

Housing Wealth and Consumption

Matteo Iacoviello*

Boston College and Federal Reserve Board

June 13, 2010

Contents

1	Housing Wealth	4
2	Housing Wealth and Consumption	6
3	The Theory	7
3.1	A Basic Model	7
3.2	Extensions	8
3.3	Taking Stock	9
4	Empirical Studies	9
4.1	The Conventional Wisdom	9
4.2	Studies Based on Time-Series Data	10
4.3	Studies Based on Micro Data	11
5	Conclusions	11

List of Figures

1.1	Housing wealth, Consumption and Non-Housing wealth in the United States from 1952 to 2008. The series are expressed in 2005 billions of dollars.	5
1.2	Annual changes in housing wealth and consumption in the U.S., from 1952 to 2008.	5

List of Tables

1.1	Composition of Household Wealth in the United States	4
-----	--	---

*iacoviello@bc.edu. Address: Boston College, Department of Economics, 140 Commonwealth Ave, Chestnut Hill, MA, 02467, USA. This is a draft entry for the International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home, Elsevier LTD, to be published in 2011. I thank Matteo Cacciatore and Morris Davis for helpful discussions.

Abstract

Housing wealth is about one half of household net worth. Consumption is a considerable fraction (about two thirds) of total Gross Domestic Product. Empirically, movements in housing wealth are associated with movements in consumption in the same direction. This observation has led many economists, commentators and policy makers to study how housing wealth and consumption are linked together. A sizeable portion of the comovement between housing wealth and consumption reflects common factors driving both variables, rather than the “wealth effect” of the former on the latter; however, a growing body of evidence suggests that the comovement is larger in developed financial markets and in the presence of liquidity constraints.

Keywords: Borrowing Constraints, Consumption, Consumption Function, Household Budget Constraint, Housing Tenure, Housing Wealth, Housing Wealth Effect, Life-Cycle Hypothesis, Utility Maximization.

Glossary

Housing Wealth: The total value of the housing capital in a particular country, regardless of whether it is owned or rented, mortgaged or not.

Consumption: The actual and imputed expenditures of households for the purpose of acquiring goods and services.

Wealth Effect: The notion that exogenous changes in wealth might affect individual behavior.

Household balance sheet, 2008 billion \$		FOF entry	
A	Assets	67,134	B100:1
B	Real Estate (Owner-Occupied Homes)	20,398	B100:3
C	Residential Real Estate of Noncorporate Business (Rented Homes)	4,964	B103:4
D	Other Tangible Assets	4,779	B100:2 less B100:3
E	Financial Assets less Residential Real Estate of Noncorp. Business	36,992	B100:8 less B103:4
F	Liabilities	14,216	B100:31
H	Household net worth	52,917	A-F
	Housing wealth	25,362	B+C
	Non housing wealth	27,555	D+E-F

Table 1.1: Composition of Household Wealth in the United States

1. Housing Wealth

At the aggregate level, housing wealth measures the market value of all the residential capital located in a particular country. According to this definition, aggregate housing wealth of U.S. households at the end of 2008 was 25.4 trillion dollars. Housing wealth is about half of total household net worth (which is 52.9 trillion dollars), and is larger than the total Gross Domestic Product (14.4 trillion dollars). Moreover, since financial wealth is more unequally distributed than housing wealth, housing wealth accounts for almost two thirds of the total wealth of the median household. A narrower definition of housing wealth includes only owner-occupied housing: using this definition, housing wealth in 2008 was 20.4 trillion dollars. Table 1.1 lists the balance sheet of the household sector in the United States at the end of 2008 using data from the Flow of Funds Accounts of the United States (FOF), using a breakdown of total household assets that differentiates housing capital from other forms of wealth. A large fraction (80 percent) of housing wealth is made up by the stock of owner-occupied homes. The remaining 20 percent (residential real estate held by nonfarm noncorporate businesses) is made up by the rental housing stock.

