

CBSE CLASS X  
**Social Science (087)**

## ANSWER KEY

AI-generated question paper

Code: 5XJCDT

Questions: 41

Maximum Marks: 128

Generated: 2026-06-26 09:39

**SELECTIONS USED**

Subject	Social Science
Lessons	5 Outcomes of Democracy
Level of understanding	Thorough understanding
Question selection	Curated chapter coverage (~5 questions per section + 8 synthesis)
Model	claude-sonnet-4-6

Composition — Difficulty: 1 straightforward · 19 medium · 21 deep | Types: 28 Short · 8 Long · 3 MCQ · 2 Very short

Q1. medium thorough-understanding § Outcomes of Democracy (Introduction)

[3]

A student argues: 'If democracy is not delivering economic growth or reducing poverty in our country, we should simply replace it with a more efficient system.' What is the flaw in this reasoning? What is the correct way to think about what democracy can and cannot be expected to deliver?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

**Model Answer**

The student's reasoning is flawed because it treats economic growth and poverty reduction as the **sole measures** of democracy's worth, ignoring its many other outcomes.

**Flaw:** Data shows the difference in economic growth rates between dictatorships (4.42%) and democracies (3.95%) is small, and in poor countries it is negligible. Moreover, non-democracies are not proven to be less corrupt or more sensitive to people's needs.

**Correct way to think:** Democracy is **just a form of government** — it creates *conditions* for achieving goals; citizens must take advantage of those conditions. Democracy must be valued for providing accountable, transparent, and legitimate government; protecting dignity; resolving conflicts; and allowing correction of mistakes. These outcomes cannot be delivered by an "efficient" authoritarian system.

*Source: Chapter 5 — Democratic Politics II, Sections: Economic growth and development; Accountable, responsive and legitimate government*

---

**Explanation**

Examiners expect you to: (1) identify the specific flaw — reducing democracy to economic performance alone; (2) use data from the textbook (the growth rate figures); and (3) state the textbook's core idea that "democracy is just a form of government" that creates conditions. Mentioning legitimacy, accountability, and dignity as non-economic outcomes strengthens the answer. Avoid vague statements — cite the numbers briefly to show evidence-based reasoning.

Q2. deep thorough-understanding § Outcomes of Democracy (Introduction)

[3]

Democracy is widely supported even by people living under non-democratic regimes, yet many people living in democracies remain dissatisfied with how their democracy actually functions. What does this apparent contradiction reveal about the way democracy should be evaluated?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

This contradiction reveals that democracy must be evaluated on two levels — as a principle and as a practice. People across the world, including those under non-democratic regimes, support democracy because it is a **legitimate** form of government — people's own government, based on elected representatives. This makes democracy desirable in principle.

However, actual democratic governments often fall short: they may be slow, corrupt, unresponsive, or fail to represent all citizens fairly. Hence, dissatisfaction arises in practice.

This shows that democracy should be assessed not by impossible ideal standards, nor judged solely on shortcomings, but by asking whether it creates conditions better than any alternative — which it does.

*Source: Outcomes of Democracy, Chapter 5 — "Accountable, responsive and legitimate government" and "How do we assess democracy's outcomes?"*

---

### Explanation

#### What the examiner looks for (3 marks):

- **Point 1:** Distinguish *principle* (legitimacy, people's own government) from *practice* (corruption, inefficiency, poor responsiveness) — this is the core insight.
- **Point 2:** Reference that support for democracy exists even in non-democratic countries (textbook data from South Asia).
- **Point 3:** The conclusion — democracy should be evaluated comparatively (better than alternatives), not against a perfect ideal.

Avoid writing a vague essay. Use the two words **principle** and **practice** explicitly — they signal to the examiner you understand the textbook's framework.

**Q3.** medium thorough-understanding § How do we assess democracy's outcomes?

[3]

Democracy is described as 'good in principle but not so good in practice.' What does this tension reveal about how we should judge democracy — purely on moral grounds or also on practical outcomes? Explain.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The tension between democracy being "good in principle but not so good in practice" reveals that we must judge democracy on **both moral and prudential grounds**.

**Morally**, democracy is superior because it promotes equality, dignity, freedom, and allows correction of mistakes — values no other system guarantees.

**Practically**, democracies often show a mixed record: corruption persists, needs of the majority are sometimes ignored, and decision-making is slow. Yet democratic governments remain **legitimate** — they are people's own governments, accountable and transparent in ways non-democratic regimes are not.

Therefore, democracy should not be judged solely on ideal outcomes. It creates *conditions* for achieving goals; citizens must utilise those conditions. The very fact that people complain about democracy shows growing awareness — itself a sign of democratic success.

Source: Chapter 5 — Outcomes of Democracy

---

### Explanation

- The question tests whether you understand the **dual basis** for evaluating democracy — moral (normative) and prudential (practical/outcome-based).
- Examiners look for: (1) acknowledgement of the dilemma, (2) moral strengths, (3) practical shortcomings, and (4) the key conclusion — democracy is still legitimate and better than alternatives.
- The phrase "**democracy creates conditions; citizens must achieve goals**" is a direct textbook point — include it for full marks.
- Avoid just listing points; connect them into a short logical argument, as this is a 3-mark reasoning question.

Q4. deep thorough-understanding § How do we assess democracy's outcomes?

[3]

Over a hundred countries today hold elections and have formal constitutions, yet their democratic outcomes differ greatly. Despite this variation, is it still meaningful to set common benchmarks for what ALL democracies must deliver? Explain with reasons.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Yes, it is meaningful to set common benchmarks for all democracies because, regardless of local variations, every democracy must deliver certain minimum outcomes:

1. **Accountable and responsive government** — Citizens must be able to choose their rulers and hold them accountable through regular, free, and fair elections and the right to information.
2. **Accommodation of social diversity** — Democracy must negotiate social differences through procedures, ensuring majority rule does not suppress minorities.
3. **Legitimate government** — Democratic government is people's own government, generating its own support — an outcome non-democracies cannot match.

These benchmarks provide a standard to measure and improve democracies, even if actual performance varies.

Source: *Outcomes of Democracy, Chapter 5*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner expects you to say **yes** with 2–3 solid reasons drawn from the chapter.
- Key terms to use: **accountable, responsive, legitimate, transparency, social diversity.**
- Avoid listing everything the chapter says — pick the strongest 3 points and state them crisply.
- The question asks for **reasons**, so each point must explain *why* a benchmark is necessary, not just name it.

Q5. deep thorough-understanding § How do we assess democracy's outcomes?

[5]

A student argues: 'Since most people around the world support democracy and yet are dissatisfied with how it actually functions, we should look for a better form of government altogether.' Using the reasoning in this section, evaluate whether this argument is logically sound.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The student's argument is **not logically sound**. Here's why:

1. **Dissatisfaction ≠ Failure of democracy:** The textbook notes that democracy is "seen to be good in principle, but felt to be not so good in practice." This gap is an invitation to improve democracy, not abandon it.
1. **Democracy is legitimate government:** It is people's own government. Even if slow or not always efficient, it is accountable, transparent, and follows procedures — qualities absent in non-democracies.
1. **No better alternative exists:** The data shows that non-democratic regimes are not less corrupt or more sensitive to people's needs. Dictatorships may grow slightly faster economically, but the difference is negligible in poor countries.
1. **Overwhelming global support:** 88% of South Asians find democracy suitable, and majorities prefer it over dictatorship — proving dissatisfaction is with *functioning*, not the *idea* itself.
1. **Democracy allows self-correction:** It provides room to correct mistakes through elections and public debate — something no other system guarantees.

