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Abstract

This paper presents a comparative analysis of the housing systems of market countries in Western Europe and countries with transitional economies in Eastern Europe. The research focuses on the housing stratification defined as social inequalities in housing needs. Data were collected from the descriptive statistics of sociodemographic and cross-country differences presented by Eurostat and NGO Housing Europe containing indicators of housing stratification.

The study showed a discrepancy between housing conditions in the Eastern European and developed Western countries in meeting housing needs. Exploring differences in the distribution of the population by place of residence and by type of residence, the authors come to a conclusion on the existence of a “cargo cult” formed in the former socialist countries with respect to residential real estate.

The concept of “rumanianization” is suggested as a result of the ranking of maturity and effectiveness of housing policies in different countries. It describes the worst case of organizing relationships in the housing sphere. This case presumes that most dwellings remain in unserved and unencumbered private property, that mortgage and housing loans are absent or underdeveloped, and that any types of rentals are unaccounted for by the statistics and thus stay outside of state control.

The authors demonstrate that use of the positive European experience in reduction of social inequality in housing may improve the efficiency of the implementation of national and regional housing programs and also may provide a transition to a socially oriented type of economic development in the future.
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INTRODUCTION

Housing stratification is one of the main types social-economic segregation that reflects the degree of social inequality in housing sphere. But it is noted by researchers that problem didn’t get properly measure of attention in science literature (Kornev 2005: 77-85). The peak of this publications happened in the end 1990 and early 2000 – in the period, as scientists admitted, when «the stratum of provided house-tenants and owners» hadn’t been yet big on the housing marketplace (Ronge 2000: 65).

Today it becomes apparently that starting processes of previous egalitarian housing structure transformation require to be circumstantially researched first because of social inequality degrees growth.

The purpose of this research are: to realize comparative analysis of housing systems of Central European countries marketplace and Eastern European countries with transitive economic; to assess possibility of positive experience in decision of housing problem in Russian realities on researched basis and account of obtained results in development and realization of Russian housing politic.

Comparative analysis of housing systems is focused on features of different countries housing stratification, that is determined as social inequality («vertical and horizontal differentiation» - Sorokin 1992: 259) in satisfaction of housing needs.

Methodological basis of research in housing stratification was formed in classic economic sociology limits, but first – in Marxism. Just in Marxism housing need was considered as material need, satisfaction of which was powerful stimulus of further industry development and improvement. At that time in the limits of postulating the dysfunctionality of social inequality in the conflictological paradigm housing inequality was accepted as obstacle of social development and was to be obviated in society of further in social equality. There is not «housing need» in «sketches» of future society, it disappears with «exploitation and oppression of the working classes by the ruling classes» that caused this need. But until that time housing need is shown as «distinctive aggravation poor housing
conditions for workers that was caused with migration to the big cities, huge increase in rent, growing people-crowding one house, impossibility for someone to find house» (Engels 2012: 16).

Next stage of theoretic interest to «housing question» in sociology is related to amplification of industrialization and urbanization processes determined necessity of research their social consequences.

Sociologists of the Chicago school work a lot in research that problem (R.Park, E.Burgess, L.Wirth, H.W. Zorbaugh), they researched social-housing categories of big American city and formation of urban areas regularities – «concentric rings».

Sociological methods of gathering primary information were improved in Chicago school research: from simple problem-oriented investigation of housing conditions to various statistical methods, questionnaire survey, analysis of personal documents, ethnographical monitoring etc. Cartography took special place among these methods, it was very productive in research of housing stratification. Further development of vision about housing stratification tied to definition «housing class», introduced by J. Rex and R. Moore (Rex, Moore 1967) on the basis of research black citizen segregation reasons that live in defined part of Birmingham, has low income and racial discrimination. After studying the stratification of big British city researchers had introduced six housing classes by types of house and differences of rights to it.

Definition «housing class» was used in cooperative Russian-American monography «Housing stratification of city: marketplace revolution of Soviet model» (Krotov, Buravoy, Lytkina 2003: 12-13), where theoretic model was shown, it was based on thesis about the interconnection and interdependence between housing and social differentiation. That interconnection in turn is structured as interdependence between three classes – housing, economic and social.

The modern sociologic idea replenished conceptual arsenal with studying problems of impact of migration, fertility, low income national mentality to type of
building, formal and informal practices of resettlement and urbanization, housing conditions and household possibility for their improvement (Starikova, Bushkova-Shiklina 2015: 74).

We should note publications among papers about social stratification problems, they contain analysis of modern marketplace housing policy in European Union it helps to assess institutional innovations in housing. As example in O. Bessonovas opinion, in these countries integration marketplace and distributive institutions, such as public house-sector, housing dotations, dotations for building, subsidies for rent, formation of hypothecary state corporations, etc. (Bessonova 2012:78).

