



**Copenhagen
Business School**
HANDELSHØJSKOLEN

Department of Economics

Copenhagen Business School

Working paper 03-2019

**Intratemporal nonseparability between housing and
nondurable consumption:
evidence from reinvestment in housing stock**

Natalia Khorunzhina

Intratemporal nonseparability between housing and nondurable consumption: evidence from reinvestment in housing stock*

Natalia Khorunzhina[†]

Copenhagen Business School

May 14, 2019

Abstract

Using the data on maintenance expenditures and self-assessed house value, I separate the measure of individual housing stock and house prices, and use these data for testing whether nondurable consumption and housing are characterized by intratemporal nonseparability in households' preferences. I find evidence in favor of intratemporal dependence between total nondurable consumption and housing. I reach a similar conclusion for some separate consumption categories, such as food and utility services. My findings also indicate households are more willing to substitute housing and nondurable consumption within a period than to substitute composite consumption bundles over different time periods.

JEL C51, D12, D13, E21, R21

Keywords: Intratemporal Nonseparability, Housing, Nondurable Consumption

*This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or non-profit sectors. I am grateful to Nils Gottfries and participants of the CESifo Conference on Macroeconomics and Survey Data for discussions and insightful comments. All errors are my own.

[†]Natalia Khorunzhina, Copenhagen Business School, Department of Economics, Porcelænshaven 16A, DK-2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark, phone: +45 3815 2403, fax: +45 3815 2576, email: nk.eco@cbs.dk.

1 Introduction

Nonseparability in preferences over nondurable consumption and housing is an important feature of many up-to-date consumption models with housing employed in economics and finance. In these models, the intratemporal tradeoff between durable and nondurable consumption and the strength of the intertemporal substitution is key to explaining a variety of important phenomena. [Piazzesi, Schneider, and Tuzel \(2007\)](#) find the strength of the intratemporal elasticity of substitution is an important factor for predictability of excess stock returns, whereas the same modeling feature, to a large extent, allows [Yogo \(2006\)](#) to explain both the cross-sectional variation in expected stock returns and the time variation in the equity premium. [Ogaki and Reinhart \(1998\)](#) argue that accounting for the intratemporal substitution between nondurables and durables improves the estimates of the intertemporal elasticity of substitution. Subsequently, [Flavin and Nakagawa \(2008\)](#) rely on the limited intratemporal substitutability between housing and nondurable consumption in generating a low elasticity of intertemporal substitution to address the observed smoothness of nondurable consumption. [Li et al. \(2016\)](#) demonstrate that the strength of the intratemporal elasticity of substitution governs the impact of changes in house prices on household homeownership rates and nondurable consumption. These studies, however, offer little consensus about the relative strength between the intratemporal and intertemporal tradeoffs, ranging from the limited intratemporal substitutability between durable and nondurable consumption ([Flavin and Nakagawa 2008](#)) to a rather flexible one ([Piazzesi, Schneider, and Tuzel 2007](#)) over the intertemporal substitutability between composite consumption bundles over different time periods.

In this paper, I test for the intratemporal nonseparability between housing and nondurable consumption in individual preferences. Without making assumptions about the functional form of the utility function, I formulate a consumption model, in which utility depends, probably nonseparably, on two distinct goods: nondurable consumption and housing. Housing stock, from which households-homeowners derive utility, is not constant but is subject to depreciation and upkeep through maintenance and renovations. To investigate empirically the intratemporal dependence over homeowner choices of nondurable consumption and housing stock, I then exploit

within-household variation in changes in the housing stock of homeowners who do not change their residence.

Residential housing stock is not constant over the length of the same homeownership and requires significant ongoing maintenance expenses. As measured based on the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), households spend, on average, around \$2,500 annually on improvement, maintenance, and repair expenditures, which constitutes about 1.5% of house value.¹ With the median maintenance expenditure of only \$600, the average cross-sectional and within-household variation in the maintenance effort is substantial, with the coefficient of variation being 252% and 108%, respectively. To the extent that homeowners expand, remodel, or fail to maintain their homes, fluctuations in both the quality and quantity of their housing stock can be nontrivial.

Although information on homeowners' maintenance effort is observed in various data sources, including the PSID used in this paper, testing whether consumption and housing are nonseparable in household utility is hindered by the inability to accurately observe individual housing stock and its variation over time. Even if a comprehensive set of home attributes is observed, these characteristics usually exhibit little variation or do not change over time. Lack of variation in observed housing characteristics makes it unsuitable for linking to individual variation in consumption. To gain information about variation in housing stock, I use the data on maintenance expenditures and self-assessed house value from the PSID to separate the measure of individual housing stock from house prices of that individual housing stock. The average housing-stock growth index is somewhat under 1, suggesting that, on average, households' maintenance efforts do not fully offset gross depreciation of housing stock. At the same time, the imputed housing-stock growth varies reasonably over and within households, making it suitable for the analysis of the intratemporal dependence within consumption model. The average index of house-price growth, imputed from the PSID, is also measured with substantial variation. Both nationwide and across regions, it closely matches the level and the pattern of dynamics of the house-price indices, constructed by the U.S. Federal Housing Finance Agency, S&P Case-Shiller, and Zillow. These imputed individual

1. [Gyourko and Tracy \(2006\)](#) provide similar evidence from the American Housing Survey on the average annual maintenance and repair expenditures at \$2,051.

housing-stock and house-price indices are used in estimation of the consumption model.

Exploiting the structure of the consumption Euler equation, I test for and find evidence of intratemporal dependence between total nondurable consumption and housing. This finding agrees with the literature that examines and provides evidence against additive separability in preferences over durable and nondurable consumption, such as [Ogaki and Reinhart \(1998\)](#), [Piazzesi, Schneider, and Tuzel \(2007\)](#), and [Yogo \(2006\)](#) for the aggregated macroeconomic framework, and [Flavin and Nakagawa \(2008\)](#) and [Li et al. \(2016\)](#) using household data. Postulating a constant-elasticity-of-substitution (CES) utility function to represent intratemporal preferences over nondurable and durable consumption, these studies pin down intratemporal and intertemporal elasticities of substitution relying on different sources of variation in durable and nondurable consumption. [Ogaki and Reinhart \(1998\)](#), [Piazzesi, Schneider, and Tuzel \(2007\)](#), and [Yogo \(2006\)](#) exploit time-series variation in aggregated nondurable and durable consumption, [Li et al. \(2016\)](#) rely on cross-sectional variation in the households' house value and income, and [Flavin and Nakagawa \(2008\)](#) use household expenditure on food as a measure of nondurable consumption and discontinuous jumps in housing stock at the time of changing residence, while assuming constant housing stock until the household moves. Unlike these studies, I do not take a stand on the structure of preferences, which makes my findings robust to possible model misspecifications. Similar to [Flavin and Nakagawa \(2008\)](#) and [Li et al. \(2016\)](#), I use household data from the PSID in the test for the intratemporal nonseparability in preferences; however, I focus on the sample of homeowners who do not move and, unlike [Flavin and Nakagawa \(2008\)](#) and [Li et al. \(2016\)](#), rely on both between- and within-household variation in total nondurable consumption and housing stock. Therefore, my results complement and extend the findings of nonseparability between nondurable consumption and housing in those studies to the sample of homeowners who do not move. The economic significance of my findings is supported by the observation that the overwhelming majority of households are homeowners and only a small fraction of them moves at a time.² Under the assumption of power utility combined with the CES intraperiod utility from nondurable consumption and housing, mostly employed in

2. Detailed moving statistics for homeowners and renters from the PSID are reported in [Bajari et al. \(2013\)](#). In particular, these authors compute that the average homeowner moves about three times in life.

the above studies, my findings indicate intertemporal consumption smoothing is stronger and more important than intratemporal substitution between nondurable consumption and housing.

Further, I find evidence against additive separability in preferences over nondurable consumption and housing in the models when the utility is assumed to be additively separable over distinct categories of consumption but may be pairwise dependent on housing stock. In estimation of these models, my findings indicate nonseparability between housing and consumption of food and utility services. Finally, I find some heterogeneity in the estimation results over householders' age and over time, whereas I detect no decisive heterogeneity over education groups.

