

## Appraising Voices on *Quora*: Engagement Realizations in Discussions of the *Sandwich* Generation Phenomenon

**Marwito Wihadi**

*marwito.wihadi@uniku.ac.id*

English Education Department, Universitas Kuningan, INDONESIA

**Fahrus Zaman Fadhly**

*fahruszf@uniku.ac.id*

English Education Department, Universitas Kuningan, INDONESIA

**Aulia Apriliani**

*auliaapr2@gmail.com*

English Education Department, Universitas Kuningan, INDONESIA

### Abstract

*Engagement is now widely found on social media such as Quora, which contains various user perspectives on social issues. However, studies on the application of Engagement in discussions about the sandwich generation on Quora are still limited. The term sandwich generation is widely discussed nowadays. It is a condition where a child who has worked must become the breadwinner of the family where all of his/her income is given to meet household needs. This research examined the Engagement used by Quora users concerning the sandwich generation phenomenon. This research aimed to determine sub-categories of Engagement and analyze their functions used by 100 Quora users. Qualitative method used for this research with used discourse analysis approach and document analysis as research instrument. The result showed that there were 769 clauses containing the sub-categories of Engagement. The functions of Engagement sub-categories included monogloss to express a direct statement, deny to refute a statement directly, counter to oppose a statement by providing another statement, concur to show agreement, pronounce to give a strong statement, endorse to support viewpoint, entertain to open up discussion, acknowledge to refer to the external source, and distance to give distance with other viewpoints. Sandwich generation users tended to reject viewpoints related to this phenomenon, while non-sandwich generation users tended to open discussion spaces related to differences of viewpoints with other users.*

### Article information

Received:  
November 19  
2025

Revised:  
December 5  
2025

Accepted:  
December 9  
2025

**Keywords:** Appraisal; Engagement; Quora; Systemic Functional Linguistics

---

## Introduction

The field of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) examines how language functions in social contexts (Alwasilah & Gunawan, 2023). Fadzila (2021) clarified in her research that Michael Alexander Kirkwood started SFL. A linguistics method called Halliday seeks to comprehend how a text constructs its meaning within a context. It can be concluded that SFL is a branch of linguistics about a text, both written and spoken text, which forms its meaning in a context, especially in a social context. Halliday (1994) in his lexicogrammar analysis quoted on the journal Hidayah, Wihadi, & Rahmatunisa (2023), created a theory of the basic purposes of language by classifying the three primary meta-functions, including textual, interpersonal, and ideational. One part of metafunction is interpersonal metafunction which focuses on social relationships and has a development known as Appraisal theory.

Referring to Mohammed (2024), Appraisal theory (Martin & White, 2005) emphasizes the emotional content of text and voice also images, when applicable, to develop the meaning that the author or speaker intends as well as the meaning that the audience interprets. Appraisal theory is divided into three categories, each of which has its function. As determined by Alwohaibi & Alyousef (2023), the Appraisal framework is made up of three interrelated domains: Graduation, Engagement, and Attitude. The Attitude domain is concerned with how language users convey their feelings, assessments, and viewpoints toward objects, people, and actions. The Engagement domain, which is the subject of this research, includes the writer's or speaker's connection with the discourse, text, or circumstance under evaluation. The Graduation domain focuses on the level of certainty that the writer or speaker has in their appraisal as well as the evaluation itself, including the level of certainty or uncertainty.

Engagement is a domain of Appraisal theory that relates to the position of the writer or speaker regarding their point of view on a matter where the main focus lies on the writer or speaker on their attitude and the second focus lies on the writer or speaker with the reader. The Engagement system explains

linguistic elements that reveal the speaker's position or posture within the text as well as how the speaker affects the readers of the text (Haq, Rahyono, & Yuwono, 2021). Through the writing or speech in the text, the writer or speaker can get the reader to be in the same circle or agree with his/her opinion on the topic or issue being discussed.

