

Owner-Occupied Housing and the Composition of the Household Portfolio

By MARJORIE FLAVIN AND TAKASHI YAMASHITA*

For most homeowners, the house is the single most important consumption good appearing as an argument of the utility function, and, at the same time, the dominant asset in the portfolio. This paper uses a mean-variance efficiency framework to examine the household's optimal portfolio problem when owner-occupied housing is included in the list of available assets. Housing differs from stocks and bonds in a crucial way: since the household's ownership of residential real estate determines the level of its consumption of housing services, the household's demand for real estate is "overdetermined" in the sense that the level of real estate ownership which is optimal from the point of view of the consumption of housing services may differ from the optimal level of housing assets from a portfolio point of view. With rental markets for housing, a household can, in principle, divorce the size of its holdings of real estate assets from the level of housing services it consumes. However, rental housing is by no means a perfect substitute for owner-occupied housing. We assume, instead, that the preferential tax treatment of owner-occupied housing and the transactions costs and agency costs involved in the rental market for housing create frictions large enough to effectively constrain the household to include in its asset portfolio the level of housing consistent with its consumption of housing services.¹ The paper focuses on the impact of the portfolio constraint imposed by the

consumption demand for housing on the household's optimal holdings of financial assets.

Section II of the paper is similar in spirit to a recent paper by Jan K. Brueckner (1997), which analyzes the interaction between the consumption demand and the investment demand for housing in a mean-variance portfolio model. Brueckner considers a general covariance matrix and mean vector of returns and a general utility function, and derives analytical results. In contrast, our implementation of the mean-variance framework is quantitative. That is, we estimate the covariance matrix and vector of expected returns for housing and financial assets and solve for the efficient frontiers and optimal portfolios numerically.

The risk characteristics of housing are estimated using two distinct sources: data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) and data from Karl E. Case and Robert J. Shiller (1989) based on repeat sales transactions prices for four U.S. cities. Both data sources indicate that housing prices have a large idiosyncratic component; the standard deviation of the return to housing, at the level of the individual house, is about 0.14. In addition to housing, the portfolio can include nonnegative amounts of Treasury bills, Treasury bonds, and stocks. The household can borrow only in the form of a mortgage, which is limited to 100 percent of the value of the house. Using the estimated vector of expected returns and covariance matrix of asset returns, we plot the constrained mean-variance efficient frontiers for various values of the household's ratio of house value to wealth, h (the "housing constraint"). The housing constraint has an enormous effect on the risk and return trade-off available to the household. Young households, which typically have large holdings of real estate relative to their net worth, are highly leveraged and therefore forced into a situation of high risk (and return). As a result, these young households have a strong incentive to reduce the risk of their portfolio by using their net worth to either pay down their

* Flavin: Department of Economics, University of California, San Diego, CA 92093, and National Bureau of Economic Research (e-mail: mflavin@ucsd.edu); Yamashita: Department of Economics, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, NV 89154 (e-mail: tyamashi@ccmail.nevada.edu). We thank Elena Bisagni, Jan Brueckner, Wouter den Haan, James Hamilton, Bruce Lehmann, Greg Mankiw, and the referees for comments, and Robert Shiller for providing the house price transactions data.

¹ The implications of the dual role of housing (as both a consumption good and an investment good) for tenure decisions of households were first analyzed by J. Vernon Henderson and Yannis M. Ioannides (1983).

mortgage or buy bonds instead of buying stocks. In contrast, the optimal portfolio share of stocks is larger for the lower ratios of housing to net worth typical of older households.

In addition to the implications for the composition of the portfolio over the life cycle, the inclusion of housing has implications for cross-sectional scatters of portfolio data. In the final section, we use the model to offer a potential resolution to the "asset allocation puzzle" posed by Niko Canner et al. (1997). Using as data points the portfolio shares recommended by financial advisors in the popular press for investors of varying degrees of risk aversion, Canner et al. point out that financial advisors tend to recommend that the ratio of bonds to stocks increase with the level of risk aversion, in apparent contradiction of the mutual fund separation theorem. Compared to a world in which the list of assets is restricted to the standard financial assets (T-bills, bonds, and stocks), the inclusion of housing has the effect of altering the risk and return trade-off in such a way that most households are at a corner with respect to T-bills. That is, the nonnegativity constraint on T-bills is binding for a wide range of values of h and of the degree of risk aversion. Since households are at a corner with respect to the riskless asset, different degrees of risk aversion cannot be accommodated by varying the relative quantities of the riskless asset and the risky portfolio; instead, preferences toward risk are accommodated by varying the ratio of bonds to stocks.²

