Insertion Sequence in TV Series "Young and Hungry"

Affandi Bimantoro

Engish Literature, Faculty of Language and Arts, The State University of Surabaya
affandibimantoro@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Dian Rivia Himmawati

English Literature, Faculty of Language and Arts, The State University of Surabaya
dianrivia@unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Komunikasi adalah sarana bagi semua orang untuk membangun sebuah hubungan satu sama lain melalui sebuah interaksi seperti bertutur kata di dunia maya, pesan singkat, atau sekedar bertatap muka di kehidupan nyata. Sebuah percakapan membutuhkan proses untuk membuatnya menjadi sempurna. Ketika pembicara pertama mengirim sebuah pesan kepada pembicara kedua, kemungkinan terjadinya percakapan semakin terbuka. Ketika pembicara kedua ingin menanggapi pesan dari pembicara pertama, pembicara kedua menunda sebuah jawaban sebenarnya dengan sebuah pertanyaan. Salah satu serial televisi yang menggunakan urutan penyisipan dalam percakapan adalah *Young and Hungry*. Dalam serial televisi ini, para pembicara memperhatikan urutan penyisipan dalam sebuah percakapan, dimana bagian dari *adjacency pair* yang mengandung pertanyaan dan jawaban yang muncul di pertengahan sebuah percakapan dan menegaskan bahwa tipe dari urutan penyisipan itu bergantung kepada *adjacency pair* dan hubungan dan status sosial dari si pembicara juga mempengaruhi penggunaan urutan penyelipan.

Kata kunci: *percakapan, urutan penyisipan, adjacency pair,*

Abstract

A conversation is a tool for many people to gain their relationship with each other through interaction or chatting, texting, or just face to face in a real life. Conversation also has the process for making the conversation can be perfect. When the first pair sends the message to the second pair, the possibility for conversation is open. When the second pair will respond what the first pair send, the second pair delay the answer with the question. One of the TV series that apply the insertion sequence in the conversation is Young and Hungry. In this TV series, the speakers concerns to insertion sequence in conversation, part of an adjacency pair that contained question and answer and it appears in the middle of conversation and claims that the type of insertion sequence is depends on adjacency pair and the relationship and the status of participant also influences the using of insertion sequence.

Keywords: *conversation, insertion sequence, adjacency pair.*

INTRODUCTION

Insertion sequence is a part of adjacency pair which occurs in the conversation in which the conversation contained that question-answer sequence and it is be delayed while another question-answer sequence intervenes. There is a sequence form of insertion sequence, Q1-Q2-A2-A1 with middle pair (Q2-A2). The aims of using an insertion sequence is to indicate certain purpose, such as to hide something or information that other people do not allow to know, or to express or make sure some feeling when the the speaker asked by another speaker, or to identify something the feel unusual. *Young and Hungry* is one of the representative movies which applies insertion sequence during the conversation, especially used by the character of *Young and Hungry,* because this TV series revolved in the daily life in each character and from their conversation delivered naturally and the researcher could find easily the insertion sequence in their conversation.

In pragmatics, a branch of linguistics, an adjacency pair is an example of conversational turn-taking. An adjacency pair is produced two utterances by two speakers, one after the other. The speaking of the first utterance (the first-pair part, or the first turn) provokes a responding utterance (the second-pair part, or the second turn, together with the two turns create an adjacency pair. For example, a question about age requires the addressee to provide an answer in the following turn, thus

completing the adjacency pair. A correctly response could be a number answer. In short, adjacency pair must be equivalent between the first turn and the second turn. If the first turn asks about the age, the second turn must be responded with the number of age and so on. Cook (1989:156) said that there are two types of conversation which appear together at the same time and they form an adjacency pair and Sacks (1967) also observed that a conversation is a combination of two turns. Some turns are more closely related than others, and separates sequences of turns called adjacency pair. But, Sacks (ibid.) suggested some of features of adjacency pair, which have been given below where there are two utterances long and produced continually by different speakers. Then, the utterances are produced by the first spealer must belong to the class of first 'pair parts', the second to the class of 'second pair parts' and the utterances are connected, not any second pair can follow any first pair part, but only an appropriate one. There is kind of first pair part which includes questions, greetings, challenges, acknowledgements, requests, offers, complaints, invitations, announcements etc. For some first pair parts the second pair part is equivalent (greeting-greeting), for some only there is only one appropriate second (question-answer), for some more than one (complain-apology/justification).

