

Financial Frictions, Asset Prices, and the Great Recession*

Zhen Huo
New York University

José-Víctor Ríos-Rull
University of Pennsylvania
Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis
UCL, CAERP, CEPR, NBER

Thursday 14th January, 2016

Abstract

We study financial shocks to households ability to borrow in an economy that replicates quantitatively US earnings, financial, and housing wealth distributions and the main macro aggregates. Such shocks generate large recessions via the negative wealth effect associated to the large drop in house prices triggered by the reduced access to credit of a large number of households. The model incorporates additional margins that are crucial for a large recession to occur: that it is difficult to reallocate production from consumption to investment or net exports, and that the reductions in consumption contribute to reductions in measured TFP.

Keywords: Balance Sheet Recession, Asset price, Goods market frictions, Labor market frictions
JEL classifications: E20, E32, E44


PRELIMINARY

*Ríos-Rull thanks the National Science Foundation for Grant SES-1156228. We are thankful for discussions with Yan Bai, Kjetil Storesletten, and Nir Jaimovich, as well as for comments in many seminars and conferences. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis or the Federal Reserve System.

1 Introduction

The Great Recession in the U.S. has several features (see Figure 1): (1) (Detrended) Output dropped dramatically, about 9 percentage points. (2) Private consumption and investment both dropped even more, about 10% and 30% respectively below trend. (3) Similarly, the value of houses prices suffered a huge loss, after some large gains before the Great Recession started. (4) There was an unprecedented credit cycle in the household side. The debt-to-income ratio increased quickly to its historical highest level (about 2.3) until 2008, and declined sharply since the crisis began. (5) The unemployment rate climbed to 10% in 2009 and remained at a high level for a fairly long period. (6) Measured total factor productivity declined. (7) Net exports increased by about 3% of GDP from 2008 to 2010.

Figure 1: Aggregate Performance of the U.S. Economy



Note: Real Output, Consumption, Investment and TFP are linearly detrended logs.

Motivated by these facts, we build a model economy to explore the extent to which a recession can be triggered by a shock to households' access to house financing. Difficulties to borrow reduce house prices, which reduce wealth, especially for a large number of highly leveraged households. The response is to cut consumption directly (and investment indirectly) prompting a recession. In an economy like the U.S. with high wealth inequality this mechanism triggers a large recession.

Our model economy includes two crucial features of the U.S. economy that make it non-trivial for financial shocks to households ability to borrow to generate a large recession: that total wealth is plentiful and that investment and net exports are mechanisms for society to save into the future. Consequently, our model economy requires the explicit inclusion of certain ingredients to generate a large recession as a result of a financial shock. First, wealth has to be very unequally distributed and a large number of households have to use the financial system to purchase houses. Second, as in [Huo and Rios-Rull \(2013\)](#) and [Midrigan and Philippon \(2011\)](#), real rigidities that make it

quite costly to have a fast expansion of the tradable sector and a rapid increase of exports when consumption falls. Third, a housing sector with prices that respond to households' willingness to buy, and that can amplify dramatically the recession in a fashion similar to that posed by [Kiyotaki and Moore \(1997\)](#). Fourth, goods market frictions that move total factor productivity endogenously and that exacerbate the recession by reducing profits.^{1,2} Finally, some labor market frictions that make hiring costly and that prevent a dramatic fall in wages.

The model economy that we pose is of the Bewley-Imrohorglu-Huggett-Aiyagari variety extended to include multiple sectors of production (tradables and nontradables), both capital and houses (which we model as being in fixed supply like land and that need to be purchased in order to be enjoyed), endogenous productivity movements (due to frictions in the goods markets), and various job market frictions. A crucial feature in our economy is that households' borrowing has to be collateralized with housing. Like in all market incomplete economies, more adverse trading possibilities for households result in higher long run output and wealth. However, the transition involves a recession. The keys to the recession are the inability of the economy to turn on a dime from an economy geared to consumption to a savings oriented economy that produces investment and exports goods, the amplification effects of the housing prices, and the endogeneity of production.

The main financial shock that we consider is a shock to the loan to value ratio and to the interest rate markup on mortgages. The former moves unexpectedly³ from 20% to 40% while the latter goes up from zero to fifty basis points. Such a shock generates a drop of 3.5% of output, 6.4% of consumption and 29.0% of investment (the increase in net exports accounts for the difference). Unemployment jumps from 6 to 8.8%, house prices fall by 18%, household debt falls by 33% and total wealth falls by 7.7%. There is also an endogenous fall in TFP of 1.5%.

The financial shock generates a recession because the difficulty to access credit reduces housing demand dramatically and with it housing prices. Households want to increase their wealth both to recover the level of lost housing (for those who had a binding collateral constraint) and to bear the higher unemployment risk and lower borrowing capacity (for those who did not have a binding collateral constraint). The new financial terms imply that all households see an increase in their optimal saving-to-income ratio. As a result, households cut their consumption which results in lower prices, occupation rate, and profits in the nontradable goods sector, and therefore lower employment and investment. The reduced hiring further increases households' unemployment risk and precautionary saving motive. The drop in house prices has two separate but related effects on households: first, it further tightens the collateral constraint and forces more households to reduce their debt involuntarily; second, it weakens all the homeowners' balance sheet, which is followed by a reduction of consumption through wealth effects. These forces reinforce each other and form a vicious cycle. For the recession to occur, the tradable sector cannot expand too fast.

We explore many versions of our economy to see how various margins affect our findings. It turns out that the change in the loan to value ratio accounts for about 60% of the fall in output, but the increased markup in mortgages have more long run permanent effects via its increase on the user cost of ownership of housing for the poorest households. The role of falling house prices is absolutely central. In its absence the fall in output would be less than a third of a percentage point. Each one of the two frictions that we pose to impede a fast growth of net exports, adjustment costs and decreasing returns to scale as a stand in for comparative advantage, reduce output about 0.60%. The endogenous fall in TFP is quite an important contributing mechanism: in its absence the fall of

¹Frictions in goods markets have been posed in [Bai, Ríos-Rull, and Storesletten \(2011\)](#), [Bai and Ríos-Rull \(2015\)](#), and [Huo and Ríos-Rull \(2013\)](#), where they are directly responsible for total factor productivity changes and in [Petrosky-Nadeau and Wasmer \(2015\)](#) where they drastically amplify and change the properties of productivity shocks. The mechanism involves households bearing some of the efforts to extract output of the economy in an environment with search frictions. That search effort goes up in the face of a negative wealth effect is new here.

²[Fernald \(2012\)](#) shows that total factor productivity dropped since 2008 and started to recover after 2010.

³Usually referred to as an MIT shock.

output would be less than half.

We extend our model economy in two ways. First, we allow for (unexpected) household default when we pose a slightly larger shock that results in a fall of house prices of 22% rather than 18% (enough to generate an empty budget set on some households despite the large loan to value ratio of the baseline economy). The losses are absorbed by the mutual funds that issued the mortgages. Under these circumstances the fall in output is 4.4% rather than 3.5%. We do not pose this economy as the baseline on grounds of having lenders lose money unexpectedly. Second, we change preferences over housing to reduce the number of homeowners matching the U.S. home ownership ratio. When adjusting the shock to match the same fall in house prices, we obtain a similar size recession.⁴

Our model has rich cross-sectional implications that can be readily compared with those in the data. In terms of the heterogeneous response of consumption, [Mian, Rao, and Sufi \(2013\)](#), [Mian and Sufi \(2014\)](#), [Petev, Pistaferri, and Eksten \(2012\)](#) and [Parker and Vissing-Jorgensen \(2009\)](#) document that the households that lose the most are the ones that cut their consumption the most. [Mian, Rao, and Sufi \(2013\)](#) and [Mian and Sufi \(2014\)](#) show, using spacial data, that it is in regions that experienced a larger house price drop where consumption fell the most and that leveraged and underwater households cut their consumption more aggressively. [Parker and Vissing-Jorgensen \(2009\)](#) and [Petev, Pistaferri, and Eksten \(2012\)](#), using CEX data, show that it is the medium to rich households (both in terms of income and wealth) who reduce consumption the most.⁵ In our extended model, where we match the U.S. home-ownership rate, the households who drop consumption the most are those whose wealth drops the most. These households are highly leveraged or have a large share of housing in their total net worth, and they are concentrated in the middle of the wealth distribution (30%-80%).⁶ The poorest households do not own houses, and their consumption actually increases slightly due to lower nontradable prices. The majority of households own some housing and suffer from a weakened balance sheet. Thus in our (extended) model economy consumption inequality falls during the recession, which is [Parker and Vissing-Jorgensen \(2009\)](#) way of summarizing the outcome. Second, in terms of the heterogeneity of unemployment risk, [Fang and Nie \(2013\)](#) and [Lifschitz, Setty, and Yedid-Levi \(2015\)](#) document that during the Great Recession, workers with the lowest educational attainment faced the largest unemployment risk due to a much higher job separation probability. In our model, the peaks of the unemployment rate among different groups of workers ranges from 5% to 14%, which replicates the key feature of data.

We also use our model to explore the implications of an expansion of credit followed by a posterior contraction, both caused by financial shocks to households' ability to borrow. Predictably the economy experiences an expansion followed by a recession. The latter is much more severe than the former. Both changes of conditions generate immediate price changes but the effects on expenditures have different temporal dimensions. Households' response to the increase in riches coming from higher house prices is to increase consumption slowly. The response to the opposite shock is, however, much faster. Households do not like to be too close to their constraints and will try hard to accumulate assets.

While we pose a fairly complicated model economy, our formulation has some shortcomings that future work should address. First, we model the housing market as frictionless. Both house size and of its financing can be costlessly resized. There is a growing amount of evidence that these assumptions are inappropriate (see for instance [Kaplan and Violante \(2014\)](#)). Because of this, the financial shock that we pose is to the loan to value ratio which may not be the relevant margin where the financial shock affected households (see [Cloyne, Ferreira, and Surico \(2015\)](#)). All this suggests that a richer model of the housing and mortgaging decisions may be important. Second, in our

⁴This economy is quite more complicated than the baseline, and we thus leave it as an extension.

⁵The CEX data is likely to miss the very high income households. See [Bricker, Henriques, Krimmel, and Sabelhaus \(2015\)](#) and [Sabelhaus, Johnson, Ash, Swanson, Garner, Greenlees, and Henderson \(2013\)](#).

⁶In our model, the loss of net worth mainly comes from the decline of housing price, and the housing wealth accounts for a relatively small fraction of the total wealth of the richest households. Our model misses the large drop in the prices of financial assets which is what may account for the large drop in consumption of the richest households in the sample used by [Parker and Vissing-Jorgensen \(2009\)](#).

economy firms that produce investment goods can redirect their output to exports costlessly when investment falls. Yet, exports take always time to expand (see [Alessandria, Pratap, and Yue \(2013\)](#)) and the investment producing sectors also suffered during the Great Recession. A richer model should have more sectors and a mechanism for investment producing firms to suffer during the recession. This is particularly the case if we think of construction of both business structures and houses, which are sectors with the features of nontradables rather than tradables. That the recession occurred in all developed economies making exports more difficult makes this shortcoming more relevant. Third, our model has a constant real interest rate. This is partly to relate it to the zero bound literature, and partly as a humility cure for our lack of understanding of what are the internal mechanisms, if any, responsible for the fall in real interest rates of the last few years. Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, a financial shock should not be a primitive, as it is in our model, but an outcome of deeper mechanisms.

This paper is related to several strands of the literature. First, it is part of the literature that attributes the recession to household financial distress, which is partly inspired by the empirical work of [Mian and Sufi \(2011, 2014\)](#) and [Mian, Rao, and Sufi \(2013\)](#). Most of these papers assume that there are two types of agents, borrowers and savers. For example, [Eggertsson and Krugman \(2012\)](#), [Guerrieri and Iacoviello \(2013\)](#) and [Justiniano, Primiceri, and Tambalotti \(2015\)](#) explore the interaction between the tightening of financial constraints and the zero-bound of nominal interest rates. When borrowers are forced to reduce their debt, the depressed demand puts downward pressure on the interest rate. To make a recession happen, nominal rigidities have to be present and the zero bound has to be binding. The problem according to these papers is that nominal prices cannot adjust to equate supply and demand. This is not the mechanism that we work out in our paper. Quantitatively, the recessions generated in the saver-borrower type of model are typically small, because the savers and borrowers often move in the opposite direction, and they wash out in the aggregate.

[Midrigan and Philippon \(2011\)](#) consider a richer environment in which different regions are distinguished by their initial debt-to-income ratio, but share the same interest rate. Both the rich and the poor are liquidity constrained but only the poor are credit constrained. A shock to the collateral constraint for liquidity significantly reduces aggregate demand if the rich cannot convert credit into liquidity quickly. Like in our paper, [Midrigan and Philippon \(2011\)](#) assume labor reallocation costs and wage rigidity to prevent households from working harder or moving to a tradable sector capable of accommodating the lack of demand. Unlike in our paper, where the change of house prices is driven by the financial shocks, the movement of housing price in [Midrigan and Philippon \(2011\)](#) is mainly triggered by a wedge in the Euler equation which can be interpreted as preference shocks or news shocks. In their model with savers and borrowers, it is difficult for liquidity shocks or credit shocks to generate large recessions. The reason for this, we think, is that savers can transform their savings into consumption easily unless assuming a large adjustment cost. The savers will pick up the slack and leave the total spending not much affected. Because in their economy there is no increased unemployment risk, households do not reduce their consumption due to a precautionary motive. Another important and related paper is [Guerrieri and Lorenzoni \(2011\)](#) who study the effects of a reduction of the borrowing limit in a [Huggett \(1993\)](#) type economy where households borrow from each other and aggregate wealth is zero (except for uina an extension with consumer durables). A tightening of the borrowing constraint induces the poorest households to increase their work effort and their savings, and the rich end up consuming more and working less. While the poor consume less and work more, the overall effect in the economy is that output declines due to the reduction of labor of the very high skilled workers. Total working hours, however, increase because most households work more. [Guerrieri and Lorenzoni \(2011\)](#) poses the same trigger than our paper, yet its consequences are very different, even though their's is a world where the lack of aggregate wealth makes the increased difficulties to borrow potentially more painful. Crucially, the environment in [Guerrieri and Lorenzoni \(2011\)](#) misses the amplification effects of house price drops on household wealth, the contribution of endogenous productivity, and the existence of real frictions that make it difficult to switch from producing for

consumption to producing for wealth accumulation (investment and net exports). In [Huo and Rios-Rull \(2015\)](#) we explored the effects of a credit tightening in an heterogeneous market economy with endogenous productivity. Here households consume two goods, one of which has to be produced by others and is subject to a search friction. Increased difficulties to access credit translate into lower ability to fetch consumption by poor people. Like in [Guerrieri and Lorenzoni \(2011\)](#) the absence of housing imply that the redistributive impact of the shock in favor of the rich makes the aggregate impact small.