My findings also relate to a large literature that documents an empirical relationship between house-price changes and the households' consumption expenditure (see [Aladangady 2017](#); [Brown-ing, Gørtz, and Leth-Petersen 2013](#); [Campbell and Cocco 2007](#); [Carroll, Otsuka, and Slacalek 2011](#); [Case, Quigley, and Shiller 2005](#); [Cooper 2013](#); [Gan 2010](#); [Mian, Rao, and Sufi 2013](#); [Mian and Sufi 2014](#); [Paiella and Pistaferri 2017](#)). An important channel for the relationship between house-price changes and consumption considered in the above studies is the housing wealth effect, which suggests house-price appreciation may result in the perception of larger housing wealth and may lead to the increase of consumption expenditure by relaxing households' lifetime resource constraints. Other channels include the collateral borrowing channel, which, under house-price appreciation, relaxes the equity borrowing constraint for households who reached borrowing limits and allows for higher consumption-expenditure levels ([DeFusco 2017](#)), and the channel of common factors that may simultaneously drive house prices and consumption ([Attanasio et al. 2009](#)). The intratemporal tradeoff between housing and nondurable consumption can give rise to yet another channel for the relationship between housing wealth and consumption. An increase in construction and maintenance costs may adversely affect the homeowners' demand for maintenance, and, as a result, the quality and quantity of housing stock, the housing wealth of homeowners, and through the intratemporal tradeoff, the consumption expenditure of households who are long in housing.

The remainder of the article is as follows. Section [2](#) sets up a theoretical model, from which I develop the econometric model. Section [3](#) describes the data sample used in estimation and presents

a method of measuring unobserved housing stock from the data on maintenance expenditure and self-assessed house value. Section 4 outlines the estimation strategy and presents the findings. Section 5 concludes. The further details on derivation of the econometric model and data-sample construction can be found in Appendices A and B.

2 Model

Consider households-homeowners who maximize a lifetime utility from consumption and housing:³

$$E_t \sum_{s=t}^T \beta^{s-t} U(C_s, H_s) \exp(\phi' z_s), \quad (1)$$

where E_t denotes expectation formed at time t , β is the time discount factor, $U(\cdot)$ is the per-period utility of consumption and housing, and $\exp(\phi' z_t)$ is the taste shifter, which may depend on demographic characteristics z_t . Households derive utility from consumption C_t , and, being homeowners, hold positive amounts of housing stock H_t (priced at P_t), which they manage. The size of the housing stock H_t is interpreted broadly as reflecting not only the physical size, but also its quality. The quantity and quality of housing stock is affected by the depreciation at the rate δ , and by the adjustments to housing stock m_t (also priced at P_t) due to maintenance, renovations, or home improvements:

$$H_t = (1 - \delta)H_{t-1} + m_t. \quad (2)$$

Every period households receive income Y_t , consume C_t , and save B_t (or borrow if negative). If no trade of an existing home occurs, the flow of funds is given by

$$C_t + P_t m_t + B_t = Y_t + R_t B_{t-1}, \quad (3)$$

3. I maintain the assumption of preferences additively separable across time and states of the world. Recently, a number of studies employ more general Epstein and Zin (1989, 1991) preferences that provide the flexibility to disentangle the risk aversion from intertemporal substitution, a feature arguably important to better match the patterns in life-cycle housing decisions, wealth accumulation, and portfolio allocation (Fischer and Khorunzhina 2019; Pelletier and Tunç, forthcoming).

where R_t is the real interest rate in period t .⁴

Households choose consumption expenditure C_t and housing renovation and upkeep m_t optimally by maximizing (1) subject to (2)-(3). The household's problem implies the following consumption optimality condition:

$$U_C(C_t, H_t) = \beta E_t [R_{t+1} U_C(C_{t+1}, H_{t+1}) \exp(\phi' \Delta z_{t+1})], \quad (4)$$

where U_C is household marginal utility with respect to consumption. Under the assumption of rational expectations, equation (4) can be written as follows:

$$\beta R_{t+1} \frac{U_C(C_{t+1}, H_{t+1})}{U_C(C_t, H_t)} \exp(\phi' \Delta z_{t+1}) = 1 + e_{t+1},$$

where e_{t+1} is the expectation error. Assume marginal utilities U_C and U_H are continuously differentiable. Taking logs, and applying first-order Taylor-series expansion to $\ln U_C$, I obtain the estimable Euler equation in log-linearized form:

$$\Delta c_{t+1} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 r_{t+1} + \alpha_2 \Delta h_{t+1} + \varphi \Delta z_{t+1} + \epsilon_{t+1}, \quad (5)$$

where r_{t+1} is the log real interest rate in period $t+1$, $\Delta c_{t+1} = \ln(C_{t+1}/C_t)$, $\Delta h_{t+1} = \ln(H_{t+1}/H_t)$, and ϵ_{t+1} is the composite error term that includes the Taylor-series remainder and the expectation error (see Appendix A for more details).

Equation (5) allows us to test for intratemporal nonseparability between nondurable consumption and housing without specifying the structure of preferences for the goods that are separable under the null. Representing $-U_{CH}/U_{CC}$, the coefficient of interest α_2 in equation (5) can be informative about the intratemporal dependence between consumption and housing. Maintaining the standard assumption of $U_{CC} < 0$, the sign of α_2 corresponds to the sign of U_{CH} . Therefore, the coefficient α_2 , statistically insignificantly different from zero, will be the evidence on additive separability

4. The maintenance expenditure in the budget constraint could also be formulated to depend on housing stock (e.g., a house with a pool might be more expensive to maintain) without further affecting the consumption Euler equation.

between nondurable consumption and housing in contemporaneous utility ($U_{CH} = 0$).

Furthermore, the sign of the mixed partial derivative U_{CH} can be informative about substitutability or complementarity in the sense that nondurable consumption and housing are substitutes (complements) if an increase in housing stock decreases (increases) the marginal utility of nondurable consumption, such that $U_{CH} < 0$ ($U_{CH} > 0$).⁵ In [Flavin and Nakagawa \(2008\)](#), who operate with this definition of complementarity, the sign of the mixed partial derivative of the utility function with respect to the two goods is an important factor determining how the transaction cost associated with trading homes affects the magnitude of the intertemporal elasticity of substitution of nondurable consumption.

Finally, consider the power utility function over a CES intraperiod utility from nondurable consumption and housing, which is the leading model in macroeconomic and finance applications with housing consumption:

$$U(C_t, H_t) = \frac{((1-a)C_t^{1-1/\varepsilon} + aH_t^{1-1/\varepsilon})^{\frac{1-1/\sigma}{1-1/\varepsilon}}}{1-1/\sigma}, \quad a \in (0, 1), \quad \varepsilon > 0, \quad \sigma > 0, \quad (6)$$

where ε governs the degree of intratemporal substitutability between nondurable consumption and housing, and σ is the intertemporal elasticity of substitution of the composite consumption bundles. The mixed partial derivative of the utility function captures both intratemporal and intertemporal tradeoffs, and the sign of U_{CH} informs about the relative strength of these tradeoffs. The mixed partial derivative of the utility function [\(6\)](#) with respect to the two goods is negative when intertemporal consumption smoothing is more important than intratemporal smoothing ($\varepsilon > \sigma$). That is, households are more willing to substitute housing and nondurable consumption within a period than to substitute composite consumption bundles over different time periods ([Piazzesi, Schneider, and Tuzel 2007](#)).

Before estimating equation [\(5\)](#), a number of issues need to be taken into consideration. One

5. This definition of complementarity, besides being not invariant to monotone transformations of the utility function ([Hicks and Allen 1934](#); [Kannai 1980](#)), does not have to agree with other classifications of complementarity (see [Samuelson 1974](#) for an overview of the different complementarity concepts and interconnections between them).

issue concerns the relevant data. Information on individual housing is usually observed in the form of the monetary value of a house and its physical characteristics. Reported house characteristics (number of rooms, area size in square meters, various housing features, such as patios, balconies, a private garden, etc.) are normally fixed, exhibit little variation over time, and therefore can hardly be used in measuring changes in housing stock. House value in monetary terms is a fusion of many elements, where major factors are the level of local real estate prices and the degree of upkeep implemented by the homeowner to defeat natural wear and tear, and perhaps to even improve the existent quality of housing stock. Equation (5) requires the measure of housing stock in both its quantity and quality; that is, housing stock must be singled out from the price per unit of housing stock, which equivalently influences the value of a house. I deal with this issue in the next section.

