TÜRKİYE CUMHURİYET MERKEZ BANKASI

WORKING PAPER NO: 14/15

News, Housing Boom-Bust Cycles, and Monetary Policy

May 2014

Birol KANIK
Wei XIAO

© Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey 2014

Address:
Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey
Head Office
Research and Monetary Policy Department
İstiklal Caddesi No: 10
Ulus, 06100 Ankara, Turkey

Phone:
+90 312 507 54 02

Facsimile:
+90 312 507 57 33

The views expressed in this working paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey. The Working Paper Series are externally refereed. The refereeing process is managed by the Research and Monetary Policy Department.

News, Housing Boom-Bust Cycles, and Monetary Policy*

Birol Kanık
Central Bank of Turkey

Wei Xiao
State University of New York at Binghamton

Abstract

We explore the possibility that a housing market boom-bust cycle may arise when public beliefs are driven by news shocks. News, imperfect and noisy by nature, may generate expectations that are overly optimistic or pessimistic. Over-optimism easily leads to excessive accumulation of housing assets, and creates a housing boom that is not based on fundamentals. When the news is found false or inaccurate, investors revert their actions, and a downturn in the housing market follows. By altering agents' net worth conditions, a housing cycle can have significant repercussions in the aggregate economy. In this paper, we construct a dynamic general equilibrium model that can give rise to a news-driven housing boom-bust cycle, and we consider how monetary policies should respond to it.

JEL classification: E3;E4;E5.

Keywords: Business cycle; News; Monetary policy.

*We would like to thank James B. Bullard, George W. Evans, Seppo Honkapohja, Hakki Yazici, Mustafa Kilinc, Barry E. Jones, Christopher L. Hanes, Nobuhiro Kiyotaki, seminar participants of Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey and Binghamton University Department of Economics for valuable comments. The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey. E-mails: birol.kanik@tcmb.gov.tr and wxiao@binghamton.edu

1 Introduction

The notion that excessive public expectations can cause housing market booms and busts is now widely accepted by policymakers and the public. Recent research has successfully incorporated housing sectors into dynamic general equilibrium models, but typically does not consider expectation errors as an independent source of fluctuations. This paper explores the idea that noisy signals or news can generate optimism and pessimism in agent expectations and cause fluctuations in housing demand. When the news is found inaccurate, the subsequent adjustment in expectations and reversal in asset transactions complete a boom-bust cycle. An important feature of the model is that housing assets serve as collateral for credit-constrained agents. By altering the borrowers' net worth conditions, a housing cycle can have significant repercussions in the aggregate economy.

This mechanism is consistent with the "credit view" that asset market conditions are not merely reflections of economic conditions, but also a cause of fluctuations. Until recently, credit channels are often absent from dynamic stochastic general equilibrium (DSGE) models. Bernanke and Gertler (1989) and Williamson (1987) represent earlier works that consider financial intermediation and agency costs as propagation mechanisms for aggregate shocks.[1] Kiyotaki and Moore (1997) make important progress by adding credit constrained agents and collateralized debts into DSGE models. Bernanke et. al. (1999) embed a financial accelerator in a sticky price environment, and make monetary policy analysis possible. Recent works, such as those by Iacoviello (2005) and Monacelli (2009), specifically incorporate a housing sector into general equilibrium models with collateral constraint, and examine monetary policy's proper response to housing market fluctuations.

The development of the literature naturally leads to a debate on policy issues. Bernanke and Gertler (2001) pose the question "should central banks respond to asset prices?" Most research suggests that it is not necessary for inflation-targeting and "Taylor rule" regimes to respond to asset prices, on the ground that asset price movements tend to change output gaps and inflation in the same direction, which can be taken care of by the policy regime (Batini and Nelson, 2000; Bernanke and Gertler, 2001; Iacoviello, 2005). Some research, however, finds that targeting asset misalignment in addition to inflation and output gaps does improve economic stability (Ceccetti, et. al., 2000). The debate between Bernanke and Gertler (2001) and Cecchetti et. al. (2000) is especially instructional. They both use the Bernanke and Gertler model to search for optimal interest rate rules, but draw distinct conclusions. What makes the difference is that in Bernanke and Gertler (2001), the economy is subject to both fundamental and non-fundamental shocks, and the central bank cannot distinguish them, whereas in

[1] Carlstrom and Fuerst (1997) build on Bernanke and Gertler (1989) and evaluate the effect of agency cost quantitatively.

Cecchetti et. al. (2000), the only shock is non-fundamental, and the central bank is aware of the price misalignment.[2] A critical lesson from this debate is that the appropriate responses of monetary policy to asset movements depend on the underlying sources of uncertainty.

In this paper, we propose that one source of uncertainty - news shocks - is important for the housing market in particular, and for the aggregate economy in general. It is important because news, imperfect and noisy by nature, may generate expectations that are overly optimistic or pessimistic. Over-optimism easily leads to excessive demand for housing assets, and creates a housing boom that is not based on fundamentals. When the news is found false or inaccurate, buyers revert their actions, and a downturn in the housing market follows. This explanation of a housing boom-bust cycle is inspired by the insight of Cochrane (1994), Beaudry and Portier (2004) and Jaimovich and Rebelo (2009). In their works, noisy news about technological progress is an important source of business cycles. This type of cycles are referred to as "Pigou cycles" since the idea dates back to the earlier works of Pigou in 1926. Recent empirical research has provided support for this view. For example, the VAR evidence of Beaudry and Portier (2006), Beaudry, Dupaigne, and Portier (2008), and Beaudry and Lucke (2010) identifies news shocks as a major source of macroeconomic fluctuations.

Our interests in this view of the cycle were also motivated by a salient fact of the recent U.S. housing market. Real housing prices significantly deviated from economic fundamentals during the 1998-2007 episode of housing boom (Shiller, 2007). In Figure 1, we reproduce with newer data a graph from Shiller (2007), which shows that real housing prices surpassed real rental prices and real building costs between 1998 and 2007. Case and Shiller (2003)'s survey results further show that speculative psychology played major roles in homeowners' purchasing decisions during much of the housing boom. Similarly, Piazzesi and Schneider (2009) study the Michigan Survey of Consumers and find that what makes the latest housing boom distinctive is that towards the end of the boom, the percentage of momentum traders – traders who buy because of their optimistic beliefs about future housing prices – rose dramatically. These facts suggest that one needs to look beyond traditional fundamentals for plausible explanations of the recent housing cycle, and we believe the Pigouian explanation is one such candidate.

We construct a general equilibrium model in which credit-constrained borrowers use their housing assets as collateral to finance their purchases. Optimistic news raises these agents' expected future net worth, expands their borrowing capacity, and allows them to purchase more housing and consumption goods. Higher housing demand raises housing prices and creates a housing boom. The housing boom

[2] In one experiment Bernanke and Gertler consider a single non-fundamental shock, and find that adding an asset price target is better than pure inflation targeting. However, they emphasize that asset prices can be substituted by output gaps.



Figure 1: Housing price, construction cost, and owner's equivalent rent

further increases the borrowing agents' net worth, and raises their purchases even more. Aggregate demand therefore increases, driving work hours and output up, producing an economic expansion. The opposite works for pessimistic news. This is the major transmission mechanism of the model. We show that when there is overly optimistic news about future demand, this transmission mechanism creates a housing boom and comovement among aggregate variables, and when the true shock is revealed, the adjustment in expectations generates a sharp decline in housing prices. A recession then follows.

Our theoretical model is based on the work of Iacoviello (2005) and Iacoviello and Neri (2010). In these papers, housing demand and housing price fluctuations can be explained by three major sources of uncertainty at the business cycle frequency: housing preference shocks, housing technology shocks, and montetary shocks. They do not consider the possibility that news about these shocks can also become an independent impulse mechanism, and non-fundamental fluctuations can be generated when news is inaccurate. In this respect, our paper can be viewed as an extension of their works. We base our econometric analysis on Iacoviello (2005)'s full quantitative model. Essentially, we add news shocks to Iacoviello's original selection of exogenous shocks, and let the data decide which shocks are more significant. We find that housing preference shocks, which Iacoviello (2005) identifies as the largest source of fluctuations, continue to be very important. However, news about future housing preferences also becomes an important driving force, and can explain a significant portion of business cycle fluctuations.

Equipped with a working model, we proceed to ask what monetary policies are appropriate in dealing with news-driven business cycles. We consider Taylor-type interest rules. We ask whether or not a policy reaction entails a specific housing price target in the interest rate rule. An interest rate rule is deemed best if it minimizes the central bank's loss function. Our result suggests that the gain from targeting asset prices, in addition to output and inflation, is small. If current values of output and inflation are not observable, and if current housing prices are observable, then targeting housing price does have some "information gain." The conclusion is reminiscent of Bernanke and Gertler (2001) and similar earlier works. Iacoviello (2005)'s experiment with a housing model also draws essentially the same conclusion. Our contribution to this topic is to demonstrate that when news shocks are the driving force of cycles, a Taylor-type monetary policy rule still does best by responding properly to inflation and output variations. To our knowledge, no other work exists that addresses this policy issue using a similar environment, in which business cycles are mainly driven by news shocks.

Our paper makes a contribution to the "news-driven business cycle" literature. In that literature, a major difficulty is that it is very hard to generate comovement among aggregate variables. In a real business cycle model, for example, positive news about future productivity changes has a strong wealth effect. It makes economic agents "go on vacation" – consume more, work less and produce less, and invest less to pay for the higher consumption. Good news creates a recession instead of a boom. Beaudry and Portier (2004) generate positive comovement with a multi-sector economy in which investment decisions and consumption decisions are decoupled so that the substitution effect between the two can be minimized. In Jaimovich and Rebelo (2009), adjustment cost, capacity utilization, and preferences that incorporate a weak wealth effect on labor supply are used to generate positive comovement. Christiano et. al. (2008) study a sticky wage model with a monetary authority that targets inflation. When there is positive productivity news, the central bank's policy can keep inflation and real wages from rising too quickly, so that unemployment and production losses can be prevented. This helps generate positive comovement among economic aggregates.

