原田英語の英検２級・準１級・１級ファイナルチェックリスト

英検1級 予想問題（問題＋解答）

https://www.haradaeigo.com/final-check/#/yoso/1kyu

予想問題：意見論述（5題）

使い方：まず prompt だけを見て、**立場と理由3つ（観点がかぶらない名詞句）**を書き出す。それから模範解答と比べよう。本番は22分、序論→本論3段落→結論の5段落で約220語が目標。

予想① 文化財の返還（賛成）

221語（200〜240）

QUESTION

● Write an essay on the given TOPIC.
● Give THREE reasons to support your answer.
● Structure: introduction, main body, and conclusion
● Suggested length: 200–240 words
● Write your essay in the space provided on Side B of your answer sheet. Any writing outside the space will not be graded.

TOPIC
Agree or disagree: Museums should return cultural artifacts to their countries of origin

Although some argue that major museums preserve cultural artifacts for all of humanity, I believe that museums should return such objects to their countries of origin for three reasons: historical justice, cultural identity, and international cooperation.

First, returning artifacts would help correct historical injustice. Many objects displayed in Western museums were acquired during the colonial era through looting, military force, or deeply unequal agreements. Retaining these items effectively legitimizes past wrongdoing, whereas returning them would acknowledge that such acquisitions were unacceptable.

Second, cultural artifacts are central to the identity of the communities that created them. Religious objects, royal treasures, and ancestral remains carry spiritual meaning that cannot be fully appreciated behind glass in a foreign capital. When young people can see these objects in their own country, they develop a deeper appreciation of their heritage.

Third, repatriation can lead to new forms of partnership. The claim that source countries lack adequate facilities is increasingly outdated, as many have built modern museums with professional conservation staff. Moreover, returning institutions can arrange long-term loans and joint research projects, allowing their visitors to keep learning about these objects while building trust with partner nations.

In conclusion, given the need to address colonial injustices, respect cultural identity, and foster genuine cooperation, I firmly believe that museums should return cultural artifacts to their places of origin.

主要な博物館は人類全体のために文化財を保存していると主張する人もいるが、私は3つの理由から、博物館はそうした品々を原産国に返還すべきだと考える。歴史的な正義、文化的アイデンティティ、そして国際協力である。

第一に、文化財を返還することは歴史的な不正を正す助けになる。欧米の博物館に展示されている品々の多くは、植民地時代に略奪や武力、あるいは極めて不平等な取り決めによって入手されたものである。こうした品々を手元に置き続けることは、事実上、過去の不正行為を正当化することになる。一方、返還すれば、そのような入手は許されないものだったと認めることになる。

第二に、文化財はそれを生み出した共同体のアイデンティティの中心にある。宗教的な品、王家の宝物、祖先の遺骨には精神的な意味があり、それは外国の首都でガラス越しに見るだけでは十分に理解できない。若い人々が自分の国でこれらの品を見られれば、自分たちの遺産をより深く大切に思うようになる。

第三に、返還は新しい形の協力関係につながりうる。原産国には十分な施設がないという主張は時代遅れになりつつあり、多くの国が専門の保存修復スタッフを備えた近代的な博物館を建ててきた。さらに、返還する側の館は長期貸与や共同研究の取り決めを結ぶことができ、来館者がこれらの品について学び続けられるようにしつつ、相手国との信頼を築くことができる。

結論として、植民地時代の不正に向き合い、文化的アイデンティティを尊重し、真の協力を育む必要性を考えれば、博物館は文化財を元の場所に返還すべきだと私は強く確信している。

- 序論は **Although some argue that ~,** で反対側を1文で認め、**for three reasons: A, B, and C** で理由を名詞句で予告。1級の王道の型。
- 観点を分ける：①歴史（正義）②文化（アイデンティティ）③実務（協力）。同じ観点を2つ並べない。
- 本論3は「原産国には施設がない」という反対側の定番の論拠を先につぶしてから主張へ。1級で効く**反論つぶし**。
- acquire through looting（略奪で入手する）、legitimize（正当化する）、repatriation（返還）は文化財の話の必須語。
- 結論は理由3つを動詞（address／respect／foster）で言い換え。序論と同じ語をくり返さない。

予想②　プライバシーと公共の安全（反対）

227語（200〜240）

QUESTION

● Write an essay on the given TOPIC.
● Give THREE reasons to support your answer.
● Structure: introduction, main body, and conclusion
● Suggested length: 200–240 words
● Write your essay in the space provided on Side B of your answer sheet. Any writing outside the space will not be graded.

TOPIC
Is the loss of privacy an acceptable price for greater public safety?

Although some argue that surveillance technologies are indispensable for preventing crime and terrorism, I believe that the loss of privacy is not an acceptable price for greater public safety for three reasons: the risk of abuse, the danger of data leaks, and the existence of better alternatives.

First, mass surveillance gives authorities power that can easily be abused. Facial recognition cameras and online monitoring can be used not only to catch criminals but also to track journalists and political activists. Even in democracies, citizens who know they are being watched may hesitate to join protests or express controversial opinions, which weakens public debate.

Second, collecting vast amounts of personal data creates serious security risks. Databases containing people's faces, movements, and messages are attractive targets for hackers, and no system is completely secure. Once such sensitive information is leaked, the damage cannot be undone, and innocent people may suffer fraud or discrimination.

Third, public safety can be improved without sacrificing privacy. Community policing, better street lighting, and social programs that tackle the root causes of crime, such as poverty, can reduce crime effectively. Moreover, targeted surveillance authorized by a court is far more proportionate than monitoring entire populations.

In conclusion, because mass surveillance invites abuse, exposes citizens to data breaches, and is unnecessary given other effective measures, I firmly believe that privacy should not be sacrificed for safety.

監視技術は犯罪やテロを防ぐのに不可欠だと主張する人もいるが、私は3つの理由から、プライバシーの喪失は公共の安全を高めるための代償として受け入れられないと考える。悪用の危険、データ流出の危険、そしてより良い代替策の存在である。

第一に、大規模な監視は当局に、容易に悪用されうる力を与える。顔認識カメラやオンライン上の監視は、犯罪者を捕まえるだけでなく、ジャーナリストや政治活動家を追跡するためにも使われうる。民主主義国家であっても、監視されていると知っている市民は抗議活動に参加したり物議をかもす意見を述べたりするのをためらうかもしれず、それは公の議論を弱める。

第二に、膨大な個人データを集めることは深刻なセキュリティ上の危険を生む。人々の顔、移動、メッセージを含むデータベースはハッカーにとって魅力的な標的であり、完全に安全なシステムなど存在しない。そうした機微な情報がいったん流出すれば、被害は取り返しがつかず、罪のない人々が詐欺や差別の被害を受けるかもしれない。

第三に、公共の安全はプライバシーを犠牲にせずに高められる。地域密着型の警察活動、街灯の改善、そして貧困など犯罪の根本原因に取り組む社会的施策は、犯罪を効果的に減らしうる。さらに、裁判所が許可した対象を絞った監視のほうが、国民全体を監視するよりもはるかに釣り合いがとれている。

結論として、大規模監視は悪用を招き、市民をデータ流出の危険にさらし、ほかに効果的な手段がある以上必要もないため、安全のためにプライバシーを犠牲にすべきではないと私は強く確信している。

- Is ~ an acceptable price? 型は、序論で **the loss of privacy is not an acceptable price** とTOPICの語をそのまま使って立場を明示。ずれ（0点の危険）を防ぐ最短ルート。
- 観点：①政治（権力の悪用・言論の萎縮）②技術（データ流出）③代替策。③の「相手の目的（安全）は別の方法で達成できる」は1級で強い論法。
- 萎縮効果は may hesitate to join protests と**具体的な行動**で書くと説得力が出る。
- proportionate（釣り合いのとれた）、targeted surveillance（対象を絞った監視）は監視・プライバシー系の万能語。

予想③　経済のグローバル化の功罪（賛成）

226語（200〜240）

QUESTION

● Write an essay on the given TOPIC.
● Give THREE reasons to support your answer.
● Structure: introduction, main body, and conclusion
● Suggested length: 200–240 words
● Write your essay in the space provided on Side B of your answer sheet. Any writing outside the space will not be graded.

TOPIC
Agree or disagree: The benefits of economic globalization outweigh its drawbacks

Although globalization has been blamed for job losses and widening inequality within some countries, I agree that its benefits outweigh its drawbacks for three reasons: poverty reduction, the spread of knowledge, and international stability.