Another issue is related to the possible endogeneity problem in equation (5) from the simultaneous choice between a household's consumption and housing and from the Taylor-series approximation used to derive this equation. To deal with this issue, equation (5) is estimated using the instrumental variable (IV) technique. The choice of instruments is discussed in section 4.

3 Data

I construct the data on consumption expenditures, the measure of changes in housing stock, and house-price growth using biennial longitudinal survey observations of households in the US in the Panel Study of Income Dynamics. In particular, from the survey on the level of households, I take variables on household consumption, housing wealth, home repairs and maintenance, and demographic characteristics.

3.1 Expenditures

The PSID is a longitudinal survey that follows a nationally representative random sample of families and their extensions since 1968. Since its start, the survey routinely collects information about food expenditures. The set of categories on consumption expenditures expanded significantly

in 1999 to include spending on healthcare, education and childcare, transportation, and utilities. With an addition of new spending information on clothing, trips, vacations, entertainment, and the expenditure on home repairs and maintenance in 2005, the PSID currently contains all essential consumption categories. In my analysis, I use data on all these consumption categories, namely, spending on food, clothing, transportation, utilities, trips and vacations, entertainment, healthcare, education, and childcare, and construct total non-housing consumption expenditure as a sum of consumption-spending categories. Data on consumption spending are deflated using the consumer price index (CPI) from the CPI releases of the Bureau of Labor Statistics applicable for each spending category (see Appendix [B](#) for details).

Housing information includes data on the number of rooms in a dwelling, house value for homeowners, and spending on home repairs and maintenance. The PSID collects information on home repairs and maintenance by asking, “How much did you spend altogether on home repairs and maintenance, including materials plus any costs for hiring a professional?” Homeowners are also asked to provide an assessment of the present value of their house and the lot by giving the value of the home as if it would be sold at the time of survey. Monetary values of housing data are deflated using the CPI index (see Appendix [B](#) for details). All monetary values are in 2009 dollars.

Motivated by the availability of data on home repairs and maintenance, and a more comprehensive set of consumption categories, from the PSID at the household level, I extract the sample of data on homeownership and housing starting in 2003 and consumption expenditures starting in 2005 and covering biennial observations up to 2015.⁶ Focusing on homeowners, the average homeownership rate in the PSID for this period is remarkably close to the 66.5% reported for these years by the US Census Bureau. The initial sample consists of the continued homeowners ages 22-65 who reside in the US during the time of the interview and do not change residence. I require that a household has non-missing observations over at least three consecutive periods, which imposes a

6. Nondurable consumption and maintenance expenditures at the household level are also available in the Consumer Expenditure Survey over a longer period of time, but at the finer, quarterly frequency. After being recorded for four consecutive quarters, households leave the sample and are replaced by new households. Therefore, one cannot construct lower-frequency (annual or biennial) changes in expenditure variables, as in the PSID. Using the PSID is also advantageous for comparing the findings with the related PSID-based studies on the relationship between nondurable consumption and housing, such as [Flavin and Nakagawa \(2008\)](#) and [Li et al. \(2016\)](#).

substantial restriction on the initial sample and provides me with 8,009 observations on households starting from 2007. Following a common practice in the literature on estimation of consumption models, I exclude observations for which total nondurable consumption grows by more than 400% or falls by more than 75% and results in further reduction of the sample by 44 observations. Next, I drop any observations for which the house reportedly lost more than two thirds of its value or more than doubled its value between consecutive periods, and the increase in house value was not supported by sizable maintenance expenditures, which lowers the sample by 121 observations. I also drop any observations for which the home was virtually rebuilt, as measured by an unusually high level of maintenance expenditures, which results in omitting 88 observations.

Altogether, I obtain 7,756 observations on homeowners between 2007 and 2015. The consumption Euler equation holds for households who can freely borrow to finance consumption expenditures, and including homeowners who can potentially borrow against their home equity could be adequate to control for liquidity constraints (Runkle 1991). Following Zeldes (1989) and the recent literature on estimation of consumption equations using asset-based sample separation (Alan, Attanasio, and Browning 2009; Gayle and Khorunzhina 2018), I also construct a restricted sample by excluding households who do not have a positive balance of financial liquidity (cash, stock, and bond holdings), which results in 6,390 observations between 2007 and 2015.⁷ Finally, the debt-service ratio (DSR) of Johnson and Li (2010) has been shown to predict the likelihood of being denied credit and is increasingly used as a measure of credit constraints. I construct the ratio between debt-service payments and household income using information on mortgage payments, taxes, insurance payments on primary residences and other real estate, automobile loan and lease payments, and vehicle insurance payments. Following Johnson and Li (2010), I then remove households in the top quintile of DSR as constrained, which results in 6,466 observations on households with a low DSR between 2007 and 2015.

7. Jappelli (1990) selects liquidity-unconstrained individuals, using direct information on borrowing constraints obtained from the Survey of Consumer Finances (SCF). Because the PSID does not provide direct indicators of credit constraints, Jappelli, Pischke, and Souleles (1998) combine information from the SCF and the PSID to assess the likelihood of a constraint for households in the PSID. A subsequent study of Domeij and Flodén (2006), however, finds the indicators of liquidity constraints built around the asset-based sample separation rule of Zeldes (1989) and direct information on borrowing constraints in Jappelli (1990) select to a large extent the same households.

Table B1 in Appendix B presents summary statistics for the data sample. Transportation, food, and health care constitute the three largest consumption-expenditure categories, amounting to about 29%, 22%, and 11% of total consumption expenditures, respectively. Child care, entertainment, and clothing are the three smallest consumption-expenditure categories, amounting to less than 10% of total consumption expenditures, altogether. Expenditure on maintenance is sizable, amounting to 1.58% of house value. Financial contributions to improvements and maintenance are routine periodic expenditures for about 79% of households in the sample.

3.2 Housing-stock and house-price growth

Equation of interest (5) requires a measure of changes in a household's housing stock H_t/H_{t-1} , which, in general, is not observable to an econometrician. Instead, the observables include current and lagged house values ($P_t H_t$ and $P_{t-1} H_{t-1}$) and the value of maintenance expenditures ($P_t m_t$). Knowing these quantities, using the law of motion for housing stock, given by equation (2), and maintaining an assumption that the renovation and maintenance expenditures $P_t m_t$ fully go into the value of the home, I compute the quantities H_t/H_{t-1} and P_t/P_{t-1} in the following way:

$$\frac{H_t}{H_{t-1}} = \frac{H_t}{H_t - m_t} \cdot (1 - \delta) = \frac{P_t H_t}{P_t H_t - P_t m_t} \cdot (1 - \delta), \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{P_t}{P_{t-1}} = \frac{P_t}{P_{t-1}} \cdot \frac{H_t - m_t}{(1 - \delta)H_{t-1}} = \frac{P_t H_t - P_t m_t}{P_{t-1} H_{t-1}} \cdot \frac{1}{(1 - \delta)}. \quad (8)$$

In both equations, the second expression substitutes $(1 - \delta)H_{t-1} = H_t - m_t$ from equation (2). Whereas computation of P_t/P_{t-1} in equation (8) relies on longitudinal data on house value, remarkably, computation of housing-stock growth in equation (7) exploits only the cross-sectional dimension of the data on house value and maintenance expenditure. This way of recovering housing-stock growth can be useful in providing a dynamic element to some data sets limited within the cross-sectional dimension. Another important feature of computation of housing-stock growth and house-price growth from equations (7) and (8) is that the depreciation rate enters both equations in a multiplicative way, which limits its effect on estimations that exploit log-transformations of these

Table 1: Summary of imputed housing-stock growth and house-price growth

	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015
H_t/H_{t-1}	0.976 (0.057)	0.974 (0.053)	0.975 (0.051)	0.977 (0.056)	0.978 (0.060)	0.980 (0.059)
P_t/P_{t-1}	1.168 (0.286)	1.101 (0.257)	0.932 (0.224)	0.989 (0.228)	1.000 (0.219)	1.045 (0.240)

NOTE: Standard deviations are reported in parentheses.

variables.