In this paper, we rely on two features of the model to generate comovement. One is the existence of heterogeneous agents, and the other is the credit channel. When news about higher future housing prices arrives, it is optimal for agents to start increasing their demand for housing today to take advantage of the capital gains. In our setup, the user cost of housing decreases more for the borrower than it does for the lender, because accumulating more housing relaxes her collateral constraint and allows her to borrow and consume more. This causes the lender to sell houses to the borrower. The reactions of consumption, labor and output depend on the strength of the credit channel. If the down-payment ratio is high (weak credit channel), substitution effect dominates wealth effect for the

borrower's consumption and leisure decisions – she decreases consumption and leisure. If the down-payment ratio is small (strong credit channel), borrower's consumption and leisure increase. On the other hand, the lender has a strong incentive to save. So she consumes less and works more. The central bank follows an interest rate rule that reacts more than one-for-one to inflation. This raises the real interest rate, and is consistent the lender's optimal saving behavior. As a result, aggregate labor and consumption comove positively with output in the strong credit channel.

Our paper is also generally related to a large literature that attempts to understand how incomplete/dispersed information affect housing and business cycles. One approach is based on the Phelp-Lucas hypothesis that imperfect information about the nature of the economy makes agents react in different ways to changes in market conditions. For example, Favara and Song (2011) implement this idea in a user-cost model of housing, where agents are differentiated as optimists and pessimists, who receive public and private signals about the nature of the economy. Optimists' expectations dominate the housing market because of a short-sell constraint on pessimists. Similarly, in Burnside, Eichenbaum and Rebelo (2011), agents have heterogeneous views about the fundamentals of the economy. They change their beliefs because of social dynamics. As a result, agents who have tigher priors become more influential and dictate market outcomes. Our paper is different from these papers in terms of the source of heterogeneity. In our paper there is no difference in the news or signals that agents receive. There is no dispersed information. It is the degree of impatience that differentiates the agents. The more impatient agents become borrowers, and the less impatient ones become lenders.

Another way to model expectations is the adaptive learning approach. Agents are boundedly rational and behave like econometricians (see Evans and Honkapohja, 2001, for a survey). They use observed data to estimate the true law of motion of the economy. Inaccurate estimation leads to expectation errors. The economy has a self-referential nature: agents' expectations will affect the true law of motion, which in turn affects agents' expectations. Thus, agents' expectations alone can drive business cycles. Eusepi and Preston (2011) and Williams (2012) study models with learning agents and find that learning can generate housing boom-bust cycles. The difference between this approach and the news-shock approach is that with learning, expectation errors are "intrinsic" in that they are generated by agents' learning behavior. On the other hand, news shocks are extrinsic because they are exogenous shocks.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 lays out the micro-founded model framework and derives the equilibrium conditions. Section 3 explores whether or not news-driven cycles can arise in this model. Section 4 presents the policy analysis. Section 5 concludes.

2 A benchmark model

In this section, we construct a simple model to illustrate the important mechanisms that make a news-driven boom-bust cycle possible. The model is based on Iacoviello (2005), which is in turn related to earlier works of Bernanke et. al. (1999) and Kiyotaki and Moore (1997). Unlike Iacoviello (2005), we assume housing assets do not enter the production function, and we do not model any entrepreneurs as borrowers.

Consider a discrete time, infinite horizon economy where a patient household (lender), an impatient household (borrower), a wholesaler firm, and some retailers reside. The borrower is less patient than the lender because she discounts the future more heavily. Both households consume, work and demand a housing asset. The borrower uses her housing assets as collaterals to borrow from the lender, and her capacity to borrow is limited by the expected future value of her discounted asset holdings. The wholesaler hires labor from both households to produce a homogeneous intermediate good. There are a large number of monopolistically competitive retailers who buy the intermediate good and differentiate it into consumption goods, and sell to the households. As in Bernanke et. al. (1999), the retailers are Calvo-type price setters who are the source of sticky prices. Collateralized borrowing, adopted from Iacoviello (2005), provides the critical channel via which changes in net worth affects the aggregate economy.

2.1 Patient household/lender

The lender maximizes a lifetime utility function given by:

$$E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^t (\ln C_{1t} + d_t \ln h_{1t} - \frac{L_{1t}^{\eta}}{\eta}),$$

subject to the constraint

$$C_{1t} + q_t h_{1t} + \frac{R_{t-1} b_{1t-1}}{\pi_t} = b_{1t} + q_t h_{1t-1} + w_{1t} L_{1t} + F_t, \tag{1}$$

where E_0 is the expectation operator, β_1 is the discount factor, C_{1t} is consumption, h_{1t} is her holding of housing asset, and L_{1t} represents hours worked. P_t is the general price level at time t. $b_t = \frac{B_t}{P_t}$ represents real holdings of one period loan, R_{t-1} is the nominal interest rate, $q_t = \frac{Q_t}{P_t}$ is real housing price, $w_{1t} = \frac{W_{1t}}{P_t}$ is real wage, $\pi_t = \frac{P_t}{P_{t-1}}$ is inflation rate, and F_t represents real profits received from the retailers. The variable d_t is a preference shock that shifts the marginal rate of substitution between housing and consumption/leisure. Note that all capital letters represent the nominal counterparts

of the defined real variables (except for C and F). The subscript "1" is used to tag all variables of the patient household. The subscript "2" will shortly be used to denote variables of the impatient household. By putting total housing stock into the utility function, we implicitly assume that housing services are proportional to the housing stock.

This is a fairly standard household problem that can be solved to yield the following first order conditions

$$\frac{1}{C_{1t}} w_{1t} = L_{1t}^{\eta-1}, \tag{2}$$

$$\frac{q_t}{C_{1t}} = \frac{d_t}{h_{1t}} + \beta_1 E_t \frac{q_{t+1}}{C_{1t+1}}, \tag{3}$$

$$\frac{1}{C_{1t}} = \beta_1 E_t \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1} C_{1t+1}}. \tag{4}$$

(2) is a standard condition linking the real wage to the borrower's marginal rate of substitution between consumption and leisure. (3) equalizes the lender's marginal utility of the consumption and the marginal benefit of acquiring housing assets. (4) is a standard Euler equation characterizing the lender's intertemporal choice between current and future consumption.

2.2 Impatient household/borrower

The impatient household's problem is similar to that of the patient household, with two differences. First, the impatient household does not own any retailers and does not receive profits, and second, her borrowing capacity is constrained by the discounted future value of the collateral – her housing assets. Thus the problem is

$$\max E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta_2^t (\ln C_{2t} + d_t \ln h_{2t} - \frac{L_{2t}^{\eta}}{\eta}),$$

subject to

$$C_{2t} + q_t h_{2t} + \frac{R_{t-1} b_{2t-1}}{\pi_t} = b_{2t} + q_t h_{2t-1} + w_{2t} L_{2t}, \tag{5}$$

$$b_{2t} \leq m_2 E_t (\frac{q_{t+1} h_{2t} \pi_{t+1}}{R_t}). \tag{6}$$

A requirement that $\beta_2 < \beta_1$ ensures that this household is more impatient than the lender and will need to borrow from her. The amount that the debtor can borrow, in nominal terms, is bounded by $m_2 E_t(\frac{Q_{t+1} h_{2t}}{R_t})$, where $0 < m_2 < 1$. In other words, a fraction $1 - m_2$ of the housing value cannot be used as collateral. One can broadly think of $1 - m_2$ as the down-payment rate, or think of m_2 as the

loan-to-value ratio.

Solving this problem yields the following conditions:

$$\frac{1}{C_{2t}} w_{2t} = L_{2t}^{\eta-1}, \tag{7}$$

$$\frac{q_t}{C_{2t}} = \frac{d_t}{h_{2t}} + \beta_2 E_t \frac{q_{t+1}}{C_{2t+1}} + \lambda_t E_t m_2 \pi_{t+1} q_{t+1}, \tag{8}$$

$$\frac{1}{C_{2t}} = \beta_2 E_t \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1} C_{2t+1}} + \lambda_t R_t, \tag{9}$$

where λ_t is the Lagrangian multiplier associated with the borrowing constraint. It represents the shadow value of relaxing the borrowing constraint. It enters both (8) and (9), and has important effects on the model's transmission mechanism. We explain this in detail in the next section.

2.3 Intermediate goods firm

The intermediate goods (wholesaler) firm hires labor from both households as inputs to produce a homogeneous good Y_t:

$$Y_t = L_{1t}^{\alpha} L_{2t}^{1-\alpha}, \tag{10}$$

where $0 < \alpha < 1$.

After the intermediate goods are produced, retailers purchase them at the wholesale price P_t^w, and transform them into final goods and sell them at the price P_t. We denote the markup of final over intermediate goods as $X_t = \frac{P_t}{P_t^w}$.

The producer maximizes her profit

$$Y_t / X_t - w_{1t} L_{1t} - w_{2t} L_{2t}. \tag{11}$$

subject to (10).

2.4 Retailers

There are a continuum of retailers indexed by i. Retailer i buys the intermediate good in a competitive market, differentiates it at no cost into $Y_t(i)$, and sells it at $P_t(i)$. Total final goods are aggregated from each individual final good as

$$Y_t^f = [\int_0^1 Y_t(i)^{\frac{\varepsilon-1}{\varepsilon}} di]^{\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon-1}}, \tag{12}$$

where $\varepsilon > 1$. Each retailer's demand curve is

$$Y_t(i) = [\frac{P_t(i)}{P_t}]^{-\varepsilon} Y_t^f. \tag{13}$$

The price index of final goods is

$$P_t = [\int_0^1 P_t(i)^{1-\varepsilon} di]^{\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}}. \tag{14}$$

We assume Calvo-type pricing for retailers. Each retailer can only change the price with probability $1-\theta$. The optimal pricing decision is

$$\max_{P_t^o} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta^k E_t\{\beta_1 \frac{C_{1t}}{C_{1t+k}} [\frac{P_t^o - P_{t+k}^w}{P_{t+k}} Y_{t+k}(i)]\}$$

subject to (13). P_t^o represents the optimal price chosen by the retailer to maximize the objective. The retailers use the lender's discount factor because they are owned by her. Differentiating with respect to P_t^o implies that the optimal set price must satisfy:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta^k E_t\{\beta_1^k \frac{C_{1t}}{C_{1t+k}} [\frac{P_t^o(i)}{P_{t+k}} - \frac{X}{X_{t+k}}) Y_{t+k}(i)]\} = 0. \tag{15}$$

Given that the fraction θ of retailers do not change their price in period t, the aggregate price evolves according to

$$P_t = [\theta P_{t-1}^{1-\varepsilon} + (1-\theta) P_t^{o1-\varepsilon}]^{\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}}. \tag{16}$$

These two conditions can be combined to create the new Phillips curve in the linearized version of the model.

