

design your future

Engels 1

studiegebied
handelswetenschappen en bedrijfskunde

bachelor bedrijfsmanagement

1^{ste} jaar



Resources Bundle English 1

Leen Baelde, Nick Claus, Lien Pergoot, Gwendolyn Rogge, Ilse Wyffels
handelswetenschappen en bedrijfskunde
bachelor in het bedrijfsmanagement 1



RESOURCES BUNDLE ENGLISH 1

Source 1: Tax meat and dairy to cut emissions and save lives, study urges.

Source: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/nov/07/tax-meat-and-dairy-to-cut-emissions-and-save-lives-study-urges>

Author: Damian Carrington

Date: 7-11-2016

Surcharges of 40% on beef and 20% on milk would compensate for climate damage and deter people from consuming as much unhealthy food



Food production causes a quarter of greenhouse gas emissions, largely from the raising of cattle and other livestock. Photograph: Mike Kemp/Getty Images

Climate taxes on meat and milk would lead to huge and vital cuts in carbon emissions as well as saving half a million lives a year via healthier diets, according to the first global analysis of the issue.

Surcharges of 40% on beef and 20% on milk would account for the damage their production causes people via climate change, an Oxford University team has calculated. These taxes would then deter people from consuming as much of these foods, reducing both emissions and illness, the team said.

Food production causes a quarter of all the greenhouse gas emissions that are driving global warming, largely from the raising of cattle and other livestock. These emissions are increasing as people around the world become richer and eat more meat.

Marco Springmann, from the Oxford Martin Programme on the Future of Food, who led the study, said: "It is clear that if we don't do something about the emissions from our food system, we have no chance of limiting climate change below 2C.

“But if you’d have to pay 40% more for your steak, you might choose to have it once a week instead of twice.”

The research, published in the journal *Nature Climate Change*, evaluated the tax required for each food type to compensate for the climate damage its production causes. Beef has a heavy footprint, due to the deforestation and methane emissions associated with cattle and the grains they are fed, and needed a 40% tax on average across the world.

The scientists then assessed how much less of each food type would be eaten as a result of the taxes. They examined different tax regimes and found the optimum arrangement in terms of both emissions and health was to combine the taxes with subsidies for healthy foods, such as fruit and vegetables, and payments to people to compensate for price increases. This ensured poorer people did not end up with worse diets as the result of taxation.

This optimum tax plan would reduce climate emissions by 1 billion tonnes a year – the same as the entire global aviation industry. This huge potential cut in emissions surprised Springmann, as did the heavy impact of dairy products.

Changes to how food is produced and consumed have largely been ignored in the battle against climate change, due to public sensitivity about their food choices, fears about increasing hunger in poorer parts of the world and the lack of straightforward measures to tackle the problem.

“If people see any food price rise, they get angry, so you have to explain why you are doing it,” said Springmann, adding that a successful food tax policy could spend all the money it raised on ensuring people could afford healthier diets. He said a tax in Denmark on unhealthy saturated fats, where the government simply kept all the revenue, was aborted after a year. But in Mexico, a sugar tax on soft drinks has been successful after the funds were spent on free drinking water in schools.

Most of the foods with big climate impacts also happen to be unhealthy when eaten in large quantities, such as beef and dairy. Therefore, if climate taxes cut consumption, fewer people would die from related diseases such as heart disease, strokes and cancers. In the US, for example, people eat three times the recommended level of meat. The researchers found climate taxes would save more than half a million early deaths every year, largely in Europe, the US, Australia and China.

However, cutting the demand for meat and dairy would not be easy, said Rob Bailey, research director at UK thinktank Chatham House: “The challenge is political. As the new research demonstrates, in many countries there is a very strong public health and climate case for dietary change, but it isn’t happening. Governments are reluctant to ‘interfere’ in people’s lifestyle choices for fear of a public backlash and criticism for ‘nanny statism’, as well as the reaction from powerful interests in the food industry and agricultural lobby.”

Bailey said there was currently little pressure on governments to act, partly because the public understanding of the link between diet and climate change is low. But, when people are informed, they find meat taxes far less unpalatable than is supposed, he said.

