 billion from Medicare to pay for it. I want to put that money back in Medicare for our seniors.

Number three, it puts in place an unelected board that's going to tell people, ultimately, what kind of treatments they can have. I don't like that idea.

Fourth, there was a survey done of small businesses across the country. It said, what's been the effect of "Obamacare" on your hiring plans? And three-quarters of them said, it makes us less likely to hire people. I just don't know how the president could have come into office, facing 23 million people out of work, rising unemployment, an economic crisis at the — at the kitchen table and spent his energy and passion for two years fighting for "Obamacare" instead of fighting for jobs for the American people.

It has killed jobs. And the best course for health care is to do what we did in my state, craft a plan at the state level that fits the needs of the state. And then let's focus on getting the costs down for people rather than raising it with the \$2,500 additional premium.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President, the argument against repeal.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, four years ago when I was running for office I was traveling around and having those same conversations that Governor Romney talks about. And it wasn't just that small businesses were seeing costs skyrocket and they couldn't get affordable coverage even if they wanted to provide it to their employees; it wasn't just that this was the biggest driver of our federal deficit, our overall health care costs. But it was families who were worried about going bankrupt if they got sick — millions of families, all across the country.

If they had a pre-existing condition they might not be able to get coverage at all. If they did have coverage, insurance companies might impose an arbitrary limit. And so as a consequence, they're paying their premiums, somebody gets really sick, lo and behold they don't have enough money to pay the bills because the insurance companies say that they've hit the limit. So we did work on this alongside working on jobs, because this is part of making sure that middle-class families are secure in this country.

And let me tell you exactly what "Obamacare" did. Number one, if you've got health insurance it doesn't mean a government take over. You keep your own

insurance. You keep your own doctor. But it does say insurance companies can't jerk you around. They can't impose arbitrary lifetime limits. They have to let you keep your kid on their insurance — your insurance plan till you're 26 years old. And it also says that they're — you're going to have to get rebates if insurance companies are spending more on administrative costs and profits than they are on actual care.

Number two, if you don't have health insurance, we're essentially setting up a group plan that allows you to benefit from group rates that are typically 18 percent lower than if you're out there trying to get insurance on the individual market.

Now, the last point I'd make before —

MR. LEHRER: Two minutes —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: — before —

MR. LEHRER: Two minutes is up, sir.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: No, I — I think I've — I had five seconds before you interrupted me — was — (laughter) — that the irony is that we've seen this model work really well in Massachusetts, because Governor Romney did a good thing, working with Democrats in the state to set up what is essentially the identical model. And as a consequence, people are covered there. It hasn't destroyed jobs. And as a consequence, we now have a system in which we have the opportunity to start bringing down cost, as opposed to just —

MR. LEHRER: Your five —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: — leaving millions of people out in the cold.

MR. LEHRER: Your five seconds went away a long time ago. (Laughter.)

PRESIDENT OBAMA: That —

MR. LEHRER: All right, Governor. Governor, tell the — tell the president directly why you think what he just said is wrong about "Obamacare."

MR. ROMNEY: Well, I did with my first statement.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: You did.

MR. ROMNEY: But I'll go on.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Please elaborate.

MR. ROMNEY: I'll elaborate.

Exactly right.

First of all, I like the way we did it in Massachusetts. I like the fact that in my state, we had Republicans and Democrats come together and work together. What you did instead was to push through a plan without a single Republican vote. As a matter of fact, when Massachusetts did something quite extraordinary, elected a Republican senator to stop "Obamacare," you pushed it through anyway. So entirely on a partisan basis, instead of bringing America together and having a discussion on this important topic, you pushed through something that you and Nancy Pelosi and Harry Reid thought was the best answer and drove it through.

What we did, in a legislature 87 percent Democrat, we worked together. Two hundred legislators in my legislature — only two voted against the plan by the time we were finished.

What were some differences?

We didn't raise taxes. You've raised them by a trillion dollars under "Obamacare." We didn't cut Medicare. Of course, we don't have Medicare, but we didn't cut Medicare by \$716 billion. We didn't put in place a board that can tell people ultimately what treatments they're going to receive.