2.5 Interest rate rule

We assume there is a central bank that implements a Taylor-type interest rate rule that targets the current levels of output gap, inflation, and possibly housing prices. The interest rule is of the form

$$R_t = R(\frac{\pi_t}{\pi})^{\tau_\pi} (\frac{Y_t}{Y})^{\tau_Y} (\frac{q_t}{q})^{\tau_q}, \tag{17}$$

where $\tau_\pi, \tau_Y, \tau_h > 0$ are the reaction parameters of the central bank, and R, π, Y, and q denote steady state values of the interest rate, inflation rate, output, and housing price. When linearized, this equation becomes the conventional linear Taylor rule, augmented with a housing price component.

2.6 Equilibrium

The equilibrium of the model is a sequence of prices $\{q_t, R_t, P_t, X_{t,} w_{1t}, w_{2t,}\}$, and an allocation $\{h_{1t}, h_{2t}, L_{1t}, L_{2t}, Y_t, C_{1t}, C_{2t}, b_{1t}, b_{2t,}\}$, such that all first order conditions and constraints hold, and all markets clear.

Goods market clears when[3]

$$C_{1t} + C_{2t} = Y_t. \tag{18}$$

It is straightforward to show that the retailer profit is equal to

$$F_t = \frac{X_t - 1}{X_t} Y_t. \tag{19}$$

The loans market equilibrium is

$$b_{1t} + b_{2t} = 0. \tag{20}$$

As in Iacoviello (2005), housing assets are assumed to have a fixed total supply H, which leads to the trivial market clearing condition

$$h_{1t} + h_{2t} = H. \tag{21}$$

With a fixed total supply and no production required, the variable h resembles the "land" variable of Kiyotaki and Moore (1997). It seems that a more realistic setup would require that housing assets and land be defined separately, and agents should be allowed to accumulate housing assets over time. In that environment, agents must acquire land first, and then use the land to accumulate housing assets. As long as the total amount of land is assumed fixed, the dynamics of housing assets will be quite similar to our simplified setup here. [4]

2.7 Steady state and calibration

We assume the steady state inflation rate is zero. The long-run real interest rate is obtained from (4) as

$$R = 1/\beta_1.$$

[3] As in Iacoviello (2005), total output can be approximated by $Y_t^f = \int_0^1 Y_t(i)di \approx Y_t$.

[4] Between 1975 and 2006, the real price of residential land in the U.S. rose 270%, while the real price of housing structures only rose for about 33% (Davis and Heathcote, 2007). In other words, most of the housing price boom has been a "land price boom." There are unoccupied land that can be added to total land supply. But as research shows, the amount of unoccupied land near residential areas is limted. Limited land availability and land-use regulations have made land supply relatively inelastic (Mishkin, 2007).

It immediately follows that for a well-defined steady state to exist, the collateral constraint (31) must be binding, for otherwise $\lambda = 0$, and (9) would force the borrower's consumption to shrink over time at the rate β_2/β_1.[5] With a binding collateral constraint, the value of the Lagrangian multiplier associated with the constraint is

$$\lambda = \frac{\beta_1 - \beta_2}{C_2}.$$

Consequently, unlike in a representative agent economy, the steady state level of borrowing is positive. There are three critical ratios that need to be calculated. One is the consumption/output ratio, which can be obtained from the steady state versions of (5) and (8):

$$\frac{C_2}{Y} = \frac{(1-\alpha)(1-v)/X}{1 + m_2(1-\beta_1)d/(1-\gamma_e)}.$$

Next is the value of real housing assets over output for the borrower

$$\frac{qh_2}{Y} = \frac{C_2}{Y}\frac{d}{1-\gamma_e}.$$

Finally, the loans/output ratio is obtained from the borrowing constraint as

$$\frac{b_2}{Y} = \beta_1 m_2 \frac{qh_2}{Y}.$$

Based on these, the corresponding ratios for the lender can be easily calculated from the equilibrium conditions.

We calibrate our parameters as follows. The discount factor is set at 0.99 for the lender and 0.98 for the more impatient borrower. The elasticity of substitution across final goods, ε, is set a 4, a value commonly used in the literature. The inverse of the elasticity of labor supply, η, is set to 1.01, as in Iacoviello (2005), which makes the labor supply curve virtually flat. The fraction of firms that keep their prices unchanged, θ, is given a value of 0.75, which corresponds to an average price duration of about one year. The steady state value of the preference shock, d_t, is set at 0.1. The share of the lender's labor in the production, α, is set at 0.5. The borrower's downpayment rate, $1 - m_2$, is given a benchmark value of 0.1, but we will experiment with other values for this important parameter in the next section.

We take log-linear approximation of the equilibrium conditions around the steady state, and solve

[5] It remains a question whether or not the constraint is always binding when the economy deviates from the steady state in response to exogenous shocks. As Iacoviello (2005) demonstrates, the constraint is indeed binding as long as the deviations are small and are close to the steady state equilibrium.

for the rational expectations solution. The following analyses are based on this solution.

3 News Driven Business Cycles

Next we investigate whether or not news shocks can generate housing boom-bust cycles. We define a realistic news-driven boom-bust cycle as one that meets two conditions: (1) positive news first leads to a boom defined as an increase in housing prices, aggregate output, employment, and consumption, and (2) the realization that the news is too optimistic leads to a recession defined as a fall in the same set of variables. The comovement of housing prices and aggregate variables is key to a news-driven cycle.

To facilitate exposition, we will first focus on presenting the result - we show in detail how the economy's aggregate variables respond to the news shock in the next subsection. Then, in the following subsection, we will analyze the transmission mechanism and explain how the model can generate positive comovement among economic aggregates.

3.1 Responses to a news shock

A natural question to ask is what type of information is contained in the news. Most research in this area favors news about future productivity changes. In Beaudry and Portier (2004 and 2007), for example, it is news about productivity that drives a "Pigou" cycle. While this type of news is appropriate in explaining episodes such as the boom of the late 1990s, we believe it is not the best impulse mechanism to consider for our model. During a typical episode of speculative boom, consumers' housing "rush" is often triggered by the perception of rapid and steady future price increases, which lead to but is also confirmed (self-fulfilled) by steady increase in housing demand. These changes are not necessarily initiated by expectations of future productivity growth. So we consider a different type of news – news about future housing demand.

There are two ways to model news about housing demand. One way is to model news as an unticipated shock to the variable d_t in the utility function, a rise of which would increase the marginal rate of substitution of housing services against consumption and leisure for both the borrower and the lender. An advantage of this is that it is by nature a demand shock, which matches our understanding of how a housing rush is triggered. In Iacoviello (2005) and Iacoviello and Neri (2010), this shock is found to be one of the most important driving forces of housing and business cycles. According to Iacoviello and Neri (2010), d_t captures social and institutional changes that shifts preferences towards housing.

We assume the variable d_t follows the process

$$d_t = \rho d_{t-1} + e_t^d,$$

where $0 < \rho < 1$, and the error term e_t^d is defined as

$$e_t^d = \xi_{t-p} + \varepsilon_t^d.$$

ε_t^d is an innovation to d_t that has mean 0 and standard deviation σ_ε. It is an unanticipated shock. ξ_{t-p} is a news shock about d_t that is revealed to the agent in time t-p but will realize in time t. ξ_t has mean 0 and a standard deviation σ_ξ. Given this definition, ξ_{t-p} is an anticipated shock to d_t. ξ_t and ε_t^d are not correlated overtime and with each other.

The drawback of this approach is that the demand shock is narrowly defined to be a preference shock, which cannot capture other types of housing demand variations. A second approach to model the demand shock (and news about the demand shock) is to start with the linearized reduced form model. In the patient agents' housing demand equation, for example, one can add an exogenous housing demand shock d_t as follows:

$$q_t = \beta_1 E_t(q_{t+1} - c_{t+1}) + c_{1t} - (1 - \beta_1)h_{1t} + d_t.$$

News shocks can then be defined the same way as above. Note that the shock d_t is a direct shock to real housing price q_t. While this definition makes the demand shock less "micro-founded," it has the advantage of allowing a broader interpretation of the shock. Thus, news shocks can be broadly understood as anticipated changes in future housing prices, which could have multiple possible causes.

For our impulse response analysis below, the timing of the news shock is as follows. In time 0 the economy is in the steady state. Then news about future preference shocks arrives. For example, agents might learn from the innovation ξ_0 that there will be a one-percent increase in d after p periods. This raises the expected values of d, and has an impact on all economic aggregates. In period p, d will increase by ξ_0 as anticipated. But what is also realized is the unanticipated shock ε_p^d. If it happens that $\varepsilon_p^d = -\xi_0$, the effect of ξ_0 is cancelled by ε_p^d, and no change occurs to d - the news is exactly "incorrect". On the other hand, if $\varepsilon_p^d = 0$, the news is exactly accurate, because $e_p^d = \xi_0$. In general, as long as $\varepsilon_t^d \neq 0$, the news shock ξ_{t-p} is a noisy signal about d_t. The techniques that we use here closely follow those of Christiano et. al. (2008).

In our experiment, we let $\rho = 0.9$, and we set the number of periods between the arrival of news

and the realization of shocks p to be 6. If p is too small, we will not be able to observe any economic dynamics between time 0 and p. If p is too large, the predictive horizon of the news seems too long to be realistic. We pick $p = 6$ somewhat arbitrarily to satisfy these two criteria.

Finally, for our benchmark experiment we assume the central bank follows a simple inflation targeting rule

$$i_t = \tau_\pi \pi_t,$$

which is the linearized version of the policy rule (17) simplified by setting the policy parameters τ_Y and τ_q to 0. We let $\tau_\pi = 1.2$.

In our simulations, we find that relatively large preference shocks (therefore news shocks) are required for most variables to exhibit significant responses. For example, when there is a 10% shock to d_t, housing price deviates from the steady state for about 1%. The exceptions are total debts and borrower housing, whose responses are much stronger. This feature is common in similar models. Iacoviello (2005)'s model, for example, also entails large preference shocks. In fact in his estimation with U.S. data, the standard deviation of preference shocks is more than 10 times that of total factor productivity shocks. In the following impulse response analysis, we set the size of the news shock to be 10%. We believe this is also consistent with the nature of a expectation-driven cycle - in reality only strong speculations can generate sizable boom-bust cycles.