Calls to cut meat-eating, by the UN and high-profile figures including climate change experts and the economist Lord Stern, have so far been both rare and controversial.

The new research found the taxes needed to compensate for climate damage were 15% on lamb, 8.5% on chicken, 7% on pork and 5% on eggs. Vegetable oil required a large tax of 25%, but this was due to the low initial price of the product, making a relatively modest surcharge look high.

These tax levels were global averages but there was significant variation with, for example, the beef tax being higher in Latin America, where cattle-raising produces more emissions than in other regions. The optimum tax plan also had regional variations, including limiting climate taxes to beef in the lowest income countries, to ensure people there were still able to afford decent diets.

Springmann said it was critical to find a way to cut the environmental impact of food production: "Either we have climate change and more heart disease, diabetes and obesity, or we do something about the food system."

Source 2: Erasmus: the EU programme for higher education

Source: <https://www.eubusiness.com/topics/education/erasmus.02/>

Author: European Commission

Date: 29-11-2010

ERASMUS is the EU's flagship education and training programme enabling 200 000 students to study and work abroad each year. In addition, it funds co-operation between higher education institutions across Europe. The programme not only supports students, but also professors and business staff who want to teach abroad, as well as helping university staff to receive training.

According to the European Commission, the ERASMUS programme is a 'European success'. Few, if any, programmes launched by the European Union have had a similar Europe-wide reach as the ERASMUS Programme. The vast majority of European universities take part in ERASMUS. More than 2.2 million students have participated since it started in 1987, as well as 250 000 higher education teachers and other staff since 1997 (this type of exchange was also expanded further in 2007).

The annual budget is in excess of 450 million euro; more than 4 000 higher education institutions in 33 countries participate, and more are waiting to join.

Impact on higher education

An overriding aim of the programme is to help create a 'European Higher Education Area' and foster innovation throughout Europe.

In addition to exchange actions ('transnational mobility'), ERASMUS helps higher education institutions to work together through intensive programmes, networks and multilateral projects.

Thanks to all these actions, ERASMUS has become a driver in the modernisation of higher education institutions and systems in Europe and, in particular, has inspired the establishment of the Bologna Process.

ERASMUS became part of the EU's Lifelong Learning Programme in 2007 and covered new areas such as student placements in enterprises (transferred from the Leonardo da Vinci Programme), university staff training and teaching for business staff.

The programme should further expand the educational opportunities it offers in the coming years, with a target of 3 million ERASMUS students by 2012.

How ERASMUS works

Higher education institutions which want to participate in ERASMUS activities must have an ERASMUS University Charter. The Charter aims to guarantee the quality of the programme by setting certain fundamental principles.

The European Commission is responsible for the overall programme implementation; its Directorate-General for Education and Culture coordinates the different activities.

So called "decentralised actions" that promote individual mobility are run by national agencies in the 33 participating countries. "Centralised" actions, such as networks, multilateral projects and the award of the ERASMUS University Charter, are managed by the EU's Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.

Source 3: Email writing

Source: Acco Deal! Reference book

Author: Geert Jacobs, Olaf Dupont, Mieke Rosselle, e.a.

Date: 2017

Questions:

- What different media do you know?
- When are they used?
- What are some of the (dis)advantages of each medium?

MEDIUM	USE	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES

MESSAGE 1

Subject: Meeting

Tom,

I just want to remind you about the meeting we have scheduled next week. Let me know if you have any questions.

Best wishes,

James

MESSAGE 2

Subject : Proposal

Jane,

Did you get my proposal? I just wanted to make sure as I haven't heard anything. I would like to discuss a number of things. Can you please call me?

Thanks!

Frank

MESSAGE 3

Subject: _____

Hi Ann,

Thanks for the report with the most recent sales results. I think that you should add more specific information about our sales figures in the second chapter. I also felt that the tone could be a bit more formal as our CEO's going to read the report too.

Thanks!

Nell

MESSAGE 4

Subject: _____

Dear Mr. Jones,

I would like to let you know that I have scheduled a meeting with our R&D department for Friday 23 May regarding the new product design.

It will be in the small conference room at 11:00 am. Please let me know if you can make it.

I am looking forward to your reply.