Table 1 reports the average values of housing-stock growth and house-price growth, computed from equations (7) and (8), and their standard deviations. For exposition, I set the depreciation rate at 5.0%, which doubles the 2.5% depreciation rate found in [Harding, Rosenthal, and Sirmans \(2007\)](#) to account for biennial frequency in the data. Also to account for biennial frequency, maintenance expenditures, reported in the survey for a year, are doubled. The average housing-stock growth index is somewhat under 1, suggesting that, on average, households' maintenance efforts do not fully offset gross depreciation of housing stock. This quality drift of residential housing stock is in agreement with housing literature documenting the depreciation rate *net of maintenance and repair expenditure* between 1% (as in [Chinloy 1979](#)) and 2% (as in [Harding, Rosenthal, and Sirmans 2007](#)) per year. The imputed measure of housing-stock growth also has a sizable standard deviation, which indicates the imputed index varies reasonably over households. The average within-household standard deviation of the housing-stock growth index is 0.03, a value of a similar magnitude to the cross-sectional standard deviation, reported in Table 1. The average index of house-price growth is also measured with substantial variation. On average, the house-price growth index is positive in 2005 and 2007. Afterward, the index is decreasing for two observation periods, with the largest decrease in the house-price index in 2009. The index shows positive growth again in 2015.

The imputed house-price growth index is calculated based on the self-reported value of the house, priced by homeowners given the quantity and quality of their housing stock, and therefore may not be directly comparable to the house-price indices (HPIs) used in the literature. Nevertheless,




Figure 1: House-price indices. The solid line shows average house-price growth imputed from the PSID, the long-dashed line shows median house-price growth imputed from the PSID, the dotted line represents S&P Case-Shiller HPI, the dashed line represents FHFA HPI, and the short-dashed line corresponds to the Zillow index.

the computed house-price growth from the PSID in Table 1 compares reasonably well to the established HPIs. I compare the imputed house-price growth index from the PSID with the weighted, repeat-sales HPI based on transactions involving single-family homes, constructed by the US Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA HPI), and with methodologically similar S&P Case-Shiller HPI. I also use the Zillow Home Value Index (Zillow HVI) for comparison, whose methodology differs from the two aforementioned HPIs, mainly because it does not rely on repeat sales. Instead, it utilizes the Z-estimate, an estimated value of a home based on its proprietary machine-learning algorithm. Zillow’s Z-estimate uses multiple sources of data, including prior sales, county records, tax assessments, real estate listings, mortgage information, and geographic information-system data. Importantly, Zillow’s website allows homeowners to view the entire history of Z-estimates and to report home improvements, which makes the Zillow HVI index relevant for comparison. The comparative analysis is presented in Figure 1. This figure reports the average and median house-price growth index imputed from the PSID, S&P Case-Shiller HPI, FHFA HPI, and Zillow HVI for the second quarter of the odd years between 2005 and 2015.

During the sample years, the PSID is a biennial survey, in which the overwhelming majority of the interviews are conducted in the second quarter, which explains the choice of the second quarter for comparisons. S&P Case-Shiller HPI, FHFA HPI, and Zillow HVI are adjusted accordingly to show house-price growth for the second quarter of the year relative to the same quarter two years ago. The three well-known HPIs and the one constructed from the PSID paint the same qualitative picture during the observed period. The imputed house-price growth closely matches the level and the pattern of dynamics in house prices over the observed period. The lower volatility of the imputed house-price growth compared to the S&P Case-Shiller HPI, FHFA HPI, and Zillow HVI is consistent with the findings in [Davis and Quintin \(2017\)](#) that, whereby, on average, homeowners tend to report accurate estimates of the current value of their home, during the boom and the bust, households update the assessments of their homes gradually, such that self-assessed house prices do not decline as severely as house-price indexes during the bust.

Further analysis shows that similarities between indices' values are even stronger on a regional level. The PSID provides information about a state of residence, which I use in constructing a state and regional measure of the house-price growth index. I compare the imputed house-price growth index from the PSID to HPIs, available on a state level – FHFA HPI and Zillow HVI. [Figure 2](#) shows the HPIs imputed from the PSID housing data, and the HPI's by the US Federal Housing Finance Agency and Zillow over four major regions: Northeast, North Central, South, and West (see [Appendix B](#) for the state composition of these regions). State comparisons can be found in [Appendix B](#), [Figure B1](#). Overall, the house-price growth index, computed from [equation \(8\)](#), is remarkably close to the HPIs reported by Zillow and the US Federal Housing Finance Agency.

4 Estimation and empirical findings

When consumption and re-investment in housing are simultaneous choices, the choice to reinvest in housing stock may be directly affected by the consumption choice and correlated with the unobserved shocks that drive consumption. This possibility creates an endogeneity problem in




Figure 2: House-price indices over four regions. The solid line shows average house-price growth imputed from the PSID, the dashed line represents FHFA HPI, and the short-dashed line corresponds to the Zillow index.

simultaneous decision-making, and ordinary least-squares estimation of equation (5) could result in biased estimates. The remedy is to find instruments, such that they are not affected by nondurable consumption but are correlated with changes in housing stock and use an IV estimation technique for obtaining consistent estimates of the parameters in equation (5).

As argued in [Harding, Rosenthal, and Sirmans \(2007\)](#), home attributes tend to be correlated with maintenance and therefore with the changes in housing stock. Indeed, in my data sample, the correlation between house size and level of maintenance expenditures is positive, significantly different from zero at the 1% significance level, and equal to 0.13. Also, home attributes have no natural role in the consumption-model specification (5). Even if home attributes could have affected the consumption level, the observed physical characteristics of the home are usually constant over

time and therefore drop out of the model in first differences. Hence, the observed attributes of a home, such as house size, can be used as instruments for reinvestment in equation (5).

When households derive utility from consumption and housing, a household's optimization problem can be supplemented by one more restriction, namely, the one describing the optimal choice of reinvestment in housing stock. The resulting demand for housing stock, along with its dependence on consumption, also depends on house prices (see equation (A4) in Appendix A). Homeowners actively manage the quantity and quality of their housing stock by implementing housing improvements, taking prices as given exogenously. House prices have no natural role in the consumption model (see equations (A3)-(A4) in Appendix A), and being exogenous to nondurable consumption choice, house prices are relevant for explaining changes in housing stock, making an excellent instrument. Changes in housing stock and house-price indices (both the imputed individual house-price index and the state-level FHFA HPI) are negatively correlated. For example, the correlation between changes in housing stock and the imputed individual house-price index in locality is -0.20 and significantly different from zero at the 1% significance level. The negative correlation between housing stock and house prices is in agreement with the restrictions of the demand theory, whereby home improvements are expected to react negatively to the increase in prices. See early empirical estimates of price elasticity of the demand for housing consumption in Rosen (1979), Hanushek and Quigley (1980), MacRae and Turner (1981), Goodman and Kawai (1986), and more recently in Goodman (2002) and Ioannides and Zabel (2003). Thus, the instruments include house size, the lagged imputed house-price index, which measures house prices specific to the locality of residence, and the locality-specific house-price index interacted with the state-of-residence house-price index.

To capture the utility taste shifter, in estimation of equation (5) I include a set of demographic variables, such as the level of education, change in age squared, and change in family size. Following Mazzocco (2007) and Meghir and Weber (1996), I also include conditioning variables of the change in a dummy if the husband works and the change in a similar dummy for the wife, to capture a possible nonseparability between modelled choices of consumption and housing, and the choice

Table 2: Estimation results

	(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>First stage</i>			
House size	-0.00076* (0.00045)	-0.00085* (0.00045)	-0.00087* (0.00048)
Lagged house-price index in locality	-0.01000*** (0.00219)	-0.00903*** (0.00311)	-0.00994*** (0.00208)
Lagged house-price index in locality interacted with lagged state house-price index	-0.04013** (0.01681)	-0.04393** (0.01990)	-0.04188** (0.01991)
Robust F-statistic	10.64	12.85	10.10
<i>Second stage</i>			
Δh_t	-2.44**	-1.76**	-3.04**
Confidence set	[-4.90, -0.63]	[-3.33, -0.18]	[-5.98, -1.04]
Kleibergen-Paap rk LM statistic	12.93	13.81	12.90
p-value	0.005	0.003	0.005
Hansen J-statistic	1.11	3.14	0.04
p-value	0.58	0.21	0.98
Observations	7,756	6,390	6,466

NOTE: The first-stage results report coefficients; their standard errors are reported in parentheses, clustered by state level, and the Kleibergen-Paap Wald rk F-statistic, adjusted for clustering by state level. Significance levels: 1% ***, 5% **, 10% *. The second-stage results report the CUE point coefficient estimates for the change in housing stock. Weak-instrument-robust confidence sets in square brackets are based on a linear combination (LC) test of 5% K and AR statistics. I also report the Kleibergen-Paap rk LM test of underidentification and Hansen's J-test of overidentifying restrictions. Instruments include house size, lagged local house-price index computed as in equation (8), and lagged local house-price index interacted with the lagged state house-price index. All regressions include year dummies, change in a dummy if the husband works, change in a similar dummy for the wife, and demographic controls, such as changes in family size, a householder's age interacted with education, and age squared.

of leisure that is not formally modelled in this paper. Year dummies are used to capture aggregate macroeconomic and financial shifters.

