

The Role of Implicature in Promoting SDG 16 Through *Preman Pensiun*: A Pragmatic Perspective

Beta Setiawati ¹

Winarti ²

Alyssa Nur Rochmah ³

Feriska Pratiwi ⁴

^xEnglish Department, Faculty of Law and Business, Universitas Duta Bangsa Surakarta, Surakarta 57135, Indonesia

^xEnglish Department, Faculty of Law and Business, Universitas Duta Bangsa Surakarta, Surakarta 57135, Indonesia

^xEnglish Department, Faculty of Law and Business, Universitas Duta Bangsa Surakarta, Surakarta 57135, Indonesia

^xEnglish Department, Faculty of Law and Business, Universitas Duta Bangsa Surakarta, Surakarta 57135, Indonesia

beta_setiawati@udb.ac.id

Abstract

The research examines how implicatures in the dialogues of the TV series *Preman Pensiun* function to promote the values of Sustainable Development Goal 16 (SDG 16). This study identifies types of implicature based on violation of the maxim, analyses their implied meanings, and examines how these implicatures support SDG 16. The research employs a qualitative pragmatic approach, focusing on the analysis of conversational implicatures found in selected episodes of *Preman Pensiun*. Data collection involves transcribing dialogues which are included to implicature by using Grice's Cooperative Principle and conversational maxims, examining how speakers imply meanings beyond their explicit statements, and categorizing implicatures based on their contribution to SDG 16's themes. The study finds 25 conversational implicature from episode 1-3 of *Preman Pensiun* Season 10 that consistently convey messages supporting SDG 16 indicators, namely anti-corruption, peace and security, justice in institution, and inclusiveness and respect. Overall, implicature in *Preman Pensiun* functions as a pragmatic tool to subtly promote SDG 16 values. By connecting these pragmatic elements to SDG 16, the study shows that television dialogues can do more than entertain. They can also raise awareness about peace, justice, and fair institutions. This research offers a fresh perspective on how language use in everyday media reflects important social values and reveals the potential of popular culture to play a role in supporting global development goals.

Keywords: implicature, SDG 16, Pragmatic Analysis, Conversational Maxims, *Preman Pensiun*

INTRODUCTION

This research is motivated by the research gap between language studies, particularly pragmatics, and sustainable development issues. Recently, studies on implicature have focused solely on linguistic aspects, without connecting them to social values relevant to people's lives. Yet, language in popular media, such as television series, is often an effective means of implicitly conveying moral, social, and justice messages.

16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions) is the reason for the need for this research. Messages about peace, tolerance, and justice are often not conveyed directly, but rather through dialogues containing implications. The *Preman Pensiun* series, known for its close connection to the social realities of Indonesian society, is one popular media outlet that contains many pragmatic implications reflecting the values of peace, justice, and social inclusion.

Based on these problems, this research needs to be conducted to reveal how the implicatures in the *Preman Pensiun* dialogue can function as a means of social education that supports the achievement of SDG 16. This analysis aims to explain the types of implicatures, interpret their implicit meanings, and examine how these meanings support the values of peace, justice, and the strengthening of social institutions. Thus, this research not only contributes to the development of pragmatics, but also to interdisciplinary studies that link linguistics to sustainable development.

The benefits of this research are divided into two aspects. Theoretically, this research enriches the study of pragmatics by presenting a new perspective that implicature is not merely a linguistic phenomenon, but also an instrument for conveying social values. Meanwhile, practically, this research can provide insight to the public that popular media can be a means of education regarding the importance of peace and justice. This research is also beneficial for academics in developing contextual pragmatic learning, and for media content creators in designing dialogues rich in positive values to strengthen social institutions and support sustainable development goals.

Pragmatic studies on implicature in popular media generally focus on mapping the types of implicatures, maxim violations, and their impact on audience interpretation. A study on *Friends* demonstrates the function of implicatures, especially violations of Grice's maxims to construct humor and implicit meanings between characters. The aim of this research is to analyse the function of the conversational implicature found in a famous American TV show, named *F.R.I.E.N.D.S*. The result concludes that out of the

ten analysed data; directive was the most used speech acts in that TV show. It also emphasizes that meaning is guided by the situational context and social relationships between characters (Cristina & Afriana, 2021).

Another study with pragmatic approach is *An Analysis of Humour Discourse in Friends from the Perspective of the Cooperative Principle*. This descriptive qualitative study uses the cooperative principle by Grice 1975 and 2002. It investigates fundamental characteristics that generate comedy in the sitcom *Friends* by analysing the dialogue of the main characters in the comedy. The findings of the research revealed that comedy achieved effects of humour by violating the maxims of the cooperative principle, i.e. quality, quantity, relation, and manner (Xu, 1975).

Similar findings emerge in *Stranger Things*, which identifies the dominance of generalized conversational implicatures and the reasons for their emergence are for teasing, refusing, hurting, apologizing, convincing, wishing, caring, showing arrogance, disappointment and anger, reminding, informing, guessing, and self-defending. Both of these groups of studies confirm that dramas or sitcoms are rich in implicatures and their effectiveness rests on the flouting of the Cooperative Principle, but have not yet examined their relationship to the values of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) especially goal 16 (Rachman & Heryono, 2022)

In the Indonesian context, the research that is closest in terms of object is *Tindak Tutur Direktif dalam Sinetron Preman Pensiun di RCTI*. The study aims to describe the types, functions, and effects of directive speech acts in the *Preman Pensiun* series on RCTI. Research on the *Preman Pensiun* series reveals various types of speech acts, including direct, indirect, literal, and non-literal forms. Directive speech acts serve multiple functions such as ordering, requesting, suggesting, forcing, inviting, and challenging. These speech acts produced both positive effects, such as happiness, relief, encouragement, and interest and negative effects, including fear, anger, and sadness (Fauzia et al., 2019). However, its focus stops at linguistic descriptions namely types and functions of language, without explicitly linking them to the SDGs framework, particularly SDG 16. Some other studies about *Preman Pensiun* do not have relation

dalam Sinetron Preman Pensiun the Series whose purpose is to reveal education on the ethics of life in the soap opera (Fuadi et al, 2023). Kusuma's study only focuses on identifying violation of maxims in the same series (Kusuma et al., 2023). Another study on *Preman Pensiun* emphasizes to determine how thugs are represented in three levels, namely the level of reality, the level of representation, and the level of ideology (Rohmah et al., 2020)