We didn't — we didn't also do something that I think a number of people across this country recognize, which is put — put people in a position where they're going to lose the insurance they had and they wanted. Right now, the CBO says up to 20 million people will lose their insurance as "Obamacare" goes into effect next year. And likewise, a study by McKinsey & Company of American businesses said 30 percent of them are anticipating dropping people from coverage. So for those reasons, for the tax, for Medicare, for this board and for people losing their insurance, this is why the American people don't want — don't want "Obamacare." It's why Republicans said, do not do this.

And the Republicans had a — had a plan. They put a plan out. They put out a plan, a bipartisan plan. It was swept aside. I think something this big, this important has to be done in a bipartisan basis. And we have to have a president who can reach across the aisle and fashion important legislation with the input from both parties.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Governor Romney said this has to be done on a bipartisan basis. This was a bipartisan idea. In fact, it was a Republican idea.

And Governor Romney, at the beginning of this debate, wrote and said, what we did in Massachusetts could be a model for the nation. And I agree that the Democratic legislators in Massachusetts might have given some advice to

Republicans in Congress about how to cooperate, but the fact of the matter is, we used the same advisers, and they say it's the same plan.

It — when Governor Romney talks about this board, for example — unelected board that we've created — what this is, is a group of health care experts, doctors, et cetera, to figure out how can we reduce the cost of care in the system overall, because the — there are two ways of dealing with our health care crisis.

One is to simply leave a whole bunch of people uninsured and let them fend for themselves, to let businesses figure out how long they can continue to pay premiums until finally they just give up and their workers are no longer getting insured, and that's been the trend line. Or, alternatively, we can figure out how do we make the cost of care more effective. And there are ways of doing it.

So at — at Cleveland Clinic, one of the best health care systems in the world, they actually provide great care cheaper than average. And the reason they do is because they do some smart things. They — they say, if a patient's coming in, let's get all the doctors together at once, do one test instead of having the patient run around with 10 tests. Let's make sure that we're providing preventive care so we're catching the onset of something like diabetes. Let's — let's pay providers on the basis of performance as opposed to on the basis of how many procedures they've — they've engaged in. Now, so what this board does is basically identifies best practices and says, let's use the purchasing power of Medicare and Medicaid to help to institutionalize all these good things that we do.

And the fact of the matter is that when "Obamacare" is fully implemented, we're going to be in a position to show that costs are going down. And over the last two years, health care premiums have gone up, it's true, but they've gone up slower than any time in the last 50 years. So we're already beginning to see progress. In the meantime, folks out there with insurance, you're already getting a rebate.

Let me make one last point. Governor Romney says we should replace it. I'm just going to repeal it, but we can replace it with something. But the problem is he hasn't described what exactly we'd replace it with other than saying we're going to leave it to the states.

But the fact of the matter is that some of the prescriptions that he's offered, like letting you buy insurance across state lines, there's no indication that that somehow is going to help somebody who's got a pre-existing condition be able to finally buy insurance. In fact, it's estimated that by repealing "Obamacare," you're looking at 50 million people losing health insurance at a time when it's vitally important.

MR. LEHRER: Let's let the governor explain what you would do if "Obamacare" is repealed. How would you replace it? What do you have in mind?

MR. ROMNEY: Let — well, actually — actually it's — it's — it's a lengthy description, but number one, pre-existing conditions are covered under my plan. Number two, young people are able to stay on their family plan. That's already offered in the private marketplace; you don't have — have the government mandate that for that to occur.

But let's come back to something the president — I agree on, which is the — the key task we have in health care is to get the costs down so it's more affordable for families, and — and then he has as a model for doing that a board of people at the government, an unelected board, appointed board, who are going to decide what kind of treatment you ought to have.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: No, it isn't.

MR. ROMNEY: In my opinion, the government is not effective in — in bringing down the cost of almost anything. As a matter of fact, free people and free enterprises trying to find ways to do things better are able to be more effective in bringing down the costs than the government will ever be. Your example of the Cleveland clinic is my case in point, along with several others I could describe. This is the private market. These are small — these are enterprises competing with each other, learning how to do better and better jobs.

