

IDEOLOGICAL SHIFTS AND SHIFTING RELATIONS OF ACTORS IN THE FIELD OF HOUSING.

ABSTRACT

This paper begins with discussion of multi-fold changes of relations in modern housing in light of the dramatic ideological and rapid structural shifts during fundamental societal transformations last century which affected the roles, interests, responsibilities and strategies of actors. We first summarise these changes concerning the relationship between agencies of housing provision such as market and public institutions as well as their clients – the individual agents. With insights into specific contexts of the formation of the Estonian housing sector we then undertake a more detailed focus on a differentiated group of individual actors' perceptions of their current housing conditions as well as their distinct position on accessing their preferred housing. Drawing on several recent (2001-2003) quantitative and qualitative housing studies and some earlier or considerably early research the paper aims to show that the modern dynamics of housing relations has to be interpreted against the background of an intense interplay between shifts having taken place on the structural level and in individual experiences in the past. It is observed that rapid shift of formal ideology and the change of relations and the subsequent structural opportunities do not necessarily define the ways people conceptualise residential culture and their individual preferences of residence.

INTRODUCTION TO THE ISSUE AND TO THEORY

Estonia has been practising its return to capitalism for over a decade by now. These have been turbulent times for the housing field, as transformations of relations on all scales of interaction have been profound and rapid. However, the peak of a radical change of the tenure structure in 1995, which as a consequence of denationalisation of housing property called for new strategies from the part of all actors involved in this sector - the state, local governments, market and service institutions as well as residents – denoted only the beginning of continuous re-definition of the relations between agencies.

Therefore and because of, perhaps, too little time between the recent profound change and the present stage of the field formation it is too early to make an attempt to de-deconstruct this social experience. On the other hand, the speed of these transformations seems to demand systematic observation of ongoing shifts in the field as well as in theoretical discourses concerned with explanations of the interplay between agencies and structures creating and changing the field. It can, at this point, be argued that in terms of the reformation of statuses (tendency towards the domination of homeownership) and relationships between agencies (reduced significance of state or local government institutions and the growth of the role of free market in the housing provision) the Estonian housing field has experienced a number of changes in a very short period of time compared to the emergence of similar trends in many European societies having experienced no fundamental transformation of social systems. The current accelerated transformation of the housing field in Estonia has distinct characteristics which can be observed on the former non-synchronised developments in the respective field of the two distinct social systems during the post-war (WW II) period. Estonia and many other post-socialist societies are, so to speak “catching up” on what has been left uncompleted before the cataclysmic socialist turn in their political systems. Today, developments occur in conditions that Giddens (1997) would conceive of as “obviously extreme” with a confusing mix of understandings, relationships and the very state of affairs concerning the conditions of the housing sector. Estonia is in a way leaving behind the destruction of the World War II only today as it is facing the challenge of reconsidering what has been inherited from the previous periods of its societal and urban residential history.

Hence in view of any of the aspects of changes in the housing field which need re-conceptualisation it seems more important than ever before to make the analysis pertinent to the time-space and cultural-structural scales of the construction of society along its history. Understanding embeddedness of housing processes within the social structural developmental context and, therefore, as a distinct experience in different societies, has been fundamental in a number of housing research studies (Kemeny, 1992, 1995; Jacobs, 1999 etc).

There is abundant academic literature, which discusses transformation issues and, in particular, the differences of housing developments in similar type of societies. Much of this discussion has a primary focus on the structural development of a field within a broader societal context (welfare regimes, citizenship etc) and institutional agents’ strategies (market and public policies etc). Most of these interpretations draw on the thesis of the dual nature of the relationship that forms between structures and agencies. However, agency is rarely defined as a complex concept as they overlook the constitutive role of individual agencies in this relationship, except in research based on social constructivist discourse clearly stipulating the duality of this relationship (Kemeny, 1992, 1995; Jacobs, 1999; Gurney, 1999; Rowlands and Gurney, 2000 etc). Individual agent’s self-perceptions seem to be far too rarely subjected to research interest as a symptomatic expression of disguised positivistic assumptions on how the social world functions.