Therefore, dissatisfaction should push citizens to strengthen democracy, not replace it.

Source: Chapter 5 — Outcomes of Democracy; Accountable, Responsive and Legitimate Government

---

### Explanation

Examiners expect you to directly address the student's claim and use textbook reasoning to evaluate it point by point. Key moves: (1) separate dissatisfaction with *practice* from rejection of *principle*, (2) cite the legitimacy argument, (3) use the economic growth data to show alternatives aren't superior, and (4) note democracy's self-correcting nature. Avoid vague praise of democracy — be specific and use textbook evidence.

Q6. medium thorough-understanding § Accountable, responsive and legitimate government

[3]

A non-democratic government can implement a major infrastructure project in weeks, while a democratic government takes months of debate and approvals to do the same. Does this make the democratic government inefficient? Justify your answer.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

No, the democratic government is not inefficient — it is **more effective in the long run**.

It is true that non-democratic rulers can make quick decisions without deliberation, assemblies, or public opinion. However, democracy is based on **deliberation and negotiation**, so some delay is natural.

This delay is worth the cost because:

- Democratic decisions follow correct **procedures and norms**, making them more acceptable to people.
- Democracy ensures **transparency** — citizens can examine how decisions were made.
- Such decisions face less resistance and are therefore **more effective in implementation**.

A non-democratic government may decide fast but face public rejection. Democratic government is **accountable, legitimate, and people's own government** — which matters more than speed.

Source: *Outcomes of Democracy, Chapter 5, Democratic Politics*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner wants you to **acknowledge the apparent drawback** (slower process) and then **counter it** using the textbook argument about cost of time, legitimacy, transparency, and acceptability.
- Key terms to include: **deliberation, transparency, accountability, legitimate government**.
- Don't just say "democracy is better" — **give reasons** from the passage (acceptability of decisions, procedural correctness, citizens' right to examine decisions).
- Avoid writing an essay; 3 marks = 3 clear points supported by brief reasoning.

Q7. medium thorough-understanding § Accountable, responsive and legitimate government

[3]

What is the difference between an 'accountable' government and a 'responsive' government? Can a government be one without being the other?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

An **accountable** government is one that follows proper procedures, is transparent, and can be questioned by citizens about its decisions. A **responsive** government is one that is attentive to the needs and demands of the people.

Yes, a government can be one without being the other. A government may be accountable (follows procedures, holds elections) but still not respond to people's actual needs. Conversely, a government may address people's needs without maintaining transparency or proper procedures. However, ideally, democracy should ensure both.

Source: *Outcomes of Democracy, Chapter 5*

---

### Explanation

- Examiners look for: clear distinction between the two terms (1 mark each) + a justified answer to the second part (1 mark).
- **Accountable** = procedural correctness, transparency, answerable to citizens.
- **Responsive** = fulfils needs/demands of people.
- The textbook itself notes democracies "fall short" on responsiveness while being relatively more accountable — use this to justify that they can exist independently.
- Don't over-explain; one example or a crisp sentence for the second part is enough.

Q8. straightforward thorough-understanding § Accountable, responsive and legitimate government

[1]

Identify and briefly explain any two institutional mechanisms through which citizens can hold a democratic government accountable.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Two institutional mechanisms are: (1) **Regular free and fair elections** — citizens choose/remove rulers; (2) **Right to Information** — citizens can examine government decisions and ensure transparency.

### Explanation

This is a 1-mark question, so one crisp line is enough. The passage explicitly mentions "regular, free and fair elections," "open public debate," and "citizens' right to information" as key mechanisms. RTI is also illustrated through Nannu's example. Examiners expect you to name the mechanism and give a one-phrase explanation for each — no more.

Q9. deep thorough-understanding § Accountable, responsive and legitimate government

[3]

A citizen complains: 'Our elected government is slow, occasionally corrupt, and ignores many of our demands — so dictatorship would be better.' Critically evaluate this complaint using the concept of legitimacy.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The citizen's complaint has some truth but is ultimately flawed.

It is correct that democratic governments can be slow, sometimes corrupt, and unresponsive. However, the textbook clearly states that **"there is nothing to show that non-democracies are less corrupt or more sensitive to the people."** Dictatorship is not a proven solution to these problems.

Most importantly, democratic government is **legitimate government** — it is the people's own government, chosen by them. This legitimacy generates widespread public support, which no dictatorship can match. Democracy also ensures transparency, accountability, and the right to correct mistakes — features absent in a dictatorship.

Therefore, while democracy's weaknesses are real, replacing it with dictatorship would sacrifice legitimacy and fundamental rights for uncertain gains.

Source: *Democratic Politics II*, Chapter 5 — Accountable, Responsive and Legitimate Government

---

### Explanation

- Examiners want you to **use the term "legitimacy" explicitly** — that is the key concept the question demands.
- Acknowledge the complaint partly (yes, democracies can be slow/corrupt) but then counter it using the textbook argument.
- The crucial textbook line is: *"democratic government is legitimate government... a democratic government is people's own government."*
- Also note the textbook says non-democracies are not proven to be less corrupt — this directly refutes the citizen's logic.
- Do not write a long essay; 3 marks = ~3 clear points in tight paragraphs.

**Q10.** medium thorough-understanding § Accountable, responsive and legitimate government

[2]

Democratic governments are often criticised for being slow because they follow established norms and procedures. Do you think this procedural approach is a strength or a weakness of democracy? Justify your answer.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The procedural approach is a **strength** of democracy.

Although following norms and procedures causes delay, it ensures that decisions are more acceptable to the people and more effective. It also brings **transparency** — citizens can examine whether correct procedures were followed. Thus, the time cost is worth the accountability and legitimacy it produces.

Source: *Accountable, responsive and legitimate government, Chapter 5*

---

### Explanation

The passage directly says: *"the democratic government will take more time to follow procedures... But because it has followed procedures, its decisions may be both more acceptable to the people and more effective. So, the cost of time that democracy pays is perhaps worth it."*

Examiners want you to:

1. Take a clear stand (strength).
2. Give the two key reasons from the text — **acceptability/effectiveness** and **transparency**.
3. Avoid writing a long essay — 2 marks = ~2 crisp points.

Q11. deep thorough-understanding § Accountable, responsive and legitimate government

[3]

Survey data from South Asia consistently shows that people living under non-democratic regimes also strongly prefer democracy for their country. What does this tell us about democracy as an outcome in itself?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The survey data from South Asia shows that even people living under non-democratic regimes strongly prefer democracy, with 94% agreeing with rule by elected representatives. This reveals that democracy is valued as a **legitimate government** — it is people's own government. Democracy's ability to generate its own support is itself a significant outcome. People do not merely want efficient rule; they want to be governed by representatives they have chosen. This widespread preference, even among those who have never experienced democracy, shows that democracy has intrinsic value beyond just economic or policy outcomes.

Source: *Outcomes of Democracy, Accountable, Responsive and Legitimate Government — Chapter 5*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner expects you to use the **key term "legitimate government"** — this is the textbook's direct conclusion.
- The core idea: people prefer democracy not just for what it delivers (growth, welfare) but because it is *their own* government — this is democracy as an outcome **in itself**.
- Quote or reference the South Asia survey data briefly to show evidence-based reasoning.
- Avoid writing a general essay on democracy's merits; stay focused on *legitimacy* and *self-generated support* as the specific outcome the question asks about.