I used to consult to businesses — excuse me, to hospitals and to health care providers. I was astonished at the creativity and innovation that exists in the American people. In order to bring the cost of health care down, we don't need to have a — an — a board of 15 people telling us what kinds of treatments we should have. We instead need to put insurance plans, providers, hospitals, doctors on targets such that they have an incentive, as you say, performance pay, for doing an excellent job, for keeping costs down, and that's happening.

Intermountain Health Care does it superbly well.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: They do.

MR. ROMNEY: Mayo Clinic is doing it superbly well, Cleveland Clinic, others. But the right answer is not to have the federal government take over health care and start mandating to the providers across America, telling a patient and a doctor what kind of treatment they can have. That's the wrong way to go. The private market and individual responsibility always work best.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Let me just point out, first of all, this board that we're talking about can't make decisions about what treatments are given. That's explicitly prohibited in the law.

But let's go back to what Governor Romney indicated, that under his plan he would be able to cover people with pre-existing conditions. Well, actually,

Governor, that isn't what your plan does. What your plan does is to duplicate what's already the law, which says if you are out of health insurance for three months then you can end up getting continuous coverage and an insurance company can't deny you if you've — if it's been under 90 days.

But that's already the law. And that doesn't help the millions of people out there with pre-existing conditions. There's a reason why Governor Romney set up the plan that he did in Massachusetts. It wasn't a government takeover of health care. It was the largest expansion of private insurance. But what it does say is that insurers, you've got to take everybody. Now, that also means that you've got more customers.

But when Governor Romney says that he'll replace it with something but can't detail how it will be in fact replaced, and the reason he set up the system he did in Massachusetts is because there isn't a better way of dealing with the pre-existing conditions problem, it — it just reminds me of — you know, he says that he's going to close deductions and loopholes for his tax plan.

That's how it's going to be paid for. But we don't know the details. He says that he's going to replace Dodd-Frank, Wall Street reform. But we don't know exactly which ones. He won't tell us. He now says he's going to replace "Obamacare" and assure that all the good things that are in it are going to be in there and you don't have to worry.

And at some point, I think the American people have to ask themselves, is the reason that Governor Romney is keeping all these plans to replace secret because they're too good? Is — is it because that somehow middle-class families are going to benefit too much from them? No, the — the reason is because when we reform Wall Street, when we tackle the problem of pre-existing conditions, then, you know, these are tough problems, and we've got to make choices. And the choices we've made have been ones that ultimately are benefiting middle-class families all across the country.

MR. LEHRER: All right, we're going to move to a —

MR. ROMNEY: No, I — I have to respond to that —

MR. LEHRER: No, but —

MR. ROMNEY: — which is — which is my experience as a governor is if I come in and — and lay down a piece of legislation and say it's my way or the highway, I don't get a lot done. What I do is the same way that Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan worked together some years ago. When Ronald Reagan ran for office, he laid out the principles that he was going to foster. He said he was going to lower tax rates. He said he was going to broaden the base. You've said the same

thing: You're going to simplify the tax code, broaden the base. Those are my principles.

I want to bring down the tax burden on middle-income families. And I'm going to work together with Congress to say, OK, what are the various ways we could bring down deductions, for instance? One way, for instance, would be to have a single number. Make up a number — 25,000 (dollars), \$50,000. Anybody can have deductions up to that amount. And then that number disappears for high-income people. That's one way one could do it. One could follow Bowles-Simpson as a model and take deduction by deduction and make differences that way.

There are alternatives to accomplish the objective I have, which is to bring down rates, broaden the base, simplify the code and create incentives for growth.

And with regards to health care, you had remarkable details with regards to my pre-existing condition plan. You obviously studied up on — on my plan. In fact, I do have a plan that deals with people with pre-existing conditions. That's part of my health care plan. And what we did in Massachusetts is a model for the nation, state by state. And I said that at that time. The federal government taking over health care for the entire nation and whisking aside the 10th Amendment, which gives states the rights for these kinds of things, is not the course for America to have a stronger, more vibrant economy.

