The possession or use of any communications device is strictly prohibited when taking this examination. If you have or use any communications device, no matter how briefly, your examination will be invalidated and no score will be calculated for you.

A separate answer sheet has been provided for you. Follow the instructions for completing the student information on your answer sheet. You must also fill in the heading on each page of your essay booklet that has a space for it, and write your name at the top of each sheet of scrap paper.

The examination has three parts. For Part 1, you are to read the texts and answer all 24 multiple-choice questions. For Part 2, you are to read the texts and write one source-based argument. For Part 3, you are to read the text and write a text-analysis response. The source-based argument and text-analysis response should be written in pen. Keep in mind that the language and perspectives in a text may reflect the historical and/or cultural context of the time or place in which it was written.
When you have completed the examination, you must sign the statement printed at the bottom of the front of the answer sheet, indicating that you had no unlawful knowledge of the questions or answers prior to the examination and that you have neither given nor received assistance in answering any of the questions during the examination. Your answer sheet cannot be accepted if you fail to sign this declaration.

DO NOT START THIS EXAMINATION UNTIL YOU ARE TOLD TO DO SO.
Part 1

**Directions** (1–24): Closely read each of the three passages below. After each passage, there are several multiple-choice questions. Select the best suggested answer to each question and record your answer on the separate answer sheet provided for you. You may use the margins to take notes as you read.

**Reading Comprehension Passage A**

When Marvin was ten years old, his father took him through the long, echoing corridors that led up through Administration and Power, until at last they came to the uppermost levels of all and were among the swiftly growing vegetation of the Farmlands. Marvin liked it here: it was fun watching the great, slender plants creeping with almost visible eagerness towards the sunlight as it filtered down through the plastic domes to meet them. The smell of life was everywhere, awakening inexpressible longings in his heart: no longer was he breathing the dry, cool air of the residential levels, purged of all smells but the faint tang of ozone. He wished he could stay here for a little while, but Father would not let him. They went onwards until they had reached the entrance to the Observatory, which he had never visited: but they did not stop, and Marvin knew with a sense of rising excitement that there could be only one goal left. For the first time in his life, he was going Outside.¹

There were a dozen of the surface vehicles, with their wide balloon tyres [tires] and pressurized cabins, in the great servicing chamber. His father must have been expected, for they were led at once to the little scout car waiting by the huge circular door of the airlock. Tense with expectancy, Marvin settled himself down in the cramped cabin while his father started the motor and checked the controls. The inner door of the lock slid open and then closed behind them: he heard the roar of the great air-pumps fade slowly away as the

¹Outside — the part of the Moon outside of Marvin’s space habitat
pressure dropped to zero. Then the ‘Vacuum’ sign flashed on, the outer door parted, and before Marvin lay the land which he had never yet entered.

He had seen it in photographs, of course: he had watched it imaged on television screens a hundred times. But now it was lying all around him, burning beneath the fierce sun that crawled so slowly across the jet-black sky. He stared into the west, away from the blinding splendour of the sun — and there were the stars, as he had been told but had never quite believed. He gazed at them for a long time, marvelling that anything could be so bright and yet so tiny. They were intense unscentillating points, and suddenly he remembered a rhyme he had once read in one of his father’s books:

Twinkle, twinkle, little star,
How I wonder what you are.

Well, he knew what the stars were. Whoever asked that question must have been very stupid. And what did they mean by ‘twinkle’? You could see at a glance that all the stars shone with the same steady, unwavering light. He abandoned the puzzle and turned his attention to the landscape around him.

They were racing across a level plain at almost a hundred miles an hour, the great balloon tyres sending up little spurts of dust behind them. There was no sign of the Colony: in the few minutes while he had been gazing at the stars, its domes and radio towers had fallen below the horizon. Yet there were other indications of man’s presence, for about a mile ahead Marvin could see the curiously shaped structures clustering round the head of a mine. Now and then a puff of vapour would emerge from a squat smoke-stack and would instantly disperse.

They were past the mine in a moment: Father was driving with a reckless and exhilarating skill as if — it was a strange thought to come into a child’s mind — he was trying to escape from something. In a few minutes they had reached the edge of the plateau

\[2\]unscentillating — not sparkling
on which the Colony had been built. The ground fell sharply away beneath them in a dizzying slope whose lower stretches were lost in shadow. Ahead, as far as the eye could reach, was a jumbled wasteland of craters, mountain ranges, and ravines. The crests of the mountains, catching the low sun, burned like islands of fire in a sea of darkness: and above them the stars still shone as steadfastly as ever. …

And now on the right was a wrinkled, dusty plain, and on the left, its ramparts and terraces rising mile after mile into the sky, was a wall of mountains that marched into the distance until its peaks sank from sight below the rim of the world. There was no sign that men had ever explored this land, but once they passed the skeleton of a crashed rocket, and beside it a stone cairn\(^3\) surmounted by a metal cross. …

The sun was now low behind the hills on the right: the valley before them should be in total darkness. Yet it was awash with a cold white radiance that came spilling over the crags beneath which they were driving. Then, suddenly, they were out in the open plain, and the source of the light lay before them in all its glory.