In the current era, there are many media that we can use to find texts that contain someone's opinion, one of which is through social media. One of the social media that provides an opportunity for users to provide responses and opinions on an issue or topic discussed is Quora. One social networking site that lets users follow one another and create social networks is Quora, which has a question-and-answer format (Sarjani, 2023). The concept of the Quora website is that users can ask questions to get information about an issue or topic, and other users can give opinions or responses about it. Thus, the user can give his/her opinion on a topic or issue that is being discussed and put the reader in the same circle with him/her, and giving rise to the Engagement used.

There are some previous studies which discussed Engagement under the umbrella of Appraisal theory in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), including, Nguyen & Nguyen (2024); Sari & Alyousef (2024); Cao (2023); Hemmati & Validi (2023); Yue & Yi (2023); Alwohaibi & Alyousef (2023); Yonata & Prastikawati (2022); Fengjing & Le (2022), Haq et al. (2021); and Liang (2020). Previous studies related to Engagement and Appraisal theory are found in many written and spoken texts ranging from news texts, research articles, textbooks, student writings, and interaction phases in lectures, to social media. The Quora platform as one of the social media used to ask and answer a certain topic or issue, allows users to see various authors' perspectives on a topic or issue that is being discussed.

The term *sandwich generation* is widely discussed nowadays. In Indonesia, the *sandwich generation* phenomenon has affected the majority of the population, especially the millennial age (Aji & Harani, 2023). This phenomenon is a condition where a child who has worked must become the breadwinner of the family where all of his/her income is given

to meet household needs. The researchers choose to examine the Engagement sub-categories and their functions used by Quora users concerning the *sandwich generation* which is widely discussed nowadays. The goal of this research is to determine the Engagement sub-categories and to find out the functions of Engagement sub-categories used by Quora users towards the *sandwich generation* phenomenon based on their responses or opinions about it.

**Methodology**

This research employs a qualitative research method with use discourse analysis approach. Exploring and comprehending the meaning that people or groups assign to a social or human problem can be done through qualitative research, which includes the following steps: data collection in the participant setting; data analysis that builds inductively from specifics to broad themes; and interpretations of the data by the research (Creswell, 2009). Discourse analysis uses in this research as an approach to analyze the data used to help understand the meaning of the text. In keeping with Gee (2011), discourse analysis is the analysis of spoken and written language with an emphasis on grammatical intricacies and how they affect communication. This research adopts Martin & White's (2005) theory of Appraisal

Framework, which focuses on the Engagement sub-categories and their functions that appears in Quora concerning the *sandwich generation* phenomenon.

The data source was taken from 100 Quora user responses consisting of 50 *sandwich generation* users and 50 non-*sandwich generation* users from some questions related to the *sandwich generation* phenomenon on Quora. To collect the data, the researchers used document analysis as a data collection technique. To analyze the data, there are several steps that done by the researchers, namely: collecting and reducing the data; finding and writing the clauses that contain Engagement sub-categories; classifying the clauses into Engagement sub-categories; analyzing the functions of Engagement sub-categories; calculating the Engagement sub-categories; and summarizing the findings.

**Results and Discussion**

**1. Sub-categories of Engagement**

The results of Engagement sub-categories were presented in this section. The table 1, table 2, and table 3 explained the findings of clauses containing Engagement sub-categories in 100 Quora users as entire data set, 50 *sandwich generation* users, and 50 non-*sandwich generation* users on Quora.

**Table 1.** Engagement Sub-categories Percentages on Quora

Engagement Typology	Engagement Categories	Sub-Categories	Sub-Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Monogloss	-	-	-	72	9.36%
Heterogloss	Contract	Disclaim	<i>Deny</i>	208	27.05%
			<i>Counter</i>	154	20.03%
			<i>Concur</i>	32	4.16%
			<i>Pronounce</i>	13	1.69%
	Expand	Entertain	<i>Endorse</i>	20	2.60%
			-	245	31.86%
			<i>Acknowledge</i>	21	2.73%
			<i>Distance</i>	4	0.52%
<b>Total</b>				<b>769</b>	<b>100%</b>

First, in 100 *sandwich generation* users and non-*sandwich generation* users, it was found that the dominant sub-categories of Engagement used were heterogloss expand *entertain* with 245 clauses (31.86%), followed

by heterogloss contract disclaim *deny* as the second dominant used with 208 clauses (27.05%).