Table 2 reports the estimation results for homeowners (column(1)), homeowners with positive liquidity (column (2)), and homeowners with a low DSR (column (3)). The results from a first-stage regression of changes in housing stock, reported in Table 2, confirm a negative relationship between house prices and housing stock. According to the first-stage results, the estimated coefficients on lagged house-price change in locality and the same interacted with the lagged house-price index in the state of residence are negative and statistically significant at the 5% significance level. The coefficients on home size are also negative and marginally statistically significant. With a negative

correlation between house size and growth in housing stock, the results in Table 2 suggest that after controlling for the house-price dynamics, smaller homes experience faster growth in housing stock. Provided that larger homes spend more on repairs and renovation and, per the American Housing Survey of the US Census Bureau, on average, maintain more adequate home quality than smaller homes, their housing stock may not grow as fast.

The robust F-statistics for the test of the hypothesis that the coefficients on the excluded instruments are zero, reported in Table 2, are between 10.1 and 12.9, which is arguably just outside of the problematic range (Staiger and Stock 1997; Stock and Yogo 2005). Nevertheless, the moderate values of the F-statistics in Table 2 can suggest the instruments may potentially be weak. In recognition of this problem, in addition to the robust F-statistics, for each estimation, I report the robust-to-clustering Kleibergen-Paap rk LM test of underidentification and Hansen's J -test of overidentifying restrictions. The main parameter of interest is estimated with the GMM continuously updated estimator (CUE), following the evidence in Hahn, Hausman, and Kuersteiner (2004) that the CUE estimator is more robust to the presence of weak instruments, and in that case, performs better than the IV or two-step GMM estimators. For all estimations, the Kleibergen–Paap underidentification LM test rejects the null hypotheses at the 95% level, suggesting the instruments are adequate to identify the equation. Furthermore, Hansen's J -statistic is far from rejection of the null that the overidentifying restrictions are valid, providing me with confidence that the instrument set is appropriate. Finally, for the estimated parameter of interest, I report a weak-instrument-robust confidence set, developed by Andrews (2016). The confidence set is based on a linear combination (LC) test of K -statistic (a score statistic based on the continuously updating GMM objective function as in Kleibergen 2005) and S -statistic that is a Lagrange multiplier version of the Anderson–Rubin (AR) weak-instruments-robust test (Stock and Wright 2000).

The presentation of the estimation results keeps the focus on the coefficient on housing-stock growth Δh_t , which indicates whether an intratemporal dependence exists between nondurable consumption and housing stock. First, I test whether an intratemporal dependence exists between total nondurable consumption and housing stock. Estimation results in Table 2 show the coefficient

by Δh_t is negative and statistically significant for all samples of homeowners. Overall, the estimation results reject separability in preferences over nondurable consumption and housing.

Further, the negative sign of the estimated coefficient provides information about the sign of the mixed partial derivative of the utility function and indicates an increase in housing stock decreases the marginal utility of nondurable consumption. In the context of power intertemporal utility combined with the CES intratemporal utility, the negative sign on the mixed partial derivative U_{CH} indicates intertemporal consumption smoothing is more important than intratemporal smoothing ($\varepsilon > \sigma$ in equation (6)). This result agrees with empirical findings on the joint estimation of the parameters of intratemporal and intertemporal elasticity of substitution (Li et al. 2016; Ogaki and Reinhart 1998; Yogo 2006). It supports parameterizations of preferences in the life-cycle housing literature (e.g., the influential studies of Cocco 2005; Yao and Zhang 2005) and financial literature (Piazzesi, Schneider, and Tuzel 2007).⁸

Because the results for the full sample of homeowners and the restricted subsamples in columns (2)-(3) of Table 2 do not differ substantially, the following set of estimations is conducted on the full sample of homeowners. I test whether an intratemporal dependence exists between separate categories of nondurable consumption and housing stock. This test is possible under the assumption that in the utility, distinct categories of consumption are additively separable but may be pairwise dependent on housing stock. That is, I estimate 10 different models for distinct nondurable consumption categories and report the findings in Table 3.

The results in Table 3 indicate the coefficient on the change in housing stock in regressions for most consumption categories is not precisely estimated. Food consumption and consumption of utility services (gas, heating fuel, electricity, water and sewer, etc.) are notable exceptions. For these categories of nondurable consumption, the coefficients on the change in housing stock are negative

8. Because detecting the relative importance of the intratemporal and intertemporal tradeoffs through the sign of the mixed derivative of the utility does not allow me to capture the individual strengths of the intratemporal or intertemporal substitutions, my findings also agree with the unit elasticity of intratemporal substitution between nondurable consumption and housing (e.g., Davis and Ortalo-Magnè 2011; Cocco 2005; Yao and Zhang 2005) and the limited intratemporal substitution between nondurable consumption and housing (such as the main result in Li et al. 2016, and the post-war sample estimate in Piazzesi, Schneider, and Tuzel 2007, Table C1) as long as the intertemporal elasticity of substitution of the composite consumption bundles over different time periods is low.

Table 3: Estimation results for the distinct categories of nondurable consumption

	food (1)	health (2)	education (3)	child care (4)	clothing (5)	recreation (6)	transport (7)	tel./internet (8)	utilities (9)	vacations (10)
Δh_t	-3.09** [-6.9,-0.6]	4.33 [-2.6,13.4]	-10.67 [-31.3,25.9]	5.28 [-13.1,35.9]	-1.96 [-7.2, 2.1]	-2.96 [-7.4, 1.4]	-1.18 [-6.5, 1.9]	-4.45 [-10.2, 1.7]	-2.29** [-5.3,-0.1]	-1.89 [-10.0,4.3]
First-stage robust F-test	10.64	12.21	3.79	5.56	9.84	17.56	10.51	10.38	11.04	10.16
rk LM test	12.93	13.24	7.94	8.97	12.07	15.22	12.61	12.74	13.10	13.82
p-value	0.005	0.004	0.047	0.030	0.007	0.002	0.006	0.005	0.004	0.003
J-test	1.05	0.56	0.17	0.05	0.70	2.66	0.96	3.42	0.47	0.02
p-value	0.59	0.76	0.92	0.97	0.70	0.27	0.62	0.18	0.79	0.99
Obs.	7,756	7,360	1,799	853	7,380	6,446	7,587	7,712	7,613	5,359

NOTE: The table reports the CUE point coefficient estimate for the change in housing stock, weak-instrument-robust confidence sets in square brackets based on a linear combination (LC) test of 5% K and AR statistics, the Kleibergen-Paap Wald rk F-statistic, adjusted for clustering by state level, the Kleibergen-Paap rk LM test of underidentification, and Hansen's J-test of overidentifying restrictions. Significance levels: 5% **, 10% *. Instruments include house size, lagged local house-price index computed as in equation (8), and the lagged local house-price index interacted with the lagged state house-price index. All regressions include year dummies, change in a dummy if the husband works, change in a similar dummy for the wife, and demographic controls, such as changes in family size, a householder's age interacted with education, and age squared.

and statistically different from zero at the 5% significance level, and the magnitude of the estimated coefficients is similar to the ones estimated with total nondurable consumption in Table 2. The finding of nonseparability between housing stock and consumption of utility services is probably not surprising, because home improvements often target a more efficient usage of water and sewer, gas, heating fuel, and electricity. Until the relatively recent expansion of the consumption questionnaire, the PSID survey collected merely the information about food expenditures, which prompted many authors to use it as a proxy for nondurable consumption. Flavin and Nakagawa (2008) estimate a model that nests intratemporal nonseparability between nondurable consumption and housing and a habit-formation component, formulating preferences using the power intertemporal utility and the CES intratemporal utility and using food-consumption data from the PSID. Unlike the findings in the literature cited above, and the results reported in this article, Flavin and Nakagawa (2008) find support for the positive mixed partial derivative of the utility, which, as argued in their study, in the presence of a transaction cost on housing, is needed for the empirically relevant limited responsiveness of nondurable consumption to the interest rate. Distinct to this study and the literature cited above, the assumption on constant housing stock for households who do not move is a notable feature of the analysis in Flavin and Nakagawa (2008), which can possibly explain the differences in findings.