After studying preparedness of housing stratification problem in foreign and national science literature it is possible to state that there are not papers in modern sociology that contain analysis of various statistic information which reflects real position of housing stratification in European Union. This research is directed to overcome these difficulties.

Empirical base is information from descriptive statistic of social-demografic and international differences, submitted Eurostat-service and nonprofit organization «Housing Europe» on the basis of which indicators of housing stratification were submitted.
THE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY HABITAT

Immediately we should note that united policy to satisfaction of housing needs in European Union doesn’t exist. Every state decides housing problem in its way using historic experience of civilizational and cultural features, modern economic situation and reformation of previous structure specific.

Eurostat (Eurostat 2017) and nonprofit organization «Housing Europe» (European federation of public, cooperative and social housing) methodic determines type of living in house through the tenure status.

Definition «tenure status» is complicated for understanding because according to rules of Russian language word «possession» as actual possession means «property» as synonym. But according to Western traditions (standarts) possession doesn’t mean property. In Roman law definitions «propriety» (proprietas), «possession» (possessio), «keeping object» (detentio) are codified. But with that it said about possession and keeping object. Tenure status units two elements: fact of a thing (corpus possidendi) and intent to own a thing (Ioffe, Musin 1975: 68-69). The discrepancies of that categories in Russian linguistic (juristic too) and in Western traditions burn certain discrepancy.

Pierre Bourdieu discovers tenure position learning from average chances for getting available material and cultural goods and service and he determined it as socially qualified physical location – original place of habitat. In French sociologists opinion chances are specific for tenants of that area in available material (money, private transport, etc) and cultural abilities to get, so habitant can take house physically, but not live in it if he doesn’t possess necessary things (P. Bourdieu 2007: 59). The most correct way to understand P. Bourdieu’s research about «tenure status» we should use his term «habitat».

Using Eurostat statistic give possibility to see country differences in citizen distribution in habitat and types of living in houses. (page 1).

---

1 Housing need is attributed by T. Parsons to important components of every social group «life-level» internal need. (Parsons 2002: 376)
2 As example – professor working in university has the right to live for time when he works – it is tenure status.
3 Pierre Bourdieu gives the example with Spanish servant from XVI Paris region, he says that she doesn’t have abilities to get goods and service suggested by region, but her owner has that abilities.
Resource: Eurostat (2017)
Remark: EU-28 - EU countries; EA-19 - Euro area countries
Page 1. Citizen distribution European Unity countries in habitat. 2015.

Eurostat makes four types of house-living:
- property (owner occupied, no outstanding mortgage or housing loan) (private property);
- property (owner occupied, with mortgage or loan);
- tenant-market price;
- tenant-reduced price or free.

As we see in page 1, in Eastern European countries the most common is private property, in Western European countries – property with mortgage or loan (Sweden – 63.4 %, Netherlands – 60.1 %), tenant-market price (Germany – 39.9 %, Austria – 29.6 %).

Housing Europe (Housing Europe 2017) in research of European housing policy extends types of distributing in habitat and types of house-living (page 2).
Resource: Housing Europe 2017: 30-88.
Page 2. Distributing in habitat and types of house-living. 2015.

Housing Europe отделяет частное владение собственностью (owner occupied) от прямого владения собственностью (direct ownership), игнорируя ипотечное жилье (owner occupied, with mortgage), частных арендаторов (private rent) от нанимателей жилья (tenant ownership), расширяя и дополняя арендные отношения социальными (social rent), государственными (public rent) и со сниженной оплатой (reduced rent).

Housing Europe separates private ownership of property (owner occupied) from direct ownership of property (direct ownership) ignores owner occupied property, with mortgage, private rent from tenant ownership, extends and supplements social rent, public rent and reduced rent.

Selection in that methodic various types of house-rent – tenant and rent, it is from housing relations written in Common Law of Great Britain where difference between definitions «possession» and «occupation» is shown. If first is inherent for tenant who can require from everyone including owner prevention of rights violations, second is inherent for hotel guest (Pacia 2016: 40-44). So isolating tenant, who is independent from owner and has rights and duties, from lessee, who is dependent from owner and has only duties, it is inherent in European countries.
Information from page 2 demonstrates differences of housing sphere in developed countries of Western Europe and developing countries of Eastern Europe. In the territory of former socialistic Commonwealth in housing sphere private property right dominates rent relations, social direction in satisfaction of housing need gives way commercial interests.

Comparison of Eurostat and Housing Europe methods gives possibility to contrast and unit types of distribution in habitat and types of house-living into common classification (page 3).

Resource: authors on the base of methodics by Housing Europe (2015: 30-88), Eurostat (2017).
Page 3. Distributing of EU countries population in habitat. 2015.