A second strand of the literature related to this paper is the exploration of the boom and bust in the housing market due to changes in borrowing requirements. [Kiyotaki, Michaelides, and Nikolov \(2011\)](#) explore the causes the boom of housing market in the 2000's and its redistributive effects. [Favilukis, Ludvigson, and Nieuwerburgh \(2012\)](#) focus on the effects of exogenous changes of financial conditions on house prices that operate via endogenous changes in the risk premium in economies with high risk aversion economies. [Garriga, Manuelli, and Peralta-Alva \(2012\)](#) explain the boom and bust of the housing market in a small open economy. [Ríos-Rull and Sánchez-Marcos \(2008b\)](#) explore the implications for housing prices and transactions of business cycles. [Greenwald \(2015\)](#) considers both the loan-to-value ratio constraint and the debt-to-income ratio constraint, and shows that which constraint is more relevant in shaping the housing price depends on the state of the aggregate economy. [Chen, Michaux, and Roussanov \(2013\)](#), [Kaplan, Mitman, and Violante \(2015b\)](#), and [Gorea and Midrigan \(2015\)](#) include long-term mortgage debt and explore the effects of housing prices change on aggregate consumption. Most of the papers discussed here assume a fixed labor supply, which prevents them from linking the change in housing market conditions to the business cycle. Our paper share with these papers the view that the change of borrowing limit has important implications on housing price dynamics, and we further explore the two-way feedback between housing prices and aggregate fluctuations.

A third strand of the literature deals with goods market frictions. Our approach to modelling goods market frictions builds on [Bai, Ríos-Rull, and Storesletten \(2011\)](#), [Bai and Ríos-Rull \(2015\)](#), and [Huo and Rios-Rull \(2015\)](#) and we extend it accommodate multiple varieties of goods. [Alessandria \(2009\)](#) and [Kaplan and Menzio \(2013a\)](#) also study the role of goods market frictions in business cycle analysis. Our model differs from theirs in that in these two papers the occupancy rate of sellers is independent of households' search effort, which is what in our paper makes measured TFP is positively correlated with aggregate demand in our model. [Petrosky-Nadeau and Wasmer \(2011\)](#) show that the search in the goods market can greatly amplify and propagate the effects of technology shocks on labor markets. [Michaillat and Saez \(2013\)](#) also consider an environment with variable occupation rate. Unlike the rest of the literature that poses two equilibrium conditions to determine both the price and market tightness, this paper ignores one of those conditions leaving only market clearing and resulting in multiple equilibria that they deal with by setting an exogenous price level.

Section 2 poses the model economy and describes our modelization of the financial shocks. Section 3 discusses how we map the model economy to data so that it looks like the U.S. economy. Section 4 does a steady-state analysis describing what are the long run implications of the financial shocks. Section 5 explores the effects of the financial shocks and what are the margins that matter. Section 6 discusses the extensions of the model economy that we study (default and preferences with zero housing) and show how our findings remain robust. Section 7 explores the cross-sectional implications of our model for the recession and compares them with those in the data. Section 8 studies the effects of an expansion of credit followed by a contraction that come out from exogenous changes in the accessibility of household secure credit and discusses how to interpret the last 15 years under that light. A brief conclusion follows. An Appendix includes details on the construction of data, a discussion of shopping effort and shopping time and provides additional tables and graphs of interest.

2 The Model Economy

We consider a Bewley-Imrohorglu-Huggett-Aiyagari type model in a small open economy (i.e., the interest rate is set by the rest of the world). There are two produced goods, tradables and nontradables, subject to adjustment costs to capital and labor that make it hard to reallocate resources fast across sectors. Nontradable goods are subject to search frictions as in [Bai, Ríos-Rull, and Storesletten \(2011\)](#) and [Huo and Ríos-Rull \(2013\)](#): firms and consumers have to search for each other before transactions can take place. Consumers exert costly effort to get around a standard search friction. The labor market is also subject to frictions with firms facing hiring costs and with workers having to search for a job. Households own financial assets and housing. Financial assets are held in mutual funds that in turn own all the assets other than privately owned housing which are shares of tradable and nontradable producing firms, mortgages and loans to/from the rest of the world. Crucially, borrowing has to be collateralized by housing.

2.1 Steady States

We start by posing the model economy in steady state. Later we discuss the financial shocks. Search frictions in the goods and labor markets crucially shape the problem of households and firms so we start describing them.

Goods Markets The tradable good, which is denoted by T and is the numeraire, can be used for consumption, investment and exporting. The tradable sector is competitive. Nontradables, denoted by N , can be used only for local consumption and are subject to additional frictions.

There is a measure one of varieties of nontradables $i \in [0, 1]$, and each variety is produced by a firm. Each firm owns a measure one of locations some of which will be matched with households and some will not. Consumers have to exert search effort to find varieties. Firms, on the other hand, search costlessly.

Matches of varieties (firms) and households are formed by combining the total measure of varieties, 1, and the aggregate measure of searching effort by households denoted D via a constant returns to scale matching function. When a household matches a variety it is randomly allocated to one of its locations. Firms do not know in advance which locations will be the ones matched with a household. This matching process ensures that all firms-varieties get the same number of customers or same occupancy rate.

We write the number of matches by $M^g(D, 1)$, and market tightness by $Q_g = \frac{1}{D}$. The probability that a shopper (a unit of shopping effort and not an agent) finds a variety is

$$\Psi^d(Q_g) = \frac{M^g(D, 1)}{D}, \quad (1)$$

while the measure of shoppers that firms have access to is

$$\Psi^f(Q_g) = M^g(D, 1). \quad (2)$$

Note that $\Psi^f(Q_g)$ is also the fraction of shops or locations of each variety that are filled by a consumer.⁷

Recall that firms do not know in advance which of its locations will be matched with a household, nor which type of household (with which willingness to spend) it will be matched with, they do know however, the probability that each location will be matched and the probability distribution of household types it will be matched with. We assume that firms post a price in all its locations and commit to it regardless of the household type that shows up.

⁷Although given the passive nature of the locations side to find households we could have written directly functions $\Psi^d(D)$ and $\Psi^f(D)$.

Firms honor all orders.⁸

Labor Market Work is indivisible, and households are either employed or unemployed. The labor market has a search friction that we model by requiring firms to pay a hiring cost κ per worker that they want to hire.⁹ Denote by V the measure of new jobs created in a given period. Newly hired employees are taken from the pool of the unemployed which consists of workers of different skill levels ϵ . Firms cannot discriminate in their search for workers by their skill level. Let $x_{\epsilon,1}$ denote the measure of employed workers of skill ϵ , and $x_{\epsilon,0}$ the measure of unemployed workers of skill ϵ , $x_0 = \sum_{\epsilon} x_{\epsilon,0}$ are all the unemployed and $x_1 = 1 - x_0$ the employed. Then, the probability of finding a job for a worker is $\frac{V}{x_0}$, while the expected skill level of a newly hired worker is $\sum_{\epsilon} \epsilon x_{\epsilon,0}$. While job finding rates do not depend on the skill level, job losing rates do, with δ_n^{ϵ} being the probability of job loss for an employed type ϵ worker.¹⁰ We can construct a transition matrix for the employment status of a household that depends on endogenous variables and is given by

$$\Pi_{e'|e,\epsilon}^w = \begin{cases} 1 - \delta_n^{\epsilon} & \text{if } e = 1, e' = 1 \\ \delta_n^{\epsilon} & \text{if } e = 1, e' = 0 \\ \frac{V}{x_u} & \text{if } e = 0, e' = 1 \\ 1 - \frac{V}{x_u} & \text{if } e = 0, e' = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

The average separation rate is $\bar{\delta}_n = \frac{\sum_{\epsilon} \delta_n^{\epsilon} x_{\epsilon,1}}{x_1}$. Households are paid a wage that is proportional to its skills. Let w be the equilibrium price of one unit of skill.

2.1.1 Households

Households live forever and are indexed by their skills ϵ , their employment status $e \in \{0, 1\}$ and their assets, a .

Endowment and labor market attachment The skill level of a household is its amount of efficient units of labor ϵ that evolves according to a Markov process with exogenous transition matrix $\Pi_{\epsilon,\epsilon'}^{\epsilon}$. As stated an employed worker loses its job at rate δ_n^{ϵ} and finds a job at rate $\frac{V}{x_u}$, the latter being an equilibrium object. An employed household is paid ϵw ; an unemployed household earns \bar{w} units of the tradable good, the consumption equivalent of home production.

Housing Households like “houses” a good that exists in fixed supply, and that has to be owned in order to be enjoyed. There are no transaction costs involved when changing the amount of housing in consecutive periods.

Assets markets A household can own housing and financial assets. At the beginning of the period we denote total household wealth by a , making the portfolio irrelevant given that there are no transaction costs. The rate of return of the financial asset depends on whether the household is a borrower or a saver. For reasons that we will become clear when we look outside steady state allocations, we decompose the rate of return to financial assets, b , in two parts, $q(b)$ that is determined today and applies to negative financial assets, and $R'(b)$ that is determined tomorrow, and applies to positive financial assets. Note that to emphasize the determination of the rate of return

⁸These assumptions amount to random search with price posting. This is an arbitrary, but simplifying, choice. An obvious alternative is competitive search where locations and households search in different markets indexed by price and market tightness. In [Huo and Rios-Rull \(2015\)](#), we pose environments with competitive search leading to poorer households going to tighter but cheaper markets which agrees with the evidence posted by [Aguiar, Hurst, and Karabarbounis \(2011\)](#) and [Kaplan and Menzio \(2013b\)](#). To have competitive search in our model economies will be far costlier, without, in all likelihood, changing the findings.

⁹We follow here [Christiano, Eichenbaum, and Trabandt \(2013\)](#) and [Gertler and Trigari \(2009\)](#).

¹⁰See Section 3 for a discussion of the reasons for this choice.

in the following period we write it with primes even if we are looking at steady states. We have

$$q(b) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } b \geq 0 \\ \frac{1}{1+r^*+\varsigma}, & \text{if } b < 0 \end{cases}, \quad R'(b) = \begin{cases} 1+r', & \text{if } b \geq 0 \\ 1, & \text{if } b < 0 \end{cases}, \quad (4)$$

here r^* is the world interest rate and ς is a markup or transaction cost to borrowing. The rate of return to savings in the mutual fund is r' , which will be specified later but it is the return of a mutual fund that owns all the firms of the economy in addition to some foreign net asset position at fixed interest rate r^* . Obviously, in steady state, $r' = r^*$, and asset prices are constant, but we use $R'(b)$ and r' to facilitate the exposition when we deal with the model economy outside the steady state.

There is also a collateral constraint. Negative financial assets can only be held if backed up by sufficient real assets. The ratio of debt to housing value can take a maximum value of $\lambda < 1$, that applies every period.

Preferences Households consume a certain number of varieties I_N and consume quantity $c_{N,i}$ of each variety $i \in [0, I_N]$. Note that different households choose different numbers of varieties, and the actual location of those varieties may differ. The utility flow from nontradables aggregates via a Dixit-Stiglitz type formulation, which in turn aggregates with the consumption of tradables c_T yielding

$$c_A = c_A(c_N, c_T) = c_A \left(\int_0^{I_N} (c_{N,i})^{\frac{1}{\rho}} di, c_T \right), \quad (5)$$

where $\rho > 1$ determines the substitutability among nontradable goods. We abuse notation by using c_A and c_N to refer both to the aggregates and to the aggregating function. Households also like housing h and dislike shopping effort, d . We denote the period utility function by $u(c_A, h, d)$. In addition, the household discounts the future at rate β . We are now in a position to write the household problem:

Households' Problem We are now in a position to write the household problem: Amsterdam

$$V(\epsilon, e, a) = \max_{\substack{c_{N,i}, c_T, I_N, d \\ h, b, a'}} u(c_A, h, d) + \beta \sum_{\epsilon', e'} \Pi_{\epsilon', \epsilon}^w \Pi_{\epsilon, \epsilon'}^\epsilon V(\epsilon', e', a'), \quad (6)$$

subject to the definition of the consumption aggregate (5) and

$$\int_0^{I_N} p_i c_{N,i} + c_T + p_h h + q(b) b = a + 1_{e=1} w \epsilon + 1_{e=0} \bar{w} \quad (7)$$

$$I_N = d \Psi^d(Q_g), \quad (8)$$

$$q(b) b \geq -\lambda p_h h, \quad (9)$$

$$a' = p'_h h + R(b) b. \quad (10)$$

Equation (7) is the household's budget constraint. Equation (8) is the requirement that varieties have to be found, which requires effort d and depends on the tightness in the goods market. Equation (9) is the collateral requirement. Equation (10) describes the evolution of total wealth, which is the sum of the value of housing and the value of financial assets. Even though we are looking at steady states, we write the price of houses in the following period to be p'_h .

Remark 1. We can take advantage of the nice properties of Dixit-Stiglitz aggregator: defining

$$c_N = \left(\frac{1}{I_N} \int_0^{I_N} c_{N,i}^\rho \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}}, \quad p = \left(\frac{1}{I_N} \int_0^{I_N} p_i^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \right)^{1-\rho}, \quad (11)$$

we can obtain the standard demand function for each variety

$$c_{N,i} = \left(\frac{p_i}{p} \right)^{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}} c_N. \quad (12)$$

In equilibrium, all firms choose the same price, $p_i = p$, which allows us to rewrite expenditures on nontradables as $p I_N c_N$ instead of $\int_0^{I_N} p_i c_{N,i}$. Also, the first argument of the aggregating function c_A collapses to $c_N I_N^\rho$.