Finally, I estimate equation (5), allowing for testing heterogeneous effects in the parameter of interest over age, education, and cyclical component. To do so, I divide the sample of homeowners by age group and interact Δh_t with a dummy for households older than age 45 (denoted as “Old” in Table 4). Next, I divide the sample between households with only a high school diploma and those with a college degree, and interact Δh_t with a dummy for households with a college degree (denoted as “College” in Table 4). Here, I dropped 404 observations for households with less than a high school education. Lastly, to explore the effect of the cyclical component, I construct a dummy variable for the period when house prices declined steeply as opposed to periods of prevalently observed non-declining house prices, and interact Δh_t with the bust dummy (denoted as “Bust” in Table 4). The instruments are interacted accordingly with the relevant dummies as well.

Table 4: Estimation results for heterogeneous effects over demographic and cyclical components

	Heterogeneous effects over:		
	age (1)	education (2)	cyclical component (3)
Δh_t	-3.87** [-5.17,-2.56]	-2.64** [-3.96,-1.33]	-2.12** [-7.41,-0.36]
$\Delta h_t \times \text{Old}$	1.37** [0.83,1.91]		
$\Delta h_t \times \text{College}$		0.35 [-0.14,0.85]	
$\Delta h_t \times \text{Bust}$			2.02** [1.37,2.93]
First-stage robust F-test	5.77	5.92	7.82
Kleibergen-Paap rk LM statistic	12.95	13.32	17.31
p-value	0.024	0.021	0.004
Hansen J-statistic	3.82	2.95	4.05
p-value	0.43	0.57	0.40
Observations	7,756	7,352	7,756

NOTE: The table reports the CUE point coefficient estimate for the change in housing stock, weak-instrument-robust confidence sets in square brackets based on a linear combination (LC) test of 5% K and AR statistics, the Kleibergen-Paap Wald rk F-statistic, adjusted for clustering by state level, the Kleibergen-Paap rk LM test of underidentification, and Hansen's J-test of overidentifying restrictions. Significance levels: 5% **, 10% *. Instruments include house size, lagged local house-price index computed as in equation (8), and lagged local house-price index interacted with the lagged state house-price index. The instruments are accordingly interacted with the relevant dummies for age, education, and bust. All regressions include year dummies, change in a dummy if the husband works, change in a similar dummy for the wife, and demographic controls, such as changes in family size, a householder's age interacted with education, and age squared.

The results in Table 4 suggest some heterogeneity is present in the estimates. The nonseparability between nondurable consumption and housing is largely present for both young and old households, although it is somewhat weaker for the old households. No decisive heterogeneity is detected over education groups. The results for the cyclical component reveal possible heterogeneity in nonseparability over time, and suggest separability between nondurable consumption and housing may not be rejected during the bust period. This finding, however, is based on only one episode of declining house prices, observed over the sample period, and calls for a further analysis of the factors behind it. It can be affected by the relative strength of the intratemporal and intertemporal consumption-smoothing motives; however, among other factors, it also is affected by the structure

of preferences over households' nondurable consumption and housing stock and by the growth rates in those consumption goods, which may also maneuver over business cycles.

5 Conclusion

I test for and find evidence of the intratemporal dependence between total nondurable consumption and housing. My results contribute to the relatively sparse literature investigating the structure of households' preferences over durable and nondurable consumption, and the importance of understanding the preferences over housing and nondurable consumption for academic research and economic policy warrants further research on this topic. For example, the finding of nonseparability between nondurable consumption and housing in individual preferences is relevant for testing the housing wealth effect on consumption. Because I do not rule out intratemporal dependence between housing and consumption, the tests for other channels between housing prices and consumption expenditure (wealth effect, collateral channel, common factors) for homeowners may likely be hindered by the intratemporal tradeoff between housing and consumption. The results may also be relevant for the life-cycle literature that often relies on preferences over consumption and housing being additively separable. The evidence on nonseparability in preferences over consumption and housing, found in this paper, suggests that if economic-policy conclusions strongly rely on the assumption of additive separability over consumption and housing in an agent's preferences, then on the disaggregated level, these conclusions may be sensitive to the composition of the target group, in particular in relation to households who are long in housing.

References

Aladangady, Aditya. 2017. "Housing Wealth and Consumption: Evidence from Geographically-Linked Microdata." *American Economic Review* 107 (11): 3415–3446.

- Alan, Sule, Orazio Attanasio, and Martin Browning.** 2009. “Estimating Euler equations with noisy data: two exact GMM estimators.” *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 24 (2): 309–324.
- Andrews, Isaiah.** 2016. “Conditional Linear Combination Tests for Weakly Identified Models.” *Econometrica* 84 (6): 2155–2182.
- Attanasio, Orazio P., Laura Blow, Robert Hamilton, and Andrew Leicester.** 2009. “Booms and busts: Consumption, house prices and expectations.” *Economica* 76 (301): 20–50.
- Bajari, Patrick, Phoebe Chan, Dirk Krueger, and Daniel Miller.** 2013. “A dynamic model of housing demand: Estimation and policy implications.” *International Economic Review* 54 (2): 409–442.
- Browning, Martin, Mette Gørtz, and Søren Leth-Petersen.** 2013. “Housing Wealth and Consumption: A Micro Panel Study.” *The Economic Journal* 123 (568): 401–428.
- Campbell, John Y., and João F. Cocco.** 2007. “How do House Prices affect Consumption? Evidence from Micro Data.” *Journal of Monetary Economics* 54 (3): 591–621.
- Carroll, Christopher D., Misuzu Otsuka, and Jiri Slacalek.** 2011. “How large are housing and financial wealth effects? A new approach.” *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 43 (1): 55–79.
- Case, Karl, John M. Quigley, and Robert Shiller.** 2005. “Comparing Wealth Effects: The Stock Market versus the Housing Market.” *Advances in Macroeconomics* 5 (1): 1–34.
- Chinloy, Peter.** 1979. “The estimation of net depreciation rates on housing.” *Journal of Urban Economics* 6 (4): 432–443.
- Cocco, João F.** 2005. “Portfolio Choice in the Presence of Housing.” *The Review of Financial Studies* 18 (2): 535–567.
- Cooper, Daniel.** 2013. “House price fluctuations: the role of housing wealth as borrowing collateral.” *Review of Economics and Statistics* 95 (4): 1183–1197.

- Davis, Morris A., and François Ortalo-Magnè.** 2011. “Household expenditures, wages, rents.” *Review of Economic Dynamics* 14 (2): 248–261.
- Davis, Morris A., and Erwan Quintin.** 2017. “On the Nature of Self-Assessed House Prices.” *Real Estate Economics* 45 (3): 628–649.
- DeFusco, Anthony A.** 2017. “Homeowner Borrowing and Housing Collateral: New Evidence from Expiring Price Controls.” *The Journal of Finance* 73 (2): 523–573.
- Domeij, David, and Martin Flodèn.** 2006. “The labor-supply elasticity and borrowing constraints: Why estimates are biased.” *Review of Economic Dynamics* 9 (2): 242–262.
- Epstein, Larry G., and Stanley E. Zin.** 1989. “Substitution, Risk Aversion, and the Temporal Behavior of Consumption and Asset Returns: A Theoretical Framework.” *Econometrica* 57 (4): 937–969.
- . 1991. “Substitution, Risk Aversion, and the Temporal Behavior of Consumption and Asset Returns: An Empirical Analysis.” *Journal of Political Economy* 99 (2): 263–286.
- Fischer, Marcel, and Natalia Khorunzhina.** 2019. “Housing Decision with Divorce Risk.” *International Economic Review* 60 (3).
- Flavin, Marjorie, and Shinobu Nakagawa.** 2008. “A Model of Housing in the Presence of Adjustment Costs: A Structural Interpretation of Habit Persistence.” *American Economic Review* 98 (1): 474–95.
- Gan, Jie.** 2010. “Housing Wealth and Consumption Growth: Evidence from a Large Panel of Households.” *Review of Financial Studies* 23 (6): 2229–2267.
- Gayle, Wayne-Roy, and Natalia Khorunzhina.** 2018. “Micro-Level Estimation of Optimal Consumption Choice With Intertemporal Nonseparability in Preferences and Measurement Errors.” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 36 (2): 227–238.