Set of Eurostat and Housing Europe information permits to reason about housing policy diversity in European Union and to make preliminary finding existence of two interdependent ways to satisfy housing needs dating to the P. Proudhon about «property as result of borrowing» (P. Proudhon 1998: 7-9) and F. Engels about «property as result of work» (Engels 2012: 19).

It is seen from history in developed countries Proudhon’s definition of property changed with consumer attitude (discovered by P. Saunders) to house as luxury with all inherent subsidiary rights and duties.
In turn, waiver of solidary positions «house as means of production» satisfying intention of ownership (private property) of real estate happened in previous socialistic states.

So, in Romania 95.6 % of housing are ownership, in Croatia 95.2 %, in Lithuania – 81.3%, etc. Herewith, another ways are not developed, such as rent, possession, mortgage loan.

We should note that in Baltic states and Poland before crisis 2008 there were attempts to introduce institute of mortgage loan, but deal had speculative nature, caused by difference of national currency, rate of inflation, subsidized by Scandinavian and Swiss banks. Colliding with risk of non-payment mortgage loan marketplace collapsed, subsidiary organizations went bankruptcy connected to foreign finances.

Interesting fact – comparison with Spanish experience, where building companies saving themselves from bankruptcy and financial insolvency in mortgage period are forced to introduce tent for minimal (communal) payment or unpaid rent.

Economically developed countries do similar way, where they use experience in deciding problem of housing needs. So, in Sweden private property – 7.2% of real estate, 41.4% - mortgage loan, 17% - private rent, 17 % - social rent, 17.4 % - tenant.

In Netherlands 7.7 % - private property, 60.1% – mortgage loan, 7% - private rent, 25.2% - social rent. Interesting fact – there are 14 % - private property, 46.9 % mortgage loan, 39 % - rent in Denmark, refusing private property is encouraged – high taw for land plot, tax-free payment in sale.

We suppose that value of housing\(^4\) can decrease in universal and monotonous distribution of it because of loss of importance for further development, so, real estate doesn’t move the class of luxury interesting for investigation, but doesn’t part of surplus value as means of production.

\(^4\) Value of housing (housing value) and it’s material and non-material cost are understood as synonyms, from German etymology «Wert». From G.Simmel point of view, «exchange cost – characteristic or function that are taken at a time with another features, must be separated from from them and to take independent significant group inherent for various goods, it must become definition above all single and symbol» (Simmel 2015: 131).
As example we see situation in Romania where citizens suppose the prices are too high, when the price of housing are almost the lowest in European Union, according to high realtor and lawyer’s prices (Romanian Property…) in confirms supposition about exaggerated expectations from institution of private property for real estate.

We consider these expectations as model of institutionally defined expectations, that were described by T. Parson, when the recognition of the authorities (ownership right) are institutionally expected from economic subjects, and the (subjects) accept this rights (T. Parson 2002: 337).

In Eastern European countries changes happened in social system, as result the process of reception of a unified model of building free marketplace capitalism arised. Fred Block criticized old paradigm of state’s intervention to economic activity, where contrast of socialistic state and state of public goods, that causes meaning of new paradigm of marketplace reconstruction, giving vision as attempt of explaining marketplace reforms in states with transit economics (Block 2004: 35-56). But in fact, class of owner, that was created on the basis of built housing in privatization way, became unavailable to take responsibility for acquired property (paying high taxes, building maintenance and repair) and to hold up their ends from institutional expectation (transfer housing into current assets).

So, we can discuss about peculiars cargo cult⁵ in relation to real estate, it was formed in previous socialistic countries.

---

⁵ Cargo cult is like fetishism of goods (J. Baudrillard) – it’s a fetishism of product depending of industry and label-values. Modern fetishism of subject is in relation to subject-label deprived of its substance and history and minimized to position of any difference and introduced to system of these differences (J. Baudrillard 2007:114).
DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION BY TYPE OF HOUSING AND HOUSING AVAILABILITY

It is advisable to give classification of distribution of the population by type of housing. Using information from Eurostat, the main type of housing in European Union is house (page 4).

As it is shown on the page 4 house is prevailing type of building in many European countries. In Baltic countries – Estonia (54,6% of population), Latvia (56,8 % of population), in Spain (45,4 of population) dominating type of building (housing fund) are apartment house or flat in a building with ten or more dwellings. Sufficiently important but not primary type of house in Malta (49% of population) and in Germany (40% of population) – small apartment house (flat in a building with less than ten dwellings).

Resource: Eurostat (2017)
Remark: EU-28 - EU countries; EA-19 - Euro area countries
Page 4. Distribution of the population by type of housing. 2015.
It is shown in page 5 (Eurostat information) detached house as private building is mostly presented in Croatia (73.4 % of population), in Slovenia (65.1 % of population). Semi-detached houses are widespread in Netherlands (59.9 % of population), in Great Britain (59.9 % of population). Flat way is main in apartment and small apartment houses in Baltic countries, Spain (65.9 % of population) and Germany (57.333 % of population).