Under equal pricing of all varieties, the first order conditions of the household problem are

$$u_{c_N} = p I_N u_{c_T}, \quad (13)$$

$$u_{I_N} = p c_N u_{c_T} - \frac{u_d}{\Psi^d(Q_g)}, \quad (14)$$

$$q(b) u_{c_T} = R'(b) \beta \sum_{e', e} \Pi_{e'|e, \epsilon}^w \Pi_{\epsilon, e'}^\epsilon u'_{c_T} + \zeta q(b), \quad (15)$$

$$p_h u_{c_T} = u_h + p'_h \beta \sum_{e', e} \Pi_{e'|e, \epsilon}^w \Pi_{\epsilon, e'}^\epsilon u'_{c_T} + \zeta \lambda p_h. \quad (16)$$

Equation (13) shows the optimality condition between nontradable and tradable goods. Note that increasing the number of varieties results in additional shopping disutility and Equation (14) determines the optimal number of varieties. Equation (15) is the Euler equation with respect to the holding of financial asset, with ζ being the multiplier associated with the collateral constraint. When the collateral constraint is not binding, $\zeta = 0$. Equation (16) is the Euler equation with respect to housing. When $\zeta > 0$, housing serves its additional role as collateral for borrowing.

Representation of households We describe the state of all households by means of a probability measure $x_{\epsilon, e}(a)$ defined over households' type. Notice that we have already defined the marginals when we discussed the labor market, $x_{\epsilon, e} = \int_0^\infty x_{\epsilon, e}(da)$.

2.1.2 Firms in the Nontradable Goods Sector

Due to the existence of adjustment costs and hiring frictions, a firm producing variety i is indexed by its capital stock k , and by its measure of workers $n = \{n_\epsilon\}$. The total labor input for a firm with employment $\{n_\epsilon\}$ is simply $\ell = \sum n_\epsilon \epsilon$.¹¹ Each firm owns a continuum of locations that have equal probability $\Psi^f(Q_g)$ of being visited by a household. Households demand different quantities of the good. To model how the firm is able to accommodate the delivery of big and small quantities of the good at different locations, we distinguish between three kinds of inputs. At each location, there is pre-installed or fixed capital, k and preinstalled labor ℓ_1 . There is also variable labor ℓ_2 that can be dispatched to whatever locations need them after the consumer makes its order. The production function at each location is

$$F^N(k, \ell_1, \ell_2) = z_N k^{\alpha_0} \ell_1^{\alpha_1} \ell_2^{\alpha_2}, \quad (17)$$

¹¹Again, because we will also look at non steady states, we keep track of the composition of the labor force. Otherwise, ℓ would have been a sufficient statistic for the firm.

where z_N is just a units parameter. When a shopper wants to buy c units of nontradables at a location, the amount of variable labor ℓ_2 needed to produce c is

$$g(c, k, \ell_1) = c^{\frac{1}{\alpha_2}} z_N^{\frac{-1}{\alpha_2}} k^{-\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_2}} \ell_1^{-\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2}}. \quad (18)$$

At the posted price p_i , the demand schedule of a household of type (ϵ, e, a) is

$$c(\epsilon, e, a; p_i) = \left(\frac{p_i}{p} \right)^{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}} c_N(\epsilon, e, a), \quad (19)$$

where $c_N(\epsilon, e, a)$ is the policy function derived from households' problem. Applying the law of large numbers, the total variable labor that a firm that has installed k and ℓ_1 in each of its locations needs is

$$\ell_2 = \Psi^f(Q^g) \int g[c(\epsilon, e, a; p_i), k, \ell_1] dx(\epsilon, e, a). \quad (20)$$

That firms have to pre-install capital and labor at a location no matter whether shoppers actually visit them later is why demand can affect productivity: with a higher probability of being visited, more capital and labor can be used. The relative marginal productivity of preinstalled versus variable labor is the key margin that determines how important is the role of household demand in determining output.

Firms have to choose labor one period in advance incurring in hiring costs to do so. Both capital investment and hiring costs are in the form of tradable goods. The problem of the firms in the nontradable sector is then

$$\Omega^N(k, n) = \max_{\substack{i, v, k', n' \\ p_i, \ell_1, \ell_2}} \Psi^f(Q_g) p_i \int c(\epsilon, e, a; p_i) dx(\epsilon, e, a) - w\ell - i - \kappa v + \frac{\Omega^N(k', n')}{1+r^*}, \quad (21)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \ell_2 \geq \Psi^f(Q^g) \int g[c(\epsilon, e, a; p_i), k, \ell_1] dx, \quad (22)$$

$$\ell_1 + \ell_2 = \sum n_\epsilon \epsilon \quad (23)$$

$$k' = (1 - \delta_k)k + i - \phi^{N,k}(k, i), \quad (24)$$

$$n'_\epsilon = (1 - \delta_n)n_\epsilon + v \frac{x_{\epsilon,0}}{x_0}. \quad (25)$$

where $\phi^{N,k}(k, i)$ is the capital adjustment cost, which slows down the adaptation process of firms to new circumstances. The first order conditions are

$$\frac{\ell_1}{\ell_2} = \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2}, \quad (26)$$

$$\frac{1+r^*}{1-\phi_i^N} = -\frac{\alpha_2}{\rho} p'_i \Psi^f(Q^g) \int g_k[c(p_i, S, \epsilon, e, a), k', \ell'_1] dx + \frac{1-\delta_k - (\phi_k^{N,k})'}{1 - (\phi_i^{N,k})'}, \quad (27)$$

$$\kappa(1+r^*) = \frac{\alpha_2}{\rho} p'_i - w + (1 - \bar{\delta}_n)\kappa. \quad (28)$$

Equation (26) is the optimality condition for the allocation of labor which implies a constant ratio between pre-installed labor and labor that moves between locations. Equations (27) and (28) are the optimality conditions for investment and hiring.

Remark 2. After some algebra, measured total factor productivity in the nontradable sector can be written as

$$TFP^N = \frac{\int c(\epsilon, e, a; p_i) dx(\epsilon, e, a)}{k^{\alpha_0}(\ell_1 + \ell_2)^{1-\alpha_0}} = z_N [\Psi^f(Q_g)]^{1-\alpha_2} \frac{\int c(\epsilon, e, a; p_i) dx(\epsilon, e, a)}{\left(\int [c(\epsilon, e, a; p_i)]^{\frac{1}{\alpha_2}} dx(\epsilon, e, a)\right)^{\alpha_2}}, \quad (29)$$

which is increasing in the fraction of locations visited by shoppers.

2.1.3 Firms in the Tradable Goods Sector

Firms in the tradable goods sector operate in a frictionless, perfectly competitive environment. To accommodate the possibility of decreasing returns to scale (a shorthand for limited comparative advantage) we pose that in addition to capital and labor, firms also need to use another factor, available in fixed supply, as an input of production. Without loss of generality, we assume that there is one firm per unit of the fixed factor. Adjustment costs to expand capital and employment, given by functions $\phi^{T,k}(k, i)$ and $\phi^{T,n}(n', n)$, difficult a quick expansion of this sector. The problem of the firms is

$$\Omega^T(k, n) = \max_{i, v} F^T(k, \ell) - w \ell - i - \kappa v - \phi^{T,n}(n', n) + \frac{\Omega^T(k', n')}{1 + r^*}, \quad (30)$$

subject to

$$\ell = \sum n_\epsilon \epsilon \quad (31)$$

$$k' = (1 - \delta_k)k + i - \phi^{T,k}(k, i), \quad (32)$$

$$n'_\epsilon = (1 - \delta_n^\epsilon)n_\epsilon + v \frac{x_{\epsilon,0}}{x_0}. \quad (33)$$

The first order conditions are

$$\frac{1 + r^*}{1 - \phi_i^{T,k}} = (F_k^T)' + \frac{1 - \delta_k - (\phi_k^{T,k})'}{1 - (\phi_i^{T,k})'}, \quad (34)$$

$$\left(\kappa + \phi_{n'}^{T,n}\right) (1 + r^*) = (F_\ell^T)' \epsilon - w - (\phi_n^{T,n})' + (1 - \bar{\delta}_n)\kappa, \quad (35)$$

which are similar to the optimality condition for nontradable firms.

Mutual Fund The mutual fund owns all tradable and nontradable firms, the loans to homeowners, and they have an international asset position that is what ensures the clearing of intertemporal savings. The steady-state rate of return of all these assets is the same, r^* We assume a markup in the interest charged to the loan, ς per unit of borrowing, to cover costs.

The total amount of net financial assets in the economy is

$$L^+ = \int_{b>0} b(\epsilon, e, a) dx(\epsilon, e, a), \quad (36)$$

while the total amount of mortgages or loans in the economy is

$$L^- = - \int_{b<0} b(\epsilon, e, a) dx(\epsilon, e, a). \quad (37)$$

The net asset foreign position or holdings in international bond is

$$B = L^+ - (\Omega^N(K_N, N_N) - \pi^N(K_N, N_N)) - (\Omega^T(K_T, N_T) - \pi^T(K_T, N_T)) - \frac{1}{1+r^*}L^-. \quad (38)$$

All this give an expression for the the realized rate of return:

$$1+r = \frac{\Omega^N(K_N, K_N) + \Omega^T(K_T, K_T) + (1+r^*)B + L^-}{L^+}. \quad (39)$$

Wage Determination We assume an exogenous wage w in steady state. Clearly, this is ridiculous, but harmless. Essentially, given that there is no leisure in the utility function, the wage just determines the unemployment rate given the decreasing returns to scale nature of the technology. With labor market frictions, there is a wide range of wages which can be accepted by firms and households, as discussed in [Hall \(2005\)](#). The traditional way to determine the wage rate in a search model is to assume a Nash bargaining protocol between a representative worker and firm, as in [Pissarides \(1987\)](#) and [Shimer \(2005\)](#). In our model, the existence of two production sectors and heterogeneous workers significantly complicates the bargaining process.¹² Moreover, an bargaining process requires the establishing of exogenous bargaining weights which is not that different from an exogenous wage. What is more interesting is how wages respond outside steady state and we discuss that issue below.

Steady-State Equilibrium For a given world interest rate r^* and exogenous wage w , a steady-state equilibrium is a set of decision rules and values for the households $(c_N, c_T, I_N, d, b, h, a', V)$ as functions of individual state variables (ϵ, e, a) ; a set of decision rules and values for the nontradable firms $(k'_N, n_N^\epsilon, i_N, v_N, \ell_1, \ell_2, p_i, \Omega^N)$ as functions of individual state variables (n_N^ϵ, k_N) ; a set of decision rules and values for the tradable firms $(k'_T, n_T^\epsilon, i_T, v_T, \Omega^T)$ as functions of individual state variables (n_T^ϵ, k_T) ; aggregate employment in both sectors N_N, N_T ; aggregate capital in both sectors K_N, K_T , the price of houses p_h , the goods market tightness Q_g and the measure of newly created jobs Φ^w , and the measure over households' type x , such that

1. Given aggregates, households and firms solve their problems.
2. Aggregate variables are consistent with individual choices.
3. The housing market clears

$$\int h(\epsilon, e, a) dx(\epsilon, e, a) = 1. \quad (40)$$

4. The measure of newly created jobs is consistent with firms' decision

$$V = V_N + V_T. \quad (41)$$

5. The goods market tightness is consistent with households' decision

$$Q_g = \frac{1}{D} = \frac{1}{\int d(\epsilon, e, a) dx(\epsilon, e, a)}. \quad (42)$$

6. The return to financial assets as defined in equation (39) equals r^* .
7. The measure x is stationary and is updated by households' choices and the process of the skill and employment shocks.

¹²In [Huo and Ríos-Rull \(2013\)](#), the wage bargaining is to maximize the surplus of a weighted average of the workers and firms in two production sectors. In [Krusell, Mukoyama, and Şahin \(2010\)](#) and [Nakajima \(2012\)](#), a representative firm bargains with different workers separately and households internalize the effect of additional saving on their bargaining position.

2.2 Out of Steady-State: Transition

To study out of steady state behavior, there are two possibilities: to pose a truly stochastic process for shocks or to pose an “unexpected shock” that happens (often referred to as an MIT shock) and then look for convergence to a new steady state. The former requires some form of approximating agents a la [Krusell and Smith Jr. \(1997, 1998\)](#) which in our economy is quite demanding as there are various market clearing prices. Because we are interested in the effects of a financial crisis, something that most people did not foresee, we think that the unexpected shock is an appropriate strategy to follow. To proceed, we need to specify the wage determination process, the only exogenous object posed in the steady state, as well as to extend the specification of the model to a non-stationary environment.

The Financial Shocks We explore the effects of a sudden worsening of the financial terms under which households have access to credit. We model this as an unforeseen but gradual change to the collateral constraint and to the borrowing cost (we also look at their separate effects). This is, starting from the steady state, the collateral constraint and the borrowing cost change unexpectedly. Households learn that there will be a new set of collateral constraint $\{\lambda_t\}$ and borrowing cost $\{\varsigma_t\}$ for $t \leq T$ and then stay at a constant value for $t > T$.

These changes affect the return to financial assets. For borrowers,

$$q_t(b) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } b \geq 0 \\ \frac{1}{1+r^*+\varsigma_t}, & \text{if } b < 0 \end{cases}. \quad (43)$$

Wage Determination We follow [Gornemann, Kuester, and Nakajima \(2012\)](#) and assume that the wage rate is determined by the following expression

$$\log w - \log \bar{w} = \varphi^w (\log Y - \log \bar{Y}), \quad (44)$$

where \bar{w} and \bar{Y} are the wage rate and output in steady state. In this formula, φ^w measures the elasticity of wage rate with respect to output. We adopt this strategy because it provides an easy mechanism to replicate the behavior of wages in the data as we will see below. Our approach avoids the issues discussed by [Shimer \(2005\)](#) and [Hagedorn and Manovskii \(2008\)](#).¹³ It is also very easy to explore the implications of more or less flexible wages.

Prices During the Transition The sudden change in the financial terms faced by households have immediate implications to the value of firms producing capital loses and reducing the instantaneous return of the mutual fund. After that period, firms have access to funds at the world interest rate so the mutual fund's rate of return equals r^* after the initial period. Note that mortgages do not change value, but installed capital does (due to the adjustment costs) as do the capitalized value of locations, the monopoly rents of varieties, and the fixed factor of the tradable producers.