The focus of analyses on structures heavily implies primacy of differentiated scientific interests. Since social science is a science which studies itself (Touraine, 1988) the focus of theoretical discussions in different societies synchronises with a particular moment in their societal history and not necessarily with a particular phase of social relations in another

society (societies). Thus, the identification of societal, structural and cultural specificities of a given society is also significant for an understanding of the formation of research interests conceptualised in particular theoretical perspectives.

Nevertheless, there is probably one, (though one of the most confusing concepts framing the housing studies) which is nonetheless the most applicable concept for the analysis of change and distinctions between housing relations in different societies – ideology. The usefulness of such a conceptual tool in the understanding of human agency and making of the social world, moreover explaining modern divergent societal paths and their connectedness with specific cultural-historical pasts, has been highlighted by social theoreticians (Bourdieu, 1999; 1994; 1998; Foucault, 1972 etc) and some housing researchers (Kemeny, 1992; Ruonavaara, 1996 etc).

Ideologies are considered to play a significant role in the formation of relations in the housing field, being part of the struggle between various agents negotiating over their interests. However, most authors agree that ideology is but one of the many factors defining agents' opportunities to pursue their interests. Expressed with some difference views on ideology appear close in a number of housing texts: Kemeny (1992) acknowledges that there is an interactive relationship between ideology and social structure, Jacobs practically does not distinguish between the notions of ideology and social structure (1999:222) and Ruonavaara (1996) identifies ideology as one of the influential kinds of discourses of a very broad scope. All three, however, seem to suggest that ideology is a set of values defining "what is and what is not possible, efficient, desirable" (Kemeny, 1992:95) or "what a society is worthy of aspiring to... and showing the means to achieve it" (Ruonavaara, 1996) or "on what an elite base their actions" (Jacobs, 1999: 57).

Taking a broad view on the concept of ideology, it is argued that as a set of dominant values, it is a rather persistent category applicable in the analysis of very different social structural and cultural circumstances. It can be identified as a separate category of thought from a formal political discourse, e. g. of an institutionalised political regime constituting a structural (ideological) framework for individual actions but not necessarily shaping individuals' world view or altering their basic value systems. What is really happening on the level of people's daily lives has to do with a combined effect of the notions of ideology and myth. Kemeny asserts that ideology as a very general orientation of reality (1992: 102), in order to be successful, should consider the existing myths which are an essential part of reality construction (1992: 103). This is because myths have an emotional appeal which is deeply rooted in specific cultural and social milieus (Kemeny, 1992). Given this, we would like to postulate that the fundamental societal transformations which took place twice last century in Estonia and entirely changed the structural and relational context of the field of housing form only a subtle relationship between radical change of formal ideology and individuals' residential dispositions. Individuals' experiences in various social systems with specific constraints and opportunities cannot be wiped away in the course of changing ideological circumstances of a structural nature. These experiences are part of individuals' cultural capital (in the Bourdieusian sense) which have a tendency to be maintained and developed as a system of understandings, beliefs, tastes and preferences, though not always applicable within specific structural constraints, quite contrary to the social and economic capital or symbolic

capital, which might be lost, especially at the extreme cases of societal transformations like the transition between social systems (Paadam, 2003). Therefore, it is argued that ideological shifts or severe changes on a formal level have a situational affect on individuals' ways of constructing their residential strategies but they may not change entirely their dispositions in cultural terms of preferences.

In this paper we focus on the construction of relations in the housing field in Estonia by conceptualising the changes along three phases in the field history connected by fundamental disconnections caused by two significant societal transformations last century. Our interest is also to postulate that there are some aspects of housing (physical and aesthetic structures contributing to the construction of meanings and residential identities), which are as essential, but often forgotten or overlooked, as the mainstream housing research emphases (access, affordability and provision). With the legacy from the past experiences on the background we then introduce the analysis of the current phase in the field as perceived by residents concerning especially their housing situation in terms of tenure and actual conditions and their opportunities for pursuing preferable housing by phrasing three simple questions: "what do people have?", "what do people want to have?" and "what can people have?". The final task centres around conceptualising formal ideological change and consequent change of structural circumstances linking with agents' responses to these changes and their constitutive role in this process. In this way we would look for the connections formed between the changing (institutional and individual) strategies and formal ideological shifts in the past and present.