**Table 2.** Engagement Sub-categories Percentages - *Sandwich Gen* Users

Engagement Typology	Engagement Categories	Sub-Categories	Sub-Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Monogloss	-	-	-	30	7.92%
Heterogloss	Contract	Disclaim	<i>Deny</i>	117	30.87%
			<i>Counter</i>	86	22.69%
			<i>Proclaim</i>	13	3.43%
			<i>Pronounce</i>	10	2.64%
			<i>Endorse</i>	2	0.53%
	Expand	Entertain	-	116	30.61%
			Attribute	4	1.06%
			<i>Distance</i>	1	0.26%
<b>Total</b>				<b>379</b>	<b>100%</b>

Second, in 50 *sandwich generation* users, there were 379 clauses containing the sub-categories of Engagement with the dominant

used were heterogloss contract disclaim *deny* with 117 clauses (30.87%).

**Table 3.** Engagement Sub-categories Percentages - *Non-Sandwich Gen* Users

Engagement Typology	Engagement Categories	Sub-Categories	Sub-Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Monogloss	-	-	-	42	10.77%
Heterogloss	Contract	Disclaim	<i>Deny</i>	91	23.33%
			<i>Counter</i>	68	17.44%
			<i>Proclaim</i>	19	4.87%
			<i>Pronounce</i>	3	0.77%
			<i>Endorse</i>	18	4.62%
	Expand	Entertain	-	129	33.08%
			Attribute	17	4.36%
			<i>Distance</i>	3	0.77%
<b>Total</b>				<b>390</b>	<b>100%</b>

Third, in 50 *non-sandwich generation* users, there were 390 clauses containing the sub-categories of Engagement with the dominant used were heterogloss expand *entertain* with 129 clauses (33.08%).

users and *non-sandwich generation* users, it was found that 72 clauses (9.36%) of 769 clauses belonged to monogloss. The example of monogloss was taken from the data 50 *sandwich generation* users:

In this section, the researchers showed samples of sub-categories of Engagement found in data findings and why they belong to those sub-categories. These samples were as follows:

*“Kewajiban orangtua itu hanya sampai anak berusia 18 tahun kok, kuliah itu sejak dulu statusnya bonus.”*

**a. Monogloss**

(“The obligation of parents is only until the child is 18 years old anyway; college has always been a bonus status.”)

Monogloss occurs when the speaker/writer frames the current proposition as having no dialogic alternatives that should be acknowledged or discussed in the current communication situation (Martin & White, 2005). From 100 *sandwich generation*

This clause showed that this statement was delivered directly and did not refer to other views by stating that the limit of parental obligations towards children was up to 18 years old where the college status was only a bonus, so this clause was included in the category of monogloss.

**b. Heterogloss: Contract – Disclaim – Deny**

*Deny* or negation is a resource for bringing the opposing positive viewpoint into the discussion and, as a result, recognizing it to reject it (Martin & White, 2005). From 100 *sandwich generation* users and non-*sandwich generation* users, it was found that 208 clauses (27.05%) from 769 clauses belonged to heterogloss contract disclaim *deny*. The example of *deny* was taken from the data 50 non-*sandwich generation* users:

“**Jangan** berfikir menikah adalah jalan keluar.”

(“**Don’t** think marriage is a way out.”)

This clause showed the opposition of the proposition conveyed that did not have the thought that marriage was a way, so this clause was included in the category of heterogloss contract disclaim *deny*. *Deny* was characterized by the use of negative sentences, in this clause using the use of “don’t”.

**c. Heterogloss: Contract – Disclaim – Counter**

*Counter* expresses a proposition that is in direct opposition to the one that is anticipated (Martin & White, 2005). From 100 *sandwich generation* users and non-*sandwich generation* users, it was found that 154 clauses (20.03%) from 769 clauses belonged to heterogloss contract disclaim *counter*. The example of *counter* was taken from the data 50 *sandwich generation* users:

“Anyway, **meskipun** berat, jadi generasi *sandwich* ini ada benefit-nya juga lho.”

(“Anyway, **even though** it's tough, being a *sandwich generation* has its benefits too.”)