1. Greeting ——▶ Greetings. It means when someone met with someone in any places and they were saying greeting to each other, so it felt respectful to each other ("Hello, Bro" ——▶ "Hello too, Bro")
2. Offer ——▶ Acceptance/ Rejection. It means when someone offered something to someone and they responded it with accept or reject. ("Would you want to go with me?" ——▶ "Okay, I will to go with you")
3. Request ——▶ Acceptance/Rejection. It means same as like offer, when someone asked to someone for helping or another thing, so their business will be easy if that people will helping to each other. ("Can I borrow your notes?" ——▶ "No, I'm so sorry, I just finished it")
4. Question ——▶ Answer. It means when someone asked to someone a question and that people will answer that equivalent with the question. ("What are you doing now?" ——▶ "I'm just finishing my assignment")
5. Complaint ——▶ Excuse/ Remedy. It means when someone got something that doesn't match with their expectation, so they made a complaint, and someone who got complaint will be remedy or excuse it. ("This sweater is rope, I must pay extra for fixing it" "No, it's free if you bring it back with your receipt")
6. De-greeting ——▶ De-greeting. It means when someone separated after meeting with someone and they waved their hand and saying some word leave-taking. ("See you in next moment" "Yeah, I wish we can meet in another chance")

According to Yule (1996:78), "insertion sequence is one adjacency pair within another". Even the expressions used may be question-answer sequences, other forms of social action are also accomplished within this pattern. Moreover, Malcolm (1977:72), stated that the next speaker did not produce the second part, but they produced another the first part. The person towards whom the first part of an adjacency pair has been directed may want to undertake some preliminary action before responding with the second part. For speech function, Holmes (2001: 258) said that if in some different speech communities insisting some different function and expression some function differently. In short, the purpose of language is not only communicate, but also determine and maintain some connection in society. From language they can express the feeling that they cannot express with the body language and usually with the language can successful for delivering the intended meaning. In social factor, language has influenced by social factors. There are 4 components, such as the participants or the users of language: who are speaking and who they are speaking to, next is the setting or social context of the interaction, which is related to its users: where they are speaking; then, the topic, which deals with what is being talked about; and the last is the function of the interaction, which deals with why they are speaking (Holmes, 2001: 8). As Holmes stated in his book, when intercultural communication happened, the social factor may be involved in that communication. There are social distance or solidarity scale which deals with the relationship between the participants, status or power scale which deals with the participants' social status, formality scale which deals with the type of the interaction and two functional scales: referential and affective which are related to the purpose of the interaction (Holmes, 2001:9)

METHOD

The subject of this study is *Young and Hungry* TV series. The writer concerned to the utterances that contained insertion sequence which is constructed in their conversation, it might be there are other patterns that appeared from their conversation and what is the speech function from the insertion sequence that happened in their conversation, such as from their insertion sequence it has directive and expressive functions and also how the social factor influences their conversation in this TV series, such as how is the participants, what is the setting, topic and related to social dimension, what is the relationship between the participants, what is the their

social status and many more. The collected data were taken from the conversation between the interlocutor in *Young and Hungry* TV series. The data consists of the conversations that contained some insertion sequence and from that insertion sequence has some functions from their conversation. This study used qualitative and descriptive approach because the data were collected in the form of a conversational text. Qualitative research is the research that occurs in natural groups, where humans do some activities and events occur together. The focus is on participants' awareness and experiences and the way they make sense of their lives. Researchers are particularly interested in understanding how things occur. The data that appear from a qualitative study are descriptive. That is data are reported in words (primarily the participant's words) or pictures, rather than in numbers (Fraenkel &Wallen, 1990). The data and the source of data used in this study were taken from *Young and Hungry* TV series. The researcher uses the conversation between the speaker and the hearer that contained insertion sequence as the data. All data were collected and interpreted one by one. The data actually were spoken. Therefore, the spoken data first were collected and transcribed before they could go onto the computer. Through the use of video recordings and some script that taken from internet, the writer could examine directly how insertion sequence happened from the interlocutor in this TV series.

The writer displayed the data in form of conversation between the speaker and the hearer from *Young and Hungry* TV series.

Types of Speech Style

Number of data
The Conversation between main character and another character

(time of conversation)

RESULTS

This study found that how the social dimension affected the insertion sequence and described what is the relationship between the speaker and the hearer and the status social through social dimension theory by Janet Holmes.

Datum 1

Head Instructor	: Well, how soon can you start?	Q1
Sofia	: How's now?	Q2
Head Instructor	: You're hired. I'll meet you in the back office to talk wage, commission, and benefits.	A2

Sofia	: Wage, commission, and benefits, oh my. Okay. I'll see you in a second.	A1
	(E16 S2 19:46)	

From the conversation above, the social factor could be categorized. There are many kinds of participant, for example, family participants (father-daughter), job participants (boss-employee), and social participants (friend-friend). The participant from conversation above is Head Instructor and Sofia. The relationship between of them is boss and employee, because Head Instructor was boss in that gymnasium and Sofia is the student in spin-class, but at that day, the teacher couldn't teach the class, so Sofia replaced him, and Head Instructor interested with her spirit for teaching the people in that class, so she offered a job for teaching the spin-class as instructor. Then, Sofia accepted it and she became a part of that gymnasium. Conversation always happens in some place, the place of conversation that happened called **Setting** and the **social context** from that conversation is same as a topic. That conversation was happening in gymnasium and the social context of the interaction was talking about interesting with someone.