One of the implicature researches on Indonesian TV programs is *Implicatures in Political Discourse on Indonesia Lawyers Club Show*. This article aims at describing and explaining forms and kinds of implicature used in political discourse by using implicature theory from Grice (1975) and Gazdar (1979). It shows that implicature in *Indonesia Lawyers Club* appears through violations of the cooperative principle in declarative and negative forms, but not interrogatives. It includes conventional, generalized, particularized, and scalar implicatures. The meanings expressed involve criticism, teasing, obscurity, image projection, agreement, disagreement, and euphemism, while their pragmatic functions cover assertive, directive, expressive, and commissive acts. The values reflected are political and moral (Khairat, 2016). It captures the density of implicatures as rhetorical strategies, but leaves a gap in connecting them to a strong agenda of SDGs. Similar result is found in Mansyur's research on implicature that is analysis of the West Java 2018–2023 leader debate found common conversational implicatures: 62.16% conventional, 22.98% conversational, and 14.86% presuppositions. These include implicatures of ordering, rejecting, disliking, seducing, complaining, dodging, and insulting (Mansyur, 2019)

Theoretically, previous studies have been based on Grice's (1975) principles of cooperation and conversational implicature, as well as Searle's speech act theory, to describe illocutionary functions and indirect speech strategies. This foundation has been consistently used to classify dialogic data, but generally stops at the level of description or discourse function (humor, politeness, mitigation) without socio-development indicators. This research maintains the same theoretical foundation but expands it through the lens of SDG 16.

The previous studies have some similarities with this research. Both use a pragmatic framework of Gricean implicature and speech acts to analyze audiovisual dialogue; both emphasize the role of context and social relations in triggering implicatures; the methodology is generally qualitative-descriptive with category coding such as implicature types, maxims violation, implied meaning, and function. In other side, the object of this study is not only discourse functions but also *Preman Pensiun* series with an SDG 16 orientation. The intended contribution is interdisciplinary which is connecting linguistic analysis with popular media and social norms. The output plan is not only a linguistic taxonomy, but a mapping of how implicatures articulate the values of peace, justice, anti-violence, accountability, as well as potential indicators of changes in audience attitudes. The possibility of operationalizing the findings for example a matrix of scenes, implicature types, SDG 16 values, that has not been done by previous studies on similar objects.

The gaps and contributions of your research, therefore, lie in combining micro-analysis namely implicature strategies at the utterance with norm or attitude shifts that relevant to SDG 16. This study is sharpening the reading the script of *Preman Pensiun* as a social education medium, not just a TV series with implicatures, but a show that promotes peaceful and inclusive societies through implicatures. It is also proposing an analytical framework that can be replicated for other local series to support SDG literacy.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a descriptive qualitative design with a pragmatic approach. The focus of the research is to analyze the form and function of implicatures in the dialogues of the *Preman Pensiun* series, then relate them to SDG 16 indicators. This approach was chosen because it can uncover implicit meanings that are not conveyed directly by the speaker, but are interpreted through the context of the conversation.

The researchers use observation sheets and coding sheets, containing categories of implicature types (maxims violation of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner), implied meaning, and relevance to SDG 16 indicators to support objectivity.

Data are taken from dialogue containing implicatures in the *Preman Pensium* series, specifically Season 10, Episodes 1–3 as a representative sample, transcription dialogue from the *Preman Pensium* series, audiovisual recordings or episodes broadcast on streaming, and supporting documents such as literature on implicature, pragmatic studies, and official indicators for SDG 16 from the UN. The researchers use data only from *Preman Pensium* Season 10 Episodes 1–3 because the early part of the season presents the main conflict and character interactions that are rich in implicature, relevant to SDG 16 values, and dense with pragmatic data. The limited episode selection was also carried out to maintain research focus, data manageability, and methodological consistency through purposive sampling.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the *Preman Pensium* series Season 10, episodes 1 to 3 reveals how conversational implicatures within the dialogues reflect broader social, ethical, and governance issues that align with the principles of Sustainable Development Goal 16 (SDG 16) namely peace, justice, and strong institutions. By examining violations of Grice's maxims in 45 selected utterances, the study identifies 25 implicatures whose implied meanings are connected to critique toward corruption, highlight social injustices, and promote values of peace and inclusiveness. The sequence of data numbers 1 to 25 is arranged based on the order of broadcast on TV. Maxim of quantity and maxim of relevance are the most frequently violated. Across the 25 implicatures identified, there are four thematic alignments emerged according to their alignment with SDG 16 indicators of United Nations (1) Anti-Corruption: Indirect speech exposes bribery, extortion, and collusion in education, business, and governance, thereby satirizing and condemning practices that undermine fairness (2) Peace and Security: Indirect apologies, warnings, and conflict-avoidance strategies promote reconciliation, personal safety, and non-violence (3) Justice in Institutions: Dialogues highlight scepticism toward justice systems, the misuse of authority, and the need for trustworthy institutions, reinforcing accountability and the rule of law (4) Inclusiveness and Respect: Indirect speech reflects politeness, trust, avoidance of sensitive topics, and cooperative interaction, which all contribute to social harmony and inclusivity. The complete research findings are as follows:

ANTI-CORRUPTION

Table 1: Datum 1

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 1 00:22:27	Ableh: "Udah kamu urus sekolahnya?" Ook : "Lewat pintu belakang." Ableh: "Nggak bisa lewat pintu depan?" Ook : "Biar cepet."	Manner Relevance	Ook uses connections or bribery to get things done	Satire on illegal acts such as collusion to enroll schools

In the table above, Ook uses indirect language "*lewat pintu belakang*" instead of explicitly admitting bribery or collusion. It shows the maxim violation of manner because maxim of manner imposes two requirements namely the response should be clear, unambiguous, and presented in a well-organized fashion and the response should be accessible and use appropriate language tailored to the recipient's level of understanding (Miehling et al., 2024). Instead of giving a straightforward answer about formal procedures, Ook highlights shortcuts. It is also included to maxim violation of relevance because this maxim requires the response should directly and relevantly address the recipient's statements in helpful manner (Miehling et al., 2024). The implied meaning of the phrase "*lewat pintu belakang*" is a satirical metaphor for corruption, bribery, or collusion, common illegal practices to bypass official procedures. Ook implies that enrolling in school through official way is considered slow and difficult, so he opts for the unlawful shortcut.

