

## Working Class Living Style Based on the Notion of Acceptable Privacy: The case of Eua-Arthorn residents

*Amata Jantarangsee*<sup>1</sup>

*Rewadee Ulit*<sup>2</sup>

*Onanong Ploywilert*<sup>3</sup>

### Abstract

This qualitative study aims to explore the unique living style of working class people by comparing with middle class living style and to illustrate how the working class lives with family members in limited spaces via the concept of privacy. Twelve in-depth interviews, supplemented with observation, were conducted with the working class people in the Eua-Arthorn flats with each household consisting of two to seven members. Findings revealed that, unlike middle class people, the working class in the Eua-Arthorn community had a unique living style concerning family circle, well-being, and practicality. Therefore, domestic life depended on other members and was based on 'practical privacy' which refers to the ability to live with some annoyances. This can be seen in the flexible boundary rule, the sharing habit in households, and the strategy for maintaining temporary privacy.

**Keywords:** Eua-Arthorn residents, working class, living style, privacy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Researcher, School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi  
evejant@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Information management officer, Community Organizations Development Institute  
(Public Organization)  
k\_rewadeeu@hotmail.com

<sup>3</sup> Research officer, Community Organizations Development Institute (Public Organization)  
rookiesmmy@gmail.com

## ความเป็นส่วนตัวที่ยืดหยุ่น : แนวคิดในการอยู่อาศัยร่วมกันของชนชั้นทำงาน ในห้องชุดบ้านเอื้ออาทร

อมต จันทร์ขี้<sup>4</sup>

เรวดี อุลิต<sup>5</sup>

อรอนงค์ พลอยวิไลศ<sup>6</sup>

### บทคัดย่อ

บทความนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่ออธิบายการอยู่อาศัยร่วมกันในที่อยู่อาศัยซึ่งมีพื้นที่จำกัดของผู้มีรายได้น้อย โดยอธิบายผ่านความต้องการความเป็นส่วนตัว ผู้ศึกษาใช้การสัมภาษณ์แบบเจาะลึกและการสังเกตการณ์ ศึกษาจำนวน 12 คน ที่เป็นชนชั้นทำงานซึ่งอยู่อาศัยในห้องชุดบ้านเอื้ออาทร และอยู่อาศัยร่วมกับสมาชิกในครอบครัว 2-7 คนต่อหนึ่งห้องชุด ผู้ศึกษาพบว่าชนชั้นทำงานที่อยู่อาศัยในบ้านเอื้ออาทรมีลักษณะการอยู่อาศัยร่วมกันที่เป็นเอกลักษณ์และแตกต่างจากชนชั้นกลาง นั่นคือชีวิตความเป็นอยู่ในบ้านมีพื้นฐานมาจากการให้ความสำคัญกับครอบครัว การมองว่าบ้านเป็นสถานที่ของตนเองและครอบครัว และคำนึงถึงการอยู่อาศัยที่เป็นไปได้ในความเป็นจริง ดังนั้น การอยู่อาศัยร่วมกันของคนกลุ่มนี้จึงยึดถือ 'ความเป็นส่วนตัวที่ยืดหยุ่น' หรือความสามารถในการอยู่อาศัยร่วมกับสมาชิกในบ้านท่ามกลางการถูกรบกวนในระดับที่ไม่มากจนเกินไป ซึ่งปรากฏให้เห็นในกฎเกณฑ์เรื่องพื้นที่และขอบเขตในบ้านที่ไม่ตายตัว การใช้ข้าวของในบ้านร่วมกัน และกลยุทธ์ในการสร้างความเป็นส่วนตัวแบบชั่วคราว

คำสำคัญ: บ้านเอื้ออาทร ชนชั้นทำงาน การอยู่อาศัยร่วมกัน ความเป็นส่วนตัว

---

<sup>4</sup> นักวิจัย คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีพระจอมเกล้าธนบุรี  
evejant@gmail.com

<sup>5</sup> เจ้าหน้าที่บริหารงานข้อมูล สถาบันพัฒนาองค์กรชุมชน (องค์การมหาชน)  
k\_rewadeeu@hotmail.com

<sup>6</sup> เจ้าหน้าที่วิจัย สถาบันพัฒนาองค์กรชุมชน (องค์การมหาชน)  
rookiesmmy@gmail.com