PHASES IN FIELD DEVELOPMENT – BRIEF HISTORY

In this section we make an attempt to briefly summarise the main characteristics of the chronologically presented phases in the Estonian housing history in the 20th century. We will have a special focus on the city of Tallinn as the most mixed of the urban contexts in the country and as the most salient reflection of urban and societal changes.

I FIRST PERIOD OF INDEPENDENCE 1918-1940S

The built form and spatial conditions:

*wooden residential buildings dominated in the country and in Tallinn, e. g wooden houses comprised 84.1 per cent of the total stock in 1922 decreasing to 77.6 percent by 1934 with a total number of dwellings 45 219; (84 per cent in the whole country, 303 958 dwellings). (Rahva demograafiline..., 1924; Eesti arvudes 1920-1935, 1937); *active construction of residential buildings started in the second half of the 1920s and continued in the 1930s with many stone buildings added in the course of the development of the central area of the city;

*architecture representing most styles of the time was created increasingly by Estonian architects (earlier architects being of Russian and German origin);

*relatively small blocks of flats were a dominating housing type, consisting in the main of 1- and 2- room flats. In the 1930s the share of 3-room flats increased: the average number of rooms per flat was 2.5 by 1934 (Eesti arvudes 1920-1935, 1937);

*the average floor space per capita before the WW II was 13.8 m² and the privacy indicator improved from 1.6 in 1922 to 1.3 by 1934 (Eesti arvudes 1920-1935, 1937);

*living standard became higher and housing construction became more of a focus of careful and integrated (local government, property developers, engineering, construction and maintenance companies) urban planning (Loman, 1938); special institutional measures were taken to control the building quality (Building Loans Committee; Kalm, 2001).

Tenure structure and relations:

*private rental housing dominated in the city: 91 per cent of housing constructed in 1918-1930 was in private ownership (Tallinna linna statistiline..., 1931);

*municipal share of housing ownership increased a few percents in 1930s, new buildings (in the central area especially) were designed with great care and were increasingly of higher quality;

*renting was a norm also for the middle classes;

*co-operative construction activities emerged in 1920s and then again at the end of the 1930s (when the national loan programmes were introduced);

*the movement 'own hearth' (Kalm, 2001; like 'own home' in Finland and Sweden, Ruonavaara, 1995) motivated housing improvement activities of individuals and strengthened 'home ideology' associated with privacy and homeownership.

Residential culture (Paadam, 2003):

*was based on a shared understanding that owners take care of property (daily maintenance, management and repairs) and residents respect the rules set by the owner and existing legislation;

*such an order was to a considerable extent negotiated in a way which satisfied both parties as residents largely strived to secure a sense of home not only by acquisition of secure tenure status but also by agreeing ways of behaviour in order to secure their sense of home in every sense of their residence.

II SOVIET OCCUPATION – 1940S – 1991

The built form and spatial conditions:

- *war time damages and in-flow of the Soviet immigrants caused a serious housing deficit. The housing deficit, especially for quality housing, lasted until the end of the period in the late 1980s;
- *the construction under the first years of occupation was characterised by the building of relatively small stone blocks;
- * a number of pre-war projects were completed, thus, the first post-war architectural contributions did not differ much from the pre-war design;
- *the impact of the Stalinist architecture could be defined as relatively liberal in Estonia, however, the Russian impact was clearly seen from the 1950s onwards on some sites (Kalm, 2001);
- * construction of large-scale housing started together with an extensive development of the building industries in the 1960s and flourished until the end of the 1980s;
- *relatively large blocks stand in the central sites of even the rural centres and the city of Tallinn grew towards suburban areas, next to the earlier created detached family housing districts;
- *family housing construction was not promoted but allowed to a limited extent to mitigate the deficit. Design and size, in particular, was highly controlled and standardised;
- *the dominating type of flats consisted of two rooms (40 per cent). The number of 3-room flats grew in the 1980s (Social trends 2, 2001). Bigger flats of more than 3 rooms made up about one tenth of all the types (Tallinn arvudes 2001, 2002);
- *the average floor space per capita followed the dynamics: 1945 – 9.3 m², 1955 – 9.1 m², 1960 – 10.8 m², 1985 – 18.1 m², end of 1980s – 21 m² (Bruns, 1993);
- * the privacy index for Tallinn housing was 2.1 in the years 1945-1960 and made a slow improvement up to 1.1 by the end of the 1990s (Arengukava 2001-2005, 2000).