Conversation never forget for discussing the **Topic** and that is about what is talked about, each participant of the interaction may have different views from the others concerning with what exactly is being talked about. They can link utterances together thematically, syntactically, or logically. The topic of that conversation was talking about offering a job to someone.

The Function from conversation above is about why they are speaking. That conversation has a function as directive, because the Head Instructor attempted to get Sofia became an instructor in that gymnasium and she would be glad if Sofia join in that gymnasium.

The purpose from conversation above is to convey the feeling that relate with the speaker, so the head instructor conveyed Sofia if she wants to join in that gymnasium as a spin-instructor. If this function related with the type of insertion sequence from RQ 1, this function categorized to Q1-Q2-A2-A1 type, because if this type related with adjacency pair, this is a Request-Acceptance type, which is Request is an act of politely asking for something and Acceptance is an act of accepting something from someone. In type of insertion sequence, conversation above categorized to Q1-Q2-A2-A1 type, because insertion sequence happened in the middle of that conversation. When Q1 started the question and then Q2-A2 appeared as insertion sequence. They delay the conversation with question and answer. Then, A1 responded what A2 said, but A1 could be responded what Q1 said.

If related to social dimension from conversation above, when Sofia made sure that the right time for her to start her teaching in that gymnasium, from conversation above Sofia inserted the conversation with a question as Q2, here the function as **Directive Function**, because Sofia wanted to make sure to head instruction that that is the right time for starting her class. Then, head instructor answered what Sofia asked that she accepted Sofia as her teacher, and head instructor as A2 has a function as **Referential Function**, because the head instructor gave an information that if she accepted in that gymnasium, she would be accept a wage, a commission and benefit. So in her conversation, she provided some information for making Sofia endured in that gym. If related to solidarity in **social distance scale** between the head instructor with Sofia is in the low distant, because Sofia made a Directive Function in her conversation, as a person who did not know well with head instructor, it showed that Sofia had a distant with the head instruction, even she did not call her with Mrs. or Miss, so consciously she made sure to the head instructor, if Sofia already knew the head instructor well, she answered YES directly in her answer.

In **status scale**, their status is just boss and employee who Sofia became a new member in that gymnasium. Sofia did not call the instructor with Mrs. or Miss, as said in theory that the status scale points to the relevance of relative status in some linguistic choices. Here, the choice was not show in this conversation, but their scale had a distant between boss and employee, even Sofia did not call the instructor with Mrs. or Miss. So, their status scale is low and subordinate. From conversation above, the **formality scale** is low formality which is informal, because even their relationship just boss and employee and they have distance, but the distance was not influence their speech style, like they did not use formal language, even the instructor as a boss, but she wants to be friendly with her employee. So she used a colloquial language, but still respectful as a boss.

For **referential and affective scales**, the conversation above was talking about someone who got offered a job. Here, referential function scales described that if someone talks many information in that conversation, it means the referential scales is high information scales, but if the information in that conversation is less, it means the referential scale is low information content. So, from conversation above, the information that gave by the speaker is high information content, because it showed in A2 the head instructor gave an information to Sofia if she worked in that gymnasium, she would accepted wage, commission and benefit that Sofia did not know before. For affective scales, their relationship is just employee and boss, it didn't have a special relationship like a couple, family or anything else, so their scale is low affective scale.

Datum 2

Josh   : Where did you learn how to crochet?   Q1
Caroline : Are we role-playing? Am I the seamstress? Q2
Josh   : Caroline, how did you make my blanket? Q3
Caroline : All right, you caught me. I had a special blanket person make it for you.   A3
Josh   : I know it was Gabi's gift.   A2
Caroline   : Well, it's not a big deal. I mean, I was just so busy with the wedding. You're gonna have hundreds of birthdays that we can celebrate together.   A1

(E10 S1 14:28)

From the conversation above, the social factor could be categorized. There are many kinds of **Participant**, for example, family participants (father-daughter), job participants (boss-employee), and social participants (friend-friend). The participant or speaker may have influence to the language used. Other speakers may have different ways to talk about one topic or issue. In that conversation, the Participant is Josh and Caroline. The relationship between of them is a couple, because Josh is Caroline's fiancée and they would be get in married soon.