It was very quiet in the little cabin now that the motors had stopped. The only sound was the faint whisper of the oxygen feed and an occasional metallic crepitation\(^4\) as the outer walls of the vehicle radiated away their heat. For no warmth at all came from the great silver crescent that floated low above the far horizon and flooded all this land with pearly light. It was so brilliant that minutes passed before Marvin could accept its challenge and look steadfastly into its glare, but at last he could discern the outlines of continents, the hazy border of the atmosphere, and the white islands of cloud. And even at this distance, he could see the glitter of sunlight on the polar ice.

It was beautiful, and it called to his heart across the abyss of space. There in that shining crescent were all the wonders that he had never known — the hues of sunset skies, the

\(^3\) cairn — memorial
\(^4\) crepitation — crackling sound
So, at last, Marvin understood the purpose of this pilgrimage. He [his father] would never walk beside the rivers of that lost and legendary world, or listen to the thunder raging above its softly rounded hills. Yet one day — how far ahead? — his children’s children would return to claim their heritage. The winds and the rains would scour the poisons from the burning lands and carry them to the sea, and in the depths of the sea they would waste their venom until they could harm no living things. Then the great ships that were still waiting here on the silent, dusty plains could lift once more into space, along the road that led to home. ... 

Why could they not return? It seemed so peaceful beneath those lines of marching cloud. Then Marvin, his eyes no longer blinded by the glare, saw that the portion of the disk that should have been in darkness was gleaming faintly with an evil phosphorescence: and he remembered. He was looking upon the funeral pyre of a world — upon the radioactive aftermath of Armageddon. Across a quarter of a million miles of space, the glow of dying atoms was still visible, a perennial reminder of the ruined past. It would be centuries yet before that deadly glow died from the rocks and life could return again to fill that silent, empty world. ... 

So, at last, Marvin understood the purpose of this pilgrimage. He [his father] would never walk beside the rivers of that lost and legendary world, or listen to the thunder raging above its softly rounded hills. Yet one day — how far ahead? — his children’s children would return to claim their heritage. The winds and the rains would scour the poisons from the burning lands and carry them to the sea, and in the depths of the sea they would waste their venom until they could harm no living things. Then the great ships that were still waiting here on the silent, dusty plains could lift once more into space, along the road that led to home. ... 

—Arthur C. Clarke
excerpted and adapted from “If I Forget Thee, Oh Earth...”
Expedition to Earth, 1999
Orbit

5benison — blessing
6pyre — bonfire
7Armageddon — a catastrophic battle
1. The images in the first paragraph serve to
   (1) create a sense of solitude
   (2) illustrate the randomness of nature
   (3) create a feeling of anticipation
   (4) illustrate the importance of family

2. Lines 12 through 19 establish
   (1) Marvin’s misgivings about going Outside
   (2) the inhospitable conditions of Outside
   (3) Father’s fears about traveling Outside
   (4) the unpleasant sensations of Outside

3. The statement “it was a strange thought to come into a child’s mind” (line 41) signals
   (1) a change in Marvin’s understanding
   (2) Marvin’s growing embrace of the unknown
   (3) Marvin’s objection to his father’s behavior
   (4) a chance for Marvin’s rescue

4. The phrase “jumbled wasteland of craters, mountain ranges, and ravines” (line 45) reveals the
   (1) futility of the Colony
   (2) desolation of the Outside
   (3) uncertainty of Marvin’s future
   (4) loneliness of Marvin’s past

5. The “glare” described in lines 62 and 72 represents Marvin’s
   (1) romantic vision of the Earth
   (2) obsession with the Earth’s past
   (3) vague memory of the Earth
   (4) faith in the Earth’s restoration

6. Lines 68 through 70 emphasize Marvin’s
   (1) sense of deprivation
   (2) appreciation of his situation
   (3) fear of destruction
   (4) recollection of his childhood
7 The details in lines 72 through 75 confirm the Earth has been damaged by
(1) climate change
(2) cosmic instability
(3) human actions
(4) natural occurrences

8 The images in lines 82 through 84 convey feelings of
(1) fear and disappointment
(2) cleansing and renewal
(3) preservation and protection
(4) confusion and impatience

GO RIGHT ON TO THE NEXT PAGE ➤
9 Which lines best capture Marvin’s understanding of his father’s perspective?

(1) “Tense with expectancy, Marvin settled himself down in the cramped cabin while his father started the motor and checked the controls” (lines 15 and 16)

(2) “They were intense unscintillating points, and suddenly he remembered a rhyme he had once read in one of his father’s books” (lines 25 and 26)

(3) “In a few minutes they had reached the edge of the plateau on which the Colony had been built” (lines 42 and 43)

(4) “He [his father] would never walk beside the rivers of that lost and legendary world, or listen to the thunder raging above its softly rounded hills” (lines 79 through 81)
This Life

My grandmother told me there’d be good days
to counter the dark ones,
with blue skies in the heart as far
as the soul could see. She said

5 you could measure a life in as many ways
as there were to bake a pound cake,
but you still needed real butter and eggs
for a good one—pound cake, that is,
but I knew what she meant. She was always

10 talking around corners like that;
she knew words carried their treasures
like a grape clusters around its own juice.
She loved words; she thought a book
was a monument to the glory of creation

15 and a library … well, sometimes
just trying to describe Jubilation
will get you a bit tongue, so let’s
leave it at that. But my grandmother
was nobody’s fool, and she’d tell anybody

20 smart enough to listen. Don’t let a little pain
stop you; try as hard as you can
every minute you’re given or else
sit down and shut-up—though in her opinion,
keeping quiet in noisy times was a sin

against everything God and democracy
intended us for. I know she’d like
where I’m standing right now. She’d say
a man who could measure his life in deeds
was larger inside than the vessel that carried him;
she’d say he was a cluster of grapes.
My grandmother was only four feet ten
but when she entered a room, even the books
came to attention. Giants come in all sizes:
Sometimes a moment is a monument;
sometimes an institution breathes—
like a library. Like this halycon\(^1\) day.