Tenure structure and relations:

- *the main act of the occupation government concerned land and housing property nationalisation. Owners, especially of rental blocks in cities were expropriated of their property, often deported or evicted from their houses or flats occupied by their families and the property distributed to new tenants under the control and order of municipal authorities;
- *public housing became a dominating tenure type. The share of co-operative and privately owned family houses was small in Tallinn (14 per cent and 10 per cent respectively; Tallinn arvudes 2000, 2001). 'Ownership' became a myth in a sense that it could be defined by life-style rather than property ownership (land belonged to the state), however, it became the life-style that people dreamed of;

*housing provision was characterised by central distribution principles, implemented by local governments, employing organisations and central government to a limited extent;

* 'egalitarian housing distribution' was another myth of the time: higher status in the Soviet social hierarchy guaranteed choice of housing in all its dimensions on a larger scale;

*housing costs were low for the sector and was highly secured by public funding.

Residential culture (Paadam, 2003):

*was defined by the new official ideology of shared collective living, however, this never really accepted by individuals possessing a different experience from the pre-occupation period. These dispositions were passed over to the next generation;

*residential blocks were maintained and repaired by institutional owners; residents had no role or responsibility in these activities, except for co-operative blocks. As a result these buildings had and maintained a higher quality compared to the public blocks;

*older residential blocks from the pre-war period were gradually degrading as the central and local governments' investments were channelled into the construction of new pre-fabricated blocks;

*shortly after the war there were still shared understandings of a desired residential culture; the more established the Soviet socialist relations in the field became the more radically different became the residents' mentality, characterised by carelessness towards all scales of a residence beyond the boundaries of a flat. However, flats became the only secure and private place for creating a sense of home;

*the image of a 'happy collective way of Soviet ways of living' had, undoubtedly, a negative effect on the previously existing dispositions of, especially, the native residents with very distinct understandings of residence and home.

III REGAINED INDEPENDENCE - 1991

The built form and spatial conditions:

*at the beginning of the regained independence up to more or less the present, the existing housing fund consisted of the residential buildings inherited from the previous period. In Tallinn, in particular, large-scale housing with standardised design from different periods dominates (see Figure 1);

Figure 1. Households in different types of dwellings, 2003

Source: Statistical Office of Estonia.

Note: detached housing includes terraced houses and semi-detached houses. Blocks of flats consist of at least three separate flats.

*there are, nevertheless, particularly attractive areas, which have become subject to gentrification: the Old Town, central districts of high quality historical architecture, and other relatively central wooden areas;

*since a significant part of the old residential buildings belong to the heritage fund the gentrified areas have become vulnerable to unprofessional and ignorant renovation-restoration activities (Paadam, 2003);

*The Heritage Board members are active but as an institution underfinanced. Also, the legislation is weak in respect of sanctions against violations (Changing neighbourhoods in Tallinn..., 2002);

*the construction of residential blocks virtually ceased for the first years of independence due to the re-structuring of all activities in all fields in society as well as agents' re-positioning in the social space. In 2004, the yearly share of new construction or thoroughly rebuilt housing was 3% of the existing total stock (Statistical Office of Estonia).

*new construction market began to target primarily the affluent clients – the “nouveau riche” – at the beginning of the restoration of capitalist relations; from 2003-2004 onwards the real estate market was booming in parallel with the housing loan market, as a result of which a number of new ‘property villages’ have emerged in the suburban areas or outside Tallinn;

*from the end of the 1990s some programmes were introduced to promote purchase of housing particularly facilitating the entry into the housing market of young families, professionals and tenants in the restituted housing, e. g. in the form of income tax incentives (concerned only with housing loan interests) and additional housing loan guarantees to reduce the amount of down-payment;

*the latest trend, which is part of the new city planning is the newly built central high-rise blocks for affluent young clients.