## Introduction

Privacy is assumed to be the basic need of human beings because everybody has some aspect of their life or behavior that would be embarrassing for other people to know about. Moreover, privacy enables a person to enact a variety of non-public postures and thus prepares him physically for public life (Bate, 1964, p. 429; Moore, 2003, p. 215; Rachels, 1975, p. 323; Schwartz, 1986, p. 745). These non-public postures and embarrassing behaviors are able to express when human beings are alone and undisturbed. Therefore, human domestic life requires the quality of being segregated from other observations and the right to be left undisturbed. The house or other accommodation is the most important place that provides space for these states ("Urbanization and the poor," 2009; Wilson, 2006, p. 10; Riley, 1999, pp. 9-10; Warren & Brandeis 1890, p. 1; 2009, p. 86).

Generally, spacious accommodation provides more privacy than small housing. By this, a single-attached house or a family unit in a condominium which provides a private room is more likely to serve the residents' need for privacy than a studio room. However, the former is available only for upper- and middle-class people. In fact, the poor have to stay in a small house or a unit in a crowded building and have to share this limited living space with their family members (Chiengthong & Wittayasomboon, 2009, p. 12; Johnson, 1952, p. 219). This real situation of quality of living that depends on social classification lead to this study. If privacy in domestic life is a must, how does a working class family live in a shared space with others? Therefore, the objectives of this research are 1) to explore whether Eua-Arthorn has a unique working-class living style when compared with the middle-class living style and 2) to illustrate how the working-class live in small living spaces with others via the concept of privacy in the working-class perspective.

## Eua-Arthorn Community Context

Under the responsibility of the National Housing Authority, the Eua-Arthorn community is the result of the government housing complying with H.E. the Prime Minister Pol. Lt. Col. Thaksin Shinawatra's urgent policy which intended to construct 600,000 units within 5 years (2003-2007). This project emerged from the poor registration and record-keeping that mentioned a lack of standard accommodation as the third-ranking of poverty problem. The primary ideal objectives of the Eua-Arthorn community were to support housing security for low income people and to develop a sustainable community. For the latter one, the Eua-Arthorn scheme included encouraging a democratic process in the community (e.g. voting committees, participation in co-operatives), and building up the generous nature of the tenants (Suppawittaya, 2003, p. 1).

The target people of the Eua-Arthorn housing complex are low income and

underprivileged people as well as junior government officers. This can be seen in the criteria that stipulate qualified households must not earn over 15,000 baht per month during 2003-2004, 17,500 baht per month in 2005, and 22,000 baht per month since 2006 (Suppawittaya, 2003, p. 1). Previous studies also showed the economic and educational characteristics of the residents of Bangchalong, Prachaniwes, and Huamark projects through their monthly income level of 13,200 Baht and the 14,696.69 Baht limit of the Rangsit Klong 3 project. Additionally, the largest portion (45.6 %) of residents in the Bangchalong, Prachaniwes, and Huamark communities held a high school degree (M.1-3 or US grades 7-9) (Boonsathorn, 2005, p.125; Denpaiboon et al., 2005, pp. 4-2). The Eua-Arthorn project was successful in providing living units for the target demographic; however, insufficient development in social relations and community cooperation was the weakness (Denpaiboon et al., 2005, p.II). In fact, the residents had a low level of expectation regarding social bonding among community members while family relations and neighbor amity were more important (Boonsathorn, 2005, pp. 132-133).

The Eua-Arthorn housing complexes were located all over Thailand but were specifically in the Bangkok metropolitan area, its perimeter, and the dominant cities and towns in other regions. The accommodation options specify a single-attached house, a one-bedroom unit (33 square meters), and a studio unit (24 square meters). Our research focus is the Eua-Arthorn Ramintra (Kubon) project located on a sub-road of Ramintra Avenue in a northern suburb of the Bangkok metropolitan district. This community consists of 82 flats and common spaces-community market, multi-function court, football field, child development center, parking lot, community joss house, sentry box, and yard between each building. Each five-storey flat provides 45 units/rooms (9 units per floor) so there are 3,731 units in total.