It aligns with SDG 16, especially reducing corruption and bribery in all their forms. The conversation criticizes and exposes the practice of corruption in education, which undermines fairness and justice. By portraying bribery as the "easy way," the show indirectly satirizes how corruption damages institutions and denies equal access to opportunities. Through implicature, the dialogue raises awareness that such practices are unethical and counter to building peaceful, just, and strong institutions.

Table 2: Datum 11

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 2 00:39:42	Ook: “ <i>Saya tau kamu menghindar traktiran saya karena kamu tahu sumbernya saya pakai uang haram</i> ”. Ableh: “ <i>Saya masih mau jualan</i> ”.	Quantity Quality Relevance	It shows a preference for earning an honest living over benefiting from unethical sources.	Rejecting involvement with unethical financial sources promotes integrity and justice in economic and social life.

The dialogue shows that Ook accuses Ableh of refusing a treat because the money comes from an illegal source. Ableh responds indirectly, stating he still wants to do his job. There are three violations of maxim namely quantity, quality, and relevance. Grice stated that maxim of quality requires speakers to speak truthfully, avoid lies, and say things with evidence. Maxim of quantity needs speakers to give enough information, no more and no less than needed. While maxim of relevance requires speakers to speak relevantly to the topic being discussed (Arifianti, 2024). The dialogue violates maxim of quantity because Ableh gives less information than needed. He does not directly say *why* he avoids the treat. Maxim of quality is violated by Ableh’s statement that avoids confirming or denying the truth of Ook’s suspicion. Instead of addressing the accusation, Ableh shifts the topic to his desire to continue selling is identified as maxim violation of relevance.

Ableh’s answer implies a preference for earning an honest living over benefiting from unethical sources. It indicates that he refuses to be associated with illicit money. He values his own honest work as tissue seller rather than enjoying benefits from crime.

Rejecting involvement with unethical financial sources promotes integrity and justice in economic and social life. This directly links to SDG 16, which emphasizes peaceful and just societies with no tolerance for illicit activity, strong institutions by building on integrity and fairness, and rule of law and justice by rejecting practices that

undermine social trust. Ableh's choice reflects a micro-level example of integrity, which is essential for fostering justice and strong social institutions.

Table 3: Datum 17

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 3 00:17:35	Bima: " <i>Tugas sudah selesai, terus kita juga sudah memperluas wilayah, terus turun ke bawah</i> ". Bos: " <i>Bagus. Setoran!</i> ".	Quantity Manner	it implies that the main goal of expanding territory and completing the task was to generate income	It criticizes corruption, extortion, or organized crime practices that undermine peace, justice, and fair governance.

The utterance violates maxim of quantity when Bima gives more details about finishing tasks and expanding territory while the real focus is on money. It is also included in maxim violation of manner since Bima's utterance is not clear. The hidden purpose, income, is implied rather than stated openly. The conversation shows that the real aim of their actions, finishing tasks and expanding territory, is not public service, but generating income through unlawful ways. This dialogue critiques corrupt practices such as extortion and organized crime, which directly weaken peace, justice, and good governance. By exposing and rejecting such behaviour, it reflects the values of SDG 16 such as promoting peaceful and just societies, fighting against corruption and crime, and supporting fair institutions and rule of law. This implicature reflects corruption and extortion, which are opposite to SDG 16 values, thus the data serves to promote integrity and justice by showing their negative impact.

Table 4: Datum 25

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 3 00:49:31	Gagah: " <i>Ini bukan tempat jualan, makanya harus ada uang keamanan</i> ".	Relevance Manner	It hints at issues like unfair business practices or exploitation.	It criticizes problems related to lack of rule of law, corruption, and insecurity in economic activities like informal fees and extortion

In this dialogue, Gagah's statement "*Ini bukan tempat jualan, makanya harus ada uang keamanan*" demonstrates a violation of both the maxim of relevance and the

Gagah diverts the conversation by imposing the idea of *uang keamanan* which is irrelevant to the initial context and creates ambiguity about its true meaning. The term *uang keamanan* functions as an implicature that masks the act of extortion under the guise of providing protection, thereby implying unfair business practices and exploitation. The implied meaning is that economic activities are subjected to coercion and informal payments, which reflects deeper issues of corruption, abuse of power, and lack of legal protection for small businesses. From the perspective of SDG 16, this utterance is significant because it illustrates the harmful consequences of weak rule of law and corrupt practices that threaten justice and social stability. By depicting this problem, the dialogue indirectly criticizes the culture of extortion and underscores the need for accountable, transparent institutions that protect people's rights and ensure a fair economic environment.

PEACE AND SECURITY

Table 5: Datum 3

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 2 00:13:53	Iding: "Maafin bapak" Istri: " <i>Udah ngga usah dibahas lagi</i> ".	Quantity Manner	It conveys reconciliation and the desire to maintain harmony.	peaceful conflict resolution and emotional reconciliation

In this excerpt, Iding's apology "*Maafin bapak*" followed by his wife's response "*Udah ngga usah dibahas lagi*" reflects a violation of the maxims of quantity and manner. The wife does not provide detailed information about whether she fully accepts the apology, and her response is expressed briefly and somewhat vaguely, leaving the exact resolution unstated. However, the implicature that emerges is a willingness to end the conflict and move forward without prolonging the issue, which conveys reconciliation and a desire to maintain harmony in the relationship. This interaction illustrates how indirect communication can function as a strategy to preserve peace and emotional balance within a family setting. In relation to SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions), the exchange highlights the value of peaceful conflict resolution and emotional reconciliation, showing that fostering understanding and forgiveness at the interpersonal level contributes to building a culture of peace and non-violence, which is a core component of SDG 16's goals

maxim of manner. Instead of directly addressing the issue of selling in the location,