Figure 1 plots household consumption expenditures in the United States along with wealth divided into housing wealth and non-housing wealth. The series have been converted in 2005 billions of dollars using the deflator for personal consumption expenditures. The stock of housing wealth is large and moves slowly over time: size and persistence explain why changes in housing wealth are potential important candidates for understanding trends and cycles in aggregate consumption expenditures.¹

Figure 2 plots annual changes in housing wealth and personal consumption expenditures in the United States from 1952 to 2008. The two variables tend to move together in post-world war II U.S. history. Their contemporaneous correlation is 0.47. This correlation is larger than the correlation between consumption and the residual components of household wealth: for instance, the contemporaneous correlation between changes in inflation-adjusted financial wealth and consumption equals 0.38.

The joint comovement between housing wealth and consumption poses a challenging question for

¹Because the stock of new housing is large relative to its flow, fluctuations in housing wealth mainly reflect movements in the price of new and existing homes, rather than actual changes in the stock itself, especially at the horizons that are typical for business cycle analysis.




Figure 1.1: Housing wealth, Consumption and Non-Housing wealth in the United States from 1952 to 2008. The series are expressed in 2005 billions of dollars.




Figure 1.2: Annual changes in housing wealth and consumption in the U.S., from 1952 to 2008.

macroeconomists, policymakers and commentators. Do fluctuations in consumption reflect fluctuations in housing wealth, or are both variables determined by some other macroeconomic factor that moves them both, such as technological change, movements in interest rates, or other factors that contribute to business cycle fluctuations?

2. Housing Wealth and Consumption

A standard macroeconomics textbook contains a section presenting the economy’s consumption function. In this consumption function, the standard determinants of consumption are wealth W and permanent income Y , and the consumption function reads as follows:

$$C = \alpha W + \beta Y \tag{1}$$

where α and β measure respectively the marginal propensity to spend out of wealth and permanent income. This equation can be obtained as the solution to a problem where individuals maximize utility over time given a set of intertemporal trading opportunities, under very special assumptions about the set of trading opportunities and about the nature of the income process that the individual faces. An equation such as (1) dates back in the history of economic thought to at least Keynes, and was given prominence in the seminal work of Milton Friedman and Franco Modigliani.

When total wealth is broken down into housing HW and non-housing wealth NW , a generalization of the above equation that allows for different marginal propensities to consume of housing and non-housing wealth can be written as:

$$C = \alpha_N NW + \alpha_H HW + \beta Y. \tag{2}$$

It is typical to interpret the coefficient α_H of the regression in (2) as measuring the “housing wealth effect”. At the basic level, in fact, this equation states that if housing wealth were to change by, say, 1 dollar, consumption should change by α_H dollars. This equation provides the basis to think about the connection between housing wealth and consumption. However, it is entirely silent about the reasons why housing wealth moves. One important caveat in interpreting the results from this equation is that, while it is reasonable to interpret part of changes in the two right-hand side variables as exogenous at the *individual* level (promotions, bequests, lottery winnings, unemployment spells, gentrification and deterioration of a neighborhood are somewhat outside the control of the individual), the interpretation of this equation at the *aggregate* level is more complicated, since, to a large extent, all variables of equation (2) are endogenously determined.

Movements in non-housing wealth, for instance, might either reflect a new view of future profits or occur because market participants apply a different set of discount factors to those expected profits, where the discount factors incorporate both risk-free interest rates and equity premiums. From a theoretical standpoint, these movements could have different effects on household spending. The same reasoning applies to housing wealth: changes in the value of the housing stock might reflect genuine shifts in tastes between housing and consumption goods, or could result from changes in availability of residential land, or from movements in sectoral technologies. It is reasonable to assume that all these changes could affect consumption, but their effect might differ.

The empirical literature (surveyed in the next section) grapples with the obvious identification problem of separating endogenous from exogenous movements in housing wealth. The theoretical literature studies instead the question of whether a housing wealth effect exists, what it means, and how to think about it.

