Consumption and House Prices in the Great Recession: Model Meets Evidence

Greg Kaplan

Kurt Mitman

Gianluca Violante

Economic Fluctuations & Growth Research Meeting NBER Summer Institute – July 16, 2016

- 1. What shock(s) drove the boom-bust in p_h ?
 - Financial deregulation vs beliefs about future growth in ph

- 1. What shock(s) drove the boom-bust in p_h ?
 - Financial deregulation vs beliefs about future growth in ph
- 2. Why the corresponding boom-bust in C?
 - · Channels: Collateral vs wealth effects

- 1. What shock(s) drove the boom-bust in p_h ?
 - Financial deregulation vs beliefs about future growth in ph
- 2. Why the corresponding boom-bust in C?
 - · Channels: Collateral vs wealth effects
- 3. Could a debt-forgiveness policy have cushioned the bust?
 - Study large-scale Principal Reduction program

- 1. What shock(s) drove the boom-bust in p_h ?
 - Financial deregulation vs beliefs about future growth in p_h
- 2. Why the corresponding boom-bust in C?
 - · Channels: Collateral vs wealth effects
- 3. Could a debt-forgiveness policy have cushioned the bust?
 - Study large-scale Principal Reduction program
- 4. What do we learn about the macro elasticity of C to p_h ?
 - Sufficient statistic approach

Model: aggregate shocks move equilibrium p_h

- Model: aggregate shocks move equilibrium p_h
- · Parameterize: match cross-sectional and lifecycle micro data

Methodology

- Model: aggregate shocks move equilibrium p_h
- · Parameterize: match cross-sectional and lifecycle micro data
- Simulate boom-bust
- Compare against aggregate time-series data
 - House prices
 - Consumption
 - · Rent-price ratio

- Home ownership
- Leverage
- Foreclosures

Compare against micro data

Model

Demographics

· OLG lifecycle economy with work & retirement

Endowments

• Workers face uninsurable risk in individual earnings y

Preferences

• Utility over nondurable *c* and housing services *h*

Housing

- Households can buy a unit of h at price p_h , or rent it at rate ρ
- Linear transaction cost $\kappa_h \cdot (p_h h)$ for sellers

Financial instruments

Liquid saving (b > 0): one-period bond, exogenous interest rate r_b (fixed)

Liquid saving (b > 0): one-period bond, exogenous interest rate r_b (fixed) Mortgages (m): long-term, fixed-rate debt contract

- Price schedule $q_j(h, m, b, y)$ competitively determined
- · Refinancing option available (cash-out)
- Max Loan-to-Value constraint binds at origination only $m \le \lambda^m p_h h$

Liquid saving (b > 0): one-period bond, exogenous interest rate r_b (fixed) Mortgages (m): long-term, fixed-rate debt contract

- Price schedule $q_j(h, m, b, y)$ competitively determined
- Refinancing option available (cash-out)
- Max Loan-to-Value constraint binds at origination only $m \le \lambda^m p_h h$

Foreclosure

· Default on mortgage debt: incur a utility loss

Liquid saving (b > 0): one-period bond, exogenous interest rate r_b (fixed) Mortgages (m): long-term, fixed-rate debt contract

- Price schedule $q_j(h, m, b, y)$ competitively determined
- Refinancing option available (cash-out)
- Max Loan-to-Value constraint binds at origination only $m \le \lambda^m p_h h$

Foreclosure

· Default on mortgage debt: incur a utility loss

HELOCs (b < 0)

- · One-period borrowing, non-defaultable
- Collateralized by housing, $b \ge -\lambda^b p_h h$

Final good sector

• $Y = Z\bar{N} \rightarrow w = Z$

Construction sector

Determines aggregate housing investments

Rental sector

- Buys housing from sellers and rents them out, or vice-versa, sells rental units to home buyers
- Zero-profit condition yields equilibrium rental rate ρ

Government

• Taxes workers (with mortgage interest deduction) and properties, and pays SS benefits to retirees

Underlying shocks that cause equilibrium house price to fluctuate:

Underlying shocks that cause equilibrium house price to fluctuate:

- 1. Aggregate labor income: Z
- 2. Credit conditions: collateral parameters λ^m , λ^b

Underlying shocks that cause equilibrium house price to fluctuate:

- 1. Aggregate labor income: Z
- 2. Credit conditions: collateral parameters λ^m , λ^b
- Beliefs / News about future housing demand: Three regimes for φ (share of housing services in *u*):

(a) ϕ_L : low housing share and unlikely transition to ϕ_H

- (b) ϕ_L^* : low housing share and likely transition to ϕ_H
- (c) ϕ_H : high housing share

Boom-Bust: shift from (a) to (b), and back to (a)

Analyze IRFs of the model economy to these realized shocks

Q1 What caused the boom-bust in p_h and *C*?





Dynamics of rent-price ratio



Belief about future appreciation essential

Dynamics of home ownership



Financial deregulation drives rise in home-ownership

Change in home ownership by age: data and model



It's the young who go in/out of housing market

Dynamics of leverage and foreclosure



- Financial deregulation key for constant leverage pre-boom
- · Interaction belief-deregulation important for foreclosure

Revisited narrative of the crisis

- Original narrative:
 - Mian-Sufi: credit growth and default concentrated in low-income and high-risk groups
- New narrative based on refined micro data:
 - 1. Adelino et al.: credit growth evenly distributed across risk-type
 - 2. Foote et al.: credit growth evenly distributed across income groups
 - 3. Albanesi et al.: default share increases for middle income
- Model:
 - · Low-income hh go from rent to buy, high-income hh upsize
 - Findings consistent with new narrative, replicates facts 1.-3.

Q2 How does the fall in p_h transmit to C?

Deleveraging or wealth effect in the bust?





Deleveraging: WEAK

Wealth effect: STRONG



Deleveraging: WEAK

Wealth effect: STRONG

 Consistent with Kaplan-Mitman-Violante (2016): 'Non-durable Consumption and Housing Net Worth in the Great Recession: Evidence form Easily Accessible Data'

Q3 Could a massive debt forgiveness program have cushioned the bust?

Counterfactual principal reduction program

All homeowners with LTV >95%: forgive excess debt

Counterfactual principal reduction program

All homeowners with LTV >95%: forgive excess debt



Beneficiaries account for small share of C + do not foreclose

- 1. Sources of boom-bust in p_h and C
 - · Main driver is beliefs, not change in credit conditions
 - Credit conditions important for ownership, leverage and foreclosure

- 1. Sources of boom-bust in p_h and C
 - Main driver is beliefs, not change in credit conditions
 - Credit conditions important for ownership, leverage and foreclosure
- 2. Transmission mechanism to household consumption
 - · Mostly a wealth effect, not collateral effect

- 1. Sources of boom-bust in p_h and C
 - Main driver is beliefs, not change in credit conditions
 - Credit conditions important for ownership, leverage and foreclosure
- 2. Transmission mechanism to household consumption
 - · Mostly a wealth effect, not collateral effect
- 3. Effectiveness of mortgage modification program
 - Big effect on foreclosures, but negligible impact on ph and C

- 1. Sources of boom-bust in p_h and C
 - Main driver is beliefs, not change in credit conditions
 - Credit conditions important for ownership, leverage and foreclosure
- 2. Transmission mechanism to household consumption
 - · Mostly a wealth effect, not collateral effect
- 3. Effectiveness of mortgage modification program
 - Big effect on foreclosures, but negligible impact on p_h and C
- 4. Two observations on the macro elasticity of C to p_h
 - Magnitude depends strongly on the underlying shock
 - Caution about the sufficient statistic approach

Thanks!