Table 6: Datum 4

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 2 00:15:36	Iding: " <i>Bagaimana kabar istri kamu?</i> " Jack: " <i>Udah saya suruh kabur</i> "	Relevance, Quantity Manner	Jack's wife might be in danger, so he told her to leave quickly as a protection from conflict.	promoting safety and security

In this dialogue, Iding's question "*Bagaimana kabar istri kamu?*" is met with Jack's unexpected answer "*Udah saya suruh kabur*", which violates the maxims of relevance, quantity, and manner. Instead of directly providing information about his wife's current condition, Jack shifts the focus to an action he has taken, which makes the response less relevant to the original question. The utterance also lacks sufficient detail which violates maxim of quantity and is expressed in a vague way that violates maxim of manner, leaving the listener to infer the real situation. The implied meaning is that Jack's wife is in potential danger, and by telling her to run away, he is attempting to protect her from harm or conflict. This implicature highlights the urgency of ensuring personal safety in a threatening environment. In relation to SDG 16, the exchange embodies the value of promoting safety and security, as it underscores the importance of protecting individuals from violence and instability. Such protection does not only preserve personal well-being but also reflect broader societal efforts to reduce violence and build peaceful and secure communities.

Table 7: Datum 14

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 3 00:04:10	Kang Murad: " <i>Bubun sudah keluar dari terminal, jangan sampai nanti dia balik lagi</i> "	Quality Manner	It implies a proactive effort to avoid potential conflict on Bubun	It focuses on conflict prevention and maintaining stability in a community

In this excerpt, Kang Murad's statement "*Bubun sudah keluar dari terminal, jangan sampai nanti dia balik lagi*" demonstrates a violation of the maxim of quality and the maxim of manner. The maxim of quality is violated because Kang Murad does not provide clear evidence of why Bubun must be kept away, leaving the listener to

the utterance is indirect and somewhat ambiguous, avoiding an explicit explanation of what might happen if Bubun returns. The implied meaning, however, is clear: Kang Murad is urging others to take preventive action to stop Bubun from reappearing at the terminal in order to avoid possible disputes or violence. This implicature highlights a proactive approach to conflict prevention and community stability, which directly aligns with the values of SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions). By discouraging actions that could escalate into conflict, the utterance reflects the principle of fostering peace and non-violence within communities. In this way, the dialogue not only reveals the characters' concern for order but also symbolically promotes SDG 16's mission to build peaceful and inclusive societies through conflict prevention and stability maintenance.

Table 8: Datum 15

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 3 00:08:45	Pickpocket 1: " <i>Jackpot ngga?</i> ". Pickpocket 2: " <i>Cuma dapat HP</i> ".	Relevance Quantity	It implies disappointment because the theft did not yield as much value as expected	It serves as a subtle critique of crime and justice systems to reduce crime rates.

The dialogue between two pickpockets reflects Grice's conversational maxims which pragmatically violates two conversational maxims specifically relevance and quantity. It violates relevance because instead of directly answering "yes" or "no" to the jackpot question, the speaker shifts the response to describe the stolen item. It also violates quantity because the answer provides limited information; while it states what was stolen, it does not fully explain whether it was valuable, sufficient, or worth the risk. The implied meaning behind this conversation is disappointment. The term "jackpot" suggests an expectation of a big gain, but the response "only got a phone" implies that the theft did not live up to that expectation. From a pragmatic perspective, this implicature portrays the uselessness of criminal behaviour, suggesting that crime often fails to bring real benefits.

In connection to SDG 16, this utterance serves as a subtle critique of crime and highlights the importance of reducing criminal activities. By showing criminals expressing disappointment, the narrative dissuades viewers from seeing theft as rewarding action. Instead, it frames crime as unprofitable and ultimately pointless, thus

infringing the values of SDG 16 potentially by reducing violence, strengthening justice, and supporting a safer society. The scene implicitly reinforces the need for strong institutions and legal systems that discourage theft while also cultivating public awareness about the consequences of unlawful acts.

Table 9: Datum 16

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 3 00:09:03	Pickpocket 1: <i>"Anak sekolah sekarang memang suka bawa HP, makanya saya nggak cari dompetnya."</i>	Relevance Quantity	It implies that targeting students for their mobile phones is more profitable than stealing wallets	Highlighting this behaviour can raise awareness for stronger protection, law enforcement, and community vigilance to prevent crimes against youth.

In the utterance, Pickpocket 1 remarks that, nowadays, students usually carry mobile phones, so he did not look for their wallets. Pragmatically, this utterance constitutes a violation of both the maxim of relevance and the maxim of quantity. It violates relevance because rather than directly addressing the immediate context of the theft, the speaker digresses into a general observation about students' habits. It also violates quantity since the speaker provides more information than necessary by explaining the rationale behind the choice of target, thereby revealing a broader strategy of theft. The implied meaning of this utterance is that students are perceived as more profitable targets because they are more likely to carry mobile phones than wallets. This implication exposes a calculated approach in criminal behaviour, where offenders rationalize their actions by prioritizing high-value and easily disposable items. Such implicature does not only convey the opportunistic mindset of the pickpocket but also underscores the vulnerability of youth to theft due to their possession of personal technology.

This scene plays a critical role in raising awareness of crimes directed at young people. By presenting students as specific targets, the narrative highlights the urgent need for stronger protective measures, effective law enforcement, and active community vigilance. Consequently, the dialogue does not merely portray a crime but serves as a social commentary that aligns with SDG 16's goals of reducing violence, strengthening justice, and ensuring safe environments for all, particularly vulnerable groups such as students.

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 3 00:19:09	<i>Otang: "Berarti, kamu harus selalu waspada dan siap melarikan diri kalau ada marabahaya".</i>	Quantity Relevance	It implies that the person's situation is unsafe, and danger could arise suddenly,	It indirectly supports the need for a secure, peaceful environment where people don't have to live in fear.