Kind regards,

Yan Roberts

Source 4: Social media and the post-privacy society

Source: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/cifamerica/2012/apr/02/social-media-and-post-privacy-society>

Author: Gary Younge

Date: 2-04-2012

Welcome to this brave new, digitally-connected world that has blown up the barriers between our public and private selves



Prosecutors in Chinese dissident Zhu Yufu's trial for subversion have cited text messages that he sent using Skype. Photograph: Mario Tama/Getty Images

While having a meal with his wife in his home town of Utica in 2007, the pollster John Zogby struck up a conversation with his 20-year-old waitress about privacy, social networking and YouTube. He asked what limits she set on what she would reveal online.

"My boobs," she said. "but only on Halloween, and only for my friends."

"Well," answers Zogby, in account from his book *The Way We'll Be*. "I'm your friend today, but tomorrow I might not be. Can you stop me from sharing your, um, breasts, with the rest of the world, or with the company you're hoping will hire you?"

"No," she replies, "but so many of us do this in one form or another that employers are just going to have to adjust or they won't have anyone to hire."

As Spring Break draws to a close, the question of what belongs in the public realm and whom it affects becomes agonisingly pertinent to thousands of undergraduates across the country. Spring Break is the annual, formal Bacchanal: the riotous, alcohol-drenched recess that launches scores of "Girls Gone Wild" videos, clogs toilets with condoms and beachside boardwalks with vomit and updates millions of Facebook pages.

But five years after Zogby's conversation, people seem to be recalibrating their limits. A report in the *New York Times* last month suggested an inhibition descending on Spring Break this year. "They are very prudish," said one bartender in Key West. "They are so afraid everyone is going to take their picture and put it online. Ten years ago, people were doing filthy, filthy things, but it wasn't posted on Facebook." It's a shame they are not having as much as they did or would like to (I'm assuming here

that "filthy" is also fun), but if the price for having "filthy fun" is that it is broadcast to anyone who wants to see it, and many who don't, then it's clearly not a price worth paying.

There are limits to how much candour we can take or expect. With the exception of those in the most intimate parts of my life, I don't really want to know everything that people think about me. Nor do I want to know everything I think about them, or share it. A certain amount of artifice is necessary if we're all going to get through the day.

Increasingly, however, it feels as though those limits are being constantly breached, either voluntarily, accidentally, by force or by cunning. With blogs, tweets, webcams, Facebook and YouTube, there is always a mic or camera somewhere and it is always running. Our personal diaries have become an open book. The era in which we might reasonably expect to enjoy a conversation that is both discrete (separate, apart and autonomous) and discreet (cautious, unobtrusive and delicate) has passed. For the moment at least, we are all living our lives in public.

The personal fallout from all of this is clear and go beyond mere embarrassment. Take Tyler Clementi, the 18-year-old Rutgers student who committed suicide after his roommate, Dharun Ravi, set up a camera in his room to watch Tyler in a gay sexual encounter. Later, Ravi would try the same again and tweet about it to his 150 followers. In the past, such homophobia would have gone no further than malicious gossip – vicious, hurtful and wrong, certainly. But in all likelihood, it would not have been as devastating to Clementi's self-respect – and possibly with less fatal consequences. Throughout the western world, teenagers – particularly, young women – are routinely humiliated by having their indiscretions recorded and sent out to the world.

But there are political ramifications, too, even if the consequences of these are less clear-cut. On the one hand, it forces elites out into the open where their deliberations and pronouncements might be judged against their actions. There are clearly benefits to this. The truly awful thing about the incident between then UK Prime Minister Gordon Brown and Gillian Duffy shortly before the last election was not just that he referred to her as "that bigoted woman" when he was in his car and didn't know the microphone was on. It was that only minutes before, he had told her she was "a very good woman [who had] served the community" when he did know they were on. That gave credence to the popular perception that the political class held voters in contempt. The problem wasn't that he got caught, it was that he did it in the first place.