I. Housing in a Mean-Variance Efficiency Framework

Of the extensive literature on efficient portfolios, only a few papers incorporate real estate as an asset. William N. Goetzmann and Roger Ibbotson (1990) and Goetzmann (1993) used regression estimates of real estate price appreciation, and Stephen A. Ross and Randall C. Zisler (1991) calculated returns from real estate investment trust funds, to characterize the risk

and return to real estate investment. While regionally diversified real estate funds have recently become available, the vast majority of households invest in real estate by purchasing a particular house, rather than by purchasing shares of a diversified real estate fund. Further, the returns to an investment in a real estate fund and the returns to an investment in one's personal residence receive very different tax treatment. In analyzing the efficient frontier facing a large institutional investor such as TIAA-CREF (Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association-College Retirement Equities Fund), Ross and Zisler have appropriately used diversified real estate funds to characterize the risk characteristics of real estate.

Our focus, in contrast, is on the portfolio problem faced by the typical household. We assume that households hold real estate in the form of a specific house (rather than investing in a diversified fund and renting to satisfy their demand for housing services) due to tax distortions and transactions or agency costs associated with renting, but do not explicitly model the renting versus owning decision. We abstract from labor income or human wealth, and assume that wealth is held only in the form of financial assets and housing. The household can invest in any of n risky financial assets, but there is no riskless asset. Further, the household can borrow up to the value of the house in the form of a mortgage; other than the mortgage, all financial assets must be held in nonnegative amounts. As in Sanford J. Grossman and Guy Laroque (1990), we assume that once the household purchases a particular house, no adjustments to the size (or any other attribute such as location) can be made without selling the existing house, incurring an adjustment cost proportional to the value of the house, and buying a new house. Unlike the house, holdings of financial assets (including the mortgage) can be adjusted with zero transactions cost.

The household's total wealth, W_t , is given by:

$$(1) \quad W_t = \mathbf{X}_t \ell + P_t H_t$$

where $\mathbf{X}_t = (1 \times n)$ vector of amounts (expressed in terms of a nondurable consumption good used as the numeraire) held of the n risky assets, $\ell = (n \times 1)$ vector of ones, H_t = the physical quantity held of housing,

² In this paper, we show the importance of owner-occupied housing in explaining the cross-sectional and temporal variations in portfolio composition. For effects of other sources of background risks, such as entrepreneurial risks and labor-income risks, see John Heaton and Deborah Lucas (2000).

measured in square feet, and P_t = the price per square foot of housing relative to the price of the nondurable good. Using the last element of \mathbf{X}_t to represent the mortgage, the corner constraints on the vector of financial assets are given by:

$$(2) \quad -P_t H_t \leq X_{n,t} \leq 0$$

(constraint on mortgage borrowing)

$$(3) \quad 0 \leq X_{i,t} \quad i = 1 \text{ to } n - 1$$

(nonnegativity constraints on other financial assets)

where $X_{i,t}$ is the i th element of \mathbf{X}_t . Note that because the household can borrow only in the form of a mortgage, it must hold a mortgage if the value of the house exceeds net worth.

Denote the real, after-tax return on financial asset i in year t as $R_{i,t}$ and the real, after-tax return on housing as $R_{H,t}$; the asset return is the sum of the expected return (μ_i or μ_H) and a stochastic component:

$$(4) \quad R_{i,t} = \mu_i + \varepsilon_{i,t}$$

$$R_{H,t} = \mu_H + \varepsilon_{H,t}.$$

The covariance matrix of returns is denoted by the $(n + 1)$ by $(n + 1)$ matrix Ω :

$$(5) \quad \Omega \equiv E(\varepsilon_t \varepsilon_t^T)$$

where ε_t is the $((n + 1) \times 1)$ vector $\varepsilon_t \equiv [\varepsilon_{1,t}, \dots, \varepsilon_{n,t}, \varepsilon_{H,t}]^T$. Both the vector of expected returns, $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, ($\boldsymbol{\mu} \equiv [\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n]^T$) and the covariance matrix of returns, Ω , are assumed time invariant.