In the utterance, Otang says to Yayat and Agus as coffee sellers that they must always be alert and ready to escape if danger arises. The danger means a condition when some thugs come to them to collect security fees. This utterance violates the maxims of quantity and relevance. It violates quantity because Otang provides more information than what is required, extending beyond the immediate context with a general warning. It also violates relevance since the advice shifts the conversation toward broader implications about constant vigilance rather than staying directly on topic. The implied meaning is that the person addressed is in an unsafe situation where danger may occur at any time, thus requiring them to be continuously careful. From the perspective of SDG 16, this utterance reflects the necessity of creating a secure and peaceful environment in which individuals do not have to live under the threat of sudden harm. By portraying the need for constant alertness as a burden, the dialogue emphasizes the importance of strengthening justice and societal protection to ensure safety and peace for all.

Table 11: Datum 19

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 3 00:20:44	<i>Ook: "Kalo kamu engga punya HP gimana?" Isabela: "Engga bisa update status". Ook: " Bukan kamu engga bisa update status, itu ngga penting, yang penting itu bapak harus tahu kamu dimana, sama siapa, lagi apa".</i>	Quantity Relevance	It shows that phones are mainly for safety, communication, and accountability, not social media or status.	It emphasizes protection, safety, and responsible monitoring of children

The dialogue between Ook and Isabela illustrates a violation of the maxims of quantity and relevance. When Ook asks what if his daughter does not have a phone. Isabela responds that she cannot update her status, which provides less relevant information and reflects a superficial view of the phone's function. The information provided by Isabela is less informative than what is required in response to Ook's

question. Ook then corrects her by emphasizing that the real importance of having a phone is not social media updates but ensuring that parents know their child's whereabouts, companions, and activities. The implied meaning here is that mobile phones serve primarily for safety, communication, and accountability, rather than for maintaining social status. In terms of SDG 16, this utterance promotes the value of protection and responsible monitoring of children, reinforcing the importance of communication tools in ensuring security, trust, and accountability within families and communities.

Table 12: Datum 20

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 3 00:24:36	Iding: " <i>Saya mau balik lagi ke jalur angkot</i> " Udan: " <i>Bukannya mau perang?</i> " Iding: " <i>Ngga, saya cuma mau nanya aja</i> ".	Quantity Relevance	It also suggests he wants to avoid the potential conflict that Udan hinted at with the word " <i>perang</i> ".	It aligns with promoting peaceful interactions and reducing the risk of conflict in the community.

Violations of the maxims of quantity and relevance is illustrated in the conversation between Iding and Udan. When Iding says, "*Saya mau balik lagi ke jalur angkot*", Udan responds, "*Bukannya mau perang?*", which introduces an irrelevant assumption that does not directly relate to Iding's statement, thus violating relevance. Iding's reply, "*Ngga, saya cuma mau nanya aja*", provides minimal clarification and lacks further detail, which violates the maxim of quantity by giving less information than expected. The implied meaning of this exchange is that Iding does not want to engage in conflict, but instead wishes to avoid it, suggesting his preference for maintaining peace over confrontation. This dialogue reflects the value of promoting peaceful interactions and preventing unnecessary disputes within the community, reinforcing the importance of dialogue and restraint in sustaining social harmony as the viewpoint of SDG 16.

Table 13: Datum 21

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 3 00:24:48	Didan: " <i>Ada perang lagi?</i> " Jack: " <i>Belum tahu, nunggu perintah Otang.</i> "	Quantity Relevance	It shows that decisions are not made individually but depend on a leader's command.	This shows choosing leadership and order over impulsive violence, which helps maintain peace and stability.

Jack. When Didan asks, “*Ada perang lagi?*” and Jack replies, “*Belum tahu, nunggu perintah Otang*”. This response violates the maxim of quantity because Jack provides less information than expected, giving only a partial answer without clarifying the actual situation. It also violates the maxim of relevance, as the reply shifts the focus from whether a fight is happening to the idea of awaiting instructions from a leader. The implied meaning of this utterance is that decisions about conflict are not made impulsively by individuals but instead rely on the authority and command of a leader. This reflects a preference for order and leadership over uncontrolled violence. With regard to SDG 16, the dialogue emphasizes how organized decision-making and reliance on leadership can restrain impulsive behavior, that can foster peace and maintain stability in the community.

Table 14: Datum 23

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 3 00:32:16	Nani: “ <i>Mimi harus kabur terus sampai kapan?</i> ” Jack: <i>Sampai mereka bosan</i> Nani: <i>Kalo mimi bosan duluan?</i> Jack: “ <i>Tahan</i> ”.	Quantity Relevance	It implies that perseverance and patience are essential for survival in risky circumstances.	It indirectly supports the idea that until justice and safety are secured, individuals sometimes need to take protective actions.

The conversation between Nani and Jack illustrates violations of the maxims of quantity and relevance. When Nani asks, “*Mimi harus kabur terus sampai kapan?*”, Jack responds, “*Sampai mereka bosan*”, which provides an indirect and insufficient answer, thus violating quantity by not offering a clear timeframe or solution. When Nani follows up with, “*Kalo Mimi bosan duluan?*”, Jack simply says, “*Tahan*”, which offers minimal information and diverts from directly addressing the concern, violating relevance. The implied meaning is that in dangerous situations, endurance and patience are necessary for survival, even when there is no immediate resolution in sight. This dialogue indirectly aligns with SDG 16 by highlighting the reality that until justice and safety are fully achieved, individuals may need to take protective measures and remain resilient in the face of risk, emphasizing the importance of creating secure environments where such measures are no longer necessary.

JUSTICE IN INSTITUTIONS

Maxims of Quantity and Relevance are violated in the dialogue between Didan and

Table 15: Datum 2

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 value
Ep. 1 00:23:59	Bubun: <i>"Kita diem diem lagi krisis, cuma beritanya kalah kenceng sama kasus politik dan kasus korupsi"</i>	Quality Manner Relevance	Important social or economic problems are overshadowed by sensational political news	It criticizes irresponsible governance and media environment

When Bubun says, *"Kita diem diem lagi krisis, cuma beritanya kalah kenceng sama kasus politik dan kasus korupsi"*, those words break several of Grice's maxims. It breaks maxim of quality because they carry an implicit critique rather than a factual statement. It also violates maxim of manner because they are expressed in a figurative and somewhat unclear way. Instead of focusing on the crisis itself, Bubun shifts the attention to how the media highlights politics and corruption more loudly and it violates relevance maxim. What he really implies is that serious social and economic issues are being ignored and drowned out by sensational political stories. This is not just a comment on the media, but also a critique of governance that fails to prioritize what truly matters for the public. Linked to SDG 16, the dialogue reminds viewers of the need for transparent leadership and responsible media that put people's interests first, so society can be better informed and institutions can function more effectively.