*the privacy index for Tallinn housing was 1.1 in 2000 and has not changed since, whereas the floor space of 22.9 m² per capita (Population Census 2000) has increased to 26 m² in 2005 (Statistical Office of Estonia).

Tenure structure and relations:

*the first and most important act paving the way for the restructuring of housing relations was denationalisation of property - restitution of expropriated land and housing property and privatisation of the state, municipal and company housing by the sitting tenants;

*massive acquisition of homeownership has resulted in an even higher percentage of private housing in the total fund than in the pre-war time;

- *a straightforward outcome of restitution may be considered the restoration of the private rental sector of housing;
 - *denationalisation has caused three types of problems: (1) concerning tenants in the restituted housing – unequal opportunities for obtaining ownership of housing, (2) privatisation in haste – low income groups are in difficulties maintaining their homeowner status, pointing up the need for social policy measures, (3) almost full-scale privatisation left no resources managing the public needs for social and municipal housing – the need for new residential buildings;
 - *while at the beginning of the 1990s the housing costs made up 2-3 per cent of household expenditures, by the end of the 1990s they already made up 19 per cent on average (Social Trends 2, 2001), with a slight decrease to 16% in 2003 (Leibkonna elujärg 2004);
 - *there is no housing deficit in the country as a whole, but some in Tallinn. However, the deficit of quality is overwhelming;
 - *access to the housing market is difficult for new (e. g. young people) and non-affluent groups. At the same time the situation in financial markets has been favourable during last years - lower interest rates (3.3-3.5%) offered by banks have enlarged the circle of eligible households considerably. The current loan market shows a tendency of getting overheated, which should alert us about the future increase of risk (e.g. in case of unemployment, health problems etc);
 - *maintenance responsibility has passed over in full to individual owners. In order to manage property flat owners are bound by legislation to found flat-owners associations (governors assigned in houses with no association by maintenance companies having provided service earlier);
 - *maintenance services are marketed at a high competition level – owners of housing, flat owners' associations especially, are increasingly becoming experts on service quality.
- Residential culture (Paadam, 2003):
- *can be contradictory by nature: dispositions towards restoring caring behaviour on all scales of residence are confronted by habits obtained in the previous system;
 - *individualisation of residential strategies having focused on immediate living space needs to be balanced with collective actions on all scales of residence and in all types of housing;
 - *emergence of 'gated communities' can be seen in newly constructed detached family housing areas;
 - *'home ideology' (Ruonavaara, 1995) is highly promoted in a neo-liberal political context; it is the meaning of home which is sold at the market (Dovey, 1999) rather than housing (observation of new advertising culture).

What people have, want to have and can have – some evidence from recent housing studies

Having reviewed the structural changes through three different societal contexts we continue to focus on individual actors' current perceptions of housing, their preferences and opportunities for moving housing in search for more favourable conditions. Our overview is based on research data concerning the city of Tallinn originating from several recent quantitative and qualitative studies conducted by research groups such as (1) the unit of sociology, TTU (1999), (2) the department of family sociology, IISS, TPU (2003), and (3) the inter-university research group set up for EU NEHOM project (2002). If not stated otherwise, our discussion is based on the studies from 1999 and 2003, which, in general, have shown similar tendencies.

At first, we will comment briefly on the formation of the current tenure structure and the social characteristics of residents in different types of owner occupied and rental housing.

In Tallinn (and in Estonia) 96 per cent of housing is in private ownership and 4 per cent belongs to the public housing fund with 80 per cent of all households living in owner-occupied housing. Ownership of this housing property has been achieved in various ways: 50 per cent of all households are former sitting tenants having privatised their flats at considerable discount prices within the special schemes launched for privatisation of the public housing in the 1990s; 20 per cent of all households have bought their present flats at the market and 11 per cent are owners of either inherited or purchased single-family houses (IISS, 2003). House owners having acquired their houses during the Soviet system had to privatise land in order to secure their property ownership.

Homeowners are divided into two different groups of house-owners and flat-owners.