First, globalization has lifted hundreds of millions of people out of extreme poverty. By gaining access to foreign markets and investment, countries such as Vietnam and Bangladesh have created millions of manufacturing jobs, allowing workers to earn far more than through subsistence farming. Few economic forces in history have raised living standards so rapidly.

Second, the free movement of goods, capital, and ideas accelerates the spread of technology. Innovations developed in one country, such as vaccines and mobile banking, can quickly benefit people elsewhere. For instance, affordable smartphones have given farmers in rural Africa access to weather forecasts and market prices, helping them raise their incomes.

Third, economic interdependence encourages countries to resolve disputes peacefully. When nations rely on one another for trade and investment, the cost of conflict becomes extremely high, giving governments a strong incentive to cooperate. Global challenges such as pandemics and climate change demand exactly this kind of cooperation.

In conclusion, given its role in reducing poverty, spreading knowledge, and promoting peace, I firmly agree that the benefits of economic globalization outweigh its drawbacks, which should be addressed through domestic policies rather than by retreating from global integration.

グローバル化は一部の国で雇用の喪失や格差の拡大を招いたと非難されてきたが、私は3つの理由から、その利点が欠点を上回るという意見に賛成する。貧困の削減、知識の普及、そして国際的な安定

である。

第一に、グローバル化は何億もの人々を極度の貧困から救い出してきた。海外の市場や投資にアクセスできるようになったことで、ベトナムやバングラデシュなどの国々は何百万もの製造業の雇用を生み出し、労働者は自給自足の農業よりもはるかに多くを稼げるようになった。歴史上、これほど急速に生活水準を引き上げた経済的な力はほとんどない。

第二に、モノ、資本、アイデアの自由な移動は技術の普及を加速させる。ワクチンやモバイル決済のように、ある国で生まれた革新は、すぐにほかの国の人々にも恩恵をもたらしうる。たとえば、手ごろな価格のスマートフォンによって、アフリカの農村部の農家は天気予報や市場価格を知ることができるようになり、収入を増やす助けになっている。

第三に、経済的な相互依存は国々に紛争を平和的に解決するよう促す。国どうしが貿易や投資で互いに依存していると、紛争の代償は極めて大きくなり、政府には協力する強い動機が生まれる。パンデミックや気候変動といった地球規模の課題も、まさにこの種の協力を必要としている。

結論として、貧困の削減、知識の普及、平和の促進に果たす役割を考えれば、経済のグローバル化の利点は欠点を上回るという意見に強く賛成する。その欠点は、グローバルな統合から後退することではなく、国内の政策によって対処すべきである。

- Agree or disagree 型は、序論で **I agree that ~** と言い切る。TOPICの outweigh its drawbacks をそのまま使えば立場がぶれない。
- 序論で反対側の論点（job losses, inequality）を認め、結論で「欠点は国内政策で対処すべき」と回収。**譲歩→回収**で1級らしいバランスに。
- 本論2は For instance で具体例を1つ（アフリカの農家とスマホ）。数字を作らなくても場面が見えれば十分。
- lift ~ out of poverty（〜を貧困から救い出す）、interdependence（相互依存）はグローバル化の定番表現。

予想④　気候変動による避難民と先進国の責任（賛成）

229語（200〜240）

QUESTION

● Write an essay on the given TOPIC.
● Give THREE reasons to support your answer.
● Structure: introduction, main body, and conclusion
● Suggested length: 200–240 words
● Write your essay in the space provided on Side B of your answer sheet. Any writing outside the space will not be graded.

TOPIC
Should wealthy nations accept more responsibility for people displaced by climate change?

Although some argue that wealthy nations already struggle to manage immigration, I believe that they should accept more responsibility for people displaced by climate change for three reasons: historical responsibility, moral obligation, and long-term self-interest.

First, wealthy nations are largely responsible for causing the problem. Industrialized countries have emitted a disproportionate share of the greenhouse gases accumulated in the atmosphere since the Industrial Revolution, while many of those most affected by rising sea levels and droughts live in poor countries that contributed little. It is only fair that those who caused the damage should help those who suffer from it.

Second, rich countries have both the resources and the moral duty to protect vulnerable people. Unlike war refugees, climate migrants are not clearly protected under current international law. Wealthy nations could lead efforts to create a legal framework for them, fund relocation programs, and resettle some of them within their own borders.

Third, helping climate-displaced people serves the long-term interests of wealthy nations themselves. If millions of people lose their homes without support, the result could be regional conflicts and irregular migration on a massive scale. Investing in adaptation and planned relocation now is far less costly than responding to humanitarian crises later.

In conclusion, considering their historical role, their capacity to help, and the threat of global instability, wealthy nations should accept far greater responsibility for climate-displaced people.

豊かな国はすでに移民の管理に苦労していると主張する人もいるが、私は3つの理由から、豊かな国は気候変動によって住む場所を追われた人々に対してより大きな責任を負うべきだと考える。歴史的な責任、道義的な義務、そして長期的な自国の利益である。

第一に、この問題を引き起こした責任の大部分は豊かな国にある。産業革命以来、大気中に蓄積した温室効果ガスの不釣り合いに大きな割合を排出してきたのは工業国である一方、海面上昇や干ばつの影響を最も受けている人々の多くは、排出にほとんど関わっていない貧しい国に住んでいる。被害を引き起こした者が、それに苦しむ者を助けるのは当然である。

第二に、豊かな国には弱い立場の人々を守る資源と道義的な義務の両方がある。戦争難民と違って、気候移民は現在の国際法では明確に保護されていない。豊かな国は、彼らのための法的な枠組みを作る取り組みを主導し、移住計画に資金を出し、その一部を自国内に受け入れることができる。

第三に、気候変動で住む場所を失った人々を助けることは、豊かな国自身の長期的な利益にもかなう。何百万もの人々が支援のないまま家を失えば、地域紛争や大規模な非正規移民が生じるおそれがある。適応策や計画的な移住に今投資するほうが、のちに人道危機に対応するよりもはるかに費用が少なくて済む。

結論として、歴史的な役割、支援する能力、そして世界の不安定化の脅威を考えれば、豊かな国は気候変動で住む場所を追われた人々に対して、はるかに大きな責任を負うべきである。

- Should ~? 型でも序論は **they should accept more responsibility** とTOPICの動詞をそのまま使う。
- 観点：①過去（歴史的な責任）②現在（道義と能力）③未来（自国の利益）。**時間軸で3つに分ける**と重なりにくい。
- 本論3は「助けることは自国のためにもなる」という自己利益の論点。理想論だけで終わらせないのが1級の説得力。
- climate migrants／climate-displaced people（気候移民）、irregular migration（非正規移民）、adaptation（適応策）を押さえる。

予想⑤　ネットの匿名性と民主的な議論（反対）

226語（200〜240）

QUESTION

● Write an essay on the given TOPIC.
● Give THREE reasons to support your answer.
● Structure: introduction, main body, and conclusion
● Suggested length: 200–240 words
● Write your essay in the space provided on Side B of your answer sheet. Any writing outside the space will not be graded.

TOPIC
Agree or disagree: Online anonymity does more harm than good to democratic debate

---

Although anonymous users are often blamed for spreading hate speech and misinformation, I disagree that online anonymity does more harm than good to democratic debate for three reasons: the protection of whistleblowers, the inclusion of vulnerable voices, and the limited effectiveness of real-name policies.

First, anonymity allows people to expose wrongdoing without fear of retaliation. Employees who reveal corporate fraud often risk losing their jobs or even their safety. Without the ability to speak anonymously, much valuable information would never reach the public, and those in power would face far less scrutiny.

Second, anonymity enables members of vulnerable groups to take part in public discussion. Sexual minorities, victims of abuse, and citizens living under authoritarian regimes may be unable to express their views under their real names. Anonymity gives them a voice in debates that directly affect their lives, making democratic discussion more inclusive.

Third, removing anonymity would not solve the problems it is blamed for. Much abusive content is posted under real names, and false information is often spread by well-known public figures. The deeper problem lies in algorithms that reward outrage, which stronger platform regulation should address.

In conclusion, since anonymity protects those who expose wrongdoing, gives a voice to the vulnerable, and is not the true cause of online hostility, I firmly believe that it does more good than harm to democratic debate.