Left there, however, and what we have is not more openness, but more gaffes. Obama and Sarkozy deriding Binyamin Netanyahu, and Obama blabbing his post-election strategy for Russia, or Tony Blair's cringeworthy "Yo, Blair" encounter with George Bush at the G8. Entertaining and illustrative, certainly, but rarely more than that. But on-mic embarrassment is not the whole story: the revelation of serious information that our rulers would rather we did not have can be compelling. WikiLeaks provides a good example. By redistributing information from the US government to the world, it gave the public an unprecedented insight into US diplomacy. Interestingly, most of what it revealed we might have guessed. But once it was out there, it was difficult for officialdom to deny it and one could argue that these

were not their secrets to keep. When the Arab Spring began, for example, the leaks provided a useful route map to both Washington's strategy and the internal cleavages within some of those countries' elites.

So far, so good. But there is a price we pay for this exposure that more than rivals the regretful blushes of a bare-breasted waitress at Halloween. The net effect will also be that, in future, US diplomats will be less forthright in offering honest opinions to their bosses for fear those opinions might one day be leaked and create an incident. So, by leaking confidential diplomatic correspondence, there is a chance of exposing hypocrisy – but that chance comes with the certainty of inhibiting open, private discussion. This endangers the kind of back-door discussions that made everything from the Northern Ireland peace process to the release of Nelson Mandela possible in a way they would not have been had everything been on display.

Moreover, for all the talk of openness, what we post we do not necessarily own. We are often handing over information about ourselves and our friends to corporate entities and advertisers, which can end up in the hands of a state that is interested in anything but openness. In Britain, the government is about to introduce legislation that would give the police and intelligence officers the right to trawl our Facebook pages, Twitter accounts and Skype interactions.

Whether personal or political, the problem with the very public lives we now all live is essentially the same. People generally arrive at positions through trial, error and experimentation. They mature by making mistakes and learning from them. But if you feel the mic is always on, you're far more likely to do something anodyne for the record than think of something creative and take risks for all to see. The power to transmit amplifies not just the audience, but the consequences.

Less filth. Less fun. Less candour. We are experiencing the Hawthorne effect, in which studying behaviour alters the behaviour itself, writ large. And while greater transparency may be one of the main outcomes, greater inhibition is no less so. To a large extent, this is a problem of our own making. Our personal diaries are, in no small part, an open book because we open them. We put details about ourselves out into the ether that often forfeit our right to privacy. It is now not uncommon to see relationships disintegrate in real time as long-term partners air grievances openly online.

The personal, the private, the privileged and the confidential no longer really exist. The stories we would otherwise choose not to share are no longer ours to keep; the conversations we hope will go no further may just keep traveling. A remark may be off-the-cuff or off-the-top-of-your-head – but nowadays, you must always assume it's on the record.

Source 5: NAFTA listening fragment

Source: <https://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2017/02/16/515380213/why-ditching-nafta-could-hurt-americas-farmers-more-than-mexicos?t=1562052881010>

Author: Dan Charles

Date: 16-2-2017

Source 6: NAFTA pros and cons: Why its six advantages outweigh its six disadvantages

Source: <https://www.thebalance.com/nafta-pros-and-cons-3970481>

Author: Kimberly Amadeo

Date: 25-6-2019

The North American Free Trade Agreement created the world's largest free trade area, covering the United States, Canada, and Mexico. In 2017, its member economies generated approximately \$22.2 trillion in gross domestic product.

NAFTA is also controversial. Politicians don't agree on whether the free trade agreement's advantages outweigh its disadvantages. Here they are so you can decide for yourself.

Pros

NAFTA has six main advantages. According to a Congressional Research Service report prepared in 2017, the act has more than tripled trade between Canada, Mexico, and the United States since it was enacted. The agreement reduced and eliminated tariffs.

Second, greater trade **increased economic output**. While it is challenging to weigh the impact of NAFTA given the variety of factors involved, experts estimated that full NAFTA implementation would U.S. growth by as much as 0.5 percent a year.

Third, while there are varying estimates, stronger growth created jobs. According to a 2010 report, U.S. free trade agreements – the lion's share of which stemmed from

the NAFTA agreement – directly supported 5.4 million jobs, while trade with these countries supported 17.7 million.