We should refine apartment buildings in Spain got popular in 1950-1960. In FRG that type of building came from GDR (Plattenbauten - large panel building) after their unification (Schwenk 1997: 67). So experience of city planning in socialistic period in Romania (Sistematizarea - systematization) (Iasi… 2008) and in Hungary (Panelház – panel houses) (Tamás 2005: 77) didn’t have influence to distribution of the population by type of housing, in spite urban nature; in these countries private houses (60.1 and 62.1%), it wasn’t reflected in average metric area of real estate (page 6).
Indicators of housing availability with square meters by tenure status permit to confirm conclusion about Eastern European citizen’s high expectations from institute of private property. In spite of average indicator of housing space for one owner (95,9 sq.m.), in Romania – 63,2 sq.m., in Latvia – 62,5 sq.m., in Lithuania – 63,2 sq.m. We should note that degree of city urbanization doesn’t exert size of population housing (page 7).
In spite of big difference between housing in big cities, suburbs, rural settlement of developed countries – as example in Belgium (117,3 sq.m. in big cities, 134,4 sq.m. in suburbs, 121,8 sq.m. in rural settlement), in Netherlands (94,3 sq.m. in big cities, 117,5 sq.m. in suburbs, 126,2 sq.m. in rural settlement), these difference don’t mean a lot in previous socialistic states.

The difference between property in city, in suburb or in rural settlement by size of housing space are insignificant, it indicates Eastern European citizen’s wish to be property-owner, literally to own property. That explanation is shown in middle housing availability, square meters of which is not considered by Eurostat. So, as example from Eurostat it is seen in Finland owner of property has 88,6 sq.m., dweller uses only 25,7 sq.m. from them, in Poland from 75,2 sq.m. only 23,6 sq.m. is used (Kuryachy et al. 2016: 9-15).

So, if 3-4 dwellers (person who is not owner) use 1 unit of big size property (housing object), then in developed countries 1-2 dwellers use 1 unit of small property. In another words, in Eastern European countries we can trace the wish to have more property (in number) without trembling to lose in status of real estate.
and its size. This attitude caused negative effect in housing conditions related to the risk of overpopulation and crowding.

**HOUSING CONDITIONS OF EU CITIZENS.**

Researched information from Eurostat about places of habitat, types of housing, housing availability with square meters determine nature of European citizens housing conditions (page 8).

![Graph showing percentage of population living in severe housing deprivation rate](image)

*Resource: Eurostat (2017)*  
*Remark: EU-28 - EU countries; EA-19 - Euro area countries*  
*Page 8. Part of population (in percent) living in severe housing deprivation rate. EU countries. 2014-2015*

It differs from Russian realities where it is accepted to note bad housing conditions, in European countries according the Eurostat statistic severe housing deprivation rate is determined. As we see on page 8, about 5% of EU citizens live in severe housing deprivation rate. But there are significant differences between countries. So, there are Romanian citizens living in severe housing deprivation rate (19.8 of population), it is four times more that average level in Europe (4-5 %)

---

6 Severe housing deprivation rate are determined through the percentage of citizens who live in overwhelmed rooms, it demonstrates even one of elements of housing privation. Housing privation is measure of insufficient facilities and is a subject to consideration, if it has relation to households with problem of leak in roof, no bath or shower, no walk-in toilet, or house is too dark (Eurostat 2017).
population), in Hungary and Latvia that level is three more (15.5%). At the same time citizens have difficulties with housing in Netherlands – only 1% of population, in Belgium – 0.9% of population, in Finland – 0.7% of population.

Eurostat methodic is filled with social-economic stratification model (by income level), that consider part of population at risk of poverty, where «risk level is related to risk of poverty and it represents part of people with equivalent available income under risk of poverty which is fixed in level 60% of national median available income» (Eurostat 2017).

The severe housing deprivation rate is measured in indications of citizens overpopulation (crowding), part of population, who have problems with housing or who are deprived of some housing elements by income level status (poverty) (chart 1).

Discovered availability of European population with square meters has a significant impact on housing fund overpopulation. With that in developed states (Denmark, Netherlands) crowding makes not more % of total number of population, in developing states (Romania, Poland) – more than 40%.

However the analysis of relative deviation between overall coefficient population crowding and coefficient of group-population crowding at risk of poverty shows that citizens live in their houses all crowding in previous socialistic countries (as example, in Romania coefficient of crowding is 49.7% and 61.7% in indigent group); in that time in Western European countries (as example, in Netherlands – 3.3% and 13.2% conformably) the difference of coefficient of overpopulation is three more between total number of population and population at risk of poverty.

We observe difficulties in housing conditions in part of population, who have problem with housing or are deprived of some housing elements by poverty status (leak in roof, dampness of walls, floors, foundation, rottenness of window frames).

