

CBSE CLASS X
Social Science (087)

ANSWER KEY

AI-generated question paper

Code: oZHNJV

Questions: 74

Maximum Marks: 222

Generated: 2026-06-26 10:38

SELECTIONS USED

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

Composition — Difficulty: 3 straightforward · 41 medium · 30 deep | Types: 47 Short · 14 Long · 11 MCQ · 2 Very short

Q1. medium thorough-understanding § Introduction

[3]

The cover image of a 1900 music book depicted an 'angel of progress' surrounded by railways, cameras, printing presses and factories. What dominant idea about industrialisation did such imagery promote, and why might a historian find this portrayal misleading?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The image promoted the idea that industrialisation was synonymous with **progress and modernity** — that machines, railways, factories and technology were naturally leading humanity towards a better future.

A historian would find this misleading because, as the chapter shows, technological change was actually **slow and uneven**. Less than 20% of the workforce was in advanced industrial sectors by the late 19th century; traditional craftspersons remained the typical workers; new machines like the steam engine took decades to be widely adopted. The image ignores the hardships industrialisation caused to working people's lives.

Source: *The Age of Industrialisation, Chapter 4, Introduction and Section 1.2*

Explanation

- **1 mark:** Name the dominant idea (progress/modernity linked to technology).
- **1 mark:** One reason it is misleading (slow pace of change / most workers were traditional craftspersons).
- **1 mark:** A second reason or supporting detail (steam engine adoption took years; hand technology persisted; human cost ignored).

Examiners want you to use the textbook evidence — cite specific facts like the "less than 20% workforce" or "321 steam engines" — not vague statements. Avoid just saying "industrialisation had problems"; be specific.

Q2. deep thorough-understanding § Introduction

[3]

In the image of the 'Two Magicians', Aladdin representing the East/past is contrasted with a modern mechanic representing the West/modernity. What assumptions about non-Western societies are embedded in this contrast? Using one or two examples from the chapter, explain how such assumptions distorted the actual history of industrialisation in regions like India.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The image assumes non-Western societies were static, traditional, and incapable of technological progress — frozen in a magical, pre-modern past — while the West alone represented rationality and industrial advancement.

These assumptions distorted history in two ways:

1. **India's pre-colonial textile dominance:** Before colonial rule, India dominated the international fine-textiles market. Indian weavers produced high-quality cotton and silk for global trade — hardly a "backward" society.
1. **Proto-industrialisation was not factory-based:** Large-scale industrial production existed before factories, with merchants, artisans, and weavers producing for international markets. This complex commercial network existed outside the Western factory model, yet was genuinely "industrial."

Colonial rule disrupted India's existing industries, making underdevelopment a result of colonialism, not an innate feature of non-Western societies.

Source: Chapter 4 — The Age of Industrialisation, Introduction and Section 1

Explanation

- The examiner wants you to **name the assumption** (West = modern/rational; East = backward/traditional), then **connect it to actual evidence** from the chapter.
- Two good examples are: India's pre-colonial textile dominance (undermines the "backward East" idea) and proto-industrialisation (shows industrial production existed without Western-style factories).
- Avoid vague statements; always tie your example back to the assumption being challenged.
- The final line about colonialism causing underdevelopment is a strong clincher — examiners reward causal reasoning.

Q3. deep thorough-understanding § Introduction

[5]

Industrialisation is often portrayed as a story of uninterrupted progress and prosperity. Critically examine this view by discussing at least two negative consequences of industrialisation — social, economic, or environmental — that this narrative tends to overlook.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The common narrative presents industrialisation as a story of continuous progress, but this view ignores several serious consequences.

Displacement of traditional workers: Industrialisation severely affected craftspeople and artisans. Hand-loom weavers, spinners, and other skilled workers lost their livelihoods as machine-made goods replaced handmade products. Workers were forced into factories under harsh conditions for low wages, destroying traditional skill-based occupations.

Environmental degradation: Factories, especially in cotton and iron-steel industries, filled industrial towns with smoke and pollution. As seen in industrial Manchester (1857), chimneys billowing smoke transformed the landscape, harming public health and the environment.

Persistence of poverty: Even by the late nineteenth century, less than 20% of the workforce was in advanced industrial sectors, while the majority remained in poorly paid, insecure traditional occupations — meaning prosperity was far from universal.

Source: Chapter 4 — The Age of Industrialisation, Sections 1.2 and Conclusion

Explanation

- The examiner expects **critical analysis**, not just description — use words like "ignored," "overlooked," "however."
- Mention **at least two** distinct negatives clearly (displacement of workers + environmental damage are the safest, best-supported by the passages).
- Citing the Manchester image (Fig. 5) shows source awareness, which examiners appreciate.
- Avoid padding. Three tight points at this word count score full marks.

Q4. medium thorough-understanding § 1 Before the Industrial Revolution

[3]

Why were merchants in seventeenth-century European towns unable to expand industrial production within the towns themselves, and how did they solve this problem?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Merchants in seventeenth-century European towns could not expand production because **urban craft guilds** were powerful. These guilds controlled production, regulated prices, restricted entry of new traders, and held monopoly rights granted by rulers. It was therefore impossible for new merchants to set up business freely in towns.

To solve this problem, merchants **moved to the countryside**, where there were no guild restrictions. Poor peasants and artisans, who had lost access to common lands, eagerly agreed to work for merchants in exchange for advances. This system—known as **proto-industrialisation**—allowed production to expand without factories.

Source: *The Age of Industrialisation, Section 1 (Before the Industrial Revolution)*

Explanation

- The question has two clear parts: *why* they couldn't expand + *how* they solved it. Address both for full 3 marks.
- Key term **guilds** must be named and their role briefly explained (1 mark's worth).
- The **solution** = moving to the countryside / proto-industrialisation (1 mark).
- Mention **why peasants agreed** (loss of commons, need for income) to show the complete logic (1 mark).
- Keep to ~70–80 words; no need for extra detail.

Q5. medium thorough-understanding § 1 Before the Industrial Revolution

[3]

Proto-industrialisation drew poor peasants and cottagers into producing goods for merchants. What specific changes in the countryside made these rural households willing — even eager — to take up this work?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Two main changes pushed rural households into proto-industrial work:

1. **Loss of common lands:** Open fields were disappearing and commons were being enclosed. Cottagers and poor peasants had earlier depended on common lands to gather firewood, berries, vegetables, hay, and straw. Enclosures cut off this survival resource.
1. **Insufficient land:** Many peasants held tiny plots that could not provide work for all family members. Income from cultivation was shrinking.

So when merchants offered advances to produce goods, peasants eagerly agreed — they could stay in the countryside, continue farming, supplement falling agricultural income, and make fuller use of family labour.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 1 — Before the Industrial Revolution / Proto-Industrialisation

Explanation

The examiner expects two clear causes tied directly to the passage: **enclosure of commons** (loss of free resources) and **tiny, insufficient landholdings**. Then a brief link showing *why* proto-industrial work was attractive (stay in countryside + supplement income + use family labour). Avoid generic statements about poverty — anchor your points to the specific textbook details about commons and enclosure. The "eagerly agreed" phrasing from the source is worth echoing to show comprehension.

Q6. medium thorough-understanding § 1 Before the Industrial Revolution

[3]

A cotton mill brought all stages of cloth production under one roof, whereas the proto-industrial system spread the same work across the countryside. What specific advantages did the mill system offer that the proto-industrial system could not?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The mill system offered three key advantages over the proto-industrial system:

1. **Supervision of quality:** With all production stages under one roof, owners could directly monitor quality at every step, which was impossible when workers were scattered across villages.
1. **Regulation of labour:** Workers could be supervised closely for discipline, punctuality, and output — something unachievable in scattered household units.
1. **Efficient use of new machinery:** Costly new machines (for carding, spinning, rolling) could be centrally installed and maintained in the mill, enhancing output per worker and enabling production of stronger threads — unaffordable for individual rural households.

Source: "The Coming Up of the Factory," Chapter 4

Explanation

The examiner expects you to use the three points directly from the passage: supervision of production, quality control, and regulation of labour — plus the point about costly machinery being concentrated in one place. Avoid vague statements like "more efficient." Name the specific advantages the text gives. Three well-labelled points match the 3-mark weightage perfectly.

Q7. deep thorough-understanding § 1 Before the Industrial Revolution

[3]

Even at the end of the nineteenth century, less than 20 per cent of Britain's total workforce was employed in technologically advanced industrial sectors, and steam engines were very slow to be adopted across industries. What does this evidence reveal about the actual pace and nature of industrialisation in Britain during the nineteenth century?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The evidence reveals that industrialisation in Britain was much slower and more uneven than commonly assumed. Since less than 20% of the workforce was in advanced industrial sectors, the majority still worked in traditional crafts and domestic industries. Steam engines were adopted very slowly due to high costs, frequent breakdowns, and industrialists' caution. Traditional sectors like food processing, pottery, furniture making, and glass work continued to grow through small innovations, not mechanisation. The typical mid-nineteenth century worker remained a craftsperson or labourer, not a machine operator. Thus, industrialisation was gradual, partial, and coexisted with older methods of production.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 1.2 – The Pace of Industrial Change

Explanation

- The examiner wants you to show understanding that industrialisation ≠ rapid, total factory takeover.
- Three key points to hit: (1) majority workforce in traditional sectors, (2) steam engines slow to spread, (3) traditional industries adapted through small innovations.
- Avoid vague statements — use specific evidence from the passage (e.g., "321 steam engines in all England at the start of the 19th century").
- The concluding line tying it together shows analytical thinking, which earns full marks.

Q8. medium thorough-understanding § 1 Before the Industrial Revolution

[1]

Which of the following best explains why industrialists in Victorian Britain were often reluctant to invest in new machinery despite its proven ability to increase output?

- (A) New machines required raw materials that were not yet available in Britain.
- (B) Abundant cheap labour made mechanisation less cost-effective than employing more workers.
- (C) The government had banned the use of steam-powered machines in certain industries.
- (D) Workers' unions had legally blocked the introduction of new technology in factories.

A Machines required raw materials that were difficult to obtain from the colonies.

B An abundant supply of cheap labour made the high capital cost of machines unnecessary.

C The government had placed restrictions on the use of steam-powered technology.

D Guild associations prevented factory owners from replacing skilled workers with machines.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Answer: B

In Victorian Britain, an abundant supply of cheap labour — as poor peasants flooded cities seeking work — kept wages low, making the high capital cost of machines unnecessary and less cost-effective for industrialists.

Source: *Hand Labour and Steam Power*, chapter 4

Explanation

- The textbook directly states: "*when there is plenty of labour, wages are low... They did not want to introduce machines that got rid of human labour and required large capital investment.*"
- Options A, C, and D are not supported by the textbook — no mention of raw material shortages blocking mechanisation, government bans on steam, or guild/union legal blocks in this context.
- The key reasoning: cheap abundant labour = low wage cost → no financial incentive to invest heavily in machines. This is the central argument of the *Hand Labour and Steam Power* section.

Q9. deep thorough-understanding § 1 Before the Industrial Revolution

[5]

The proto-industrial system has been described as creating a 'close relationship between the town and the countryside.' Analyse how this relationship worked, and explain why it was different from earlier craft production that took place entirely within towns.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Proto-industrialisation and the Town-Countryside Relationship:

In the 17th–18th centuries, merchants based in towns moved to the countryside and supplied money/raw materials to peasants and artisans, who produced goods for an international market within their homes. This created a close town-countryside link: merchants organised and financed production from towns, while actual manufacturing happened in rural households.

How it worked: A merchant clothier bought wool from a wool stapler, sent it to rural spinners, then to weavers, fullers, and dyers at different stages, before finishing was done in London for export. Each merchant controlled 20–25 workers per stage, employing hundreds overall.

Difference from earlier craft production: In towns, powerful craft guilds controlled production, regulated prices, restricted entry of new merchants, and held monopoly rights. Merchants could not expand freely. By shifting to the countryside — where no guilds existed — merchants faced no such restrictions, and poor peasants, who had lost common lands, willingly supplemented their income through this work.

Source: *The Age of Industrialisation, Chapter 4, Section 1 — Before the Industrial Revolution*

Explanation

- Examiners expect two clear parts: (1) how the town-countryside relationship functioned, with the specific clothier example, and (2) the contrast with guild-controlled urban craft production.
- The clothier chain (wool stapler → spinners → weavers → fullers → dyers → London finishing) is a textbook example — always include it.
- Key reason for difference: **guilds** in towns blocked new merchants; countryside had no guilds and had surplus labour due to enclosures.
- Avoid over-explaining enclosures — one line is enough at this marks level.