In figure 2, we plot the impulse response of the economy to a news shock. The news is assumed to be exactly accurate. Consumption/output and labor hours increase, and so do housing prices. The inflation rate goes up on impulse, accompanied by the nominal interest rate (upper panel). From the bottom panel of the figure, we can see that the borrower has increased her housing asset and collateralized borrowing quite dramatically - a 7% increase. In period seven, when the actual preference shock is realized, the economy is already on its convergent path back to the steady state. Since the news is accurate, the realization of the shock does not bring any new information, and does not alter the agents' optimal plan.

Next we consider the scenario where the news shock is exactly incorrect. In period one, agents learn about an increase in the preference shock d_t. But in period seven, they observe that there is no preference shock at all. We plot the impulse responses in figure 3. Upon receiving the news and believing it is accurate, agents' reactions are identical to those in figure 3. In period seven, however, the actual shock is realized and the agents learn that the news has been incorrect. They immediately re-optimize their objectives by incorporating the new information. There are sharp decreases in output, consumption, labor, housing prices, and the borrower's housing assets and total debts. Between



Figure 2: Impulse responses to correct news



Figure 3: Impulse responses to incorrect news

period one and seven, almost all variables have experienced a cycle that is shaped like an inverted "U." Moreover, except for housing prices, most variables went below trend for a considerable amount of time before converging to the steady state.

The type of dynamics in figure 3 is what we would like to characterize as a news-driven boom-bust cycle. We emphasize that throughout the episode, there have been no fundamental shocks at all. The only change has been some incorrect news that altered agents' expectations between period one and seven. As in Beaudry and Portier (2004), we can define "optimism" as the case where agents' expectations are better than reality. Then what figure 3 shows is exactly a case where optimism alone can generate a boom-bust cycle. Indeed, since such a cycle is clearly not fundamental-based, one is tempted to call the temporary housing price hike a "bubble."

3.2 Understanding the mechanism

In a typical general equilibrium model, it is quite difficult to generate comovement among aggregate variables on impact of news shocks. For instance, in a real business cycle model, good news creates a recession instead of a boom. Positive news about future productivity brings about a strong wealth effect that makes agents "go on vacation" – consume more, work less and produce less, and invest less to pay for the higher consumption. In our model, three features are responsible for the positive comovement: agent heterogeneity, the collateral constraint, and nominal rigidity. The first feature ensures that borrowers and lenders do not respond to news shocks in the same way, the second feature links these responses to the strength of the credit channel, and the third feature generates a wedge between real and nominal wage and interest rate, and enhances the mechanism created by the first two features. The combined effect of these three features is that economic aggregates will display positive movement when there is a news shock. Next, we explain in detail how this mechanism works.

The starting point of our analysis is to explain how the collateral constraint alters the model's propagation mechanism. Consider how rising housing prices affect the user cost of capital (housing) for lenders and borrowers, respectively. Define the user cost of capital as the marginal rate of substitution between housing and consumption U_h/U_c. It measures how many units of consumption goods an agent is willing to give up in exchange for a unit of housing, and can be viewed as the unit price of the housing asset – in terms of consumption goods.

The intuition is more transparent when we consider *linearized* versions of the Euler equations. For

lenders, the Euler equations (3) and (4) can be combined to define the user cost as

$$\text{user cost } = q_t - \frac{\beta_1}{1-\beta_1}(E_t q_{t+1} - q_t) + \frac{\beta_1}{1-\beta_1} r_t. \tag{22}$$

The user cost is influenced by three conventional channels: current real housing price q_t, the real interest rate r_t, defined as $i_t - E_t \pi_{t+1}$, and expected housing price appreciation $E_t q_{t+1} - q_t$. Higher current housing prices raise the user cost. Other things equal, a rise in the real interest rate raises the user cost, and an expected housing price appreciation lowers the user cost.[6]

For the borrowers, the collateral constraint adds an additional channel to user costs. Linearize (8) and (9) to obtain

$$\text{u.cost } \approx q_t - \frac{\gamma_e}{1-\gamma_e}(E_t q_{t+1} - q_t) + \frac{\beta_1}{1-\gamma_e} r_t + \frac{(1-m_2)(\beta_1-\beta_2)}{1-\gamma_e}\lambda_t, \tag{23}$$

where $\gamma_e = \beta_2 + m_2(\beta_1 - \beta_2)$. The three conventional channels are covered by the first three terms, which are similar to those in (22). The last term in (23) is critical. λ_t is the Lagrangian multiplier for the collateral borrowing constraint (31). It measures the shadow price of borrowing – the marginal benefit of increasing the value of the collateral by one more unit, which relaxes the borrowing constraint and allows the agent to purchase more consumption and housing to improve welfare (see 8). When $\lambda_t = 0$, the collateral constraint is not binding, and the agent is not credit-constrained. When the value of λ_t goes above zero, the agent becomes credit-constrained, and becomes increasingly so as λ_t increases. The tighter the collateral constraint, the more valuable an extra unit of housing asset is – since it can relax the constraint. Consequently, agents are willing to give up more consumption to obtain it. This creates a positive relationship between the value of λ_t and the user cost of housing. A tighter collateral constraint will thus lead to a higher user cost of housing. When the housing price rises, its impact on the first two channels are almost identical for the lender and the borrower ($\gamma_e \approx \beta_1$). But there is an additional impact on the borrower via the third channel: it relaxes the borrowing constraint (decreasing λ_t), increases the borrower's net worth, and reduces the borrower's user cost further. Because of this extra impact, the borrower's user cost always decreases more than the lender when the housing price rises.

Now we can turn to the comovement issue. As a starting point, consider what would happen if there is no news and the preference shock is unanticipated. On impact of a preference shock, both the lender and the borrower demand more housing services. Housing price goes up. But the supply

[6] Another conventional channel, the depreciation rate of capital, is not in the equation because we assume there is no depreciation for housing assets.

of housing assets is fixed, only one agent can increase her housing purchases. As we explained above, when hoursing prices increase, the borrower's user cost always decreases more than the lender due to the relaxation of the collateral constraint. As a result, the borrower gets to accumulate more housing assets. The lender sells housing assets to the borrower. The borrower's consumption decision now depends on the trade-off between two opposing effects. One is a wealth effect induced by the relaxation of the collateral constraint, which tends to make the borrower consume more. The other is a substitution effect that makes agents want to consume more housing and less of other goods. When the model's credit channel is strong, the wealth effect dominates. The borrower uses her housing assets as collateral to finance more housing and final goods purchases, and works less and have more leisure. In order to save enough to make the lending, the lender now must consume less and work more. Rising demand in final goods pushes inflation up, and since the central bank follows the Taylor principle by raising the nominal rate more than 1-for-1 to inflation, real interest rate also goes up. This enhances the intertemporal substitution effect for the lender, and justifies her decision to save more. Interestingly, in this case the lender's increase in labor hours always more than offsets the borrower's reduction in hours, despite the assumption that labor supply elasticities are the same. Total hours and output both go up. The comovement is strong. We plot the responses of different variables to a preference shock in Figure 4. The red solid lines depict the mechanism that we just described.

What happens if the preference shock is anticipated because of news? We show the impulse responses in Figure 5. We use a red solid line to describe what would happen if there is a news shock in period 1 and the news is accurately realized in period 7, and a dark dotted line to show the case where there is no news and just an unanticipated preference shock in period . As the figure shows, news shocks alter the business cycle in two ways. First, it changes the timing of cycles by shifting all phases of the cycle several periods earlier. For example, without news the peak of the output boom happens around period 9. But with news, the output boom takes place in period 2, and in period 9, output is already on its returning path to the long-run steady state equilibrium. Second, news shocks also magnifies the responses of some variables. For example, output, hours, and housing prices all respond more strongly to news shocks than to unanticipated shocks. The reason is that with news, the rise in expected net worth and the change in consumer taste do not take place simultaneously. The rise in expected net worth happens first. Without any substitution effect from a change in preferences, consumption and output increase more strongly.



Figure 4: Responses to a preference shock



Figure 5: Responses to a news shock (solid line) and an unanticipated preference shock (dotted line)

3.3 Robustness

In this section we examine the sensitivity of the aforementioned mechanism to changes in model speficications. We will examine the effect of changes in the strength of the credit channel, changes in price flexibility, and changes in the structure of the labor market.

3.3.1 Strength of the credit channel

How crucial is the credit channel in facilitating a news-driven boom-bust cycle? To examine this issue, we distinguish two cases in subsequent analysis. In the first case, the down-payment ratio, $1 - m_2$, is high. We set it to be 0.5. This means that the maximum amount of credit that borrowers can get is 50% of the real expected value of her housing assets. It greatly reduces the size of credit the borrower can get when housing prices go up. We call this the "weak credit channel" case. The second case is the benchmark case where $1 - m_2 = 0.1$. We call this the "strong credit channel" case. We set up two versions of the model economy, one with a weak credit channel, and the other with a strong credit channel. All other specifications of the two economies are identical. In period 1, the two economies are disturbed by the same news shock. Figure 6 displays the impulse responses of both economies in the first 20 periods. The red solid lines depict what happens in the strong credit channel economy, and the dotted lines does the same for the weak credit channel economy.

The weak credit channel economy differs from its strong credit channel counterpart in two important ways. First, the overal response of the economy is greatly dampened on impact of the news shock. For example, the rise in output is only around 0.1%, much less than the 0.7% rise in the strong credit channel economy. Similar changes happen to almost all other aggregate variables. The only exception is housing prices. News shocks lead to very similar changes in housing prices in the two economies. This is not surprising, as housing price changes are primarily driven by the expected preference shock.

Second, the weak credit channel economy make different predictions for some variables. For example, lender consumption increases instead of decreasing, and lender hours decrease instead of increasing for most of the periods after impact. The borrower's responses in consumption and hours also reverse directions correspondingly. The explanation is as follows. Recall that the borrower is subject to two opposing effects: a wealth effect and a substitution effect. In the strong credit channel economy, the wealth effect dominates. But when the credit channel is weak enough, the substitution effect starts to dominate. The borrower consumes *less* final goods and leisure (but consumes more housing). The lender, on the other hand, must consume more final goods and leisure to compensate for the loss of housing services. There is still comovement among aggregate variables, but the causes are quite different from the strong credit channel case. We found that with our calibration, a threshhold value for m_2 that would switch the relative importance of the two effects is about 0.7. When $m_2 > 0.7$, the credit channel is strong enough for the wealth effect to dominate.