This clause showed the opposition to the statement conveyed by providing an alternative view by using the conjunction “even though”, the writer stated that although being a *sandwich generation* was hard there were also benefits to life, so this clause was included in the heterogloss contract disclaim *counter* category.

**d. Heterogloss: Contract – Proclaim – Concur**

*Concur* indicates agreement or shared knowledge with certain anticipated dialogue partners (Martin & White, 2005). From 100 *sandwich generation* users and non-*sandwich generation* users, it was found that 32 clauses (4.16%) from 769 clauses belonged to heterogloss contract proclaim *concur*. The example of *concur* was taken from the data 50 non-*sandwich generation* users:

“**Gua setuju** lu harus extra struggle tapi gua yakinin sama lu kalo itu enggak apa-apa.”

(“**I agree that** you must struggle extra but I assure you that it's okay.”)

This clause showed the writer's agreement by stating that he agreed that extra struggle was necessary but then expresses a different viewpoint where the writer assures that extra struggle was okay, so this clause was included in the category of *concur* concede.

**e. Heterogloss: Contract – Proclaim – Pronounce**

*Pronounce* uses interpolation, authorial emphasis, or intentional authorial involvement (Martin & White, 2005). From 100 *sandwich generation* users and non-*sandwich generation* users, it was found that 13 clauses (1.69%) from 769 clauses belonged to heterogloss contract proclaim *pronounce*. The example of *pronounce* was taken from the data 50 *sandwich generation* users:

“**Memang** kalian tidak minta dilahirkan untuk bekerja, cari uang, lalu memberikan uang tersebut pada orang tua.”

(“**Indeed** you don't ask to be born to work, earn money, and then give the money to your parents.”)

This clause showed the emphasis conveyed by the writer by using the phrase “indeed” regarding children who did not ask to be born to work, earn money, and give the money to their parents, so this clause was

included in the category of heterogloss contract proclaim *pronounce*.

#### f. Heterogloss: Contract – Proclaim – Endorse

*Endorse* makes propositions that are deemed to be accurate, legitimate, indisputable, or most defensible based on external sources (Martin & White, 2005). From 100 *sandwich generation* users and non-*sandwich generation* users, it was found that 20 clauses (2.60%) from 769 clauses belonged to heterogloss contract proclaim *endorse*. The example of *endorse* was taken from the data 50 non-*sandwich generation* users:

*“Bila melihat dari hasil riset di atas, cukup membuktikan bahwa merawat anak dan orang tua di rumah dapat menumbuhkan ikatan keluarga yang lebih dekat antar generasi.”*

(When looking at the results of the above research, it is quite evident that caring for children and parents at home can foster closer family ties between generations.”)

This clause showed the use of other sources, namely from the the research results in the previous clause where the writer supported the source by expressing that it was enough to prove that caring for children and parents can foster the bond of a family, so this clause was included in the category of heterogloss contract proclaim *endorse*.

#### g. Heterogloss: Expand – Entertain

*Entertain* makes a proposition that is predicated on its own subjectivity and contingency, the writer’s voice portrays the proposition as one of several conceivable views (Martin & White, 2005). From 100 *sandwich generation* users and non-*sandwich generation* users, it was found that 245 clauses (31.86%) from 769 clauses belonged to heterogloss expand *entertain* and is the dominant one used in this research. The example of *entertain* was taken from the data 50 *sandwich generation* users:

*“Mungkin teman-teman kuliah saya tahunya saya dibayarin orang tua sama seperti kebanyakan dari mereka, tapi ya kenyataannya saya ngerjain apapun yang saya bisa kerjain yang penting bisa dapat uang buat bayar semesteran 😊 kadang juga kalau kurang saya pinjam uang ke saudara dan beberapa teman.”*

(“**Maybe** my college friends think that I’m paid by my parents like most of them, but in reality I do whatever I can do as long as I can earn money to pay for the semester 😊 sometimes if I don’t have enough, I borrow money from relatives and friends.”)

This clause showed that the writer expresses her opinion by not assuming that her opinion was correct by using the modal attribute “maybe” which contains a possibility where the writer expresses that her college friends might only know if the writer was financed by her parents when in reality she was not, so this clause was included in the category of heterogloss expand *entertain*.