—Rita Dove
from *The Poets Laureate Anthology*, 2010
W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

\(^1\)halycon — peaceful
10. Lines 1 through 4 establish the grandmother’s 
   (1) questioning nature 
   (2) vivid imagination 
   (3) cautious attitude 
   (4) optimistic outlook 

11. The figurative language in lines 9 and 10 highlights the grandmother’s 
   (1) desire to avoid conflicts 
   (2) tendency to keep secrets 
   (3) strategy to impart wisdom 
   (4) ability to create humor 

12. Which phrase from the poem clarifies the narrator’s statement in line 30? 
   (1) “there’d be good days” (line 1) 
   (2) “smart enough to listen” (line 20) 
   (3) “measure his life in deeds” (line 28) 
   (4) “sometimes an institution breathes” (line 35) 

13. The personification in lines 32 and 33 emphasizes the grandmother’s 
   (1) small size 
   (2) commanding presence 
   (3) family history 
   (4) successful career 

14. The overall tone of the poem can best be described as 
   (1) objective 
   (2) skeptical 
   (3) respectful 
   (4) critical
Texting isn’t the first new technology blamed for ruining communication and common courtesy.

Is text-messaging driving us apart? These days, we talk to each other a lot with our thumbs—mashing out over six billion text messages a day in the United States, and likely a few billion more on services like WhatsApp and Facebook Messenger.

But some worry that so much messaging leads, paradoxically, to less communication. When Sherry Turkle, the MIT clinical psychologist and author, interviewed college students, they said texting was causing friction in their face-to-face interactions. While hanging out with friends they’d be texting surreptitiously at the same time, pretending to maintain eye contact but mentally somewhere else. The new form of communication was fun, sure, but it was colliding with—and eroding—the old one.

“Our texts are fine,” as one student said. “It’s what texting does to our conversations when we are together that’s the problem.” …

New technologies often unsettle the way we relate to one another, of course. But social ruptures caused by texting have a strong echo in the arguments we had a hundred years ago. That’s when a newfangled appliance gave us a strange new way to contact one another en masse:¹ the telephone. …

At first, the telephone was marketed mainly as a tool for business. Physicians and drugstores bought them to process orders, and business owners installed them at home so they could be quickly reached. The phone, proclaimed early ad copy, gave business leaders an ESP-like “sixth sense”² of their far-flung operations. …

¹ en masse — in a group at the same time
² ESP-like “sixth sense” — heightened intuition
Nonetheless, the telephone quickly gave birth to curious new forms of socializing. Callers arranged regular weekly “visiting” calls, dialing remote family to catch up on news. “Distance rolls away and for a few minutes every Thursday night the familiar voices tell the little family gossip that both are so eager to hear,” a Bell ad cooed in 1921.

Phone companies even boasted that the phone was an improvement over that stodgy, low-fi communication, the letter. “Correspondence will help for a time, but friendships do not flourish for long on letters alone,” a 1931 Bell sales manual noted. “When you can’t visit in person, telephone periodically. Telephone calls will keep up the whole intimacy remarkably well.”

Soon, though, social critics began to wonder: Was all this phone chatter good for us? Was it somehow a lesser form of communication than what had come before? “Does the telephone make men more active or more lazy?” wondered the Knights of Columbus in a 1926 meeting. “Does the telephone break up home life and the old practice of visiting friends?”

Others worried that the inverse would occur—that it would be so easy to talk that we’d never leave each other alone. “Thanks to the telephone, motor-car and such-like inventions, our neighbors have it in their power to turn our leisure into a series of interruptions,” complained an American professor in 1929. And surely it couldn’t be healthy to talk to each other so much. Wouldn’t it create Too Much Information [TMI]?

“We shall soon be nothing but transparent heaps of jelly to each other,” a London writer moaned in 1897. Others fretted that the telephone sped up life, demanding instant reactions. “The use of the telephone gives little room for reflection,” wrote a British newspaper in 1899. “It does not improve the temper, and it engenders a feverishness in the ordinary concerns of life which does not make for domestic happiness and comfort.”

