



About this file:

The **24+ Essay Series** is compiled and published periodically by our team at: www.samteaches.com.

Each set includes 12 essays (8 independent tasks and 4 dependent ones) of our students, which my colleagues and I have thoroughly checked and scored 24+. There is great consistency between these scores and the actual results students get on the test, though slight variations do exist based on their performance and exam questions.

24+ Essay Series does not include the actual corrections and comments made by our team since it is meant to provide a sample for your idea development and paragraph structure, and should be intended as such. Materials with other purposes are available.

Visit our website for additional exclusively-designed TOEFL files and materials: www.samteaches.com

Join our newly created Telegram group @[www.t.me/zamzam_sam](https://t.me/zamzam_sam) to be informed about our courses and webinars, and get access to mini-lessons, teachers' comments, and sample paragraphs that include grammatical, lexical and structural corrections. (We also have friendly and active members, who constantly help each other out. Feel free to drop by just to say hi!)

Thank you,

Sam Zarrinmehr

Q: Some parents offer their school-age children money for each high (mark) they get in school. Do you think this is a good idea?

Parents are definitely wishing their children have a good performance in their school education. This is because having an impressive educational record is most likely to pave the path of success in the next stage of their professional life. Accordingly, the parents tend to take various approaches so that they could reach to their goals. In this regard, a question which is often raised is that whether it is a good idea that school-age children are offered money for getting each high mark in school. I strongly agree with this deed and believe it will bring fruitful outcomes. In what follows, I will pinpoint my two conspicuous reasons to justify my view in the following.

The first point to be mentioned is that offering money in turn of acquiring each high grade would be an impressive incentive to next high grades, in that, if children are given money for achieving a high point, they will definitely continue to work harder so that they will be capable of obtaining the next gift. In other words, offering money would presumably encourage the children to keep studying. My own personal experience demonstrates this issue well. When I was at primary school, my parents offered me 10\$ for getting A at each course. This offer highly encouraged me to be an aim-oriented and hard-working student to acquire money. Having worked hard, I eventually succeeded in obtaining it in every course and was totally given 50\$. This example shows how effective such an offer could pay off.

Second, it is critically important that a child learns the ways s/he can manage the economic matters. To explain more, it is a wholesome idea that parents give money to school-age children, and monitor how they are likely to spend it. They know when monitored, the children will strive to drastically handle their financial demands. Additionally, it is a good practice for their future when they will be responsible for meeting the needs of their own family. The results of an investigation, conducted through a survey, revealed that individuals who have been familiar with monetary and financial issues since childhood perform financially better in their life. Thus, giving money to teenagers would properly provide a valuable opportunity to learn how to manage their money, equipping them with worthwhile managerial skills.

To sum up, by contemplating the aforementioned reasons, one realizes that offering school-age children money for achieving a high point is a good idea. This is because it holds an encouraging impact, and gives raise to be practiced financial management skill.

Score: 25~

Q: Which one of the following values is the most important to share with a young child (5-10 years old)?

- 1. Being helpful**
- 2. Being honest**
- 3. Being well organized**

Without any doubt, children are both the makers and the markers of healthy, sustainable societies. Children and young people are the makers of future world, and measures of their progress will also be the markers of that world. Some people are inclined toward the opinion that sharing and teaching them to be helpful and well organized are of great importance. However, others may have the opposing viewpoint. They believe that it is worth seeking for honesty in children and in adults. I firmly concur with the group's idea. In what follows, my reasons supporting this opinion would be delineated.

The first exquisite point to be mentioned is that honesty is a huge part of self-improvement and overcoming delusional thinking for whole people. It becomes of greater importance when people are in the lower ages, especially ranged from five to ten years old, because they begin to know their personality and the world around themselves. If they aren't honest with themselves, then they can't expect to learn and grow as individuals, because they aren't willing to recognize reality for what it is. When they are dishonest, they only choose to see what they want to see, but they ignore what they don't want to see. This may provide short-term happiness or relief, but in the long-run it's unhealthy and destructive. Being honest with ourselves can sometimes be painful, but it's a necessary component to long-term happiness and success in our lives.

The second rationale behind my opinion is rooted in the fact that honesty builds trust and honest individuals know this and it gives them very effective relationship-building abilities. Unsurprisingly, honesty engenders trust among people, groups, and organizations. When people know that someone makes no attempt to conceal their true feelings and motives, they have no fear of communicating with each other and building a relationship. Moreover, children, who are in the way to build their future, are supposed to learn the most important factors to make friends and a long-term relationship. As can be seen, honest children enhance their abilities to connect to their peers, society, and future.