The small group of house-owners (11 per cent) have historically consisted mainly of Estonians residing in houses built before the WWII, during the 1950s-1970s at times of great public housing deficit; however, the number of wealthy Russian house buyers among them has been gradually growing especially in property developments in new locations. House-owners are a diverse group in terms of the value of their property as well as their economic capacity to act in modern circumstances. The share of better-off households (monthly net income above 5000 EEK per a household member) among them has been increasing due to new house purchasers and was twice as large as the average for the Tallinn population in 2003.

Flat-owners are in the majority the former sitting tenants of blocks of flats in large-scale housing areas constructed between 1960s and 1980s. Forming a particularly heterogeneous group in terms of their demographic characteristics as well as their economic, social and cultural capacities, they can also be distinguished by ways they became owners of housing property. The group of flat owners consists to a larger extent of "privatisers" representing well above average groups of non-Estonians, elderly, and less solvent residents in the city. The 'buyers' form a group similar to new tenants in the private rental sector who are, in general, younger and better off residents.

Despite homeownership having become a normalized housing behaviour, this widely accepted rule has not been followed in all individual residential strategies, either voluntarily or non-voluntarily.

Thus tenants also represent a heterogeneous group of residents in different types of the relatively marginal rental sector. As concerning the private rental sector there are two groups of tenants disposed to similar current strategies but with distinct capacities and motivational bases: (1) younger single people or cohabiting couples with relatively good monthly income having moved to Tallinn from other parts of the country who prefer renting at this phase of their life as they are not yet willing to settle down or have not enough capital to invest in the purchase of their own housing, which is, nevertheless, their future intention; (2) relatively older and/or with less economic capital, the tenants forced into their current tenure situation due to property restitution and their non-eligibility to privatise that housing as former sitting tenants of the then public housing who have not been able to change their housing situation for different reasons. Nevertheless, purchase of housing property in the market is particularly unaffordable for this group. The tenants in municipal housing make up the smallest group - 3 per cent -. There is, no doubt, an increasing demand for the enlargement of this sector for the clientele from both the restituted section of the private rental housing as well as the owner-occupied sector of housing.

How do residents with experience of different tenure status perceive their housing situation today?

It is not a surprise, especially when the massive change of tenure structure is concerned, that the highest satisfaction today can be found among house-owners (90 per cent satisfied) and the lowest among tenants (60 per cent). The share of the satisfied residents among flat-owners is 76 per cent. While house-owners value most the privacy in their residence as well as their peaceful, quiet and pleasant neighbourhood, the flat-owners are most satisfied with comforts in their flat. The two groups together with tenants are satisfied with easy accessibility of their housing location. During the four years between two surveys (TTU and IISS, 1999-2004), the satisfaction with housing costs, which are considered fairly reasonable, and good condition of their residential buildings has risen significantly among the Tallinn flat-owners and tenants. This may signal positive developments in the housing sector, where gradual improvements of physical and technical condition of buildings have enabled residents to economize housing costs and enjoy higher comfort. This observation is particularly sound in respect of blocks where residents have founded flat owners' associations (Changing neighbourhoods..., 2002).

However, compared to other tenure groups, tenants form a more diverse group in terms of satisfaction levels. It is argued that their relatively lower satisfaction with current circumstances has been affected by their earlier housing path and changes in tenure relations. Tenants in restituted housing, whose current ambivalent status has not particularly been in their own hands but was designed by the ownership reform, are considerably less satisfied with their current status compared to the 'voluntary' tenants in the private rental sector, having been able to make a choice and construct their current housing strategy in accordance with their capacities, high or low.

As the most dissatisfied group the tenants have the highest potential for moving housing: half of them are planning to move within the next five years. It is considered that the higher potential of tenants' housing mobility is related to the temporality of their current housing situation as it is believed to be a phase before moving on to 'one's own home' (NEHOM 2002, TTU 1999).

Nevertheless, also, the general rate of potential 'movers' has increased two times during the last decade in all tenure groups (see figure 2).

Figure 2. Residents' intentions to move housing within the next five years

Source: IISS 1993, IISS 2003, TTU 1999

The growing numbers of potential movers is supposed to reflect the widened scale of options available for individual actors at the property market together with the development of financial institutions and more favourable long-term housing loan conditions emerging in parallel with the gradually raising incomes and living standard.