Table 16: Datum 8

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG Values
Ep. 2 00:24:36	Bi Yayah: <i>"yang bikin saya heran, dia enggak mau lapor polisi"</i> Otang: <i>"Apa katanya?"</i> Bi Yayah: <i>"Percuma"</i> .	Relevance, Quantity Manner	It reflects scepticism about the effectiveness of the justice system	It suggests that justice systems must be accessible, reliable, and trusted by the public

The dialogue between Bi Yayah and Otang demonstrates violations of the maxims of relevance, quantity, and manner. Bi Yayah responds to Otang by saying, *"Percuma"*, which violates quantity because the answer is too brief and lacks sufficient explanation, relevance because it does not fully connect to the expectation of a more detailed justification, and manner because the response is vague and ambiguous. The implied meaning is a deep sense of scepticism toward the effectiveness of the justice system, suggesting that reporting to the police would not bring meaningful results. This reflects a critical view of legal institutions and highlights the importance of building trust in

justice systems that are accessible, reliable, and trusted by the community, reinforcing the goal of ensuring fairness and accountability in upholding the rule of law.

Table 17: Datum 9

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 2 00:38:06	Bos: <i>"Bos besar ngasih perintah agar kita memperluas wilayah kita"</i> .	Quantity Manner Quality	This suggests an organized power structure and possibly forceful means of gaining impact.	It highlights issues of peace, security, and rule of law.

The statement of *Bos* violates the maxims of quantity, manner, and quality. It violates quantity because the utterance gives only partial information without explaining how or why the expansion will occur. It violates manner since it is vague and leaves the method of expansion unclear, which could imply secrecy or hidden strategies. Finally, it violates quality because the statement assumes the legitimacy of the order without providing justification, raising doubts about its truthfulness. The implied meaning is that there exists an organized hierarchy where decisions come from a higher authority and are expected to be followed, potentially through forceful means. This dialogue reflects challenges to peace and security by illustrating how power structures can perpetuate control and conflict. It highlights the importance of strengthening the rule of law and building institutions that discourage domination through force, instead promoting justice, accountability, and peaceful coexistence as the goal of SDG 16.

Table 18: Datum 10

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 2 00:38:06	Agus: <i>"Mungkin karena sudah aman"</i> . Perkasa: <i>"Ngga ada daerah yang benar benar aman"</i> .	Quantity Quality Relevance	No place can be considered completely safe	It criticizes that achieving peace requires continuous effort, vigilance, and strong institutions to maintain community safety.

In this dialogue, both Agus and Perkasa's statements contain violations of Grice's maxims. Agus's utterance *"Mungkin karena sudah aman"* violates the maxim of quantity because it is too brief and lacks sufficient detail to explain why a place is considered safe, leaving the information incomplete for the context. It also violates the maxim of quality since his use of *"mungkin"* shows uncertainty and suggests that his

statement is not fully reliable. On SDG 16, Berka's response, "Negoraka itu enak, dia benar benar aman" shifts the focus from the specific situation to a generalization, which makes it less directly relevant to Agus's point, thus violating the maxim of relevance. These violations together imply scepticism about the idea of absolute safety, highlighting that security is never guaranteed and must always be maintained through continuous vigilance and strong institutions. The implied meaning is that danger and risk can arise anywhere, and no community can be considered entirely secure. From the perspective of SDG 16, this dialogue serves as a critique and reminder that peace and security cannot be taken for granted. They require ongoing effort, vigilance, and the presence of strong, reliable institutions to ensure community safety and protect people from potential threats.

Table 19: Datum 12

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 2 00:40:52	Yayat : <i>"Kita kasih uang?"</i> Agus: <i>"Kita sudah di sini sebelum mereka"</i> .	Quantity Relevance	It's a refusal to submit to intimidation based on legitimacy.	By standing against unlawful control, it promotes justice and fairness,

Agus's response violates quantity because it does not directly answer the "yes" or "no" question, instead offering limited information that requires interpretation. It also violates relevance, since the reply shifts the focus from the act of giving money to asserting legitimacy through prior presence. The implied meaning is a refusal to yield to intimidation, as Agus suggests that their prior occupation of the space gives them rightful authority, making payment unnecessary. In the context of SDG 16, this dialogue reflects opposition to illegitimate authority and unjust pressure, emphasizing the values of justice, equity, and integrity while rejecting practices of corruption or extortion, thus contributing to the development of stronger and more accountable institutions.

INCLUSIVENESS AND RESPECT

Table 20: Datum 5

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 2 00:15:45	Iding: <i>"Kabur kemana?"</i> Jack: <i>"Dia lebih tahu"</i>	Relevance Quantity Manner	It suggests respect for her privacy or an unwillingness to get involved further.	It emphasizes non-interference and trust in another person's decisions.

Jack's response violates the maxims of relevance, quantity, and manner. It violates relevance because Jack does not directly answer the question, Quantity maxim breaks because he provides less information than expected, and manner violation is caused by the statement which is vague and indirect. The implied meaning is that Jack either wants to respect the individual's privacy or chooses not to be further involved in the matter. In relation to SDG 16, this dialogue reflects the value of non-interference, trust, and respect for personal choices, highlighting the importance of allowing individuals autonomy in their decisions while avoiding unnecessary conflict.

Table 21: Datum 6

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 2 00:17:16	Bi Yayah: " <i>Saya ada bisnis</i> ". Didan: " <i>Bisnis apa?</i> " Bi Yayah: " <i>Sementara rahasia, sampai Otang bilang iya</i> ".	Relevance, Quantity Manner	It implies caution, confidentiality, and the importance of securing agreement before sharing information	It reflects ethical conduct, respect for agreements, and trust-building in professional relationships.