Low level of housing room quality is observed in Portugal (28.1% of all population, 36.6% of indigent group). The difference of this quantity between
average quantity for all population and population at risk of poverty is noticed in Slovakia is 1,5 times more.

Low level of availability with bathroom is typical for Romania (30,8% of population, 65,5% of indigent group), the difference between these groups is 1,5 times more. The biggest inequality in availability with bathrooms is observed in Slovakia – 7 times more, (0,8 % - all population, 5,5% - indigent group).

Difficulties with having plumbing devices with flush system are seen in Romania (32,8%- all population, 68% - indigent group). The biggest difference is seen in Slovakia – it is 5 times more (1,4% and 8% conformably).

It is possible to see insufficient level of illumination or, as it is shown in Eurostat, «dwelling too dark» in Hungary (8,6 – all population, 16,1 % - indigent group). Significant difference (in three times more) between that indication quantity for total number of population (3,1%) and quantity of population at risk of poverty (9,2%) is seen in Slovakia.
**Chart 1**

Quantity of severe housing deprivation rate in indications of citizens overpopulation (overcrowding), part of population, who have problems with housing or who are deprived of some housing elements by income level status (poverty). 2015.

| Country | Overpopulation (overcrowding) | Leaking roof / damp walls / floors / foundation or rot in window frames | Lack of bath/shower | Lack of indoor flushing toilet | Dwelling too dark |
|---------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
|         | Total population, (%)         | Population at risk of poverty, (%)              | Total population, (%) | Population at risk of poverty, (%) | Total population, (%) |
| EU-28   | 16.7                          | 29.5                                            | 15.2                | 24.0                          | 2.2               |
| EA-19   | 12.1                          | 24.2                                            | 16.0                | 24.4                          | 0.5               |
| Belgium | 1.6                           | 6.5                                             | 18.2                | 30.9                          | 0.7               |
| Bulgaria | 41.4                         | 48.5                                            | 12.9                | 26.3                          | 11.6              |
| Czechia | 18.7                          | 40.4                                            | 8.9                 | 17.8                          | 0.3               |
| Denmark | 8.1                           | 27.2                                            | 16.1                | 22.2                          | 2.2               |
| Germany | 7.0                           | 17.3                                            | 12.8                | 19.7                          | 0.0               |
| Estonia | 13.4                          | 15.0                                            | 13.4                | 21.8                          | 7.3               |
| Ireland | 3.4                           | 6.0                                             | 13.6                | 19.6                          | 0.2               |
| Greece | 28.1                          | 42.0                                            | 15.1                | 20.4                          | 0.5               |
| Spain   | 5.5                           | 11.4                                            | 15.2                | 21.3                          | 0.1               |
| France  | 7.4                           | 20.9                                            | 12.6                | 23.9                          | 0.5               |
| Croatia | 41.7                          | 45.0                                            | 10.9                | 21.0                          | 1.7               |
| Italy   | 27.8                          | 43.8                                            | 24.1                | 32.2                          | 0.4               |
| Cyprus  | 1.4                           | 3.5                                             | 26.5                | 33.9                          | 0.9               |
| Latvia  | 41.4                          | 49.4                                            | 24.4                | 38.7                          | 15.3              |
| Lithuania | 26.4                        | 34.5                                            | 17.0                | 30.3                          | 11.5              |
| Luxembourg | 6.8                        | 19.8                                            | 14.4                | 25.8                          | 0.1               |
| Hungary | 41.1                          | 62.0                                            | 25.4                | 44.9                          | 3.7               |
| Malta   | 3.5                           | 7.7                                             | 10.2                | 12.8                          | 0.2               |
| Netherlands | 3.3                        | 13.2                                            | 15.7                | 21.5                          | 0.1               |
| Austria | 15.0                          | 34.1                                            | 11.7                | 16.5                          | 0.5               |
| Poland  | 43.4                          | 59.7                                            | 11.9                | 21.2                          | 3.3               |