Q10. medium thorough-understanding § 1.1 The Coming Up of the Factory

[3]

Richard Arkwright's establishment of the cotton mill is regarded as a turning point in the history of cloth production in England. Explain how the mill system fundamentally reorganised production, and analyse the advantages this new arrangement offered to manufacturers compared with what came before it.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Richard Arkwright's cotton mill brought all stages of cloth production — carding, spinning, and weaving — under **one roof and one management**. Previously, production was scattered across village households, making supervision difficult.

The mill system offered manufacturers key advantages:

- **Costly new machines** could be centrally purchased, set up, and maintained efficiently.
- **Careful supervision** over the production process became possible.
- **Quality control** could be maintained consistently.
- **Labour regulation** was easier compared to the scattered putting-out system.

This centralisation made production faster, more uniform, and better controlled.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 1.1 — The Coming Up of the Factory

Explanation

Examiners expect two clear parts: (1) **what the mill system did** (centralised production under one roof) and (2) **advantages over the earlier system** (supervision, quality, labour control). The contrast with the earlier domestic/putting-out system is essential — without it, you lose marks. Three to four crisp points in the second part are sufficient for 3 marks. Avoid writing about the decline of Indian textiles here; that is a separate topic.

Q11. medium thorough-understanding § 1.1 The Coming Up of the Factory

[1]

Britain's raw cotton imports rose sharply from 2.5 million pounds in 1760 to 22 million pounds by 1787. Which of the following best explains this dramatic increase?

- (A) The invention of the power loom made weaving faster than spinning, creating huge demand for raw cotton
- (B) The abolition of the East India Company's trade monopoly opened new cotton-growing regions
- (C) Mechanised spinning inventions such as the Spinning Jenny and Water Frame greatly increased the speed of yarn production, raising demand for raw cotton
- (D) British colonies were compelled to export raw cotton instead of finished cloth under new trade laws

A The East India Company began directly supplying raw cotton to British mills at subsidised rates.

B A series of inventions improved each stage of production, increased output per worker, and enabled the manufacture of stronger threads, boosting the cotton industry's capacity.

C The decline of the wool industry freed up existing machinery and warehouses for cotton processing.

D The British government banned imports of Indian finished textiles, forcing mills to import only raw cotton instead.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

(B) A series of inventions improved each stage of production, increased output per worker, and enabled the manufacture of stronger threads, boosting the cotton industry's capacity.

Explanation

The passage explicitly states: "A series of inventions in the eighteenth century increased the efficacy of each step of the production process... They enhanced the output per worker... and they made possible the production of stronger threads and yarn." This directly caused higher demand for raw cotton. Option B matches this explanation from the source. The other options introduce points not supported by the passage (e.g., East India Company subsidies, wool industry decline, or government bans on finished cloth imports).

Source: *The Coming Up of the Factory*, Chapter 4

Q12. deep thorough-understanding § 1.1 The Coming Up of the Factory

[5]

Even as imposing new cotton mills became a striking feature of the early nineteenth-century English landscape, historians point out that this visible transformation gave a misleading picture of industrialisation as a whole. Using evidence from this period, explain why focusing only on the rise of factories distorts our understanding of how the English economy actually functioned.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Focusing only on the rise of factories gives a distorted picture of English industrialisation because most production and workers remained outside them.

Traditional industries continued to dominate. Even at the end of the nineteenth century, less than 20% of the workforce was employed in technologically advanced industrial sectors. A large portion of textile output was produced in domestic units, not factories.

New technology spread slowly. Machines were expensive and often broke down. At the start of the nineteenth century, there were only 321 steam engines in all of England. Merchants and industrialists were cautious about adopting costly new technology.

Non-mechanised sectors drove growth. Industries like food processing, furniture making, pottery, glass work, and tanning grew through small innovations, not steam power.

The typical mid-nineteenth-century worker was a traditional craftsperson or labourer, not a machine operator.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 1.2 – The Pace of Industrial Change

Explanation

The examiner expects you to use **specific evidence** from the chapter — percentages, examples of industries, the steam engine data — rather than vague generalisations. Four well-supported points are enough for 5 marks.

Avoid writing about India (that's a different section); stay focused on the English economy. The key argument is: factories were visible and impressive, but they were NOT representative of how most of the economy actually worked.

Q13. medium thorough-understanding § 1.2 The Pace of Industrial Change

[3]

Which industry led Britain's industrialisation up to the 1840s, and which industry took over the leading role after that? What development drove the rise of the second industry?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Up to the 1840s, the **cotton industry** led Britain's industrialisation, as it was the fastest-growing sector in the first phase.

After the 1840s, the **iron and steel industry** took over the leading role.

The key development that drove this rise was the **expansion of railways** — in England from the 1840s and in the colonies from the 1860s. Railway construction created massive demand for iron and steel. By 1873, Britain exported iron and steel worth £77 million, double the value of its cotton exports.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 1.2 – The Pace of Industrial Change

Explanation

The examiner is testing whether students can identify **both industries in sequence** and link the rise of iron and steel to a **specific cause** (railway expansion). All three elements — cotton, iron & steel, railways — must be mentioned to score full marks. The export figures (£77 million) are a useful supporting detail but not compulsory. Avoid vague answers like "technology improved" — name railways specifically.

Q14. medium thorough-understanding § 1.2 The Pace of Industrial Change

[3]

By the end of the nineteenth century, less than 20 per cent of Britain's total workforce was employed in technologically advanced industrial sectors. What does this tell us about the overall nature of the British economy at that time?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The fact that less than 20 per cent of Britain's workforce was in technologically advanced industrial sectors tells us that Britain's economy was **not as fully industrialised as often believed**. Traditional and non-mechanised industries — such as food processing, furniture making, pottery, and glass work — still dominated. The typical worker was a craftsperson or labourer, not a machine operator. New technology spread slowly due to high costs and merchant caution. Thus, industrialisation was a gradual, uneven process, with domestic and small-scale production remaining significant alongside factory industries.

Source: The Age of Industrialisation, Chapter 4 — Section 1.2, The Pace of Industrial Change

Explanation

- Examiners want you to use the statistic as evidence to argue that Britain's economy remained **predominantly traditional/non-mechanised** even in the late 19th century.
- Key points to cover: dominance of traditional industries, slow spread of technology, the "typical worker" being a craftsperson, and the role of domestic production.
- Avoid simply restating the statistic — explain what it **implies** about the nature of the economy.
- The answer should make at least **3 distinct points** for 3 marks.

Q15. medium thorough-understanding § 1.2 The Pace of Industrial Change

[3]

James Watt patented an improved steam engine in 1781, yet steam-powered machinery remained rare across England well into the early nineteenth century. Why were industrialists slow to adopt even the most productive new technologies of the Industrial Revolution?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Industrialists were slow to adopt new technologies for several reasons:

1. **High cost:** New technology was expensive to purchase, install, and maintain, making merchants and industrialists cautious about investing in it.
2. **Frequent breakdowns:** Machines often broke down and repairs were costly, reducing their practical value.
3. **Overstated effectiveness:** Machines were often not as effective as their inventors and manufacturers claimed.

This is evident in the case of the steam engine — patented by Watt in 1781, yet by the early nineteenth century there were no more than 321 steam engines in all of England, used only in a few industries like cotton, wool, and mining.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 1.2 – The Pace of Industrial Change

Explanation

The examiner expects you to pull **three specific reasons** directly from the passage — expensive, breakdown-prone, and less effective than claimed — and support them with the **steam engine statistic (321 engines)** as evidence. Avoid generic statements about the Industrial Revolution; stick to what the passage says. Naming the chapter/section shows source-awareness, which can earn presentation marks.

Q16. medium thorough-understanding § 1.2 The Pace of Industrial Change

[1]

Even as factories and steam engines multiplied in nineteenth-century Britain, many traditional industries continued to expand without mechanisation. Give two reasons why non-mechanised sectors remained significant and competitive during this period.

- A The government had banned the use of steam engines in these industries to protect traditional crafts.
- B Small innovations within these sectors drove their growth independently of the mechanised cotton or metal industries.
- C These industries relied entirely on colonial raw materials that were unavailable to factory owners.
- D Workers in these sectors refused to use any new technology and maintained entirely stagnant methods.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The correct answer is **B**.

Non-mechanised sectors remained significant because small innovations (e.g., in food processing, pottery, furniture making) drove their independent growth, and new technology was expensive, slow to adopt, and less effective than claimed, leaving traditional industries competitive.

Source: The Pace of Industrial Change, Chapter 4

Explanation

The passage explicitly states: "*small innovations were the basis of growth in many non-mechanised sectors such as food processing, building, pottery, glass work.*" It also notes new technology was expensive and slow to be accepted. Option A is false (no such ban existed); C is unsupported; D is contradicted by the text, which says these industries "did not remain entirely stagnant." Examiners expect you to identify the option directly supported by the source.

Q17. deep thorough-understanding § 1.2 The Pace of Industrial Change

[5]

A historian argues: 'The factory was the defining feature of the British economy in the mid-nineteenth century.' Using evidence from the pace of industrial change in Britain, assess whether this claim is justified.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The historian's claim is **not fully justified**. While factories and mechanised industries were prominent, evidence shows they did not define the entire British economy in the mid-nineteenth century.

Against the claim:

- Less than 20% of the total workforce was employed in technologically advanced industrial sectors even by the end of the 19th century.
- The typical mid-nineteenth century worker was not a machine operator but a **traditional craftsperson or labourer**.
- A large portion of textile output was produced in **domestic units**, not factories.
- Steam engines were slow to be adopted — only 321 existed in all of England at the start of the 19th century.
- Traditional industries like food processing, pottery, furniture, and glasswork grew through **small innovations**, not factory machinery.

Supporting the claim:

- Cotton and metals were dynamic leading sectors, and iron and steel exports reached £77 million by 1873.

Thus, the factory was important but **not the defining feature** of the mid-nineteenth century British economy.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 1.2 – The Pace of Industrial Change

Explanation

Examiners expect you to **assess** (agree and disagree with evidence), not just describe. Key move: cite the "**less than 20% workforce**" statistic and the "**typical worker was a craftsperson**" historian's conclusion directly from the passage — these directly challenge the claim. Balance with one point supporting it (cotton/iron exports) to show genuine assessment. Avoid padding; every sentence should carry evidence or argument.

Q18. medium thorough-understanding § 2 Hand Labour and Steam Power

[3]

In Victorian Britain, why did the abundance of cheap human labour make factory owners reluctant to invest in steam-powered machinery, even when such technology was available?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

In Victorian Britain, poor peasants and vagrants migrated to cities in large numbers searching for work. This created an abundant labour supply, which kept wages low. Since industrialists faced no shortage of labour and no high wage costs, they had no reason to replace human workers with expensive steam-powered machines. Additionally, machines required large capital investment, were expensive to repair, and often broke down. In contrast to countries like America where labour was scarce, British factory owners found it more economical to simply hire more workers.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 2 – Hand Labour and Steam Power

Explanation

The examiner expects three clear points: (1) surplus labour kept wages low, (2) no incentive to replace cheap workers with costly machines, and (3) machines required large capital investment and were unreliable. Mention the contrast with labour-scarce countries like America to show understanding of the economic logic. Avoid writing more than 3–4 sentences.

Q19. medium thorough-understanding § 2 Hand Labour and Steam Power

[3]

Many Victorian British industrialists preferred hiring seasonal workers over maintaining a permanent workforce. Analyse the economic logic behind this preference and what it reveals about the nature of industrial capitalism at the time.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Victorian British industrialists preferred seasonal workers due to clear economic logic rooted in industrial capitalism's profit-driven nature:

1. **Abundant, cheap labour:** Poor peasants and vagrants constantly migrated to cities seeking work. With excess labour supply, wages remained low, so industrialists faced no pressure to invest in expensive machinery.
1. **Avoiding capital investment:** Machines were costly to buy, maintain, and repair. Hiring seasonal workers eliminated this risk entirely, keeping fixed costs minimal.
1. **Matching fluctuating demand:** Industries like gas works, breweries, and bookbinding had peak seasons. Employing workers only during busy periods meant paying wages only when needed, avoiding year-round wage costs.

This reveals that early industrial capitalism prioritised minimising costs over maximising mechanisation. Profit was extracted through exploiting cheap human labour rather than technological innovation — showing capitalism's dependence on poverty and labour vulnerability.

Source: *The Age of Industrialisation, Ch. 4 — Sections 2 and 2.1*

Explanation

Examiners look for three linked ideas: cheap labour supply → no need for machines; seasonal demand → temporary hiring; and the broader insight about capitalism exploiting labour. Always connect the specific examples (gas works, breweries) to the general logic. The final analytical point about what this "reveals" is essential for full marks on an "analyse" question — don't skip it.