Dividing equation (1) by W_t , the household's asset holdings can be restated as shares of total wealth rather than as levels:

$$(6) \quad 1 = h_t + \mathbf{x}_t \ell$$

where $h_t \equiv \frac{P_t H_t}{W_t}$ and $\mathbf{x}_t \equiv \frac{\mathbf{X}_t}{W_t}$.

The optimal portfolios calculated in Section II are based on the assumption that the household maximizes a function of the mean and

variance of the return to its asset portfolio, inclusive of housing.³ Stating both the maximization problem and the constraints in terms of shares of wealth, the household's problem is:

(7)

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}_t} \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_t \boldsymbol{\mu} + h_t \mu_H) - \frac{A}{2} [\mathbf{x}_t, h_t] \Omega [\mathbf{x}_t, h_t]^T \right\}$$

subject to:

$$1 = h_t + \mathbf{x}_t \ell$$

(adding up constraint)

$$-h_t \leq x_{n,t} \leq 0$$

(constraint on mortgage borrowing)

$$0 \leq x_{i,t} \quad i = 1 \text{ to } n - 1$$

(nonnegativity constraints on other financial assets).

In essence, we model the household as maximizing over its holdings of financial assets, conditional on the current value of the state variable which represents the ratio of house value to net worth, h_t . While we do not formally model the house purchase decision, we follow Grossman and Laroque (1990) in assuming that at every moment, the household considers whether the disparity between the current-size house and the frictionlessly optimal-size house is sufficiently large to justify paying the transactions cost and reoptimizing over the house, H_t . If it is optimal to sell the house immediately, the household (instantaneously) pays the transactions cost, sells the old house, and buys a new house. Thus the home purchase decision is endogenous and fully rational, but, because of the transactions cost, infrequent. For example, in the model studied by Grossman and Laroque (1990), a conservative estimate of the transactions cost of 5 percent of the value of the house sold implies that the average time between house purchases is 20 to 30 years.

Since the state variable h_t places a constraint

³ The issue of whether, and under what conditions, the mean-variance optimization framework can be obtained as the outcome of the household's lifetime utility maximization problem is not addressed in this paper.

on the optimization problem, we refer to the value of h_t as “the housing constraint.” For a given value of h_t , the mean-variance efficient frontier available to the household can be calculated by finding the value of \mathbf{x}_t which achieves the minimum variance portfolio for a given expected return. Thus the constrained mean-variance efficient frontier available to the household depends of the value of the state variable h_t . In equation (7), the household’s preferences toward risk are reflected in the parameter A ; higher values of A indicate a greater degree of risk aversion. For the preferences expressed in (7), the slope of the household’s indifference curve is:

$$(8) \quad \frac{\partial \bar{\mu}}{\partial \sigma} = A\sigma$$

$$\text{where} \quad \bar{\mu} = \mathbf{x}_t \boldsymbol{\mu} + h_t \mu_H$$

$$\sigma^2 = [\mathbf{x}_t, h_t] \boldsymbol{\Omega} [\mathbf{x}_t, h_t]^T.$$

Because of the corner constraints, the optimization problem is solved by numerical methods; the optimal portfolio will depend both on the state variable h_t and on preferences toward risk, A . To estimate returns on housing, we use data from the 1968–1992 waves of the PSID. Every year, the PSID asks homeowners how much their house would sell for if the house were put on the market on the date of the interview, enabling us to calculate the return to owner-occupied housing at the household level.⁴ The return to housing depends on appreciation of the value of the house, the value of the flow of housing services, and costs of ownership and maintenance. Lacking direct observations on the rental value of the house and maintenance costs, these components are modeled as follows:

$$(9) \quad D_t = (r + d)P_{t-1} + \text{PropertyTax}_t$$

$$(10) \quad \text{COM}_t = dP_{t-1} + (1 - \tau)\text{PropertyTax}_t$$

⁴ As a rough measure of the accuracy of subjective housing value measures, Jonathan Skinner (1994) compares the annual rate of self-reported price changes with the objective Commerce Department measures and finds the two series are quite close in mapping house-price changes over the 1970’s and 1980’s.