When Bi Yayah replies, "*Sementara rahasia, sampai Otang bilang iya*" , it violates the maxims of relevance, quantity, and manner. It violates relevance because her answer does not directly address the question, quantity because she withholds the expected details, and manner because she leaves the response intentionally vague. The implied meaning is that Bi Yayah is exercising caution, emphasizing the need for confidentiality and waiting for Otang's approval before disclosing sensitive information. In terms of SDG 16, this reflects ethical conduct, respect for agreements, and the role of trust in professional or community relationships, which are crucial for fostering accountability and responsible decision-making.

Table 22: Datum 7

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 2 00:18:04	Iding: " <i>good morning brother</i> " Otang: " <i>Pagi</i> ".	Relevance, Quantity Manner	It reflects familiarity and a relaxed relationship	Greeting helps maintain peaceful and respectful interpersonal interactions

In this dialogue, Iding greets Otang in English to which Otang simply replies in Indonesian. This short dialogue violates the maxims of relevance, quantity, and manner. It violates relevance because Otang's reply is minimal and does not fully match the warmth of Iding's greeting, quantity because he provides less information than expected

in a social exchange and Kang Murad as the response which directly responds to 'Somewhat value'. The implied meaning is that despite the minimal response, there is familiarity and ease in their relationship, showing comfort in not needing elaborate exchanges. In relation to SDG 16, this moment highlights the role of greetings as a simple yet powerful way to maintain peaceful, respectful, and cooperative interactions, which contribute to social harmony and trust within the community.

Table 23: Datum 13

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 2 00:48:48	Kang Murad: "Kita mulai". Cecep: "Kang Murad duluan".	Relevance Manner	Cecep is deferring to Kang Murad out of respect, politeness, or acknowledgment of his seniority	it demonstrates mutual respect and cooperative social interaction

At first glance, it seems like a simple moment, but it actually reflects a deeper meaning. Instead of moving directly to the task, Cecep's response shifts the focus back to Kang Murad, which makes it a violation of the maxim of relevance, while the indirectness of his words makes it a violation of the maxim of manner. Beyond the technical side, what Cecep is really doing is showing respect, deference, and recognition of Kang Murad's seniority by letting him take the lead. Connected to SDG 16, this interaction illustrates how small acts of politeness and mutual respect can play an important role in building harmony, cooperation, and trust within communities as values that are essential for maintaining peace and strengthening social bonds.

Table 24: Datum 22

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 3 00:28:52	Ableh: "Sumpah kamu mau dilanggar?" Ook: "Kita ngomongin yang lain aja Bleh, misalnya liburan di rumah nenek."	Quantity Relevance	This implies avoidance to a sensitive or morally wrong topic	It models conflict avoidance, ethical awareness, and preservation of trust that foster peaceful and accountable interactions

Ableh asks Ook a serious question in this dialogue. Rather than answering directly, Ook changes the subject, saying, "Kita ngomongin yang lain aja Bleh, misalnya liburan di rumah nenek". This shift violates the maxims of quantity and relevance because Ook neither provides a proper answer nor stays on topic. Instead, his response suggests an intentional move to avoid a sensitive or morally troubling issue, showing discomfort and perhaps a refusal to engage in wrongdoing. Linked to SDG 16, this moment highlights the importance of avoiding unnecessary conflict, practicing ethical awareness and maintaining trust in

communication. By steering the conversation away from a problematic matter, the exchange demonstrates how respect, caution, and a focus on peace can help build stronger and more harmonious relationships.

Table 25: Datum 24

Episode Time	Utterance	Maxim Violated	Implied Meaning	SDG 16 Value
Ep. 3 00:34:11	Jack: “Masak udah ngasih tumpangan, masih nunggu juga?”	Quantity Manner	It suggests a sense of generosity being taken for granted	It promotes the value of cooperation and reducing social tensions, aligning with peaceful and inclusive societies

Instead of speaking directly, Jack uses an implied criticism, which violates the Maxims of quantity and manner because his point is left unsaid and open to interpretation. His words suggest that he feels his kindness is being taken for granted, pointing to a lack of mutual respect. Connected to SDG 16, this exchange emphasizes the value of cooperation, fairness, and gratitude in relationships.

CONCLUSIONS

This study finds that the use of conversational implicature in *Preman Pensium* Season 10 episodes 1–3 goes far beyond a stylistic feature of dialogue. It acts as a communication strategy that reflects, critiques, and promotes key social values tied to Sustainable Development Goal 16 (SDG 16) namely peace, justice, and strong institutions. From the 45 implicatures analyzed, containing 25 related to SDG 16 implicatures, it becomes clear that the characters’ indirect ways of speaking carry deeper meanings about corruption, justice, peace, and inclusiveness.

The findings show that implicatures in the series strongly connect with four main themes of SDG 16. First, Anti-Corruption (4 data), where indirect remarks criticize bribery, collusion, and abuse of power in daily life, exposing how such practices threaten fairness and accountability. Second, Peace and Security (10 data), where strategies like apologies, warnings, or evasions are used to prevent conflict, protect others, or encourage reconciliation. Third, Justice in Institutions (5 data), where characters question law enforcement, point out abuse of authority, and emphasize the importance of trustworthy institutions. Finally, Inclusiveness and Respect (6 data), where politeness, indirect refusals, and sensitivity to others’ feelings highlight the value of maintaining harmony and mutual respect in social interaction.

From a pragmatic lens, this study confirms that indirect communication can often be more effective than direct commands in preserving social harmony. By bending conversational rules, characters are able to soften criticism, resist unethical behaviour, or guide conversations toward peaceful solutions rather than conflict. This reflects the cultural importance of harmony in Indonesian society, while also supporting broader values of integrity, justice, and peace. In this sense, implicature emerges as a subtle yet powerful tool for promoting SDG 16 through everyday conversations.