#### h. Heterogloss: Expand – Attribute - Acknowledge

By connecting the notion to an external source, *acknowledge* shows how the writer’s voice is actively involved with that source (Martin & White, 2005). From 100 *sandwich generation* users and non-*sandwich generation* users, it was found that 21 clauses (2.73%) from 769 clauses belonged to heterogloss expand attribute *acknowledge*. The example of *acknowledge* was taken from the data 50 non-*sandwich generation* users:

*“Dilansir dari Ngomongin Uang, orang yang mengalami Sandwich generation dipengaruhi oleh Tingkat Literasi Keuangan di Indonesia masih rendah.”*

(“**Reporting from Ngomongin Uang**, people who experience the *Sandwich generation* are influenced by the low Level of Financial Literacy in Indonesia.”)

This clause showed the use of an external source quoted from *Ngomongin Uang* where people who experience the *sandwich*

*generation* phenomenon in Indonesia were influenced by the low level of financial literacy, so this clause was included in the category of heterogloss expand attribute *acknowledge*.

#### i. Heterogloss: Expand – Attribute - Distance

*Distance* indicates the precise separation between the content that is credited and the statement that is being stated (Martin & White, 2005). From 100 *sandwich generation* users and non-*sandwich generation* users, it was found that 4 clauses (0.52%) from 769 clauses belonged to heterogloss expand attribute *distance*. The example of *distance* was taken from the data 50 non-*sandwich generation* users:

*“Di banyak negara yang dianggap maju, setiap orang yang bekerja, termasuk wirausaha, harus punya (atau ikut) dana pensiun yang dikelola negara (atau swasta).”*

**(“In many countries that are considered developed, everyone who works, including entrepreneurs, must have (or participate in) a state-run (or private) pension fund.”)**

This clause used indirect attribution by using the phrase “considered” to create distance from the proposition. The writer created distance in this clause by revealing that in many countries that were considered developed, working people must have a pension fund managed by the state/private sector, so this clause was included in the category of heterogloss expand attribute *distance*.

## 2. The Functions of Engagement Sub-categories

The results of functions of Engagement sub-categories from 100 Quora user responses were presented in this section. The table 4 described the functions of Engagement sub-categories found in 100 Quora user responses.

Based on the table 4, there were several functions of each Engagement sub-category including: 1) monogloss served to express a direct statement from the writer

concerning the *sandwich generation* phenomenon being discussed, with 72 functions (9.36%); 2) *deny* served to refute a statement directly concerning the *sandwich generation* phenomenon being discussed, with 208 functions (27.05%); 3) *counter* served to oppose a previous statement by providing another statement from the writer’s point of view, with 154 functions (20.03%); 4) *concur* served to show agreement with a viewpoint concerning the *sandwich generation* phenomenon being discussed, with 32 functions (4.16%); 5) *pronounce* served to give a strong and emphatic statement to emphasize the writer’s viewpoint, with 13 functions (1.69%); 6) *endorse* served to support another viewpoint by involving the writer’s point of view, with 20 functions (2.60%); 7) *entertain* served: a) to give space for other viewpoints by using modality with 176 functions (22.89%), b) to signal that there are other varying viewpoints with 43 functions (5.59%), and c) to state that the writer does not consider the statement to be correct and that there may be other viewpoints that are more appropriate with 26 functions (3.38%); 8) *acknowledge* served to refer to the external sources to state the writer's viewpoint without any support or rejection of the source, with 21 functions (2.73%); and 9) *distance* served to give distance between the writer's point of view and other viewpoints where the writer is skeptical of the viewpoint, with 4 functions (0.52%).

Referring to the findings from the entire data set, 769 clauses containing Engagement sub-categories were found with the most dominant used were *entertain* with 245 clauses (31.86%). This result was in line with Cao (2023) where the results of her study showed a more dominant use of *entertain* that showed this is clear that readers of the dialogic text generally develop a sense of solidarity with the writer or with other readers who have different viewpoints. The characteristics of the Quora platform, which had the concept of a Q&A-style online discussion forum, allowed users to have diverse viewpoints on a topic being discussed. The *sandwich generation* phenomenon was used as a topic in this research. Dapang, Hasibuan, & Syafira (2023) defined the term “*sandwich generation*” describes a group of people who are under pressure to meet the requirements of their

parents, relatives, and children. This showed that the phenomenon was personal, complex, and influenced by each individual's social environment. This made many users choose to

express their viewpoints openly and provide space for other users to express different viewpoints by using *entertain*.