This Eua-Arthorn community offers only one-bedroom units at the official net price of 390,000 Baht each; however, the price was recently raised to a range from 450,000-490,000 Baht. Each unit is architecturally divided into 4 parts: living room, bedroom, bathroom, and balcony. Generally, the residents use the living room, the largest area, for dining, watching television, and welcoming guests. The small bedroom is commonly used to take a rest and engage in private activities. The narrow balcony at the back is adapted to be a space for cooking, laundry or gardening.

### **Class does matter: Difference in Living Style**

A class comprises the collective people who share the same categories of interests, social experiences, traditions, consciousness and value systems; therefore, people who claim to be in a different class adhere to a different culture. In a domestic aspect, the

cultures of living in the middle class and lower class are not similar. Many scholars urge that a house of the middle class represents a status symbol; in contrast, a house of the working class is a practical living space (Gans, 1962, p. 21, 242; Allen, 2008, p. 32). This contrast leads to dissimilarity in notions about privacy value.

### **1. Living style of Middle Class**

Middle class households always use their housing consumption practices to establish their class position. They can only properly impose themselves in the social space via their housing consumption practices (Savage et al., 2005 cited in Allen, 2008, p. 70). In other words, they use their house as the signifier for their social class. By this, the middle class do not use their house only for realistic practices but they also use it in a surreal aspect. One of the surreal aspects constructed in their domestic life is privacy which has also been emblematic of more subjective desires. This is evidenced in the typical structure or traditional physical characteristics representative of the middle class standard of accommodation—a series of common rooms, such as living, dining, and family rooms, and a number of separate bedrooms. In an ideal world of a middle class home, each adult would have a separate study or work room, while the children's bedroom doubles as their study area. But if space doesn't permit this arrangement, then they resolve to create at least one peaceful zone. If there's one particularly noisy family member (keen on loud music or computer games), it is to everybody's benefit to allocate them a room of their own (Riley, 1999, p. 9). Therefore, privacy for middle class people means the desire for separated space for each family member. Moreover, a private house signifies their middle class position.

### **2. Living style of Working Class**

While middle-class people view privacy as a desire to separate living spaces and to show their social status, the working class deals with privacy in a different way. Because their subculture is distinguished by the dominant role of the family circle and their way of life is based on social relationships amidst relatives, the working class consider the family and neighbors as important components of their living quality, view the world from within the confines of the family circle, and consider everything outside it as either a means to its maintenance or to its destruction. But, although the outside world is be used for the benefit of this circle, it is faced with detachment and even hostility in most other respects (Boonsathorn, 2005, pp.130-132; Gans, 1962, pp. 244-245). According to the family circle lifestyle, one not focused on the individual, the domestic life of working-class people is likely to predominantly concern their family members and other relevant aspects. They are not oriented to housing as a possession for themselves or it is 'there for me'; on the

contrary, they regard their house as a site where they live with others. This is what Allen calls the 'we-being' form which means houses are for me along with specific others. In other words, the house is not only the site for the owner but also the place for the people all around such as family, friends, and neighbors. The working class orientation towards houses is that they are 'comfortable' and 'welcoming' of others (Allen, 2008, pp. 71, 77-78).

Domestic life in the culture of a family circle is simultaneously accompanied by economic insecurity and necessities. This has shown to produce a form of being (or intentionality) that primarily encounters the world as an entity that makes an endless series of urgent demands on them, for example, to 'get by from day to day' and 'deal with bills to be paid'. Because a state of being that is absorbed by the urgent demands that economic insecurity and necessities impose, working class people view the house in terms of their practical dwelling space and therefore 'just' buy what is 'practically there' or meet the standard of 'average everyday practicalities'. By this, working-class people talk about their relationship to housing only in a matter-of-fact form of language that emerges from the reality principle. With recognition of the inevitability of their own housing situation, they have a realistic view of the house acquisition desire. They do not mind if physically enlarging their residence to accommodate daily activities such as extending the roof at the back of the house to facilitate washing activities is unsightly. Despite the poor quality and cramped spaces of their house, they describe their life in terms of their 'happiness with what they have got'. Hence, the working-class spacious suburban house is only really an admirable ideal that they cannot have or don't necessarily want (Allen, 2008, pp. 70-71, 73, 76; Denpaiboon et al., 2005, pp. 5-4, 5-5).