Fourth, **foreign direct investment** (FDI) more than tripled. The U.S. increased FDI in Mexico from \$15.2 billion in 1993 to \$104.4 billion in 2012, and from \$69.9 billion in Canada in 1993 to \$352.9 billion in 2015. Mexico ramped up investment in the U.S. by 1283% over the same time period, while Canada's FDI increased by 911%.

Fifth, NAFTA **lowered prices**. U.S. oil imports from Mexico cost less because NAFTA got rid of tariffs. That reduces America's reliance on oil from the Middle East. Low-cost oil reduces gas prices, which reduces transportation cost. Food prices are lower in turn.

Sixth, the agreement **helped with government spending**. Each nation's government contracts became available to suppliers in all three member countries. That increased competition and lowered costs.

Cons

NAFTA has six main disadvantages.

First, certain estimates indicate that it led to job losses. A 2011 report from the Economic Policy Institute estimated a loss of 682,900 jobs. Other estimates estimate a **loss of 500,000-750,000 U.S. jobs**. Most were in the manufacturing industries in California, New York, Michigan, and Texas. Though the estimated job gains exceed those lost, certain industries were particularly impacted, including manufacturing, automotive, textile, computer, and electrical appliance industries.

Second, job migration **suppressed wages**. Companies threatened to move to Mexico to keep workers from joining unions. Without the unions, workers could not bargain for better wages. This strategy was so successful that it became standard operating procedure. Between 1993 and 1995, half of all companies used it. By 1999, that rate had grown to 65 percent.

Third, NAFTA **put Mexican farmers** out of business. It allowed U.S. government-subsidized farm products into Mexico. Local farmers could not compete with the subsidized prices. As a result, 1.3 million farmers were put out of business, according

to the Economic Policy Institute. It forced unemployed farmers to cross the border illegally to find work. In 1995, there were 2.9 million Mexicans living in the United States illegally. It increased to 4.5 million in 2000, probably due to NAFTA. The recession drove that figure to 6.9 million in 2007.

In 2014, it fell to 5.8 million, roughly double where it was before NAFTA.

Fourth, unemployed Mexican farmers went to **work in substandard conditions** in the maquiladora program. Maquiladora is where United States-owned companies employ Mexican workers near the border. They cheaply assemble products for export back into the United States. Employment in maquiladoras rose 120,000 in 1980 to 1.2 million in 2006.

Fifth, U.S. companies **degraded the Mexican environment** to keep costs low. Agribusiness in Mexico used more fertilizers and other chemicals, resulting in increased pollution. Rural farmers were forced into marginal land to stay in business, resulting in increased deforestation rates. That deforestation contributes to global warming.

Sixth, NAFTA **allowed Mexican trucks** access into the United States. Mexican trucks are not held to the same safety standards as American trucks. Congress never allowed this provision to go into effect.

NAFTA's Pros May Outweigh Its Cons

NAFTA's disadvantages are significant. Can anything justify the loss of entire industries in New York or Michigan? Worker mistreatment in the United States or in the maquiladora program is also concerning. NAFTA may also be responsible for environmental damage along the border.

But from an economic perspective, many believe that NAFTA is a success and that without it, the impacts of competition from the growing economies of the European Union or China would be worse. That's critical now that both of these trade areas rank above the United States as the world's largest economies.

While some argue that NAFTA helped the U.S. fare the 2008 financial crisis, other analysis suggests NAFTA may have contributed to it. In addition, some of the ill

effects associated with NAFTA may be attributable to other causes, such as China joining the World Trade Organization in 2001.

Evaluating NAFTA's value is not an easy or simple question. However, many experts believe that free trade agreements are a necessity for the United States when competing in an ever more globalized world.

USMCA

Despite these advantages, the United States, Mexico, and Canada renegotiated NAFTA on September 30, 2018. The new deal is called the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement. It must be ratified by each country's legislature. Trump has called for Congress to ratify it within six months. If not ratified, the U.S. will revert to pre-NAFTA trade conditions. If ratified, it will go into effect in 2020.

The Trump administration renegotiated with the aim of lowering the trade deficit between the United States and Mexico. The new deal changes NAFTA in six major areas.

