While discussing the concepts of class consciousness, embourgeoisement and working class images of society, some of the studies have already been discussed in the 'Introduction'. Some other studies carried out in this specific field of research assume theoretical as well as methodological importance in that they contribute for further explorations with their empirical evidences, and they are reviewed hereunder.

In recent years there has developed an interest among sociologists in assessing the subjective aspects of class and stratification. They have questioned samples of people about their views on class and society and their own position in the social structure, exploring what they have variously called 'class imagery', 'Class identification', 'images of society', 'class schemes', 'stratification schemes', etc.

While some sociologists treat the relationship between objective position in the social structure and subjective apprehension as problematic, others take people's expressed views on class and society as non-problematic information. Some even argue that the class position of a person is what he or she believes it to be. Thus,
"class is defined by men as they live their own history, and, in the end, this is its only definition". (Thompson quoted in Clegg et al 1986:205). The notion of self-assigned class is attractive to researchers because, as Hiller (1975) would believe, verbalized interpretations of social inequality may be used both as the orientation and justification of action itself on the one hand, and on the other, as the basis for the action of other parties. Hiller admits that inequal distribution of riches, income, educational opportunities, life chances and so on may often influence the thinking and behaviour of people without them being fully or partly aware of it, and hence it is a phenomenon to be reckoned with. He distinguishes conception of stratification from societal stratification per se, and sees a person's stratification scheme as being partly given to him through the process of socialization, partly imposed on him by others, and to some extent constructed by him in interaction with others in groups and organizations.

A number of social scientists have expressed doubts about the value of verbalized stratification schemes obtained from members of the public. If people are often unaware of the impact of structural forces on their thinking and
behaviour, how can they accurately account for their ideas and actions? Verbalized interpretations of stratification and class in any conventional research setting may have little to do with the class awareness and action manifested in a critical situation. Doubts of this kind have led some sociologists to conclude that images of class and stratification are of limited use. They would argue that self-assigned class is often no more than a rough idea of status awareness. What Martin (quoted in Coxon et al 1986:7) says deserves attention: “The majority of our subjects thought in terms of a three class system, and most of them described these classes by the same set of names—upper, middle and working. But could we assume that these names have the same significance to all who use them? To speak of these classes was to refer implicitly to a mental map of the social scene. But was it substantially the same map? Were the boundary lines separating the regions always drawn with the same degree of clarity and precision, or were they sometimes—either among a particular group of respondents or in respect of a particular division—vague and uncertain? Might it not be the case that for some of our informants the boundaries had been shifted so as to increase or diminish the territory of a particular region? Would all subjects whatever their own vantage point think of all the regions primarily in terms of the same attributes?"
Devoid of these arguments, empirical studies are being undertaken to identify the working class images of society. One of the pioneering works on this subject is the study conducted by Bott (1957). She distinguished between power and prestige images. There are four models of the class structure. They are two-valued power model, three-valued prestige model, many-valued prestige model and mixed power and prestige model. Bott suggests that one major influence on class imagery is the way people internalise the norms of their primary groups. Power models are associated with closed working class communities where there is little geographical or social mobility and where community and work relations are superimposed. Prestige images are associated with the more open networks of social relationships typical of the middle class. Ossowski (1963) holds similar notions that image of three or more classes is somehow necessarily linked to consensus models, and conversely, that image of the two-class variety necessarily implies a conflict model.

The influence of Bott's work has been profound. Her idea that the content of an individual's belief system gives information from which the structure of that system may be deduced runs through the highly influential article of Lockwood (1966) and has also influenced more recent research (see for example, Bulmer 1975 and Davis 1979). For Lockwood
working class images of society are spontaneously generated through work experiences and the values held by the local communities. The conceptions of the larger society are the outcome of generalizations from inequalities and deprivations they experience directly in their own lives. They "visualise the class structure of their society from the vantage point of their particular milieux and their perceptions of the larger society will vary according to their experiences of social inequality in the smaller societies in which they live out their daily lives" (Lockwood 1966, reproduced in Giadens and Held 1982:359).

On this assumption, Lockwood distinguishes three working class images of society: deferential, proletarian and privatised. In the proletarian image, there is a sense of division between 'us' and 'them' which is experienced as one of antagonism and power. The deferential image views the social order as a prestige hierarchy with many gradations the relations between which are not antagonistic but legitimate. The privatised image views relationships and divisions in society essentially in terms of income and material possessions.
Influenced by the typology provided by Lockwood, various researchers have attempted to elicit these images among industrial workers. Some researchers have claimed that they were unable to find these three kinds of workers in practice. They have found workers as to have a complex of overlapping images (Bell and Newby 1975 and Morawska 1985). The thesis formulated by Lockwood that the common elements of life and experience will give rise to similar types of images of society in occupational communities, has not been supported by the subsequent studies by Bell and Newby (1975) Cousins and Brown (1975) and Moore (1972). In his study of mining communities in Durham, Moore found little evidence of a heightened awareness of class consciousness. Cousins and Brown have stressed the diversity and variability of images of society among the shipbuilding workers. They (1975; 79-80) state that "the social situation of workers in a traditional industry and their images of society are more varied than has been allowed for; and that the links between social context and social consciousness are looser than has been suggested, that workers faced by similar market and work situations may interpret them differently and have some choice as to the strategies they may pursue. This is not to reject the basic proposition of Bott, Lockwood and others, but to suggest that it demands both the
specification of a much wider range of typical possibilities and the introduction of a greater element of "indeterminacy into the assumed relationship of social context and social consciousness".