匿名の利用者はヘイトスピーチや誤情報を広めているとしばしば非難されるが、私は3つの理由から、ネット上の匿名性は民主的な議論にとって益より害のほうが大きいという意見に反対する。内部告発者の保護、弱い立場の声を取り込むこと、そして実名制の効果が限られていることである。

第一に、匿名性は報復を恐れずに不正を暴くことを可能にする。企業の不正を明らかにする従業員は、職や、ときには身の安全さえ失う危険を冒すことが多い。匿名で発言できなければ、多くの価値ある情報が世間に届かず、権力を持つ人々ははるかに監視されにくくなるだろう。

第二に、匿名性によって弱い立場の集団に属する人々が公の議論に参加できるようになる。性的少数者、虐待の被害者、権威主義体制のもとで暮らす市民は、実名では意見を表明できないかもしれない。匿名性は、自分の生活に直接関わる議論の場で彼らに発言の機会を与え、民主的な議論をより包摂的なものにする。

第三に、匿名性をなくしても、その原因だとされる問題は解決しない。攻撃的な投稿の多くは実名でなされており、誤った情報はしばしば著名人によって広められている。より根深い問題は怒りをあおる投稿を優遇するアルゴリズムにあり、プラットフォームへのより強い規制で対処すべきである。

結論として、匿名性は不正を暴く人を守り、弱い立場の人々に発言の機会を与え、ネット上の敵意の本当の原因でもないため、民主的な議論にとって害より益のほうが大きいと私は強く確信している。

- **反対**の立場は、序論で **I disagree that ~** とTOPICの文をそのまま続ける。何に反対しているのかがはっきりする。
- 本論3は「問題の原因はほかにある」という論法。相手の懸念は認めつつ、原因をずらして反論する上級テク。
- whistleblower（内部告発者）、retaliation（報復）、scrutiny（監視の目）、inclusive（包摂的な）は民主主義・SNS系の頻出語。
- 結論は does more good than harm と、TOPICの more harm than good を裏返して立場を締める。

予想問題：要約（3題）

使い方：20分で解く。まず各段落の役割（背景／賛成／反対／結論 など）を余白に一言で書き、具体例・数字・固有名詞を削ってから書き始めよう。

予想①　ベーシックインカム（賛否・評価型）

102語（90〜110）

QUESTION

● Read the article below and summarize it in your own words as far as possible in English.
● Summarize it between 90 and 110 words.
● Write your summary in the space provided on Side A of your answer sheet. Any writing outside the space will not be graded.

In recent years, the idea of a universal basic income, or UBI, has moved from the margins of political debate into the mainstream. Under such a system, the government would provide every adult citizen with a regular cash payment, regardless of employment status or income. Interest in the concept has grown as advances in automation and artificial intelligence threaten to eliminate many jobs, and several countries and cities have conducted pilot programs to test its effects in the real world.

Supporters argue that a UBI would offer a simple and dignified alternative to existing welfare programs. Traditional benefits often require applicants to prove that they are poor or actively seeking work, a process that can be humiliating and costly to administer. Moreover, because payments are reduced as recipients earn more, such programs can discourage people from taking low-paid jobs. A guaranteed income, advocates say, would remove these problems and give people the security to retrain, start businesses, or care for family members.

Critics, however, point to the enormous cost of providing payments to everyone, including the wealthy. Funding a meaningful UBI would likely require substantial tax increases or cuts to other public services, such as healthcare and education. Some economists also worry that a guaranteed income could reduce people's motivation to work, leading to labor shortages in essential industries and slowing economic growth.

Results from pilot programs have done little to settle the debate. In several trials conducted in North America and Europe, recipients reported lower stress and better physical and mental health, and most did not stop working. Yet these experiments were typically small, temporary, and limited to selected groups, so they cannot show how a nationwide program would affect taxes, prices, and employment over the long term. As a result, many experts believe that far more extensive research is needed before any government can responsibly adopt such a policy.

A universal basic income, under which governments regularly give all adults cash regardless of their circumstances, has attracted growing attention as automation threatens employment. Proponents claim that it would be simpler and less degrading than conventional welfare, which demands proof of need and can discourage work, and that it would free

people to pursue training, entrepreneurship, or caregiving. Opponents, however, argue that it would be extremely expensive, requiring higher taxes or reduced public services, and might weaken the incentive to work. Although trials have shown some positive effects, their limited scale and duration mean that further study is needed before nationwide adoption.

【パッセージの要旨】第1段落：ベーシックインカム（UBI）＝全成人への定期的な現金給付。自動化で関心が高まり、試験導入も。第2段落：賛成派＝従来の福祉より簡素で尊厳を傷つけない（困窮の証明が不要・働く意欲をそがない）、学び直しや起業の余裕ができる。第3段落：反対派＝莫大な費用（増税・公共サービス削減）、働く意欲の低下。第4段落：試験導入では良い結果も出たが、小規模・短期間で結論は出ない→さらなる研究が必要。

【模範要約の訳】ベーシックインカムとは、政府が状況にかかわらず全成人に定期的に現金を支給する制度であり、自動化が雇用を脅かす中で注目を集めている。賛成派は、困窮の証明を求め、働く意欲をそぎかねない従来の福祉よりも簡素で人の尊厳を傷つけにくく、人々が職業訓練や起業、家族の介護に取り組めるようになると主張する。しかし反対派は、極めて費用がかかり、増税や公共サービスの削減が必要になるうえ、働く意欲を弱めかねないと論じる。試験導入では一定の良い効果が見られたものの、規模も期間も限られているため、全国で導入する前にさらなる研究が必要である。

- 型は **定義 → 賛成 → 反対 → 評価（研究が必要）**。4段落を1文ずつに圧縮すればそのまま要約になる。
- 賛成側の具体例（retrain, start businesses, care for family members）は **pursue training, entrepreneurship, or caregiving** と名詞でまとめて言い換え。
- 第4段落の地域名（North America and Europe）や細かい結果は落とす。残すのは「良い結果もあるが小規模・短期で結論は出ない」という評価だけ。
- Proponents claim ~. Opponents, however, argue ~. は賛否型パッセージの万能フレーム。

予想②　遺伝子ドライブとマラリア対策（新技術・規制型）

106語（90〜110）

QUESTION

● Read the article below and summarize it in your own words as far as possible in English.
● Summarize it between 90 and 110 words.
● Write your summary in the space provided on Side A of your answer sheet. Any writing outside the space will not be graded.

Malaria remains one of the world's deadliest diseases, killing hundreds of thousands of people every year, most of them young children in sub-Saharan Africa. Although bed nets and insecticides have saved many lives, mosquitoes are becoming resistant to common chemicals, and progress against the disease has stalled. In response, scientists have developed a powerful new tool known as a gene drive, which uses gene-editing technology to spread a particular genetic trait through an entire wild population.

Normally, any particular version of a gene is passed on to only about half of an organism's offspring. A gene drive, however, ensures that a modified gene is inherited by nearly all descendants, allowing it to spread rapidly over just a few generations. Researchers could use this method to make female mosquitoes infertile or unable to carry the malaria parasite. Laboratory experiments have shown that caged populations can be dramatically reduced within a relatively short time, raising hopes that the disease could one day be eliminated in affected regions.

Many ecologists, however, warn that releasing gene-drive organisms into the wild could have unpredictable consequences. Because the modified genes are designed to spread on their own, it may be impossible to recall them once they have been released. Wiping out a species of mosquito could also disrupt food chains, affecting the birds, fish, and bats that feed on them. Moreover, since mosquitoes do not respect national borders, a release in one country could alter the ecosystems of its neighbors without their consent.

These concerns have prompted calls for strict international oversight. Some environmental groups have demanded a global moratorium on releases until the risks are better understood, while others, including many public health officials in affected countries, argue that delaying the technology would cost countless lives. Many experts now propose a gradual approach in which field trials proceed step by step, with local communities and neighboring governments fully involved in every decision.

As conventional methods of fighting malaria become less effective, scientists have developed gene drives, which use gene editing to spread a chosen trait throughout a wild population. Because a modified gene is passed to almost all offspring, the technique could make

mosquitoes sterile or unable to transmit the disease, and laboratory tests have been promising. However, ecologists fear that such organisms could not be recalled once released, and that eliminating mosquitoes might damage ecosystems and affect neighboring countries. Consequently, while some demand a temporary ban and others stress the urgency of saving lives, many experts favor cautious, gradual trials that involve local communities and nearby nations.