3. The Theory

3.1. A Basic Model

To illustrate the ideas, this section considers a simple model of consumption and housing determination. A household lives forever and has preferences defined over current and future consumption c_t and housing services h_t . That is, the household problem is defined by:

$$\max E_t \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t (u(c_t) + v(h_t)) \quad (3)$$

where β is the household discount factor, and E_t is the expectation operator. This preference specification is standard in models of household behavior. Life-cycle and bequest considerations, endogenous labor supply, non-separability between housing and consumption, and housing tenure choice are ignored here. The household faces the following budget constraint in every period t :

$$c_t + q_t h_t + s_t = Y_t + q_t h_{t-1} + R_t s_{t-1}. \quad (4)$$

where q_t is the price of housing, s_t is non-housing wealth (for instance, shares in a firm or holdings of government debt),² R_t is the return on non-housing wealth, Y_t is labor income. In equation (4), the right-hand side measures total resources available to the household at the end of the period t . These resources, in absence of portfolio adjustment costs, can be used for consumption, housing wealth accumulation and non-housing wealth accumulation. In absence of general equilibrium considerations, one can treat q_t , R_t , and Y_t as exogenous (and possibly random), and assume that the household chooses plans for consumption c_t , housing h_t and financial wealth s_t . In this simple framework, random changes in q_t , R_t , Y_t can proxy respectively for housing wealth shocks, non-housing wealth shocks, and income shocks. For given initial conditions, the solution to the household problem can then be rearranged to express optimal household consumption as a function of lagged wealth s_{t-1} , housing wealth h_{t-1} , and as a function of innovations q_t , R_t and Y_t . It has the interpretation of a consumption function.³

What are the implications for consumption of a shock to housing wealth in this model? To gain some intuition, consider the simplest possible case where the household, because of large adjustment costs to housing,⁴ does not change house between two consecutive periods: $h_t = h_{t-1}$ for every t . It is easy to see that changes in q_t are irrelevant for consumption behavior of this household, since $q_t h_t = q_t h_{t-1}$ in every period, so that housing wealth disappears from the household budget constraint. Intuitively, higher housing values ($q_t h_{t-1}$) result in higher housing consumption costs ($q_t h_t$) that exactly offset the housing wealth effect on non-housing consumption; when q_t rises, wealth in units of consumption is larger, but, unless the individual changes housing, housing wealth does not imply larger consumption.⁵

If the household can change housing consumption between two periods (h_t needs not to equal h_{t-1}), an additional effect kicks in. When house prices rise, the so-called substitution effect will cause

²Negative values of s_t are possible. In this case, they would correspond to financial liabilities (for instance, credit card or mortgage debt).

³In models without housing, simplifying assumptions about the functional form of the utility functions allow to obtain a simple closed-form consumption function: see for instance Flavin (1981).

⁴Adjustment costs can be introduced through a simple penalty term of the form $\phi_h (h_t - h_{t-1})^2$ in the right-hand side of the budget constraint. When ϕ_h approaches infinity, the optimal plan for the household is constant housing consumption.

⁵This basic logic is what leads Buiter (2008) to assert that housing wealth is not net wealth, unless individuals decrease their housing consumption in response to housing price changes.

households to reduce their demand for housing, and will free up resources that can be used to consume more. In this scenario, the immediate effect of an increase in housing wealth is that of stimulating consumption. The interpretation of the rise in consumption, however, is subtle: part of the rise in consumption does reflect the result that wealth, measured in units of consumption, is larger, so that the individual will optimally reallocate part of the larger wealth to all expenditure categories. Part of the rise in consumption, instead, reflect the simple economics of asset substitution: the household can now achieve higher utility by consuming relatively less housing and more consumption goods.

3.2. Extensions

What is missing from the basic theory above?