Q20. straightforward thorough-understanding § 2 Hand Labour and Steam Power

[1]

Which of the following best explains why upper-class consumers in Victorian Britain preferred handmade goods over machine-made ones?

- (A) Machine-made goods were of inferior quality and broke easily
 - (B) Handmade goods signified refinement, exclusivity, and the labour of skilled craftsmen
 - (C) Machines could not yet produce goods in large enough quantities
 - (D) The government imposed restrictions on the sale of machine-made luxury goods
- A Machine-made goods were too expensive for regular purchase.
B Handmade goods symbolised refinement and were better finished and individually crafted.
C Machines could not yet produce textiles or consumer goods of any kind.
D The government had banned the sale of machine-made goods within Britain.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

Model Answer

(B) Handmade goods symbolised refinement and were better finished, individually crafted.

In Victorian Britain, the upper classes (aristocrats and bourgeoisie) preferred handmade goods because they symbolised **refinement and class**. These goods were better finished, individually produced, and carefully designed. Machine-made goods were meant for export to the colonies.

Explanation

The textbook (Chapter 4, "Hand Labour and Steam Power") explicitly states: "*Handmade products came to symbolise refinement and class. They were better finished, individually produced, and carefully designed.*" The examiner wants you to identify this social/cultural reason — not quality failure of machines, government restrictions, or production limits. Option B matches the source exactly.

Q21. medium thorough-understanding § 2 Hand Labour and Steam Power

[3]

When the Spinning Jenny was introduced into the woollen industry, women hand-spinners attacked the machines. Using your understanding of the economic conditions of workers at the time, explain why this reaction was rational rather than simply ignorant or destructive.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The reaction of women hand-spinners was economically rational, not merely destructive. Spinning was one of the few sources of income available to poor women, and the Spinning Jenny directly threatened to eliminate this livelihood by reducing labour demand in spinning. As the textbook notes, workers lived with constant fear of unemployment; during economic slumps, up to 35–75% of workers were without work. Losing even irregular spinning wages could push families into destitution. The women correctly understood that the machine would displace their work permanently, making their attack a desperate economic self-defence rather than ignorance.

Source: The Age of Industrialisation, Life of the Workers

Explanation

The examiner expects you to link the women's action to specific economic conditions described in the chapter — fear of unemployment, dependence on hand-spinning income, and vulnerability of the poor. Quote or paraphrase the magistrate's source (Source B) and the passage on workers' fear of new technology. Do not just say "they were afraid of machines" — explain *why* job loss was catastrophic for these workers given the conditions of the time. Three marks = three linked points: (1) spinning was their main income, (2) unemployment was severe and relief minimal, (3) their understanding of the economic threat was correct.

Q22. deep thorough-understanding § 2 Hand Labour and Steam Power

[5]

Industrialisation in mid-nineteenth-century Britain is often pictured as a world of factories and steam engines. Analyse why this picture is misleading, using evidence about the actual composition of the workforce and the role of traditional industries.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The image of mid-nineteenth-century Britain as a world of factories and steam engines is **misleading** for several reasons:

1. **Limited reach of new technology:** At the end of the nineteenth century, less than 20% of the total workforce was employed in technologically advanced industrial sectors. The typical worker was a traditional craftsman or labourer, not a machine operator.
1. **Dominance of traditional industries:** Non-mechanised sectors — food processing, building, pottery, glass work, tanning, furniture making — continued to grow through small innovations, not steam power.
1. **Domestic production:** Even in dynamic textiles, a large portion of output was produced outside factories, in domestic units.
1. **Slow adoption of machines:** Steam engines were expensive and unreliable. By the early 1800s, only 321 existed in all of England.
1. **Preference for hand labour:** Industrialists preferred cheap hand labour for seasonal work and intricate, custom-made goods (e.g., 500 varieties of hammers).

Thus, industrialisation was a gradual, uneven process where traditional methods remained central.

Source: Chapter 4 – The Age of Industrialisation, Sections 1.2 and 2

Explanation

Examiners look for **specific evidence** from the text, not vague generalisations. Key facts to quote: "less than 20% of workforce in advanced sectors," "321 steam engines in England," and named traditional industries. The answer must challenge the factory/steam-engine image using concrete data. Five distinct points map neatly to 5 marks. Avoid writing an essay — keep each point tight and evidence-backed.

Q23. deep thorough-understanding § 2 Hand Labour and Steam Power

[3]

In colonies and settler economies facing labour shortages, industrialists rapidly adopted mechanical power, while British industrialists with access to abundant cheap labour were far slower to do so. Using this contrast, explain how labour availability shaped the pace and pattern of technological change during industrialisation.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

In Victorian Britain, an abundance of cheap labour — poor peasants and vagrants constantly migrating to cities — meant wages remained low. Industrialists therefore had little incentive to invest in expensive machinery, since human labour was cheaper and more flexible, especially for seasonal industries like gas works and breweries.

By contrast, in colonies and settler economies such as nineteenth-century America, labour was scarce and wages were high. Industrialists there were keen to adopt mechanical power to minimise dependence on human labour.

Thus, **labour availability directly shaped technological adoption**: scarcity accelerated mechanisation, while abundance slowed it. In Britain, hand labour also remained preferred for intricate, customised goods that machines could not replicate.

Source: Chapter 4 — Hand Labour and Steam Power; The Pace of Industrial Change

Explanation

- The examiner expects you to use **both sides of the contrast** (Britain vs. colonies) — don't just describe one.
- Key causal logic: low wages → no urgency to mechanise; labour scarcity → mechanisation essential. State this explicitly.
- Mentioning seasonal demand and handmade goods adds a third dimension showing *why* British industrialists actively preferred hand labour — earns the third mark.
- Avoid writing a general essay on industrialisation; stay focused on the labour–technology relationship as the question demands.

Q24. medium thorough-understanding § 2.1 Life of the Workers

[3]

Why did the actual chance of getting a job in a city factory depend heavily on a worker's personal connections rather than simply their skill or availability?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Getting a job in a city factory was rarely based on skill alone because entry into mills was controlled by a **jobber** — a trusted worker employed by industrialists to recruit new hands. The jobber brought people from his own village, helped them settle in the city, and arranged jobs. Since the number of job-seekers always exceeded vacancies, workers had to rely on these personal connections. Over time, jobbers demanded money and gifts in return for their favour, meaning a worker without the right contact — or unable to pay — had little chance regardless of ability.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 4.2 — *Where Did the Workers Come From?*

Explanation

The examiner looks for **three key points** (one per mark):

1. Demand > supply — jobs were scarce, competition was high.
2. The role of the **jobber** as gatekeeper to factory employment.
3. The jobber's abuse of power — demanding money/gifts, showing that personal connections (not skill) determined entry.

Cite the jobber system explicitly; that is the heart of this answer. Source E (Vasant Parkar's quote about workers paying jobbers) is good supporting evidence if you want to add a line, but the core explanation must cover the three points above.

Q25. medium thorough-understanding § 2.1 Life of the Workers

[3]

A worker's nominal wages rose slightly in the early nineteenth century, yet historians argue that workers were not necessarily better off. What factor, other than the wage rate itself, explains this apparent contradiction?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Even though nominal wages rose slightly, workers were **not necessarily better off** because of the following key factor:

Real wages fell due to rising prices. During periods like the prolonged Napoleonic Wars, prices rose sharply, so the same wages could buy fewer goods. This means the real value of earnings declined significantly. Additionally, employment was **seasonal and irregular**. The income of workers depended not just on the wage rate but on the **number of days actually employed**. Long periods without work meant annual earnings remained very low despite a slightly higher daily wage rate.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 2.1 – Life of the Workers

Explanation

The examiner expects students to distinguish between **nominal wages** (the wage rate on paper) and **real wages** (purchasing power) and also highlight **irregular/seasonal employment** as the second critical factor. Both points come directly from the passage: "Wages increased somewhat... But they tell us little about the welfare of the workers... real value of what workers earned fell significantly... What was also critical was the period of employment." Do not just say "prices rose" — link it clearly to purchasing power/real wages for full marks.

Q26. medium thorough-understanding § 2.1 Life of the Workers

[1]

Which of the following best explains why industrialists in Victorian Britain often preferred hand labour over steam-powered machines, even when machines were available?

- (A) Steam machines were frequently breaking down and were unreliable
- (B) Labour was abundant and cheap, making machines an unnecessary capital expense
- (C) The government imposed heavy taxes on the use of steam-powered machinery
- (D) Trade unions had legally banned the use of machinery in most industries

A Machines could not produce the volume of goods required for export markets.

B A large pool of cheap labour made the high capital cost of machines unnecessary and risky.

C The government had banned the use of steam engines in most industries.

D Hand-made goods fetched lower prices and were preferred by the poor.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Answer: B

Labour was abundant and cheap in Victorian Britain, making the high capital cost of machines unnecessary and risky for industrialists.

Explanation

The passage explicitly states: *"when there is plenty of labour, wages are low... They did not want to introduce machines that got rid of human labour and required large capital investment."* Option B directly reflects this. Options C and D are factually incorrect per the passage; Option A is contradicted by the text's emphasis on cost, not volume.

Q27. medium thorough-understanding § 2.1 Life of the Workers

[3]

Women who spun yarn by hand were among the fiercest opponents of the Spinning Jenny when it was introduced in the woollen industry. Using your understanding of how workers' livelihoods were structured, explain why their reaction was so strong.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Hand-spinning provided the primary source of livelihood for many women, who depended on it for their daily wages. When the Spinning Jenny was introduced, one machine could do the work of several spinners, drastically reducing the demand for hand-spun yarn. This directly threatened women's employment and income. With no alternative work available, they feared permanent loss of earnings. Their reaction was fierce because this was not merely a change in technology — it was a threat to their survival and that of their families.

Explanation

The question tests your understanding of how new machines displaced workers in early industrialisation. The key point examiners want: hand-spinning was a critical source of income for women → Jenny reduced labour demand → loss of livelihood, not just inconvenience. Avoid vague answers like "they disliked change." Link technology directly to economic threat. The source passages mention workers attacking the Spinning Jenny; use that as your base and reason out *why*.

Q28. medium thorough-understanding § 2.1 Life of the Workers

[2]

Seasonal industries like gas works and breweries consistently chose hand labour over machinery for meeting peak demand. What specific characteristic of their production cycle made this choice more economical than investing in machines?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

In seasonal industries like gas works and breweries, production was **not continuous throughout the year** — it peaked only during winter months. Investing in expensive machinery for peak-season use alone would be wasteful, as machines would sit idle for the rest of the year. Employing workers only for the season was far cheaper than large capital investment in machines.

Source: Hand Labour and Steam Power, Chapter 4

Explanation

The key phrase the examiner wants is **fluctuating/seasonal production cycle** — machines require heavy capital investment but would lie idle off-season, whereas workers can be hired and dismissed seasonally. Avoid general points about cheap labour; focus specifically on the seasonal/fluctuating nature of demand making machine investment uneconomical. Two marks = two clear points: (1) production fluctuated with the season, (2) idle machines meant wasted capital investment.

Q29. deep thorough-understanding § 2.1 Life of the Workers

[5]

The jobber system helped industrialists fill vacancies quickly, but it also created serious problems for workers. Analyse the jobber's role to show how the same system that gave workers access to employment also made them vulnerable.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The **jobber system** in Indian mills was designed to solve industrialists' recruitment problem. Since the number of job-seekers always exceeded available vacancies, industrialists employed a jobber — usually an old, trusted worker — to find new recruits.

How the system helped workers:

- The jobber brought people from his own village, giving them direct access to mill employment.
- He helped new migrants settle in the city and provided money during personal crises.
- Workers without urban contacts depended entirely on him for a foothold in industrial employment.

How it made workers vulnerable:

- The jobber accumulated authority and power over workers.
- He began demanding money and gifts in exchange for getting someone hired or retaining their job (as Source E confirms — workers paid jobbers to secure jobs for their sons).
- Workers became dependent on, and exploited by, the very person who was meant to help them.

Thus the jobber was both a gateway and a gatekeeper — the same power that gave him the ability to employ workers allowed him to control and exploit them.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 4.2 – Where Did the Workers Come From?

Explanation

The examiner is looking for **two sides of the same argument** — not just a description of the jobber, but an analysis showing how the same role created both opportunity and vulnerability. Mention: (1) why the jobber was needed (recruitment problem, migrants without contacts), (2) what benefit workers got, (3) how power shifted and exploitation began. Using Source E (Vasant Parkar's quote about paying jobbers) adds evidence and fetches higher marks. Avoid writing a general essay about factory conditions — stay focused on the jobber's dual role.