【パッセージの要旨】第1段落：マラリアは今も多くの命を奪う。殺虫剤への耐性で対策が停滞→遺伝子ドライブ（遺伝子編集で特定の形質を野生の集団全体に広める技術）が登場。第2段落：改変した遺伝子がほぼすべての子孫に受け継がれる→蚊を不妊にする・病原体を運べなくすることが可能。実験室では有望な結果。第3段落：生態学者の懸念＝放したら回収できない、食物連鎖の乱れ、国境を越えて隣国の生態系に影響。第4段落：国際的な監督を求める声。一時停止を求める団体と、遅れれば命が失われるという意見→地元と隣国を巻き込んだ段階的な試験が提案されている。

【模範要約の訳】マラリアと闘う従来の方法の効果が薄れる中、科学者たちは遺伝子編集を使って選んだ形質を野生の集団全体に広める「遺伝子ドライブ」を開発した。改変された遺伝子はほぼすべての子孫に受け継がれるため、この技術で蚊を不妊にしたり病気を媒介できなくしたりできる可能性があり、実験室での試験結果も有望である。しかし生態学者は、そうした生物はいったん放すと回収できず、蚊を根絶すれば生態系を損ない、近隣諸国にも影響が及びかねないと懸念している。そのため、一時的な禁止を求める声と人命を救う緊急性を強調する声がある中で、多くの専門家は地域社会や近隣国を巻き込んだ慎重で段階的な試験を支持している。

- 型は **背景（問題）→ 新技術の仕組みと期待 → 懸念 → 対応策**。1級で多いタイプのひとつ。
- 第2段落の仕組みは1文に。「半分ではなく、ほぼすべての子孫に」が核心なので、それだけ残す。
- 第3段落の具体例（birds, fish, and bats）は **damage ecosystems** と抽象化。生き物の名前は要約に入れない。
- moratorium（一時停止）→ temporary ban、gradual approach → cautious, gradual trials と言い換え。本文の語句を長く写さない。

予想③　小型モジュール炉と原子力の復活（期待と懸念型）

103語（90〜110）

QUESTION

● Read the article below and summarize it in your own words as far as possible in English.
● Summarize it between 90 and 110 words.
● Write your summary in the space provided on Side A of your answer sheet. Any writing outside the space will not be graded.

In the years following serious accidents such as those at Chernobyl and Fukushima, nuclear power seemed to be in permanent decline. A number of countries announced plans to close their reactors, and public opinion in many places turned firmly against the technology. In recent years, however, attitudes have begun to shift. Faced with the urgent need to cut carbon emissions and growing concerns about energy security, many governments are once again considering nuclear power as a key part of their energy strategy.

Much of this renewed interest centers on small modular reactors, or SMRs. Unlike traditional nuclear plants, which are enormous projects that often take more than a decade to build and frequently exceed their budgets, SMRs are designed to be manufactured in factories and then assembled on site. Supporters claim that this approach will lower costs and shorten construction times. They also point out that, unlike solar and wind power, nuclear reactors can generate electricity around the clock regardless of the weather.

Skeptics, however, question whether these promises can be fulfilled. Although dozens of SMR designs have been proposed, very few have actually been built, and some high-profile projects have been canceled after their estimated costs rose sharply. Critics also note that the problem of long-term radioactive waste storage remains unsolved in most countries. In addition, distributing many small reactors across a country could create more potential targets for terrorists and make security more difficult to maintain.

Meanwhile, the cost of renewable energy and battery storage continues to fall rapidly, leading some analysts to argue that public funds would be better spent on these technologies. Others counter that a reliable low-carbon energy system will require a mix of sources, including nuclear power. Whether SMRs become a major part of that mix is likely to depend on whether the first commercial projects can be completed on time and within budget.

After years of decline caused by serious accidents, nuclear power is attracting renewed interest as governments seek to cut carbon emissions and secure stable energy supplies. Much of this attention focuses on small modular reactors, which supporters say can be factory-built cheaply and quickly and, unlike renewables, provide constant power. Critics, however, point

out that few have actually been constructed, that some projects were abandoned as costs soared, and that concerns about waste disposal and security remain. With renewable energy becoming cheaper, opinions are divided over nuclear power's role, and the future of these reactors will depend on whether early commercial projects succeed.

【パッセージの要旨】第1段落：大事故のあと衰退した原子力が、脱炭素とエネルギー安全保障のために再び注目されている。第2段落：中心は小型モジュール炉（SMR）＝工場で製造して現地で組み立て→安く早く建設できる、天候に左右されず24時間発電できる。第3段落：懐疑派＝実際の建設はわずか、費用高騰で中止の例、核のごみ問題は未解決、テロの標的が増える。第4段落：再エネと蓄電池は安くなり続け資金はそちらへという意見と、原子力を含む電源の組み合わせが必要という意見。SMRの将来は初期の商業案件の成否しだい。

【模範要約の訳】重大事故によって長年衰退していた原子力は、各国政府が炭素排出の削減と安定したエネルギー供給の確保を目指す中で、再び関心を集めている。その関心の多くは小型モジュール炉に向けられており、支持者によれば、工場で安く早く製造でき、再生可能エネルギーと違って常に電力を供給できる。しかし批判派は、実際に建設されたものはわずかで、費用の高騰で中止された計画もあり、廃棄物処理や安全保障への懸念も残っていると指摘する。再生可能エネルギーが安くなる中、原子力の役割をめぐって意見は分かれており、これらの原子炉の将来は初期の商業案件が成功するかどうかにかかっている。

- 型は **背景（復活）→ 期待 → 懸念 → 見通し**。第4段落の「対立する意見」と「〜しだい」の両方を最後の1文に入れる。
- 固有名詞（Chernobyl, Fukushima）は serious accidents とまとめる。地名・人名は基本的に残さない。
- manufactured in factories and then assembled on site → factory-built、around the clock regardless of the weather → provide constant power と短く言い換え。
- 結論の文は「何しだいか」（whether early commercial projects succeed）を必ず残す。ここを落とすと要約が尻切れになる。

予想問題：大問1 ミニ模試（20問）

目標は20問中15問以上。本番の22問なら6問落としても合格圏。**空所の前後にある言い換え・対比のヒント**（セミコロン、not merely、refusing to など）から先に探そう。

大問1 予想ミニ模試（単語 Q1〜15・句動詞 Q16〜20）

Q1. The senator's speech was criticized as a string of empty ( ) about national unity that offered no concrete proposals.

① proclivities ② ramifications ③ platitudes ④ contingencies

Q2. After the scandal, the CEO tried to ( ) angry shareholders by announcing that he would donate his entire bonus to charity.

① placate ② exacerbate ③ vindicate ④ relegate

Q3. Although the author's early novels were widely read, her later works were so ( ) that even professional critics struggled to understand them.

① gregarious ② perfunctory ③ ostentatious ④ abstruse

Q4. The two neighboring countries have long been at odds, and the recent border incident only deepened the ( ) between them.

① clemency ② enmity ③ levity ④ parity

Q5. The new evidence did not merely weaken the prosecution's case; it completely ( ) the main witness's testimony.

① embellished ② refuted ③ reiterated ④ condoned

Q6. The professor is known for her ( ) lectures; she can talk for an hour without ever getting to the point.

① laconic ② lucid ③ cogent ④ prolix

Q7. The company's sudden decision to close the factory was seen as a ( ) of its promise to protect local jobs.

① repudiation ② culmination ③ consolidation ④ proliferation

Q8. Rather than confronting the problem directly, the government chose to ( ), issuing vague statements that committed it to nothing.

① reciprocate ② exonerate ③ equivocate ④ proliferate

Q9. The minister's ( ) remarks about the disaster victims caused a public outcry, and he resigned within a week.

① magnanimous ② judicious ③ conciliatory ④ callous

Q10. Although the treaty was signed with great fanfare, it soon became clear that it was little more than a ( ); neither side had any intention of honoring it.

① windfall ② charade ③ precedent ④ stalemate

Q11. The coach was praised for his ability to ( ) a sense of discipline in young players without discouraging them.

① instill ② inhibit ③ impede ④ incur

Q12. Investors grew ( ) after the company repeatedly failed to meet its profit targets, and its share price fell sharply.

① leery ② jubilant ③ complacent ④ effusive

Q13. The museum's new director has been criticized for ( ) in hiring; three of the five new curators are her former students.

① frugality ② impartiality ③ cronyism ④ altruism

Q14. The rebel forces were finally forced to ( ) after the army cut off their food and water supplies.

① mobilize ② convene ③ deliberate ④ capitulate

Q15. The negotiations dragged on for months because both sides remained ( ), refusing to make even minor concessions.

① pliable ② intransigent ③ amenable ④ acquiescent

Q16. The two parties worked through the night to ( ) a compromise on the budget before the deadline.

① egg on ② stave off ③ hammer out ④ tide over

Q17. The central bank raised interest rates in an effort to ( ) inflation, which had reached its highest level in decades.

① rein in ② eke out ③ bandy about ④ pan out

Q18. Many small shops managed to ( ) the economic downturn by cutting costs and offering online delivery.