Similarly, Bell and Newby's (1975) study of agricultural workers shows that the agricultural workers make use of a variety of images according to the characteristics of the local social situation. There is ambivalence of images, that is a multiplicity of images from which the agricultural workers draw upon the one most appropriate to explain a particular situation with which they are confronted. Yet another hypothesis provided by Lockwood that small firm employment is conducive for deferential image has been found ungrounded by a study conducted by Curran (1981). His findings suggest that the industry in which the worker is employed may be a more important influence on social imagery than size of workplace.

Miners, as said, are typically proletarian according to Lockwood. But a classic study of the miners reveal that they "seize on the most conspicuous outward characteristic of the class difference, and this is spending power, the possession of wealth "(Dennis et al quoted in Moorhouse 1975:473). The conditions suggested by Lockwood for the pecuniary model are notably absent in the case of the miners
who are rather supposed to have a power model. Contrariwise, the pecuniary model is present among the miners. However, the references to 'money' in the miners' world view are of significance. According to Moorhouse (1976:474), "Instead of being an alternative to and, indeed, the antithesis of power, it (money) is rather the way inequalities of power and status can be succinctly symbolized or expressed. .... In short, statements about money are statements about power". Thus, it is important to study about the attitudes on money power. On this basis, his study in association with Chamberlain and his own paper conclude that the majority view of the class system in Britain is very much a dichotomized one and there is a possibility of class based action to change the present structures in British society (Moorhouse and Chamberlain 1974 and Moorhouse 1976). Yet the estimation of the extent of class consciousness and the evaluation of the radical potential of the working class in western countries is a matter of much dispute (Goldthorpe and Lockwood 1963, Hobsbaum 1964, Parkin 1967 and 1971, McKenzie and Silver 1969, Wertheimer 1969, Gray 1974 and Cousins and Davis 1974).
Weinberg and Lyons (1972) have presented an analysis of forty British locality studies to examine the ways in which British researchers have utilized class and status concepts. Occupation emerges as the major objective indicator of class. The other criteria used cover education, income, family, speech, dress, attitudes towards money, interests, house and possessions and self-assigned class. Property and power scarcely feature in those studies. The results of empirical investigations of images of society are varied, reflecting differences in the conception observed. As already noted, Bott (1957) discovered four images of society: dichotomous power image, trichotomous prestige image, many-valued prestige image and mixed power and prestige image. Lockwood (1966) proposed three images: deferential, proletarian and privatised. Oeser and Hammond (quoted in Stacey 1976:74-75) have found five different strata frameworks in their Australian sample: a dichotomous conflict model, a prestige hierarchy, an economic hierarchy and two composite models. To this list Lopreato and Hazelrigg (quoted in Stacey 1976:75) have added occupational images, work and political dependency images, composite power and composite prestige images from the replies of their US informants. Hiller (quoted in Stacey 1976:75) has found nine class schemes:
a power/ownership dichotomy, a snobbishness dichotomy, four hierarchical prestige schemes and three residual schemes.

There is general agreement among social scientists that no large measure of consensus exists on how people see their country's pattern of social inequality or how legitimate they feel it to be. It is generally accepted that within any given region or country people are acting on the basis of quite different conceptions of inequality and varying degrees of acceptance of the existing ruling ideology.

The above reviewed studies have pointed to certain nuances involved in studying working class images of society. Some studies have raised doubts about the direct relationship between working class images and their immediate social and work experiences. It has been pointed out that the role of ideology in shaping the images deserves attention. One of the major institutions through which a particular ideology is disseminated is a political party. This is particularly important because political parties are supposed to have declared ideologies and interests. They often appeal to the people with the proclaimed righteousness of their ideologies. While promoting mass support, they have to promote popular acceptance of their ideologies. The
latter task becomes easier for the ruling parties as they are equipped with certain state apparatuses.

The three images provided by Lockwood have been found by some studies as complex and not mutually exclusive; they overlap on each other producing ambivalence in identifying any particular image. The proletarian image, as given by Lockwood, is not inclusive of class consciousness in its original sense. Studying merely the oppositional consciousness given in Lockwood’s proletarian image is to exclude revolutionary consciousness, perhaps the most important dimension of that image. Once this element is added to the proletarian image, the typology seems to be relatively more sophisticated. There may well be other images that have to be explored. But we are not equipped with enough theoretical background to name or define them. At the moment, Lockwood’s typology seems to be the better touchstone in exploring working class images of society in the modern times.

Considering the foregoing theoretical considerations, the present study attempts to study working class images of society using the Lockwoodian typology: deference, proletarianism and privatisation. That element of revolutionary
consciousness has been included in the proletarian image. The main focus has been directed to the role of political ideology in shaping the images.