|        | EU-28        | Total population at risk of poverty, (%) | Total population at risk of poverty, (%) | Total population at risk of poverty, (%) | Total population at risk of poverty, (%) | Total population at risk of poverty, (%) | Total population at risk of poverty, (%) |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
|        | EU-28        | 16.7                                     | 29.5                                     | 15.2                                     | 24.0                                     | 2.2                                     | 6.6                                      |
|        | EA-19        | 12.1                                     | 24.2                                     | 16.0                                     | 24.4                                     | 0.5                                     | 1.3                                      |
|        | Belgium      | 1.6                                      | 6.5                                      | 18.2                                     | 30.9                                     | 0.7                                     | 1.6                                      |
|        | Bulgaria     | 41.4                                     | 48.5                                     | 12.9                                     | 26.3                                     | 11.6                                     | 33.2                                     |
|        | Czechia      | 18.7                                     | 40.4                                     | 8.9                                      | 17.8                                     | 0.3                                     | 1.0                                      |
|        | Denmark      | 8.1                                      | 27.2                                     | 16.1                                     | 22.2                                     | 2.2                                     | 6.7                                      |
|        | Germany      | 7.0                                      | 17.3                                     | 12.8                                     | 19.7                                     | 0.0                                     | 0.0                                      |
|        | Estonia      | 13.4                                     | 15.0                                     | 13.4                                     | 21.8                                     | 7.3                                     | 15.4                                     |
|        | Ireland      | 3.4                                      | 6.0                                      | 13.6                                     | 19.6                                     | 0.2                                     | 0.4                                      |
|        | Greece       | 28.1                                     | 42.0                                     | 15.1                                     | 20.4                                     | 0.5                                     | 0.9                                      |
|        | Spain        | 5.5                                      | 11.4                                     | 15.2                                     | 21.3                                     | 0.1                                     | 0.2                                      |
|        | France       | 7.4                                      | 20.9                                     | 12.6                                     | 23.9                                     | 0.5                                     | 1.0                                      |
|        | Croatia      | 41.7                                     | 45.0                                     | 10.9                                     | 21.0                                     | 1.7                                     | 5.9                                      |
|        | Italy        | 27.8                                     | 43.8                                     | 24.1                                     | 32.2                                     | 0.4                                     | 0.6                                      |
|        | Cyprus       | 1.4                                      | 3.5                                      | 26.5                                     | 33.9                                     | 0.9                                     | 2.9                                      |
|        | Latvia       | 41.4                                     | 49.4                                     | 24.4                                     | 38.7                                     | 15.3                                     | 36.0                                     |
|        | Lithuania    | 26.4                                     | 34.5                                     | 17.0                                     | 30.3                                     | 11.5                                     | 30.3                                     |
|        | Luxembourg   | 6.8                                      | 19.8                                     | 14.4                                     | 25.8                                     | 0.1                                     | 0.0                                      |
|        | Hungary      | 41.1                                     | 62.0                                     | 25.4                                     | 44.9                                     | 3.7                                     | 15.8                                     |
|        | Malta        | 3.5                                      | 7.7                                      | 10.2                                     | 12.8                                     | 0.2                                     | 0.1                                      |
|        | Netherlands  | 3.3                                      | 13.2                                     | 15.7                                     | 21.5                                     | 0.1                                     | 0.2                                      |
|        | Austria      | 15.0                                     | 34.1                                     | 11.7                                     | 16.5                                     | 0.5                                     | 1.1                                      |
|        | Poland       | 43.4                                     | 59.7                                     | 11.9                                     | 21.2                                     | 3.3                                     | 10.0                                     |
| Portugal | 10,3 | 21,0 | 28,1 | 36,6 | 1,5 | 3,0 | 1,0 | 2,6 | 8,0 | 11,0 |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Romania  | 49,7 | 61,7 | 12,8 | 26,6 | 30,8| 65,5| 32,8| 68,0| 5,8 | 10,4 |
| Slovenia  | 13,7 | 23,1 | 26,9 | 37,2 | 0,5 | 2,4 | 0,3 | 1,4 | 5,7 | 9,6  |
| Slovakia | 37,8 | 57,6 | 6,3  | 17,6 | 0,8 | 5,5 | 1,4 | 8,0 | 3,1 | 9,2  |
| Finland  | 6,7  | 21,0 | 4,4  | 6,2  | 0,8 | 2,4 | 0,5 | 1,5 | 4,0 | 6,0  |
| Sweden   | 11,6 | 36,1 | 7,5  | 9,7  | 0,6 | 2,2 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 5,3 | 5,9  |
| United Kingdom | 7,3 | 14,0 | 14,8 | 21,8 | 0,6 | 1,3 | 0,4 | 0,8 | 5,2 | 6,6  |

*Resource: [Eurostat 2017].*

So, it is possible to make preliminary conclusion in result of research Eurostat information about housing conclusions level.

Significant disproportions are found in made analysis in European citizens’s deciding housing problem. The nature of taking into account indications of social inequality basing Eurostat methodic demonstrates difference of housing conditions in Eastern Europe to central European level in accessibility of satisfying natural housing needs (Parsons 2002: 376). By one side, population of countries with transit economic meets problem in communal sphere or are deprived of some housing elements more often than another; by another side, there are not significant differences between severe housing deprivation rate of all population and part of population at risk of poverty. We think these events became result of united policy of socialistic city-planning that was adopted from USSR experience from time of panel building 1960-1970.

We see inequality, when housing conditions of indigent group are two (sometimes three) times more that another population in developed capitalistic countries with relatively stable situation and positive housing policy.