① palm off ② whip up ③ trump up ④ ride out

Q19. The initial enthusiasm for the project ( ) as months passed without any visible progress.

① shored up ② bowed out ③ petered out ④ cashed in

Q20. The company was accused of trying to ( ) customers with vague promises instead of giving them refunds.

① ratchet up ② fob off ③ mull over ④ farm out

予想問題：言い換えクイズ（10問）

コツ：本文と**同じ単語が多い選択肢ほど疑う**。正解は「意味は同じ・語は別」。has yet to／far from／contingent on のような**否定・条件の表現**の読み違いが一番の失点源。

本文 → 選択肢の言い換え

Q1. 本文：The initiative has yet to yield tangible results.
→ 正しい言い換えは？

① The initiative has already produced clear benefits.　② The initiative has not achieved concrete outcomes so far.　③ The initiative was abandoned before it could produce results.　④ The initiative's results have been exaggerated.

Q2. 本文：Critics contend that the policy disproportionately burdens low-income households.
→ 正しい言い換えは？

① Critics say the policy helps poor families more than rich ones.　② Critics say all households are affected equally.　③ Critics say the policy should be extended to low-income households.　④ Critics say poorer families bear an unfairly large share of the policy's costs.

Q3. 本文：The findings cast doubt on the long-held assumption that bilingual children fall behind academically.
→ 正しい言い換えは？

① The research challenges a traditional belief about bilingual children's school performance.　② The research confirms that bilingual children struggle at school.　③ The research shows that bilingual children had never been studied before.　④ The research proves that bilingual children perform better than others.

Q4. 本文：The scheme was scrapped amid mounting concerns over its cost.
→ 正しい言い換えは？

① The scheme was expanded despite its high cost.　② The scheme was delayed until its cost could be calculated.　③ The scheme was abandoned as worries about its expense grew.　④ The scheme's cost was reduced in response to public concern.

Q5. 本文：Far from curbing consumption, the tax appears to have had little effect on drinking habits.
→ 正しい言い換えは？

① The tax successfully reduced drinking.　② The tax caused people to drink much more.　③ The tax seems to have done little to reduce drinking.　④ The tax was designed to encourage drinking.

Q6. 本文：The species owes its survival largely to the efforts of local volunteers.
→ 正しい言い換えは？

① Local volunteers are the main reason the species still exists.　② The species survived despite interference from local volunteers.　③ Local volunteers have been unable to save the species.　④ The species survives mainly because of government programs.

Q7. 本文：The merger was contingent on approval from regulators in both countries.
→ 正しい言い換えは？

① Regulators in both countries had already approved the merger.　② The merger was approved by regulators in only one country.　③ Regulators opposed the merger in both countries.　④ The merger could proceed only if regulators in both countries agreed to it.

Q8. 本文：The company has come under fire for its reluctance to disclose how it uses customer data.
→ 正しい言い換えは？

① The company has been praised for openly sharing customer data.　② The company has been criticized for being unwilling to reveal how it handles customer information.　③ The company has been accused of selling customer data illegally.　④ The company has lost many customers after a data breach.

Q9. 本文：Initially dismissed as a passing fad, the practice has since gained widespread acceptance.
→ 正しい言い換えは？

① Although people first thought it was a temporary trend, the practice is now widely accepted.　② The practice was popular at first but has since declined.　③ The practice has always been widely accepted.　④ People now dismiss the practice as a temporary trend.

Q10. 本文：There is little consensus among economists as to whether the measure stimulated growth.
→ 正しい言い換えは？

① Economists agree that the measure stimulated growth.　② Economists agree that the measure slowed growth.　③ Economists are divided on whether the measure boosted the economy.　④ Few economists have studied the measure.

予想問題：リスニングの場面・質問・ひっかけ

パート別 よく出る場面と質問パターン（予想）

パート	よく出る場面	質問の型	聞き方
Part1 会話（No.1〜10）	職場（人事・予算・プロジェクトの遅れ）、夫婦・家族（引っ越し・家計・子どもの進路）、医師と患者、友人の転職相談	What does the woman imply? ／ What will the man probably do? ／ What is the man's main concern?	最後の発言で結論が決まることが多い。but・actually の後を待つ
Part2 説明文（No.11〜20）	医学・脳科学の新発見、生物・環境、古代文明・歴史上の人物、社会制度・経済、テクノロジー	What is one reason ~? ／ What do some researchers believe? ／ What does the speaker suggest about ~?	「定説 → However → 新説」の流れ。答えは新説の側に来やすい
Part3 Real-Life（No.21〜25）	自動音声、留守電、係員の説明（手続き・保険・住まい・旅行の変更）、講座やツアーの案内	What should you do (first)? ／ Which ~ should you choose? ／ Where should you go?	読む時間10秒で Situation の条件（期限・予算・すでにしたこと）に下線
Part4 インタビュー（No.26〜27）	研究者・起業家・医療や教育の現場の人・NPO職員へのインタビュー（キャリアの転機、仕事の苦労、業界の今後）	What does X say about ~? ／ What is one thing X suggests? ／ What does X think about the future of ~?	1問目は前半、2問目は後半に答えがあることが多い。ゲスト本人の意見を拾う

ひっかけの型

罠 聞こえた単語そのまま

放送の単語がそのまま入った選択肢はまず疑う。正解はたいてい言い換え。

> turned down the offer → He declined it.

罠 but の前で選ぶ

「〜も考えたが」の前半は捨てる情報。本音は but／however／actually の後。

> The pay was tempting, but ...

罠 定説のほうを選ぶ

Part2 の「かつては〜と考えられていた」は罠。recent research suggests の後が答え。

> Scientists long assumed ~. However, new evidence suggests ~.

罠 **Situation の条件を無視**

Real-Life で最初に聞こえる方法は一般向け。If you ~ の例外が自分の条件に合うことが多い。

> If you need it within 30 days, you must ~.

罠 **言い過ぎの選択肢**

always／completely／prove など、放送より強い言葉の選択肢は外れやすい。

> suggests → proves は×

罠 **昔の考えと今の考え**

「最初は〜だと思った」は過去の考え。今の考え（now／these days）と区別する。

> When I started, I thought ~. What really surprised me was ~.

罠 **聞き手の意見を選ぶ**

Part4 はインタビュアーの発言とゲストの意見をまぜない。質問はゲストについて。

> Interviewer: Some say ~. Guest: Actually, I'd say ~.

この合図が来たら答えが来る

合図	次に来るもの	例
However ／ But ／ Actually	本音・新説（答え）	Actually, the money came more easily than I expected.
What really ~ was ...	いちばん言いたいこと	What really surprised me was ~.
If you ~, (you must) ...	Real-Life の条件分岐	If you're calling from overseas, press 2.
Please note that ~	例外・制限（ひっかけの元）	Please note that refunds are not available.
So ／ That's why ~	結論・今の行動	So now I spend most of my time on ~.
Recent research suggests ~	Part2 の答え	Recent studies suggest the cause is more complex.

合図の練習（スクリプトを読んで答える）

Q1. 【Part1】

☆: I heard you turned down the transfer to the Singapore office.

★: I thought long and hard about it. The pay rise was tempting, but with my father's health the way it is, I just couldn't see myself being that far away. Besides, Jenna's offered me a spot on the new product team here.

Question: Why did the man decline the transfer?

① The salary increase was too small.　② He was promised a promotion in Singapore.　③ He wants to stay near his father.　④ He dislikes working with Jenna.

Q2. 【Part2】

For decades, scientists assumed that the sharp decline in bee populations was caused mainly by a single type of pesticide. However, recent research suggests that the picture is far more complicated. Bees appear to be weakened by a combination of factors, including habitat loss, parasites, and poor nutrition, which together make them more vulnerable to chemicals.

Question: What does recent research suggest about the decline in bee populations?

① It results from several factors acting together.　② It is caused mainly by a single pesticide.　③ It has been greatly exaggerated by scientists.　④ It could be stopped by banning chemicals.

Q3. 【Part3 Real-Life】

Situation: Your passport expires soon, and you need it for a business trip in three weeks. You have not applied for a renewal yet.

Question: What should you do?

Thank you for calling the Passport Office. Standard renewals can be submitted online and take approximately six weeks to process. If you need your passport within 30 days, you must use our express service, which requires an in-person appointment. Appointments can be booked through our website. Please note that applicants who have already submitted an online application cannot switch to the express service.

① Submit a standard renewal application online.　② Call again to switch to the express service.　③ Go to the office without an appointment.　④ Book an express service appointment online.

Q4. 【Part4 インタビュー】

Interviewer: How has your approach to running the clinic changed over the years?