In short, the thing that honest people understand better than anything else is that being inwardly honest is as important, if not more important, than being outwardly honest. Being honest with ourselves can be painful, particularly for children, but highly rewarding. When honesty meets our willingness to change, there are ways we can grow and improve.

Score: 24~

Q: Some people like to buy and eat their meals at restaurants frequently while others like to do this at home. Which do you prefer? Why? (TOEFL iBT Exam of June 10, 2017)

It is widely accepted that eating is one of the pivotal parts of one's life by which the energy for living is afforded and most of the people have programs for their food. In this modern era, people have lots of occupancies and they may not have enough time for themselves. Regarding this issue some prefer to buy and eat their meals at restaurants frequently while others like to do this at home. I am a member of the second group and from my perspective they are doing the right. In the following paragraphs I will elaborate my point of view by some outstanding reasons.

The first reason that I would like to put emphasis on is that the second group will eat healthier food. When food is prepared at home, we know what we eat and we rarely do not trick ourselves about it. In contrast, not only do the foods which are prepared in restaurant not provide one's body enough nutrition, but also long use of them can be harmful and cause diseases. Actually, most of the restaurants try to have their food delicious to make their customers a fan of themselves. By having this aim the nutrition facts of the meals are disregarded. However, when one prepares food at home, s/he focuses on nutrition as well as taste, and they know what ingredients they are using and how healthy they are. Currently, academicians who work in this era try to make the people aware of this fact. A recent study which is conducted to find the relationship between the health level of the people and their usual meals found that people who have the habit to eat at restaurants show more disease rates than those try to prepare their food at home.

Furthermore, one may bring up the idea that today you can find places where healthy food is provided and one who is careful about this issue can eat at such places. Here it should be presented that such places cannot be found easily and even if there is one near some body the main problem will come up: "Money". As healthy food providers try to maintain their quality, they should always use the best material for providing their food which causes a meal to cost high for the people. Now imagine the costs one should pay for eating regularly at such places. Meantime, a method for saving money is to eat at home, thus in this way the life would be less expensive.

To make a long story short, all the aforementioned reasons lead us to the conclusion that eating regularly at home is a better choice instead of restaurants and not only brings a healthier life, but also reduces expenses of it. Of course, sometimes people have to eat at restaurants but as a regular habit, it would not be a good one.

Score: 25~

Q: When parents are busy, is it better to let childcare centers take care of their kids, or have individual caretakers do it?

Nowadays, most parents do not have enough time to spend with their children for different reasons, some of them are busy working outdoors, participating in different classes, etc. so they have to look for a place to take care of their children; some people choose to send their children to a childcare center where many children are taken care of; others prefer to send their children to an individual caregiver. I, personally, think an individual caregiver is a better option; the following reasons will aptly elucidate my perspectives.

The first exquisite point to be mention is that the possibility of getting hurt by other children is zero by the individual caregiver option. In childcare centers, there are many children and they may hurt each when they play; especially when they are less than 3 years old, they should be watched carefully. For example, once my nephew was in one of these childcare centers, when he was painting, he nearly became blind because one of the kids put a pencil into his eyes. Of course, he didn't do it on purpose since he was a little kid too; there were lots of them there and one person was not enough to take care all of the carefully.

Second, it is established beyond doubt that children may learn some inappropriate behaviors or words in a group of strange children, but being with an individual caregiver does not have this drawback. There are plenty of them in childcare centers and it is not possible to watch all of them all the time; children may learn some improper behaviors or words from each other even without knowing the meaning of them, but with an individual caregiver, not only are the parents sure that their children will received full time attention but also they won't meet these problem too.

Third, it is an indisputable fact that by an individual caregiver, people are able to perform their children's specific plan like: especial food diet, medicine, lesson, etc. which are not feasible or hard to be observed in details in childcare centers because there are just one or two caregiver for all those children; it is obvious that they cannot dedicated a lot of time to each of them, but the number of the children an individual care giver should taking care of is limited, as a result some intensive cares are doable.

To sum up, by considering all the ideas above, sending children to an individual caregiver in comparison with sending them to a childcare center not only provides a more protected situation for children but also there is no chance of learning some unsuitable behavior or words from other children and parents can be sure that their children's some special plan can be carried out on time.