1. The simple theory above makes the extreme assumption that changes in the price of housing are purely exogenous. To see why modifying this assumption might change the results, consider the case where changes in the price of housing are the consequence of a shift in tastes between non-housing and housing goods: for instance, individuals might decide that they prefer to live in larger and nicer homes rather than going out to the restaurant: under this assumption, it is possible that increases in the price of housing are associated with lower consumption, since the change in house prices is the consequence of a tilting in preferences away from consumption goods. Empirically, evidence in favor of a mechanism of this kind comes from the observation (at least in the United States) that movements in housing prices are positively correlated with movements in housing investment: in a simple demand-supply diagram of the housing market, this evidence would seem to support the idea that movements in housing prices (and wealth) are the consequence of shifts in housing demand, rather than housing supply.
2. Another consideration that is missing from the basic story is the presence of borrowing constraints. The structure of financial markets in many developed economies implies that households have easy access to housing wealth through second mortgages, home equity loans, or home equity lines of credit. If liquidity constrained households - who are believed to have a high marginal propensity to spend on average - can borrow more whenever their housing wealth rises, this channel is likely to lead to a larger correlation between movements in housing wealth and movements in aggregate consumption.⁶ More in general, one can expect larger aggregate effects from changes in housing wealth since housing wealth is more evenly distributed across the population than non-housing wealth: if relatively poor people have higher than average propensity to consume, the aggregate consumption response to changes in housing wealth might be larger than otherwise.
3. The basic model also sidesteps life-cycle and housing tenure considerations. The representative household of the model display a profile of housing consumption that is constant over time. In reality, how consumption is connected to movements in housing wealth should also depend on whether individuals expect to modify their housing consumption in the future. Cross-sectional data show that housing wealth typically increases over the life cycle, before flattening out at a relatively old age. This is true both at the extensive margin (home ownership rates increase

⁶One way to think about liquidity constraints is to assume that the household faces the following constraint

$$-s_t \leq \theta q_t h_t.$$

Under this additional constraint, the household financial liabilities cannot rise above a fraction θ of the household housing wealth $q_t h_t$.

with age) and at the intensive margin (homeowners' housing size increases with age). Taking these elements into consideration, one should expect that life-cycle considerations should imply a negative response of consumption to increases in aggregate housing prices, since - to the extent that renters plan to become homeowners at some point of their life, or homeowners plan to move to larger homes - higher housing prices require larger savings than otherwise if individuals are planning to buy a larger home.

4. A final aspect to consider is how persistent changes in housing wealth are relative to changes in other forms of wealth. Historically, changes in housing returns have been more persistent than changes in the return to, say, stockmarket wealth. Households consumption might respond more to a given size change in housing wealth if this change is not expected to reverse quickly.

3.3. Taking Stock

A message from the basic theory is that, after solving the household intertemporal optimization problem, one can derive an aggregate consumption function where consumption is expressed as a function of income and wealth, and where the marginal propensity to consume out of housing wealth is positive or negative depending on the underlying characteristics of the economy.

In richer environments, however, especially when their purpose is to model the economy as a whole (rather than the behavior of a single economic agent), one should assume that wealth is endogenous, and its fluctuations are driven by current or expected movements in technology, tastes, taxes, or some other unidentified economic primitives. These primitives, in turn, may affect at the same time both consumption and wealth itself, thus making any statement about links from wealth to consumption (or vice versa) hard to interpret.

Yet central bankers, practitioners and policymakers routinely think of movements in wealth as exogenous, mostly because these movements are hard to predict or explain based on movements in readily available observable variables that one can regard as purely exogenous.