This principle of being happy with one's existence also influenced the criteria of worthwhile housing consumption on reality of their existence/dwelling with values the house as 'a place to live' or 'where I am' and as 'a brick and mortar' or 'shelter'. Moreover, working-class households trend to perceive housing as something that is 'ready to hand' which means that it is simply 'there' ('a place to live') on an average-everyday basis (Allen, 2008, pp. 75-76; Heidegger, 1962 cited in Allen, 2008, p. 77). This perception of relationship to housing is also reflected in the forms of articulation that working class respondents employ to describe the primary importance of their house as being 'in the thick' of their everyday lives or in terms of its ability to provide a space for 'peace', 'comfort', 'relaxation', and so on (Merleau-Ponty, 1962 cited in Allen, 2008, p. 73; Allen, 2008, p. 77).

## **Research Method**

In this study, the author chose working class people who resided in specific Eua-Arthorn communities as the informants. This working class definition is based on the ladderred

model of stratification<sup>7</sup> which claims that a member of the working class, or the lower-middle class, is someone who fits the profile of a low to medium income earner, has a limited formal education, and identifies with a low to medium occupational prestige. Hence, the working class members include blue collar workers (those in skilled trades who do manual labor), low-income bureaucratic workers, and many service workers (secretaries, hairdressers, waitresses, police, and firefighters) (Anderson & Taylor, 2004, pp.259-263). Therefore, 12 of the informants or their family members are masseuses, housekeepers, motorcycle taxi drivers, taxi-drivers, engine drivers, mechanics, street vendors, merchandise clerks, or sellers. All of the informants, 3 men and 9 women from 11 households, resided in the same Eua-Arthorn community and lived in one-bedroom units (33 square meters). They were not originated in Bangkok and their birth places were in the following provinces: Chaiyapoom, Burirum, Srisaket, Nakornsrihammarat, Sukhothai, Chiangrai, Chonburi, Amnatchareon, Yasothorn, and Phetchaboon. Their former housing was varied: a rental room, a rental house, a room in a shared rental house, and a house in a slum. The number of persons in each household was at least two with a maximum of seven.

An in-depth interview was conducted with the informants in their own residence or at a common area of the Eua-Arthorn community. Moreover, if an informant allowed the author to conduct the interview in their room, the author used the observation technique to collect data such as their room arrangement and interaction between members. The informants were asked to describe why they decided to live in an Eua-Arthorn house, how they use their rooms and common spaces, how they live with the other family members/neighbors, and were induced to discuss the idea of privacy in domestic life. The interview and observation data were noted in text and an outline of the unit plan was created. Then, these data were interpreted and analyzed in aspect of their unique living culture and their need of privacy.

## **We-being, family circle, and practicality: reasons for living in Eua-Arthorn housing**

The domestic lifestyle of working class people in the Eua-Arthorn housing complex represents the family circle and the we-being living style as can be seen in the reasons or the explanations for living in the Eua-Arthorn community. Many working class residents in the Eua-Arthorn complex chose their houses based on the importance of the family circle. This

---

<sup>7</sup> The model that shows the strata of people by socio-economic status criteria (income, occupational prestige, and education). According to this model, social class is divided into five categories: upper, upper-middle, middle, lower-middle, and lower class.

is reflected in the reasons for moving here. The residents urged that this type of dwelling supported their responsibility to family, for example, taking care of babies and kids on their own and for their neighbors, and settling their family. This is evidenced in their family living style: "Da" chose her Eua-Arthorn house because it is close to their daughter and son's school. "Wan", the vendor, quit her job at the factory to take care of their children because her husband is a full-time taxi driver and has no time to pick up their child after school.

In the working-class view, the house is not only the site for themselves but also the place for the people all around. Most of the working-class people in the Eua-Arthorn community are not living alone. They always consider the surrounding significant others - family member, relative, friends, and neighbors - in their domestic life. The members, both in the same unit and other units, were the main factor to motivate them to live here. Many decided to buy rooms because their relatives settled in this community. Some of them were able to share one unit with 3 family members without discomfort. Some of them enjoy a lively community with good neighbors that have important roles to play in their lives such as companion, helper in urgent situations, counselor, or supporter during mental crises. Some of them stay here in this society because their daughters have other children readily available as playmates.