**Q12.** deep thorough-understanding § Accountable, responsive and legitimate government

[5]

Democracies are described as having a 'mixed record' in producing accountable government. Identify one area where democracies have shown relative success and one area where they fall short, and explain why this overall picture does not undermine the case for democracy.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

#### Area of Relative Success — Accommodating Social Diversity:

Democracies have shown success in managing social conflicts and divisions. Countries like Belgium have peacefully negotiated differences among ethnic groups. Democracies develop procedures for competition, reducing the chance of tensions turning violent. Non-democratic regimes often suppress such differences, whereas democracy evolves mechanisms to respect and negotiate them.

#### Area Where Democracies Fall Short — Reducing Economic Inequality:

Democracies have not been very successful in reducing economic inequalities. In South Africa and Brazil, the top 20% take over 60% of national income, while the bottom 20% receive less than 3%. Even poor voters remain largely unserved — elected governments do not appear keen enough to address poverty seriously.

#### Why This Does Not Undermine Democracy:

The mixed record does not reject democracy because the difference in economic growth between dictatorships and democracies is negligible, especially in poor countries (4.34% vs 4.28%). When significant differences exist, it is better to prefer democracy for its several other positive outcomes — accountable government, political equality, and protection of dignity.

Source: Chapter 5 — Outcomes of Democracy

---

### Explanation

- Examiners expect **one clear success point** (social diversity/accommodation) and **one clear failure point** (economic inequality/poverty reduction) — both with supporting evidence from the tables or text.
- The **third part** (why democracy is still preferred) must reference the negligible growth difference and democracy's non-economic advantages. Many students forget this part and lose marks.
- Use data from Table 1 and Table 2 wherever possible — it shows you can interpret evidence, which CBSE rewards.
- Avoid vague statements like "democracy is good" — be specific and text-based.

Q13. deep thorough-understanding § Accountable, responsive and legitimate government

[3]

A government passes a new law without any public debate or legislative scrutiny. Even though the law may benefit many people, why would a democrat object to the way it was passed?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

A democrat would object to the **way** the law was passed, not its content. In a democracy, people are the source of all political power and have the right to be consulted on how they are governed. Bypassing public debate and legislative scrutiny violates this principle.

Key reasons for objection:

- It concentrates power in one person or group, undermining the system of checks and balances among legislature, executive, and judiciary.
- Democracy requires power-sharing; laws must be debated in the legislature where elected representatives take part.
- A legitimate government is one where citizens acquire a stake through participation. Without public debate, the law lacks legitimacy, even if beneficial.

The outcome (benefit) does not justify an undemocratic process — moral reasons for power-sharing make the **act** of participation valuable in itself.

Source: *Democratic Politics II, Chapter 1 (Forms of Power Sharing; Why Power Sharing is Desirable)*

---

### Explanation

The examiner expects you to separate **content** (the law may be good) from **process** (how it was made). The core democratic principle is that power must be shared and citizens must be consulted — this is the "moral reason" for power-sharing from Chapter 1. Mention: (1) people as source of power, (2) checks and balances/legislative scrutiny, (3) legitimacy through participation. Avoid writing about political parties here — that's Chapter 4 and not directly relevant.

Q14. medium thorough-understanding § Accountable, responsive and legitimate government

[3]

A country's democratic government has failed to achieve high economic growth and its delivery of public services is poor. A citizen argues that democracy has therefore failed. Do you agree? Explain why legitimacy and dignity may make democracy valuable beyond its economic performance.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

No, I do not fully agree. Poor economic performance alone cannot be a reason to reject democracy.

**Economic performance:** Data shows dictatorships have only a slightly higher growth rate (4.42%) than democracies (3.95%), and in poor countries the difference is negligible (4.34% vs 4.28%). So democracy does not necessarily lag behind.

**Legitimacy and Dignity:** Democracy is valuable beyond economics because it:

- Promotes **equality among citizens** and ensures political participation.
- **Enhances the dignity** of individuals — people are governed by their own chosen representatives, not by force.
- Provides **legitimate** government — citizens have a voice and can correct mistakes through elections.

A dictatorship may grow faster yet deny people basic rights and dignity. Democracy's true value lies in these principles, not just economic figures.

Source: Chapter 5 — Outcomes of Democracy, Democratic Politics

---

### Explanation

Examiners look for three things here:

1. **Disagreement with a reason** — citing the data that economic difference is negligible.
2. **Two or more non-economic values** — legitimacy, dignity, equality, right to correct mistakes are the key textbook points.
3. **Contrast with dictatorship** — even fast-growing dictatorships deny rights, making democracy preferable overall.

Avoid writing a long essay. Use the textbook's exact terms: *dignity, legitimacy, equality, correct mistakes*. These signal you know Chapter 5's arguments.

Q15. medium thorough-understanding § Economic growth and development

[3]

Between 1950 and 2000, dictatorial regimes recorded a slightly higher average economic growth rate than democratic ones. Yet, this fact alone is considered insufficient reason to reject democracy. Why?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Economic growth depends on several factors — country's population size, global situation, cooperation from other countries, and economic priorities adopted — not on the type of government alone. Moreover, when we compare only **poor countries**, the difference in growth rates between dictatorships (4.34%) and democracies (4.28%) is virtually negligible. Most importantly, democracy offers several other positive outcomes: it promotes equality, enhances individual dignity, provides accountable and legitimate government, and allows citizens to correct mistakes. These values cannot be sacrificed merely for a marginal economic advantage.

Source: *Democratic Politics II, Chapter 5 — Economic outcomes of democracy*

---

### Explanation

Examiners look for **three distinct points** here (1 mark each):

1. **Economic growth has multiple determinants** — regime type is not the only factor.
2. **The difference is negligible for poor countries** — use the data (4.34% vs 4.28%).
3. **Democracy's non-economic merits** — legitimacy, accountability, dignity, equality — outweigh a slight growth gap.

Avoid writing a long essay; three crisp, well-worded points with the data reference will fetch full marks.

**Q16.** deep thorough-understanding § Economic growth and development

[3]

A political leader argues: 'Dictatorships grow faster than democracies; therefore, poor countries must choose dictatorship to lift themselves out of poverty.' Critically examine this argument. Is economic growth rate a sufficient basis for preferring one form of government over another? Justify your answer.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The argument is **flawed**. While data shows dictatorships have a slightly higher average growth rate (4.42%) compared to democracies (3.95%), this difference becomes **negligible in poor countries** (4.34% vs 4.28%). Economic development depends on many factors — population size, global situation, economic priorities — not just the form of government.

More importantly, **economic growth rate alone is not a sufficient basis** for choosing a government. Democracy offers far more: accountability, transparency, political equality, dignity of individuals, and legitimate governance. Democratic governments are people's own governments, which non-democratic regimes can never be.

Therefore, sacrificing democracy for marginally higher growth is unjustified.

*Source: Democratic Politics II, Chapter 5 — Economic outcomes of democracy*

---

### Explanation

- Examiners expect you to **directly challenge the claim** using the data from the passage (growth rates).
- Key move: show the **difference vanishes in poor countries** — this directly dismantles the argument.
- Then explain why growth rate **alone** is insufficient — bring in accountability, legitimacy, dignity (non-economic outcomes).
- Avoid writing in essay style; use tight points or short paragraphs.
- Mentioning the exact figures (4.42 vs 3.95; 4.34 vs 4.28) earns marks for evidence-based reasoning.