4. Empirical Studies

4.1. The Conventional Wisdom

A simple regression on quarterly United States data for the period 1952.I-2008.IV of:

$$\Delta(\log C) = \alpha + \beta_{HW}\Delta \log(HW_{-1}) + \beta_{NW}\Delta \log(NW_{-1})$$

where C , HW and NW measure respectively consumption, housing wealth and non-housing wealth, and Δ is the first difference operator, yields the following coefficients (standard errors below):

$$\Delta(\log C) = \underset{0.0006}{0.007} + \underset{0.035}{0.136}\Delta(\log HW_{-1}) + \underset{0.013}{0.056}\Delta(\log NW_{-1}).$$

More sophisticated regressions yield similar results, at least qualitatively if not quantitatively. This simple regression has the virtue of being simple, replicable and transparent. These estimates are more often converted into dollar-to-dollar estimates using the fact that, in the sample in question, the average ratio of housing wealth to annual consumption is about 2.3, and the average ratio of non-housing wealth to annual consumption is about 2.75. A one dollar increase in housing wealth then generates an increase in annualized consumption of about 6 cents, and one dollar increase in non-housing wealth generates an increase in consumption of about 2 cents.⁷

⁷That is, $0.136/2.3 = 0.059$, and $0.056/2.75 = 0.02$. The numbers in the text are rounded to the nearest cent.

The results of this simple regression are the basis for a series of wisdoms about wealth effects and the basis for thinking about housing wealth and consumption. In particular, the larger sensitivity of consumption to housing wealth is one of the many reasons why policymakers might be more worried about changes in housing than non-housing wealth.

4.2. Studies Based on Time-Series Data

Perhaps one of the most prominent studies of the link between housing wealth and consumption is the FRB/US model, which is the econometric model of the U.S. economy used by the Federal Reserve. One of the model blocks describes household consumption behavior as a function of total wealth and its composition. This model predicts, among other things, a marginal propensity to consume out of net tangible assets (housing wealth and consumer durables less home mortgages) which is 7.5 cents on the dollar. It also predicts a marginal propensity to consume of 3 cents on the dollar for corporate equities.

Several studies have reviewed the literature as well as proposed new estimates. It is fair to say that the broad consensus from the literature based on time-series data is not very different from the FRB/US model view. Estimates for the marginal propensity to consume out of (total) household wealth that range from 3 to 6 cents-to-the-dollar using several alternative specifications of simple, long-run consumption functions. Poterba's (2000) survey of other estimates from the research literature also lie in this range. These papers do not explicitly deal with housing, but they are useful starting points to think about the connection between wealth and consumption.

Tracy, Schneider and Chan (1999) note that the change in household net worth associated with a change in house prices is larger than the change from a comparable change in stock values for the vast majority of households.

Carroll, Otsuka and Slacalek (2006) propose a time-series based method that exploits the sluggishness of consumption growth to distinguish between immediate and eventual wealth effects. In U.S. data, they estimate that the immediate (next-quarter) marginal propensity to consume from a \$1 change in housing wealth is about 2 cents, with an eventual effect around 9 cents, substantially larger than the effect of shocks to financial wealth.

Case, Quigley and Shiller (2005) find a strong correlation between aggregate house prices and aggregate consumption in a panel of developed countries from the late 1970s through the late 1990s. According to their central estimates, a 1 percent increase in housing wealth increases consumption by roughly 0.11 percent for the international panel. For the panel of U.S. states, the corresponding number is smaller, and equals 0.04 percent. In addition, they find for the U.S. that the effects are two to ten times larger after the mid 1980s, when a series of financial reforms (such as the Tax Reform Act of 1986) greatly enhanced the ability of households to borrow against their housing wealth.

The main problem with aggregate data is that the aggregate data do not rule out alternative explanations for the time series correlation: either indirect wealth effects or reverse causation running from changes in household saving to changes in wealth. Iacoviello and Neri (2007) address this problem in a model where both consumption and housing wealth are endogenous, and are driven by movements in technology, preferences, monetary policy. They show that their model quantitatively replicates the positive correlation in the data between consumption growth and housing wealth growth. Most of this correlation, however, simply captures common factors (shocks) that move the two variables in the same direction.⁸ They use the model to ask the following question: what is the

⁸Movements in interest rates, inflation and technology are likely to cause comovement between housing wealth and consumption.

contribution of liquidity effects to the comovement between consumption and housing wealth? They find that liquidity constraints reinforce the correlation between consumption and housing wealth.