To see more clearly how r_t involves, we write the rate of return of savings as

$$1 + r_t = \frac{\Omega_t^N(K_{N,t}, K_{N,t}) + \Omega_t^T(K_{T,t}, K_{T,t}) + (1 + r^*)B_{t-1} + L_{t-1}^-}{L_{t-1}^+} \quad (45)$$

After the financial shock, firms' equity value shrinks, and the return to saving r_0 is less than their expected steady state return r^* and the savers the capital loss. Mortgage holders suffer because their assets, houses, see their value

¹³A more modern approach is that of [Christiano, Eichenbaum, and Trabandt \(2013\)](#) that by estimates the details of the bargaining protocols by targeting the response of wages and should give a similar response to our approach, even if it is more theoretically sound.

reduced, but not the value of the liabilities due to the lack of bankruptcies or foreclosures. After the initial period, the rate of return of the mutual fund reverts to r^* .

Along the transition various prices have to be determined: the housing market has to clear, yielding $p_{h,t}$, the price of nontradables has to be set by the monopolistic competitive firms, and also the wage has to be determined as it is a function of output which is itself an endogenous variable (see equation (44)).

The household problem is during the transition

$$V_t(\epsilon, e, a) = \max_{\substack{c_N, c_T, I_N, d \\ h, b, a'}} u(c_A, h, d) + \beta \sum_{\epsilon', e'} \Pi_{e'|e, \epsilon, t}^w \Pi_{\epsilon, \epsilon'}^\epsilon V_{t+1}(\epsilon', e', a'), \quad (46)$$

subject to

$$p_t I_N c_N + c_T + p_{h,t} h + q_t(b)b = a + 1_{e=1} w_t \epsilon + 1_{e=0} \bar{w} \quad (47)$$

$$I_N = d \Psi^d(Q_{g,t}), \quad (48)$$

$$a' = p_{h,t+1} h + R_{t+1}(b)b, \quad (49)$$

$$q_t(b)b \geq -\lambda_t p_{h,t} h. \quad (50)$$

With $V_t \rightarrow V^1$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, where V^1 is the value function in the steady state of the exogenous variables after the shocks. In the same fashion all prices and aggregates also converge to the steady state values of the economy with the financial variables λ and ζ are set to their final values. The two types of firms face similar problems during the transition.

Computation of the Transition It requires the computation of the initial and of the final steady states. Then we assume that the transition lasts for T periods (350 in our case). So we pose that for given wages and prices for houses, and for nontradables during the 350 periods of the transition we solve the transition problem for households and firms and compute what would have been the market equilibrium prices and wages. A fixed point of this is the transition.

Properties of the Allocation along the Transition Note that the tightening of the collateral constraint, induces in many households either a reduction in consumption or in housing or both. In fact, all households reduce their consumption of tradables due to a precautionary motive. The reduction of nontradables demand reduce their prices which in turn reduces the wealth of all households further reducing their consumption. Another property to note is that in the final stage of the transition households will be wealthier due to the precautionary motive, therefore consumption will be higher.

3 Mapping the Model to Data

We start by discussing some details of national accounting, describing how the variables in the model correspond to those measured in the National Income and Product Accounts (NIPA) (Section 3.1). We then discuss the functional forms used and the parameters involved (Section 3.2), and we set the targets that the model economy has to satisfy (Section 3.3). We then discuss how to set the parameters that do not affect the steady state but have dynamic implications (Section 3.4) and we finish with the description of what we mean by the financial shock (Section 3.5).

3.1 NIPA and measured Total Factor Productivity

Output measured in terms of the numeraire in base year prices is given by¹⁴

$$Y_t = p^* Y_{N,t} + Y_{T,t}, \quad (51)$$

where the nontradable goods output $Y_{N,t}$ is given by

$$Y_{N,t} = \Psi^f(Q_{g,t}) \int c_{N,t}(\epsilon, e, a) dx_t(\epsilon, e, a), \quad (52)$$

and the tradable goods output $Y_{T,t}$ is given by

$$Y_{T,t} = F^T(K_{T,t}, N_{T,t}). \quad (53)$$

The GDP deflator in our economy is

$$\bar{P}_t = \frac{Y_{N,t}}{Y_t} p_t + \frac{Y_{T,t}}{Y_t}. \quad (54)$$

To construct aggregate measures of factors we use total employment $N_t = N_{N,t} + N_{T,t}$, total capital as $K_t = K_{N,t} + K_{T,t}$, and total labor input as the product of employment and the average efficiency units of employed workers $L_t = \sum_{\epsilon} x_{\epsilon,1,t} \epsilon$. We construct two different measures of factor productivity. One uses efficient labor, and the other total employment, yielding

$$Z_t^1 = \frac{Y_t}{K_t^{1-v} L_t^v}, \quad (55)$$

$$Z_t^2 = \frac{Y_t}{K_t^{1-v} N_t^v}, \quad (56)$$

where v is the steady-state labor share.

When the quality of the labor force is constant these two measures of TFP display the same patterns. However, in our model, the quality of labor force is counter-cyclical, making these two measures different.

3.2 Functional Forms and Parameters

Preferences (11) We adopt GHH-type (Greenwood, Hercowitz, and Huffman (1988)) preferences between consumption and shopping effort. These preferences guarantee that the quantity consumed per variety and the number of varieties move together as a function of income, which in turn makes measured TFP procyclical. The period utility function is separable between consumption and housing services, and is given by

$$u(c_A, d, h) = \frac{1}{1 - \sigma_c} \left(c_A - \xi_d \frac{d^{1+\gamma}}{1 + \gamma} \right)^{1 - \sigma_c} + v(h) \quad (57)$$

Tradables and nontradables are combined into c_A , via an Armington aggregator:

$$c_A = \left(\omega \left[\int_0^{I_N} c_{N,i}^{\frac{1}{\rho}} di \right]^{\frac{\rho(\eta-1)}{\eta}} + (1 - \omega) c_T^{\frac{\eta-1}{\eta}} \right)^{\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}}, \quad (58)$$

¹⁴Notice that adjustment costs are internal to the firm and hence are not part of GDP. In any case, they are too small to make any measurable difference.

The preference parameters include the discount factor β , the risk aversion parameter for consumption, σ_c , the parameter that determines average shopping effort ξ_d , the elasticity of substitution between tradable and nontradable goods, η , the parameter that determines the elasticity of substitution among nontradables, ρ , and the home bias parameter ω .

The utility function for housing services $v(h)$ is more involved. As discussed earlier, to match the cross-sectional housing value distribution, the marginal utility of housing has to decrease more quickly for rich households. In other words, Engel curves between housing and non-housing for high income levels should be nonlinear. This feature prevents rich households from buying and enjoying a lot of housing after the finance shock. With linear Engel curves, the price of housing would barely move.¹⁵ We pose a non-binding satiation point in housing, and three different regions with increasing curvature. Specifically, we have

$$v(h) = \begin{cases} \xi_h \log h, & \text{if } h < \hat{h}_1 \\ \frac{\xi_h}{1-\sigma_h} (h + \xi_h^1)^{1-\sigma_h} + \xi_h^2, & \text{if } \hat{h}_1 \leq h \leq \hat{h}_2 \\ \xi_h^3 \sqrt{\hat{h}^2 - (\hat{h} - h)^2} + \xi_h^4, & \text{if } h > \hat{h}_2. \end{cases} \quad (59)$$

While this function looks like it has many parameters, $\{\xi_h^1, \xi_h^2, \xi_h^3, \xi_h^4\}$ are chosen to ensure that the function is continuously differentiable. Still there are five parameters left: $\xi_h, \hat{h}_1, \hat{h}_2, \sigma_h$, and \bar{h} . The latter is set to be large enough to get no agents in its neighbourhood. The other four are set in the calibration stage.

Process for Skills and Employment (19) We pose a four state Markov chain for skills and skill-specific job losing rates.

Production Technology (7) The production functions of tradables and nontradable are both Cobb-Douglas: $F^N(k, \ell_1, \ell_2) = z_N k^{\alpha_0} \ell_1^{\alpha_1} \ell_2^{\alpha_2}$ and $F^T(k, n) = z_T k^{\theta_0} n^{\theta_1}$.

Adjustment Costs (3) Capital adjustment costs affect equally both sectors and are given by $\phi^k(k^j, ij) = \frac{\psi^k}{2} \left(\frac{j}{k^j} - \delta_k \right)^2 k^j$, for $j \in \{T, N\}$, where δ_k , the capital depreciation rate, ψ^k the size of the adjustment cost have to be set. In addition to the capital adjustment cost, the tradable sector also has labor adjustment costs which are given by a very similar expression as those of capital¹⁶ $\phi^{T,n}(n', n) = \frac{\psi^n}{2} \left(\frac{n'}{n} - 1 \right)^2 n$.

Matching in the Goods Market (2) The matching technology in the nontradable goods market is

$$M(D, T) = \nu D^\mu T^{1-\mu}, \quad (60)$$

where μ determines the elasticity of the matching probability with respect to market tightness and ν is the matching efficiency.

3.3 Targets and Values

The model period is half a quarter, shorter than the standard quarter because the minimum unemployment length is one period and we want to match the U.S. average duration.

We separate the parameters into three groups: the first group includes the parameters that we set exogenously

¹⁵A possible solution to this problem is to have segmented markets a la [Ortalo-Magne and Rady \(2006\)](#) or [Ríos-Rull and Sánchez-Marcos \(2008a\)](#) which would have increased dramatically the computational burden of the project.

¹⁶The differences are minute and have to do with the fact that investment itself includes the transaction costs which in the worse case implies about a difference of 0.2%. We write them differently to avoid the cumbersome notation of the expression for the attrition rate of employment that varies slightly with the skill composition of employment.

Table 1: Exogenously Determined Parameters

Parameter	Value
Risk aversion for consumption, σ_c	2.0
Satiation level for housing, \bar{h}	5.0
Curvature of shopping disutility, γ	1.5
Elasticity of substitution bw tradables and nontradables, η	0.80
Price markup, ρ	1.1
Loan to value ratio, λ	0.80
Interest rate for international bonds, r^*	4%

(see Table 1). In the second group (shown in Tables 8 and 9), the parameters are jointly determined by solving a large system of equations that equate model statistics in the steady state with targets based on U.S. data.¹⁷ The third group of parameters have no bearing for the steady state and are determined to match certain targets in the transition experiments. All parameters are described in annual terms unless specified otherwise.

Exogenous parameters We set the risk aversion for consumption to 2.¹⁸ We set the satiation point of housing holding to be $\bar{h} = 5$ (in the calibrated economy, the 99th percentile has 4.8 units of housing and the household 99.9, 4.9.). We choose a curvature of the searching disutility, $\frac{1}{\gamma} = 0.67$, in order to have a value consistent with the Frisch elasticity of labor.¹⁹ To determine the elasticity of substitution between market goods and numeraire goods, we follow the trade literature on the elasticity of substitution between nontradable goods and tradable goods. We choose the benchmark value used in Bianchi (2011), 0.80, which is also similar to the estimate in Heathcote and Perri (2002). The price markup ρ reflects the substitutability among the nontradable goods as well as the price markup set by the monopolistic firms. In the literature, there is no solid evidence on how large this parameter should be. Basu and Fernald (1997), using micro reasoning, claim that the implied markup is not significantly greater than 1, while Christiano, Eichenbaum, and Evans (2005) estimate the price markup using macro data and obtain a value ranging from 1.01 to 1.85. We have set $\rho = 1.1$. We choose the maximum loan-to-value ratio λ to be 0.80, which implies a 20% down payment ratio. Clearly, larger loans to value ratio were the norm in the years before the financial crisis. Our choice is guided by the requirement that the crisis leaves nobody with an empty budget set while still have a sensible reduction of the price of housing. This is because in our economy there is no default, so housing price drops are limited by the minimum equity and the meager earnings of the unemployed houses. Below we will discuss bankruptcy. The risk free rate of return is 4%.

There are other parameters that are also set exogenously but depend on the calibrated parameters, and we discuss them below. They amount essentially to symmetry requirements to reduce the set of targets.

Calibrated Parameters The second set of parameters are jointly determined by matching steady-state moments with corresponding targets. We split these targets into those related to aggregate macroeconomic moments, those related to cross-sectional moments, and those associated to the determination of units. We associate one parameter to each target, and since the parameters are jointly determined this association is just heuristic but we find it useful

¹⁷This second group is the set of calibrated parameters or exactly identified GMM estimated parameters.

¹⁸It is the risk aversion of the consumption aggregate net of search effort.

¹⁹This is another irrelevant parameter. What matters here is the disutility level parameter ξ_d and the compounded effect of the search disutility curvature γ and the matching technology elasticity μ . In fact with random search the effect of these two cannot be separated. Parameters ξ_d and μ are set at the calibration stage.

for understanding the workings of the model. Table 8 shows targets and parameters. Some of those parameters have economic meaning, others are just the determinants of units. Accordingly, the table separates these two blocks.


In terms of households' balance sheet, we target the wealth to output ratio to 4.0, the housing value to output ratio to 1.7 and the debt to output ratio to 0.4. These targets match the U.S. data between 2004 and 2007 (calculated from the Flow of Funds, see Appendix A for a detailed description of the data). Turning to the production side, we target tradable output to be 30% of total output, the capital to output ratio to be 2 and the labor share in both sectors to be 0.64. We assume a constant-return-to-scale production function in the nontradable goods sector, but a decreasing-return-to-scale production function in the tradable goods sector to prevent the tradable sector from expanding too quickly in the transition. We target a 6% unemployment rate. The literature has few direct estimates of the vacancy cost. Silva and Toledo (2009) report the flow vacancy costs to be 4.3% of the quarterly wage and the training costs to be 55% of the quarterly wage. Hagedorn and Manovskii (2008) and Shimer (2012) have a smaller vacancy cost estimate. We target a vacancy cost to output ratio of 0.02, which lies in between these estimates. Regarding unemployed workers, we target the ratio of the value of home production to the lowest earnings to 0.5. For the nontradable goods sector, we target a capacity utilization of 81%, which is the average of the official data series Corrado and Matthey (1997). To set the cut-off values and the curvature for the housing utility function, we choose \hat{h}_1 , \hat{h}_2 and σ_h to match the U.S. housing Lorenz curve. To determine units, we normalize total output, the nontradable goods price and goods market tightness to 1.