**Table 4.** The Functions of Engagement Sub-categories

Engagement Typology	Sub-Categories	Frequency	Percentage	Functions	
Monogloss	-	72	9.36%	Expressing direct statement from the writer concerning the <i>sandwich generation</i> phenomenon being discussed	
Heterogloss	Contract Disclaim Deny	208	27.05%	Refuting a statement directly concerning the <i>sandwich generation</i> phenomenon being discussed	
	Contract Disclaim Counter	154	20.03%	Opposing a previous statement by providing another statement from the writer's point of view	
	Contract Proclaim Concur	32	4.16%	Showing agreement with a viewpoint concerning the <i>sandwich generation</i> phenomenon being discussed	
	Contract Proclaim Pronounce	13	1.69%	Giving a strong and emphatic statement to emphasize the writer's viewpoint	
	Contract Proclaim Endorse	20	2.60%	Supporting another viewpoint by involving the writer's point of view	
	Expand Entertain		176	22.89%	1) Giving space for other viewpoints by using modality
			43	5.59%	2) Signalling that there are other varying viewpoints
			26	3.38%	3) Stating that the writer does not consider the statement to be correct and that there may be other viewpoints that is more appropriate
		Expand Attribute Acknowledge	21	2.73%	Referring to the external sources to state the writer's viewpoint without any support or rejection of the source
		Expand Attribute Distance	4	0.52%	Giving distance between the writer's point of view and other viewpoints where the writer is skeptical of the viewpoint
<b>Total</b>		<b>769</b>	<b>100%</b>		

Furthermore, in 50 *sandwich generation* users, 379 clauses containing Engagement sub-categories were found with the most dominant used were *deny* with 117 clauses (30.87%). This result was equivalent to Ziliwu (2020) where the results of her study showed a more dominant use of disclaim which is in the *deny* sub-category where it is used to instruct the listeners to avoid doing something pointlessly. *Sandwich generation* users often

denied certain viewpoints related to this phenomenon. Emotional factors and personal experiences were behind this. In order to meet the demands of both generations, members of the *sandwich generation* may have to balance many responsibilities, deal with severe time limits, emotional stress, financial obligations, and compromises in both their personal and professional lives (Syufa'at, Zaidi, & Mutholaah, 2023). The pressure and burden they experience directly in this phenomenon

made them felt the need to reject viewpoints that were not in line with what they experience.

Meanwhile, in 50 non-*sandwich generation* users, 390 clauses contain Engagement sub-categories with the most dominant used were *entertain*. This result was in accordant with Hasibuan, Deliana, Nurlala, Setia, & Rangkuti (2024) where the results of their research showed a more dominant use of *entertain* that used to show that the speaker considers other viewpoints and provides an explanation for their viewpoints. Non-*sandwich generation* users tended to be more open to various possible viewpoints, opened space for other viewpoints, and showed recognition of variations in viewpoints from other users. They only knew this phenomenon from their environment, and social media, because it was experienced by many people in Indonesia. In addition, many of this generation shared their experiences on social media such as Quora. So, non-*sandwich generation* users tended to be less attached to one particular viewpoint and made room for other more appropriate possibilities in a discussion of this phenomenon in Indonesia on Quora as online discussion forum.

Each Engagement sub-category had a different function. First, monogloss served to express a direct statement from the writer concerning the sandwich generation phenomenon being discussed. Being monoglossic involves reflecting the subjectivity of the speaker and ruling off the possibility of discourse dialogue (Liang, 2020). Second, *deny* served to directly reject statements related to the sandwich generation phenomenon being discussed, which was characterized by the use of negative sentences. The writer uses denial resources in an effort to directly communicate with the readers by trying to align them with their negated viewpoints (Cao, 2023). Third, *counter* served to oppose the previous statement by providing an alternative statement from the writer's point of view. *Counter* the prior assertion by presenting an alternative perspective, so 'countering' the predicted proposition (Martin & White, 2005).