The domestic life of the working class in the Eua-Arthorn community is based on urgent demand and economic necessities. Price is the very first reason why the working class buys or rents Eua-Arthorn housing. The working class income which rarely exceeds 20,000 baht per household is in line with Eua-Arthorn prices. All of them chose this kind of housing because 'it's cheap' and affordable, and it is 'easy to get loan' and possible to get attractive terms of payment. Not only is the amount of loan or rental of concern to the Eua-Arthorn members, compensation in daily life - such as water supply and electricity supply - is also significant. A lower electricity, water and supply charge (if compared with a rental room) pleased the inhabitants, however, the flat price of monthly water supply and common charge after living for 5 years raised the dissatisfaction of some Eua-Arthorn members.

The working class in an Eua-Arthorn house viewed the space on the basis of practical dwelling space or utility in function aspect. The value of a house depended on what this space was used for or where their family members were able to live. One of the inhabitants stated that the house is the place for sleeping and taking showers. They preferred a yard because it was the playing space for their kids, for sitting leisurely, and for the gathering of parents. They admired the wide roads in the housing complex and the plentiful parking as the space to serve numerous vehicles. The outdoor courts were delightful because it was a space for exercise.

In the working class view, a house relates to the 'average-everyday basic' life style (Allen, 2008, pp. 77, 82). Most of the working class in the Eua-Arthorn community viewed a house in terms of their ability to support their practical everyday life. Therefore, they chose an Eua-Arthorn house because of the following reasons:

1. Convenience. Many Eua-Arthorn residents mentioned that they live here because of location. This community is close to their work place, their children's schools, and department stores. The convenience of being located near necessary facilities (i.e. community market, access to public transportation) was also a main factor to stay in an Eua-Arthorn house.

2. Comfort. Most of the residents were contented with the separated spaces and large size of their rooms. They would no longer need to do everything in the same room because of the separated sectors (bedroom, bathroom, balcony, living room) in each unit. For example, a spacious living room can provide ample space for preparing crepe material to earn a living. This upgrade in living spaces brought concrete comfort to their everyday life activities.

The reasons for living in the Eua-Arthorn housing community show that the informants are working class people and clearly define the characteristics of a working class domestic life.

### **Privacy based on family, we-being, and practicality**

Due to the living culture of the working class, their physical life is attached to and is an extension of the family circle, we-being style, and practical notions. Their thoughts about privacy were expected to be studied based on their specific culture, so the need of privacy in working class housing should be explained in their own way and not according to middle class prerogatives. Their unique life condition shaped the working class people in Eua-Arthorn where they did not perceive privacy as an absolute desire. Concerning their family members, it is family circle values that shaped their attitude toward housing that a house is not a thing to serve each member's life, but it serves as an important space to support their family life. The we-being living style promotes giving priority to their friends and neighbors; therefore, for the Eua-Arthorn member, the additional or main function of their house is to welcome others. Their economic necessities which lead them to live within the reality of their dwelling space shape their attitude toward vertical housing that it was the construction design to live in which provides a little more feeling (i.e. relaxation, comfort), in contrast to the surreal feeling that middle class people have (i.e. peaceful life). This emphasizes that in the working class people's domestic world, the need for privacy is not in the first order. Hence, privacy is not imperative but it is a practical matter. In other words, the privacy of

the working class is more flexible and more accommodating.

In the working class view, the most important value is not desire for privacy. The main expectation of Eua-Arthorn is more concrete benefits, for example, to share accommodation with others, to save expenditure, and to be stable in Bangkok. Therefore, they need privacy at a sufficient level or even less when compared with the middle class desire. This is evidenced in the following feeling toward privacy in the house: "House is not a place to stay alone", "Privacy in a house is not a must... it's no sense to stay in no sound and apart from observation", "What would you expected from home... it is not the office where you get a tranquil room to build up an idea", "Not worrying much about privacy", and "I have been through such a tough life in the rural home before...this is not too bad for me to bear".