Score: 26-27~

Q: Are governments doing well in educating people to pay attention to the importance of the food nutrition and healthy eating?

It is needless to say that healthy life style of the people in a society should be one of the governments' priorities and they should make some strategies for educating people to eat healthy. In this regard, some insist that governments do not pay attention enough for this issue and even if they do something in order to educate people, they are not sufficient and not a satisfying result. However, others hold a different perspective, proposing that governments have made some profitable strategies which will lead to great results step by step. I, for one, concur with the latter group and will elaborate on my viewpoint thorough the following paragraphs.

Firstly, it is a rule in many countries that all food industries have to pass some standards and the government, by means of media, tell people those standards and emphasis on checking them before buying products. As an illustration, in my country the government started to use a kind of hologram on food packs which had passes some standards relating to human health and announce it at and radio every day in order to make sure every people catch it. Knowing that only healthy food products have that hologram, people started to buy those kinds of foods and avoid using other products. In that way, food industries which were not sanitary enough had to improve their food qualities or they became bankrupted.

Secondly, there are many educational programs for children both at school and at kids' TV shows which teach them about harmful effects of some foods on their health. For example, in my country there is a TV program for kids which talks about one kind of food every session. One day, when I was watching it with my brother, it was about chips and snacks, which my brother ate a lot even instead of his main meal. The program was trying to make children avoid eating those junk foods too much by talking about their disadvantages for their health and encouraging them to eat healthier foods. After that my brother was less interested in those kinds of foods which lead to a healthier eating behavior for him.

In conclusion, although some people believe that there are some imperfections in governments' plans in educating people to eat healthy, since it is obvious that the governments are paying attention to educate people of different ages to care about their food thorough media and some other methods, I firmly think that they are doing their best and can finally got great results from their strategies.

Score: 24~

Q: Agree or disagree? Nowadays it is easier to maintain good health than in the past.

Throughout the whole history, no one can cast a shadow of doubt on the fact that having a good health has played a pivotal and prominent role for every person's life and perennially, every society has been trying to choose and achieve a healthy life. As a controversial matter, plethora of people may hold this conviction that nowadays it is easier to maintain good health than in the past, while others refute it and have a colliding viewpoint. Being cognizant to the logic who endorse or repudiate the legitimacy of this connection, and not having any biased perception, I totally disagree with the former idea and among a plentitude of reasons in support of this assertion, two reasons could be picked up for further analysis.

To commence with, one of the most enthralling aspects of the current discussion which demands a keen contemplation is this issue that today's people have been facing tremendous environmental problems creating irreparable and unpleasant effects on people health. As a case in point, nowadays there are various and extensive amounts of pollutants in air having been created by industrial factories. Not only can these materials pollute the air and atmosphere, but also they can have a striking and profound impression on people health. In these days, most of people suffer many diseases such as lung ones due to this polluted air. On the other hand, in the past, there were not massive factories and cars. As a result, less fossil fuels were burnt by humankind and people had a delicate and clean air. Had people faced this conspicuous pollution in the past, they would have had a wide range of diseases.

Another main reason leading credence to the argument is this issue that nowadays people have a hectic life and in this situation, they have more mental obsessions in job positions and daily life. This circumstance causes stress, tension and mental diseases for them. These mental sicknesses result in physical health and it is axiomatic that people cannot experience a healthy life. On the other hand, today's people with more obsessions have less free time for cooking healthy foods and exercise. A vivid example can be given to shed more light on what was elaborated above. One of my friends worked a lot to overcome numerous her obstacles in daily life such as economic problem. Not only did she not pay attention to herself, but also she did not have enough time for cooking and resting and she often ate in fast food restaurants. Admittedly, we know these restaurants prepare high calorie foods with low nutritional value and after a while, she was prone to digestive disease.

In brief, based on contemplation of all the aforementioned reasons, today's it is more difficult to achieve and maintain a good health because of environmental problems such as profound air pollution. Also with changing the lifestyle of people, they have not enough time for cooking healthy food and exercise.

score: 25~

Q: agree or disagree: young people do not have much influence in today's important decisions.

The important decisions of a country are made by the politicians nowadays, and whether young people have the ability to make an effect on the decision is a good question.

Personally, I do believe that there is a potential for youngs to make a difference in the crucial decisions which would affect the country's future.

First, they still have the right to vote. No matter how complicated the issue is or how others think that young people are just a minority and/or not mature enough, they still have the right to vote and their voice will still be counted. So, in some important situations when the voting system is adopted, such as the presidential election or things that go through the process of referendum, young people's voice will still be listened and have the potential to affect the result.