MR. LEHRER: That is a terrific segue to our next segment, and is the role of government. And let's see, role of government and it is — you are first on this, Mr. President. The question is this. Do you believe — both of you — but you have the first two minutes on this, Mr. President — do you believe there's a fundamental difference between the two of you as to how you view the mission of the federal government?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, I definitely think there are differences.

MR. LEHRER: And — yeah.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: The first role of the federal government is to keep the American people safe. That's its most basic function. And as commander in chief, that is something that I've worked on and thought about every single day that I've been in the Oval Office.

But I also believe that government has the capacity — the federal government has the capacity to help open up opportunity and create ladders of opportunity and to create frameworks where the American people can succeed. Look, the genius of America is the free enterprise system, and freedom, and the fact that people can go out there and start a business, work on an idea, make their own decisions.

But as Abraham Lincoln understood, there are also some things we do better together.

So in the middle of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln said, let's help to finance the Transcontinental Railroad. Let's start the National Academy of Sciences. Let's start land grant colleges, because we want to give these gateways of opportunity for all Americans, because if all Americans are getting opportunity, we're all going to be better off. That doesn't restrict people's freedom; that enhances it.

And so what I've tried to do as president is to apply those same principles. And when it comes to education, what I've said is we've got to reform schools that are not working. We use something called Race to the Top. Wasn't a top-down approach, Governor. What we've said is to states, we'll give you more money if you initiate reforms. And as a consequence, you had 46 states around the country who have made a real difference.

But what I've also said is let's hire another hundred thousand math and science teachers to make sure we maintain our technological lead and our people are skilled and able to succeed. And hard-pressed states right now can't all do that. In fact, we've seen layoffs of hundreds of thousands of teachers over the last several years, and Governor Romney doesn't think we need more teachers. I do, because I think that that is the kind of investment where the federal government can help. It can't do it all, but it can make a difference, and as a consequence, we'll have a better-trained workforce, and that will create jobs, because companies want to locate in places where we've got a skilled workforce.

MR. LEHRER: Two minutes, Governor, on the role of government, your view.

MR. ROMNEY: Well, first, I love great schools. Massachusetts, our schools are ranked number one of all 50 states. And the key to great schools: great teachers. So I reject the idea that I don't believe in great teachers or more teachers. Every school district, every state should make that decision on their own.

The role of government — look behind us: the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

The role of government is to promote and protect the principles of those documents. First, life and liberty. We have a responsibility to protect the lives and liberties of our people, and that means the military, second to none. I do not believe in cutting our military. I believe in maintaining the strength of America's military.

Second, in that line that says, we are endowed by our Creator with our rights — I believe we must maintain our commitment to religious tolerance and freedom in this country. That statement also says that we are endowed by our Creator with the right to pursue happiness as we choose. I interpret that as, one, making sure that

those people who are less fortunate and can't care for themselves are cared by — by one another.

We're a nation that believes we're all children of the same God. And we care for those that have difficulties — those that are elderly and have problems and challenges, those that disabled, we care for them. And we look for discovery and innovation, all these thing desired out of the American heart to provide the pursuit of happiness for our citizens.

But we also believe in maintaining for individuals the right to pursue their dreams, and not to have the government substitute itself for the rights of free individuals. And what we're seeing right now is, in my view, a — a trickle-down government approach which has government thinking it can do a better job than free people pursuing their dreams. And it's not working.

And the proof of that is 23 million people out of work. The proof of that is one out of six people in poverty. The proof of that is we've gone from 32 million on food stamps to 47 million on food stamps. The proof of that is that 50 percent of college graduates this year can't find work.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: (Inaudible) —

MR. ROMNEY: We know that the path we're taking is not working. It's time for a new path.

MR. LEHRER: All right, let's go through some specifics in terms of what — how each of you views the role of government. How do — education. Does the federal government have a responsibility to improve the quality of public education in America?