Loosening of privacy can be seen in the lessening of boundary rules. Space in Eua-Arthorn house is not strictly delineated. This is quite different from the middle class accommodation which clearly divided their house in two zones (individual member zone and family zone). Each middle class resident possesses a private bedroom with their own furniture which contains private belonging, i.e. clothes, and personal grooming items. Family members share their domestic utensils or appliances (i.e. television, sofa, dishes, and magazines) in the living room. In some of the informants' rooms, boundaries rules are not visible. The everyday life of the working class in the Eua-Arthorn community does not depend on intensive boundary rules. Some of them do not have a private corner or space specified for each member's activities, and this can be seen in the following quotations: "We don't have certain private corner", "We stay together, it's too narrow to have a private space", and "Everyone can do whatever they want within the house" (so, Wan's husband could lay down in any space in the room). This concept includes the space for each member's belongings. Most of them use available space and their things simultaneously. Some families with 4 members use the same drawer to collect their underwear, and some Eua-Arthorn members have only one television in a unit for watching together. There is a limited expectance of private space in the case those things that cannot be used by others, such as, Jai's husband has a private corner on the top of the refrigerator for his amulets. In their domestic life, sharing things within an acceptable privacy limitation culture is a common habit of Eua-Arthorn's working class. For example, some of them put their accessories in the bathroom, instead of placing them on a dressing table, so the other members could share the items. Some of them think that a bed is not only to be used by them, but also shared with other inhabitants and guests.

In many households, living with several members in the same unit did not disturb each other's domestic life. Their living among others was 'smooth' and 'convenient' even if they

could observe the behavior of the other residents. This can be seen in Par's conversation, "Staying with my daughter didn't make me feel that I was losing privacy"; and Noom's conversation, "We've got sufficiency privacy...we're married couples...we're open enough...we could do anything we want without personal space required". This is also reflected in the reason why they feel comfortable while another member is around: "Pikul staying with two children and husband was satisfactory because 'I need someone by my side and they are not too annoying'".

Therefore, the Eua-Arthorn working class people derived a flexible privacy reality that better aligns with their unique domestic culture which concerns their family circle, living with others, and practical matters.

### **Acceptable Privacy: How to maintain privacy in Eua-Arthorn Community**

In my attempt to identify the unique working class living style, I did not mean that they did not want privacy at all while they stayed with their family members and their relatives in the Eua-Arthorn community. In fact, their lifestyle was predicated by an 'acceptable privacy' condition rather than an absolute privacy value. This acceptable privacy state was constructed by the reason defining their 'community' within which they perceived the Eua-Arthorn community as a place for a pool of people living in a shared space. This realistic living condition referred to their life which did contain some annoyance; they are aware of and have adjusted to the notion that it was not a life without irritation. These were the evidences that showed how informants adjusted themselves for staying in Eua-Arthorn houses with some privacy disruption: Dang expressed her feelings toward noise leaking into her room that "they are not making loud noise every day...only sometimes...before I moved here, I knew that this place could be loud as there are lots of residences in this area... plus my room is right by the road so people are passing around unavoidably", Nam explained her thoughts toward noise that "I have trained myself not to be easily distracted or impatient with the noise" and "I'm tried not to pay attention to that noise", and Pikul explained how she lived with noisy neighbors that "I just be patient".

Another method to acclimatize themselves to live within an acceptable level of privacy was the notion to deal with the lack of privacy. The first strategy was to avoid the source of nuisance. If an irritant emanated from out of their own space, they were likely to place themselves in the innermost area which, by necessity, served as the bed room. Activities needing tranquility, such as praying and studying, usually occurred in this room. Moreover, closing the bedroom door and windows meant 'the noisy world is over'. If the insiders created any type of loud noise in the room, many Eua-Arthorn residents chose to escape

from that area. For example, Tubtim went out of the room to sit in the community common area instead of staying among the loudness made by 6 family members. These constant realities kept the residents in a state of flux-accept that privacy is a temporary situation or live with flexible privacy expectations. The second idea was to eliminate things that disturbed them. Many residents traced the smell of dog droppings right to the offending owners' rooms, and understood that the bad smell destroys their domestic privacy. However, they didn't wait for housekeeping to clean or hope for a committee to solve this problem. When the smell blew into their room, Jai and her neighbors joined efforts to clean the common yard by themselves so that they could be free from this privacy infringer for a while.