Perhaps the strangest thing was being in the room while a friend talked to someone else—someone outside the room. In 1880, Mark Twain wrote “A Telephonic Conversation,” transcribing the half-a-conversation as he listened to his wife on the phone. To the observer,
as the skit pointed out, a telephone call sounded like disjointed nonsense. Even phone companies worried about whether the device created new forms of rude behavior; a 1910 Bell ad warned about “Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde at the Telephone.” …

Indeed, some believed the phone improved our social behavior, because it forced a listener to pay closer attention to a speaker. Devoid of visual signals, we must be “all ears and memory,” a pundit\(^3\) wrote in 1915: “The mind cannot wander.” Plus, by eradicating distance, wouldn’t the phone reduce misunderstanding? War, even? “Someday we will build up a world telephone system making necessary to all peoples the use of a common language, or common understanding of languages, which will join all the people of the earth into one brotherhood,” gushed John J. Carty, AT&T chief engineer, in 1907.

These utopian\(^4\) views, of course, were wildly optimistic. But the gloomy views of pessimists, as [author, Claude] Fischer notes, didn’t come true either. Even Emily Post, the etiquette expert, came around to the telephone. By the 1920s, she’d accepted “Hello” as a suitable greeting, and even thought it was acceptable to invite someone to dinner with a call. “Custom which has altered many ways and manners has taken away all opprobrium\(^5\) from the message,” she shrugged.

Nowadays, the telephone call seems like a quaint throwback to a gentler era. When Jenna Birch, the journalist, started dating a man who insisted on calling her on the phone, she found it warm and delightful—though her friends thought the behavior odd. Phone calls now seem retro.\(^6\)

Academics have observed this shift, too. “My students just do not think of the phone as a mechanism of vocal interaction—they think of that as very rare,” says John Durham

\(^3\) pundit — an expert who shares opinions with the public
\(^4\) utopian — idealistic
\(^5\) opprobrium — disgrace
\(^6\) retro — dated
Peters, a communication professor at the University of Iowa, and author of *Speaking Into the Air*. He doesn’t think the shift to texting has degraded our interactions, though. By the middle of the 20th century, studies found that the telephone appeared not to have eroded social contact—indeed, some research found those with phones wrote more old-fashioned letters than those without. Similarly, modern surveys by the Pew Research Center have found that teenagers who text the most are also those who spend the most time face to face with friends. Communication, it seems, begets more communication, and—as Peters argues—just because talk happens in text doesn’t mean it’s not meaningful.

“Media scholars,” he notes, “have this long romance with ‘conversation’ as the cure to the disease of media.”

Still, it’s not hard to be dispirited by the divided attention so many of Turkle’s subjects bemoaned in their lives. Indeed, Michéle Martin, of Carleton, thinks we’re living through a replay of the telephone, where the things that made it valuable—instant communications—are the same that made it annoying. “People believe they are liberated because they can bring the mobile phone everywhere,” Martin says. “But at the same time they are slaves to it.”

The poet Carl Sandburg captured that dissonance in a 1916 poem about the telephone. He imagined a telephone wire being aware of the disparate uses to which it was being put—coursing with conversations both deep and frivolous. “It is love and war and money; it is the fighting and the tears, the work and want / Death and laughter of men and women passing through me, carrier of your speech.”

—Clive Thompson

excerpted and adapted from “OMG! We’ve Been Here B4”

*Smithsonian*, March 2016

---

7 dispirited — discouraged

8 disparate — varying
15 The first paragraph of the text serves to
(1) highlight the prevalence of texting
(2) stress the benefits of texting
(3) explain the origins of texting
(4) support the abolition of texting

16 As used in line 7, the word “surreptitiously” most nearly means
(1) politely (3) secretly
(2) boldly (4) earnestly

17 The details in lines 16 through 19 reveal that the telephone was initially
(1) associated with the supernatural
(2) not considered very useful
(3) often blamed for worker illness
(4) not used for social purposes

18 The use of the word “cooed” (line 23) implies that telephone advertisers were
(1) helpful and patient
(2) strategic and persuasive
(3) childish and inconsiderate
(4) sarcastic and relentless

19 Lines 29 through 38 illustrate society’s
(1) enthusiasm about using new technology
(2) dependence on those proficient in new technology
(3) grasp of the significance of new technology
(4) concern about the impact of new technology

20 The figurative language in line 39 implies that telephone use would cause people to
(1) lose self-confidence and motivation
(2) lack substance and individuality
(3) attract danger and adversity
(4) become narrow-minded and uninformed
21 The statements from a Bell ad (lines 48 and 49) and the AT&T chief engineer (lines 55 and 56) offer
(1) contrasting perspectives on the potential effects of the telephone
(2) strong support for the growing popularity of the telephone
(3) alternative options for communicating with family members
(4) insightful evaluation of the importance of long-distance conversations

22 The “utopian views” of the early 1900s (line 57) suggested that telephone use could
(1) improve local commerce
(2) encourage language studies
(3) promote global unity
(4) influence community values

23 The information about Emily Post (lines 58 through 62) contributes to a central idea that
(1) rules of proper behavior can be confusing
(2) norms of good conduct are universal
(3) concepts of politeness can evolve over time
(4) conventions of salutation depend on status

24 The quotations in lines 82 through 84 reflect a sense of
(1) bias
(2) irony
(3) suspense
(4) resolution
Part 2

Argument

Directions: Closely read each of the four texts provided on pages 22 through 33 and write a source-based argument on the topic below. You may use the margins to take notes as you read and scrap paper to plan your response. Write your argument beginning on page 1 of your essay booklet.