Guest: Well, when I started, I thought the biggest obstacle would be funding. Actually, the money came more easily than I expected. What really surprised me was how hard it was to keep good nurses. We'd train them, and then they'd leave for hospitals in the city.

So now I spend most of my time on things like flexible schedules and housing support.
Question: What does the guest say has been the clinic's biggest challenge?

① Raising enough money to operate. ② Keeping qualified nurses. ③ Finding housing for doctors. ④ Training staff to use new technology.

Q5. 【Part1】
★: Did you get a chance to look over my proposal for the ad campaign?
☆: I did. There's some great material in there. I'm just not sure the board is ready for something quite so bold, especially after last quarter's numbers.
★: So you think I should tone it down?
☆: I'd at least have a more conservative option ready.
Question: What does the woman imply?

① The proposal should be rejected entirely. ② The board has already approved the campaign. ③ The man should prepare a safer alternative. ④ Last quarter's sales figures were excellent.

予想問題：二次 スピーチトピック10＋模範スピーチ3本

使い方：トピックを1つ見たら**1分で**「立場・理由3つ・例1つ」を頭の中で決める（本番はメモ禁止）。yes／no の論点は両方読んで、質疑応答で反対側から突っ込まれる準備にも使おう。

2分スピーチの骨組み

I'd like to talk about whether **[トピック]**. I believe **[立場]**, for three reasons.
First, **[理由1]**. For example, **[例]**.
Second, **[理由2]**.
Third, **[理由3]**.
Of course, some people argue that **[反対意見]**. However, **[反論]**.
For these reasons, I believe **[立場]**. Thank you.

導入15秒→理由3つ各30秒→反論への一言→結論10秒で約2分。理由が2つしか出なければ、反論への一言を長めにして時間を埋める。

予想トピック10

Is a universal basic income the best response to job losses caused by automation?
自動化による失業への最善の対策はベーシックインカムか。 ネタを見る

Agree or disagree: Nuclear power should play a central role in Japan's energy policy
賛成か反対か：原子力は日本のエネルギー政策で中心的な役割を果たすべきだ。 ネタを見る

Can international rules effectively control the use of gene-editing technology?
国際的なルールで遺伝子編集技術の利用を効果的に管理できるか。 ネタを見る

Is foreign aid an effective way to reduce global poverty?
対外援助は世界の貧困を減らす効果的な方法か。 ネタを見る

Should social media use be banned for children under 16?
16歳未満の子どものソーシャルメディア利用は禁止すべきか。 ネタを見る

Can democracy function properly in the age of online misinformation?
ネット上の誤情報の時代に、民主主義は正常に機能しうるか。 ネタを見る

Should Japan allow dual citizenship?
日本は二重国籍を認めるべきか。 ネタを見る

Agree or disagree: Economic growth and environmental sustainability can go hand in hand
賛成か反対か：経済成長と環境の持続可能性は両立できる。 ネタを見る

Should governments do more to preserve declining rural communities?
政府は衰退する地方の地域社会を守るためにもっと力を入れるべきか。 ネタを見る

Agree or disagree: Mandatory retirement ages should be abolished
賛成か反対か：定年制は廃止すべきだ。 ネタを見る

模範スピーチ①　ベーシックインカム（反対）

Is a universal basic income the best response to job losses caused by automation?

240語（220〜260）

QUESTION

Is a universal basic income the best response to job losses caused by automation?

Thank you. I'd like to talk about whether a universal basic income is the best response to job losses caused by automation. In my opinion, it isn't, and I have three reasons.

First, a universal basic income would be extremely expensive. Giving every adult a meaningful monthly payment would cost an enormous amount, especially in a country like Japan, where public debt is already very high and social security costs keep rising as the population ages. To pay for it, the government would have to raise taxes sharply or cut important services such as healthcare.

Second, it treats the symptom rather than the cause. People who lose their jobs to machines need more than money. They need new skills and a sense of purpose. If the government simply hands out cash, many people may stay out of the labor market for years, and their skills will become even more outdated.

Third, there are better, more targeted alternatives. For example, the government could invest in large-scale retraining programs in fields like nursing, data analysis, and renewable energy, where demand for workers is growing. It could also strengthen unemployment benefits for people who are actually affected by automation, instead of paying everyone, including the wealthy.

In conclusion, although automation is a serious challenge, I don't believe a universal basic income is the best solution, because it's too costly, it doesn't address the real problem, and more effective options are available. Thank you.

ありがとうございます。自動化による失業への最善の対策はベーシックインカムかどうかについてお話しします。私の意見では、そうではありません。理由は3つあります。

第一に、ベーシックインカムには非常に費用がかかります。すべての成人に意味のある額を毎月支給すれば莫大な費用がかかります。特に日本のように、すでに公的債務が非常に大きく、高齢化で社会保障費が増え続けている国ではなおさらです。その財源をまかなうには、政府は大幅に増税するか、医療などの重要なサービスを削らなければならないでしょう。

第二に、それは原因ではなく症状に対処するものです。機械に仕事を奪われた人々に必要なのはお金だけではありません。新しい技能と、生きがいが必要なのです。政府がただ現金を配るだけなら、多くの人が何年も労働市場の外にとどまり、技能はさらに時代遅れになってしまうかもしれません。

第三に、より良く、より的を絞った代替策があります。たとえば政府は、看護、データ分析、再生可能エネルギーのように人手の需要が伸びている分野で、大規模な職業再訓練に投資できます。また、富裕層を含む全員に支払うのではなく、実際に自動化の影響を受けた人々への失業給付を手厚くすることもできます。

結論として、自動化は深刻な課題ですが、費用がかかりすぎること、本当の問題に対処していないこと、そしてより効果的な選択肢があることから、ベーシックインカムが最善の解決策だとは思いません。ありがとうございました。

- 冒頭で **I'd like to talk about whether ~** とトピックを読み、すぐ **In my opinion, it isn't** と立場を言う。最初の15秒で立場が伝わればOK。
- Is ~ the best response? 型は「費用・効果の問題」＋「もっと良い代替策がある」で反対すると、理由が3つそろいやすい。
- 話し言葉なので I'd／isn't／don't などの短縮形は自然。約240語＝ゆっくり話して2分弱が目安。
- 最後に理由3つを1文でまとめて Thank you. で終える。時間が余っても新しい理由は足さない。

想定質問（質疑応答は約4分）。答えは2〜4文で「結論→理由→例」。

面接委員

You said a basic income would be too expensive. But couldn't it replace existing welfare programs and reduce administrative costs?
費用がかかりすぎるとのことでしたが、既存の福祉制度に取って代わって、事務の費用を減らせるのではありませんか。

あなた

That's a fair point, and it could reduce some administrative costs. However, if it replaced all welfare programs, people with special needs, such as those with disabilities, might receive less support than they do now. So I still believe targeted support is more effective.
もっともなご指摘で、事務の費用は多少減らせるかもしれません。しかし、すべての福祉制度に取って代われば、障害のある人など特別な支援が必要な人が、今より少ない支援しか受けられなくなるおそれがあります。ですから、やはり的を絞った支援のほうが効果的だと思います。

面接委員

Do you think retraining programs really work for older workers?
職業再訓練は年配の労働者にも本当に効果があると思いますか。

あなた

It can certainly be more challenging for older workers. But programs that build on their existing experience, for example, training factory workers to maintain automated equipment, can be quite effective.

年配の労働者には確かに難しい面があります。でも、たとえば工場の作業員に自動化された設備の保守を教えるなど、今ある経験を生かす訓練なら、かなり効果があると思います。

面接委員

Some pilot programs found that people kept working even after receiving a basic income. Doesn't that weaken your argument?
試験導入では、ベーシックインカムを受け取っても人々は働き続けたという結果もあります。それはあなたの主張を弱めませんか。

あなた

Those results are interesting, but most of the trials were small and lasted only a year or two. People might behave differently if they knew the payments would continue for the rest of their lives. So I don't think we can draw firm conclusions yet.
興味深い結果ですが、ほとんどの試験は小規模で、1〜2年しか続きませんでした。一生支給が続くとわかっていれば、人の行動は変わるかもしれません。ですから、まだはっきりした結論は出せないと思います。

反論されたら That's a fair point. で一度受け止め、However で自分の立場に戻る。意見を急に変えない。

模範スピーチ②　16歳未満のSNS禁止（賛成）

Should social media use be banned for children under 16? 246語（220〜260）

QUESTION

Should social media use be banned for children under 16?

I'd like to talk about whether social media use should be banned for children under sixteen. I believe it should, for three main reasons.