The **Setting** from conversation above is the place of conversation happened and the **social context** from that conversation. That conversation was happening in Josh's bedroom and the social context of the interaction was about Josh felt curious with Caroline how she made his blanket, because in his mind, Caroline couldn't sow or crochet, so it was impossible if Caroline made him a blanket. Conversation never forget for discussing the **Topic** and that is about what is talked about, each participant of the interaction may have different views from the others concerning with what exactly is being talked about. The topic of that conversation was talking about knowing about the hidden information.

The **Function** from conversation above is about why they were speaking. That conversation had a function as expressive, because Josh expressed his feeling, his curiosity with Caroline, what she was hidden from him. She hid something from him, because she did not want Josh knew if she forgot his birthday and forgot to give him a present, so Caroline conveyed Gabi's gift as her present.

The purpose from conversation above is to identify something that feel unusual. So, when Josh asked to Caroline when she learnt about the crochet and Caroline tried to change the topic of conversation and at that time, Josh really felt angry to her, because

of she did not tell the truth to him if her gift did not from her, but it was from Gabi. If this function related with the type of insertion sequence from RQ 1, this function categorized to Q1-Q2-Q3-A3-A2 type, because if this type related with adjacency pair, this is Question-Answer type, which is question is a sentence, phrase that used for getting information from someone or when someone felt doubt or uncertainty about something, and answer is response from someone when they gave a question with the correct response to that question and in insertion sequence categorized to Q1-Q2-Q3-A3-A2 type, because insertion sequence happened after Q3 responded what Q2 said and A3 answered what Q3 said and they happened in the middle of conversation between Q1 and Q2.

If it is related to social dimension from conversation above, in this sitcom, their relationship was a couple, they dated for long time and ready for getting married. It showed that when Josh asked to Caroline as Q3 that how did she make the blanket, it had a function as **Expressive Function**, because he showed an angry expression even he did not say with high intonation, he really disappointed that she lied to him. Then, Caroline as A3 answered his question that she found out by him if she lied to him that her gift was not from her, but from Gabi. So, it had a function as **Expressive Function**, because she showed a confess feeling to Josh that she did not learn crochet, she forgot his birthday and she admitted if Gabi's gift was from her. But the solidarity in **social distance scale** between Josh and Caroline was high solidarity or intimate. Because, they were a couple and both of them had a same function as an **Expressive Function** that some people who have a close relationship, they did not feel awkward for delivering their feeling, like angry or happy without felt embarrassed to each other and they called their name when they talked, it reflected that they in a low-status in social life and the way their speaking as a couple which is their style did not require some rules for speaking, like they must talking with good manner, or they must control their tones or etc. For the formality scale, this scale is useful in judging the influence of the setting or type of interaction on language choice. From conversation above, the **formality scale** is low formality which is informal, because even their relationship just a couple, but the distance was not influence their speech style, like they didn't use formal language, even they dated for long time, so he used a colloquial language, but he still respect with Caroline as his girlfriend even they broke up and called off their wedding.

Referential and affective scales from conversation above was talking about someone who curiosity. Here, referential function scales described that if someone talks many information in that conversation, it means the referential scales is high information scales, but if the information in that conversation is less, it means the referential scales is low information content. So, from conversation above, the information that gave by the speaker was low information content, because Josh expressed his feeling with Caroline that she lied to him. She admitted that the gift that she gave for him is from Caroline, but the fact it was from Gabi. Josh knew it from Elliot. For affective scales, their scales was high affective scales, because both of them were in love and a couple, so higher the scales, it means the relationship was closer than before.

> **Datum 3**
> Gabi : How you feelin'? You know, about all this stuff? Q1
> Jack : You mean our business stuff or you and me stuff? Q2
> Gabi : All of it. A2
> Jack : A sick road trip with my girl, tons of cooking, awesome music festival. I feel pumped A1
>
> (E1 S3 01:39)

From the conversation above, the social factor could be categorized. From the **Participant**, there are many kinds of participant, for example, family participants (father-daughter), job participants (boss-employee), and social participants (friend-friend). In that conversation, the Participants were Gabi and Jack. The relationship between of them was a social participants (friend-friend), because Jack was Josh's brother and Gabi was Josh's employee, so they knew each other from Josh's apartment.

The **Setting** from conversation above was the place of conversation happened and the **social context** from that conversation. That conversation was happening when they on the way to Coachella and happened in their food-truck and the social context of the interaction was about Gabi asked to Jack how was he feeling about that journey, because Jack liked with Gabi, and Gabi asked to him how is he feeling, how is the journey with her. Conversation never forget for discussing the **Topic** and that is about what is talked about, each participant of the interaction may have different views from the others concerning with what exactly is being talked about. They can link utterances together thematically, syntactically, or logically. The topic of that conversation was talking about asking something about feeling to each other.