Table 2: Endogenously Determined Parameters: Aggregate

Target	Data	Model	Parameter	Value
Aggregate Targets				
Share of tradables	0.30	0.30	ω	0.98
Occupancy Rate	0.81	0.30	ν	0.81
Capital to output ratio	2.00	2.00	δ_k	0.01
Labor Share in nontradables	0.64	0.64	α_0	0.27
Symmetry of Labor Coeff. in Nontradables	$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$		α_1	0.36
Labor Share in tradables	0.64	0.64	θ_1	0.66
Vacancy cost to output ratio	0.02	0.02	κ	0.42
Home production to lowest earning ratio	0.50	0.50	\bar{w}	0.07
Wealth to output ratio	4.00	4.02	β	0.97
Housing value to output ratio	1.70	1.70	ξ_h	0.54
Unemployment Rate	6.00	6.00	w	0.68
Cross-Sectional Targets				
Fraction of housing held by bottom 70%	0.25	0.25	\hat{h}_1	1.48
Fraction of housing held by bottom 80%	0.39	0.39	\hat{h}_2	4.22
Fraction of housing held by bottom 90%	0.58	0.58	σ_h	2.92
Units Targets				
Output	1.00	1.00	z_N	0.93
Relative price of nontradables	1.00	1.00	z_T	0.48
Market tightness in goods markets	1.00	1.00	ξ_d	0.03

We calibrate the endowment process to capture the earnings and wealth distribution in U.S. We use four discrete endowment levels, i.e., $\epsilon \in \{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3, \epsilon_4\}$. We interpret the first three endowments as earnings for the majority of households, and the fourth endowment level is intended to capture the super rich households in the economy as in [Castañeda, Díaz-Giménez, and Ríos-Rull \(2003\)](#) or [Díaz, Pijoan-Mas, and Ríos-Rull \(2003\)](#). The transition probability and the levels of the first three states are calibrated to approximate an AR(1) process using the method by [Tauchen \(1986\)](#). Following [Nakajima \(2012\)](#) and [Domeij and Heathcote \(2004\)](#), we set the persistence of the endowment process to 0.91, and the standard deviation of the innovation term to 0.20. We assume the first three types of households have the same probability of becoming type 4 households who are super rich, $\pi_{entry} = \Pi_{i,4}^\epsilon, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and that type 4 households return to one of the first three states with the same probability $\pi_{exit} = \Pi_{4,i}^\epsilon, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. We calibrate the rest of the parameters to match the earning Gini index, 0.64 and the wealth Gini index, 0.82 (calculated from 2007 SCF data). [Figure 2](#) show the comparison of the networth and housing Lorenz curve between our model and the U.S. economy.

Figure 2: Cross-Sectional Distribution



As shown by [Fang and Nie \(2013\)](#) and [Lifschitz, Setty, and Yedid-Levi \(2015\)](#), different education groups have job finding rates similar to each other, but the job separation rate is substantially larger for low educated workers. Accordingly, we choose the separation rate for type 1 workers to target an average job duration of 1.5 year and the separation rate for type 3 and type 4 workers to target an average job duration of 5 years. The job separation rate for type 2 workers is set to match the total unemployment rate, which implies a 2.5 year job duration.

3.4 Dynamic Parameters

The last group of parameters has no steady-state implications, and we set them according to their dynamic implications.

Wage Equation Recall our following wage rule

$$\log \frac{w_t}{P_t} - \log \frac{w}{P} = \varphi^w (\log Y_t - \log Y), \quad (61)$$

Table 3: Parameters Related to the Endowment Process in the Baseline Economy

Parameter	Value	Target	Value	Model
δ_n^1	0.083	Job duration for type 1	1.5 year	1.5 year
δ_n^3	0.025	Job duration for type 3	5 year	5 year
δ_n^4	0.025	Job duration for type 4	5 year	5 year
ϵ_4	37.41	Debt to output ratio	0.40	0.40
ϵ_1	0.169	Average skill level	1.00	1.00
$\Pi_{1,4}^\epsilon$	0.002	Income Gini index	0.64	0.65
$\Pi_{4,1}^\epsilon$	0.011	Wealth Gini index	0.82	0.84
$\Pi_{1,1}^\epsilon$	0.964	Persistence, ρ_s	0.91	0.91
$\Pi_{2,2}^\epsilon$	0.976	St.d of innovation, σ_s	0.20	0.20

Table 4: Parameters Related to the Endowment Process in the Baseline Economy

Parameter	Value	Target	Parameter	Value	Target
$\Pi_{3,3}^\epsilon$	0.964	$\sum_{i=1}^3 \Pi_{3,i} = 1 - \Pi_{1,4}$	$\Pi_{2,4}^\epsilon$	0.002	$\Pi_{2,4} = \Pi_{1,4}$
$\Pi_{3,2}^\epsilon$	0.033	Tauchen (1986) method	$\Pi_{3,4}^\epsilon$	0.002	$\Pi_{3,4} = \Pi_{1,4}$
$\Pi_{1,2}^\epsilon$	0.033	$\Pi_{1,2} = \Pi_{3,2}$	$\Pi_{4,2}^\epsilon$	0.011	$\Pi_{4,2} = \Pi_{4,1}$
$\Pi_{1,3}^\epsilon$	0.000	$\sum_{i=1}^3 \Pi_{1,i} = 1 - \Pi_{1,4}$	$\Pi_{4,3}^\epsilon$	0.011	$\Pi_{4,3} = \Pi_{4,1}$
$\Pi_{2,1}^\epsilon$	0.011	$\Pi_{2,1} = \Pi_{2,3}$	$\Pi_{4,4}^\epsilon$	0.967	$\sum_{i=1}^4 \Pi_{4,i} = 1$
$\Pi_{2,3}^\epsilon$	0.011	$\sum_{i=1}^3 \Pi_{2,i} = 1 - \Pi_{1,4}$	ϵ_2	0.423	$\log y_{s,2} = 0.5(\log y_{s,3} + \log y_{s,1})$
$\Pi_{3,1}^\epsilon$	0.000	$\Pi_{3,1} = \Pi_{1,3}$	ϵ_3	1.059	$\log y_{s,3} - \log y_{s,1} = 2\sigma_y$

Figure 3 displays the paths for (detrended) output, wages and the forecasted wages based on different values of φ^w . The best fit between the actual and the forecasted wage series occurs at an approximated value of $\varphi^w = 0.55$.²⁰

Adjustment Costs In our model, ψ^k and ψ^n determine how fast the economy can reallocate resources across sectors and over time. In the baseline model, we set $\psi^k = \psi^n$ and we choose a value of 1.57 to match the 30% drop of investment during the Great Recession. By doing this we impose the drop of investment. Recall that the important objective of this paper is to explore what can generate a drop in consumption.


Decreasing Return to Scale in Tradables The share of income from the tradable sector that does not go to labor can be due to either capital or the fixed factor. We have chosen the size of the fixed factor (the degree of decreasing returns) to limit the expansion of nontradables after the financial shock to 4%, capturing a notion of limited comparative advantage (see Alessandria, Pratap, and Yue (2013)). This implies a value of $\theta_0 = .21$.²¹

Still, our model economy dramatically exaggerates the increase in exports. Note that 30% of output is tradable, and even if it is difficult to expand this sector fast, all the tradable consumption and all the investment can automatically be exported without any cost. As a result, exports expand tremendously in the recession. The adjustment costs only partially limit the additional expansion of exports.

²⁰This value is similar to that used in Gornemann, Kuester, and Nakajima (2012) and Hagedorn and Manovskii (2008).

²¹In the case of this variable the steady state changes when this variable changes. We proceeded by guess and verify, fixing this variable, recalibrating all the other parameters to attain the desired steady state, and verifying that nontradables expand the desired amount.

Figure 3: Comparison Between Real Wage and Approximated Wage



Note: Real output and real wage are linearly detrended from 1990:I to 2015:II.

Table 5: Dynamically Calibrated Parameters

Parameter	Value	Target
Adjustment cost, ψ	1.57	Investment declines by 30%
Decreasing return to scale in tradables, θ_0	0.21	Tradables to output ratio increases by 4%
Wage elasticity, φ^w	0.55	Ratio of wage change to output change, 0.45
Matching elasticity in goods market, μ	0.80	TFP declines by 1.5%

Matching Elasticity in the Nontradable Goods Market The magnitude of the change of TFP in our model is mainly determined by the search frictions in the goods market. If $\mu = 0$, then firms will meet their customers at a constant rate and TFP would be constant over the cycle. For $\mu > 0$, TFP responds to variations in search effort of households. We choose μ to generate the observed reduction of TFP in the U.S. during the Great Recession. With aggregate data this parameter and the shopping elasticity in preferences cannot be identified separately with aggregate data, but their joint effect can be measured from the response of TFP.

3.5 The financial shocks


The last thing to set is the magnitude of the financial shock. One possible strategy would be to choose the financial shock so that the model generates the observed drop in housing prices which is about 25%. We do not choose this because in our model economy a drop of price so large would require that some households lose so much as to have an empty budget set which would mean bankruptcy, a feature that we abstract from (in Section 6.1 we extend the model to incorporate a form of default and then we do target the price drop). Instead, we explore the effects of a financial shock that generates a price drop that is consistent with the model in the sense that no agent has an empty set. Such a price drop is about 18% or 72% of that in the data. The shock takes the form of both an increase in the down payment from 20% to 40% (reduction of the loan to value ratio from 80% to 60%) and an increase in the interest rate markup of 50 basis points annually (from zero to 50).

4 Steady-State Analysis: Long Term Implications of Financial Shocks

We start analyzing households' choices of housing and financial assets. Figure 4 displays the policy functions for employed workers with skill type 1 to 3 in the baseline economy, ignoring the very rich, who are essentially to the right of the Figure. There are three wealth ranges for each skill-type of household. The poorest households are those

for whom the housing function has very steep upwards segments and the financial assets function has downward segments. These households' collateral constraint is binding and do not satisfy the static Euler equation between housing and consumption: they would like to enjoy more housing but cannot due to the binding constraint. The next wealth type goes from the minimum financial wealth to zero financial wealth. They have debt, so they are leveraged (more than 100% of their wealth is in housing), but they have the amount of housing that they want and the collateral constraint is not binding for them. Finally, the last wealth group has positive financial assets. Those are the ones that own all firms, all mortgages and have some foreign asset position.

Figure 4: Policy Function for Housing and Financial Asset in the Baseline Economy



In Bewley-Imrohoroglu-Huggett-Aiyagari type incomplete market economies, an increase in frictions typically translates into more steady-state wealth. The reason is that households want a higher wealth to income ratio to bear the increased difficulties posed by more frictions. In our economy, the higher loan to value ratio unambiguously increases total steady state wealth. The effect of the markup shock is less clear because it increases the user cost of housing for borrowers, and hence it may reduce the rationale for holding wealth. Overall, though, as Table 6 shows there is a small increase in total wealth despite having a decline in housing wealth (due to lower housing prices) in the new steady state. Given the constant world interest rate, and the small appreciation of the stock market, this is achieved via an improvement in the net foreign asset position. The increase in wealth, the reduction in the housing prices and the tighter loan to value ratio all contribute to reduce the indebtedness of households that falls some 30% to a bit above a quarter of GDP.

The higher wealth of households translates into higher GDP via an increase in consumption (note that most of consumption consists of nontradables that cannot be imported). Investment and employment also go up to maintain the higher output of nontradables. There is an increase in productivity generated by the higher search effort of households who now consume more varieties. The total effect is 0.24% higher productivity.

The reduction in the loan to value ratio (λ shock) has twice the effects on output and employment, but smaller effects on the price of houses, than the increase loans mark-up (ζ shock). The reason for the relative sizes on output and employment is the relative size of the shocks. The larger effect on the housing price is the direct increase in the user cost of houses for borrowers of the markup shock.

5 Exploring the Effects of the Financial Shock

While the long term effects of the financial shock are to increase wealth, output, and consumption, the transition involves a recession. Asset prices respond immediately to the new credit conditions, this is, upon impact house

Table 6: Percentage Differences Between the Steady State Before and After the Shocks

	Both Shocks	λ shock	ς shock
<i>Differences in Assets and Debts relative to GDP</i>			
Net Wealth	5.88	4.38	1.50
Housing Wealth	-16.50	-9.37	-10.25
Stock Market	2.75	2.00	1.12
Net Foreign Asset Position	19.50	11.60	10.90
Debt	-13.14	-8.51	-6.94
<i>NIPA related</i>			
Output	0.90	0.68	0.33
Employment	0.60	0.46	0.22
Consumption	1.88	1.40	0.73
Investment	0.77	0.56	0.31
Nontradable output	1.89	1.41	0.73
Tradable output	-1.43	-1.00	-0.62
<i>TFP related and house prices</i>			
TFP	0.24	0.19	0.08
Labor productivity	0.30	0.23	0.11
Labor quality	-0.19	-0.15	-0.07
Search effort	1.00	0.79	0.34
Housing prices	-9.71	-5.48	-6.07

prices go down producing an instantaneous reduction of wealth due only to lower prices (neither houses, capital, nor the ability to collect rents are destroyed). The asset price amplification of the financial shock is similar to those discussed and [Kiyotaki and Moore \(1997\)](#). There is no reduction in the production possibilities of the economy, nor a switch of equilibria.

In response to the tighter financial conditions households reduce dramatically their housing demand and increase their savings, both processes feeding into each other as lower housing demand reduce their prices which in turn increases savings which lowers output. Households reduce consumption, which consists mostly of nontradables. This sector then suffers a reduction of productivity and profits that reduces employment. Households want to allocate resources to the production of tradables to increase net exports and accumulate the necessary wealth, but the adjustment costs and decreasing returns to scale makes this process difficult. The reduction in consumption of nontradables occurs immediately, while the increase in the production of tradables takes time. All this creates the recession.

We now look in detail at the direct effects of the financial shock by looking at the transition of the aggregates in our main experiment (Section [5.1](#)). To better understand the role that each of the parts of the model economy that we have posed we start by looking separately at the two items in the financial shock (Section [5.2](#)); at the contribution to the recession of the drop in housing prices (Section [5.3](#)); at the role of the real frictions that prevent the economy from reallocating fast factors of production from the nontradable sector to the tradable sector (Section [5.4](#)); at the role of endogenous productivity (Section [5.5](#)), and at the role of wage rigidity (Section [5.6](#)).