First, social media can seriously harm young people's mental health. Many platforms are designed to keep users scrolling for as long as possible, and teenagers are especially vulnerable to comparing themselves with others. Doctors and teachers in many countries have expressed concern about rising levels of anxiety, depression, and sleep problems among young people who spend hours online every day.

Second, children are exposed to risks that they aren't mature enough to handle. These include cyberbullying, contact with strangers who may try to exploit them, and harmful content about things like extreme dieting. Even careful parents find it almost impossible to monitor everything their children see on their phones.

Third, a legal age limit would actually make things easier for parents. At the moment, many parents feel pressured to let their children use social media because all their classmates do. If the law set a clear minimum age, this peer pressure would largely disappear, and families wouldn't have to fight over the issue every day.

Of course, some people argue that a ban would be difficult to enforce, and that's true to some extent. However, age limits for alcohol and driving are not perfectly enforced either, yet they still send an important message to society.

For these reasons, I believe that social media should be banned for children under sixteen. Thank you.

16歳未満の子どものソーシャルメディア利用を禁止すべきかどうかについてお話しします。私は禁止すべきだと考えます。主な理由は3つです。

第一に、ソーシャルメディアは若者の心の健康を深刻に損なう可能性があります。多くのプラットフォームは利用者ができるだけ長くスクロールし続けるように設計されており、10代の若者は特に他人

と自分を比べてしまいやすいのです。多くの国の医師や教師が、毎日何時間もネットで過ごす若者の間で、不安やうつ、睡眠の問題が増えていることに懸念を示しています。

第二に、子どもたちは、対処できるほど成熟していない危険にさらされています。ネットいじめ、子どもを食い物にしようとする見知らぬ人との接触、極端なダイエットなどに関する有害な内容がそうです。注意深い親でさえ、子どもがスマートフォンで見ているものをすべて見守るのはほぼ不可能です。

第三に、法律で年齢制限を設ければ、むしろ親にとって楽になります。今は、同級生がみんな使っているからという理由で、子どもにソーシャルメディアを使わせなければというプレッシャーを感じている親が多くいます。法律がはっきりした最低年齢を定めれば、こうした同調圧力はほぼなくなり、家族が毎日この問題でもめる必要もなくなります。

もちろん、禁止を徹底するのは難しいと主張する人もいて、それはある程度その通りです。しかし、飲酒や運転の年齢制限も完璧に守られているわけではありませんが、それでも社会に大切なメッセージを送っています。

以上の理由から、16歳未満の子どものソーシャルメディア利用は禁止すべきだと考えます。ありがとうございました。

- 理由3つのあとに **Of course, some people argue that ~. However, ~.** で反論を1つ先回り。質疑応答で聞かれることも予測しやすくなる。
- 観点：①健康（心）②安全（危険）③家庭（同調圧力）。③の「規制がむしろ親を助ける」は意外性があり、印象に残りやすい。
- peer pressure（同調圧力）、enforce（徹底させる）、exploit（食い物にする）は子ども・ネット系の必須語。
- Should ~ be banned? には、禁止の対象（under sixteen／social media）をはっきりさせて話すと答えがぶれない。

想定質問。実現方法（How?）と反対側の利点（Isn't ~ also useful?）はほぼ必ず聞かれると思って準備。

面接委員

How would the government actually check users' ages?
政府は実際にどうやって利用者の年齢を確認するのですか。

あなた

That's a difficult question. One option is to require platforms to use reliable age verification, for example, by checking official identification through a secure third party. It won't be perfect, but the responsibility should lie with the companies, not with children or parents.
難しい質問です。ひとつの方法は、信頼できる第三者を通じて公的な身分証を確認するなど、確かな年齢確認をプラットフォームに義務づけることです。完璧ではないでしょうが、責任は子どもや親ではなく企業が負うべきです。

面接委員

Isn't social media also useful for young people, for example, for learning or finding communities?

ソーシャルメディアは、学習や居場所探しなど、若者にとって役に立つ面もあるのではありませんか。

あなた

Yes, I agree that it has some benefits. But children could still use educational websites and messaging apps with their parents' permission. The ban would target platforms built around endless feeds and likes.

はい、利点があることには同意します。でも子どもたちは、親の許可があれば教育サイトやメッセージアプリは引き続き使えます。禁止の対象は、終わりのないフィードや「いいね」を中心に作られたプラットフォームです。

面接委員

Do you think sixteen is the right age?

16歳という年齢は適切だと思いますか。

あなた

I think it's a reasonable line, because by sixteen most teenagers are more emotionally mature and better able to judge risks. But the exact age is less important than having a clear rule that everyone follows.

妥当な線だと思います。16歳になれば、ほとんどの10代は精神的に成熟し、危険を判断する力もついているからです。ただ、正確な年齢よりも、みんなが守るはっきりしたルールがあることのほうが大切です。

That's a difficult question. は考える時間をかせぐ合図。黙りこむより、これを言ってから One option is ~ で答える。

模範スピーチ③　二重国籍（賛成）

Should Japan allow dual citizenship? 247語（220〜260）

QUESTION

Should Japan allow dual citizenship?

I'd like to talk about whether Japan should allow dual citizenship. My answer is yes, and I'd like to explain three reasons.

First, the current system forces many people to make a painful choice. Under Japanese law, people who hold more than one nationality are generally required to choose one by a certain age. For children of international marriages, this can feel like being asked to reject one of their parents. Many people with deep ties to Japan end up giving up their Japanese nationality simply because they need the other one for work or family reasons.

Second, allowing dual citizenship would benefit Japan's economy. Japan is facing a serious labor shortage and needs talented people from around the world. Highly skilled professionals who are thinking about settling here might be more willing to become Japanese citizens if they didn't have to give up their original nationality. Similarly, Japanese people working overseas could keep their ties to Japan and later bring their experience back home.

Third, many developed countries already accept dual citizenship without serious problems. Some people worry about divided loyalty or security risks, but countries such as the United Kingdom and Canada have allowed it for many years. These concerns can be managed through specific rules, for example, for sensitive government positions.

In conclusion, because the current rule causes personal hardship, limits Japan's ability to attract talent, and is out of step with international practice, I believe that Japan should allow dual citizenship. Thank you.

日本は二重国籍を認めるべきかどうかについてお話しします。私の答えは「認めるべき」で、理由を3つ説明します。

第一に、今の制度は多くの人につらい選択を強いています。日本の法律では、複数の国籍を持つ人は、一定の年齢までにどちらかを選ぶことが原則として求められます。国際結婚で生まれた子どもにとって、これは親のどちらかを拒むよう求められているように感じられることがあります。日本と深いつながりのある人の多くが、仕事や家族の事情でもう一方の国籍が必要だというだけの理由で、結局日本国籍を手放しています。

第二に、二重国籍を認めれば日本経済のためになります。日本は深刻な人手不足に直面しており、世界中から優秀な人材を必要としています。日本への定住を考えている高度な技能を持つ専門職の人たちも、元の国籍を手放さなくてよいのなら、日本国籍の取得にもっと前向きになるかもしれません。同様に、海外で働く日本人も日本とのつながりを保ち、のちにその経験を日本に持ち帰ることができます。

第三に、多くの先進国はすでに大きな問題なく二重国籍を認めています。忠誠心が分かれることや安全保障上の危険を心配する人もいますが、イギリスやカナダのような国は長年二重国籍を認めてきました。こうした懸念は、たとえば機密に関わる政府の役職について特別な規則を設けることで対処できます。

結論として、今の規則は個人に苦しみを与え、日本が人材を引きつける力を制限し、国際的な慣行ともずれているため、日本は二重国籍を認めるべきだと考えます。ありがとうございました。

- 日本に関するトピックは **Under Japanese law, ~** のように日本の現状から入ると説得力が出る。細かい条文や年齢は言わず by a certain age とぼかすのが安全。
- 観点：①個人（家族の苦しみ）②経済（人材）③国際比較。「個人→国→世界」と視野を広げる順は話しやすい。
- 本論3で反対側の懸念（divided loyalty）を自分から出し、具体的な対処法（sensitive government positions）で答えておく。
- out of step with international practice（国際的な慣行とずれている）は日本の制度を論じるときの万能表現。

想定質問。日本の制度の話は「国民の支持」「本当に効果があるか」を突っ込まれやすい。

面接委員

What about concerns that dual citizens might not be fully loyal to Japan?
二重国籍の人は日本に十分な忠誠心を持たないのではないか、という懸念についてはどうですか。

あなた

I understand that concern, but I don't think holding two passports makes someone less committed to Japan. Loyalty comes from people's connections to their community. If necessary, certain sensitive government positions could be limited to people with only Japanese citizenship.
その懸念は理解できますが、パスポートを2つ持っているからといって日本への思いが弱くなるとは思いません。忠誠心は地域社会とのつながりから生まれるものです。必要なら、政府の機密に関わる一部の役職は、日本国籍だけを持つ人に限ればよいと思います。

面接委員

Do you think the Japanese public would support this change?
日本の国民はこの変更を支持すると思いますか。

あなた

Opinion may be divided at the moment, partly because many people aren't aware of how the current rule affects families. If the government explained the benefits clearly, I think support would gradually increase.