Fourth, *concur* served to show agreement with a viewpoint concerning the *sandwich generation* phenomenon being discussed. *Concur* declares that the speaker in the text connected by an expression of agreement agrees or knows the same thing as the presumed addressee (Martin & White, 2005). Fifth, *pronounce* served to give a strong and emphatic statement to emphasize the writer's viewpoint. The second category of proclaim is *pronounce*, which emphasizes the speaker or makes use of particular allusions to express several viewpoints on the subject matter (Hasibuan et al., 2024). Sixth, *endorse* served to support other viewpoints by involving the writer's point of view. Endorsing ideas outside of the text as true, truthful, and indisputable is a frequent technique to express the writer's opinions (Nguyen & Nguyen, 2024).

Seventh, *entertain* served to give space for other viewpoints by using modality, to signal that there are other varying viewpoints, and to state that the writer does not consider the statement to be correct and that there may be other viewpoints that is more appropriate. In line with Martin & White (2005), they stated several functions of *entertain*, namely; to give allowances and give space for other viewpoints for the use of modality, to signal the writer's anticipation of varying viewpoints for the use of phrases like *I believe*, and to indicate that the statement does not assume the statement is correct and that there may be another statement that is more appropriate for possible uses such as *possibly*.

Eighth, *acknowledge* served to refer to the external sources to state the writer's viewpoint without any support or rejection of the source. Using common techniques like quoting and referencing, *acknowledge* tends to identify the information's source, which is also accountable for the information's correctness (Yue & Yi, 2023). Last, *distance* served to give distance between the writer's point of view and other viewpoints where the writer was skeptical of the viewpoint. The distance subsystem can also be used to criticize or reject an entity's or situation's good traits, such as skepticism, doubt, or disagreement with the veracity of assertions made about it (Alwohaibi & Alyousef, 2023).

The discussion of the data findings above showed that there were differences in the findings of the two types of data categories, namely 50 *sandwich generation* users dominantly used *deny*, and 50 non-*sandwich generation* users dominantly used *entertain*. The functions of Engagement sub-categories showed that each sub-category had its function in using Engagement as part of Appraisal theory.

## Conclusion

Regarding the research question, there were differences in using sub-categories of Engagement in the two data categories. This could be seen from their background and how they respond to this phenomenon. The findings showed that emotional distress and social environment influence how users expressed their viewpoints, especially when the topic was closely related to their life experiences. The diverse functions of the Engagement sub-categories showed how language was not only used to convey meaning but also to regulate social relations, such as regulating emotions, relationships, and positions in discussion spaces, especially through social media. Each Engagement sub-category had a different function in expressing the writer's position, either to agree, refute, or open the possibility of other viewpoints in the discussion concerning the *sandwich generation* phenomenon on Quora.

Further research is suggested to conduct a more in-depth analysis of the use of the Engagement sub-categories by using the same phenomenon about *sandwich generation* phenomenon as the focus of the study. A comparison of the use of the Engagement sub-categories, such as *deny* and *counter* sub-categories between *sandwich generation* users and non-*sandwich generation* users can provide a deeper understanding of how stances and social positions are expressed through language choices in online discussions.