5.1 The Main Experiment

The main experiment poses a two-prong financial shock. The loan-to-value ratio goes up in 3 equal steps over 3 months (this helps to prevent households from having an empty budget set) and the interest rate of loans experiences a 50 basis points increase. The increase in the loan-to-value ratio makes many households, those whose collateral constraint was initially binding or close to be binding, incapable of maintaining the same size house as before, inducing them to sell. Further, the increased interest rate makes houses less attractive for many borrowers who will also reduce their housing holdings. All this pushes house price downwards further amplifying the effects of the financial shock. For all the households who were initially away from the collateral binding region, there is also an incentive to increase savings because the tightened borrowing capability and higher unemployment risk during the transition push up the optimal saving-to-income ratio. The contribution of the increased markup on the interest in loans is to make housing less attractive for borrowers by increasing its user cost, contributing also to the decline in house prices and the increase in savings.

The sudden loss of wealth and its associated desire to increase savings depresses consumption of both tradables and nontradables. Tradables can be easily exported in this economy, but lower consumption of nontradables reduces their producers' profits both via a decrease in the probability of selling and via a decrease in their price. In response, nontradable producing firms cut their investment and hiring, leading to higher unemployment and lower output. Lower unemployment decreases the job finding rate, further tightening households' budget constraint and strengthening their saving motive, which further increases the downward pressure on firms' profits. Firms in the tradable goods sector benefit from the recession: neither their price nor their productivity is affected, but their labor costs decrease due to the reduction of wages during the recession. Consequently, they expand, but because of their adjustment costs, they do so slowly, and because of the decreasing returns to scale their expansion is limited. The inability of the tradable sector to expand fast is a necessary condition for the recession.

How this all fits together is shown in the first column of Table 7 and in Figure 6. The Table shows the values of the largest drop in most variables due to the main experiment: GDP falls 3.5%, consumption 6.4%, and investment 29%. The fall in GDP is much smaller than that of consumption and investment due to a massive increase in net exports. All the reduction in investment and tradable consumption becomes exports. Output is reallocated from the nontradable to the tradable sector, but the drop in nontradables is much larger than the increase in tradables due to the adjustment costs. Unemployment increases to almost 9%.

House prices fall by 18%, close to the maximum that occurs without bankrupting some households (we change this requirement in Section 6.1 to explore the effects of a slightly larger financial shock). Firms' values fall little so the overall fall in wealth is 8%, but because of the portfolio composition across households, poor people lose the most.

Variations in households' search effort lead to variations in measured total factor productivity. When households lower their consumption of nontradables they lower both the quantity consumed of each variety and the number of varieties they choose by reducing the amount of search effort.²² In the model TFP declines by 1.5% even if only the nontradable sector is subject to search frictions.

Our model shares with the data that high-skilled workers face a lower job separation rate. In the recession, the pool of employed contains a higher fraction of skilled workers, and the labor quality increases accordingly as in the data. The left panel of Figure 5 shows the evolution of the unemployment rate for the various skill groups. The lower the skills the larger the increase in the unemployment rate. This pattern is what happened in the U.S. economy as the right panel of the Figure shows. The unemployment rate for high school dropouts increased to a level as

²²Appendix B has a discussion of the behavior of shopping effort and shopping time over the Great Recession.

Table 7: Changes in Aggregate Variables during the Transition

	Main Exp.	Separate Shocks		Const-Hous	Other Experiments		
	Both Items	Down Paym	r markup	Prices	High φ^w flex wage	Low ψ no adj-cost	Low μ const-TFP
<i>NIPA related</i>							
Output	-3.47	-2.22	-1.60	-0.32	-2.80	-2.44	-1.51
Employment	8.83	7.99	7.50	6.27	7.97	7.57	8.50
Consumption	-6.37	-3.91	-2.93	-0.44	-5.60	-6.47	-4.71
Investment	-28.96	-16.55	-13.98	-1.82	-23.80	116.95	-24.76
Nontradable output	-6.37	-3.75	-2.78	-0.54	-5.23	-6.65	-3.25
Tradable output	3.89	2.24	1.95	0.31	5.06	8.63	4.38
<i>Asset and debt</i>							
Wealth	-7.74	-4.66	-4.08	—	-7.62	-7.68	-7.48
Housing price	-33.33	-21.76	-10.31	—	-33.15	-32.92	-32.55
Debt	-17.81	-10.88	-9.35	—	-17.70	-17.63	-17.37
<i>TFP related</i>							
TFP	-1.45	-0.95	-0.65	-0.15	-1.54	-2.07	-0.07
Labor productivity	-1.45	-0.95	-0.65	-0.15	-1.51	-1.64	-0.09
Labor quality	1.01	0.74	0.55	0.10	0.73	0.58	0.93
Search effort	-5.03	-3.14	-2.17	-0.49	-4.68	-4.90	-4.19


high as 16%, while the unemployment rate for those with a college degree or higher only moves between 2% and 5%. As documented in [Fang and Nie \(2013\)](#) and [Lifschitz, Setty, and Yedid-Levi \(2015\)](#), over the business cycle workers with different educational attainment share similar job finding rates, but more educated workers have a much lower job separation rate. Our steady-state calibration captures this pattern, which results in heterogeneous unemployment rate dynamics during the transition.

In the period when the financial shock occurs, output falls only due to the drop in productivity that results from households lower effort since capital and labor are predetermined. After this first period, the reductions in hiring and investing kick in. The tradable sector reallocates lower consumption and investment to exports and starts expanding slowly.

Figure 6 displays the transition paths of the most important aggregate variables in our main experiment. After the financial shock, output falls by 3.5% and then gradually recovers. The recovery of consumption and unemployment is also quite slow. Much slower than that of investment. The former is slowed by the requirements of households savings to recover, an endogenously generated process. The recovery of investment is due to the adjustment costs and to the need to track the demand for nontradables. The recovery of TFP follows that of consumption.

Housing prices never recover completely, poor households do not find it worthwhile to hold enough assets to consume a lot of housing and the financial shock limits their access to credit. Furthermore, the shock to the interest rate markup increases the user cost of housing for borrowers. Wealth is also slow to recover as it requires the accumulation of savings after the price loses of the shock.

Figure 5: Cross-Sectional Change of Unemployment Rate



The fall in consumption is not immediate. It takes three periods to achieve its largest size. The reason for this is that the considerable installed capacity of nontradables, that only slowly gets reduced induces a large reduction in the price of nontradables that makes nontradables more attractive relative to tradables for a while. There is no really a data counterpart of the large fall in the relative price of nontradables (or internal devaluation). However, such counter-factual implication on price dynamics can be eliminated by adding financial frictions in the firm side and posing consumers as capital as in [Gilchrist, Sim, Schoenle, and Zakrajsek \(2014\)](#), or by allowing firm entry and exit as explored in our companion paper. We abstract from expanding the model in these directions to improve the match with the data. Our model is quite complicated as it is now.

5.2 Decomposition: Only Collateral Constraint or Borrowing Surcharge Changes

What feature of the financial shock matters more? The higher loan to value ratio or the increased markup to loans? To answer we pose these two parts of the financial shock separately. Figure 7 poses the outcomes of the main experiment with both parts of the financial shock and each one of them separately. Two properties stand up. First the effect of the collateral constraint is larger (60 to 40), but it also recovers faster as households accumulate more wealth. In fact, with the interest rate markup has larger long run effects.

5.3 The Reduction in Housing Prices

How important is the amplification mechanism of the reduction in housing prices? It is absolutely critical. To assess its importance we consider the effects of the financial shocks without affecting housing prices. This can be seen as either a disequilibrium exercise to isolate the role of housing price in generating the recession, or the effects of the financial constraint in an economy where housing services are yielded by a storable good that can be transformed into the tradable good at rate r in one direction and at rate $r + \varsigma$ in the other. Consequently its price is fixed and its quantity can move around. Specifically, we fix the price of houses to equal to its value in the initial steady state and we keep it there throughout the transition, letting the quantity adjust.

Figure 8 compares the responses to the shock under the main experiment and under constant housing prices. The recession essentially disappears with constant housing prices: output falls by less than 0.5% upon impact and starts to grow slowly after that converging to more than one percent of higher output in the long run. Households immediately adjust to the more stringent borrowing conditions by unleashing houses and they increase their savings

Figure 6: Aggregate Economy Response in the Baseline Model





Figure 7: Aggregate Economy Response: Collateral Constraint Shock and Borrowing Surcharge Shock



to adapt to the new circumstances.

The difference between the two economies is the size of the wealth effect. Under constant prices there is almost zero wealth effect: what nontradable firms lose is compensated by the gains of tradable firms, both minute in any case. Households affected directly by the tighter borrowing simply reduce their housing holdings, and save more in financial assets. This comparison highlights the central role of the housing bust in generating a recession. It has the dual effects that reinforce each other: the worsening households' balance sheet condition and the further tightening of households' collateral constraint.


This exercise is also helpful to see why in economies with ad hoc borrowing constraints à la Aiyagari, its tightening only has limited effects on economy activity (see [Guerrieri and Lorenzoni \(2011\)](#), [Huo and Rios-Rull \(2015\)](#), and [Phillips and Herkenhoff \(2015\)](#) for example). Changes of the ad hoc borrowing constraint only affect the very poor households (10% to 15%) directly, those with negative net worth, and these households have a very small contribution to the overall economic activity. Richer households are affected and increase their savings because of precautionary reasons but they do so very slowly. With houses, not only there is a direct negative wealth effect, but it affects a lot the large number of households with some mortgage debt (70%).

5.4 Role of Adjustment Costs and Decreasing Return to Scale

In our model economy, the recession requires difficulties to reallocate production from nontradables to tradables. This occurs via both adjustment costs and decreasing returns to scale. To see the role of each channel we explore an economy with the same decreasing returns to scale as the baseline, but with no adjustment costs. Its properties are featured in [Figure 9](#).

We see that output falls by 2.5% and unemployment goes up to 7.5%, not as much as the main experiment, but still a sizeable recession. Investment, however, more than doubles as resources are immediately reallocated to the

Figure 8: Aggregate Economy Response: Constant Housing Prices




tradable sector. The expansion of output in the tradable sector is much larger and faster than in the baseline. The combination of decreasing returns to scale and the recovery of wages makes the tradable sector go back down after the initial expansion. Clearly, decreasing returns to scale also play an important role, as otherwise, there would be no increase in unemployment because workers would have been reallocated almost immediately to the tradable sector.

As [Alessandria, Pratap, and Yue \(2013\)](#) document, expansions of the exporting sector tend to be slow, which indicates that severe adjustment costs in the tradable sector are required to impede a huge expansion of this sector when the recession occurs. If anything, our calibration assumptions underestimate the role of these adjustment costs by allowing a fast expansion of exports and of net exports.

5.5 Role of Endogenous Productivity

One of the ingredients in our economy, and a theoretical contribution in its own, is that a negative wealth effect diminishes productivity endogenously. Unlike in [Bai, Rios-Rull, and Storesletten \(2011\)](#), [Petrosky-Nadeau and Wasmer \(2015\)](#), or [Huo and Rios-Rull \(2015\)](#), in our economy households reduce their consumption by partly

Figure 9: Aggregate Economy Response: no Adjustment Costs in the Tradable Sector



reducing consumption per variety and partly by reducing the number of varieties which implies a reduction of their search effort.²³ We implement the no endogenous productivity feature by reducing dramatically parameter μ from a value of 0.8 to a value of 0.05. Recall that μ is the exponent of search effort in the matching function. When it gets close to zero, there are still search frictions but measured TFP will be effectively independent of household search effort.

Figure 10 shows what happens. The drop of output is much smaller because all the decline of output is due to the drop of employment and not of productivity (actually there is a tiny increased in measured TFP due to the increase of labor quality that is associated to higher unemployment). Unemployment goes up by 15% less and its recovery is faster. As a result, consumption falls by 4.5% rather than by the 6.5% that we obtained in the main experiment.


5.6 Role of Wage Rigidity

The degree of wage rigidity in the economy is determined by the wage elasticity parameter φ^w in Equation (61). Households are always willing to work, so the lower the salary the higher is output. To see the extent to which this matters, we pose an economy where the elasticity of wages is unitary.²⁴ As we can see in Figure 11, labor share in the main experiment, stays below the long run level for a long time (except for the very beginning), while labor share with a unitary elasticity drops instantaneously but recovers much faster. The lackluster behavior of labor share as documented by Karabarbounis and Neiman (2014) seems to be more consistent with the baseline than

²³Again, a competitive search version of this economy will pose a partition of locations by both prices and market tightness, with rich agents paying more but searching less. This would be consistent with the cross-sectional evidence posted by Aguiar, Hurst, and Karabarbounis (2011) and Kaplan and Menzio (2013b) of the higher search effort for specific goods of certain low income groups (the unemployed, the retired).

²⁴To see what this implies consider that the wage equation that we are using is in logs $\widehat{w} = \varphi^w \widehat{y}$, and that in the short-run, output is determined by labor, yielding $\widehat{y} = z + \alpha \widehat{n}$, where α is the contribution of labor in the production function, and z is the Solow residual. It follows that the labor share is given by $\widehat{\tau} = (\widehat{w} + \widehat{n}) - \widehat{y} = \widehat{n} - (1 - \varphi^w)\widehat{y} = \widehat{n} - (1 - \varphi^w)(z + \alpha\widehat{n}) = [1 - (1 - \varphi^w)\alpha]\widehat{n} - (1 - \varphi^w)z$. Whether the labor share increases or decreases in the recession depends on the relative change in n and z . In our model, employment initially does not change due to the search frictions. All the movement in output is due to the change in Solow residual. As a result, labor share increases initially in the recession. As time goes on, employment becomes the dominating force, and the labor share decreases.

Figure 10: Aggregate Economy Response: Role of Goods Market Matching Elasticity



with the unitary elasticity of substitution. The unemployment rate increases to 8% with unitary elasticity, which is lower than the main experiment. Most importantly, the level of unemployment rate returns to its steady-state value within a year, a fairly fast recovery. In contrast, in the baseline model with more rigid wages, the unemployment rate declines slowly, and the prolonged high unemployment era resembles the slow recovery in the U.S. economy.

6 Various Extensions


We now explore various mechanisms that some changes in the model and not just in the parameter values.