The **Function** from conversation above is about why they are speaking. That conversation has a function as expressive, because Gabi asked to Jack how he was feeling and Jack responded with his feeling if he felt happy could trip to Coachella with someone that he like and he felt like pumped.

The purpose from conversation above is to convey the feeling from the hearer to the speaker. So, when Gabi asked to Jack how he was feeling when they went together to Coachella for selling their food, and Jack responded with question that how was he feeling about business stuff or their stuff, means their relationship stuff, it showed that Jack conveyed Gabi's question that she asked about his feeling for going together. If this function related with the type of insertion sequence from RQ 1, this function categorized to Q1-Q2-A2-A1 type, because if this type related with adjacency pair, this is Question-Answer type because Gabi asked with WH-Statement "How…?" even Jack's answer didn't "yes or no", but it showed that he could answer her question and in insertion sequence categorized to Q1-Q2-A2-A1 type, because insertion sequence happened after Q2 responded what Q1 said and A2 answered what Q2 said and they happened in the middle of conversation between Q1 and A1.

If related to social dimension from conversation above, the solidarity in **social distance scale** between Jack and Gabi was high solidarity or intimate, because it showed that Jack responded what Gabi asked, he inserted a question as Q2 and it had a function as **Directive Function**, because he wanted to make sure that Gabi's question about his feeling means business stuff or the relationship of them stuff and Gabi answered as A2 and it had a function as **Expressive Function**, because she showed an expression happy and curious about Jack's answer about his feeling, so she answered "All of it…" means his feeling about all of their journey to Coachella. So, they did not have an awkward moment when they went out together and their relationship became intimate even they did not date to each other.

In **status scale**, their status did not date to each other, but they had special feeling towards each other. Jack had a feeling to Gabi after he kissed her when he met at the first time, and Gabi had a feeling too after Josh broke their relationship and she felt dumped, so when she met Jack, she had a feel to him. But, they already knew each other, so the status scale for them was low and subordinate, because they called their name when they talked, it reflected that they were in a low-status in social life and the their way of speaking were like between friends which the style did not require some rules for speaking, like they must talking with good manner, or they must control their tones or etc. For the **formality scale**, this scale is useful in judging the influence of the setting or type of interaction on language choice. From conversation above, the formality scale was low formality which was informal, because even their relationship was just friends, but the distance was not influence their speech style, like they did not use formal language, even they almost dated but in the end they did not dated, so he used a colloquial language, but he still respected Gabi as his girlfriend even she already taught him to become a chef and they had a food truck together.

For **referential and affective scales**, from conversation above was talking about the feeling. Here, referential function scales described that if someone talks many information in that conversation, it means the referential scales is high information scales, but if the information in that conversation is less, it means the referential scales is low information content. So, from conversation above, the information that gave by the speaker is low information content, because Gabi asked to Josh how was his feeling about the journey to Coachella. He did not give any important information in his conversation, he just expressed his feeling about going together with Gabi and he felt happy with it and for affective scales, their scales was high affective scales, because they loved each other even they were not a couple, but their relationship was like brother and sister.

Datum 4

Josh : Did you figure out a way to make sure I pick Jilly's pie over Gabi's pie?   Q1
Elliot : Can we please stop talking about their pies? It's making me dry heave.   Q2
Josh   : I'm serious. I need to pick Jilly's.   A2
Elliot   : It's easy. Jilly's using the aubergine ramekin, Gabi's using the chartreuse.   A1
Josh   : Can you say that again in hetero?
Elliot   : Jilly's purple, Gabi's green. And a ramekin's a small dish you bake in.

(E2 S2 13:56)

From the conversation above, the social factor could be categorized. There are many kinds of **Participant**, for example, family participants (father-daughter), job participants (boss-employee), and social participants (friend-friend). In that conversation, the Participants were Josh and Elliot. The relationship between of them was Job Participant (Boss-Employee), because Josh was Elliot's boss and Elliot was Josh's publicist.

The **Setting** from conversation above is the place of conversation happened and the **social context** from that conversation. That conversation was happening in Josh's office in his apartment and the context was about Josh asked the opinion from Elliot about what should he choose from Jilly and Gabi's pie, and Elliot knew about their pies. Conversation never forget for discussing the **Topic** and that is about what is talked about, each participant of the interaction may have different views from the others concerning with what exactly is being talked about. They can link utterances together thematically, syntactically, or logically. The topic of that conversation was talking about asking something or asking the opinion.

The **Function** from conversation above was about why they are speaking. That conversation had a function as referential, because Josh asked Elliot for the opinion, what should he choose from their pies and Elliot gave information about the difference from their pies.