Topic: Should pets be allowed in the workplace?

Your Task: Carefully read each of the four texts provided. Then, using evidence from at least three of the texts, write a well-developed argument regarding whether or not pets should be allowed in the workplace. Clearly establish your claim, distinguish your claim from alternate or opposing claims, and use specific, relevant, and sufficient evidence from at least three of the texts to develop your argument. Do not simply summarize each text.
Guidelines:

**Be sure to:**

- Establish your claim regarding whether or not pets should be allowed in the workplace
- Distinguish your claim from alternate or opposing claims
- Use specific, relevant, and sufficient evidence from at least three of the texts to develop your argument
- Identify each source that you reference by text number and line number(s) or graphic (for example: Text 1, line 4 or Text 2, graphic)
- Organize your ideas in a cohesive and coherent manner
- Maintain a formal style of writing
- Follow the conventions of standard written English

Texts:

Text 1 – Do Pets in the Workplace Improve Morale?
Text 2 – Why Pets in the Workplace May Not Be As Great As You Thought
Text 3 – Why a Pet-Friendly Office May Be the Key to Employee Satisfaction
Text 4 – Don’t Bring Your Dog to Work
Text 1

Do Pets in the Workplace Improve Morale?

Human resource managers are always looking for ways to improve morale and create a more appealing workplace culture. The popularity of the recent film release “The Secret Life of Pets” [2016] underscores the love we Americans have for our pets. In fact, around 65 percent of U.S. households are home to at least one pet. The majority of these are dogs and cats. …

The benefits of being around animals have inspired human resource personnel and other business decision makers to allow pets in the workplace. The top motive for making this allowance is the stress-reducing effect that animals bring. Employees who are less stressed at work are more productive and miss fewer days due to being sick.

Pet-friendly businesses usually focus mainly on allowing dogs in the workplace. However, some allow cats, birds and reptiles. A retail business might have “shop cats” that live on the premises, or smaller animals kept in cages that can become company mascots and offer a source of stress relief for workers.

An Internet giant paves the way with pets in the workplace.

…These days, about 2,000 dogs accompany their owners to Amazon each day. Workers and management have embraced the culture, and the pet-friendly policy benefits both owners and those who don’t own pets. No matter what the workday brings, Amazon staff members are never far away from a coworker’s terrier or spaniel poking its head around a corner. Any stress they were feeling melts away. …

Pet-friendly workplaces rate higher.

Banfield Pet Hospital recently surveyed over 1,000 employees and 200 human resource decision makers for its Pets At Work barometer called “Pet-Friendly Workplace PAWrometer.” The goal was to measure worker opinions about pets in the workplace. Those
who worked in pet-friendly offices were found to believe it improves the atmosphere in the workplace significantly.

The majority of workers in pet-friendly workplaces consider the policy to be positive. A full 91 percent of managers and 82 percent of employees felt workers become more loyal to the company with this policy. A large majority felt it made the workplace more productive, and 86 percent of workers and 92 percent of management reported decreased worker stress levels. Not only do pets in the workplace make the environment less stressful, workers are also less burdened with guilt about leaving a pet at home alone while they are at work. They are then more likely to work longer hours if required.

While pet-friendly businesses improve existing employees’ lives, they are also appealing to new applicants. It’s a benefit that millennials find appealing and offers a way to draw in a larger talent pool.

So, how do pet-friendly workplaces stack up in terms of pros and cons? Let’s take a look:

The benefits of pets in the workplace.

- **Happier, more productive workers.** Both pet owners and non-pet owning employees report lowered stress levels and a higher level of job satisfaction with pets on the premises. This naturally leads to increased productivity.

- **Healthier workers.** In addition to reduced stress levels, being around animals has documented positive effects on blood pressure, cholesterol levels and the immune system.

- **Increased loyalty.** Over half of employees in non-pet-friendly workplaces report they’d be more likely to continue working for a company if they could bring their pet to work.

---

1 millennials — the generation born in the 1980s or 1990s, especially in the U.S.
Potential problems you may encounter by allowing pets in the workplace.

- **Not everyone is an animal lover.** There are people who dislike animals for one reason or another. Allergies, phobias, or a general dislike of animals could cause pets in the workplace to encroach\(^2\) upon productivity and quality of life for these individuals.

- **Hygiene and cleanliness issues.** Even potty-trained pets can have an accident now and then. There is no guarantee this won’t happen in the workplace, especially with a high volume of animals brought to work.

- **Interoffice squabbles.** Not all animals get along, so there is the potential for fights between dogs and cats brought to work.

While worker distraction is a concern for some human resource managers considering a pet-friendly policy, the vast majority report that the benefits to morale and overall productivity far outweigh time spent “distracted” by pets in the workplace.

Advocates of allowing pets in the workplace insist that there are ways around the “cons” or risks of pet-friendly workplaces. The key to a successful pet policy is a clear structure. …

—excerpted and adapted from “Do Pets in the Workplace Improve Morale?” [https://online.arbor.edu](https://online.arbor.edu), August 8, 2016

---

\(^2\) encroach — intrude
Why Pets in the Workplace May Not Be As Great As You Thought

...Study after study has proven how pets have a calming effect on our bodies and minds, how they help children with A.D.D. [Attention Deficit Disorder] focus better, how they reduce blood pressure and lower stress, how pets at the workplace make employees more creative, productive, and cordial to each other, and how they’re such awesome additions to our lives overall.