In the end, this research shows that popular media can play a meaningful role in shaping social awareness. The dialogues in *Preman Pensiun*, though often casual or humorous, carry hidden lessons about corruption, justice, peace, and inclusivity. By weaving these values into indirect expressions, the series does not only entertain its audience but also encourage reflection on the importance of peace, justice, and strong institutions. Pragmatic analysis thus reveals how language in cultural texts can contribute to advancing global development goals.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research is supported by *Direktorat Jenderal Riset dan Pengembangan, Kementerian Pendidikan Tinggi, Sains dan Teknologi*, and *Universitas Duta Bangsa Surakarta* with main contract number 127/C3/DT.05.00/PL/2025 and derivative contract number 043/LL6/PL/AL.04/2025, 038/UDB.LPPM/A.34-HK/V/2025. The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial and instructional support provided those institutions, which made this study possible.

REFERENCES

- Arifianti, I. & K. (2024). INTERPRETASI PRAGMATIK MELALUI IMPLIKATUR KONVENSIONAL DAN NONKONVENSIONAL DALAM DEBAT CAPRES INDONESIA 2024. *Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 13(15 Desember 2024), 268–281. <https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v13i2.7814>
- Cristina, V., & Afriana, A. (2021). Functions of Conversational Implicature in Tv Show “F.R.I.E.N.D.S”: Pragmatics Approach. *Jurnal Basis*, 8(1), 75–84. <https://doi.org/10.33884/basisupb.v8i1.2935>
- Fauzia, V. S., Haryadi, H., & Sulistyaningrum, S. (2019). Tindak Tutur Direktif Dalam Sinetron Preman Pensiun Di Rcti. *Jurnal Sastra Indonesia*, 8(1), 33–39. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jsi.v8i1.29855>
- Fuadi, S. ., & Syam, R. S. . (2023). Pendidikan Etika Hidup Dalam Sinetron “Preman Pensiun the Series.” *Jurnal Pendidikan, Bahasa Dan Budaya*, 2(1), 212–221. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jpbb.v2i1.1159>
- Ghawaidi, S. H., & Alsmari, N. A. (2025). The Art of the Unsaid: Analyzing the Use of Conversational Implicature in Political Communication. *World Journal of English Language*, 15(4), 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n4p49>
- Khairat, M. E. L. (2016). *Implicatures in Political Discourse on Indonesia Lawyers Club*. 5(1).
- Kusuma, Y. H., Fari, A., & Yunus, M. (2023). *PELANGGARAN PRINSIP KERJA SAMA DALAM SINETRON PREMAN PENSIUN* 6. 445–452.
- Mansyur, M. (2019). Implikatur dan Praanggapan pada Program Debat Terbuka Pasangan Pemimpin Jawa Barat Periode 2018-2023 dengan Tajuk “Debat Publik Kedua Cagub Jawa Barat” (Suatu Kajian Pragmatik). *Diskursus: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia*, 2(01), 49. <https://doi.org/10.30998/diskursus.v2i01.6662>
- Masduki, & D’Haenens, L. (2022). Concentration of Media Ownership in Indonesia: A Setback for Viewpoint Diversity. *International Journal of Communication*, 16, 2239–2259.
- Miehling, E., Nagireddy, M., Sattigeri, P., Daly, E. M., Piorkowski, D., & Richards, J. T. (2024). Language Models in Dialogue: Conversational Maxims for Human-AI Interactions. *EMNLP 2024 - 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Findings of EMNLP 2024*, 2, 14420–14437. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.843>
- Nkurunziza, B., Ngoboka, J. P., & Habyarimana, H. (2024). A Pragmatic Analysis of Conversational Implicatures in English Drama and their Role in Teaching Critical Literacy. *African Journal of Empirical Research*, 5(3), 34–46. <https://doi.org/10.51867/ajernet.5.3.4>

- Omar, F. R., & Razi, Ö. (2022). Impact of instruction based on movie and TV series clips on EFL learners' pragmatic competence: Speech acts in focus. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(October), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.974757>
- Qathrunnada, Z., Nugroho, C., Yusanto, F., Wulandari, A., & Wulan, R. R. (2025). Ideology, resistance, and sociopolitical dynamics in Indonesia: media narratives and resistance discourses on the chairman of the corruption eradication commission's corruption case. *Frontiers in Communication*, 10(February), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2025.1552110>
- Rachman, Z. R., & Heryono, H. (2022). Conversational Implicatures in "Stranger Things Season 1 Episode 1" Movie Series: Pragmatics Study. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal*, 5(3), 18883–18889. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i3.5887>
- Rohmah, H. Y., Sjuchro, D. W., & Abdullah, A. (2020). Representasi preman dalam sinetron Preman Pensiun. *ProTVF*, 4(2), 206. <https://doi.org/10.24198/ptvf.v4i2.22880>
- Saed, H., Haider, A. S., Albarakati, M., Tair, S. A., & Alqatawna, M. (2025). Translating conversational implicatures in English movies and series into Arabic: can floutings be captured? *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-04187-8>
- Sorlin, S. (2024). TV Series and Research in Pragmatics: From the Discipline to the Object and Back: Humans (Channel 4, 2015–2018) as Case Study. *TV/Series*, 22(January), 2015–2018. <https://doi.org/10.4000/tvseries.7449>
- Su, R., & Zhang, Y. (2025). Conversational implicature: a diachronic cognitive pragmatic approach. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05248-2>
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2025). The Sustainable Development Goals Report. *United Nations*. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2025/The-Sustainable-Development-Goals-Report-2025.pdf>
- Walsh, J. P., Baker, V., & Frade, B. (2024). Policing and social media: The framing of technological use by Canadian newspapers (2005–2020). *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 24(4), 819–840. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958221114254>
- Xu, G. (1975). An Analysis of Humor Discourse in Friends from the Perspective of the Cooperative Principle. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 12, 460–470. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2022.124033>
- Yulianti, S., Arafah, B., Rofikah, U., Idris, A. M. S., Samsur, N., & Arafah, A. N. B. (2022). Conversational Implicatures on Saturday Night Live Talk Show. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(1), 189–197. <https://doi.org/10.17507/JLTR.1301.22>



**"Innovating Knowledge through Language and Culture:
Interdisciplinary Pathways for Global Understanding"**