where r is the real interest rate, d is the depreciation rate, and τ is the marginal income tax rate. The imputed annual rental value (analogous to the dividend on a stock), denoted D_t , reflects the assumption that property taxes are passed through into rents.⁵ In the absence of expenditures on maintenance and repairs, physical depreciation (at rate d) would be reflected in the real value of the house (P_t). However, we assume that both landlords and homeowners spend on maintenance and repairs an amount equal to the annual depreciation of the house so that the physical condition of the house is constant. In addition to maintenance and repairs, the cost of ownership and maintenance (COM_t) includes the net property tax payment (i.e., net of the deduction against income taxes). The real return on housing, $R_{H,t}$, is:⁶

$$(11) \quad R_{H,t} = \frac{P_t + D_t - \text{COM}_t - P_{t-1}}{P_{t-1}} \\ = \frac{P_t + rP_{t-1} + \tau \text{PropertyTax}_t - P_{t-1}}{P_{t-1}}.$$

⁵ In equation (9), we are modeling the market rent which the homeowner would pay if he explicitly rented the house from a landlord rather than owning it himself. Equation (9) does not contradict the public finance result that states that the incidence of the property tax falls on the landlord in the form of lower property values, and cannot be shifted onto renters. Since the house price data reflects the market value of the house under the existing tax regime, as opposed to the value the house would have in the absence of a property tax, the fact that the landlord “pays” the tax in the form of lower property values is already incorporated in the house price data. Given data on the market value of a particular house, equation (9) is a simple model, based on the zero-profit condition, of how the landlord would set the market rent on that particular house; i.e., the market rent would be sufficient to cover the landlord’s costs (interest or forgone interest, depreciation, and the property tax bill).

⁶ A possible bias arises from the fact that the house price is not the actual transaction price but the owner’s estimate. If there is a systematic bias in the owner’s estimate of the house price, then the return calculation may also be biased. Using the panel aspect of the 1985 and 1987 waves of the American Housing Survey, John L. Goodman, Jr. and John B. Ittner (1993) compare owners’ estimates with subsequent sales prices and find that the mean error of the homeowner’s estimate is 8.3 percent, and that the errors are not correlated with characteristics of the house or demographic characteristics of the owners. Given Goodman and Ittner’s estimate of the homeowners’ bias, it is straightforward to show, using equation (11), that the mean overestimation of 8.3 percent of the real house price would give us a downward bias in the calculated rate of return of around 0.06 percent, assuming a 33-percent marginal tax rate and a 2.5-percent property tax rate.

In computing the real return to housing, the nominal house value and nominal property tax payments as reported by the respondent are converted into real terms using the CPI-U deflator to obtain P_t and $PropertyTax_t$. The short-term interest rate, r , is assumed to be a fixed 5 percent. In general, the marginal income tax rate, τ , will vary both cross-sectionally and across time. For most waves of the PSID, it is possible to impute the household's marginal tax rate; thus, one could construct a series of real returns to housing using a household- and time-specific value of the marginal tax rate. However, it is not necessary to interpret "the household" as a representative household (i.e., one of many identical households) or as an average household, since the analysis is entirely partial equilibrium and no aggregate market-clearing conditions are imposed. Instead, "the household" is interpreted as a specific, hypothetical household which faces a known marginal income tax rate of 33 percent (28 percent federal and 5 percent state).⁷

In order to incorporate tax effects, all asset returns are stated in after-tax, real terms. In the case of the return to housing, the imputed rent portion of the return is not taxed. While capital gains on housing are taxable in some circumstances, we assume that the bulk of realized capital gains escape taxation due to rollover provisions and the fact that inherited real estate receives a stepped-up cost basis when transferred. We therefore assume that neither the rental value nor the capital gains portion of the

return is taxed, and interpret $R_{H,t}$ as the after-tax real return to housing.