So it would seem that if we spend the best parts of our waking hours at work, there’s no better way to carry forward these wonderful benefits that pets bring into our work lives too, right? Well, unfortunately there are no simple answers here.

While there is a growing wave of companies led by the usual suspects—Google, Zynga, Ben & Jerry’s, and others—that allow employees to take their pets along to the workplace, there’s also a growing debate about the practicality of the whole idea. And these voices of concern are not just coming from the minority of pet-haters or pet-neutral folks around. Even pet owners have reservations about bringing their beloved pooch to the office with them on a daily basis. Here’s why:

Not in the Pink of Health

...Spare a thought for the millions of your fellow Americans who suffer from pet related allergies. The Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America pegs the figure of Americans with one form of pet allergy or another at 15% to 30% of the total population. Some of these allergies are so severe that they cause rashes, temporary breathlessness, panic attacks, and even severe respiratory disorders.

In addition to a physical reaction to the presence of pets around them, you could have coworkers who are genuinely scared of animals and feel stressed out around them. For such
individuals a pet in their workplace is not a calming presence, but rather a constant threat to their wellbeing and safety.

**Safety First**

…Many industries by their very nature are not conducive\(^1\) to having pets sauntering around. Medical facilities, pharmaceutical companies, chemical laboratories, and food businesses are all sectors where a pet can be a serious threat to the quality of the final product or service. In such environments, pets pose a genuine contamination hazard and are best kept out, no questions asked.

In some cases, it’s in your pet’s best interest to chill out at home and skip the trip to the workplace. Industries like construction, mining, refineries, and more can be dangerous for your pet’s health and well-being. You wouldn’t want to put your pet at risk just so you can be happy at work, would you? …

**Real Costs to the Company**

As any pet owner will tell you, owning their bundle of joy is not cheap. From $1570 for a large dog to $575 for a parakeet per year, pet ownership comes at an ever-increasing price tag. When you turn your office into a pet-friendly zone, you are in turn taking on some of the expenses of owning a pet upon yourself. Be prepared to stock your workplace with at least basic pet supplies like snacks, water bowls, kitty litter, and chew toys.

If you think your costs end there (or are tangible), you are mistaken. Pets at the workplace also bring with them a built-in deterrent\(^2\) for employees seeking career opportunities at your organization. With the market for talented and qualified workers already so scarce, adding an extra filter to your recruitment process may not be the smartest idea from a competitive perspective. …

---

\(^1\) conducive — favorable

\(^2\) deterrent — obstacle
While the benefits that pets bring with them are numerous and the pro-pet lobby gets louder with every passing day, organizations need to also give credence\(^3\) to the real issues that four-legged and feathered guests at work bring along with them. …

—Rohan Ayyar

excerpted and adapted from “Why Pets in the Workplace May Not Be As Great As You Thought”

www.fastcompany.com, November 14, 2014

\(^3\)credence — support
Text 3

Why a Pet-Friendly Office May Be the Key to Employee Satisfaction

...The pet-friendly office is transforming our current idea of the typical nine-to-five workspace. Although the primary allure appears to be 24/7 cuddles with man’s best friend, the actual benefits of a pet-friendly office go much deeper.

Some of the world’s biggest companies have proudly joined the ranks of pet-friendly businesses, from Googleplex,\(^1\) to Build-A-Bear Workshop, to hospitals in New Jersey. This shift in office culture has shown that pet-friendly offices can provide unexpected (and positive) results to all varieties of businesses. ...

**Employee Satisfaction and Stress**

Employee satisfaction is a constant concern for an engaging and exciting place. Studies have shown that unhappy workers can cause businesses to lose thousands of dollars over time due to sick leave, mediocre work, and destructive behavior. Keeping the office engaging and exciting can be a struggle, and combating organizational stress may be key to improving a company’s profits. ...

Giving employees the option to bring their pet to work could also save them the worry associated with leaving a pet at home. Instead of scrambling through the end of the day to go home and let the dog out, they have the dog with them and can continue to work without rushing. Instead of spending money on a pet daycare on a regular basis, workers can watch their furry friend while in the office.

Pets are also known to be great stress-relievers in general. It’s no wonder that Animal-Assisted Therapy is recognized as one of the leading treatments for post-war PTSD [Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder] and is gaining ground as a popular solution for social

\(^1\)Googleplex — Google headquarters
workers. Multiple studies have shown that simply petting cats or dogs can be extremely beneficial for our health; from lowering blood pressure to increasing bone density.

**Attract Millennials**

As a millennial, I can assure you: I would choose a pet-friendly office over the majority of other job offers out there. The benefit of bringing my pup to work is a much stronger pull than a larger paycheck or fancy corner office.

Millennials love their pets, and millennials love pet-friendly offices. In fact, you could even argue that millennials are the reason pet-friendly offices are taking the business world by storm. Being the largest demographic to enter the workforce, they have already brought with them a demand for a new form of workplace flexibility and a break from the traditional office culture of our predecessors. ...