今は意見が分かれているかもしれません。今の規則が家族にどう影響しているかを知らない人が多いのも一因です。政府が利点をはっきり説明すれば、支持は少しずつ増えていくと思います。

面接委員

Would allowing dual citizenship really attract more skilled workers to Japan?

二重国籍を認めれば、本当に技能のある人材が日本にもっと集まるのでしょうか。

あなた

It wouldn't solve the labor shortage on its own. Factors like salaries and working conditions are probably more important. But removing this barrier would send a clear message that Japan welcomes people who want to make a long-term commitment here.

それだけで人手不足が解決するわけではありません。給与や労働条件のほうがおそらく重要でしょう。でも、この壁をなくせば、日本に長く根を下ろしたい人を歓迎するという明確なメッセージになります。

It wouldn't solve ~ on its own. But ~ は「それだけでは不十分だが意味はある」と一部を認めて主張を守る型。質疑応答で何度でも使える。

クイズの解答・解説

大問1 予想ミニ模試（単語 Q1〜15・句動詞 Q16〜20）

- Q1：③ **platitudes**　platitude＝陳腐な決まり文句。empty と no concrete proposals がヒント。proclivity＝性癖、ramification＝（予期せぬ）影響、contingency＝不測の事態。
- Q2：① **placate**　placate＝（怒っている人を）なだめる。目的語は angry shareholders（怒った株主）。寄付を発表してなだめようとした。exacerbate＝悪化させる、vindicate＝潔白を証明する、relegate＝格下げする。
- Q3：④ **abstruse**　abstruse＝難解な。批評家でも理解に苦しむ。gregarious＝社交的な、perfunctory＝おざなりの、ostentatious＝これ見よがしの。
- Q4：② **enmity**　enmity＝敵意・反目。at odds（対立して）とつながる。clemency＝寛大な処置、levity＝軽率さ、parity＝同等。
- Q5：② **refuted**　refute＝論破する・誤りを証明する。not merely weaken（弱めただけでなく）→ completely で一段強い語。embellish＝誇張する、reiterate＝くり返す、condone＝大目に見る。
- Q6：④ **prolix**　prolix＝冗長な。セミコロンの後が説明。laconic＝言葉数の少ない、lucid＝明快な、cogent＝説得力のある。
- Q7：① **repudiation**　repudiation＝（約束などの）拒否・破棄。工場閉鎖＝雇用を守る約束を破った。culmination＝最高点、consolidation＝統合、proliferation＝急増。
- Q8：③ **equivocate**　equivocate＝言葉を濁す。vague statements が決め手。reciprocate＝お返しをする、exonerate＝無罪とする、proliferate＝急増する。
- Q9：④ **callous**　callous＝冷淡な・無神経な。outcry（抗議）と辞任につながるのはマイナスの語。magnanimous＝寛大な、judicious＝賢明な、conciliatory＝融和的な。
- Q10：② **charade**　charade＝見せかけ・茶番。守る気がない条約。windfall＝思わぬ収入、precedent＝前例、stalemate＝行き詰まり。
- Q11：① **instill**　instill A in B＝BにAを植えつける。in young players の in が目印。inhibit＝抑制する、impede＝妨げる、incur＝（損失を）被る。
- Q12：① **leery**　leery＝用心深い・疑ってかかる。目標未達→株価下落。jubilant＝歓喜した、complacent＝現状に満足した、effusive＝感情をあらわにした。
- Q13：③ **cronyism**　cronyism＝えこひいき・身内びいき。元教え子ばかり採用。frugality＝倹約、impartiality＝公平さ（逆の意味）、altruism＝利他主義。

- Q14：④ **capitulate**　capitulate＝降伏する。補給を断たれて finally forced to。mobilize＝動員する、convene＝招集する、deliberate＝熟考する。
- Q15：② **intransigent**　intransigent＝妥協しない・頑固な。refusing to make concessions の言い換え。pliable＝柔軟な、amenable＝従順な、acquiescent＝黙って従う（3つとも逆）。
- Q16：③ **hammer out**　hammer out＝（議論を重ねて）合意をまとめ上げる。a compromise と相性抜群。egg on＝けしかける、stave off＝食い止める、tide over＝（困難を）乗り切らせる。
- Q17：① **rein in**　rein in＝抑制する（手綱を引く）。利上げ→インフレ抑制。eke out＝やりくりする、bandy about＝（うわさを）言いふらす、pan out＝うまくいく。
- Q18：④ **ride out**　ride out＝（嵐・不況を）乗り切る。managed to と by cutting costs がヒント。palm off＝つかませる、whip up＝あおる、trump up＝でっち上げる。
- Q19：③ **petered out**　peter out＝次第に消える。as months passed（月日がたつにつれ）と相性がよい。shore up＝てこ入れする、bow out＝身を引く、cash in＝現金化する・つけこむ。
- Q20：② **fob off**　fob off A with B＝AをBでごまかす・あしらう。with vague promises が決め手。ratchet up＝徐々に上げる、mull over＝熟考する、farm out＝外注する。

本文 → 選択肢の言い換え

- Q1：② **The initiative has not achieved concrete outcomes so far.**　has yet to ~＝まだ〜していない（否定）。tangible → concrete、yield results → achieve outcomes。already（肯定）にひっかからない。
- Q2：④ **Critics say poorer families bear an unfairly large share of the policy's costs.**　disproportionately burdens＝不釣り合いに重い負担をかける → bear an unfairly large share。contend＝主張する。
- Q3：① **The research challenges a traditional belief about bilingual children's school performance.**　cast doubt on＝疑問を投げかける → challenge、long-held assumption → traditional belief。proves ~ better は言い過ぎ。
- Q4：③ **The scheme was abandoned as worries about its expense grew.**　scrap＝廃止する → abandon、mounting concerns → worries grew。amid＝〜のさなかに。
- Q5：③ **The tax seems to have done little to reduce drinking.**　far from ~＝〜どころか（〜していない）。ただし後半は little effect なので「増えた」まで言うと言い過ぎ。appears → seems。
- Q6：① **Local volunteers are the main reason the species still exists.**　owe A to B＝AはBのおかげ。largely → main reason。主語と目的語が入れかわる言い換えは1級の定

番。

- Q7：④ **The merger could proceed only if regulators in both countries agreed to it.**　contingent on＝〜しだいの・〜を条件とする → only if。すでに承認された（already）とは言っていない。
- Q8：② **The company has been criticized for being unwilling to reveal how it handles customer information.**　come under fire＝非難される → be criticized、reluctance to disclose → unwilling to reveal。違法販売とは言っていない。
- Q9：① **Although people first thought it was a temporary trend, the practice is now widely accepted.**　initially dismissed（最初は相手にされなかった）→ has since gained（その後〜を得た）の時間の流れをつかむ。passing fad → temporary trend。
- Q10：③ **Economists are divided on whether the measure boosted the economy.** little consensus＝ほとんど合意がない → divided。little は「研究が少ない」ではなく「合意が少ない」。stimulate → boost。

合図の練習（スクリプトを読んで答える）

- Q1：③ **He wants to stay near his father.**　The pay rise was tempting, **but** ~ の but の後が本音（父の健康）。turned down → decline、that far away → stay near の言い換えにも注目。
- Q2：① **It results from several factors acting together.**　For decades, scientists assumed ~ は昔の定説＝ひっかけ。However, recent research suggests の後の a combination of factors が答え。
- Q3：④ **Book an express service appointment online.**　最初の Standard renewals（約6週間）は3週間後の出張に間に合わない＝ひっかけ。If you need your passport within 30 days が自分の条件 → 予約はウェブで。
- Q4：② **Keeping qualified nurses.**　when I started, I thought ~ は昔の考え。Actually と What really surprised me was の後が答え。keep good nurses → keeping qualified nurses。
- Q5：③ **The man should prepare a safer alternative.**　ほめ言葉（great material）の後の I'm just not sure が本音の合図。最後の a more conservative option → safer alternative。entirely（全部ダメ）は言い過ぎ。