Q30. deep thorough-understanding § 2.1 Life of the Workers

[3]

During the 1830s economic slump, unemployment in some regions of Britain rose to between 35 and 75 per cent. Beyond the immediate cause of the slump itself, what does this extreme figure reveal about the condition of the working class in early industrial Britain?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The extreme unemployment figures (35–75%) reveal that the working class had no economic safety net or job security. Workers were largely employed on a seasonal or casual basis, and wages were kept low due to an abundant labour supply — poor peasants and vagrants constantly migrated to cities seeking work. Since industrialists preferred cheap hand labour and avoided machinery, workers remained vulnerable to any economic downturn. There were no social welfare protections, forcing the unemployed into desperate circumstances — walking miles for work and sleeping under haystacks, as Will Thorne's account shows.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 2 – Hand Labour and Steam Power

Explanation

The examiner wants you to **go beyond just restating the slump** — the key phrase is "what does this reveal." You must link the statistic to the **structural vulnerability** of workers: seasonal employment, casual labour, no welfare system, and a labour surplus that kept wages minimal. Quoting or referencing Will Thorne adds evidence. Avoid padding; make every line analytically relevant.

Q31. deep thorough-understanding § 2.1 Life of the Workers

[3]

After the 1840s, large-scale construction of railways, tunnels, and urban drainage created a surge in employment opportunities for workers. How does this development challenge the idea that industrialisation in Britain was driven solely by factory-based, steam-powered production?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

After the 1840s, the construction of railways, tunnels, and urban drainage systems created massive demand for labour that was neither factory-based nor steam-powered in the traditional sense. This shows that industrialisation was far broader than factory production alone.

The textbook notes that even at the end of the 19th century, less than 20% of the workforce was employed in technologically advanced sectors. Traditional industries like building, food processing, and pottery also grew through small innovations. The typical mid-19th century worker was a craftsperson or labourer, not a machine operator. Thus, industrialisation encompassed construction, hand labour, and non-mechanised sectors alongside factories.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 1.2 – The Pace of Industrial Change

Explanation

- The examiner expects you to **directly challenge the factory-only view** using evidence from the passage.
- Key points to hit: (1) railway/construction work as a major employment sector, (2) less than 20% in advanced industrial sectors, (3) the "typical worker" was a craftsperson/labourer — this quote is examiner-favourite.
- Do **not** write a general essay on industrialisation; stay close to the passage evidence.
- 3 marks = one focused argument + 2 supporting points from the source. That's all you need.

Q32. deep thorough-understanding § 3 Industrialisation in the Colonies

[3]

Indian cotton weavers were hit by a severe shortage of raw cotton in the 1860s at the very same time they were already struggling against cheap Manchester imports. What was the cause of this raw cotton shortage, and how did it make the weavers' situation worse than if either problem had occurred alone?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The raw cotton shortage in the 1860s was caused by the American Civil War. When war broke out in America, cotton supplies from the US to Britain were cut off. Britain then turned to India for raw cotton, so raw cotton exports from India increased sharply and prices shot up.

This made the weavers' situation far worse because they were already struggling to compete with cheap Manchester imports. Now they faced a double blow: their sales were depressed by cheap foreign cloth, yet their production costs rose because raw cotton had to be bought at exorbitant prices. Either problem alone might have been survivable, but together — low selling prices and high input costs — made weaving completely unviable.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 3.3 — *Manchester Comes to India*

Explanation

- **Cause** (1 mark): American Civil War → US cotton cut off → Britain sourced from India → raw cotton prices in India soared.
- **Combined effect** (2 marks): Examiners want you to show *why the combination is worse* — low revenue (Manchester competition) + high costs (raw cotton prices) = loss at every step. Mentioning either problem alone doesn't earn full marks; you must explain the interaction.
- Keep the answer focused and avoid listing unrelated facts about the textile decline.

Q33. medium thorough-understanding § 3.1 The Age of Indian Textiles

[3]

Before European companies gained dominance, Indian merchants controlled a vast network of textile exports linking interior weaving regions to coastal ports. Describe the layered roles different categories of intermediary merchants played in this network, and explain how goods moved from the loom to the ship.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

In the pre-colonial Indian textile trade, goods moved from loom to ship through a layered network:

1. **Weavers** in interior villages produced the cloth.
2. **Supply merchants** linked weaving villages to port towns. They gave advances to weavers, procured the finished cloth, and transported it to the ports.
3. **Bankers** financed production and trade across this network.
4. At the port, **big shippers and export merchants** employed **brokers** who negotiated prices and bought goods from the supply merchants.

Armenian and Persian merchants carried goods overland via the north-west frontier to Central Asia, while sea routes through Surat, Masulipatam, and Hoogly connected India to West and Southeast Asian markets.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 3.1 – The Age of Indian Textiles

Explanation

The examiner expects students to identify the **distinct roles** of each type of merchant – supply merchant, banker, broker, and big exporter – not just say "merchants traded cloth." The movement from loom → village → port → ship must be clear and sequential. Mentioning land and sea routes adds completeness for 3 marks. Avoid vague phrases like "they helped trade"; be specific about what each agent actually did (advance credit, procure, negotiate, ship).

Q34. deep thorough-understanding § 3.1 The Age of Indian Textiles

[3]

The decline of Surat and Hoogly as trading ports and the simultaneous rise of Bombay and Calcutta in the late eighteenth century reflected more than just a shift in geography. What does this shift reveal about the changing nature of control over Indian trade?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The shift from Surat and Hoogly to Bombay and Calcutta reveals that control over Indian trade passed from Indian merchants to European companies. Earlier, Indian merchants, bankers, and supply merchants controlled trade networks through the old ports. As European companies gained monopoly rights and political power, these ports decayed — Surat's trade fell from Rs 16 million to Rs 3 million by the 1740s. The new ports were controlled by Europeans, goods were carried in European ships, and Indian trading houses either collapsed or were forced to operate within European-dominated networks.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 3.1 – The Age of Indian Textiles

Explanation

- Examiners expect you to name the specific ports and link their decline/rise to the transfer of commercial control.
- The Rs 16 million → Rs 3 million statistic is a strong factual detail that earns marks.
- Key phrases to use: "monopoly rights," "European companies," "Indian merchants went bankrupt/collapsed" — these show you understand the economic shift, not just the geographic one.
- Avoid vague statements like "trade changed" — always say *who* lost control and *who* gained it.

Q35. medium thorough-understanding § 3.1 The Age of Indian Textiles**[1]**

Which of the following best explains why the pre-colonial port of Surat lost its commercial importance by the end of the eighteenth century?

- (A) A series of destructive floods ruined its harbour infrastructure
- (B) English and Dutch companies captured the oceanic trade, cutting off the credit and customs networks that sustained Surat's merchants
- (C) The Mughal Empire deliberately shifted its revenue collection to inland routes, bypassing Surat
- (D) Indian weavers preferred to sell directly to Calcutta-based traders who offered higher prices

- A A severe earthquake destroyed Surat's harbour facilities, making the port unusable for large ships.
- B European companies secured monopoly rights over trade and shifted commerce to new colonial ports they controlled, causing credit and export volumes through Surat to collapse.
- C Indian merchants voluntarily moved their operations to Bombay because it offered lower customs duties.
- D The demand for Indian textiles in West Asia and the Gulf declined sharply, removing the main purpose of the Surat trade route.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

Model Answer**Answer: B**

European companies secured monopoly rights over trade and shifted commerce to new colonial ports (Bombay, Calcutta), causing credit networks to collapse and export volumes through Surat to slump from ₹16 million to ₹3 million by the 1740s.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 3.1 – The Age of Indian Textiles

Explanation

The passage directly states: "European companies gradually gained power — first securing concessions, then monopoly rights to trade. This resulted in a decline of the old ports of Surat and Hoogly... exports fell dramatically, credit began drying up." The specific trade figures (₹16 million → ₹3 million) are key evidence examiners expect. Options A (earthquake) and D (demand decline) are not mentioned in the text; Option C (voluntary move for lower duties) is also unsupported. Always anchor your MCQ justification in textbook facts.

Q36. medium thorough-understanding § 3.2 What Happened to Weavers?

[3]

The East India Company introduced a system of advances to weavers in India. Explain how this system worked and the consequences it had for weavers who tried to sell their cloth to other buyers.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The East India Company introduced a system of **advances** to control weavers. Once an order was placed, weavers were given loans to purchase raw materials. In return, they had to hand over the finished cloth only to the Company's agent, the **gomastha**. They were **prevented from selling to any other buyer**.

Consequences for weavers who tried to sell elsewhere: They lost the freedom to bargain or approach rival traders. The price paid by the Company was miserably low, and since they had already accepted loans, they were completely tied to the Company. Many weavers were beaten or flogged by gomasthas for delays. Over time, weavers deserted villages, revolted, or abandoned weaving altogether.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 3.2 – What Happened to Weavers?

Explanation

- Examiners expect two clear parts: **how the system worked** (loans → raw material → cloth surrendered to gomastha) and **consequences** (loss of bargaining power, low prices, tied by debt, punishment).
- Use key terms: *advances*, *gomastha*, *monopoly*. These signal textbook knowledge and earn marks.
- At 3 marks, keep it to ~3 crisp points — don't overwrite. Each point should be distinct.

Q37. medium thorough-understanding § 3.2 What Happened to Weavers?

[3]

Earlier supply merchants and the Company-appointed gomasthas both supervised weavers and collected cloth. Why, then, did the arrival of gomasthas lead to conflict in weaving villages when the earlier merchants had not?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Earlier supply merchants lived within weaving villages and shared long-term social bonds with weavers. They understood local needs, helped weavers in times of crisis, and allowed some flexibility in bargaining.

The Company-appointed gomasthas, however, were **outsiders** with no social ties to the village. They behaved arrogantly, arrived with sepoy and peons, and physically punished weavers for delays. Moreover, the system of advances tied weavers exclusively to the Company — they could not sell to other buyers or bargain for better prices. The combination of coercive behaviour and loss of economic freedom caused serious conflict.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 3.2 – What Happened to Weavers?

Explanation

The examiner wants you to contrast **two specific differences**: (1) social relationship — merchants were insiders vs. gomasthas were outsiders, and (2) economic control — merchants allowed bargaining vs. gomasthas used the advance system to bind weavers. Both points are needed for full marks. Quoting key textbook phrases like "outsiders," "sepoy and peons," and "miserably low prices" signals you've read the source carefully. Avoid writing a general essay about the Company — stay focused on the comparison.

Q38. medium thorough-understanding § 3.2 What Happened to Weavers?

[1]

The Company offered weavers loans (advances) to secure cloth supply. Which of the following best explains why these loans ultimately worsened the weavers' condition?

- (A) The loans were given in foreign currency, causing exchange losses
- (B) Weavers were bound to sell only to the Company at prices the Company fixed, preventing them from profiting from market competition
- (C) The loans carried very high interest rates that quickly exceeded the value of the cloth produced
- (D) Weavers had to use the loans to buy raw materials from Company-controlled stores at inflated prices

A The loans forced them to abandon their land and devote all their time to weaving, making them entirely dependent on the Company's low prices.

B The loans were given in raw cotton rather than cash, making it hard to buy food.

C The Company used the loans to force weavers to move from their home villages to factory towns.

D The interest rates on the loans were so high that weavers could never repay them from their wages.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

Model Answer

(B) — Weavers who accepted loans were forced to sell cloth only to the Company at prices the Company fixed, losing the ability to bargain or sell to other buyers for better prices.

Source: What Happened to Weavers?, chapter 4

Explanation

The passage clearly states: "Those who took loans had to hand over the cloth they produced to the gomastha. They could not take it to any other trader" and "the price they received from the Company was miserably low." This is the core mechanism of exploitation — not interest rates or inflated raw materials. None of the given options (A–D) perfectly matches, but the question asks you to identify the correct explanation from the stem options (A–D), and **(B)** from the question stem is correct. Note the MCQ options listed under A–D in the choices section are distractors; always re-read which set you are choosing from.

Q39. deep thorough-understanding § 3.2 What Happened to Weavers?

[5]

In the 1750s India's textile trade was thriving, yet by the early nineteenth century textile exports had collapsed. Trace the chain of events — from the rise of European company power to the arrival of Manchester cloth — that caused this collapse, and explain why Indian weavers were hit from two directions at once.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Rise of Company Power and Control over Weavers:

After establishing political power in Bengal and Carnatic in the 1760s–70s, the East India Company gained monopoly over trade. It appointed *gomasthas* to supervise weavers directly, eliminated independent traders, and tied weavers through a system of advances (loans). Weavers who accepted loans had to sell exclusively to the Company at miserably low prices and could not bargain freely.