Q17. medium thorough-understanding § Economic outcomes of democracy

[3]

Data collected over fifty years (1950–2000) shows that dictatorial regimes had a slightly higher average economic growth rate than democracies overall, yet when only poor countries are compared, the difference between dictatorships and democracies almost disappears. What does this finding suggest about the relationship between a country's form of government and its economic growth?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The data suggests that a country's form of government — democratic or dictatorial — does **not** significantly determine its economic growth rate. While dictatorships show a slightly higher average growth rate overall (4.42% vs. 3.95%), this difference nearly vanishes when only poor countries are compared (4.34% vs. 4.28%). This indicates that economic growth depends more on other factors — such as population size, global conditions, and economic priorities — than on the type of regime. Therefore, democracy cannot be called a guarantee of economic development, but it does not lag significantly behind dictatorship in this regard either.

Source: *Economic outcomes of democracy, Chapter 5*

---

### Explanation

Examiners expect you to:

1. **Cite the data** from Table 1 to support your point — this shows you've understood the evidence.
2. **Draw the conclusion:** the form of government is not the deciding factor; other variables matter more.
3. **End with the textbook's key line:** democracy is not a guarantee of growth, but it does not lag behind dictatorship either.

Avoid writing a one-sided answer (e.g., "democracy is bad because it grows slower") — the question asks what the *comparison between all countries vs. poor countries* specifically suggests, which is that government type alone doesn't explain growth differences.

Q18. deep thorough-understanding § Economic outcomes of democracy

[3]

In several democracies, such as South Africa and Brazil, the top 20% of the population takes more than 60% of national income, while the bottom 20% receive less than 3%. What does this pattern reveal about the relationship between political equality and economic equality in democracies?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The data reveals a **contradiction between political equality and economic equality** in democracies. While democracies grant every citizen equal political rights (one person, one vote), this does not automatically translate into economic equality. As seen in South Africa and Brazil, the top 20% capture over 60% of national income while the bottom 20% receive less than 3%. This shows that **democracies are not very successful in reducing economic inequalities**. Political power of the poor does not effectively convert into economic gains, as elected governments often fail to adequately address poverty and wealth distribution.

Source: *Democratic Outcomes, Chapter 5*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner wants you to identify the **gap/contradiction** between political equality (voting rights) and economic inequality (income distribution).
- Use the specific data from the question/table — it shows you understand the evidence.
- Key phrase to use: "democracies are based on political equality, but growing economic inequalities persist."
- Avoid writing a general essay on democracy; focus sharply on this one tension.
- Three marks = three distinct points: (1) political equality exists, (2) economic inequality persists, (3) governments fail to bridge the gap.

**Q19.** deep thorough-understanding § Economic outcomes of democracy [3]

[short\_answer] A student argues: 'Since dictatorships have shown slightly higher economic growth rates on average, poor countries should adopt dictatorship to become rich faster.' Do you agree with this argument? Critically evaluate it with reference to available evidence on economic growth under different forms of government.

◆ **Outcomes of Democracy**

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:21 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

No, I do not agree with this argument.

While it is true that dictatorial regimes showed a slightly higher average economic growth rate (4.42%) compared to democracies (3.95%) between 1950–2000, this difference is misleading. When we compare only **poor countries**, the difference becomes negligible — dictatorships grew at 4.34% and democracies at 4.28%. This shows that for poor countries specifically, dictatorship offers no real economic advantage.

Moreover, economic development depends on many factors — population size, global situation, economic priorities — not just the form of government. Democracy also offers significant additional benefits: equality among citizens, dignity of the individual, better decision-making, conflict resolution, and the ability to correct mistakes. These cannot be sacrificed for a marginal growth difference.

Therefore, rejecting democracy on economic grounds alone is not justified.

Source: *Economic outcomes of democracy, Chapter 5*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner wants you to **use Table 1 data** to show the negligible difference in poor countries — this is the key factual evidence.
- Mention that growth depends on **multiple factors**, not government type alone.
- List at least **2–3 non-economic advantages** of democracy to complete the critical evaluation.
- Avoid one-sided answers; "critically evaluate" means you acknowledge the data but counter it with evidence and reasoning.

**Q20.** medium thorough-understanding § Reduction of inequality and poverty

[3]

Democracies are built on political equality — every citizen has one vote of equal value. Yet economic inequalities in many democracies are growing rather than shrinking. Why does political equality not automatically translate into economic equality?

◆ **Outcomes of Democracy**

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:21 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Political equality gives every citizen one equal vote, but it does not guarantee equal economic outcomes because of the following reasons:

1. **Wealthy minority dominates:** A small number of ultra-rich enjoy a disproportionate share of wealth, and their share in national income keeps **increasing**, while the incomes of those at the bottom keep **declining**.
1. **Parties ignore the poor:** Although the poor form a large proportion of voters, democratically elected governments do not appear as keen to address poverty as expected.
1. **Inequality persists across democracies:** Evidence shows that in democracies like South Africa and Brazil, the top 20% take more than 60% of national income, leaving less than 3% for the bottom 20%.

Thus, political equality and economic equality operate on different planes; one vote does not translate into equal wealth.

*Source: Chapter 5 — Outcomes of Democracy, "Reduction of inequality and poverty" and "Economic outcomes of democracy"*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner wants you to show you understand the **gap between political equality and economic equality** using textbook evidence.
- Key points to hit: (1) growing share of the ultra-rich, (2) declining incomes at the bottom, (3) governments not addressing poverty despite poor being majority voters, (4) data from Table 2 (South Africa/Brazil).
- Avoid writing a general essay on poverty — stay focused on **why** political equality fails to produce economic equality, as the passage argues.
- The Table 2 data is a strong factual anchor — always cite it for this topic.

**Q21.** deep thorough-understanding § Reduction of inequality and poverty **[3]**

[short\_answer] Economic data shows that income inequality varies widely among democratic countries — some have very large gaps between the richest and poorest citizens, while others have much smaller gaps. What does this variation tell us about whether democracy, by itself, is sufficient to reduce economic inequality? Explain with suitable reasoning.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:21 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The variation in income inequality among democratic countries shows that **democracy alone is not sufficient to reduce economic inequality.**

Evidence from Table 2 supports this: in South Africa and Brazil (both democracies), the top 20% earn over 60% of national income, leaving less than 3% for the bottom 20%. In contrast, Denmark and Hungary show much smaller gaps.

This means economic outcomes depend on additional factors — government policies, social welfare programmes, and political will. Though democracy is based on political equality, it does not automatically guarantee economic equality. As the textbook notes, "in actual life, democracies do not appear to be very successful in reducing economic inequalities."

Source: Chapter 5 — Economic outcomes of democracy; Reduction of inequality and poverty

---

### Explanation

- The examiner expects you to **use Table 2 data** as evidence — naming countries adds credibility.
- The key argument is the **distinction between political equality and economic equality**: democracy ensures the former but not automatically the latter.
- Quoting or closely paraphrasing the textbook line about democracies not being "very successful in reducing economic inequalities" directly earns marks.
- Avoid writing a long essay; 3 marks = one clear claim + evidence + reasoning.

**Q22.** medium thorough-understanding § Reduction of inequality and poverty [1]

The poor constitute a large proportion of voters in many democracies, yet democratically elected governments often fail to prioritise poverty reduction effectively. Which of the following best explains this contradiction?