Second, they use social media to express their opinion. Often, young people are familiar with using social media, and since this type of media is getting popular and growing its influence, it is a good way for youngers to express their thought and try to convince others to take in their opinion. Also, it is a good way to connect with others with the similar thoughts. For example, the gun control issue that happened in the USA, the thoughts are expressed on the Internet and, finally, there were some marches went on and some students even had the chance to meet with the president of the city/state. Of course, some will argue that the ways mentioned in the here are just minor ways and do not have much potential to have an influence on the society as a whole. This is possible, but do not underestimate the potential that social media can make, as the gun control example showed.

To sum up, I believe that young people do have the influence on the country's' important decisions because they are familiar with the use of social media, which have the big possibility to influence people unconsciously, and will always have the right to vote.

Score: 24~

Q: The government can take a variety of actions to help protect the environment. Which one of the following do you think is the most important for the nation's government to take to protect the environment?

- 1. Fund the research to develop environmentally friendly energy sources such as solar and wind energy**
- 2. Preserve the natural places like forests and protect the animals that live there**
- 3. Enforce laws to prevent the pollution of air and water by large companies**

Throughout history, protecting environment and specifically actions needed for having a pristine environment play an indispensable role in people's lives. As a matter of fact, government is crucially responsible for protecting the environment and should make decisions to preserve it in general. In this regard, there is a long-standing discussion between academicians about ways that the government should be aware of and take actions to protect the environment, by and large. From my vantage point, funding the research related to developing environmentally effective energy sources can be definitely the most significant action through the mentioned choices and in the following paragraphs, I will cogently illustrate my perspective with two conspicuous reasons.

The first reason coming to mind to substantiate my perspective is concerned with this issue that developing friendly energy sources will highly decrease the pollution due to the fact that utilizing such sources like solar and wind energy-based sources won't have negative effects on the environment as a whole. Besides, it is worthwhile to clarify the matter that such sources do not need large factories with a vast amount of gas emissions which we are seen on a daily basis especially in today's modern era. That is to say, not only don't such energy sources ~~do not~~ make harmful materials and emissions in conjunction with spreading out to the environment, but also it can bring about lots of positive impacts on the environment in particular. To exemplify, Norway is the first pioneer of improving the technology to change its factories and non-energy-based sources to wind farms and has built a lot of astonishingly remarkable offshore wind farms which is helping it to protect the environment and statistics have shown their success in this field. Hence, it can be concluded that the more the government use and actually alternate the solar and wind energy sources in lieu of other harmful sources, the more it can see positive influences on the environment.

Another equally noteworthy reason supporting my opinion is that the government should fund the research in such energy sources considering the fact that they are more likely to be improved in comparison with other choices. It should be noted that although funding research might be a time-consuming process from the beginning, it can eventually lead the environment to be cleaner. To put it in other words, it is evident that we have lots of environmental issues in today's world such as climate change and starting the action to protect the environment is undoubtedly staple and essential in general. For instance, the amazon fire is expanding every day and since it is a kind of massive and colossal destruction for the forest and animals that live there, this means that it is beyond the power of just a country and/or its counterparts in the world. On the other hand, providing research about

utilizing wind and solar energies is more attainable and can be seen in the near future as we already have seen some countries with such kinds of energy sources. Therefore, to say with conviction, the government should contemplate funding research on the topic of clean energy sources as the most achievable and beneficial action.

To sum it up, by taking into account all the aforementioned reasons, I do believe that the government should participate in funding research to develop environmentally energy sources as the most substantial action due to the fact that these sources will not pollute the environment and are not as difficult as preserving all the forests and animals all over the world, for instance.

Score: 25-26~

www.samteaches.com

TPO 32

The reading passage presents some evidence which indicates that the strange sounds, heard by Russian sailors in the ocean, were caused by Orca whales, squids, or secret submarines. However, the lecturer finds the ideas brought up by the critics implausible and refutes them all.

First, the reading brings up the idea that the noises could be produced by the Orca populations when they ritually try to mate. In contrast, the lecturer holds the idea that the sources of the quacker sound could not be caused by Orca whales. Namely, Orca whales are usually swimming around the surface of the water, although submarines are supposed to move deep in the water. Indeed, it seems implausible for submarines' crews to hear the sounds of Orca whales from the surface of the ocean. Also, submarines' detectors would find the presence of the whales, if they moved around the submarines. Therefore, there are sufficient evidences which prove that the sources of the sound could not be Orca populations.