- Goodman, Allen C.** 2002. “Estimating Equilibrium Housing Demand for “Stayers”.” *Journal of Urban Economics* 51 (1): 1–24.
- Goodman, Allen C., and Masahiro Kawai.** 1986. “Functional form, sample selection, and housing demand.” *Journal of Urban Economics* 20 (2): 155–167.
- Gyourko, Joseph, and Joseph Tracy.** 2006. “Using Home Maintenance and Repairs to Smooth Variable Earnings.” *Review of Economics and Statistics* 88 (4): 736–747.
- Hahn, Jinyong, Jerry Hausman, and Guido Kuersteiner.** 2004. “Estimation with weak instruments: Accuracy of higher-order bias and MSE approximations.” *The Econometrics Journal* 7 (1): 272–306.
- Hanushek, Eric A, and John M Quigley.** 1980. “What Is the Price Elasticity of Housing Demand?” *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 62 (3): 449–54.
- Harding, John P., Stuart S. Rosenthal, and C.F. Sirmans.** 2007. “Depreciation of housing capital, maintenance, and house price inflation: Estimates from a repeat sales model.” *Journal of Urban Economics* 61 (2): 193–217.
- Hicks, John R., and Roy G. D. Allen.** 1934. “A Reconsideration of the Theory of Value. Part I.” *Economica* 1 (1): 52–76.
- Ioannides, Yannis M., and Jeffrey E. Zabel.** 2003. “Neighbourhood effects and housing demand.” *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 18 (5): 563–584.
- Jappelli, Tullio.** 1990. “Who is Credit Constrained in the U. S. Economy?” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 105 (1): 219–234.
- Jappelli, Tullio, Jörn-Steffen Pischke, and Nicholas S. Souleles.** 1998. “Testing for Liquidity Constraints in Euler Equations with Complementary Data Sources.” *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 80 (2): 251–262.

- Johnson, Kathleen W., and Geng Li.** 2010. “The Debt-Payment-to-Income Ratio as an Indicator of Borrowing Constraints: Evidence from Two Household Surveys.” *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 42 (7): 1373–1390.
- Kannai, Yakar.** 1980. “The ALEP definition of complementarity and least concave utility functions.” *Journal of Economic Theory* 22 (1): 115–117.
- Kleibergen, Frank.** 2005. “Testing Parameters in GMM Without Assuming that They Are Identified.” *Econometrica* 73 (4): 1103–1123.
- Li, Wenli, Haiyong Liu, Fang Yang, and Rui Yao.** 2016. “Housing over time and over the life cycle: a structural estimation.” *International Economic Review* 57 (4): 1237–1260.
- MacRae, C. Duncan, and Margery Austin Turner.** 1981. “Estimating demand for owner-occupied housing subject to the income tax.” *Journal of Urban Economics* 10 (3): 338–356.
- Mazzocco, Maurizio.** 2007. “Household Intertemporal Behaviour: A Collective Characterization and a Test of Commitment.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 74 (3): 857–895.
- Meghir, Costas, and Guglielmo Weber.** 1996. “Intertemporal Nonseparability or Borrowing Restrictions? A Disaggregate Analysis using a U.S. Consumption Panel.” *Econometrica* 64 (5): 1151–1181.
- Mian, Atif, Kamalesh Rao, and Amir Sufi.** 2013. “Household Balance Sheets, Consumption, and the Economic Slump.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 128 (4): 1687–1726.
- Mian, Atif, and Amir Sufi.** 2014. *House Price Gains and US Household Spending from 2002 to 2006*. NBER Working Paper 20152.
- Ogaki, Masao, and Carmen M. Reinhart.** 1998. “Measuring Intertemporal Substitution: The Role of Durable Goods.” *Journal of Political Economy* 106 (5): 1078–1098.
- Paiella, Monica, and Luigi Pistaferri.** 2017. “Decomposing the Wealth Effect on Consumption.” *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 99 (4): 710–721.

- Pelletier, Denis, and Cengiz Tunç.** Forthcoming. “Endogenous Life-Cycle Housing Investment and Portfolio Allocation.” *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*.
- Piazzesi, Monika, Martin Schneider, and Selale Tuzel.** 2007. “Housing, consumption and asset pricing.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 83 (3): 531–569.
- Rosen, Harvey S.** 1979. “Owner occupied housing and the federal income tax: Estimates and simulations.” *Journal of Urban Economics* 6 (2): 247–266.
- Runkle, David E.** 1991. “Liquidity constraints and the permanent-income hypothesis: Evidence from panel data.” *Journal of Monetary Economics* 27 (1): 73–98.
- Samuelson, Paul A.** 1974. “Complementarity: An Essay on The 40th Anniversary of the Hicks-Allen Revolution in Demand Theory.” *Journal of Economic Literature* 12 (4): 1255–1289.
- Staiger, Douglas, and James H. Stock.** 1997. “Instrumental Variables Regression with Weak Instruments.” *Econometrica* 65 (3): 557–586.
- Stock, James H., and Jonathan H. Wright.** 2000. “GMM with Weak Identification.” *Econometrica* 68 (5): 1055–1096.
- Stock, James, and Motohiro Yogo.** 2005. “Testing for Weak Instruments in Linear IV Regression.” In *Identification and Inference for Econometric Models*, edited by Donald W.K. Andrews. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Yao, Rui, and Harold H. Zhang.** 2005. “Optimal Consumption and Portfolio Choices with Risky Housing and Borrowing Constraints.” *Review of Financial Studies* 18 (1): 197–239.
- Yogo, Motohiro.** 2006. “A Consumption-Based Explanation of Expected Stock Returns.” *The Journal of Finance* 61 (2): 539–580.
- Zeldes, Stephen P.** 1989. “Consumption and Liquidity Constraints: An Empirical Investigation.” *Journal of Political Economy* 97 (2): 305–346.

Appendix

A Log-linearized Euler equations

Denote \bar{C} and \bar{H} as the expected values of nondurable consumption and housing stock. Let $\hat{C} = \ln(C/\bar{C})$ and $\hat{H} = \ln(H/\bar{H})$. The subsequent derivations closely follow [Mazzocco \(2007\)](#).

Let ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 be defined as follows:

$$\phi_1(\hat{C}, \hat{H}) = \ln \{U_C(\exp\{\hat{C}\}E[C], \exp\{\hat{H}\}E[H])\},$$

$$\phi_2(\hat{C}, \hat{H}) = \ln \{U_H(\exp\{\hat{C}\}E[C], \exp\{\hat{H}\}E[H])\},$$

where U_C and U_H are household marginal utilities with respect to consumption and housing. Assume marginal utilities U_C and U_H are continuously differentiable. Let the one-variable functions $\vartheta_1 : I_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\vartheta_2 : I_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as $\vartheta_1(k) = \phi_1(k\hat{C}, k\hat{H})$ and $\vartheta_2(k) = \phi_2(k\hat{C}, k\hat{H})$, where $I_1 = (-a, a)$ and $I_2 = (-b, b)$. Applying the one-variable Taylor expansion formula with remainder, I get

$$\vartheta_i(k) = \vartheta_i(0) + \vartheta_i'(0)k + r_i(k) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2 \quad (\text{A1})$$

with

$$r_i(k) = \int_0^k (k-t)\vartheta_i''(t)dt.$$

From [\(A1\)](#) and the definition of $\vartheta_i(k)$ with $k = 1$, I get

$$\phi_i(\hat{C}, \hat{H}) = \phi_i(0) + \frac{\partial \phi_i(0)}{\partial \hat{C}}\hat{C} + \frac{\partial \phi_i(0)}{\partial \hat{H}}\hat{H} + R_i(\hat{C}, \hat{H}) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Under the assumption of rational expectations, the households' Euler equations can be written as

$$\beta R_{t+1} \frac{U_C(C_{t+1}, H_{t+1})}{U_C(C_t, H_t)} \exp(\phi' \Delta z_{t+1}) = 1 + e_{t+1}^C,$$

$$\beta R_{t+1} \frac{P_t}{P_{t+1}} \frac{U_H(C_{t+1}, H_{t+1})}{U_H(C_t, H_t)} \exp(\phi' \Delta z_{t+1}) = 1 + e_{t+1}^H,$$

where e_{t+1}^C and e_{t+1}^H are the expectation errors. Taking logs, using $\phi_1 = \ln U_C$ and $\phi_2 = \ln U_H$, I have

$$\phi_1(\hat{C}_{t+1}, \hat{H}_{t+1}) - \phi_1(\hat{C}_t, \hat{H}_t) = -\ln \beta - \ln R_{t+1} - \phi \Delta z_{t+1} + \ln(1 + e_{t+1}^C),$$

$$\phi_2(\hat{C}_{t+1}, \hat{H}_{t+1}) - \phi_2(\hat{C}_t, \hat{H}_t) = -\ln \beta - \ln R_{t+1} - \phi \Delta z_{t+1} + \ln(P_{t+1}/P_t) + \ln(1 + e_{t+1}^H).$$