Collapse of Exports:

In 1811–12, piece-goods were 33% of India's exports; by 1850–51, only 3%. As British cotton industries expanded, the British government imposed tariffs on Indian cloth entering Britain, shutting out Indian textiles from European markets.

Arrival of Manchester Cloth — Two-Sided Attack:

Simultaneously, the East India Company was pressured by British industrialists to open Indian markets to British manufactures. Cheap, machine-made Manchester cloth flooded India. Indian weavers were thus hit from **two directions at once**:

1. **Export market collapsed** — tariff barriers blocked Indian cloth from Britain and other markets.
2. **Home/local market shrank** — cheap Manchester imports undercut Indian handloom cloth domestically.

By the 1850s, reports from most weaving regions described decline and desolation, with weavers migrating or turning to agricultural labour.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 3.2 (What Happened to Weavers?) and Section 3.3 (Manchester Comes to India)

Explanation

- Examiners expect a **chronological chain**: Company monopoly → export tariffs in Britain → Manchester imports flooding India → double squeeze on weavers.
- The phrase "**two directions at once**" in the question is a direct cue — always explicitly name both: collapse of export market AND shrinking of local/home market. Name both clearly for full marks.
- Mention the gomastha system briefly — it shows how even before Manchester arrived, weavers had already lost bargaining power.
- Use the data (33% → 3%) to show the scale of decline; examiners reward evidence from the text.
- Keep each point tight; this is 5 marks, so ~4–5 focused points suffice. Avoid padding.

Q40. deep thorough-understanding § 3.2 What Happened to Weavers?

[3]

When faced with the pressures of Company control, some weavers deserted their villages and migrated, some revolted, and others eventually abandoned weaving for agricultural labour. What does the variety of these responses tell us about the options that were — and were not — available to weavers at the time?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The variety of weavers' responses — migration, revolt, and abandoning weaving — reveals that **no good option existed**; only desperate choices were available. The Company's control stripped weavers of bargaining power: advance loans tied them to the Company, gomasthas enforced miserably low prices, and competing buyers were eliminated. Migrating merely relocated hardship; revolting was risky with little chance of success; shifting to agricultural labour meant abandoning a skilled trade entirely. These responses show weavers had **lost all economic agency** — they could neither negotiate prices nor sell freely — leaving survival, not prosperity, as the only goal.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 3.2 — What Happened to Weavers?

Explanation

- The examiner wants **analytical thinking**, not just a list of the three responses. Connect each response to the *constraints* that made it a last resort.
- Key phrase to use: "no viable alternative" / "lost bargaining power" / "tied by loans."
- Avoid narrating the story again — interpret what it *tells us* about options available.
- The three responses (migration, revolt, abandoning weaving) are your evidence; the conclusion about lost agency is your answer.

Q41. medium thorough-understanding § 3.3 Manchester Comes to India

[3]

Between 1811–12 and 1850–51, India's share of piece-goods in its total exports fell from 33 per cent to just 3 per cent. Identify the two simultaneous market pressures on Indian cotton weavers that caused this collapse, and explain how each one worked.

◆ **The Age of Industrialisation**

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Indian cotton weavers faced two simultaneous pressures:

1. **Collapse of export market:** Britain imposed high import duties on Indian textiles to protect its own growing cotton industry. As a result, Indian cloth was shut out of British and other international markets, destroying the export trade.
1. **Loss of local market:** The East India Company was persuaded by British industrialists to open Indian markets to British manufactures. Cheap, machine-made Manchester cloth flooded India. Since it was produced at lower cost, Indian weavers could not compete, and their home market also shrank rapidly.

Together, these two pressures caused piece-goods exports to collapse from 33% to just 3% of India's exports.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 3.3 – Manchester Comes to India

Explanation

- This is a 3-mark question, so examiners expect **two clearly identified pressures** (1 mark each) plus a brief explanation of how each worked (the mechanism). The final line tying it to the statistic reinforces accuracy.
- Key terms to use: **import duties, export market collapse, Manchester imports, machine-made/cheaper goods, local/home market shrank.**
- Do **not** mix in the raw cotton shortage (1860s problem) — that is a later, separate issue and would waste words here.

Q42. straightforward thorough-understanding § 3.3 Manchester Comes to India

[1]

Despite India's long tradition of cotton weaving, the Indian market itself began to be flooded with Manchester cloth by the mid-nineteenth century. Explain the structural reasons — economic, technological, and political — that made this possible.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

Model Answer

British industrialists pressured the government to impose import duties protecting Manchester goods, the East India Company opened Indian markets to British cloth, and machine production made imports far cheaper than handloom-woven Indian textiles.

Source: *Manchester Comes to India*, Chapter 4

Explanation

Even though it's 1 mark, the question asks for **three** structural reasons (economic, technological, political). Fit all three briefly into one sentence or two short clauses. Examiners look for: (1) political — tariff/duty protection + Company's role, (2) economic — cheaper machine-made goods, (3) technological — machine/factory production lowering costs. Don't write lengthy explanations; just name/state each cause concisely.

Q43. medium thorough-understanding § 3.3 Manchester Comes to India

[2]

How did the American Civil War, which took place thousands of miles from India, end up worsening the condition of Indian weavers?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

Model Answer

During the American Civil War, cotton supplies from the US to Britain were cut off. Britain then turned to India for raw cotton, causing a sharp rise in raw cotton prices in India. Indian weavers were left starved of raw material and were forced to buy cotton at exorbitant prices, making weaving unviable and unprofitable.

Source: *Manchester Comes to India*, Chapter 4

Explanation

The examiner looks for a clear **cause-and-effect chain**: US Civil War → cotton supply cut → Britain sourced from India → raw cotton prices rose in India → weavers couldn't afford raw material. Both marks are for tracing this chain accurately. Do not confuse this with the Manchester imports problem — that is a separate issue. Stick to the specific American Civil War link as stated in the passage.

Q44. deep thorough-understanding § 3.3 Manchester Comes to India

[3]

An Indian merchant in the 1820s argues: 'India has always dominated global textile trade — our cloth is unrivalled and our weavers are skilled. No foreign power can displace us.' Using evidence from the collapse of India's textile exports between the 1810s and 1850s, critically examine this claim, identifying the forces the merchant failed to anticipate.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The merchant's confidence was misplaced. He failed to anticipate three key forces:

1. **British protectionism:** Britain imposed tariffs on Indian cotton imports, shutting out fine Indian textiles from European markets.
2. **Manchester competition:** British mills produced cheap machine-made cloth, flooding Indian markets. Indian piece-goods exports fell from 33% (1811–12) to just 3% (1850–51).
3. **Colonial trade policy:** The East India Company pressured Indian markets to absorb British manufactures, simultaneously killing India's export and domestic markets.

India shifted from exporting finished cloth to exporting raw cotton — a reversal that exposed complete deindustrialisation of the weaving sector.

Source: *The Making of a Global World, Chapter 4 (Sections 3.2, 3.3)*

Explanation

- The question asks you to **critically examine** — so don't just narrate; use the data (33% → 3%) to directly challenge the merchant's claim.
- Three forces = three points: tariff barriers, machine competition, and colonial policy. Cover all three briefly.
- The examiner rewards use of **specific figures** and the term **deindustrialisation**.
- Don't waste words praising India's past glory — get straight to what went wrong and why the merchant was wrong.

Q45. deep thorough-understanding § 3.3 Manchester Comes to India

[5]

The decline of India's textile export trade in the nineteenth century was as much a result of political decisions as of technological change. Analyse this statement with reference to the roles played by the British government, the East India Company, and the rise of machine industry in England.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The decline of India's textile exports in the nineteenth century resulted from both deliberate political actions and technological changes:

- 1. British Government's Role:** Under pressure from British industrialists, the government imposed high tariff barriers on Indian cotton imports into Britain. This shut Indian textiles out of the British market, causing cotton textile exports to fall from 30% of India's exports (1800) to below 3% (1870s).
- 1. East India Company's Role:** The Company used its political power to force Indian weavers into exploitative contracts through the *gomastha* system and advances, paying them miserably low prices. It also opened Indian markets to British manufactures, flooding them with cheap Manchester goods.
- 1. Rise of Machine Industry:** British mills produced cloth at far lower costs using machines. Indian weavers lost both their export markets and domestic markets simultaneously, as they could not compete with cheap, machine-made imports.

Thus, political decisions by the government and Company created conditions that combined with industrial technology to destroy India's textile trade.

Source: Chapter 4, Sections 3.2, 3.3, 2.6

Explanation

- Examiners expect **three distinct agents** (British govt, EIC, machine industry) clearly addressed — structure your answer around them.
- Quote the data points (30% → 3%) to show source-based evidence; examiners reward specific figures.
- The key concept is that **both** political action (tariffs, forced markets) **and** technology worked together — don't treat it as either/or.
- Avoid lengthy introductions; begin directly with the analysis. Five crisp points with a one-line conclusion is ideal for 5 marks.

Q46. deep thorough-understanding § 4 Factories Come Up

[3]

Indian industrialists in the late nineteenth century largely avoided producing cotton fabric and instead focused on spinning yarn. What two market realities made yarn a safer choice than cloth at that time, and how did the First World War eventually change this calculation?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Indian industrialists avoided cloth production for two reasons: first, Manchester cloth already dominated the Indian market, making competition very risky; and second, yarn was **not** a major British import into India, so there was no direct competition. Indian-spun coarse yarn was sold to handloom weavers or exported to China, giving mills a ready market.

The First World War changed this. With British mills occupied with war production, Manchester imports into India fell sharply. Indian mills now had a large, uncontested home market for cloth. Factory output boomed, and after the war, Manchester never recovered its earlier position in India.

Source: *The Age of Industrialisation, Chapter 4, Section 5 – The Peculiarities of Industrial Growth*

Explanation

Examiners expect **two specific market realities** (Manchester dominance in cloth + absence of British competition in yarn) and a **clear causal link** to WWI (British mills diverted → Indian mills filled the gap). Avoid vague statements like "war helped industry." Name the mechanism: Manchester imports declined, home market opened up. Keep it within 3-mark length (~70–80 words).

Q47. medium thorough-understanding § 4.1 The Early Entrepreneurs

[3]

Why did many Indian merchants who became industrialists in the nineteenth century first build their wealth through the China trade rather than through domestic commerce?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Indian merchants were restricted from trading with Europe in manufactured goods under colonial rule and were gradually edged out of the shipping business. This severely limited domestic commercial opportunities. However, the China trade – involving opium exports to China and tea shipments to England – remained open to them as junior partners of the British. By providing finance, procuring supplies, and shipping consignments in this trade, merchants like Dwarkanath Tagore, Dinshaw Petit, Jamsetjee Tata, Seth Hukumchand, and the Birla family accumulated the initial capital they later used to set up industrial enterprises in India.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 4.1 – The Early Entrepreneurs

Explanation

- The question asks **why** the China trade specifically – link colonial restrictions on domestic/European trade to the China trade as the viable alternative.
- Name at least 2–3 merchants as examples (examiners look for this).
- Key phrase: "junior players" – they provided finance, supplies, shipping, not control.
- Avoid going into details of industrialisation; stay focused on the *reason* for the China trade route to wealth.

Q48. deep thorough-understanding § 4.1 The Early Entrepreneurs

[3]

European Managing Agencies controlled a large sector of Indian industries, yet it was often Indian financiers who provided the capital. What does this arrangement reveal about the nature of colonial economic power in India?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The arrangement between European Managing Agencies and Indian financiers reveals the exploitative nature of colonial economic power. European agencies like Bird Heiglers & Co. and Andrew Yule mobilised capital, set up joint-stock companies, and **made all investment and business decisions**, while Indian financiers merely provided the capital. Indians bore the financial risk but had no decision-making authority. Furthermore, European merchant-industrialists had their own chambers of commerce which Indian businessmen were **not allowed to join**. This shows that colonial power ensured economic control and profits remained with Europeans, reducing Indians to subordinate financial backers despite being the actual source of capital.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 4.1 – The Early Entrepreneurs

Explanation

- The examiner wants you to use **specific examples** from the passage (name the agencies) and identify the **power imbalance**: Indians provided money, Europeans made decisions.
- Key phrase to use: "Indian financiers provided the capital while the European Agencies made all investment and business decisions."
- Also mention the exclusion from chambers of commerce — it shows systemic racial and economic discrimination, not just a business arrangement.
- Avoid writing a general essay on colonialism; keep it grounded in the textbook evidence given.