The 'push' factors which trigger moving are connected with insufficient quality of housing, or its unsuitability for the household's needs (i.e. shortage of space, inconvenient interior planning of a flat etc), or unpleasant neighbourhoods (poor natural and aesthetic environment, as well as dislike of other residents of very different views on residential culture and behaviour) and appear the same for all 'movers'.

The residential districts targeted by potential movers are primarily those of new housing developments, either of single-family houses or blocks, as well as prestigious established districts of detached housing, Old Town and central areas. The latter concentrate residential architecture of high cultural as well as symbolic value with strong reference to the residential culture characteristic of the pre-occupation period before the 1940s. The areas of small-size, often wooden blocks with semi-private gardens, which are located close to the centre have become popular moving destinations for younger middle-class families.

On the total scale of preferences the above housing types and locations dominate as a clear contrast to the Soviet-type large-scale blocks and their mixed compositions of residents. Housing preferences and the potential of moving housing are mostly related to the search of a place to create a home, where images of an ideal home are essential. All housing studies in Tallinn and Estonia have shown that 'a house of one's own' – a single-family house – is a dominating image. Different studies indicate that 55-60 per cent of potential movers cannot actually make that choice, mainly for the lack of economic resources (the average monthly net income per household member was in 2003 in Tallinn 3470.- EEK; 2788.- in Estonia) . In 2003, individuals made 46972 real estate transactions (16 per cent more than during previous year, data for Estonia) with an average value of 418 000 EEK. (Arco Vara 2004). Lack of finances and inability to get a housing loan is also defining the housing path for residents in the rental sector. In addition to these economic constraints, one third of the tenants have complained (2003) that their housing choices are constrained by a limited variety of available good quality housing at the rental market. One of the most significant factors distinguishing between people's economic capacity from the beginning of the ownership reform has been their positioning in the market after the denationalisation of housing property: they either became owners of restituted or privatised property of distinct market value or did not become property owners after all if they were situated as tenants in restituted housing or in public housing not subjected to privatisation.

However, the realisation of preferences in actual residential strategies depends on individuals' and families' capacities, which have been obtained in the conditions of previous social systems of capitalist and socialist nature of relations (respectively before the 1940s and until 1991) and newly established structural circumstances, which intersect with unique personal experiences. Hence, individuals' and families' capacities appear as differentiated equally in terms of their economic status as well as their social and cultural dispositions.

Connecting ideological shifts with field formation in housing

The modern formation of housing relations in Estonia can be best observed in the study of three phases in the history of its social systems, two of which are shaped by capitalist relations and one, the intermediary phase, by social relations formed under state socialism. Hence, the phases of the development of the field are disconnected by fundamental structural transformations closely bound to radical ideological shifts in the understanding of the social relations in a society. The consequences of breaks or disconnections between the two phases in capitalist relations can, in our view, be analysed only through the dialectics of disconnections-connections between all three phases in the development of relations in the housing field. It is of particular interest in this context how the change of dominant ideological discourse at each of the societal ruptures relates to the restructuring of the relations between institutional and individual actors and, hence, the making of residential culture. A number of authors have emphasised the time factor in this process. This implies that the emergence of a dominant ideology and (re)shaping of social institutions can be understood only over an extended period of time (Kemeny, 1992: 95).

Having introduced in this paper the basic characteristics of the field of housing before WW11, during the Soviet system, and in the current situation in terms of the changes of the built forms and spatial conditions of residences, tenure structure and its relational aspects as well as the perception of residential culture, we contend that all different previous experiences have contributed to the formation of modern preferences of residents. The latter are quite differentiated due to distinct earlier experiences both on personal and collective levels and the previous as well as current conditions which have defined the structural boundaries for the realisation of individual aspirations in the field. However, it is considered that structural conditions, especially the social relations in the Soviet system and economic constraints in the current system cannot be viewed as the sole factors determining the formation of individuals' preferences. As has been said earlier in this paper, the multi-fold cultural experiences are a strong driving force shaping the relatively persistent cultural dispositions of distinct groups. Therefore the ideological shifts changing the structural context of field relations may either be strongly opposed by individuals, particularly in respect of the myths of ideal residential culture, or supported by them in actual strategies of residents in respect of their consistency with recognised values. The current preferences in the housing field which predominantly centre around the detached housing ideal as opposed to the overwhelming experience of residing in large public blocks in the ideological context of the previous system signify that there has been no convergent shifts between formal ideology and the cultural dispositions of individuals, especially among those with alternative immediate or communicated experiences on a family level. And last but not least, these alternatives have been maintained, although on a low level in quantitative terms due to a symbolic affect of residential buildings of distinct form, aesthetics and age having existed in parallel to the dominant physical structures symbolising different ideology and thus the quality of life.