The purpose from conversation above was to express the speaker feeling that Elliot bored with Josh's question. So, when Josh asked to Gabi what should he picked that Gabi or Jilly's pie, so he asked the opinion from Elliot, but Elliot bored with his question. Josh made the

challenge for Gabi and Jilly, because they fought about making dinner in Josh's meeting and who was the winner, she would be making the dinner. So, when Josh confused what should he picked, he asked Elliot's opinion and when Josh asked he responded with the question, "Can we please stop talking about their pies?...", it showed that he bored with Josh's situation and Josh conveying Elliot that he must picked Jilly because he dated with her. If this function related with the type of insertion sequence from RQ 1, this function categorized to Q1-Q2-A2-A1 type, because if this type related with adjacency pair, this is Question-Answer type, because Josh asked with question word "Did you…?" even Elliot's answer didn't "yes or no", but it showed that he could explain what Josh asked to him and in insertion sequence categorized to Q1-Q2-A2-A1 type, because insertion sequence happened after Q2 responded what Q1 said and A2 answered what Q2 said and they happened in the middle of conversation between Q1 and A1.

If related to social dimension from conversation above, the solidarity in **social distance scale** between Josh and Elliot is in the high distance, because Elliot as his publicist already working for him for long time and Josh truthfully to him with what he said. So, when Josh asked his opinion for picking their pies, he just asked from Elliot not Yolanda and he could pick the right pie. In that situation, Elliot felt bored with his question and it showed in Q2 and it had a function as **Expressive Function**, because he expressed his bored feeling about that challenge. Josh always asked about what should he choose and his decision would not hurt anyone who won that challenge and Josh answered what Elliot's respond with A2 and it has a function as **Expressive Function**, because he expressed his conviction that he must choose Jilly's pie not Gabi's pie, if he chose Gabi's pie, it meant he could not move on from her.

In **status scale**, their status is just boss and employee who Elliot as his publicist and Josh truthfully to him because he already work for him for long time. Elliot didn't call Josh with Mr. or other formal words, because they close each other, they like a family especially with Josh who live alone in his apartment, even Elliot did not stay with him, but they met every day and every time, so both of them already get along and as said in theory that the status scale points to the relevance of relative status in some linguistic choices. Here, the choice was not show in this conversation, but their scale had a distant between boss and employee, even Elliot did not call Josh with Mr. or other formal word so, their status scale were low and subordinate. For the **formality scale**, this scale was useful in judging the influence of the setting or type of interaction on language choice. From

conversation above, the formality scale was low formality or informal, because even their relationship was just boss and employee and they had distance, but the distance was not influence their speech style, like they did not use formal language, or they did not a special gesture when they talked to each other. Even Josh as a hiss boss, but he wanted to be friendly with his employee. He did not want a distance in them, so he used a colloquial language, so it looked like friendly but still respectful as a boss.

For **referential and affective scales**, from conversation above was talking about someone who confused with the choice. Here, referential function scales described that if someone talks many information in that conversation, it means the referential scales is high information scales, but if the information in that conversation is less, it means the referential scales is low information content. So, from conversation above, the information that gave by the speaker was high information content, because Elliot gave information to Josh that Gabi's pie was green and Jilly's pie was purple with "Gay" language. For affective scales, even their relationship just boss and employee, but Josh assumed that Elliot like family, because their relationship existed for long time, so they were close to each other and their relationship was high affective scales.

DISCUSSION

From Holmes's theory in "An Introduction to Sociolinguistics" book, he divided the social factor into 4 factor, they were the Participant, the Setting, the Topic, and the Function. Conversation is strongly influenced by social factors. They were the participants or the users of language: who were speaking and who they were speaking to and the setting or social context of the interaction, which is related to its users and where they are speaking and for the topic, which deals with what is being talked about; and the function of the interaction, which deals with why they are speaking.

Mostly, all of the conversation could be discussed in social factor, because all factor has an important role for making the conversation became good conversation and easy understanding. From those factors, it would prove important for describing and analyzing all of kinds of interaction. From the table above, the first factor is Participant, this factor was easiest to identify. There were many kinds of participant, for example family participants (father-daughter, mother-son, and aunty-uncle), job participants (boss-employee), and social participants (friend-friend, teacher-student). The participant or speaker may have influence to the language used and also different ways to talk about one topic or issue. The second factor is setting. This factor was

divided into 2, place and social context. For place, it was talking about the place of conversation happened, like in office, school, apartment or everywhere and for social context of the interaction, it was talking about when the speakers has to collect an appropriate style in giving utterances determined by the social context. They should know the different styles of language and the situation in which the style is proper. But, different aspects of the social identity of a person were also relevant in determining his/her different setting or social context. The third factor is Topic, this factor was talking about the whole of conversation was talking about or the theme of conversation, each participant has different perspective from the others relating to what exactly is being talked about. Specific topic may be discussed in one point rather than another, regardless of the setting or receiver. People somehow attempt to create one main topic, so that the communication runs well. Lastly, the Function, this factor was talking about why were they talking, the reason of the participant talked to each other. This factor also discussed about the ways of speech functions were expressed in different contexts involve considerations of politeness. Being polite is so important to understand language as well as social and cultural values of the community.