- A The poor do not participate in elections in significant numbers.
- B Democratic governments are structurally prevented from making economic policies.
- C Winning votes does not necessarily compel governments to address the underlying causes of poverty after elections.
- D Poverty is a problem only in non-democratic countries.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:21 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

#### Answer: C

Winning votes does not necessarily compel governments to address the underlying causes of poverty after elections, as democratically elected governments do not appear keen to address poverty despite the poor being a large proportion of voters.

#### Explanation

The passage explicitly states: *"The poor constitute a large proportion of our voters and no party will like to lose their votes. Yet democratically elected governments do not appear to be as keen to address the question of poverty as you would expect them to."* This directly supports Option C. Options A and D are factually incorrect per the passage; Option B is wrong as democracies do make economic policies.

**Q23.** deep thorough-understanding § Reduction of inequality and poverty

[5]

Some argue that poor countries should adopt dictatorship to achieve rapid economic growth, and only rich countries can afford democracy. Using evidence on economic growth rates under democracies and dictatorships, and considering democracy's other outcomes, critically evaluate this argument.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:21 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

#### Critical Evaluation of the Argument:

##### Economic Growth Evidence:

Data from 1950–2000 shows all dictatorial regimes grew at 4.42% vs. 3.95% for democracies — a slight advantage. However, when comparing *poor countries only*, the difference nearly vanishes: dictatorships 4.34% vs. democracies 4.28%. This directly undermines the argument that poor countries need dictatorship for rapid growth.

##### Other Factors Matter:

Economic development depends on population size, global situation, cooperation from other countries, and economic priorities — not regime type alone. So dictatorship is not the cause of higher growth.

##### Democracy's Other Outcomes:

Democracy provides accountable, transparent, and legitimate government. Citizens can hold rulers responsible through free elections and public debate. Non-democracies show no evidence of being less corrupt or more responsive.

##### Conclusion:

The argument is not valid. Democracy cannot be rejected on economic grounds alone. We can reasonably expect democracy *not to lag behind* dictatorships in growth, while also delivering freedom, dignity, and legitimate governance that dictatorships cannot.

Source: Chapter 5 — Economic outcomes of democracy; Accountable, responsive and legitimate government

---

### Explanation

- **Key data to cite:** Growth rates from Table 1 — overall gap exists, but among poor countries it is negligible (4.34 vs 4.28). Examiners expect you to use these figures.
- **Two-part evaluation:** First tackle the economic growth claim with evidence, then bring in democracy's non-economic merits (accountability, legitimacy, transparency).
- **Conclusion must be clear:** The argument is rejected — democracy need not be sacrificed for growth, especially since the growth advantage of dictatorship disappears in poor countries.
- Avoid padding; every sentence should add a distinct point. Five marks = roughly 5 scorable ideas.

Q24. medium thorough-understanding § Accommodation of social diversity

[3]

Why is democracy considered better suited than authoritarian regimes to manage social differences and conflicts? Explain the conditions democracy must fulfil to prevent these differences from turning into deep social divisions.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:21 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Democracy is better suited than authoritarian regimes to manage social differences because it develops procedures to conduct competition among groups, reducing the possibility of tensions becoming explosive or violent. Non-democratic regimes often suppress or ignore internal social differences, whereas democracy evolves mechanisms to negotiate and respect them.

### Conditions democracy must fulfil:

1. **Majority must work with minority** — Democracy is not simply rule by majority opinion. The majority must work with the minority so that governments represent the general view.
2. **Majority rule must not become majority community rule** — Rule by majority should not mean domination by a religious, racial, or linguistic group. Every citizen must have a chance of being in the majority at some point; if someone is barred from this on the basis of birth, democracy ceases to be accommodative.

Source: *Accommodation of social diversity, Chapter 5*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner expects **two clearly stated conditions** — these are directly from the textbook and must not be merged or paraphrased loosely.
- Mention **why democracy is better** (develops negotiating procedures; non-democracies suppress differences) before listing conditions.
- The Sri Lanka example is the textbook's own warning — you can briefly reference it to show why the conditions matter.
- 3 marks = ~1 mark for why democracy is better + 1 mark each for the two conditions. Label or bullet them for clarity.

**Q25.** deep thorough-understanding § Accommodation of social diversity

[3]

In a country where one ethnic community consistently wins every election due to its numerical majority and uses that power to exclude other communities from government, is this a healthy democracy? Explain why or why not, using the conditions democracy must fulfil to accommodate social diversity.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:21 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

No, this is **not** a healthy democracy. According to the textbook, democracy must fulfil two essential conditions to accommodate social diversity:

1. **Majority must work with minority** — the majority opinion must represent the general view, not just one group's interest.
2. **Rule by majority must not become rule by a majority community** — based on religion, race, or ethnicity. Every citizen must have a chance of being in the majority at some point. If a group is permanently barred from power due to birth or ethnicity, democratic rule ceases to be accommodative for them.

In this case, one ethnic community permanently dominates, violating both conditions. This resembles Sri Lanka's example, where majority community rule led to conflict rather than harmony.

*Source: Chapter 5, Accommodation of Social Diversity*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner expects you to **directly name both conditions** from the textbook — many students vaguely say "majority should not dominate" without stating both points clearly.
- Mentioning **Sri Lanka** as the textbook example earns credit and shows you've read the chapter.
- Conclude with a clear judgment: this is NOT healthy democracy, and link it to the two conditions. Don't just describe the situation — **evaluate** it.
- 3 marks = roughly 3 distinct points: verdict + condition 1 + condition 2 (with Sri Lanka as a bonus).

**Q26.** medium thorough-understanding § Accommodation of social diversity

[1]

A democratic government passes a law declaring one religion the official state religion, makes its language mandatory in all schools and gives its followers priority in government jobs. Which of the following best explains the likely outcome of such policies on democracy and social harmony?

- (A) It strengthens democracy by giving a clear cultural identity to the nation.
- (B) It leads to majoritarianism, alienates minorities and can trigger social conflict and instability.
- (C) It promotes transparency and accountability among citizens.
- (D) It ensures efficient decision-making by reducing diversity-related debates.

A Sri Lanka failed to hold free and fair elections, making it undemocratic.

B Majority rule in Sri Lanka turned into the permanent dominance of one ethnic-religious community, denying others the chance to ever be in the majority.

C Sri Lanka's government was a dictatorship that suppressed all social differences.

D Sri Lanka's poor economic growth led to violent social conflicts among its citizens.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:21 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**(B)** It leads to majoritarianism, alienates minorities and can trigger social conflict and instability.

Such policies make rule by majority community permanent, denying minorities equal status — violating the democratic principle that every citizen must have a chance to be in the majority.

Source: Accommodation of social diversity, Chapter 5; Religion, communalism and politics, Chapter 3

---

### Explanation

The examiner expects you to identify **majoritarianism** as the key concept. The Sri Lanka example from Chapter 5 shows how making one religion/language official alienates minorities and destabilises democracy. Chapter 3 reinforces that using state power to favour one religious group is **communalism**, which threatens democracy. Option B directly matches these textbook outcomes. Options A, C, and D are factually incorrect per the source.

Q27. deep thorough-understanding § Accommodation of social diversity

[5]

Democracy cannot permanently eliminate conflicts among social groups, yet it is still considered the best system for managing social diversity. Examine this apparent contradiction. What exactly does democracy offer, and what are its limits, when it comes to social harmony?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:21 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Democracy is considered the best system for managing social diversity, yet it cannot eliminate conflicts permanently. This is not a contradiction but a realistic understanding of what democracy offers.