By definition of $\phi_i(\hat{C}, \hat{H})$, I have $\partial \phi_1 / \partial \hat{C} = U_{CC}/U_C$, $\partial \phi_1 / \partial \hat{H} = U_{CH}/U_C$, $\partial \phi_2 / \partial \hat{C} = U_{HC}/U_H$, and $\partial \phi_2 / \partial \hat{H} = U_{HH}/U_H$. Then from (A2),

$$\frac{U_{CC}}{U_C} \ln \frac{C_{t+1}}{C_t} + \frac{U_{CH}}{U_C} \ln \frac{H_{t+1}}{H_t} = -\ln \beta - \ln R_{t+1} - \phi \Delta z_{t+1} - \Delta R_1 + \ln(1 + e_{t+1}^C), \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{U_{HC}}{U_H} \ln \frac{C_{t+1}}{C_t} + \frac{U_{HH}}{U_H} \ln \frac{H_{t+1}}{H_t} &= -\ln \beta - \ln R_{t+1} + \ln \frac{P_{t+1}}{P_t} - \phi \Delta z_{t+1} - \Delta R_2 \\ &+ \ln(1 + e_{t+1}^H), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

where ΔR_i for $i = 1, 2$ is the Taylor-series remainder. Equation (5) follows from rearranging equation (A3) and writing the resulting equation one period back.

B Data Construction

B.1 Deflating

Consumption categories reported in the PSID include food, clothing, transportation, utilities, trips and vacations, entertainment, healthcare, education, and childcare. Deflating of the consumption expenditures and housing data is closely related to the timing of the relevant survey question. Some questions ask about expenditures in the month when the interview occurred, whereas others are asked about the previous year.

Food. Food-consumption expenditures include food consumed at home, away from home, delivered food, and the value of food stamps. Data on food consumed at home and the value of food stamps are deflated using the CPI for food at home. Data on food consumed away from home and delivered food are deflated using the CPI deflator for food away from home. Food-consumption data are

Table B1: Summary Statistics

	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015
Consumption	37,054.3	37,846.0	35,578.4	34,422.7	34,405.9	36,739.3
Food	8,533.6	8,664.8	7,896.8	7,990.7	8,165.7	7,969.0
Clothing	2,112.3	2,079.7	1,790.0	1,819.3	1,599.5	1,700.6
Entertainment	1,173.7	1,232.7	1,247.1	1,127.7	1,108.3	1,084.1
Telecommunications	2,043.5	2,349.1	2,645.0	2,764.6	3,037.3	3,297.5
Utilities	3,269.4	2,933.2	3,070.5	3,145.9	2,937.9	2,953.2
Trips, vacations	2,231.9	2,565.7	2,492.4	2,530.8	2,537.7	2,598.7
Transportation	9,949.9	10,069.4	9,040.8	8,111.2	8,292.3	10,810.9
Education	3,103.0	3,047.0	2,569.7	2,382.7	2,321.0	2,224.8
Childcare	661.9	595.1	686.7	637.5	631.3	478.9
Healthcare	3,975.2	4,309.3	4,139.4	3,912.4	3,775.0	3,621.5
House value	276,241.4	288,350.0	247,357.0	237,246.5	224,979.6	214,371.1
Maintenance	2,795.1	2,926.6	2,460.9	2,427.5	2,217.8	2,271.2
Home size	7.1	7.1	7.0	6.9	6.9	6.8
Age	46.3	48.3	48.3	48.9	49.3	49.6
Years of education	13.8	13.8	14.0	14.1	14.2	14.1
Family size	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9
Household income	85,290.1	87,429.6	88,311.7	81,594.4	84,767.6	85,496.4
Debt service	20,179.4	19,505.2	18,947.5	21,158.6	17,123.7	18,386.8
Fin. liquidity	90,938.0	112,030.2	106,437.9	90,180.4	84,915.2	94,926.1
N homeowners	1,261	1,261	1,556	1,625	1,696	1,618
N with pos.liquidity	1,039	1,039	1,316	1,328	1,390	1,317
N with low DSR	1,053	1,053	1,297	1,357	1,432	1,327

NOTE: All monetary values are in 2009 dollars. For periods 2007 - 2015, the total number of observations for the sample of homeowners is 7,756, for the sample of homeowners with positive financial liquidity is 6,390, and for the sample of homeowners with a low debt-service ratio (DSR) is 6,466.

deflated according to the month and year when the interview occurred, whereas data on food stamps and income are deflated using the CPI for the end of the year before the interview was conducted.

Clothing. Spending on clothing and apparel is deflated using CPI for apparel for the end of the year before the interview was conducted.

Utility. Utility data include payments for gas or other types of heating fuel, electricity expenses, payments for water and sewer, and other utilities. Each of these utility spending categories is deflated using CPI appropriate for the category (utility fuels and gas service, electricity, water, and

sewerage maintenance) according to the month and year when the interview occurred.

Communication. Data on telecommunication include payments for telephone, cable or satellite TV, and internet service. Telecommunication data are deflated using CPI for communication according to the month and year when the interview occurred.

Healthcare. Healthcare spending includes payments for health insurance, prescriptions, in-home medical care and special facilities, doctors, outpatient surgery, dental bills, hospital bills, and nursing homes. At the time of the interview, the PSID collects healthcare expenditures combined over two previous years. The total healthcare expenditures are divided by 2 to obtain the value at the annual frequency, comparable with other expenditure categories. Total spending on healthcare is deflated using CPI for medical care for the end of the year before the interview was conducted.

Education and childcare. School-related expenses are deflated using CPI for education, whereas childcare expenditures are deflated using CPI for childcare and nursery school for the end of the year before the interview was conducted.

Entertainment and vacations. Recreation and entertainment spending and expenditures on vacations and trips are deflated using CPI for recreation. Vacations and trips data are deflated according to the month and year when the interview occurred, whereas recreation and entertainment data are deflated using the CPI for the end of the year before the interview was conducted.

Transportation. Transportation expenditures are deflated using CPI for transportation. Many of the transportation categories (expenses on gasoline, parking, bus and train, cab fare, vehicle repair, additional car or lease payments, and other transportation-related spending) are reported for the month before the interview was conducted and are deflated according to the previous month of the current year when the interview occurred.

Housing. Housing-related data (home repairs and maintenance, and house value) are deflated using CPI for owners' equivalent rent of primary residence. House-value data are deflated according to the month and year when the interview occurred, whereas data on home repairs and maintenance are deflated using the CPI for the end of the year before the interview was conducted.

B.2 US Regions

Figure 2 reports comparisons of the imputed house-price growth from the PSID and the HPIs by the US Federal Housing Finance Agency and Zillow over four major US regions: Northeast, North Central, South, and West. Following the regional assignment of the states in the PSID, states were grouped into regions as follows:

1. Northeast: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont
2. North Central: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin
3. South: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington DC, West Virginia
4. West: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming

The price-growth indices for the fifth region, which includes Alaska and Hawaii, are not reported due to a small number of observations in the PSID for these states.




Figure B1: House-price indices over states. The solid line shows average house-price growth imputed from the PSID, the dashed line represents FHFA HPI, and the short-dashed line corresponds to the Zillow index. Alaska, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming are not reported due to a small number of observations (less than 10 per period).