Q49. medium thorough-understanding § 4.1 The Early Entrepreneurs

[1]

Which of the following best explains why Indian weavers and artisans lost their export markets in the second half of the nineteenth century?

- (A) They refused to adopt new weaving techniques introduced by the colonial government
- (B) Machine-made British cloth flooded Indian and global markets, undercutting handmade goods on price
- (C) The colonial government imposed high export duties specifically on Indian handloom products
- (D) Indian merchants chose to focus exclusively on the China trade rather than exporting textiles

A Indian merchants lacked the capital or skills needed to produce manufactured goods for export.

B Colonial control over trade barred Indian merchants from trading manufactured goods with Europe, pushing them toward raw material and food grain exports.

C Indian industrialists voluntarily chose to focus on raw materials because the profit margins were higher than in manufacturing.

D The East India Company actively encouraged Indian merchants to modernise and move into factory production.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

Model Answer

(B) Machine-made British cloth flooded Indian and global markets, undercutting handmade goods on price.

Indian weavers lost export markets because British cotton manufactures, produced cheaply by machines, flooded Indian and international markets, making handmade cloth uncompetitive on price.

Source: *The Age of Industrialisation*, Section 3.3 – Manchester Comes to India / Section 2.6, Chapter 4.

Explanation

The passage from Section 3.3 directly states: "their export market collapsed, and the local market shrank, being glutted with Manchester imports. Produced by machines at lower costs, the imported cotton goods were so cheap that weavers could not easily compete." Option B captures this precisely. Options A, C, and D are either unsupported or contradicted by the text — the colonial government actually *removed* barriers to British goods entering India, not imposed duties on Indian handlooms for export. Examiners expect you to identify the *price undercutting by machine-made British cloth* as the core reason.

Q50. deep thorough-understanding § 4.1 The Early Entrepreneurs

[5]

After colonial control tightened, Indian merchants were gradually pushed out of shipping and restricted in trade with Europe. Yet some of them went on to become major industrialists. Analyse how the contraction of their trading opportunities may have actually redirected entrepreneurial energy toward building industries inside India.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

Model Answer

As colonial control tightened, Indian merchants faced shrinking opportunities in external trade — they were barred from trading manufactured goods with Europe and gradually edged out of the shipping business. Forced to export only raw materials like raw cotton, opium, and indigo, their earlier profits from wider trade were curtailed.

However, merchants who had accumulated capital through the China trade — like Dwarkanath Tagore in Bengal, Parsis like Dinshaw Petit and J.N. Tata in Bombay, and Marwari Seth Hukumchand — redirected that wealth into industrial enterprises inside India. Similarly, merchants who operated within India, transferring funds and financing traders, invested in factories when industrial opportunities arose.

Thus, exclusion from overseas trade acted as a push factor, redirecting entrepreneurial energy toward building cotton mills, jute mills, and iron and steel works within India — channelling accumulated commercial capital into domestic industrial investment.

Source: *The Age of Industrialisation, Chapter 4, Section 4.1 — The Early Entrepreneurs*

Explanation

- Examiners expect you to **link the restriction of trade to industrial investment** — show cause and effect clearly.
- Name **specific industrialists** from the passage (Tagore, Tata, Seth Hukumchand, G.D. Birla) for full marks — generic answers lose marks.
- The key argument is: blocked from external trade → capital already accumulated → reinvested in domestic industry. State this explicitly.
- Don't write about weavers or indentured labour — stay focused on merchants/industrialists.
- Around 110–120 words is ideal for 5 marks; don't pad with irrelevant colonial history.

Q51. medium thorough-understanding § 4.2 Where Did the Workers Come From?

[3]

Over 50 per cent of workers in the Bombay cotton mills in 1911 came from the neighbouring district of Ratnagiri, yet many of them regularly returned to their villages during harvests and festivals. What does this pattern of movement tell us about the relationship these workers maintained with rural life, and how might it have affected the mills' ability to maintain a stable workforce?

◆ **The Age of Industrialisation**

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

Model Answer

This pattern shows that mill workers maintained strong ties with their villages — physically and emotionally. As Vasant Parkar noted, workers went home during harvests and sowing seasons, and mills even granted leave for this purpose. Workers saw the city as a place of employment but the village as their true home.

For the mills, this created difficulty in maintaining a stable, permanent workforce. When large numbers left during harvest seasons and festivals, production was disrupted. Mills had to rely on jobbers to continuously recruit new hands, which also increased their dependence on these middlemen.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 4.2 — *Where Did the Workers Come From?*

Explanation

- The examiner expects two angles: (1) what the pattern reveals about workers' identity/attachment to rural life, and (2) its impact on mill operations (workforce instability).
- Quoting or paraphrasing Source E (Vasant Parkar) scores well as it directly supports the answer.
- Mention of jobbers as a consequence of workforce instability adds depth within the word limit.
- Avoid writing a general essay — keep it focused and factual, tied to the passage.

Q52. medium thorough-understanding § 4.2 Where Did the Workers Come From?

[3]

Despite the rapid growth of mills and rising demand for labour in colonial India, workers without social connections found it nearly impossible to secure factory employment. Explain the system that made personal ties more important than skill or availability in getting hired.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Industrialists in colonial India employed a **jobber** to recruit workers. The jobber was usually an old, trusted worker who brought recruits from his own village. He helped them settle in the city and assisted them during financial crises. This made personal ties — belonging to the jobber's village or social network — essential for getting hired, more important than a worker's skill or willingness to work.

Over time, the jobber became a powerful figure. He began demanding **money and gifts** in exchange for securing jobs. As Source E confirms, workers even paid the jobber to get their sons employed in the mill. Thus, social connections replaced merit as the key to factory employment.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 4.2 – Where Did the Workers Come From?

Explanation

Examiners expect you to name the system (**jobber system**) and explain: (1) who the jobber was, (2) what functions he performed (recruitment, settlement, financial help), and (3) how this made personal/social ties more important than skill. Mentioning that jobbers demanded money/gifts shows understanding of how the system distorted fair hiring. Quoting or referencing Source E adds credibility. Avoid padding — three tight sentences earn full marks here.

Q53. deep thorough-understanding § 4.2 Where Did the Workers Come From?

[3]

The jobber in Indian factories started as a trusted worker who helped new recruits settle in, but eventually became someone who demanded money and controlled workers' lives. What structural feature of the recruitment system allowed this shift in the jobber's role to happen?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The structural feature that enabled this shift was the **industrialists' dependence on the jobber as the sole intermediary for recruitment**. Since factory owners did not recruit workers directly, the jobber held exclusive control over who got hired. Workers outnumbered available jobs, so employment was scarce and highly competitive. Because desperate recruits had no other route into the mills, the jobber exploited his gatekeeper position — demanding money and gifts in exchange for jobs and using his authority to control workers' lives beyond the workplace.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 4.2 — *Where Did the Workers Come From?*

Explanation

The examiner wants you to identify the **structural/systemic cause**, not just describe what the jobber did. The key structural feature is that industrialists used jobbers as the **only channel of recruitment**, creating a monopoly of access. Combined with labour surplus (more seekers than jobs), this gave jobbers unchecked power. Avoid simply retelling the story — focus on **why** the system allowed abuse. Citing the passage detail about labour surplus strengthens the answer.

Q54. medium thorough-understanding § 5 The Peculiarities of Industrial Growth

[3]

European Managing Agencies in colonial India tended to invest in tea, coffee, mining, indigo and jute rather than in industries that served the Indian domestic market. What does this pattern of investment reveal about their priorities, and how did it shape the nature of industrial growth in India?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

Model Answer

European Managing Agencies invested in tea, coffee, mining, indigo, and jute because these were products **required primarily for export trade** and not for sale in the Indian domestic market. Their priority was to extract raw materials and agricultural produce for European markets, not to develop India's industrial base.

This pattern shaped Indian industrial growth in a skewed manner — capital goods industries, manufacturing, and industries serving Indian consumers were neglected. Indian businessmen, when they entered industry, had to find gaps (like coarse cotton yarn) since European agencies dominated export-oriented sectors. As a result, India's industrial growth remained limited, dependent, and lopsided until the First World War.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 5 — *The Peculiarities of Industrial Growth*

Explanation

- The key phrase from the textbook is: *"Most of these were products required primarily for export trade and not for sale in India"* — quote or paraphrase this directly.
- Examiners look for **two parts**: (1) what the priority was (export/profit, not Indian development) and (2) the **consequence** on Indian industrial growth (lopsided/limited growth, neglect of domestic market industries).
- Don't write generic points about colonialism — stick to the specific evidence: the *types* of investment and *why* those types mattered.
- 3 marks = ~2-3 focused points, no padding needed.

Q55. medium thorough-understanding § 5 The Peculiarities of Industrial Growth

[5]

The First World War is often described as a turning point for Indian industry. Explain the chain of events through which the war led to a boom in Indian industrial production, and why Manchester could not recapture its earlier dominance in India after the war ended.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

Model Answer

War-induced Industrial Boom in India:

- 1. British mills diverted:** When war broke out in 1914, British mills were busy producing for the war effort, so Manchester cloth exports to India fell sharply.
- 2. Indian mills got new orders:** Indian textile mills received large orders for military supplies — uniforms, boots, tents, and other war goods.
- 3. New factories set up:** Indian industrialists expanded production to meet wartime demand; new factories were established and existing ones ran at full capacity.
- 4. Employment increased:** Industrial employment rose significantly during the war years, creating a broad economic boom in production and jobs.

Why Manchester Could Not Recapture Dominance After the War:

- While Britain was preoccupied with war, industries had **developed and strengthened** in India and Japan.
- Indian mills had grown in capacity, efficiency, and confidence during the war years.
- Britain also faced **huge external debts** borrowed from the US to finance the war, weakening its economic position.
- Post-war, **production contracted** and unemployment soared in Britain (1 in 5 workers jobless in 1921), making recovery slow and difficult.

Thus the war permanently shifted industrial balance in India's favour.

Source: *The Making of a Global World, Chapter 3 (Sections 3.1, 3.2); The Age of Industrialisation, Chapter 4 (Section 4.1)*

Explanation

- The question has **two distinct parts** — the examiner expects you to address both: (i) how the war caused an industrial boom in India, and (ii) why Manchester couldn't recover. Split your answer clearly.
- Key facts to include: Manchester exports fell → Indian mills got war orders → capacity expanded. Post-war: Indian industries were now established, Britain was debt-ridden and facing unemployment.
- The passage explicitly states "*While Britain was preoccupied with war, industries had developed in India and Japan*" — this is the core reason for Manchester's failure to recapture dominance. Always anchor your answer to textbook language.
- Avoid writing about unrelated events (e.g., nationalist movements, Swadeshi). Stick to the economic chain of events as described in the source.

Q56. medium thorough-understanding § 5 The Peculiarities of Industrial Growth

[1]

[mcq] Despite cheap machine-made cloth flooding Indian markets in the nineteenth century, handloom cloth production continued to grow well into the twentieth century. Which of the following best explains how handloom weavers managed to survive competition from mill-made cloth?

- (A) The government imposed heavy tariffs on mill-made cloth, making it unaffordable for most buyers.
- (B) Weavers adopted new technologies, carved out niche markets with finer weaves, and catered to demands mills could not meet.
- (C) Mill owners voluntarily withdrew from segments of the market traditionally served by handloom weavers.
- (D) Colonial administrators passed legislation reserving certain cloth types exclusively for handloom production.

A The colonial government banned the import of mill-made cloth to protect Indian weavers.

B Weavers adopted technological improvements like the fly shuttle and focused on specialised products that mills could not easily replicate.

C Handloom weavers lowered their prices below those of mill-made goods to retain customers.

D Indian mills shifted entirely to yarn production, leaving the cloth market open for handloom weavers.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

Model Answer

(B) Weavers adopted technological improvements like the fly shuttle and focused on specialised products that mills could not easily replicate.

Weavers survived by adopting the fly shuttle (over 35% looms by 1941), boosting productivity, and producing specialised weaves — Banarasi saris, Madras lungis — which mills could not imitate.

Source: *The Age of Industrialisation*, Chapter 4, Section 5.1

Explanation

The passage explicitly states two survival strategies: (1) **technological adoption** — the fly shuttle increased productivity without raising costs excessively; and (2) **niche specialisation** — finer, intricate weaves like Banarasi saris and Madras handkerchiefs could not be replicated by mills. Option A is wrong (no import ban mentioned), C is wrong (weavers did not simply cut prices), and D is wrong (mills shifted to cloth, not away from it). Always link your MCQ choice to textbook evidence when writing the answer.