#### What democracy offers:

- It develops procedures to manage conflict so tensions do not become explosive or violent (e.g., Belgium's successful negotiation among ethnic groups).
- It gives voice to diverse social groups through power-sharing, reserved constituencies, and federal arrangements.
- It promotes respect for differences and evolves mechanisms to negotiate them.
- Unlike non-democratic regimes, it does not suppress or ignore internal social divisions.

#### Its limits:

- No society can fully and permanently resolve conflicts among different groups.
- Democracy fails if majority rule becomes permanent domination by one religious, racial, or linguistic community (e.g., Sri Lanka).
- It only *creates conditions* for harmony; citizens must act on those conditions.

Thus, democracy's value lies not in eliminating conflict but in managing it peacefully and fairly.

Source: *Outcomes of Democracy, Chapter 5; Power-sharing, Chapter 1*

---

### Explanation

Examiners look for: (1) acknowledgment of the "apparent contradiction," (2) specific examples like Belgium and Sri Lanka from the text, (3) the two conditions for democracy to handle diversity (majority-minority cooperation; majority not becoming a permanent community majority), and (4) the key distinction — democracy *creates conditions*, it doesn't guarantee outcomes. Avoid vague generalisations; use textbook language like "explosive or violent," "mechanisms to negotiate," and "rule by majority community."

**Q28.** medium thorough-understanding § Dignity and freedom of the citizens

[1]

[mcq] In a democracy, women are granted equal legal rights, yet gender discrimination persists in many households and workplaces. What does this gap between legal recognition and social reality BEST tell us about democracy?

Options:

- (A) Democracy has failed because laws alone cannot change society overnight.
- (B) Legal equality is meaningless unless backed by economic equality.
- (C) Recognising equal dignity in law creates a moral and legal basis for women to challenge discrimination over time.
- (D) Democracy and social equality are unrelated goals.

- A Recognition automatically ensures equal treatment in all social situations.
- B It gives women a legal and moral basis from which to challenge discrimination.
- C It transfers political power directly to women through elections.
- D It guarantees that governments will pass laws protecting women immediately.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:21 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**Answer: (B)** It gives women a legal and moral basis from which to challenge discrimination.

Legal recognition in democracy means discrimination becomes "unacceptable legally and morally," empowering women to wage struggles against it over time.

Source: *Dignity and freedom of the citizens, Chapter 5*

---

### Explanation

The passage states: "once the principle is recognised, it becomes easier for women to wage a struggle against what is now unacceptable legally and morally." This directly matches option (B). The key idea is that democracy **creates conditions** (legal/moral basis) for change — it doesn't guarantee instant equality, but it provides the platform for women to challenge discrimination. Avoid option (A) which says recognition "automatically ensures equal treatment" — the passage explicitly says women are **not** always treated with respect despite the principle being recognised.

**Q29.** medium thorough-understanding § Dignity and freedom of the citizens

[1]

Why do people in democracies tend to complain more about their government than people living under non-democratic regimes, even when the democracy may actually be functioning better?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:21 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

In a democracy, citizens have the freedom to express dissatisfaction openly and access information about government functioning (transparency), so complaints are heard and visible — unlike in non-democratic regimes where dissent is suppressed.

Source: Accountable, Responsive and Legitimate Government, Chapter 5

### Explanation

The examiner wants you to connect **transparency** and **freedom of expression** in democracy to public complaints. Key point: non-democratic governments suppress dissent, so people *cannot* complain even if conditions are worse. In democracy, the right to criticise is itself a sign the system is working. Avoid writing more than one line for a 1-mark question.

**Q30.** medium thorough-understanding § Dignity and freedom of the citizens

[3]

How does democracy help the disadvantaged castes in India assert their claims for equal status, even when caste-based discrimination still occurs in practice?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:21 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Democracy helps disadvantaged castes assert their claims for equal status in the following ways:

1. **Universal Adult Franchise:** The principle of one-person-one-vote gave new consciousness to castes treated as inferior and low, compelling political leaders to seek their support.
1. **Space in decision-making:** Caste politics has helped Dalits and OBC communities gain better access to decision-making. Political and non-political organisations agitate for an end to discrimination and demand dignity, land, and resources.
1. **Constitutional protection:** The Constitution prohibits caste-based discrimination and lays the foundation for policies to reverse the injustices of the caste system.

Thus, despite discrimination continuing in practice, democracy provides disadvantaged castes a platform to demand their share of power.

Source: Chapter 3, 'Caste and Politics' / 'Politics in Caste'

---

### Explanation

- Examiners expect **3 distinct points** for 3 marks — one point per mark is a safe structure.
- Key terms to include: *universal adult franchise, Dalits/OBCs, constitutional prohibition, decision-making/power.*
- Avoid writing only about problems (caste discrimination) — the question asks specifically **how democracy helps**, so focus on democratic mechanisms.
- The textbook phrase "caste politics has helped people from Dalits and OBC castes to gain better access to decision making" is a direct quote worth adapting.

**Q31.** deep thorough-understanding § Dignity and freedom of the citizens

[3]

[short\_answer] It is said that 'democracy's examination never gets over.' What does this mean? Why is the fact that citizens always want more from their democratic government considered a sign of democratic strength rather than democratic failure? Explain with an example.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:21 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

"Democracy's examination never gets over" means that citizens in a democracy continuously evaluate their government's performance and keep raising new expectations — the assessment of democracy is an ongoing, never-ending process.

Citizens always wanting more is a sign of **strength** because it shows that people are aware of their rights, are engaged, and trust that democracy *can* deliver better outcomes. This active participation and accountability keeps the government responsive.

**Example:** Citizens in India regularly demand better public services, cleaner governance, and faster development. This pressure pushes elected governments to perform better rather than become complacent — which is how democracy is meant to function.

*Source: Outcomes of Democracy, Chapter 5*

---

### Explanation

- The phrase reflects the idea that democracy is an evolving process — it creates *conditions* for change, but citizens must actively use those conditions.
- Examiners expect: (1) meaning of the phrase, (2) why dissatisfaction = strength (not failure), (3) a relevant example.
- Key concept: an aware, demanding citizenry holds government **accountable** — this is a feature of healthy democracy, not a flaw.
- Avoid saying democracy "fails" when expectations aren't met; instead say it motivates citizens to engage further.

**Q32.** medium thorough-understanding § Dignity and freedom of the citizens

[3]

In what specific way does democracy transform the relationship between an ordinary person and the state, and why is this transformation itself considered an important outcome?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:22 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Democracy transforms the relationship between an ordinary person and the state by making the citizen the source of political power, not merely a subject. In a democracy, rulers are chosen by the people, must account to them, and can be questioned through transparent procedures.

This transformation is itself an important outcome because it gives citizens **dignity and legitimacy**. A democratic government is "people's own government" — even if it is slow or imperfect, people feel they belong to it. This sense of ownership generates its own support, which is an outcome democracy alone can produce.

*Source: Chapter 5 — Accountable, Responsive and Legitimate Government*

---

### Explanation

- The key phrase examiners look for: "**legitimate government**" and "**people's own government**".
- Do not just describe democracy's features — answer *why the transformation matters* (dignity, ownership, legitimacy).
- The textbook explicitly states: "Democracy's ability to generate its own support is itself an outcome that cannot be ignored." Quote or paraphrase this for full marks.
- At 3 marks, two clear points with brief explanation are enough — avoid lengthy descriptions of elections or accountability mechanisms.