We should note nuances of separate approaches in deciding social matter and minimizing economic problems in developed countries f Western Europe. If Germany derived O. Bismarck corporatism of social policy, then Austria – F. Hayek liberal approach, and Sweden – his Nobel prize-colleague G. Myrdal (Блауг
The role of independent unionists is big in Denmark and Netherlands; leading state corporations are strong in Belgium. Syndicalist approach prospers in deciding social problems in France; situationistic – in Britain. Perhaps, that explains Western Europe countries subsidiarity as contrary to solidarity of Eastern European.

Scientists tried to generalize, to make the denominators the same, to explain social-economic processes of European society. The discussion topic about market economy affiliation (M. Weber: 1990 44-271), set in the beginning of XX century by M. Weber in «The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism», was developed by G.Esping-Andersen in the end of XX century, he tried to classify states in Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) by types of social policy various welfare profile. Danish sociologist G.Esping-Andersen uses two measurements for definitions of welfare inclusion into some social structures and classes in «The three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism» (Esping-Andersen 1991) - de-commodification and stratification; first is orientated to results of social policy. He noted three stable state groups: liberal regime (Great Britain, USA, Ireland, Canada, Australia), conservative regime (Germany, France, Austria, the Benelux countries, Italy), social-democratic regime (Scandinavian country). Main critics of that typology noted retirement from classic Weber conception of capitalism, personal global methodology, used by G.Esping-Andersen outdated information from 1980’s, narrowness and focus on 18 developed countries, ignoring gender approach (Andreas 2006: 3–26). Later K. Bambra polemizing with critics refreshed information about de-commodification and stratification, with that she proved the hypothesis of relatively unchanged Danish sociologist’s methodology. So typology of capitalistic societies, that he provided, are reliable and important for further research (Bambra 2004: 3–23).

N. Manning adhered G.Esping-Andersen methodology in relation to states of common welfare, he researched experience of state-management in post-socialistic

---

7 Subsidiarity as personal responsibility.
8 Solidarity as collective responsibility.
states and he noticed two social systems remaining from USSR dissolution. First – old socialistic state model, although reducing, but still having matter. Second – new and related to remaining and unoccupied system of social providing. With that second system moves to the social providing as goods with clear level-system of stratification and to the increasing marketplace’s role, but not to state control. As N. Manning supposes, though post-Soviet states should be added to European typology, fundamental changes, touching Central and Eastern European citizens, will resonate with longstanding traditions of developed states (Manning 1998: 48–67).

It is not difficult to note that the absence of uniformity in Western states can be reflected in housing policy. But experience, that was accumulated in states of Warsaw pact, post-Soviet republics and previous Yugoslavia, is not adapted to modern marketplace realities.
SATISFACTION WITH HOUSING

Eurostat demonstrates high indications of satisfaction with housing conditions in EU states. Average European indications grew up from 83.1% to 89.3% (2007-2012) (page 9).

Resource: Eurostat (2017)

Remark: EU-28 - EU countries; EA-19 - Euro area countries

Page 9. Part of EU population (in percent) satisfied with housing conditions. 2007 and 2012.

Rapid growth of population part, who are satisfied with housing, shows Lithuanian statistic (from 61.9% to 84% 2007-2012), in Hungary (from 61.7% to 80% 2007-2012). Curiosly satisfaction in Romania in these period grew up in 3.5 times more – from 18.8% to 87.7%. At the same time part of population, who are satisfied with their housing, decreases in Luxembourg (from 94.1% to 92.3% 2007-2012), particularly in Denmark (from 93.6 to 73.7% 2007-2012) (page 10).
We should note there are households with two grownups (in Poland – 16.9% of population) or households with children (in Bulgaria – 26.1% of population) in population distributed by types of household in countries with low or very low level of satisfaction with housing. In that side indication of satisfaction with housing causes interest in Denmark. Members of all households are not satisfied with their housing in this country (households with one person – 22.5%, households with two grownup – 22.9%, households without children – 22.8%, households with children – 30.2%); 26.3% of population demonstrate their general discontent.

In this case critical attitude to habitat is explained with high requirement to housing conditions and, perhaps, with influence of «left» organizations contributing citizens’s discontent with his their position and social policy, carried by authorities, authorities’s action.
We made the attempt to unite received information, to rank information on EU countries according to development of their housing relations.

The results of rank research are shown on the page 11.

We can note states as determined with high level of housing conditions: Sweden (69 points), Belgium, Finland, Luxembourg, Netherlands (64 points), Cyprus and France (60 points),

Level of housing relations above the average is observed in Denmark (59 points), Great Britain (58 points), Germany (55 points), Ireland (51 points), Austria (52 points), Spain (50 points).

Average level of housing relations is observed in Portugal (48 points), Malta (46 points), Italy (41 points).