Q57. deep thorough-understanding § 5 The Peculiarities of Industrial Growth

[3]

A student argues: 'By 1931, since factory industries were growing steadily in India, the majority of industrial workers must have been employed in registered factories.' Using evidence about the structure of Indian industry at the time, explain why this argument is incorrect and what it overlooks.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The argument is incorrect because it overlooks the vast non-mechanised sector. While factory workers did grow — from 584,000 in 1901 to over 2,436,000 by 1946 — the textbook explicitly states that "they were a small proportion of the total industrial workforce." The majority of industrial workers were actually employed outside registered factories, in small workshops, home-based production, and hand-technology units. Artisans, handloom weavers, and other non-factory workers continued to dominate Indian industry. Factory growth, though real, did not translate into majority employment in registered factories.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 4.2 "Where Did the Workers Come From?" and Conclusion

Explanation

- The key textbook line is: "they were a small proportion of the total industrial workforce" — examiners expect this to be cited or paraphrased directly.
- Quote the factory worker statistics (584,000 in 1901; 2,436,000 by 1946) to show you know the evidence, but then contrast it with the non-mechanised majority.
- The Conclusion section reinforces that "hand technology and small-scale production remained an important part of the industrial landscape" — use this to counter the student's claim.
- Avoid just saying factories grew; you must explain *why the majority still lay outside* registered factories.

Q58. medium thorough-understanding § 5.1 Small-scale Industries Predominate

[3]

In the early twentieth century, even as factory industries grew in India, the majority of industrial workers were NOT employed in registered factories. What does this tell us about the nature of Indian industrialisation compared to the popular image of industrialisation as being driven by large-scale mechanised production?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Indian industrialisation differed significantly from the Western image of large-scale mechanised factory production. Only **5% of industrial workers** were in registered factories in 1911, rising to just 10% by 1931. The vast majority worked in small workshops, household units, and handicraft sectors in alleys and bylanes. Large industries were also geographically concentrated — about 67% in Bengal and Bombay alone.

This shows that Indian industrialisation was characterised by the **coexistence of factory production and small-scale/non-mechanised production**, not a replacement of one by the other. Handloom output actually nearly trebled between 1900 and 1940. Small-scale producers were not remnants of the past — their labour was integral to industrialisation.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 5.1 – Small-scale Industries Predominate

Explanation

What examiners look for:

- The key statistic: only 5% (1911) and 10% (1931) in registered factories — quote this.
- Contrast with the "popular image" of big mechanised factories — name that image explicitly.
- Show that small-scale/handicraft sector actually *grew*, not declined (handloom example).
- Conclude that Indian industrialisation was a *dual* or *mixed* process.

Common mistakes: Students write only about factory growth and forget the non-mechanised sector, which is the entire point of the question.

Q59. medium thorough-understanding § 5.1 Small-scale Industries Predominate

[3]

Cheap machine-made thread destroyed India's spinning industry in the nineteenth century, yet handloom cloth production nearly tripled between 1900 and 1940. What made it possible for weavers to survive competition from mills when spinners could not?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Weavers survived because they had advantages spinners lacked:

1. **Technological adaptation:** Weavers adopted the fly shuttle, which increased productivity and reduced labour costs. By 1941, over 35% of handlooms used fly shuttles; in Travancore, Bengal and Madras the proportion reached 70–80%.
1. **Specialised weaves:** Mills could not imitate intricate designs — Banarasi saris, Baluchari weaves, Madras lungis and handkerchiefs — giving handloom weavers a protected niche market.
1. **Stable demand for fine cloth:** The rich continued buying fine varieties even during famines, providing steady demand that coarser mill cloth could not capture.

Spinners, by contrast, produced a uniform product easily replicated by machines at lower cost, leaving them no such refuge.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 5.1 — Small-scale Industries Predominate

Explanation

The examiner expects **three distinct reasons**, since this is 3 marks. Each point should be traceable to the passage: (i) fly-shuttle technology, (ii) unique designs mills couldn't copy, and (iii) demand from the wealthy for fine cloth. The contrast with spinners (who had no such advantages — their yarn was uniform and easily machine-made) sharpens the answer. Avoid vague language like "they were skilled" — be specific about *which* skills or technologies gave weavers the edge.

Q60. deep thorough-understanding § 5.1 Small-scale Industries Predominate

[3]

A student argues: 'Because mill-made cloth was cheaper, it would always eventually replace all handloom products, regardless of which type of cloth it was.' To what extent does evidence from Indian textile production between 1900 and 1940 support or challenge this view? Explain with specific examples.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The student's argument is **only partially supported** by evidence.

Support: Mill-made cloth did destroy India's spinning industry in the 19th century, and cheap Manchester imports collapsed handloom exports. Coarse cloth weavers suffered severely as poor consumers abandoned purchases during famines.

Challenge: Handloom cloth production *trebled* between 1900 and 1940. Mills could **not** replicate specialised weaves — Banarasi saris, Madras lungis, and handkerchiefs retained markets. Weavers adopted fly shuttles, raising productivity. Demand for finer varieties from wealthier buyers remained stable even during famines, protecting certain weavers.

Thus, mill-made cloth displaced some segments but could not replace all handloom products, especially fine and specialised textiles.

Source: Ch. 4, Section 5.1 — *Small-scale Industries Predominate*

Explanation

- The question asks you to **evaluate** — so you must show both sides (support and challenge) before concluding.
- Key facts examiners expect: handloom output trebling 1900–1940; fly shuttle adoption; mills unable to copy intricate/specialised weaves; coarse vs. fine cloth distinction.
- Don't just list facts — explicitly link each to whether it supports or challenges the argument.
- The word "regardless of which type of cloth" is your clue: the answer must distinguish between coarse and fine/specialised cloth.

Q61. deep thorough-understanding § 5.1 Small-scale Industries Predominate

[5]

Analyse how the adoption of the fly shuttle by handloom weavers illustrates a broader principle about how craft industries responded to industrialisation in twentieth-century India. In your answer, also explain the limits of this adaptation — why expanded production did not necessarily mean prosperity for the weavers.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The adoption of the fly shuttle by handloom weavers illustrates a key principle: **craft industries selectively adopted new technology to survive competition with mills, without abandoning their traditional structure.** Weavers did not mechanise fully; they incorporated affordable innovations that boosted output while keeping costs low.

Impact of fly shuttle: It increased productivity per worker, speeded production, and allowed weaving of wider cloth. By 1941, over 35% of handlooms used fly shuttles; in Bengal, Travancore and Madras this rose to 70–80%. As a result, handloom cloth production nearly trebled between 1900 and 1940.

Limits of adaptation — why prosperity did not follow:

- Weavers worked extremely long hours; the entire household, including women and children, was drawn into production.
- Demand for coarser cloth (bought by the poor) collapsed during famines and bad harvests, hitting those weavers hardest.
- Expanded output did not translate into higher earnings — more production simply meant harder labour under the same difficult conditions.

Thus, technological adaptation ensured **survival**, not prosperity; weavers remained an integral but exploited part of the industrialisation process.

Source: Chapter 4 — "The Age of Industrialisation", Section 5.1 Small-scale Industries Predominate

Explanation

The examiner looks for **two distinct parts**: (1) the principle illustrated — selective/partial technology adoption as a survival strategy — with the fly shuttle as evidence; and (2) the **limits** — why more production ≠ better lives. Many students write only about the fly shuttle's benefits and forget the second half. Always cite the statistics (35%, 70–80%, trebling 1900–1940) — they earn easy marks. The phrase "survival, not prosperity" is a clean concluding idea that examiners reward.

Q62. medium thorough-understanding § 6 Market for Goods

[3]

Manchester industrialists printed labels bearing images of Indian gods and goddesses on cloth bundles sold in India. Why would such images be more effective at winning Indian consumers than simply printing 'MADE IN MANCHESTER' in bold text?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Manchester industrialists used images of Indian gods and goddesses because:

1. **Divine approval:** The association with familiar deities like Krishna, Lakshmi, or Saraswati gave the impression that the gods themselves approved the quality of the product.
1. **Sense of familiarity:** The imprinted image of Indian gods made goods manufactured in a foreign land appear somewhat familiar and trustworthy to Indian consumers.
1. **Wider reach:** Unlike text such as 'MADE IN MANCHESTER', religious images could connect even with illiterate buyers who could not read English.

Thus, divine imagery worked as a powerful emotional and cultural tool to win Indian consumers' confidence.

Source: *Market for Goods, Chapter 4*

Explanation

The examiner expects three distinct points matching the 3 marks. The key ideas from the passage are: divine approval, making foreign goods feel familiar, and the emotional/cultural appeal of religious imagery (which also bypasses the literacy barrier). Avoid writing vague statements — link each point clearly to *why* it was more effective than plain text. The phrase "divine approval" and "familiar to Indian people" are directly from the source and should appear in your answer.

Q63. medium thorough-understanding § 6 Market for Goods

[3]

When Indian manufacturers advertised their products in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, they used a distinctly different appeal compared to Manchester manufacturers advertising in India. What was that difference, and why was it effective in the Indian context at that time?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Difference: Manchester manufacturers used images of Indian gods, goddesses, and royal figures on labels to make foreign products seem familiar and trustworthy. Indian manufacturers, however, used a **nationalist appeal** — their advertisements carried the **swadeshi message**: "If you care for the nation, buy products that Indians produce."

Why it was effective: During this period, the nationalist movement was growing and Indians felt strong pride in their country. Appealing to patriotic sentiment motivated consumers to deliberately choose Indian-made goods over cheaper British imports, making the nationalist appeal powerful and emotionally resonant.

Source: *Market for Goods, Chapter 4*

Explanation

The key distinction examiners look for is:

- **Manchester** used gods/royal figures → to create familiarity and trust for a *foreign* product.
- **Indian manufacturers** used the *swadeshi/nationalist* message → buy Indian to support the nation.

Always name "swadeshi" — it's the key term here. The "why effective" part needs to link to the nationalist movement context of the time. Don't over-explain; two crisp points earn full marks.

Q64. straightforward thorough-understanding § 6 Market for Goods

[1]

[very_short_answer] What specific characteristic of calendars made them a uniquely effective advertising medium for manufacturers selling products in late-nineteenth-century India?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Calendars were used even by people who could not read, and were displayed year-round in homes, tea shops, and offices, forcing viewers to see the advertisement daily throughout the year.

Source: *The Age of Industrialisation, Section 6 – Market for Goods*

Explanation

The examiner wants **two linked points**: (1) calendars reached illiterate audiences (unlike newspapers/magazines), and (2) they provided continuous, year-long exposure. Both points together explain the *unique* effectiveness. Mentioning only one will likely lose the mark. Keep the answer to one sentence or two very short phrases.

Q65. deep thorough-understanding § 6 Market for Goods

[5]

Manufacturers in Britain placed images of Indian royalty and nawabs on their advertisement calendars and cloth labels sold in India. Analyse the underlying logic of this strategy. What assumption did these manufacturers make about Indian consumers, and how does this reflect the broader relationship between colonial manufacturers and the Indian market?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

Model Answer

British manufacturers used images of Indian royalty, nawabs, and gods on cloth labels and advertisement calendars to capture the Indian market. The underlying logic was **psychological appeal and cultural familiarity**.

Assumptions about Indian consumers:

- Indians deeply respected royalty and religious figures, so associating products with them would transfer that respect to the goods.
- The message was: "If kings use it, its quality cannot be questioned."
- Images of gods like Krishna and Saraswati gave divine approval and made foreign goods feel familiar to Indian buyers.
- Calendars reached even illiterate consumers, who saw advertisements daily in homes and tea shops.

Broader colonial relationship:

British manufacturers treated India purely as a **consumer market** for their machine-made goods. They studied Indian sentiments not out of respect but to manipulate buying behaviour. This reflects the exploitative colonial logic — India's culture was used as a tool to sell goods that were simultaneously destroying Indian weavers and craftsmen.

Source: *Print Culture and the Modern World / The Age of Industrialisation, Chapter 4, Section 6 – Market for Goods*

Explanation**What examiners look for:**

1. The specific strategy — use of religious figures + royalty/nawabs on labels and calendars.
2. The underlying logic — creating trust, familiarity, and aspiration.
3. The assumption — Indians respect authority (royal/divine), so linking products to them boosts sales.
4. The broader point — India was a captive market; cultural symbols were exploited commercially.

Key terms to use: divine approval, cultural familiarity, aspirational marketing, captive consumer market.

Don't just describe the images — **analyse why** manufacturers chose them. That analytical step earns the higher marks in a 5-mark question.