MR. ROMNEY: Well, the primary responsibility for education is — is of course at the state and local level. But the federal government also can play a very important role. And I — and I agree with Secretary Arne Duncan. He's — there's some ideas he's put forward on Race to the Top — not all of them but some of them I agree with, and congratulate him for pursuing that. The federal government can get local and — and state schools to do a better job.

My own view, by the way, is I've added to that. I happen to believe — I want the kids that are getting federal dollars from IDEA or — or Title I — these are disabled kids or — or poor kids or — or lower-income kids, rather. I want them to be able to go to the school of their choice. So all federal funds, instead of going to the — to the state or to the school district, I'd have go — if you will, follow the child and let the parent and the child decide where to send their — their — their student.

MR. LEHRER: How do you see the federal government's responsibility to — as I say, to improve the quality of public education in this country?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, as I've indicated, I think that it has a significant role to play. Through our Race to the Top program, we've worked with Republican and Democratic governors to initiate major reforms, and they're having an impact right now.

MR. LEHRER: Do you think you have a difference with your views and those of Governor Romney on — about education and the federal government?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: You know, this is where budgets matter because budgets reflect choices. So when Governor Romney indicates that he wants to cut taxes and potentially benefit folks like me and him, and to pay for it, we're having to initiate significant cuts in federal support for education, that makes a difference.

You know, his running mate, Congressman Ryan, put forward a budget that reflects many of the principles that Governor Romney's talked about. And it wasn't very detailed. This seems to be a trend. But — but what it did do is to — if you extrapolated how much money we're talking about, you'd look at cutting the education budget by up to 20 percent.

When it comes to community colleges, we are seeing great work done out there all over the country because we have the opportunity to train people for jobs that exist right now. And one of the things I suspect Governor Romney and I probably agree on is getting businesses to work with community colleges so that they're setting up their training programs —

MR. LEHRER: Do you agree, Governor?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Let — let — let me just finish the point.

MR. ROMNEY: Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: I suspect it'll be a small agreement.

MR. ROMNEY: It's going over well in my state, by the way, yeah.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: The — where their partnering so that — they're designing training programs, and people who are going through them know that there's a job waiting for them if they complete them. That makes a big difference. But that requires some federal support.

Let me just say one final example. When it comes to making college affordable — whether it's two-year or four-year — one of the things that I did as president was we were sending \$60 billion to banks and lenders as middle men for the student

loan program, even though the loans were guaranteed. So there was no risk for the banks or the lenders but they were taking billions out of the system.

And we said, why not cut out the middle man? And as a consequence, what we've been able to do is to provide millions more students assistance, lower or keep low interest rates on student loans. And this is an example of where our priorities make a difference. Governor Romney, I genuinely believe, cares about education. But when he tells a student that, you know, you should borrow money from your parents to go to college, you know, that indicates the degree to which, you know, there may not be as much of a focus on the fact that folks like myself, folks like Michelle, kids probably who attend University of Denver just don't have that option.

And for us to be able to make sure that they've got that opportunity and they can walk through that door, that is vitally important — not just to those kids. It's how we're going to grow this economy over the long term.

MR. LEHRER: We're running out of time.

MR. ROMNEY: Jim, Jim —

MR. LEHRER: I'm certainly going give you a chance to respond to that. Yes, sir, Governor.

MR. ROMNEY: Mr. — Mr. President, you're entitled, as the president, to your own airplane and to your own house, but not to your own facts — (laughter) — all right? I'm — I'm not going to cut education funding. I don't have any plan to cut education funding and grants that go to people going to college. I'm planning on continuing to grow, so I'm not planning on making changes there.

But you make a very good point, which is that the — the place you put your money makes a pretty clear indication of where your heart is. You put \$90 billion into — into green jobs. And — and I — look, I'm all in favor of green energy. Ninety billion (dollars) — that — that would have — that would have hired 2 million teachers. Ninety billion dollars. And these businesses — many of them have gone out of business. I think about half of them, of the ones have been invested in, they've gone out of business. A number of them happened to be owned by — by people who were contributors to your campaigns.