In calculating real after-tax mortgage rates, we assume that the household takes out a fixed-rate mortgage in the year in which the house is purchased and does not refinance as long as they remain in the same house. Taking into account the fact that the nominal rather than real mortgage interest payments are deductible, the household pays a real after-tax interest rate of:

$$(12) \text{ Mortgage}_t = \frac{1 + (1 - \tau)\text{Nominal Mortgage}_s}{1 + \text{Inflation}_t} - 1.$$

In equation (12), *Nominal Mortgage_s* denotes the fixed rate at which the mortgage was issued when the home was purchased in year s and *Mortgage_t* denotes the after-tax real interest rate on the mortgage in a subsequent year t . In implementing equation (12), *Nominal Mortgage_s* is measured by the annual average of conventional home mortgage rates charged by major lenders in year s , τ is the hypothetical marginal tax rate of 33 percent, and the inflation rate is measured by the CPI-U. The household is not bound by a fixed amortization schedule, but instead has flexibility in optimizing over the size of the mortgage. For example, the household can reduce its degree of leverage by paying down the mortgage balance. Conversely, the household can increase its total mortgage indebtedness by taking out a second mortgage without having to refinance the original mortgage.

The return on Treasury bills is measured by constructing the holding period return generated by rolling over short-term Treasury bills for a period of one year, assuming that the holding period return is taxed at a marginal rate (federal only) of 28 percent, then converting the after-tax nominal rate into real terms. Similarly, the return to Treasury bonds is measured by deflating the after-tax (28-percent) holding period yield on 20-year Treasury bonds.

Data on the S&P 500 is used to measure stock returns. Using separate data series on dividend income and capital gains, we assume that dividend income is taxed at the rate of 33 percent, while the capital gains portion of the return escapes taxation completely. The after-tax nominal

⁷ An alternative approach would be to estimate the expected return vector and covariance matrix of after-tax returns by taking sample averages of the historical data on after-tax returns. In this approach, the data on after-tax returns would reflect variation over time in marginal tax rates as well as variation in pretax returns. Because it implicitly assumes that the household faces a marginal tax rate which is a random draw from the historical distribution of marginal tax rates, we think that this approach overstates the degree of randomness in the marginal tax rate facing the household at a particular point in time. However, as a robustness check, we calculated an alternative version of Table 1A in which historical variation over time of the federal marginal tax rate is included. That is, for each year, we calculated the marginal federal tax rate of the PSID household that ranked in the 75th percentile for income, and used the year-specific marginal federal tax rate to calculate after-tax real returns. A comparison of these estimates, reported in the Data Appendix, with the corresponding estimates in Table 1A, indicates that the alternative method of incorporating taxes makes very little difference.

TABLE 1A—EXPECTED RETURNS AND COVARIANCE MATRIX—PSID DATA

	T-Bills	Bonds	Stocks	Mortgage	House
Mean return (arithmetic)	−0.0038	0.0060	0.0824	0.0000	0.0659
Standard deviation	0.0435	0.0840	0.2415	0.0336	0.1424
Covariance Matrix					
T-bills	0.0018920				
Bonds	0.0025050	0.0070613			
Stocks	0.0002008	0.0040381	0.0583292		
Mortgage	0.0007087	0.0023854	0.0025400	0.0011274	
House	−0.000119	−0.000067	−0.000178	−0.0000057	0.020284
Correlation Matrix					
T-bills	1.0000				
Bonds	0.68533 (0.09103)	1.0000			
Stocks	0.01912 (0.12498)	0.19897 (0.12251)	1.0000		
Mortgage	0.84119 (0.11529)	0.680286 (0.15626)	0.467954 (0.18842)	1.0000	
House	−0.03339 (0.21309)	−0.004506 (0.21320)	−0.000771 (0.21319)	−0.001192 (0.21320)	1.0000

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses.

return is then converted to a real return. Note that by assuming that capital gains are not taxed, our measure of the after-tax return to stocks probably overstates the actual return.