**Improve Communication**

If you’ve ever walked your dog through a park or downtown area, there’s a significant chance that you’ve received more waves, ‘hellos’, and acknowledgements than if you had been walking by yourself. Walking or even being near a dog is an excellent ice-breaker.

Shifting to a pet-friendly workspace can bring that same level of open and enthusiastic communication into the office. Water cooler conversations will lose some of their awkward chatter, and employees will have the added encouragement of meeting new people in the building through their pets. This can lead to some inspiring brainstorm conversations as well as an increase in camaraderie and trust among workers.

A 2012 study by the Virginia Commonwealth University found that employees that brought their dogs to work were not only less stressed than their pet-free predecessors, but those employees believed they were 50 percent more productive with the presence of their pets.

---

2 water cooler conversations — informal conversation
3 camaraderie — fellowship
pets. The public relations manager of the company that participated, Lisa Conklin of Replacements Dinnerware, stated after the conclusion of the study:

“The study proved what we always thought: having dogs around leads to a more productive work environment, and people get to know each other through the pets. If you are in a position where something is stressful, seeing that wagging tail and puppy smile brightens the day—it can turn around the whole environment.”

**Promote Employee Activity**

On top of all these benefits, pets can also improve employee activity. Dog owners in the office will most likely have to walk their dog at least once a day, allowing them the opportunity to get away from their computer and into the open air. Workplace wellness has received considerable attention lately and more companies are making this a priority. Pet-friendly offices can inspire a smooth transition to a more ‘mobile’ office. …

—Katie McBeth

excerpted and adapted from “Why a Pet-Friendly Office May Be the Key to Employee Satisfaction”

Don’t Bring Your Dog to Work

If there’s a dog in the cubicle next to you, you’re hardly alone: About 7 percent of employers now allow pets in the workplace, reports NPR [National Public Radio]. Five years ago, that figure stood at 5 percent. That might not seem like a big jump, but once you remove jobs that don’t have offices from the equation—manufacturing and agriculture, for instance—that’s about a 50 percent increase. That rise is a victory for people who tout the benefits of inviting dogs and other furry friends into the office: It lowers the stress of employees, increases morale, produces tangible health benefits, and reduces turnover, all at no cost to the company.

But how do the dogs feel about it?

“Most people do not understand dog body language,” said E’Lise Christensen, a board-certified veterinary behaviorist in Colorado. One major concern she has with the rise of pet-friendly work environments is the corresponding increased risk for behavioral problems, especially dog bites. Since almost no one, not even many dog trainers, knows how to properly interpret dog body language, co-workers might interpret the panting of a dog in the office as a friendly smile, rather than a sign of nervousness. And in dogs, nervousness can lead to bites. “[People] can identify abject fear, and they can identify extreme aggression, but they cannot reliably identify things in between,” said Christensen. It’s in that wide middle area where we may not recognize pet discomfort.

Bonnie Beaver, executive director of the American College of Veterinary Behaviorists and a professor at Texas A&M University, said in an email that dog bites are not the only behavioral issues that might present problems. Generally, dogs are expected to sit still in an office setting, which can be difficult for active dogs, leading to boredom (which, in turn, leads to problem behaviors like chewing up desk legs). These policies are also particularly hard on

---

1. abject — severe
dogs if they’re taken to the office only occasionally, instead of regularly; dogs are big on routines, and uncertainty adds to their fear and stress.

Once you expand the conversation beyond our most domesticated companion, the prospects get even iffier. “Not all animals are comfortable with a very social setting,” said Christensen. Each new animal, like cats or pot-bellied pigs, brings its own social complexities, not to mention the possibility of contagious disease (it’s rare that employers require proof of vaccination). Rabies, ringworm, and parasitic infections like scabies are all potential health risks for humans that come into contact with pets that haven’t been properly vetted.²

Of course there’s obvious appeal. Many people love dogs. They write whole articles gushing about a furrier workplace. (Dog skeptics, at least vocal ones, are harder to find.) When an employer is on board, the policy is often as informal as a person in charge saying, “Yeah, sure, whatever. Bring your dogs. It’ll be great.” Little or no oversight is applied to a matter that needs it in order to ensure the environment is conducive³ to pets in the workplace.

Christensen said companies should ideally hire an in-house behavioral expert to oversee a pet-at-work policy, especially in the initial stages, “but unless you’re Google, I don’t see that happening.” More realistically, she said, better awareness will go a long way. Employers should take care to craft a policy that works for dogs’ well-being as well as humans’. This can include requiring proof of vaccinations, as well as providing training for offices on dog behavior (which can be as basic as watching videos).

“It’s critical that people with dogs get special education, in at least body language, even if they think they know normal body language,” said Christensen. Given that most people can’t even tell the difference between a relaxed and anxious dog, this advice seems prudent.

---

²vetted — examined
³conducive — favorable
Before more offices throw open their doors to dogs willy-nilly\(^4\) and more pets start tagging along on the morning commute, we should learn how better to listen to them. They might be asking to stay at home.