Figure 6: The strong credit channel economy (solid line) vs. the weak credit channel economy (dotted line)

3.3.2 Nominal rigidity

In our benchmark calibration, the Calvo pricing setting parameter $\theta = 0.75$. That is, 25% of firms are allowed to adjust their prices every period. How sensitive is the model's result to the level of price stickiness? To examine this, we study an alternative version of the model economy, in which all

prices are flexible. All firms can set their prices freely, and the new Phillips curve no longer holds. This economy exhibits the "classical dichotomy" in that all real variables are determined independent of the nominal variables. In Figure 7, we make side-by-side comparison of this economy and the benchmark economy.



Figure 7: Sticky price (solid line) vs. flexible price (dotted line)

As the figure shows, with flexible prices, the model cannot generate boom-bust cycles as in the

sticky price case. The responses of output, hours and consumption are all negative, while housing prices and total debts both increase. A news shock now leads to a recession. A closer look at the figure reveals that a major change in the flexible price case is that the borrower's wealth effect is greatly reduced - the third graph in the first row shows that the borrower's consumption increases only by less than 0.5%, much less than the 2% increase in the sticky price case. In the meantime, the lender's intertemporal substitution effect is strengthened, which leads to higher saving. The figure also shows that with flexible prices, output's response to a news shock is significantly dampened, but the response of real housing price remains strong.

Why does flexible price lead to a different prediction? Evidently, the key lies in changes in the real interest rate. With sticky prices, the real interest rate is essentially tied to the central bank's interest rate policy. A Taylor-type policy rule ensures that changes in the real interest rate follows the inflation rate. As a result, if prices are sticky enough, the real interest rate will not change dramatically. Relatively sluggish changes in the real interest rate permits borrowers to borrow more without quickly increasing borrowing costs. Things are different with flexible prices. The real interest rate is determined independent of monetary policies. On impact of the news shcok, the real interest rate adjusts immediately according to credit market conditions. Higher real interest rate partially offsets the wealth effect of higher housing prices, and causes borrower consumption to increase less than in the sticky price case.

In our analysis, we find that the above mechanism exists not only in a flexible-price economy, but also in sticky-price economies. In essence, the level of nominal rigidity must be strong enough for the wealth effect to dominate other effects. The level of nominal rigidity is measured by the parameter θ. We experiment with a series of different values for θ, and find that with our calibarion, the threshhold value is about 0.65. If $\theta < 0.65$, the borrower's wealth effect is not strong enough, and output and labor hours start to react negatively to news shocks. The comovement breaks down. We note that this result is similar to Christiano et. al. (2008), who find that wage rigidity is important in generating news-driven pro-cyclical cycles in the stock market.

3.3.3 Labor market

In the benchmark economy, the lender and borrower's labor hours are not perfectly substitutable. There are two separate labor markets with two distinct wage rates. As we have seen in the previous sections, the two wage rates can move in opposite directions. A natural question to ask is that what happens if there is a unified labor market with a single wage rate. Is this feature crucial for a boom-bust cycle to exist?

To address this issue, we slightly modify the model specification as follows. Let the intermediate firm's production function be

$$Y_t = L_t^{\alpha}, \tag{24}$$

where

$$L_t = L_{1t} + L_{2t}. \tag{25}$$

And let there be only one labor market with one wage rate w_t. The intermediate firm's production function becomes

$$Y_t/X_t - w_t(L_{1t} + L_{2t}). \tag{26}$$

All the first order necessary conditions of the model are changed correspondingly. We simulate the response of this economy to a news shock and report the result in Figure 8. We set $\alpha = 1$ in the simulation, so that there is still constant returns to scale in the production function.



Figure 8: Responses to a news shock when labor inputs are perfectly substitutable

The response of the model economy is very similar to the benchmark economy with separate labor markets. There is still comovement among major aggregate variables, and all variables respond to the news shocks in the same way as in the benchmark case. The main difference is that the responses of labor hours are now much stronger than before. Both the lender and the borrower's hours move more than 200% from their steady state value on impact. The net change in total labor supply, however, is

only about 1%, which is in the empirically plausible range.

Recall that when labor is not perfectly substitutable, the production function is defined as

$$Y_t = A_t L_{1t}^{\alpha} L_{2t}^{1-\alpha},$$

where α is the share of the patient household's labor hours in the production technology. As in Iacoviello (2005), our benchmark calibration for α is 0.5. A natural question to ask is whether or not the comovement result is sensitive to the size of α. We experiment with different values for α, and examine the comovement of variables for each case. Our result shows that as long as α is not too big (higher than 0.6), labor hours will be pro-cyclical, and the comovement result holds. If α is higher than 0.6, labor hours become counter-cyclical.

4 Estimation

We need a more comprehensive model to match realistic properties of macro data. We extend our model according to Iacoviello (2005). The model adds a few new features to the benchmark model of Section 2. The most significant change is that it has two credit-constrained agents instead of one. In addition to the impatient consumer, the intermediate good producer is also credit-constrained. She borrows collateralized loans to finance consumption and the production of intermediate goods. Another significant change is that both housing assets and physical capital are now inputs to the production function for intermediate goods. There are capital adjustment costs for both of them that generate more realistic dynamics for the economy. We present the technical details of the full model in the appendix.

We specify five sources of uncertainty in our model. These are productivity shocks A_t, policy shocks v_t, cost-push shocks u_t, preference shocks d_t, and news shocks. The first four are conventional unanticipated shocks considered in Iacoviello (2005). The fifth element, news shocks to housing preferences, is our innovation. The first three shocks do not involve any news and can be organized as

$$Z_t = JZ_{t-1} + \epsilon_t, \tag{27}$$

where Z_t is a three by one vector of shocks, and ϵ_t is a vector of i.i.d. innovations with mean 0 and standard deviations σ_j for $j = A, v$, and u.

Specifying news shocks is challenging in econometric analysis. In principle, news matters for both the short-run and the long-run, and should be considered for a wide range of time horizons. Doing so,

however, will render the econometric model excessively cumbersome. Some form of simplification is necessary. Schmitt-Grohe and Uribe (2012) capture news by specifying two anticipated shocks that are revealed one year and two years ahead, respectively. The following setup closely follows their paper. To be consistent with our structural model, we only consider news about housing demand.

There are two news shocks. One is learned four periods before the realization of the fundamental shock, and the other is learned eight periods before.

$$\begin{aligned} d_t &= \rho^d d_{t-1} + e_t^d, \\ e_t^d &= \varepsilon_t^0 + \varepsilon_t^4 + \varepsilon_t^8, \end{aligned}$$

where ε_t^0 is an unanticipated change in d_t, and ε_t^4 and ε_t^8 are the two innovations that represent news shocks. ε_t^i for $i = 0, 4$, and 8 is assumed to be i.i.d. normal innovations with zero mean and standard deviations σ_ε^i.

Our econometrics strategy is as follows. Our goal is to examine whether or not news shocks play any significant role in explaining the data. To do so, we divide the model's parameters into two groups. One group of parameters characterize the nature of shocks. These would include the standard deviations and autocorrelation coefficients for the exogenous variables we described above. We put all variables that are unrelated to the exogenous variables into the second group. [7] We calibrate the second group of parameters in a standard way. Then, we let the data decide which of the five sources of uncertainty is important by estimating the first group of parameters. In essence, we search for the properties of the exogenous variables that enable the model to explain the data as well as possible. For example, if news shocks are not important for business cycles, we expect to see small and insignificant estimates for their standard errors.

[7] We put the standard deviation of policy shocks in the second group because it can be estimated during the calibration process for the policy rule. This closely folows the approach of Iacoviello (2005).

Parameter	Value	Description
β_1	0.99	Patient household discount factor
β_2, γ	0.95	Impatient agents discount factor
d	0.1	Preference weight on housing
η_1, η_2	1.01	Labor supply aversion
μ	0.3	Variable capital share
ν	0.05	Housing share
ψ	2	Variable capital adjustment cost
δ	0.03	Variable capital depreciation rate
ϕ	0	Housing adjustment cost
X	1.05	Steady-state gross markup
θ	0.75	Probability of fixed prices
α	0.64	Patient household wage share
ρ^R	0.73	Interest rate smoothing parameter
τ_Y, τ_π	0.13, 1.27	Coefficients of the Taylor rule
σ_R	0.29	Standard deviation of policy shocks
m_2, m_3	0.9	Loan-to-value ratio

Table 1: Calibrated parameters

Since we want to compare our results with Iacoviello (2005), we try to match his calibration of parameters as much as possible. In Iacoviello (2005), some parameter values are selected to match those used in the literature. β,δ,μ,X,θ, and η belong to this group. Some values are estimated using the data. The interest rate rule and the adjustment cost parameters fall into this group. We use these parameters to calibrate our model. Only three parameters do not exactly match those in Iacoviello (2005). m_2 and m_3 are not calibrated in his paper. They are instead included in the structural estimation, and the values are found to be 0.9 and 0.55, respectively. In this paper we calibrate them both to be equal to the benchmark value of 0.9. The degrees of impatience for the borrower and the entrepreneur, γ and β_2, are 0.95 and 0.98 in his paper. They are selected from an estimated range of (0.91, 0.99). In this paper we let the degree of impatience be the same for the borrower and for the entreprenuer. So, we set $\gamma = \beta_2 = 0.95$. We make these small adjustments to enhance the strength of the credit channel in our model. All calibrated parameters are presented in Table 1.

We use a simulated method of moments to estimate the model. Specifically, we search for parameters that minimize the distance between the impulse responses implied by the model and those computed from actual data. Let Θ represent a vector of parameters that we are interested in, let $M(\Theta)$ represent the impulse responses computed from model simulated data, and let $\widehat{M}$ represent impulse responses computed from actual data. Our simulated method of moments estimator is defined as

$$\Theta = \arg\min[M(\Theta) - \widehat{M}]' W [M(\Theta) - \widehat{M}],$$

where W is a positive-definite weighting matrix. Our the interested parameters are $\Theta' = (\rho^A, \rho^u, \rho^d, \sigma_A, \sigma_u, \sigma_v, \sigma_\varepsilon^0, \sigma_\varepsilon^4, \sigma_\varepsilon^8)'$.