6.1 Allowing Default

During the Great Recession, the foreclosure rate rose sharply (see Calomiris, Longhofer, and Miles (2008), Mian, Sufi, and Trebbi (2011), and Chatterjee and Eyigungor (2015) who document that the cumulative foreclosure rate was between 16% and 20% between 2007 and 2009). Yet, the main experiments in our economy have none. We constrained the size of the financial shocks and the baseline value of the collateral constraint to ensure that no household would be left with an empty budget set.²⁵ We did so because we did not want to consider unexpected losses for lenders without any upside in terms of interest rates that covered possible foreclosures. In this Section we abandon this concern and consider the possibility that housing prices drop beyond the value that keeps all households with positive wealth. In doing this we impute the unpaid mortgages (the amount of negative wealth held by mortgage holders after the drop in housing prices) as a reduction in the value of the mutual funds that hold the assets of those with positive financial assets. The experiment that we consider has the same collateral constraint as our main experiment, but doubles the markup on the interest of loans to 1%. The results are in Figure 12. Housing prices fall by more than 20%, generating bankruptcies. The larger wealth loss moves consumption down

²⁵Given the low value of income when unemployed this means essentially zero wealth.

Figure 11: Aggregate Economy Response: Role of Wage Rigidity



further and with it, employment (unemployment jumps to almost 10%) and output that falls 4.6%.

Clearly allowing for foreclosures, even in the relatively clumsy way that we do, further amplifies the size of the recession.

6.2 Some Households have Zero Housing

The home-ownership rate in U.S. is about two thirds, while in our baseline model, all households have a positive amount of housing (a joint implication of Inada conditions on preferences and of the perfect divisibility of housing). This assumption may exaggerate the effects of the financial shock because households with zero housing are not directly affected by the tightening of the collateral constraint and the drop of housing prices directly (in fact, they may benefit from the latter), even though they still have an incentive to increase their saving for precautionary reasons. In this Section, we modify the housing utility function to allow for the possibility of zero housing holding, and to explore its quantitative implications.


To pose households with zero housing we make a small change in the utility function, adding one new parameter, \underline{h} . Accordingly, we have

$$v(h) = \begin{cases} \xi_h \log(h + \underline{h}), & \text{if } h < \hat{h}_1, \\ \frac{\xi_h}{1-\sigma_h} (h + \xi_h^1)^{1-\sigma_h} + \xi_h^2, & \text{if } \hat{h}_1 \leq h \leq \hat{h}_2, \\ \xi_h^3 \sqrt{h^2 - (\bar{h} - h)^2} + \xi_h^4, & \text{if } h > \hat{h}_2. \end{cases} \quad (62)$$

When $\underline{h} > 0$ households with relatively low wealth choose positive consumption but zero housing. We recalibrate the economy to match the same steady-state targets as the baseline model (see Appendix for details), and we choose \underline{h} such that 32% of households have zero housing.

Figure 13 displays the policy functions for employed workers with skill type 1 to 3 in the zero assets economy. In

Figure 12: Aggregate Economy Response: Allowing Default



addition to the three groups of the Baseline Economy that we saw in Figure 4, there is another, poorer, group that does not own any housing (this wealth-type only exists for skill types 1 and 2), and therefore will not suffer any capital loss as a result of the financial shock.


In this recalibrated economy, the same size shock that we used to hit the baseline economy with in our main experiment generates a lower response of housing prices and, consequently, of output. We think, however, that the right comparison is to choose a size of the shock (the shock to the markup ς) and a size of the elasticity of the matching function that replicates both the reduction in housing wealth and in measured TFP that we obtained in the main experiment and compare its effects on output, unemployment and consumption. The results are displayed in Figure 14.

Clearly, once we resize the shocks to replicate the same housing price and TFP falls, the effects on consumption are essentially the same as in the main experiment (actually they are about 8% smaller). The effects are also longer because of the slower response of type 1 households. As we will see below when we discuss the cross-sectional implications of the Great Recession, the larger shock required to get the same house price drop in the economy with zero housing households makes households in skill-group 1 desire to save more which depresses their consumption much longer (see Figures 16 and 19 in the Appendix).

7 Cross-Sectional Implications of the Great Recession

The model has very strong implications about whose consumption dropped the most: those with the largest wealth loses. We explore this issue within the extended model where many households are not homeowners because in this model the predictions are sharper and can be more readily compared with the data. One type of evidence is produced by Mian and Sufi (2010, 2011, 2014) who show that larger housing price drops lead to more severe recessions and larger consumption drops across U.S. metropolitan areas. Also, the response of consumption to

Figure 13: Policy Function for Housing and Financial Asset in the Zero Housing Economy



housing price changes is particularly large for highly leveraged and underwater households.²⁶

Petev, Pistaferri, and Eksten (2012) and Parker and Vissing-Jorgensen (2009) provide more direct evidence of which households cut consumption the most based on the Consumer Expenditure Survey. Petev, Pistaferri, and Eksten (2012) find that the annual consumption growth rates between 2007 and 2009 by the income quantiles are: -3%, -2%, -3%, -4%, -5%, with the middle and rich households dropping the most. Conditional on initial net worth, the consumption growth rate of the bottom 50% is -2%, it is -7% for the top 10%, and -3% for the rest. Parker and Vissing-Jorgensen (2009) find that high-consumption households are significantly more exposed to aggregate fluctuations than low-consumption households. Between 2008 and 2009, the ratio of consumption of the top 20 to the bottom 80 falls by 9%. They explain this fact by showing that high-income households' income is more exposed to aggregate fluctuations.


We can explore which are the households bore the brunt of the fall in consumption in our model. Figure 15 shows the reduction in wealth and consumption for different households sorted in deciles by wealth. The wealth of the poorest households barely changes because most of them have zero housing. The richest households also have a relatively small change of wealth because the housing are a small fraction of their total wealth. The households in the middle suffer the most, since the majority of their wealth is housing equity. The change of consumption mimics the change of wealth.²⁷ Figure 16 shows the the average wealth and consumption paths after the financial shock for each of the four skill groups. Households of skill type 2 and 3, are the ones with the largest loss of wealth (they are very leveraged) and, consequently, they cut their consumption the most. This is the case despite the fact that it is the low skilled workers (group 1) the group that suffered the most in terms of unemployment. All these cross-sectional facts are consistent with the evidence posted by Parker and Vissing-Jorgensen (2009) and Petev, Pistaferri, and Eksten (2012).

²⁶Kaplan, Mitman, and Violante (2015a) explore in a model related to this how more inelastic house construction areas lead to more severe recessions.

²⁷Actually, there is a brief spike in consumption for the poorest and richest households due to a large initial drop in the price of nontradables. During the transition, consumption in tradable goods drops by 9%, and consumption in nontradable goods drops by 5%. While this negative spike in the price of nontradables did not occur in the U.S., it can be averted by a slight modification in the timing of the price posting of nontradable firms: to post the price before the realization of the financial shock. This will result in a further drop in output at the time of the financial shock.

Figure 14: Aggregate Response: Economy with 32% of Households Holding Zero Houses.

The Shock to ζ to and the Goods Market Elasticity μ are Adjusted to Match the Fall in Housing Price and in TFP



8 Credit Cycles: Expansion and Recession

We want to finish the paper with an exploration of the possible role of credit expansion in the boom years previous to the Great Recession. To this extent we pose two financial (MIT) shocks. One that expands the ability to borrow, and one that contracts it. We pose as initial condition the low loan to value ratio and the high markup (the situation after the shock in the main experiment), we then expand credit by surprise (to the initial condition of the baseline economy and with households believing that these conditions will hold forever), and after 3 years, we surprise households again, with the credit terms returning to the original terms. We refer to this as the boom and bust cycle.

Figure 17 displays the implied path of the loan to value ratio and various aggregate variables in the boom and bust cycle. We see that in the boom stage, output and employment both increase. Due to the lower down payment ratio, households now can borrow more than before and bid for houses inducing a large price increase. As a result, total debt grows. The positive wealth effect is what increases consumption, expanding the nontradable sector. When the financial bonanza is over, households cut their debt and expenditure resulting in a similar process to that in our

Figure 15: Change of Wealth and Consumption by Initial Wealth Condition





Figure 16: Change of Asset and Consumption for Different Skill Types: Zero Housing Economy



main experiment.


Crucially, the boom and the bust are not symmetric. With credit expansion, the boom is relatively mild, while the recession followed by the credit tightening is much severe. The reason is that when the loan-to-value ratio increases, it relaxes households' collateral constraint and allows households to attempt to increase their housing, which moves the price up. The boon in wealth induces an increase in consumption, but households want to spread this higher consumption over a long time, thus inducing a small jump in consumption. In contrast, a tightening of the loan-to-value ratio moves many households into consuming less housing than they would like and they respond by a sharper increase in saving. The intuition is similar to that explained in [Guerrieri and Iacoviello \(2013\)](#).

9 Conclusion

We have presented a theory of the Great Recession based on the negative wealth effects induced by an adverse shock to the ability of households to acquire loans amplified via a large reduction of house prices. We have done so in the context of a quantitatively sound model that replicates the main features of the U.S. economy both in terms of the main aggregates, and of the distribution of income and wealth.

We have shown what are the ingredients necessary for a large recession to occur, which are the concentration of income and wealth, the leverage of households, the real frictions that make it difficult to transform an economy

Figure 17: Aggregate Economy Response: Boom and Bust Cycle



fast from being consumption oriented to being saving or export oriented and the contribution of consumption expenditures to productivity.

But there are three obvious directions of research to improve our understanding of the Great Recession:

1. Our modeling of the housing market has been quite pedestrian with no adjustment costs of either housing or the amount borrowed, despite a growing amount of evidence that these are large (Kaplan and Violante (2014)). Our modeling choices require households to adjust their housing every period to continually satisfy their collateral constraint. The shock that we pose to the loan to value ratio may be misplaced. It is possible that the increased difficulties to borrow may have been in terms of the payment to income ratio. All these suggests that a richer model of the housing and mortgaging decisions may be important.
2. In our economy, the fall in investment is automatically exported, without any loss of profits or employment, while in the data exports take always time to expand and the invesment producing sectors suffered also during the Great Recession. To deal with this issue we should differentiate more sectors of production, so the fall in investment contributes to the reduction of output. This is particularly the case if we think of construction of both business structures and houses, which are sectors with the features of nontradables rather than tradables.
3. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we have posed a financial shock as a primitive, when clearly should not be the case. A better understanding of the determinants of household credit is required.

References

- AGUIAR, M., AND E. HURST (2005): "Consumption versus Expenditure," *Journal of Political Economy*, 113(5), 919–948.
- (2007): "Life-Cycle Prices and Production," *American Economic Review*, 97(5), 1533–1559.
- AGUIAR, M. A., E. HURST, AND L. KARABARBOUNIS (2011): "Time use during the recessions," Discussion paper, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- (2013): "Time Use During the Great Recession," Forthcoming, *American Economic Review*.
- ALESSANDRIA, G. (2009): "Consumer Search, Price Dispersion, And International Relative Price Fluctuations," *International Economic Review*, 50(3), 803–829.
- ALESSANDRIA, G., S. PRATAP, AND V. YUE (2013): "Export Dynamics in Large Devaluations," mimeo.
- BAI, Y., AND J.-V. RÍOS-RULL (2015): "Demand Shocks and Open Economy Puzzles," *American Economic Review*, 105(5), 644–49.
- BAI, Y., J.-V. RÍOS-RULL, AND K. STORESLETTEN (2011): "Demand Shocks as Productivity Shocks," manuscript, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis.
- BASU, S., AND J. FERNALD (1997): "Returns to Scale in U.S. Production: Estimates and Implications," *Journal of Political Economy*, 105(2), 249–283.
- BIANCHI, J. (2011): "Overborrowing and Systemic Externalities in the Business Cycle," *American Economic Review*, 101(7), 3400–3426.
- BRICKER, J., A. HENRIQUES, J. KRIMMEL, AND J. SABELHAUS (2015): "Measuring Income and Wealth at the Top Using Administrative and Survey Data," Unpublished manuscript, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
- CALOMIRIS, C. W., S. D. LONGHOFER, AND W. MILES (2008): "The Foreclosure-House Price Nexus: Lessons from the 2007-2008 Housing Turmoil," NBER Working Papers 14294, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- CASTAÑEDA, A., J. DÍAZ-GIMÉNEZ, AND J.-V. RÍOS-RULL (2003): "Accounting for the U.S. Earnings and Wealth Inequality," *Journal of Political Economy*, 111(4), 818–857.
- CHATTERJEE, S., AND B. EYIGUNGOR (2015): "A Quantitative Analysis of the US Housing and Mortgage Markets and the Foreclosure Crisis," *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 18(2), 165–184.
- CHEN, H., M. MICHAUX, AND N. ROUSSANOV (2013): "Houses as ATMs? Mortgage Refinancing and Macroeconomic Uncertainty," Discussion Paper 19421, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc, NBER Working Papers.
- CHRISTIANO, L. J., M. EICHENBAUM, AND C. L. EVANS (2005): "Nominal Rigidities and the Dynamic Effects of a Shock to Monetary Policy," *Journal of Political Economy*, 113(1), 1–45.
- CHRISTIANO, L. J., M. S. EICHENBAUM, AND M. TRABANDT (2013): "Unemployment and Business Cycles," Mimeo, Northwestern University.