Furthermore, the reading highlights the idea that giant squids, which are intelligent animals and live deep in the ocean, might release the strange sounds. Conversely, the lecturer underlines the fact that Russian submarines had been hearing the quacker sound for two decades since 1960s until 1980s. However, squid sounds have always been heard around the Russian submarines, and they have never ~~been~~ disappeared since then. So, squids could not make the temporary quacker sounds which continued for almost twenty years.

Finally, the author argues that quackers were caused by a foreign submarine. On the other hand, the lecturer dismisses this idea by stressing the fact that a hidden submarine from another country could not be the reason of the quackers. It means after discovering the features of the source of the sounds, experts figured out that the sources of the quackers were moving quickly and changing direction very fast, while, the submarines do not have those features, cannot move and change direction as fast as the source of the sound can do. Also, submarines' engines cause some noises which different from the quacker sounds. And even today's submarines are not enough fast and silent. Therefore, foreign submarines could not make the odd sounds.

Score: 24-25~

TPO 34

The reading passage presents 3 theories about the causes of extinction of sea cows which lived in Islands in Siberia. However, the lecturer finds the ideas brought up by the critics implausible and refutes them all.

First, the reading brings up the idea that the sea cows were hunted by the native people; the sea cows were the main source of food for native people. In contrast, the lecturer holds the idea that the sea cows were so massive that only a couple of them was enough for all native people to subsist on. On the other hand, there was a low population who lived there so they did not need much food.

Furthermore, the reading highlights the point that some ecosystems' disturbances had effects on the sea cows' food, Kelp. Gradually the Kelp decreased and it was one of the reasons of extinction. Conversely, the lecturer underlines the fact that ecosystem disturbances should have affected on not only the Kelp, but also other sea animals like whale; while there was not any report of extinction whales by fishing ships.

Finally, the author argues that The European fur traders were the main cause of extinction. They had weapons that was able to hunt the sea cows quickly. On the other hand, the lecturer dismisses this idea by the point that the populations of sea cows had diminished before the Europeans came to Islands. There should be another reason which was the main reason of extinction.

Score: 24

TPO 34

The reading claims that the reasons for the extinction of a huge marine animal known as Steller's sea cow which lived around the Bering Island off the coast of Siberia are not clear yet, and it brings up three reasons for this issue. However, the lecturer finds all the ideas dubious and presents some evidence to refute them all.

Firstly, the author argues that a group of native Siberian people over hunted them due to food providing due to providing food. Conversely, the lecturer brings up the idea that sea cows were massive creatures and one of them could feed a whole village for months and there was no need for over hunting them.

Furthermore, the reading passage holds the view that population decrease of these creatures was due to a lack of food which was caused by ecosystem disturbance. This deterioration has led to a decline in their main source of food, kelp. On the contrary, the professor underlines the fact that in case of an ecosystems disturbance occurrence, other plants and animals like whales should have been also affected; however, no other population decrease has been reported except sea cows.

Finally, the reading claims that the main cause of sea cows' extinction could have been European fur traders caught the last sea cow in 1768. In contrast, the speaker dismisses this issue due to the fact that the population of sea cows was already low at the arrival of European fur traders and these creatures have not become extinct due to the traders and the extinction process had been started years ago before their arrival due to some other causes.

Score: 25~

TPO 32

The reading presents three theories which indicate the sources of some underwater noises that Russian submarine's crew called quackers; however, the lecturer finds all the ideas dubious and presents some evidence to refute them all.

Firstly, the reading suggests that quacker is the sound of the male and female orca whales during a courtship ritual. Conversely, the lecturer brings up the idea that orcas live in the surface whereas submarines are in the deep part of the ocean, so the sounds of the orca's cannot be heard by submarines. Besides, the submarines would have picked up the skeleton of the whales by their sonar.

Furthermore, the reading holds the view that the sound were caused by giant squids which live deep in the ocean and they cannot be detected by sonar because of their soft bodies; on the contrary, the lecturer underlines the fact that it is pretty unlikely that the sound was heard in 1960 but disappeared in 1980 while squids were still there.

Finally, the reading asserts that the sounds may have belonged to some military technology from another country and unintentionally emitted from another submarine; the speaker dismisses this issue due to the fact that submarines cannot move or change direction that fast and that silently because of the lack technology which rejects the writer's claims.

Score: 28~