Description	Parameter	Value	s.e.	Iacoviello (2005)
Autocorrelation of shocks				
Inflation	ρ^u	**0.36**	0.11	0.59
Technology	ρ^A	0.01	0.053	0.03
Housing preference	ρ^d	**0.796**	0.015	0.85
Standard deviation of shocks				
Inflation	σ_u	**0.196**	0.03	0.17
Technology	σ_A	**3.21**	0.26	2.24
Housing preference	σ_d	**30.59**	3.52	24.89
News (four periods ahead)	σ_4	**11.86**	2.295	x
News (eight periods ahead)	σ_8	0.01	3.755	x

Table 2: Estimated parameters and their standard errors

Iacoviello (2005) uses four data series in his estimation of impulse responses: housing prices, represented by the Conventional Mortgage Home Price Index from Freddie Mac, real GDP, changes in the log of GDP deflator, and the Federal Funds rate. For a close comparison with his results, we use the exact same impulse response functions he computed using these data.

In a model without news shocks, one can use a VAR estimation to identify four exogenous shocks, and match their impulse responses with those generated by the theoretical model. For example, running a VAR of the four data series will conveniently identify a shock to GDP, a housing price shock, an inflation shock, and a policy shock. In Iacoviello (2005), the impulse responses to the four shocks are matched with those to the four exogenous variables of the model.[8] When news shocks are introduced, we can no longer use this standard procedure to make this type of one-for-one matches. The reason is that news shocks are not identfiable in a standard VAR estimation. To identify a news shock, one often has to find a proxy for news or implement non-standard identification techniques.[9] To solve this problem, we modify the estimation procedure slightly. For the data, the impulse responses can be computed in the usual way. To obtain corresponding impulse responses from the model, we simulate the model using all five exogenous shocks, and collect the artificial data. We then select the four variables that we are interested in, and run a standard VAR to compute impulse responses. This approach has two advantages. First, both impulse responses are generated by running unrestricted VARs, and the match is one-for-one. Two, this procedure is consistent with our underlying story that news shocks are important for business cycles, but are omitted from standard models and VAR analysis.

Estimated parameters are listed in Table 2. The first and second columns define the parameters.

[8]The impulse responses from the model and from the data are not strictly comparable. For example, the impuse reponse to a GDP shock in the data and the impulse response to a technology shock in the model are not exactly the same thing. Iacoviello (2005) states this caveat in this paper.

[9]For example, Beaudry and Portier (2006) use anticipated changes in stock prices as proxies for news shocks. Sims (2009) suggest a method to identify news shocks that requires more data about fundamental variables. For example, productivity data are necessary for the identification of news shocks about future productivity changes.

In the third and fourth columns, we present our estimated parameter values and standard errors, and in the fifth column, we list the values of the same parameters estimated by Iacoviello (2005) in a model without news shocks. All significant estimates are bolded. The results can be summarized as follows. First, news shocks are important. The estimated standard deviation for the four-period-ahead news shock is large and significant. The standard deviation is 11.86, larger than that of all other exogenous variables except unanticipated housing demand shocks. Since we use quarterly data, the result suggests that short-term expectations of about one year in time horizon are important in the housing market. Longer-term expecations, however, is not important: the estimate for the eight-period-ahead news shock is small and insignificant. Second, unanticipated housing demand shocks have the highest volatility. This result is consistent with Iacoviello (2005) and Iacoviell and Neri (2009). Three, compared with the model without news shocks, the estimated autocorrelation coefficients for inflation, technology and housing preference shocks are all smaller. This is due to the fact that news shocks are an additonal source of persistence, and this reduces the need for persistence in the shock processes themselves.

To test the robustness of the above result, we estimate our model using a different method - the maximum likelihood method. The results are presented in the Appendix. The results are remarkably similar to what we obtained in Table 2: news shocks and preference shocks are the two most important impulses of fluctuations. We also experimented with news shocks that have different time horizons - we tried 2, 4, 6, and 8-periods-ahead news shocks. Interestingly, the 4 and 6-periods-ahead news shocks are consistently estimated to have a significant and large standard deviations, while the 2 and 8-periods-ahead news shocks are always estiamted to have small and insignificant standard deviations. It appears that news that predicts events which will happen one year to one year and a half into the future has the most influence on the housing cycle.

To have a better understanding of the significance of the news shocks, we conduct a variance decompostion analysis using our benchmark result as follows. We run two separate simulations using the estimated parameters. In the first simulation, we let the four-period-ahead news shock be the only source of uncertainty. In the second, we allow all five exogenous shocks to affect the economy. All shocks are calibrated using the estimated values. The volatilities for economic aggregates are computed for each experiment. In the first experiment, the standard deviations for housing prices and real GDP are 1.19 and 0.52, respectively. In the second experiment, their values become 2.52 and 1.97. The ratios of the two sets of volatilites are computed as 26% and 47%. Essentially, news shocks explain 26% of the volatility of real GDP, and 47% of the volatility of housing prices in the model. We can also do the same computations for the real data. The results are 34% and 58%, respectively. We list

	Output		Housing Prices	
	Volatility	Explained by news	Volatility	Explained by news
Data	1.52	34%	2.05	58%
All shocks	1.98	26%	2.52	47%
News shock only	0.52	x	1.19	x

Table 3: Variance decomposition analysis for news shocks

the results of this analysis in Table 3.

5 News shock and monetary policy

How should the central bank respond to a news-driven housing cycle? We consider a Taylor-type policy rule that targets inflation, output and possibly housing prices:

$$i_t = \rho^R i_{t-1} + (1 - \rho^R)(\tau_\pi \pi_t + \tau_y y_t + \tau_q q_t). \tag{28}$$

A key question is whether or not central banks can better stabilize the economy by specifically targeting housing prices, in addition to output gaps and inflation. We turn to stochastic simulations for some quantitative answers.

We assume that the central bank's loss function comprises the volatility of two variables – output gaps and inflation. The central bank's goal is to pick policy parameters τ_π, τ_y and τ_q to minimize an weighted average of the unconditional standard deviation of the two variables over time. Thus the loss function can be defined as

$$-\frac{1}{2} E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^t (\pi_t^2 + \lambda y_t^2),$$

where $\lambda > 0$ measures the relative weight given to output stabilization.

In the following experiments, we simulate the model using various combinations of policy weights, and search for policy weights that minimizes the central bank's loss function. If the optimal policy weights involves a sizable coefficient for housing prices, we conclude responding to housing prices is beneficial to economic stabilization. Otherwise we will conclude it is not.

In our experiments, we use the calibrated and estimated parameter values from the previous section. We allow τ_π to vary between 1.01 and 3 (again, $\tau_\pi > 1$ ensures a determinate, unique equilibrium), τ_y to vary between 0 and 2, and τ_q to vary between 0 and 1. These restrictions are put in place to ensure that the policy parameters are within a (generous) range consistent with empirical estimates. For each variation of the policy rule, we run stochastic simulations of the model to calculate the central bank's loss function. The "optimal" policy parameters are the ones that minimize this function.

Our result can be intuitively presented with two plots (Figure 9). In both panels of Figure 9, the horizontal axis measures the volatility of inflation and the vertical axis measures the volatility of output. Therefore each point in the diagram represents a simulated value for the central bank's loss function. In panel A, we fix the policy parameter for inflation τ_π at the benchmark value, and vary the policy weights for output τ_y and housing prices τ_q. A shift of the curve represents a change of the loss function due to a change in τ_q, and a movement along the curve represents a change of loss function due to a change in τ_y. We can see that for given values of τ_q (and τ_π), a rise in the value of τ_y will reduce output volatility at the expense of higher inflation volatility. In this case we will move along the curve downwards to the right. This simply illustrates the usual policy trade-off between output and inflation volatility. What is important is that when τ_q increases, this trade-off becomes worse as the curve shift outward, representing higher volatilities for both output and inflation. Obviously, responding to housing prices is not desirable for the central bank. Panel B tells a similar story. We fix the policy weight for output at the benchmark value, and vary the policy weights for inflation and housing prices. The results are essentially the same.

Next we present the result from a more comprehensive search for the optimal policy parameters. We consider three possible weight allocations for the central bank's loss function. We use $\sigma_\pi^2 + 2\sigma_y^2$ to represent a loss function that emphasizes output stabilization, $\sigma_\pi^2 + 0.2\sigma_y^2$ to represent one that emphasizes inflation stabilization, and a third one that puts equal weights on output and inflation. For each loss function, we search for the combinations of τ_π, τ_y and τ_q that minimize the (infinite) sum of the discounted loss function over time. The ranges allowed for these weights cover all empirically relevant cases; in particular, we search over a fine grid of values for τ_q and τ_y between 0 and 5 and for τ_π between 1.01 and 5.[10] We use an increment stepsize of 0.1.

In Table 4, we present the searching result for a "current data" policy rule that allows the central bank to target the current levels of output and inflation. We shut down interest rate smoothing ($\rho^R = 0$) for this case. We distinguish between two cases. In one case the only shocks to the economy are news shocks, and in the other, all shocks affect the economy. The result suggest that the interest rate policy should strongly target inflation when the loss function puts more weight on inflation volatility; that it should target the output gap, especially when there is more weight on output volatility in the loss function; and that its response to housing prices should be very small, if any. When the central bank cares more about output, a small weight is given to housing prices. When the central bank mainly cares about price stability, no weight is given to housing prices. The result is also remarkably similar between the single-shock case and the all-shock case.

[10] τ_π must be greater than 1 to ensure the uniqueness of the equilibrium.