Look, the right course for — for America's government — we were talking about the role of government — is not to become the economic player picking winners and losers, telling people what kind of health treatment they can receive, taking over the health care system that — that has existed in this country for — for a long, long time and has produced the best health records in the world. The right answer for government is to say, how do we make the private sector become more efficient and more effective?

How do we get schools to be more competitive? Let's grade them. I propose we grade our schools so parents know which schools are succeeding and failing, so they can take their child to a — to a school that's being more successful. I don't — I don't want to cut our commitment to education; I wanted to make it more effective and efficient.

And by the way, I've had that experience. I don't just talk about it. I've been there. Massachusetts schools are ranked number one in the nation. This is not because I didn't have commitment to education. It's because I care about education for all of our kids.

MR. LEHRER: All right, gentlemen, look —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Jim, I — (inaudible) —

MR. LEHRER: Excuse me, one sec — excuse, me sir. (Laughter.) We've got — we've got — barely have three minutes left. I'm not going to grade the two of you and say you've — your answers have been too long or I've done a poor job —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: You've done a great job, Jim.

MR. LEHRER: Oh, well, no. But the fact is, government — the role of government and governing, we've lost a (pod ?), in other words, so we only have three minutes left in the — in the debate before we go to your closing statements. And so I want to ask finally here — and remember, we've got three minutes total time here.

And the question is this: Many of the legislative functions of the federal government right now are in a state of paralysis as a result of partisan gridlock. If elected in your case, if re-elected in your case, what would you do about that?

Governor?

MR. ROMNEY: Jim, I had the great experience — it didn't seem like it at the time — of being elected in a state where my legislature was 87 percent Democrat, and that meant I figured out from day one I had to get along and I had to work across the aisle to get anything done. We drove our schools to be number one in the nation. We cut taxes 19 times.

MR. LEHRER: Well, what would you do as president?

MR. ROMNEY: We — as president, I will sit down on day one — actually the day after I get elected, I'll sit down with leaders — the Democratic leaders as well as Republican leaders and — as we did in my state. We met every Monday for a couple hours, talked about the issues and the challenges in the — in the — in our

state, in that case. We have to work on a collaborative basis — not because we're going to compromise our principle(s), but because there's common ground.

And the challenges America faces right now — look, the reason I'm in this race is there are people that are really hurting today in this country, and we face — this deficit could crush the future generations. What's happening in the Middle East? There are developments around the world that are of real concern. And Republicans and Democrats both love America, but we need to have leadership — leadership in Washington that will actually bring people together and get the job done and could not care less if it's a Republican or a Democrat. I've done it before. I'll do it again.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, first of all, I think Governor Romney's going to have a busy first day, because he's also going to repeal "Obamacare," which will not be very popular among Democrats as you're sitting down with them.

(Laughter.)

But look, my philosophy has been I will take ideas from anybody, Democrat or Republican, as long as they're advancing the cause of making middle-class families stronger and giving ladders of opportunity into the middle class. That's how we cut taxes for middle-class families and small businesses. That's how we cut a trillion dollars of spending that wasn't advancing that cause. That's how we signed three trade deals into law that are helping us to double our exports and sell more American products around the world. That's how we repealed "don't ask, don't tell." That's how we ended the war in Iraq, as I promised, and that's how we're going to wind down the war in Afghanistan. That's how we went after al-Qaida and bin Laden.

So we've — we've seen progress even under Republican control of the House or Representatives. But ultimately, part of being principled, part of being a leader is, A, being able to describe exactly what it is that you intend to do, not just saying, I'll sit down, but you have to have a plan.

Number two, what's important is occasionally you've got to say now to — to — to folks both in your own party and in the other party. And you know, yes, have we had some fights between me and the Republicans when they fought back against us, reining in the excesses of Wall Street? Absolutely, because that was a fight that needed to be had. When — when we were fighting about whether or not we were going to make sure that Americans had more security with their health insurance and they said no, yes, that was a fight that we needed to have. And so part of leadership and governing is both saying what it is that you are for, but also being willing to say no to some things.