## References

- Aji, W. T., & Harani, F. (2023). Global phenomenon: The millennial generation is trapped by sandwich generation in Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences (IJEPS)*, 1(4), 269–274. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.59890/ijeeps.v1i4.864>
- Alwasilah, Y. A., & Gunawan, W. (2023). A systemic functional linguistic study on language use of Indonesian students in writing. *JOMANTARA: Indonesian Journal of Art And Culture*, 3(2), 110–124. <https://journal.unpas.ac.id/index.php/jomantara/article/view/8966>
- Alwohaibi, H. A., & Alyousef, H. S. (2023). An investigation of engagement resources in the world cup 2022 newspaper articles in the Arab world media. *JCLR Journal of Contemporary Language Research*, 2(2), 118–128. <https://doi.org/10.58803/jclr.v2i2.27>
- Cao, F. (2023). Engagement resources in the English news texts of two phases in China's constructing Greater Bay Area. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 10(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2243076>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches third edititon* (Third Edit). SAGE Publications.
- Dapang, M., Hasibuan, M. C. A., & Syafira, Z. (2023). Studi literatur perbandingan kemampuan generasi sandwich dengan generasi non-sandwich terhadap perilaku pengelolaan finansial. *Jurnal Bela Negara UPN Veteran Jakarta*, 1(2), 22–31. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.70377/jbn.v1i2.5503>
- Fadzila, N. N. (2021). Textual analysis in TEDx Salem speech on “prioritizing mental health in schools by Hailey Hardcastle.” *International Journal of Systemic Functional Linguistics*, 4(2), 30–32. <https://doi.org/10.22225/ijlfl.v4i2.4378.Article>
- Fengjing, S., & Le, Z. (2022). Engagement resources across disciplines in research articles: A corpus-based study. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 19(9), 332–337.

- <https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8072/2022.09.006>
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (Third Edit). Routledge Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Haq, Z., Rahyono2, F., & Yuwono, U. (2021). Engagement analysis on Indonesian evaluative text on facebook social media. *ELT-Lectura: Studies and Perspectives in English Language Teaching*, 8(2), 121–131. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31849/elt-lectura.v8i2.7050>
- Hasibuan, F. A. L. A., Deliana, Nurlela, Setia, E., & Rangkuti, R. (2024). Engagement system in BBC The Big questions: Appraisal approach. *Parole: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 14(1), 21–34. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14710/parole.v14i1.21-34>
- Hemmati, A., & Validi, M. (2023). Heteroglossic engagement resources in discussion sections of good and excellent master of arts theses written by Iranian EFL students in applied linguistics. *Teaching English Language*, 17(2), 135–167. <https://doi.org/https://10.22132/TEL.2023.384338.1435>
- Hidayah, S. N., Wihadi, M., & Rahmatunisa, W. (2023). Textual metafunction analysis about education news text on selected national online newspapers. *Journey: Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 6(2), 498–504. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33503/journey.v6i2.690>
- Liang, S. (2020). An analysis of engagement resources in courtroom closing arguments: A case study of Jodi Arias case. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 2(4), 89–98. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal>
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mohammed, A. (2024). Appraisal theory and interpreting political speech. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, 20(20), 46–59. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n20p46>
- Nguyen, H. B., & Nguyen, P. T. L. (2024). An analysis of the engagement system of Vietnamese research articles in the light of the appraisal framework. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(5), 1595–1603. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1405.33>
- Sari, A., & Alyousef, H. S. (2024). The use of engagement resources in GCSE EFL and ESL reading exams: A practical application of appraisal theory [in English]. *Journal of Studies in Applied Language (JSAL)*, 7(1), 01–22. <https://doi.org/10.61186/jsal.7.1.1>
- Sarjani, D. K. (2023). Self disclosure pada pengguna platform media sosial tanya jawab quora. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi UHO: Jurnal Penelitian Kajian Ilmu Komunikasi Dan Informasi*, 8(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.52423/jikuho.v8i1.3>
- Syufa'at, Zaidi, S. M. S., & Mutholaah. (2023). Sandwich generation in contemporary Indonesia: Determining responsibility in caring for elderly under Islamic law and positive law. *Al-Manāhij: Jurnal Kajian Hukum Islam*, 17(2), 167–182. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24090/mnh.v17i2.9371>
- Yonata, F., & Prastikawati, E. F. (2022). Arguing dialogically: Engagement resources used in an Indonesian senior secondary EFL textbook. *LANGUAGE CIRCLE: Journal of Language and Literature*, 16(2), 308–320. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v16i2.34133>
- Yue, B., & Yi, Z. (2023). Interpersonal functions of engagement markers in interaction phase of lectures from the perspective of appraisal theory: A case study of an online lecture. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 9(2), 172–175. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijll.2023.9.2.399>
- Ziliwu, E. (2020). Appraisal of engagement in Les Brown speech's enough is enough. *LingPoet: Journal of Linguistics and Literary Research*, 1(1), 6–13. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.32734/lingpoet.v1i1.4691>