(a) Policy Frontier 1



(b) Policy Frontier 2

Figure 9: Policy Frontiers

Loss function	All shocks	News shock only
$\sigma_\pi^2 + 0.2\sigma_y^2$	$\tau_\pi = 2.86, \tau_y = 1.44, \tau_q = 0.11$	$\tau_\pi = 3.88, \tau_y = 1.44, \tau_q = 0$
$\sigma_\pi^2 + \sigma_y^2$	$\tau_\pi = 1.01, \tau_y = 3.90, \tau_q = 0.21$	$\tau_\pi = 1.01, \tau_y = 2.46, \tau_q = 0.11$
$\sigma_\pi^2 + 2.0\sigma_y^2$	$\tau_\pi = 1.01, \tau_y = 3.90, \tau_q = 0.21$	$\tau_\pi = 1.01, \tau_y = 2.46, \tau_q = 0.11$

Table 4: Optimal policy parameters for Policy rule $i_t = \tau_\pi \pi_t + \tau_y y_t + \tau_q q_t$

Loss function	All shocks	News shock only
$\sigma_\pi^2 + 0.2\sigma_y^2$	$\tau_\pi = 1.83, \tau_y = 1.01, \tau_q = 0.21$	$\tau_\pi = 2.45, \tau_y = 1.03, \tau_q = 0.11$
$\sigma_\pi^2 + \sigma_y^2$	$\tau_\pi = 1.01, \tau_y = 1.23, \tau_q = 0.21$	$\tau_\pi = 1.01, \tau_y = 1.44, \tau_q = 0.21$
$\sigma_\pi^2 + 2\sigma_y^2$	$\tau_\pi = 1.01, \tau_y = 1.23, \tau_q = 0.21$	$\tau_\pi = 1.01, \tau_y = 1.64, \tau_q = 0.21$

Table 5: Optimal policy parameters for policy rule $i_t = \tau_\pi \pi_{t-1} + \tau_y y_{t-1} + \tau_q q_t$

We then consider the possibility that knowing current housing price data may provide the central bank with an information gain. The logic is that contemporaneous macro data such as output and inflation are often not readily available to the central bank at policymaking time. The same limitation, however, need not apply to asset price data, because asset prices are much more frequently updated and collected, and therefore easier to observe. Consequently, having current asset price data may provide the central bank with a potential information gain. Therefore, we consider a policy rule

$$i_t = \tau_\pi \pi_{t-1} + \tau_y y_{t-1} + \tau_q q_t.$$

The central bank is able to respond to a current housing price change without having to wait for data on output and inflation. We present our result in Table 5. Surprisingly, the result is very similar to that of the current data rule case. The optimal policy weights for housing prices remain very small. In fact the computed optimal values are identical to that case. There is an upper bound of about 0.21 that the policy weight never surpass.

Finally, we add policy smoothing and allow ρ^R to be a positive number, say 0.5. The results remain very similar. The only difference is that the values for all policy weights tend to be larger than the no policy smoothing case. This is not surprsing, as all policy weights must be discounted by $1 - \rho^R$ now (see 28). Due to the similarity, we do not report the results in tables.

The conclusion that responding to asset prices is unimportant is reminiscent of the findings of Bernanke and Gertler (2001) (for general asset prices) and Iacoviello (2005). The purpose of our experiment is to investigate whether or not the existing conclusions need to be modified when business cycles are driven by news. Our result suggests that these conclusions continue to prevail.

6 Conclusion

We explore the possibility that a housing boom-bust cycle can be driven by news in a dynamic general equilibrium model with collateral constraint. We find that news about housing demand can generate housing boom-bust cycles. Housing values affect agents' net worth and their ability to borrow and spend. A housing cycle can therefore trigger similar movements in aggregate economic activities.

When economic news is inaccurate, most of the fluctuations are not based on fundamentals and are later canceled by the realization of the real shocks. This kind of fluctuations have the feature of "bubbles." We find that if the central bank's response to the housing cycles is weak, the impact of the cycle on the real economy is stronger. We ask the question "how should central bank respond to news-driven cycles?" We ran stochastic simulations of the model economy, and look for the optimal interest rate policy that minimizes the central bank's loss functions. Our results suggest that the central bank should target inflation and output gaps, and need not target housing prices.

Given the results in this paper, opportunities now exist to enrich our understanding of housing boom-bust cycles in other respects. One possible extension is to consider other types of monetary policies, such as a money growth rule, or a policy where the central bank directly provides credits to borrowers. We leave these for future research.

References

[1] Batini, N. and E. Nelson 2000, When the Bubble Bursts: Monetary Policy Rules and Foreign Exchange Market Behavior, working paper, Bank of England.

[2] Beaudry P. and F. Portier 2004, An Exploration into Pigou's Theory of Cycles, Journal of Monetary Economics 51, 1183 - 1216.

[3] Beaudry, P. and F. Portier, 2006. News, stock prices, and economic áuctuations. American Economic Review 96 (4), 1293-1307.

[4] Beaudry, P. and F. Portier 2007, When can changes in expectations cause business cycle fluctuations in neoclassical settings?, Journal of Economic Theory, 135 (1), 458-477.

[5] Beaudry, P., Dupaigne, M., anf F. Portier, 2008. The international propagation of news shocks. Unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia.

[6] Beaudry, P. and B. Lucke, 2010. Letting different views about business cycles compete. NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2009 24, 413-455

[7] Bernanke, B. and M. Gertler 1989, Agency Costs, Net Worth, and Business Fluctuations, American Economic Review 79 (1), 14 - 31.

[8] Bernanke, B. and M. Gertler 2001, Should Central Banks Respond to Movements in Asset Prices? American Economic Review 91 (2), 253 - 257.

[9] Bernanke, B., M. Gertler and S. Gilchrist 1999, The Financial Accelerator in a Quantitative Business Cycle Framework, in J. Taylor and M. Woodford, eds., Handbook of Macroeconomics, Vol. 1C. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, North-Holland, 1341 - 1393.

[10] Burnside, C., M. Eichenbaum, S. Rebelo, 2011, Understanding Booms and Busts in Housing Markets, NBER Working Paper 16734.

[11] Calza, A., T. Monacelli, and L. Stracca 2007, Mortgage Markets,Collateral Constraints, and Monetary Policy: Do Institutional Factors Matter?" CEPR Discussion Paper No. 6231 (London: Centre for Economic Policy Research).

[12] Carlstrom, C. and T. Fuerst 1997, Agency Costs, Net Worth, and Business Fluctuations: A Computational General Equilibrium Analysis, American Economic Review 87 (5), 893 - 910.

[13] Case K. and R. Shiller 2003, Is There a Bubble in the Housing Market? Brooking Papers on Economic Activity 2, 299 - 362.

[14] Cecchetti, S., H. Genberg, J. Lipsky, and S. Wadhwani 2000, Asset Prices and Central Bank Policy, Geneva Report on the World Economy 2, CEPR and ICMB.

[15] Christiano, L., C. Ilut, R. Motto, and M. Rostagno 2008, Monetary Policy and Stock Market Boom-bust cycles, ECB working paper No. 955.

[16] Cochrane, J. 1994, "Shocks," Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy 41, 295-364.

[17] Davis, M. and J. Heathcote 2005, "Housing And The Business Cycle," International Economic Review 46(3), 751-784.

[18] Davis, M. and J. Heathcote 2007, "The price and quantity of residential land in the United States," Journal of Monetary Economics 54(8), 2595-2620.

[19] Eusepi, S. and B. Preston, 2012, Expectations, Learning and Business Cycle Fluctuations, American Economic Review, Forthcoming.

[20] Favara G. and Z. M. Song, 2011, House Price Dynamics with Dispersed Information, working paper.

[21] Iacoviello, M. 2005, "House Prices, Borrowing Constraints, and Monetary Policy in the Business Cycle," American Economic Review, 95 (3), 739-764.

[22] Jaimovich N. and S. Rebelo, 2009, Can News about the Future Drive the Business Cycle? American Economic Review 99 (4) 1097-1118.

[23] Kiyotaki, N. and J. Moore 1997, Credit Cycles, Journal of Political Economy 105 (2), 211 - 248.

[24] Lucas, Robert E., Jr., 1972, Expectations and the Neutrality of Money, Journal of Economic Theory, 4, 103-124.

[25] Mishkin, F. 2007, Housing and Monetary Transmission Mechanism, NBER working paper, NO. 13518.

[26] Monacelli, T. 2009, New Keynesian models, durable goods, and collateral constraint, Journal of Monetary Economics 56 (2), 242 - 254.

[27] Pariès, M. and A. Notarpietro 2008, Monetary policy and housing prices in an estimated DSGE model for the US and the euro area, Working Paper Series 972, European Central Bank.

[28] Phelps, Edmund S.,1970, Introduction: The New Microeconomics in Employment and Inflation Theory, in E.S. Phelps et al., Microeconomic Foundations of Employment and Inflation Theory, New York: Norton.

[29] Piazzesi, M. and M. Schneider, 2009. Momentum traders in the housing market: survey evidence and a search model. NBER working paper, No. 14669.

[30] Schimitt Grohe, S. and M. Uribe 2009, What's News in Business Cycles, CEPR Discussion Papers 7201.

[31] Shiller, R. 2007, Understanding Recent Trends in House Prices and Home Ownership, Cowles Foundation Discussion Paper No. 1630.

[32] Williamson, S. 1987, Financial Intermediation, Business Failures, and Real Business Cycles, Journal of Political Economy 95 (6), 1196 - 1216.

Appendix

A The extended model

The saver maximizes a lifetime utility function given by:

$$E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^t (\ln C_{1t} + d_t \ln h_{1t} - \frac{L_{1t}^{\eta}}{\eta}),$$

subject to the constraint

$$C_{1t} + q_t h_{1t} + \frac{R_{t-1} b_{1t-1}}{\pi_t} = b_{1t} + q_t h_{1t-1} + w_{1t} L_{1t} + F_t, \tag{29}$$

where the subscript "1" is used to tag all variables of the patient household. The subscript "2" and "3" will shortly be used to denote variables of the impatient household and the producer.