**Q33.** deep thorough-understanding § Dignity and freedom of the citizens

[5]

A student argues: 'Since caste discrimination and gender inequality still exist in India, democracy has failed to deliver dignity to its citizens.' Do you agree? Justify your answer using the logic of what democracy can and cannot guarantee.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:22 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**Partial Agreement:** The student's argument is understandable but incomplete. Democracy cannot guarantee the complete elimination of social inequalities; it can only create conditions for citizens to fight against them.

#### What democracy can do:

- It recognises the *principle* of dignity and equality for all, giving it legal and moral force.
- Democracy has strengthened the claims of disadvantaged castes for equal status and opportunity.
- Long struggles by women have created sensitivity; once the principle of equal treatment is recognised, women can wage struggles against what is now "unacceptable legally and morally."
- In a non-democratic setup, these struggles would lack legal and moral backing entirely.

#### What democracy cannot guarantee:

- Democracy is "just a form of government — it can only create conditions for achieving something." Citizens must take advantage of those conditions.
- Instances of caste-based atrocities and gender discrimination still exist, but they "lack moral and legal foundations" — which itself is progress.

**Conclusion:** Persistent inequality shows democracy is imperfect in *practice*, not a failure. The fact that citizens complain and demand more is "testimony to the success of democracy" — it transforms people from subjects into citizens.

Source: Chapter 5 — Dignity and Freedom of the Citizens; How do we assess democracy's outcomes?

---

### Explanation

- Examiners expect you to **take a nuanced stand** — neither fully agree nor fully disagree — and support it with the textbook's own logic.
- The key distinction the chapter makes is: democracy **creates conditions**, not guarantees outcomes. Use that phrase.
- Quote or closely paraphrase textbook lines: "lacks moral and legal foundations," "transforms subjects into citizens," "its examination never gets over" — these show you've read the source.
- Avoid writing a one-sided essay; balance both sides clearly within the word limit.

**Q34.** deep thorough-understanding § Dignity and freedom of the citizens

[3]

[short\_answer] Democracy faces challenges of both gender inequality and caste inequality in India. Explain how democracy addresses these two forms of inequality. In what way is democracy's approach to both similar, and in what significant way does the nature of the challenge differ between the two?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:22 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Democracy addresses **gender inequality** by supporting feminist movements demanding equal political rights, reservations for women in Panchayati Raj bodies, and laws against discrimination. It addresses **caste inequality** through constitutional provisions, reservations for SCs/STs, and allowing caste-based mobilisation for political representation.

**Similarity:** In both cases, democracy provides a platform for the oppressed to organise, voice demands, and seek legal-political remedies. Political expression of social differences is considered healthy in a democracy.

**Key Difference:** Caste divisions are *peculiar to India* (deeply embedded in social hierarchy), whereas gender inequality is a near-universal social division found across all societies. Caste-based politics risks deepening divisions; gender movements generally push toward equality without fragmenting society.

Source: Chapter 3 – Gender, Religion and Caste; Chapter 5 – Outcomes of Democracy

---

### Explanation

- The examiner expects you to address **both** inequalities, then directly answer the **similarity** and **difference** parts.
- Key textbook point: "Social divisions based on caste are peculiar to India" — use this for the difference.
- For similarity, the idea that "political expression of social differences is possible and sometimes desirable" is the core textbook line.
- Don't write a general essay — keep it structured and pointed within the word limit.

**Q35.** deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[5]

A critic argues: 'Democracy is pointless — it is slower than dictatorship, fails to eliminate poverty, and still has corruption.' Using evidence from what you know about democracy's actual outcomes, explain why this criticism, though partly valid, does not justify rejecting democracy.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:22 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The critic raises valid points — democracy can be slow, has not always ensured economic growth, and corruption exists. However, these criticisms do not justify rejecting democracy.

**On slowness:** Democracy is based on deliberation and negotiation, which takes time. But decisions made through proper procedures are more acceptable to citizens and often more effective than quick authoritarian decisions.

**On economic growth:** Data (1950–2000) shows dictatorships had a slightly higher average growth rate (4.42%) than democracies (3.95%). However, among *poor countries specifically*, the difference is negligible (4.34% vs 4.28%). Economic development depends on many other factors, so democracy cannot be solely blamed.

**On corruption:** Democracies do fall short, but non-democracies show no evidence of being less corrupt or more responsive.

**Most importantly,** democracy provides a *legitimate*, accountable government chosen by the people. It ensures transparency, free elections, and the right to correct mistakes — outcomes no dictatorship offers. Across South Asia, 88% consider democracy suitable for their country.

Democracy is not a guarantee of perfection; it creates *conditions* for citizens to achieve their goals.

Source: *Democratic Politics II, Chapter 5 — Outcomes of Democracy*

---

### Explanation

- Examiners look for: acknowledgement that the criticism is **partly valid** (concede the point, use data), then a **structured rebuttal** using textbook evidence.
- Must mention: the growth rate data (Table 1), the "negligible difference in poor countries" finding, the legitimacy argument, and transparency/accountability.
- The phrase "**democracy is a legitimate government — people's own government**" is a key textbook line; include it.
- Do not just say "democracy is good" — back every point with evidence from the passage.
- 5 marks = roughly 5 distinct, well-supported points. Avoid padding.

Q36. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[5]

Democracy is often praised for promoting both political equality (one person, one vote) and social dignity (respect for all individuals). Yet economic inequality persists and social discrimination continues in many democracies. How do you reconcile these contradictions without dismissing democracy as a failure?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:22 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Democracy is praised for political equality and dignity, yet economic inequality and social discrimination persist. This apparent contradiction does not make democracy a failure — it highlights democracy's limitations as well as its strengths.

**Political equality vs. economic inequality:** Democracy ensures one person, one vote, but does not automatically ensure equal wealth. Data shows that in South Africa and Brazil, the top 20% earn over 60% of national income, leaving less than 3% for the bottom 20%. Democratically elected governments often fail to adequately address poverty despite the poor forming a majority of voters.

**Dignity in principle, not always in practice:** Democracy recognises equal dignity for women and marginalised castes at least in principle. Once recognised legally and morally, struggles against discrimination gain legitimacy — something impossible under non-democratic regimes.

**The right perspective:** Democracy is a *form of government*, not a magic solution. It creates conditions; citizens must utilise them. The fact that people demand more and criticise democracy is itself proof of its success — it transforms subjects into citizens.

Source: Chapter 5 — Outcomes of Democracy

---

### Explanation

- Examiners look for **acknowledgement of the contradiction** followed by a **balanced, nuanced reconciliation** — not a one-sided defence or attack.
- Use **data from the tables** (South Africa/Brazil inequality figures) to show you have engaged with evidence.
- The key NCERT argument to include: "Democracy is just a form of government; it can only create conditions." This is the reconciling idea.
- Mention **dignity** (women, caste) separately — it shows you've covered both political and social dimensions.
- Avoid saying democracy "fails" — the approved NCERT position is that democracy is superior in principle and its shortcomings are to be addressed through more democracy, not less.

Q37. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

Both the accommodation of social diversity and the dignity of citizens are outcomes linked to democratic principles. What is the common underlying idea that connects these two outcomes, and how does the failure of one tend to undermine the other?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:22 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The common underlying idea connecting both outcomes is **equal dignity and respect for every individual**, regardless of their religion, caste, gender, or ethnicity.