For social dimension, it divided into 5 kinds, like a social distance, a status scale, a formality scale and two functional scales. From the first data, social distance was talking about the solidarity from the people, when someone met with someone else at the first time, their solidarity is low and has a distant, because they just met at the first time, so they must adapted to each other and it will be closer if they met every day, it showed when Sofia get an offer from an instructor. They just met at the first time, even Sofia didn't call her with Ms. but Sofia still respect with the instructor and if someone well-knowing with someone, their solidarity is high and intimate, so when they talked to each other, there is no awkward moment and they will be connected when they chit-chat to each other, like Sofia and Gabi. Their relationship was built since in junior high school, so they already knew each other and they looked like sisters. It different from the second until fourth data, social distance between theme is high solidarity, because they already knew each other, they met every day or might be they have special relationship like Josh and Caroline.

For status scale, this scale was talking about the relative status in some linguistic choice. When someone has a higher status, other people will respect it. Like boss and employee, the employee will call Sir to their boss for showing respectful to their boss, and if someone has a lower status, other people will be respect too but it doesn't strict like a higher status. Like when someone

know to each other for long time, even she/he has a higher status in their conversation, they didn't use Sir or Miss in their conversation, they just call their name and it proved from the table above that the status didn't influence their conversation for calling someone and the status scale from all of conversation is low status, because like Josh as Boss, his employee still call him with his name without Sir. He didn't want to have a distant between his employees, so their relationship was like family and closed to each other.

For formality scale, this scale was talking about the social setting and type of interaction on language choice. When some people in hotel and they meet for business, or ritual service in mosque, the language used will be influenced by the formality scale. That scale is formal and high formality. It different from friendly chat, all people use colloquial language and that scale is informal and low formality. So, more higher the place or the social setting means the formality is higher and the interaction will showed the good manner for making good conversation, but more lower the place or the social setting means the formality is lower and the interaction will showed the informal manner, like friend with friend, they didn't use a formal language for chatting, they just use a simple word for making good conversation. From the table above, mostly used an informal scale and low formality, because their solidarity is like family, even Josh as boss, or Elliot and Yolanda as senior for Gabi, but they didn't want a distance between them and their relationship was closer for long time.

For referential and affective scale, referential scale was talking about when someone talked and they inserted some information that made the hearer knew about something new, it means that conversation is high referential, so if when someone talked about their feeling, it means that conversation is low referential. From table above, it showed that if someone talked more information in their conversation, it means the referential-ness is higher and it showed in Sofia and the head instructor. The head instructor gave information that if she joined in her gymnasium as a teacher, she will accept a wage, commission and benefit. As a people met at the first time, their relationship has a distance as a boss and new employee, if they already knew each other even their status is different, their scales will be low scale, because Sofia will be know what is she talked about without the head instructor described it. Different from Josh and Caroline, Jack and Gabi or Josh and Elliot, their conversation are less information, overall their conversation were talking about their feeling, even angry, disappointed, happy or curious, but they didn't insert some information in their conversation, so their scales were low.

For affective scale, this scale was talking about the relationship between the speaker and the hearer, more closely their relationship in that conversation, it means more higher their affective in that scales, so if their relationship were distance, it means their scale is lower affective. From table above, same as like the referential one, Sofia and the head instructor's scales is low affective content, because they just met at the first time, they knew each other for short time, their relationship is just boss and new employee, so here their relationship has a distance and low affectiveness. Different from Josh and Caroline, Jack and Gabi or Josh and Elliot, their relationship existed for long time, they knew each other deeply, even their feeling is angry or happy, their connection without a distance, so their scales is high affective content.

In short, from type of insertion sequence, speech function and social factor, it showed that they have a relation to each other, like insertion sequence appeared in the middle of conversation as Q2 and A2 or Q3 and A3, it depends on how much the participant and the statement that their delivered in that conversation. If the person who became Q2 and A2 has different status, it will be influenced the function and the social dimension from insertion sequence, for example Q2 is boss and his/her statement has a function as a Directive and A2 is employee and his/her statement has a function as an Expressive, Q2 has a distance with A2 because their relationship is boss and employee, so the different of social status will be influenced the speech function and the using of insertion sequence. The higher from their status, the using of insertion sequence will be decreased as a possible and if the status from the participant is same or lower status, the using of insertion sequence will be increase or often. So, often or not using of insertion sequence it depends on the relationship and the status of the participants.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION
Conclusion

From the data in season 1 until 3 in each episode from each season that showed in this study, the conversation has an insertion sequence and different function in each data and related to Janet Holmes's theory, such as Expressive and Expressive, Expressive and Referential and so on showed that the different purpose from the interlocutor, it means the different function from their conversation and the function influenced the relationship between the interlocutors.