Q66. deep thorough-understanding § Conclusion

[3]

Despite the continued existence of hand technology, cottage industries, and small workshops throughout the industrial age, industrialisation became synonymous in popular and historical imagination with large factories and machines. Why did this selective perception take hold, and what does it reveal about how economic and technological change is understood and recorded? Support your answer with specific examples from the chapter.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The perception took hold because large factories and steam-powered machines were visually dramatic and symbolically powerful, making them easier to record and celebrate. Historians often began industrial histories with the "setting up of the first factories," overlooking what came before and alongside them.

However, this is misleading. Even at the end of the nineteenth century, less than 20% of Britain's workforce was in technologically advanced sectors. The typical mid-nineteenth century worker was a craftsman or labourer, not a machine operator. In India, only 5% of industrial labour worked in registered factories in 1911. Handloom cloth production actually trebled between 1900 and 1940.

This selective perception reveals that economic history tends to privilege the new and visible over the ordinary and widespread, distorting our understanding of how industrialisation actually functioned.

Source: Chapter 4, Sections 1, 1.2, 5.1, and Conclusion

Explanation

Examiners look for: (1) identifying *why* factories dominated the imagination — their visibility and symbolic value; (2) specific textual evidence that contradicts this perception (the statistics on workforce, handloom expansion, slow spread of steam engines); (3) a concluding insight on what this reveals about how history is recorded. Avoid vague generalisations — always anchor each point to a fact from the chapter. The answer should be analytical, not just descriptive.

Q67. medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

Both proto-industrial merchants in Europe and the East India Company in India used a system of giving advances to rural producers. What was the key difference in the power relationship these two systems created with the producers they employed?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Key Difference in Power Relationship:

In proto-industrial Europe, supply merchants lived within weaving villages, shared close social ties with weavers, helped them in times of need, and allowed them to bargain and sell to the best buyer. The advance system there was largely cooperative.

In contrast, once the East India Company gained political power, it used advances to **trap** weavers. Weavers who accepted loans were forced to sell only to the Company at miserably low prices. The Company's gomasthas — outsiders backed by sepoys — punished and flogged weavers for delays, eliminating all bargaining power. Political monopoly turned the advance system into a mechanism of coercion, not support.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 3.2 — *What Happened to Weavers?*

Explanation

- The examiner wants a **contrast**, not just a description of one system.
- Key phrases to use: *bargain, monopoly, gomastha, coercion, miserably low prices.*
- The core point: European merchants **competed** for weavers → weavers had choice. The EIC used **political power** to eliminate competition → weavers had no choice.
- Don't over-describe the proto-industrial system (the passage says little about it directly); focus your contrast on what the passage does say about both merchant relationships.

Q68. medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[5]

Trace how the fate of Indian cotton weavers changed across the nineteenth century by identifying THREE distinct pressures they faced, each arising from a different cause.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Indian cotton weavers faced a dramatic decline across the nineteenth century due to three distinct pressures:

- 1. Collapse of export markets (early 19th century):** British industrial groups pressurised their government to impose import duties on Indian textiles, shutting Indian cloth out of British markets. India's share of piece-goods exports fell from 33% (1811–12) to just 3% (1850–51).
- 2. Flooding of local markets with cheap Manchester imports:** British manufacturers used the East India Company to push machine-made cloth into India. By 1870, cotton piece-goods formed over 50% of Indian imports. Weavers like the Koshtis could not compete and were forced to migrate as day labourers.
- 3. Raw cotton shortage (1860s):** The American Civil War cut off Britain's cotton supply. Britain turned to India, causing raw cotton prices to rise sharply. Indian weavers were starved of raw material and forced to buy at exorbitant prices, making weaving unviable.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 3.3

Explanation

- The examiner expects **three clearly labelled, distinct pressures** — each from a **different cause** (trade policy, market competition, raw material crisis). Mixing them loses marks.
- Each point should name the cause, the effect on weavers, and ideally a **fact or figure** from the passage (percentages, the Civil War, Koshtis example) — this signals you used the source.
- Avoid vague phrases like "they suffered a lot." Use precise economic terms: *export market*, *import duty*, *machine-made goods*, *raw cotton prices*.
- 5 marks = roughly 3 developed points + brief intro/linking — not bullet points alone, but not an essay either.

Q69. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

Despite the rapid growth of factories in both Britain and colonial India during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the majority of workers in both countries continued to labour outside factories. Explain why non-factory production persisted in each country, and identify what both situations had in common despite having different underlying causes.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Britain: Even as factories grew, many industrialists preferred hand labour over machines. Work requiring delicate craftsmanship — fine embroidery, intricate designs — could not be mechanised. Hand labour was also cheaper when abundant labour was available, avoiding costly machine investment.

Colonial India: Large industries were concentrated in Bengal and Bombay. Across the rest of India, small workshops and household units dominated. Only 5% of industrial workers were in registered factories in 1911 and 10% in 1931. Handloom weavers survived by adopting technology like the fly shuttle and producing specialised designs mills could not imitate.

Common factor: In both countries, non-factory producers served niche markets requiring skills machines could not replicate, and their labour remained integral to industrialisation despite factories growing alongside them.

Source: Chapter 4 — Small-scale Industries Predominate; Before the Industrial Revolution

Explanation

- The question has two parts + one comparison — address all three explicitly.
- For Britain, draw on proto-industrialisation and preference for hand labour (guild restrictions, cheaper labour, delicate work).
- For India, use the specific statistics (5%, 10%) and the handloom/fly-shuttle example from the passage.
- The "common factor" is the key synthesis point examiners look for: niche/specialised production that factories could not replace.
- Keep statistics precise — examiners reward use of data from the source.

Q70. medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis) [1]

Which of the following best explains why Indian handloom weavers managed to survive competition from mill-made cloth in the early twentieth century, while Indian spinners had been largely wiped out in the nineteenth century?

- (A) Weavers shifted to producing coarse cloth for rural markets, while spinners could not adapt to machine-spun yarn prices
- (B) The colonial government imposed tariffs protecting weavers but not spinners
- (C) Indian mills produced yarn but not cloth, so weavers had no domestic competition unlike spinners
- (D) Weavers adopted the fly shuttle, doubling output and reducing costs enough to match mill prices, while spinners had no comparable innovation
- A Weavers received government subsidies whereas spinners did not.
- B Weavers adopted labour-saving devices and produced specialised cloth that machines could not replicate, whereas spinning was a uniform process easily mechanised.
- C The swadeshi movement specifically protected weaving but ignored spinning.
- D Weavers exported their goods to China while spinners depended only on the local market.

◆ **The Age of Industrialisation**

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Answer: B

Weavers adopted labour-saving devices like the fly shuttle and produced specialised cloth (e.g., Banarasi saris, Madras lungis) that mills could not replicate, whereas spinning was a uniform process easily mechanised and undercut by cheap mill-made yarn.

Source: Chapter 4, Section 5.1 – Small-scale Industries Predominate

Explanation

The passage explicitly states two reasons weavers survived: (1) **technological adaptation** — the fly shuttle increased productivity and reduced costs; (2) **product specialisation** — intricate weaves and regional designs could not be imitated by mills. Spinners, by contrast, performed a uniform task that machines replicated cheaply, wiping them out in the 19th century. Option B captures both reasons. Examiners expect both points (innovation + specialisation) to be mentioned for full credit.

Q71. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[5]

The shift of India's thriving export trade from the ports of Surat and Hoogly to Bombay and Calcutta is often described as more than just a change of geography. Justify this claim by explaining what the shift represented in terms of who controlled trade and how it affected Indian merchants and weavers.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:03 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The shift from Surat and Hoogly to Bombay and Calcutta was not merely geographical — it marked a fundamental transfer of control over Indian trade from Indian merchants to European companies.

Change in control: Earlier, Indian merchants, bankers, and supply merchants ran the entire trade network — financing production, procuring cloth, and exporting goods. By the 1750s, European companies secured monopoly trading rights, causing Surat's trade to collapse from ₹16 million to ₹3 million by the 1740s. The new ports, Bombay and Calcutta, were controlled by European companies using European ships.

Impact on Indian merchants: Old trading houses collapsed. Local bankers went bankrupt as credit dried up. Surviving merchants had to operate within networks shaped by European companies, losing independence.

Impact on weavers: The Company appointed *gomasthas* to control weavers directly. Through the advance system, weavers were tied to the Company, received miserably low prices, lost the freedom to sell to other buyers, and faced physical punishment for delays.

Source: Chapter 4, Sections 3.1 and 3.2

Explanation

Examiners look for three distinct layers here: (1) the shift as a symbol of colonial takeover of trade, (2) the statistical/evidence-based decline of old ports, and (3) consequences for both Indian merchants and weavers separately. Avoid treating it as just a trade geography question — the word "justify" demands you explain the deeper power shift. Use the ₹16 million → ₹3 million figure as supporting evidence; it impresses examiners. The term *gomastha* and the advance system are key vocabulary to include.

Q72. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

In nineteenth-century Britain, workers violently resisted the Spinning Jenny, yet by the twentieth century Indian handloom weavers willingly adopted the fly shuttle. What does this contrast reveal about the circumstances under which workers accept or resist new technology?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:03 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Workers resist new technology when it threatens their livelihood and survival. In Britain, women workers attacked the Spinning Jenny because it reduced labour demand, directly threatening their employment and income.

In contrast, Indian handloom weavers willingly adopted the fly shuttle because it **helped** them — increasing productivity per worker, speeding up production, and enabling them to compete with mill industries, without excessively pushing up costs.

This contrast reveals that workers **accept** technology when it improves their position and **resist** it when it destroys their means of survival. The key factor is whether new technology aids workers or displaces them.

Source: Chapter 4 — Small-scale Industries Predominate; Hand Labour and Steam Power

Explanation

- The examiner wants you to **contrast both cases** and then draw a **generalised conclusion** — that is the core of the 3-mark answer.
- Mention the Spinning Jenny resistance (threat to jobs) and fly shuttle adoption (aided productivity/competition) explicitly — these are the two specific examples the question demands.
- End with a clear principle: acceptance vs. resistance depends on whether technology helps or harms workers' economic position.
- Do not over-explain; ~75 words is ideal for 3 marks.

Q73. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

Manchester cloth manufacturers printed images of Indian gods, goddesses, and historical rulers on their product labels when selling in India, while Indian mill-owners used swadeshi nationalist imagery in their advertisements. What do these contrasting strategies reveal about the different challenges each group of manufacturers faced in winning over Indian buyers?

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:03 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Manchester manufacturers were **outsiders** trying to overcome Indian buyers' distrust of foreign goods. By printing images of Indian gods (Krishna, Saraswati, Lakshmi) and respected rulers like Maharaja Ranjit Singh on labels, they made their foreign cloth appear familiar and trustworthy, as if divinely approved.

Indian mill-owners faced the **opposite challenge**: convincing buyers to prefer Indian-made goods over established foreign brands. They used swadeshi nationalist imagery to appeal to patriotic sentiment — "if you care for the nation, buy Indian products."

Thus, Manchester used **cultural familiarity** to reduce foreignness, while Indian manufacturers used **nationalist identity** to build loyalty.

Source: *Print Culture and The Making of the Consumer Market, Chapter 4*

Explanation

- Examiners look for **contrast** between the two strategies and the **underlying reason** for each — don't just describe what they did, explain *why*.
- Key terms to use: "divine approval," "familiar," "swadeshi," "nationalist message" — these come directly from the textbook.
- Avoid writing too much; at 3 marks, two focused points with a conclusion is enough.
- The core logic: Manchester = cultural bridge to reduce alienation; Indian mills = nationalism to build preference. State this clearly.

Q74. medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[1]

Consider the following two statements:

Assertion (A): The First World War proved to be a turning point for industrial growth in India, after which Manchester could never fully recapture its earlier dominance in the Indian market.

Reason (R): During the war, British mills were diverted to war production, allowing Indian mills to supply the home market; after the war, Britain's own industrial economy weakened and could not compete with newer industrial powers.

Choose the correct option:

- A Both A and R are true, and R is the correct explanation of A.
- B Both A and R are true, but R is NOT the correct explanation of A.
- C A is true but R is false.
- D A is false but R is true.

◆ The Age of Industrialisation

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:03 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Option A — Both A and R are true, and R is the correct explanation of A.

Explanation

The passage (3.2) confirms A: Britain "found it difficult to recapture its earlier position of dominance in the Indian market." R is also supported: British mills diverted to war production boosted Indian mills, and after the war Britain's weakened economy could not compete. R directly explains why Manchester lost dominance, making A the correct choice.

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>