	(dismay, outrage, health concerns)	(dissapointment, it is not fair, but i do not want to stay hungry)	happens)	(rather opportunity then threat, better than eating dogs/carrion)	ancestors ate it, its delcious)	strong YES (the company shall run out of business, Tesco is villain)	rather Tesco who is guilty, because the suppliers are pressured by prices)	NEUTRAL (noone is responsible, or everyone in the supply chain is responsible)	weak NO (guilt is mainly on suppliers, TESCO cannot be responsible for their actions)	strong NO (Tesco is vctim, it is only media constructed bubble)	Othe topic discussed
		+1	C	-1	-2	+2	+1	C) -1	-2	
	OFFENSIVENES					RESPONSIBILIT	-				UNUSABLE
rules											
from the comment, it is possible to extract that the author is strongly resentful/indignant by HMS or scandals similar-as serious threat	1										
from the comment it, is possible to extract that the author is resentful by the HMS or similar scandals as possible threat not associated by the meat type itself, but the potential contamination of meat, diseases, drugs, feed supplements, unknown manufacturing practices		1									
from the commnent, it is no possible to extract whether the author is resentful by the HMS, rather the attention is payed to another aspect of the situation			1								
from the comment, it is possible to extract that the author has mixed feelings-fact that the horsemeat is present is even considered as improvement, but the objection is that it was not on the product packaging information creates space for threat -suspicion that the horsemeat was of questionable quality				1							
form the comment, it is possible to extract that the author disagrees with the aggressive responses regarding HMS, in this case nothing bad has happened, people only received more healthy and nutritious meat than they ordered					1						
from the comment, it is possible to extract that the author considers Tesco/other retailers/food companies in general as culprits, who by their behavior are attributed the cause for HMS. They are the initiators of the whole situation and held responsible for similar scandals as well.						1					
from the comment, it is possible to extract that the author considers Tesco or retailers in general together as culprits, who by their behavior HMS or similar scandals create or at least insufficiently/ineffectively prevent such act from happening. Another culprits are stingy customers who buy everything cheap, speculators selling falsely declared products and food companies that lower the prices at all costs							1				
Tesco is only (although not completely innocent) victim with regards how the ekosystem is set, it is a player that could not act differently without damaging own financial sustainability. people would buy the products elsewhere in any case; or the author did not chose to discuss on the degree of shared responsibility of Tesco in HMS								1	1		
Tesco carries only marginal responsibility, for instance could have been more consistent on assuring that the ingretients are labelled throughouly as well as better better selection of suppliers. Villains in this case are the others.									1		
Tesco is playing in accordance with its rules. The author advocates for the fact that others did not comply with the rules and decieved others including customers, Tesco and possibly some innocent suppliers in such fraud.										1	
The author did not expess own attitude in regards to studied context, autor's activity was associated with other topic/or irrelevant (showing off, intruding the discussion, changing the topic, etc.)											1