This study talked about the insertion sequence from conversation in *Young and Hungry* from season 1 until 3 in each episode from each season and the intensity of using an insertion sequence influenced from the

relationship between them. Through the social dimension theory from Janet Holmes, an insertion sequence can clearly explain that the intensity of using insertion affected the relationship between the speaker and the hearer, like if the relationship between the interlocutor is closer, their scale is high solidarity and it affected another scales and if the relationship between the interlocutor is far, their scale will be low and another scales will be low and informal. All of kind of social dimension affected the intensity of using or appearing of insertion sequence.

Suggestion

The analysis has been done by the writer is focused on the insertion sequence and how does the social dimension affect the insertion sequence in conversation from *Young and Hungry*. However, this study could be expanded to be a pragmatic and sociolinguistic. For the next analyst, especially in adjacency pair, there are still many possible topics in relation with conversation analysis and adjacency pair. This study has a great number of interesting topics to be studied and the objects could be found everywhere; in movies, books, advertisements, social media, etc.

REFERENCES

Cook, Guy. 1989. Language Teaching: A Scheme for Teacher Education. Discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coulthard, Malcolm. 1977. An Introduction to Discourse analysis. England: Longman Group Ltd.

Creswell, John W. 2009. Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches Third Edition. California: Thousand Oaks.

Dornyei, Zoltan. 2007. Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methodologies. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fitriana, Apriliana, Ghea, 2013. Adjacency Pair anaylsis in "Red Riding Hood"movie. Publication Article. Surakarta. Muhammadiyah University.

Hasan, Fuad, 2015. Adjacency Pairs in "Knight and Day" movie. Thesis. Surabaya. UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

Hidayah, Nur, 2012. The Analysis of Speech Function used by English Teachers' instruction at SMPN 6 Salatiga in the Academic Year of 2011/2012. Thesis. Salatiga. STAIN.

Holmes, Janet, 2001. An introduction to sociolinguistics. London and New York: Longman

Muftin, Jenan, Atiya, 2010. Insertion Sequence in English and Arabic Religious Texts; A contrastive study. Journal. College of educational from University of Al-Qadisiya.

Kamusku Bahasa Indonesia-Inggris

Merriam Webster Dictionary

Richards, Jack. C, Schmidt, Richard W. 1983. Language and Communication: Applied Linguistics and Language Study. California: Longman 1983.

Richards, Jack. C, Plat, John. Talbot. Weber, Heidi. 1985. Language and Communication: Applied Linguistics and Language Study. Harlow, Essex, England: Longman 1985

Richard, Jack et al.1985. Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics. England: Longman 1985.

S. C. Levinson .1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press

Schlegoff, E.A. 1968. Sequencing in Conversational Opening. American Anthropologist, 70 (6). 1075-1076

Schlegloff, E. 2007. Sequence Organization in Interaction: Vol 1: A Primer in Conversation Analysis, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trudgill, Peter. 2000. Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society, Penguin: UK.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. 1986. An introduction to Sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Woods, Nicola. 2006. Describing Discourse: A Practical Guide to Discourse Analysis. Illustration. Hoddler Arnold.

Yule, George. 1996. Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.

https://www.academia.edu/7332119/Conversational_Analysis_in_Pragmatics_Conversational_Analysis (04 December 2016)

http://farchah.blogspot.co.id/2006/07/identifying-adjacency-pairs-in-short.html (04 December 2016)

https://fatchulfkip.wordpress.com/2008/03/19/sociolinguistics(04 December 2016)

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/young_%26_hungry(04 December 2016)

https://Younghungry.wikia.com/wiki/Gabi_diamond(04 December 2016)

http://www.iwatchseries.ch/watch-young-and-hungry-online/(04 December 2016)

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/sitcom(04 December 2016)

https://daigakuin.soka.ac.jp(04 December 2016)

https://abudira.wordpress.com/2012/08/02/janet-holmes-theory-of-8-speech-function-in-sociolingustics/(04 December 2016)

http://eprints.uny.ac.id/8365/3/BAB%202-06211141009.pdf(04 December 2016)

http://perpus.iainsalatiga.ac.id/docfiles/fulltext/5bbdd8b36bd99bba.pdf(04 December 2016)