Even when they did not have a private room because of the lack of economic sufficiency, they had a creative method to assure themselves of an acceptable amount of privacy through a coping strategy called 'switching'. There were two strategies to deal with members in the same house. Firstly, 'space switching'-while one member occupied an area, another member went to stay in another corner. This was evidenced in Wan's family; when she got upset with her husband, she left him in the living room while she stayed in the bedroom; and in Jai's family, Jai escaped to the bedroom which was less noisy when her husband played with their children. A second tactic was 'time switching' or using the same area at different times. This was shown in the Daeng family where her son and younger brother dined at the same table but at different periods. These switching techniques contributed to the residents' satisfaction by providing sufficient privacy in limited spaces. Another strategy to get an acceptable level of privacy was to separate the Eua-Arthorn house space. This can be seen in Da's daughter's room where she installed a light brown glass partition to increase her daughter's privacy, and also in Nam's mother-in-law's space where a cloth curtain was pulled down at night to divide each other's sleeping space. Although a permanent or concrete wall which could provide absolute privacy was impossible for an Eua-Arthorn building, a temporary partition was enough for the working class in Eua-Arthorn to have a short period of privacy. Although the light brown glass partition or the cloth curtain was unable to completely buffer against sounds or sights, they nevertheless helped an Eua-Arthorn house to be more comfortable for multiple residents. This is to say, working class residents in Eua-Arthorn houses had interesting strategies to gain acceptable privacy levels to accommodate their value of living with others in a limited space.

## Conclusion

A difference in social classification leads to differences in living styles. The living culture of the working class is not similar to the middle class domestic life which concentrates

on acquiring a house for expression of their status and desire for absolute privacy by occupying one's own separated space. In the case of the working class in the Eua-Arthorn housing community, the residents demonstrated the working class's living style based on three aspects: family circle, we-being, and practicality. Consideration of others and economic necessities shaped the need of privacy to be more flexible and more lenient. This concept of 'acceptable privacy' refers to frictionless living with others including a suitable level of tolerance for annoyance due to space constraints, ambient noise and lack of privacy. This is evidenced in the lessening of boundary rules and the sharing of domestic things as well as in the way the residents try to get temporary privacy as an escape and eliminate sources of problems that interfere with the concept of we-being.

## Acknowledgement

This study would not have been possible without the help of the residents of the Eua-Arthorn Ramintra (Kubon) who allowed the author to enter their domestic lives and provided the valuable information. The author is also grateful for Selim Hassan's assistance in editing this paper.

## References

- Allen, C. (2008). *Housing market renewal and social class*. New York: Routledge.
- Anderson, M. & Taylor, H. (2004). *Sociology: Understanding a diverse society*. Victoria: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Bate, A. (1964). Privacy- a useful concept? *Social Force*, 42(4), 429-434.
- Boonsathorn, A. (2005). *Perception of community service quality an expectation of quality of life: A case study of residence in Bangchalong, Prachaniwes and Huamark Aur-Arthorn housing project(nha)*. Proceeding from The first national conference on Demography. , Twin Tower hotel, Bangkok: Thai Population Association.  
(Originated in Thai)
- Chiangthong, S. and Wittayasomboon, I. (2009). *Little people in the big city*. Bangkok: Community Organizations Development Institute.
- Denpaiboon, C., Horayangkura, V., and Takada, M. (2005). *Impact of affordable housing development for low-income group on urban development: A case of Baan Eur-Arthorn project, Rangsit Klong 3*. (Term project). Bangkok: The Thai Research Fund.  
(Originated in Thai)
- Gans, H. (1962). *The urban villagers: Group and class in the life of Italian-Americans*. New York: The free press.

- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Johnson, E. (1952). Family privacy in Multi-Unit Dwelling. *Marriage and Family Living*, 14(3), 219-225.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Moore, M. (2003). Privacy: Its meaning and value. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 40(3), 215-227.
- Rachels, J. (1975). Why privacy is important. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 4(4), 323-333.
- Riley, T. (1999). *The un-private house*. New York: Museum of Modern Arts.
- Savage, M., Bagnall, G. and Longhurst, B. et al., (2005). *Globalization and Belonging*. London: Sage.
- Schwartz, B. (1986). The Social psychology of privacy. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 73(6), 741-752.
- Suppawittaya, A. (2003). *Assessment of the Eua-Arthorn Housing project in the ownership distribution for low income people*. (Term project). Nida, Bangkok. (Originated in Thai)
- Urbanization and the poor. (2009). *GH Bank Housing Journal*, 3(9), 85-88.
- Warren, S., and Brandeis, L. (1890). The right to privacy. *Harvard Law Review*, 4(5), 193-220.
- Wilson, J. (2006). *Private places*. London: Aurum Press.