The impatient household's problem is similar to that of the patient household, except for two differences. First, the impatient household does not own any retailers and does not receive profits, and two, her borrowing capacity is constrained by the discounted future value of the collateral - her housing assets. The problem thus is

$$\max E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta_2^t (\ln C_{2t} + d_t \ln h_{2t} - \frac{L_{2t}^{\eta}}{\eta}),$$

subject to

$$C_{2t} + q_t h_{2t} + \frac{R_{t-1} b_{2t-1}}{\pi_t} = b_{2t} + q_t h_{2t-1} + w_t L_{2t}, \tag{30}$$

$$b_{2t} \leq m_2 E_t (\frac{q_{t+1} h_{2t} \pi_{t+1}}{R_t}). \tag{31}$$

The intermediate good producer (entrepreneur) maximizes her utility

$$E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \ln C_{3t},$$

subject to the budget constraint

$$C_{3t} + q_t h_{3t} + \frac{R_{t-1} b_{3t-1}}{\pi_t} + w_{1t} L_{1t} + w_{2t} L_{2t} = \frac{Y_t}{X_t} + b_{3t} + q_t h_{3t-1}, \tag{32}$$

and a borrowing constraint similar to (31):

$$b_{3t} \leq \frac{m_3 E_t q_{t+1} h_{3t} \pi_{t+1}}{R_t}. \tag{33}$$

γ is the entrepreneurs' discount rate. Again with $\gamma < \beta_1$, the producer is less patient than the saver, and her net borrowing is positive in the steady state.

The production function of intermediate good firms becomes

$$Y_t = A_t K_t^u h_{3t-1}^v L_{1t}^{\alpha(1-u-v)} L_{2t}^{(1-\alpha)(1-u-v)}.$$

Finally, we add adjustment costs to the accumulation process for both physical capital and housing:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{Kt} &= \psi(\frac{I_t}{K_t} - \delta)^2 K_{t-1}/(2\sigma), \\ \xi_{ht} &= \phi(\frac{h_t - h_{t-1}}{h_{t-1}})^2 q_t h_{t-1}/2, \end{aligned}$$

where $I_t = K_t - (1-\delta)K_{t-1}$.

The producer's budget constraint becomes

$$C_{3t} + q_t h_{3t} + \frac{R_{t-1} b_{3t-1}}{\pi_t} + w_{1t} L_{1t} + w_{2t} L_{2t} + I_t + \xi_{Kt} + \xi_{ht} = \frac{Y_t}{X_t} + b_{3t} + q_t h_{3t-1}.$$

The impatient household's budget constraint becomes

$$C_{2t} + q_t h_{2t} + \frac{R_{t-1} b_{2t-1}}{\pi_t} = b_{2t} + q_t h_{2t-1} + w_t L_{2t} - \xi_{ht}.$$

B Maximum Likelihood Estimation

B.1 The likelihood function

The reduced form model consists of two parts. The state equation is

$$s_{t+1} = A s_t + B \varepsilon_t,$$

and the observation equation is

$$y_t = C s_t,$$

where s_t is a vector of state and exogenous variables and y_t is a vector of endogenous variables. All parameters to be estimated are included in Θ. Denote the set of past observations of y_t by $Y_{t-1} = (y_{t-1,.....}y_1)$, the conditional expectation of s_t based on Y_{t-1} by $\widetilde{s}_{t|t-1}$ and the Mean Squared Error (MSE) of this forecast by $P_{t|t-1}$. Under the assumption of Normally distributed shocks, the density of y_t conditional on Y_{t-1} is

$$f(y_t \mid Y_{t-1}; \Theta) = N(C\widetilde{s}_{t|t-1}, CP_{t|t-1}C^{'}).$$

The log likelihood function is defined as

$$L(\Theta) = -(T/2)\ln(2\pi) - (1/2)\ln|CP_{t|t-1}C^{'}| - (1/2)\sum_{i=1}^{T}(y_t - C\widetilde{s}_{t|t-1})'(CP_{t|t-1}C^{'})^{-1}(y_t - C\widetilde{s}_{t|t-1}),$$

where T is the sample size. Then The Maximum Likelihood estimator of Θ is

$$\widetilde{\Theta}_{ml} = \max_{\{\Theta\}} L(\Theta).$$

B.2 Estimation results

As we explain in Section 4, we calibrate one group of parameters, and estimate the rest. The calibrated parameters are based on Iacoviello (2005) and are the same as those in Table 1 in Section 4.[11] Estimated parameters are listed in Table 6. The results are very similar to those estimated using an SMM (see Table 2). The estimated standard deviation for the four-period-ahead news shock is large and significant. The estimate for the eight-period-ahead news shock is small and insignificant. Unanticipated housing demand shocks still have highest a volatility.

[11] We find that while our results are generally robust with different calibrations of the discount factor β_2, low values of it does affect one parameter – the significance of the preference shocks. For example, when $\beta_2 = 0.95$, the standard deviation for preference shocks σ_d becomes insignificant. The standard deviation for news shocks, on the other hand, is always significant. In the following tables, we use $\beta_2 = 0.98$ to obtain significant estimates for σ_d.

Description	parameter	estimated value (MLE)	s.e.	Iacoviello
Autocorrelation of Shocks				
Inflation	ρ_u	0.79	0.018	0.59
Technology	ρ_A	0.99	0.001	0.03
Housing Preference	ρ_d	0.77	0.055	0.85
Standard Deviation of Shocks				
Inflation	σ_u	1.48	0.11	0.17
Technology	σ_A	3.64	0.209	2.24
Housing Preference	σ_d	31.72	11.44	24.89
News (4 periods ahead)	σ_4	54.68	15.53	X
News (8 periods ahead)	σ_8	5.77	25.31	X

Table 6: Estimated parameters and their standard errors. The news shocks are revealed 4 and 8 periods ahead of the realization of the fundamental shocks, respectively.

Next, we experiment with different horizons for the news shocks. The two pairs of news shocks we tried are 6 and 8 periods ahead and 2 and 6 periods ahead shocks. The estimated results are reported in Tables 7 and 8, respectively. When news are 6 and 8 periods ahead of the actual events, the 6 period ahead news shock is significant, the 8 period ahead news shock is insignificant. When news are 2 and 6 periods ahead of the actual events, the 6 period ahead news shock is significant, and the 2 period ahead news shock is not. These results suggest that 4-6 quarters ahead news shocks are mostly likely to be the driving forces of housing boom-bust cycles.

Description	parameter	estimated value (MLE)	s.e.	Iacoviello
Autocorrelation of Shocks				
Inflation	ρ_u	0.79	0.016	0.59
Technology	ρ_A	0.99	0.001	0.03
Housing Preference	ρ_d	0.70	0.10	0.85
Standard Deviation of Shocks				
Inflation	σ_u	1.47	0.11	0.17
Technology	σ_A	3.71	0.10	2.24
Housing Preference	σ_d	44.95	12.30	24.89
News (6 periods ahead)	σ_6	64.08	23.31	X
News (8 periods ahead)	σ_8	1.57 (not significant)	44.19	X

Table 7: Estimated parameters and their standard errors. The news shocks are revealed 6 and 8 periods ahead of the realization of the fundamental shocks, respectively.

Description	parameter	estimated value (MLE)	s.e.	Iacoviello
Autocorrelation of Shocks				
Inflation	ρ_u	0.77	0.018	0.59
Technology	ρ_A	0.99	0.001	0.03
Housing Preference	ρ_d	0.85	0.045	0.85
Standard Deviation of Shocks				
Inflation	σ_u	1.55	0.12	0.17
Technology	σ_A	3.60	0.22	2.24
Housing Preference	σ_d	29.96	7.29	24.89
News (2 period ahead)	σ_2	2.75 (not significant)	16.40	X
News (6 period ahead)	σ_6	32.08	12.09	X

Table 8: Estimated parameters and their standard errors. The news shocks are revealed 2 and 6 periods ahead of the realization of the fundamental shocks, respectively.

Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey
Recent Working Papers
The complete list of Working Paper series can be found at Bank's website
(http://www.tcmb.gov.tr).

Evaluating the Impact of the Post-2008 Employment Subsidy Program in Turkey
(Binnur Balkan, Yusuf Soner Başkaya, Semih Tümen Working Paper No. 14/14, May 2014)

A Comparison of Optimal Policy Rules for Pre and Post Inflation Targeting Eras: Empirical Evidence from Bank of Canada
(Neslihan Kaya Working Paper No. 14/13, May 2014)

Non-core Liabilities as an Indicator of Systemic Risk and a Liquidity Stress Test Application on Turkish Banking System
(Kurmaş Akdoğan, Burcu Deniz Yıldırım Working Paper No. 14/12, April 2014)

Mean Reversion of the Current Account and Sustainability: Evidence from European Countries
(Kurmaş Akdoğan Working Paper No. 14/11, April 2014)

Reassessing the Trends in the Relative Supply of College-Equivalent Workers in the U.S.: A Selection-Correction Approach
(Zeynep Elitaş, Hakan Ercan, Semih Tümen Working Paper No. 14/10, April 2014)

Quantifying and Explaining Stickiness in Housing Rents: A Turkish Case Study with Micro-Level Data
(Cem Aysoy, Cevriye Aysoy, Semih Tümen Working Paper No. 14/09, April 2014)

GDP Growth in Turkey: Inclusive or Not?
(Temel Taşkın Working Paper No. 14/08, April 2014)

Openness to International Trade and Economic Growth: A Cross-Country Empirical Investigation
(Bülent Ulaşan Working Paper No. 14/07, March 2014)

Estimating NAIRU for the Turkish Economy Using Extended Kalman Filter Approach
(Vuslat Us Working Paper No. 14/06, March 2014)

Nüfus Yapısındaki Değişimlerin Uzun Dönem Konut Talebi Üzerindeki Etkileri
(Yavuz Arslan, Evren Ceritoğlu, Birol Kanık Çalışma Tebliği No. 14/05, Mart 2014)

Macroprudential Policies as Buffer Against Volatile Cross-border Capital Flows
(Ahmet Faruk Aysan, Salih Fendoğlu, Mustafa Kılınç Working Paper No. 14/04, February 2014)

Managing Short-Term Capital Flows in New Central Banking: Unconventional Monetary Policy Framework in Turkey
(Ahmet Faruk Aysan, Salih Fendoğlu, Mustafa Kılınç Working Paper No. 14/03, February 2014)

Interest Rate Corridor, Liquidity Management and the Overnight Spread
(Hande Küçük, Pınar Özlü, Anıl Talaslı, Deren Ünalmış, Canan Yüksel Working Paper No. 14/02, February 2014)

Heterogeneity and Uncertainty in the Dynamics of Firm Selection into Foreign Markets
(Mehmet Fatih Ulu Working Paper No. 14/01, January 2014)

Domestic Savings-Investment Gap and Growth: A Cross-Country Panel Study
(Aytül Ganioğlu, Cihan Yalçın Working Paper No. 13/46, December 2013)