4.3. Studies Based on Micro Data

A growing literature has used household-level data to connect movements in consumption and movements in housing wealth. One of the central questions in this literature is to study how households respond to changes in the value of their housing wealth. One of the central problems is how to identify movements in housing wealth that are orthogonal to other factors that might also move consumption.

Campbell and Cocco (2005) study micro data from the UK Family Expenditure Survey from 1988-2000. They use repeated cross-sections of household expenditure data and regional home price information to estimate a small, positive consumption response to home prices for young homeowners, and a large positive response for old homeowners. Using mean home values and consumption as reported in their paper, this translates into marginal propensities to consume out of housing wealth of 0.06 for young homeowners, and 0.11 for old homeowners.

Mian and Sufi (2009) investigate how existing homeowners respond to the rising value of their home equity, a channel they refer to as the home equity-based borrowing channel. They use land topology-based housing supply elasticities in order to identify exogenous variations in house price growth across different geographical areas and individual-level data on homeowner debt and defaults from 1997 to 2008. They show that existing homeowners increase significantly their borrowing in response to changes in their home equity, and use the extra borrowing mainly for real outlays, such as consumption or home improvements.

5. Conclusions

Housing wealth is a major component of household wealth. Housing wealth is linked to non-housing consumption through the simple logic and algebra of the budget constraint: by moving to a smaller or larger house, household can free up or use resources that would otherwise go into non-housing consumption or other forms of saving. Empirically, housing wealth and consumption tend to move together; why this happens is subject to many interpretations: some third factor might move both variables, or there could be a direct effect from one to the other. Studies based on time-series data, on panel data and on more recently available, detailed micro data point out to the possibility that a considerable portion of the effect of housing wealth on consumption could reflect the influence of changes in housing wealth on borrowing against such wealth. However, most of the positive comovement between housing wealth and consumption reflects common shocks, and should not be interpreted as causal from the first to the second.

References

- BUITER, W. H. (2008): “Housing Wealth isn’t Wealth,” CEPR Discussion Papers 6920, C.E.P.R. Discussion Papers.
- CAMPBELL, J. Y., AND J. F. COCCO (2007): “How do house prices affect consumption? Evidence from micro data,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 54(3), 591–621.
- CARROLL, C. D., M. OTSUKA, AND J. SLACALEK (2006): “How Large Is the Housing Wealth Effect? A New Approach,” NBER Working Papers 12746, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

- CASE, K., J. QUIGLEY, AND R. SHILLER (2005): “Comparing Wealth Effects: The Stock Market versus the Housing Market,” *Advances in Macroeconomics*, 5(1), 1235–1235.
- DAVIS, M. A., AND J. HEATHCOTE (2007): “The price and quantity of residential land in the United States,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 54(8), 2595–2620.
- DAVIS, M. A., AND M. G. PALUMBO (2001): “A primer on the economics and time series econometrics of wealth effects,” Finance and Economics Discussion Series 2001-09, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (U.S.).
- FLAVIN, M. A. (1981): “The Adjustment of Consumption to Changing Expectations about Future Income,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 89(5), 974–1009.
- IACOVIELLO, M. (2005): “House Prices, Borrowing Constraints, and Monetary Policy in the Business Cycle,” *American Economic Review*, 95(3), 739–764.
- IACOVIELLO, M., AND S. NERI (2007): “Housing Market Spillovers: Evidence from an Estimated DSGE Model,” Boston College Working Papers in Economics 659, Boston College Department of Economics.
- MIAN, A. R., AND A. SUFI (2009): “House Prices, Home Equity-Based Borrowing, and the U.S. Household Leverage Crisis,” NBER Working Papers 15283, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- TRACY, J., H. SCHNEIDER, AND S. CHAN (1999): “Are stocks overtaking real estate in household portfolios?,” *Current Issues in Economics and Finance*, (Apr).