And I've got to tell you, Governor Romney, when it comes to his own party during the course of this campaign, has not displayed that willingness to say no to some of the more extreme parts of his party.

MR. LEHRER: That brings us to closing statements. There was a coin toss. Governor Romney, you won the toss, and you elected to go last.

So you have a closing two minutes, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, Jim, I want to thank you and I want to thank Governor Romney, because I think this was a terrific debate and I very much appreciate it.

And I want to thank the University of Denver.

You know, four years ago we were going through a major crisis, and yet my faith and confidence in the American future is undiminished. And the reason is because of its people. Because of the woman I met in North Carolina who decided at 55 to go back to school because she wanted to inspire her daughter, and now has a new job from that new training that she's gotten. Because of the company in Minnesota who was willing to give up salaries and perks for their executives to make sure that they didn't lay off workers during a recession. The auto workers that you meet in Toledo or Detroit take such pride in building the best cars in the world — not just because of a paycheck, but because it gives them that sense of pride, that they're helping to build America.

And so the question now is, how do we build on those strengths? And everything that I've tried to do and everything that I'm now proposing for the next four years in terms of improving our education system, or developing American energy, or making sure that we're closing loopholes for companies that are shipping jobs overseas and focusing on small businesses and companies that are creating jobs here in the United States, or — or closing our deficit in a responsible, balanced way that allows us to invest in our future — all those things are designed to make sure that the American people, their genius, their grit, their determination is — is channeled, and — and — and they have an opportunity to succeed.

And everybody's getting a fair shot and everybody's getting a fair share. Everybody's doing a fair share and everybody's playing by the same rules.

You know, four years ago I said that I'm not a perfect man and I wouldn't be a perfect president. And that's probably a promise that Governor Romney thinks I've kept. But I also promised that I'd fight every single day on behalf of the American people and the middle class and all those who are striving to get in the middle class.

I've kept that promise and if you'll vote for me, then I promise I'll fight just as hard in a second term.

MR. LEHRER: Governor Romney, your two-minute closing.

MR. ROMNEY: Thank you, Jim and Mr. President. And thank you for tuning in this evening. This is a — this is an important election. And I'm concerned about America. I'm concerned about the direction America has been taking over the last four years. I know this is bigger than election about the two of us as individuals. It's bigger than our respective parties. It's an election about the course of America — what kind of America do you want to have for yourself and for your children.

And there really are two very different paths that we began speaking about this evening. And over the course of this month we're going to have two more presidential debates and vice presidential debate. We'll talk about those two paths. But they lead in very different directions. And it's not just looking to our words that you have to take in evidence of where they go; you can look at the record.

There's no question in my mind that if the president were to be re-elected you'll continue to see a middle-class squeeze with incomes going down and prices going up. I'll get incomes up again. You'll see chronic unemployment. We've had 43 straight months with unemployment above 8 percent. If I'm president, I will create — help create 12 million new jobs in this country with rising incomes.

If the president's re-elected, "Obamacare" will be fully installed. In my view, that's going to mean a whole different way of life for people who counted on the insurance plan they had in the past. Many will lose it. You're going to see health premiums go up by some \$2,500 per — per family. If I'm elected, we won't have "Obamacare." We'll put in place the kind of principles that I put in place in my own state and allow each state to craft their own programs to get people insured. And we'll focus on getting the cost of health care down.

If the president were to be re-elected, you're going to see a \$716 billion cut to Medicare. You'll have 4 million people who will lose Medicare advantage. You'll have hospitals and providers that'll no longer accept Medicare patients.

I'll restore that \$716 billion to Medicare.

And finally, military. If the president's re-elected, you'll see dramatic cuts to our military. The secretary of defense has said these would be even devastating. I will not cut our commitment to our military. I will keep America strong and get America's middle class working again.

Thank you, Jim.

MR. LEHRER: Thank you, Governor.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The next debate will be the vice presidential event on Thursday, October 11th at Center College in Danville, Kentucky. For now, from the University of Denver, I'm Jim Lehrer. Thank you, and good night. (Cheers, applause.)