- CLOYNE, J., C. FERREIRA, AND P. SURICO (2015): "Monetary Policy when Households have Debt: New Evidence on the Transmission Mechanism," Mimeo, LBS.
- CORRADO, C., AND J. MATTEY (1997): "Capacity Utilization," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11(1), 151–167.
- DÍAZ, A., J. PIJOAN-MAS, AND J.-V. RÍOS-RULL (2003): "Precautionary Savings and Wealth Distribution under Habit Formation Preferences," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 50(6), 1257–1291.
- DOMELJ, D., AND J. HEATHCOTE (2004): "On the Distributional Effects of Reducing Capital Taxes," *International Economic Review*, 45(2), 523–554.
- EGGERTSSON, G. B., AND P. KRUGMAN (2012): "Debt, Deleveraging, and the Liquidity Trap: A Fisher-Minsky-Koo Approach," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(3), 1469–1513.
- FANG, L., AND J. NIE (2013): "Human Capital Dynamics and the U.S. Labor Market," Working Paper, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City.
- FAVILUKIS, J., S. LUDVIGSON, AND S. V. NIEUWERBURGH (2012): "The Macroeconomic Effects of Housing Wealth, Housing Finance, and Limited Risk-Sharing in General Equilibrium," Mimeo.
- FERNALD, J. (2012): "Productivity and Potential Output Before, During, and After the Great Recession," Mimeo.
- GARRIGA, C., R. MANUELLI, AND A. PERALTA-ALVA (2012): "Bubbles or Fundamentals? Understanding Boom and Bust Episodes in the Housing Market," Mimeo.
- GERTLER, M., AND A. TRIGARI (2009): "Unemployment Fluctuations with Staggered Nash Wage Bargaining," *Journal of Political Economy*, 117(1), 38–86.
- GILCHRIST, S., J. SIM, R. SCHOENLE, AND E. ZAKRAJSEK (2014): "Inflation Dynamics During the Financial Crisis," Mimeo.
- GOREA, D., AND V. MIDRIGAN (2015): "Liquidity Constraints in the U.S. Housing Market," Working Paper.
- GORNEMANN, N., K. KUESTER, AND M. NAKAJIMA (2012): "Monetary policy with heterogeneous agents," Mimeo.
- GREENWALD, D. L. (2015): "The Mortgage Credit Channel of Macroeconomic Transmission," Working Paper.
- GREENWOOD, J., Z. HERCOWITZ, AND G. HUFFMAN (1988): "Investment, Capacity Utilization, and the Real Business Cycle," *American Economic Review*, 78(3), 402–418.
- GUERRIERI, L., AND M. IACOVIELLO (2013): "Collateral Constraints and Macroeconomic Asymmetries," Mimeo.
- GUERRIERI, V., AND G. LORENZONI (2011): "Credit Crises, Precautionary Savings, and the Liquidity Trap," NBER Working Paper 17583.
- HAGEDORN, M., AND I. MANOVSKII (2008): "The Cyclical Behavior of Equilibrium Unemployment and Vacancies Revisited," *American Economic Review*, 98(4), 1692–1706.
- HALL, R. (2005): "Employment Fluctuations with Equilibrium Wage Stickiness," *American Economic Review*, 95(1), 50–65.
- HEATHCOTE, J., AND F. PERRI (2002): "Financial Autarky and International Business Cycles," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 49(3), 601–627.

- HUGGETT, M. (1993): "The Risk-Free Rate in Heterogeneous-Agent, Incomplete-Insurance Economies," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 17(5), 953–969.
- HUO, Z., AND J.-V. RÍOS-RULL (2013): "Paradox of Thrift Recessions," Research Department Staff Report 490, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis.
- HUO, Z., AND J.-V. RÍOS-RULL (2015): "Tightening Financial Frictions on Households, Recessions, and Price Reallocations," *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 18(1), 118–139.
- JUSTINIANO, A., G. PRIMICERI, AND A. TAMBALOTTI (2015): "Household leveraging and deleveraging," *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 18(1), 3–20.
- KAPLAN, G., AND G. MENZIO (2013a): "Shopping Externalities and Self-Fulfilling Unemployment Fluctuations," Working Paper 18777, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- KAPLAN, G., AND G. MENZIO (2013b): "Shopping Externalities and Self-Fulfilling Unemployment Fluctuations," NBER Working Paper 18777.
- KAPLAN, G., K. MITMAN, AND G. VIOLANTE (2015a): "Consumption and House Prices in the Great Recession: Model meets Evidence," Unpublished Manuscript, NYU.
- KAPLAN, G., K. MITMAN, AND G. L. VIOLANTE (2015b): "Consumption and House Prices in the Great Recession: Model Meets Evidence," Working Paper.
- KAPLAN, G., AND G. VIOLANTE (2014): "A Model of the Consumption Response to Fiscal Stimulus Payments," *Econometrica*, 82, 1199–1239.
- KARABARBOUNIS, L., AND B. NEIMAN (2014): "The Global Decline of the Labor Share," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129(1), 61–103.
- KIYOTAKI, N., A. MICHAELIDES, AND K. NIKOLOV (2011): "Winners and Losers in Housing Markets," *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 43, 255–296.
- KIYOTAKI, N., AND J. MOORE (1997): "Credit Cycles," *Journal of Political Economy*, 105(2), 211–48.
- KRUSELL, P., T. MUKOYAMA, AND A. ŞAHİN (2010): "Labour-Market Matching with Precautionary Savings and Aggregate Fluctuations," *Review of Economic Studies*, 77(4), 1477–1507.
- KRUSELL, P., AND A. A. SMITH JR. (1997): "Income and Wealth Heterogeneity, Portfolio Choice, and Equilibrium Asset Returns," *Macroeconomic Dynamics*, 1, 387–422.
- (1998): "Income and Wealth Heterogeneity in the Macroeconomy," *Journal of Political Economy*, 106(5), 867–896.
- LIFSCHITZ, A., O. SETTY, AND Y. YEDID-LEVI (2015): "Who Cares about Unemployment Insurance?," Unpublished Manuscript, University of British Columbia.
- MIAN, A., K. RAO, AND A. SUFI (2013): "Household Balance Sheets, Consumption, and the Economic Slump," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128(4), 1687–1726.
- MIAN, A., AND A. SUFI (2010): "The Great Recession: Lessons from Microeconomic Data," *American Economic Review*, 100(2), 51–56.
- (2011): "House Prices, Home Equity-Based Borrowing, and the U.S. Household Leverage Crisis," *American Economic Review*, 101(5), 2131–56.

- MIAN, A., AND A. SUFI (2014): "What Explains the 2007 2009 Drop in Employment?," *Econometrica*, 82(5), 2197–2223.
- MIAN, A., A. SUFI, AND F. TREBBI (2011): "Foreclosures, House Prices, and the Real Economy," NBER Working Papers 16685, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- MICHAILLAT, P., AND E. SAEZ (2013): "A Model of Aggregate Demand and Unemployment," Working Paper 18826, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- MIDRIGAN, V., AND T. PHILIPPON (2011): "Household Leverage and the Recession," Working Paper FIN-11-038, New York University.
- NAKAJIMA, M. (2012): "Business Cycles In The Equilibrium Model Of Labor Market Search And Self-Insurance," *International Economic Review*, 53(2), 399–432.
- ORTALO-MAGNE, F., AND S. RADY (2006): "Housing Market Dynamics: On the Contribution of Income Shocks and Credit Constraints," *restud*, 73, 459–485.
- PARKER, J. A., AND A. VISSING-JORGENSEN (2009): "Who Bears Aggregate Fluctuations and How?," *American Economic Review*, 99(2), 399–405.
- PETEV, I., L. PISTAFERRI, AND I. S. EKSTEN (2012): "Consumption and the Great Recession: An analysis of trends, perceptions, and distributional effects," *Analyses of the Great Recession*.
- PETROSKY-NADEAU, N., AND E. WASMER (2011): "Macroeconomic Dynamics in a Model of Goods, Labor and Credit Market Frictions," GSIA Working Paper 2011-E6, Carnegie Mellon University.
- (2015): "Macroeconomic Dynamics in a Model of Goods, Labor and Credit Market Frictions," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 72, 97–113.
- PETROSKY-NADEAU, N., E. WASMER, AND S. ZENG (2014): "Shopping time," Working Paper Series 2014-24, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.
- PHILLIPS, G., AND K. HERKENHOFF (2015): "The Impact of Consumer Credit Constraints on Earnings, Sorting, and Job Finding Rates of Displaced Workers," Mimeo.
- PISSARIDES, C. A. (1987): "Search, Wage Bargains and Cycles," *Review of Economic Studies*, 54(3), 473–83.
- RÍOS-RULL, J.-V., AND V. SÁNCHEZ-MARCOS (2008a): "An Aggregate Economy with Different Size Houses," *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 6(2-3), 705–714.
- (2008b): "House Price Movements," Mimeo, Universidad de Cantabria.
- SABELHAUS, J., D. JOHNSON, S. ASH, D. SWANSON, T. GARNER, J. GREENLEES, AND S. HENDERSON (2013): "Is the Consumer Expenditure Survey Representative by Income?," Working Paper 19589, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- SHIMER, R. (2005): "The Cyclical Behavior of Equilibrium Unemployment and Vacancies," *American Economic Review*, 95(1), 25–49.
- SHIMER, R. (2012): "Wage Rigidities and Jobless Recoveries," Forthcoming in *Journal of Monetary Economics*.
- SILVA, J. I., AND M. TOLEDO (2009): "The Unemployment Volatility Puzzle: The Role of Matching Costs Revisited," Mimeo.
- TAUCHEN, G. (1986): "Finite State Markov-Chain Approximations to Univariate and Vector Autoregressions," *Economics Letters*, 20(2), 177–181.

Appendix

A Details on the Construction of the Data

A.1 Data Source

1. Output: Real Gross Domestic Product. Source: US. Bureau of Economic Analysis.
2. Investment: Gross Private Domestic Investment. Source: US. Bureau of Economic Analysis.
3. Consumption: Personal Consumption Expenditures. Source: US. Bureau of Economic Analysis.
4. Networth: Net Worth, Households and Nonprofit Organizations. Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Balance Sheet of Households and Nonprofit Organizations.
5. Mortgage Debt: Home mortgages, Households and Nonprofit Organizations. Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Balance Sheet of Households and Nonprofit Organizations.
6. Housing value: Real estate (households), Households and Nonprofit Organizations. Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Balance Sheet of Households and Nonprofit Organizations.
7. Unemployment: Civilian Unemployment Rate. Source: US. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
8. Labor share: Labor Share, Nonfarm Business Sector. Source: US. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
9. Per capita output: Real Output Per Person, Nonfarm Business Sector. Source: US. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
10. Unemployment by education: Unemployment Rates by Educational Attainment. Source: US. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
11. TFP measured by total hours: TFP. Source: <http://www.frbsf.org/economic-research/indicators-data/total-factor-productivity-tfp>
12. Labor quality: Labor composition. Source: <http://www.frbsf.org/economic-research/indicators-data/total-factor-productivity-tfp>

A.2 Data Construction

Real Wage: The real wage is constructed in the following way:

$$\text{Real wage} = \frac{\text{Per capita output}}{\text{Labor share}} \quad (63)$$

TFP measured by total labor inputs TFP measured by total labor inputs is constructed in the following way:


$$\begin{aligned} \log(\text{TFP measured by total labor inputs}) = \\ \log(\text{TFP measured by total hours}) - (1 - \text{Labor share})\log(\text{Labor quality}) \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

B A Discussion of Shopping Effort and Shopping Time

We interpret search effort as the disutility associated with acquiring consumption, such as waiting for a restaurant table or booking hotels online, waiting for a hair cut, commuting to the dentist, settling for a less preferred color in a new car, and so on. Consequently, the search effort is different from just the shopping time spent on finding a cheaper price, such as searching for coupons or sales in a grocery store, which is the notion used by [Aguiar and Hurst \(2005\)](#) and [Aguiar and Hurst \(2007\)](#). Whether consumers actually show up in restaurants or theatres affects the occupation rate of the economy, and in recessions, firms operate with a lower capacity. As shown in [Aguiar and Hurst \(2005\)](#), retired and unemployed people do eat at restaurants less frequently than working people. Even though shopping time is a much narrower notion than our


interpretation of search effort, we find that total shopping time and the time spent shopping for goods other than necessities tend to be pro-cyclical, as shown in Figure 18. However, we do not want to insist on the cyclicity of shopping time, because the Survey data is still relatively short and there is a trend of the time spent on shopping. For example, [Aguiar, Hurst, and Karabarbounis \(2013\)](#) find that shopping time increased during the Great Recession based on cross-sectional evidence, while [Petrosky-Nadeau, Wasmer, and Zeng \(2014\)](#) find the shopping time is pro-cyclical.

Figure 18: Shopping Time



C Additional Graphs of Interest

Figure 19: Change of Asset and Consumption for Different Skill Types: Baseline Economy



D Additional Tables

Parameters of the Model in Section 6.2 In this exercise, we choose the same shock to the down-payment ratio λ , and choose the shock to ς such that the model generates the same drop of housing price as in the baseline model. The required increase of in the interest rate markup is 80 basis points annually. The following tables present the recalibrated parameters in this model.

Table 8: Endogenously Determined Parameters in the Zero Housing Economy: Aggregate

Target	Data	Model	Parameter	Value
Aggregate Targets				
Share of tradables	0.30	0.30	ω	0.97
Occupancy Rate	0.81	0.30	ν	0.81
Capital to output ratio	2.00	2.00	δ_k	0.01
Labor Share in nontradables	0.64	0.64	α_0	0.27
Symmetry of Labor Coeff. in Nontradables	$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$		α_1	0.36
Labor Share in tradables	0.64	0.64	θ_1	0.66
Vacancy cost to output ratio	0.02	0.02	κ	0.42
Home production to lowest earning ratio	0.50	0.50	\bar{w}	0.07
Wealth to output ratio	4.00	4.01	β	0.98
Housing value to output ratio	1.70	1.70	ξ_h	0.54
Unemployment Rate	6.00	6.00	w	0.68
Cross-Sectional Targets				
Fraction of housing held by bottom 70%	0.25	0.25	\hat{h}_1	1.48
Fraction of housing held by bottom 80%	0.39	0.39	\hat{h}_2	4.14
Fraction of housing held by bottom 90%	0.58	0.58	σ_h	3.79
Fraction of households with no house	0.32	0.32	\underline{h}	0.81
Units Targets				
Output	1.00	1.00	z_N	0.93
Relative price of nontradables	1.00	1.00	z_T	0.51
Market tightness in goods markets	1.00	1.00	ξ_d	0.04

Table 9: Parameters Related to the Endowment Process in the Zero Housing Economy

Parameter	Value	Target	Value	Model
δ_n^1	0.083	Job duration for type 1	1.5 year	1.5 year
δ_n^3	0.025	Job duration for type 3	5 year	5 year
δ_n^4	0.025	Job duration for type 4	5 year	5 year
ϵ_1	0.164	Average skill level	1.00	1.00
ϵ_4	50.14	Debt to output ratio	0.40	0.40
$\Pi_{1,4}^\epsilon$	0.002	Income Gini index	0.64	0.64
$\Pi_{4,1}^\epsilon$	0.015	Wealth Gini index	0.82	0.84
$\Pi_{1,1}^\epsilon$	0.965	Persistence, ρ_s	0.91	0.91
$\Pi_{2,2}^\epsilon$	0.977	St.d of innovation, σ_s	0.20	0.20

Table 10: Dynamically Calibrated Parameters in the Zero Housing Economy

Parameter	Value	Target
Adjustment cost, ψ	1.70	Investment declines by 30%
Decreasing return to scale in tradables, θ_0	0.21	Tradables to output ratio increases by 4%
Wage elasticity, φ^w	0.55	Ratio of wage change to output change, 0.45
Matching elasticity in goods market, μ	0.95	TFP declines by 1.5%