—Matt Miller
excerpted and adapted from “Don’t Bring Your Dog to Work”
www.slate.com, August 15, 2016

\(^4\)willy-nilly — in an unplanned manner
Part 3

Text-Analysis Response

Your Task: Closely read the text provided on pages 35 through 37 and write a well-developed, text-based response of two to three paragraphs. In your response, identify a central idea in the text and analyze how the author’s use of one writing strategy (literary element or literary technique or rhetorical device) develops this central idea. Use strong and thorough evidence from the text to support your analysis. Do not simply summarize the text. You may use the margins to take notes as you read and scrap paper to plan your response. Write your response in the spaces provided on pages 7 through 9 of your essay booklet.

Guidelines:

Be sure to:

• Identify a central idea in the text
• Analyze how the author’s use of one writing strategy (literary element or literary technique or rhetorical device) develops this central idea. Examples include: characterization, conflict, denotation/connotation, metaphor, simile, irony, language use, point-of-view, setting, structure, symbolism, theme, tone, etc.
• Use strong and thorough evidence from the text to support your analysis
• Organize your ideas in a cohesive and coherent manner
• Maintain a formal style of writing
• Follow the conventions of standard written English
…There were a number of people out this afternoon, far more than last Sunday. And the band sounded louder and gayer. That was because the Season had begun. For although the band played all the year round on Sundays, out of season it was never the same. It was like some one playing with only the family to listen; it didn’t care how it played if there weren’t any strangers present. Wasn’t the conductor wearing a new coat, too? She was sure it was new. He scraped with his foot and flapped his arms like a rooster about to crow, and the bandsmen sitting in the green rotunda blew out their cheeks and glared at the music. Now there came a little “flutey” bit—very pretty!—a little chain of bright drops. She was sure it would be repeated. It was; she lifted her head and smiled.

Only two people shared her “special” seat: a fine old man in a velvet coat, his hands clasped over a huge carved walking-stick, and a big old woman, sitting upright, with a roll of knitting on her embroidered apron. They did not speak. This was disappointing, for Miss Brill always looked forward to the conversation. She had become really quite expert, she thought, at listening as though she didn’t listen, at sitting in other people’s lives just for a minute while they talked round her.

She glanced, sideways, at the old couple. Perhaps they would go soon. Last Sunday, too, hadn’t been as interesting as usual. An Englishman and his wife, he wearing a dreadful Panama hat and she button boots. And she’d gone on the whole time about how she ought to wear spectacles;¹ she knew she needed them; but that it was no good getting any; they’d be sure to break and they’d never keep on. And he’d been so patient. He’d suggested everything—gold rims, the kind that curved round your ears, little pads inside the bridge. No, nothing would please her. “They’ll always be sliding down my nose!” Miss Brill had wanted to shake her.

¹spectacles — glasses
The old people sat on the bench, still as statues. Never mind, there was always the crowd to watch. To and fro, in front of the flower-beds and the band rotunda, the couples and groups paraded, stopped to talk, to greet, to buy a handful of flowers from the old beggar who had his tray fixed to the railings. Little children ran among them, swooping and laughing; little boys with big white silk bows under their chins, little girls, little French dolls, dressed up in velvet and lace. And sometimes a tiny staggerer came suddenly rocking into the open from under the trees, stopped, stared, as suddenly sat down “flop,” until its small high-stepping mother, like a young hen, rushed scolding to its rescue. Other people sat on the benches and green chairs, but they were nearly always the same, Sunday after Sunday, and—Miss Brill had often noticed—there was something funny about nearly all of them. They were odd, silent, nearly all old, and from the way they stared they looked as though they’d just come from dark little rooms or even—even cupboards!

Behind the rotunda the slender trees with yellow leaves down drooping, and through them just a line of sea, and beyond the blue sky with gold-veined clouds.

Tum-tum-tum tiddle-um! tiddle-um! tum tiddley-um tum ta! blew the band. …

Oh, how fascinating it was! How she enjoyed it! How she loved sitting here, watching it all! It was like a play. It was exactly like a play. Who could believe the sky at the back wasn’t painted? But it wasn’t till a little brown dog trotted on solemn and then slowly trotted off, like a little “theatre” dog, a little dog that had been drugged, that Miss Brill discovered what it was that made it so exciting. They were all on the stage. They weren’t only the audience, not only looking on; they were acting. Even she had a part and came every Sunday. No doubt somebody would have noticed if she hadn’t been there; she was part of the performance after all. How strange she’d never thought of it like that before! And yet it explained why she made such a point of starting from home at just the same time each week—so as not to be late for the performance—and it also explained why she had quite a queer, shy feeling at telling her English pupils how she spent her Sunday afternoons. No wonder! Miss Brill nearly laughed out loud. She was on the stage. She thought of the old
invalid gentleman to whom she read the newspaper four afternoons a week while he slept in the garden. She had got quite used to the frail head on the cotton pillow, the hollowed eyes, the open mouth and the high pinched nose. If he’d been dead she mightn’t have noticed for weeks; she wouldn’t have minded. But suddenly he knew he was having the paper read to him by an actress! “An actress!” The old head lifted; two points of light quivered in the old eyes. “An actress—are ye?” And Miss Brill smoothed the newspaper as though it were the manuscript of her part and said gently; “Yes, I have been an actress for a long time.” …

—Katherine Mansfield
excerpted from “Miss Brill”
The Garden Party and Other Stories, 1922
Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.