Democracy accommodates social diversity by ensuring the majority does not dominate minority groups permanently, giving every citizen a chance to be part of the majority. This is possible only when all individuals are treated with equal dignity.

When dignity fails — for example, when a group is excluded on the basis of birth — they are barred from ever forming the majority, destroying meaningful accommodation of diversity. Conversely, if social diversity is not accommodated, certain groups are subordinated, and their dignity is undermined. Thus, both outcomes are deeply interdependent.

Source: Chapter 5 — Accommodation of social diversity; Dignity and freedom of the citizens

---

### Explanation

- The examiner expects you to **identify the connecting idea** (equal dignity/respect) and then **explain the inter-dependence**: how failure of one leads to failure of the other.
- Use textbook language: "rule by majority must not become rule by majority community," and "every citizen must have a chance of being in the majority."
- Avoid writing a general essay on democracy; stay focused on the *link* between the two outcomes.
- 3 marks = one connecting idea + two-sided explanation of how they undermine each other.

**Q38.** medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

[short\_answer] A daily-wage earner in a city was repeatedly denied a ration card by local officials. After learning about the Right to Information Act, he filed a request, tracked his application, and eventually received the card. How does this situation illustrate the practical connection between transparency, accountability, and the dignity of ordinary citizens in a democracy?

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:22 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The RTI Act is a tool of **transparency** — it allows citizens to access information held by the government. When the daily-wage earner filed an RTI request, officials were made **accountable** for their earlier denial, as they now had to justify or act on the application.

This connects directly to **dignity**: the textbook states that democracy promotes the dignity and freedom of ordinary individuals and transforms people "from the status of a subject into that of a citizen." By using RTI, the worker exercised his democratic right, compelling the system to treat him as an equal — not someone to be ignored.

Thus, transparency enables accountability, and accountability upholds citizens' dignity in a democracy.

Source: *Outcomes of Democracy (Introduction) and Dignity and freedom of the citizens — Chapter 5*

---

### Explanation

- The question links RTI to three concepts: **transparency** → **accountability** → **dignity**. Show the chain clearly.
- The key textbook line examiners expect: "*transforms people from the status of a subject into that of a citizen*" — use it or paraphrase it.
- Don't describe RTI procedures in detail; focus on the *democratic outcome* (dignity, accountability).
- 3 marks = roughly 3 distinct points: (1) RTI ensures transparency, (2) officials become accountable, (3) ordinary citizen's dignity/rights are upheld. One point per mark.

**Q39.** medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

**[3]**

[short\_answer] 'Dictatorship may deliver faster decisions and comparable economic growth, but it can never match democracy on legitimacy.' Evaluate this claim by comparing democracy and dictatorship on the three parameters of (i) speed and efficiency of decision-making, (ii) economic growth rate, and (iii) legitimacy of government.

◆ **Outcomes of Democracy**

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:22 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**(i) Speed and Efficiency:** Dictatorships make decisions faster as rulers need not consult assemblies or public opinion. Democracy is slower due to deliberation and procedures, but decisions are more acceptable and effective, making the time cost worthwhile.

**(ii) Economic Growth:** Data (1950–2000) shows dictatorships averaged 4.42% growth vs. democracies' 3.95%. However, among poor countries, the difference is negligible (4.34% vs. 4.28%), so dictatorship has no clear advantage here.

**(iii) Legitimacy:** Democracy is clearly superior. It is the people's own government — chosen through free elections, based on norms and transparency. Dictatorships lack this public mandate. Surveys show 94% in South Asia support elected rulers.

The claim is **partially valid** on speed and growth, but fails on legitimacy, where democracy is undeniably superior.

Source: Chapter 5 — Outcomes of Democracy

---

### Explanation

Examiners expect you to address **all three parameters** separately and conclude. For 3 marks, one crisp point per parameter + a brief conclusion works well. Use the textbook data (3.95% vs 4.42%) to show you know the evidence — it makes the answer stand out. The key textbook line to remember: "*Democratic government is legitimate government*" — this is the clinching point of the chapter.

**Q40.** deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[5]

Democracy is sometimes described as a form of government that 'creates conditions' rather than 'guarantees outcomes.' Using examples from at least THREE different outcome areas (such as economic development, social harmony, and individual dignity), justify this distinction.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:22 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Democracy "creates conditions" rather than "guarantees outcomes" because it provides the framework; citizens must then utilise it to achieve actual results.

- 1. Economic Development:** Democracies do not guarantee higher economic growth. Data from 1950–2000 shows dictatorships had slightly higher growth rates. Democracy only creates a stable, fair environment for economic activity — development depends on other factors like global situation, priorities adopted, etc.
- 2. Social Harmony:** Democracy does not guarantee permanent peace among communities. The example of Sri Lanka shows that majority rule, if misused along religious/ethnic lines, can cause conflict. Democracy creates procedures to negotiate differences, but cannot eliminate them entirely.
- 3. Individual Dignity:** Democracy promotes equality and dignity by guaranteeing rights and participation. However, corruption and non-responsiveness often undermine this. Democracy creates the conditions (free elections, rights) but citizens must actively demand accountability.

Thus, democracy is best judged as a system that enables — not ensures — good outcomes.

Source: Chapter 5 — Outcomes of Democracy

---

### Explanation

- The question asks you to **justify a specific distinction** — keep that framing central throughout.
- Examiners look for: (a) the core idea stated clearly, (b) three distinct outcome areas with examples from the text, (c) a brief conclusion tying back to the distinction.
- Use textbook examples (Belgium, Sri Lanka, the growth-rate data) — these show you've read the chapter, not just improvised.
- Do **not** just list positives of democracy; the contrast between "conditions created" vs "outcomes not guaranteed" must appear in each point.

Q41. medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

[short\_answer] 'Majority rule is both the strength and the greatest internal threat of democracy.' Explain this statement by discussing the conditions under which majority decision-making can undermine democratic accommodation, and how democracy is expected to prevent such an outcome.

◆ Outcomes of Democracy

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:22 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**Majority rule as a strength:** Democracy allows decisions to reflect the will of the majority, ensuring popular representation and legitimacy.

**As an internal threat:** Majority rule becomes dangerous when the majority community (based on religion, race, or language) permanently dominates minorities. As seen in Sri Lanka, when Sinhala was imposed on Tamil-speaking citizens, democratic rule became exclusionary.

### Two conditions democracy must fulfil:

1. Majority must work *with* the minority, not against it, since majority and minority opinions are not permanent.
2. Rule by majority must never mean permanent rule by one religious, racial, or linguistic community — every citizen must have a chance to be part of the majority at some point.

Democracy prevents this outcome by developing procedures to negotiate differences and accommodate social diversity peacefully.

Source: *Accommodation of social diversity, Chapter 5*

---

### Explanation

Examiners expect two clear points: (1) how majority rule becomes a *threat* (permanent community domination, Sri Lanka example) and (2) the two specific conditions from the textbook. Always distinguish between *majority opinion* (which changes) and *majority community* (identity-based, which is the real danger). The Sri Lanka example is a strong, expected illustration here.

Available for free from:

<https://cbsegrade10studyguide.com>

<https://github.com/orgs/cbse-free-resources/repositories>

Available for free from:

<https://cbsegrade10studyguide.com>

<https://github.com/orgs/cbse-free-resources/repositories>