REFERENCES

Arengukava 2003-2009 (2002).

www.tallinn.ee/est/linna_juhtimine/juhtimise_lahtekohad/arengukavad_ja_strateegiad/arengukava_2003_-_2009

Bourdieu, P. (1999a/1972) *Outline of the Theory of Practice*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Bourdieu, P. (1994) *In Other Words. Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Bourdieu, P. (1998) *Practical Reason. On the Theory of Action*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Bruns, D. (1993) Tallinn. Linnaehituslik kujunemine, Valgus, Tallinn.

Changing Neighbourhoods in Tallinn: Mustamäe, Kalamaja, Kadriorg (2002) Paadam, K. (ed) Tallinn: TTU Press.

Dovey, K. (1999) *Framing Places. Mediating Power in Built Environment*. London: Routledge.

Eesti arvudes 1920-1935 (1937), Eesti Statistika Keskbüroo, Tallinn.

Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Giddens, A. (1997/1984) *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gurney, G.M. (1999b) *Pride and Prejudice: Discourses of Normalisation in Public and Private Accounts of Home Ownership*. *Housing Studies*, 14: 163-183.

Jacobs, K. (1999) *The Dynamics of Local Housing Policy. A Study of Council Housing Renewal in the London Borough of Hackney*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Kalm, M. (2001) *Eesti 20.sajandi arhitektuur. Estonian 20th century architecture*, Prisma Prindi Kirjastus, Tallinn.

Kemeny, J. (1992) *Housing and Social Theory*. London: Routledge.

Kemeny, J. (1995) *From Public Housing to the Social Market. Rental policy strategies in comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.

Leibkonna elujärg (2004) Tallinn: Statistical Office of Estonia

Loman (1938) *Uus Kopli*. In: *Varamu*. 2., pp. 725-736

Overview of the Estonian property market. 1st half of 2004. (2004). Arco Vara Real Estate Company. http://www.arcovara.ee/vfs/48/Eesti%20kinnisvaraturu%20ylevaade%202004%201pa_ENG.pdf

Paadam, K. (2003) *Constructing Residence as Home: Homeowners and their Housing Histories*. TPU Dissertations on Social Sciences. Tallinn: TPU Press.

Rahva demograafiline koosseis ja korteriolud Eestis. 1922.a. Üldrahvalugemise andmed. Vihk 1 (1924), Riigi Statistika Keskbüroo, Tallinn.

Ruonavaara, H. (1995) "Housing Discourse and Detached House Ownership in Early 20th Century Finland", pp. 261-276 in J. Allen, I. Ambrose and S. Brink (eds.) Making Them Meet. Policy. Design. Management. Satisfaction, CIB Publication-176, SBI, Hørsholm.

Ruonavaara, H. (1996b) "The Home Ideology and Housing Discourse in Finland 1900-1950", Housing Studies, Vol. 11, No 1, 89-104

Rowlands, R. and Gurney, C. M. (2000) "Young People's Perceptions of Housing Tenure: A Case Study in the Socialization of Tenure Prejudice", Housing, Theory and Society Vol.17, No. 3, 121-130

Statistical Office of Estonia, <http://pub.stat.ee/px-web.2001/dialog/statfilere.asp>, 01.10.2004

Social Trends 2 (2001), Statistical Office of Estonia, Tallinn.

Tallinn arvudes 2001 (2002), Tallinna Linnavalitsus, Tallinn.

Tallinna linna statistiline aastaraamat. VII Aastakäik (1931), Linna Statistikabüroo väljaanne, Tallinn, pp. 80-99

Touraine, A. (1988) Return of the Actor. Social Theory in Postindustrial Society. Minnesota: Minneapolis University of Minnesota Press.