Source 7: 7 Steps to a Great Corporate Culture

Source: <https://www.omniagroup.com/7-steps-to-a-great-corporate-culture/>

Author: Carletta Clyatt

Date: 12-03-2012

Do you have a **clearly defined corporate culture** within your organization? If you can't readily describe the values, beliefs and behaviors encouraged within your four walls, it may be long overdue to revisit them.

Surprisingly, many companies fail to develop a culture to **invest and grow their greatest asset ... their people!**

Companies with clearly defined cultures are typically better places to work giving them a powerful edge over competitors because they draw and retain top talent.

Corporate culture is a powerful tool in a company's long-term success... here are some key points to help boost yours:

1. Establish principles – A small set of principles that define who you are as an organization makes it easier to make the right business decisions, hire the right staff and regain control over chaotic work situations.

2. Use the principles – Use the principles to guide business discussions, serve customers and develop engaged employees. Be sure of the actions you take and encouragement in others will produce the results reflected in your corporate culture’s principles. Driving positive behaviour leads to better business results.

3. Lead by example – Owners and managers must live in the basic elements of their favored culture: values, beliefs, and behaviors. Values are meaningless without the other two elements.

4. Performance appraisals and management systems – Build the principles into all your appraisal and management systems making it easier to recognize and reward behaviors reflective of your guiding principles and discouraging those that deviate from it. Maximizing each worker’s performance so it falls in line with your defined culture is key to maintaining morale – and establishing your company as one that appreciates employees.

5. Screen for shared values – Screen for and hire people who share your values and will naturally adhere to the principles. For long-standing employees, create processes that help them adapt to new ways of thinking and behavior.

6. Allow for change – As generational shifts overtake the workplace, replacing seasoned workers with younger ones, modifications to your corporate culture will undoubtedly be necessary. Of special interest to younger employees is job flexibility, utilization of technology and casual work settings.

7. Encourage participation – Encourage workers to take an active role in determining how to reflect the principles of your corporate culture. This step might require regular benchmarking to assess progress and search for best practices both inside and outside the organization.

While outlining a winning corporate culture might be relatively simple, instilling the set principles in others may be less so. You can make this task easier, however, by gaining insight into the inherent work approaches, objectives and expectations of your staff.

Tools, such as behavioural assessments are designed to provide you with this, **making work easier** and more enjoyable for everyone on the team. While many of these products provide some insight into your job candidates and existing staff, The Omnia Profile is the one offering a **unique benchmarking feature**, where individuals can be compared to one another and indications of one person’s needs over another’s are made. Additionally, these Profiles are **interpreted by trained analysts** – not computers – who know how to allow for the specific quirks of an individual or factor in an employer’s unique needs.

Are you sure you’re doing all you can to create a winning culture and boost business results?

Source 8: Business English: work-life balance

Source: <http://www.englishwithjo.com/business-english-work-life-balance/> + https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=2&v=FNDYcki2PXA

Author: Jo Gillan & Askmen

Date: 12-04-2013 & 24-08-2012



Work-life balance refers to the balance between a person's career and his or her personal life. Many people work longer hours and have fewer holidays and days off, in part because of globalization, outsourcing, and a loss of job security. As a result, employees have less time for personal interests, friends and family. Such an imbalance can lead to reduced productivity, depression and high levels of stress. Although the employee makes the choice to work longer hours, the corporate culture is also responsible. Companies should educate their workers on the importance of a healthy work-life balance.

Video

Listen for the following expressions being used in the video. What do you think they mean?

- I'm going to be out of pocket for a while
- Later in life I'm going to reap the benefits of it.
- You're working your tail off
- We're going to scale back

Do you agree with the view that sometimes we need to be off-balance in order to have a successful career?

Vocabulary

Nouns

Holiday leave
Lifestyle
Workload
Workplace
Commitment
Leisure
Burnout
Workaholic

Adjectives

Energetic
Organised
Fulfilling
Off-balance
Stressful
Committed
Flexible
Satisfying

Verbs

Encourage
Neglect
Balance
Prioritise
Delegate
Manage
Cope

Idioms

- Pace of life – “I really can't keep up with the pace of life in London, I think I will move to the country and try to get a job there”
- Rat race – “I think I will try to leave this rat race and start up my own business from home”