Discussion of Winners and Losers in Housing Markets by N. Kiyotaki, A. Michaelides, and K. Nikolov

Makoto Nakajima¹

¹Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia

September 2008

Plan.

- Overview.
- Review of the model.
- 3 Review of experiments.
- Discussion of main findings.

Overview

- Question:
 - What generates housing price fluctuations and, what are the welfare consequences for different groups of households?
- Construct:
 - Quantitative general equilibrium life-cycle model with housing
- 3 Study:
 - Effect of one-time unexpected shock on housing prices
 - Distributional implications of housing price changes

Review of the Model

Elements standard in macro models of housing

- Dual role of housing
- Life-cycle (Stochastic aging)
- 4 Higher utility of owning rather than renting
- Downpayment requirement
- General equilibrium

Elements novel in their model

- Housing is "Structure" = Capital $^{\gamma}$ Land $^{1-\gamma}$ (Fixed supply)
- Solving transition (perfect foresight dynamics)

Elements not in their model

- Idiosyncratic shocks (income, family composition)
- 2 Lumpy adjustment
- 3 Size difference of rental and owned housing
- Risk of assets

Review of the Experiments

- Calibrate the model to the recent U.S. economy.
- Steady state comparison:
 - Change g_a , R, θ
- 3 Transition dynamics after the initial unexpected shocks
 - Change g_a , R
 - 2 Both high and low γ

Main finding 1

When land share in the value of structures is large (e.g. Metropolitan area, Japan), housing prices respond more sharply to shocks.

- Higher land share implies a lower supply elasticity of structures (housings).
- Consistent with cross-country or cross-states data?

Main finding 2

Combination of $\uparrow g_a$ and $\downarrow R$ has a potential to explain the observed large increase in housing prices.

- Also generates ↓ in homeownership rate.
 - Not consistent with U.S. (and other countries') experience.
 - Potential remedies:
 - ↓ Downpayment ratio
 - ↓ Cost of mortgage loans
 - ↑ Variety of mortgage loans
- \prescript housing price in closed economy.
 - Need to pin down the degree of "openness".

Main finding 3

Downpayment ratio affects homeownership rate, but does't affect the housing prices.

• The effect of a change in downpayment requirement differs depending on assumptions associated with housing.

Effect of ↓ downpayment ratio	Homeownership rate	Housing price
Current paper	<u> </u>	No
No rental market	NA	\uparrow
Life-cycle without income shock	\uparrow	No
With income shocks	↑	No
Ortalo-Magné and Rady (2006)	\uparrow	\uparrow
Chambers et al. (2008)	No	NA

Discussion: Model with Life-Cycle and Income Shocks

Experiments	TFP +1%		$\theta:30\% \rightarrow 20\%$		
Economy	No shock	With shocks	No Shock	With shocks	
House price	+1.2%	+1.3%	_	-0.1%	
Homeownership	_	_	+4.4%	+4.1%	
Output	+1.2%	+1.3%	_	_	

Model with:

- General equilibrium
- Fixed supply of housing capital
- 3 Life-cycle (Deterministic)
- Uninsured idiosyncratic income shocks (Permanent and transitory)

Findings:

- Income shock doesn't matter.
- ↑ TFP level raises housing prices.

Main finding 4

When housing prices increase, large redistribution from renters to owners.

- Intuitive but very nice that they can actually quantify the magnitude of the redistribution effect.
- ◆ Large redistribution effect between renters and owners is partly due to
 ↓ homeownership rate.
- With a large degree of income (and wealth) inequality, possibly interesting non-linear welfare effect.

Discussion: Beautiful Things to Do with the Model

- Cross-section of states or countries.
 - ullet Captures difference in γ
 - Consistent with cross-sectional differences in housing price volatility?
- Pully dynamic transition path.
 - Use dynamic path of g_a , R, θ as inputs
 - Generate dynamic path of housing prices, homeownership rate, etc.

References

- Chambers, Matthew, Carlos Garriga, and Don E. Schlagenhauf, "Accounting for Changes in the Homeownership Rate," 2008. forthcoming, International Economic Review.
- **Ortalo-Magné and Sven Rady**, "Housing Market Dynamics: On the Constribution of Income Shocks and Credit Constraints," *Review of Economic Studies*, 2006, *73*, 459–485.