Level of housing relations below the average is in Czechia (39 points), Slovenia (38 points), Slovakia (34 points), Greece (33 points), Estonia (30 points).

Low level is in Poland (27 points), Latvia (23 points), Hungary (22 points), Bulgaria (21 points), Croatia (21 points), Lithuania (20 points). The lowest level is in Romania (13 points).

For comparative estimate researcher made calculus of relative deviation, shown in percents to received average European level of housing relations (43,71 points) (page 12).

Remark: ranks were added from point system from appropriate definitions (no information= 0; the lowest – 1; very low – 2; low – 3; below the average – 4; average – 5; above the average – 6; high – 7; very high - 8). As result for every country number of points satisfying indications of housing conditions and rank of housing relations (10-very low; 20 – low; 30 – below the average; 40 – average; 50 – above the average; 60 - high).
Page 11. The rank (point system) indications of housing relations level in EU states.

Page 12. The results of comparison of estimates of housing relations in EU states with average European level.

As it is shown on page 12, estimates of studied states housing relations differ from average European level variously. Romania shows the lowest level (29.74% of relative deviation from average European level), that can permits to make
conclusion about existence of phenomenon «rumanianization», showing the worse way of organizing housing relations.

So, we must understand «rumanianization» as phenomenon, caused with negative realizing housing policy, where features are:

the only way of satisfaction of housing needs is private property of housing (owner occupied, no outstanding mortgage or housing loan);

the only place of habitat (living) is housing owner occupied, that is why marketplace of estate has capitalistic nature;

no mortgage, no housing credit or they are not developed;

rent and tenant (all types) are not considered by statistic and are located in «black» area of state control;

population chooses the «symbolic meaning» of things instead of personal growth and development of values (importance (germ. Wert), cost (germ. Kosten), price (germ. Preis)) of real estate;

negative experience is adopted of other countries in deciding housing problem.

**CONCLUSIONS**

As research shows, there is large diversity of housing politics, ways decide housing problems. That diversity is conditioned with historic and civilizational-cultural features of countries, their economic development level and with a couple of secondary factors.

Without developed approach of realizing housing policy social space of EU reminds regions around central area of Greenwich Village, described by A.Giddens (A.Giddens 2005: 495-496).

Research of Eurostat and Housing Europe’s statistic gave us footing to classify distribution of population by habitat and types of living in housing. Comparative analysis permitted to demonstrate significant differences in deciding housing problem in Western and Eastern Europe. The feature of housing relations in Western Europe is relation to subsidiary approach («house as luxury») in
opposing to Eastern European solidary overcharged expectation from right of private property for real estate, that came instead of socialistic city-planning, where «house as luxury».

Rent and tenant, mortgage loan, leasing, loan, social reimbursement of expenses for housing got extend in states with developed economic, that demonstrates stability of housing sector. The bet was privatization of realty in realization of unconditional common income method and integration of private property as only way to decide housing problem in developing economics.

Divercity of ways of deciding housing problem and citizen’s freedom to choose cause increase of housing value. Material and non-material cost of real estate in Western European countries is higher than in previous socialistic states (sometimes with only type of living in houses).

European experience of deciding problem of satisfying housing needs gives footing to note contradiction of priority and purposes state programs «Providing citizens of Russia Federation with available and comfortable housing and communal services» (About approval … 2014).

In that document decline of building housing fund cost and price for buying it is supposed to be alongside development of marketplace available rent-housing. Along with this, conditionality to applicant of state program (not less two living wage and not more four living wage) narrow range of persons who have abilities to comport with conditionality; as example in St. Petersburg it is 34,4% of citizens by relation between income and living wage, that limits citizen’s rights for satisfying their housing needs, and it means that id makes citizens dependent from income limits.

Eastern European citizen have overcharged expectations from institute of private property, that causes very negative influence to housing situation. We can note high coefficient of overpopulation (crowding), increasing part of population who have problems with housing or are deprived of some housing elements by income level status (poverty) here.
Social-economic stratification model (by income level) basing Eurostat’s methodic considers part of population at risk of poverty, demonstrates significant disproportions in deciding housing problems in European population. Inequality is observed in developed countries with relatively stable situation, in which housing level of indigent groups is two, even four time more than remaining citizens.

We think considering this negative experience, availability of significant part of population at risk of poverty (as example it is 25.4% of St. Petersburg citizens having income less than 60% of median income), receiving European criteria of determining serious material deprivation, can help us to increase efficiency of development and realization of Russian housing policy, minimization of supererogatory social inequality problems.

The analysis of indications of citizens satisfying with their housing in EU countries demonstrates personalization of critical attitude to habitat and type of living, that is explained with high requirements of citizens to housing conditions.

In result of ranking information to EU states by maturity criteria and efficiency of housing politics and analysis of their realization practice term «rumanianization» was suggested as characterizing the worst way of organizing relations in housing sphere.
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