Real after-tax mortgage rates and returns to housing are calculated for homeowners in the PSID from 1968 to 1992. Excluding the poverty subsample, all households that owned a house over at least a two-year period between 1968 and 1992 were included (1,817 households). For each household, the return to housing $R_{H,t}$ was calculated using equation (11) if the household was living in the same house during year t and year $t - 1$. If, in year t , the household moved to a new house or became a renter, the value of $R_{H,t}$ was set to missing.

The calculation of returns to housing relies on the change in the reported value of the house between interviews, which are usually conducted between February and April. We interpret the housing return series as measuring the return over the March-to-March interval, and construct the returns on financial assets for the same time intervals. While the data on housing returns and mortgage rates are limited to the 1968–1992 period, data for a longer period (1926–1992) are used for T-bills, T-bonds, and the S&P 500. A detailed description of the data

and calculation of rates of return is provided in the Data Appendix.

The mean returns, standard deviations, and covariance matrix of the five assets are reported in Table 1A. In calculating the sample statistics of mean returns on housing assets and their covariance with other financial assets, we assume that all returns are drawn from the same distribution regardless of region and year. As a robustness measure, we trimmed the top and bottom 2 percent of housing returns on the grounds that the tails contain some extreme values likely to reflect gross measurement errors. As expected, stocks have the highest after-tax real rate of return at 8.2 percent, and Treasury bills the lowest, with negative 0.4 percent. The real return to housing at 6.6 percent is comparable to that of stocks, while the return to housing has a substantially smaller standard deviation than the stock return. The after-tax real interest rate on a fixed mortgage is on average zero over this period. According to the bottom row of the correlation matrix, the return to housing is uncorrelated with the return to each of the financial assets. In each case, the correlation of the return to T-bills, T-bonds, stocks, and mortgages has a correlation with the return to housing which is essentially zero in

TABLE 1B—EXPECTED RETURNS AND COVARIANCE MATRIX—CASE-SHILLER PRICE INDICES

	T-Bills	Bonds	Stocks	Atlanta	Chicago	Dallas	San Francisco
Mean return	-0.0038	0.0060	0.0824	0.05356	0.05363	0.07196	0.09787
Standard deviation	0.0435	0.0840	0.2415	0.04200	0.06079	0.04872	0.06540
Covariance Matrix							
T-bills	0.0018920						
Bonds	0.0025050	0.0070613					
Stocks	0.0002008	0.0040381	0.0583292				
Atlanta	0.0005253	0.0020381	0.003202	0.001764			
Chicago	0.0002768	0.002859	0.002211	0.001006	0.003696		
Dallas	-0.000127	-0.000769	-0.000825	0.000851	0.001327	0.002373	
San Francisco	-0.00058	0.000415	-0.000223	-0.000159	0.001931	0.000796	0.004277
Correlation Matrix							
T-bills	1.0000						
Bonds	0.68533 (0.09103)	1.0000					
Stocks	0.01912 (0.12498)	0.19897 (0.12251)	1.0000				
Atlanta	0.41871 (0.24271)	0.38527 (0.24663)	0.42041 (0.23970)	1.0000			
Chicago	0.15244 (0.26414)	0.37332 (0.24794)	0.20051 (0.26001)	0.39412 (0.24563)	1.0000		
Dallas	-0.08701 (0.26625)	-0.12527 (0.26516)	-0.09341 (0.26632)	0.41585 (0.24306)	0.44796 (0.23895)	1.0000	
San Francisco	-0.29702 (0.25520)	0.05041 (0.26692)	-0.01879 (0.26721)	-0.05794 (0.26681)	0.48567 (0.23362)	0.24987 (0.25878)	1.0000

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses.

terms of numerical size and statistical significance.⁸

In many ways the PSID data is ideally suited to our purpose; it is a large, nationally representative sample and measures house prices at the level of the individual house, with no geographic aggregation. Unlike transactions price data, which may be distorted by composition effects due to variation over time in the transactions volume of different segments of the real estate market, the PSID tracks the same households over time. However, the fact that the PSID house price data is based on the owner's valuation rather than on transactions prices is a potential problem. As a check on the PSID data, the covariance matrix was also estimated using data from Case and Shiller (1989) based on repeat sales transactions prices for four cities—

Atlanta, Chicago, Dallas, and San Francisco. Table 1B reports expected returns and covariances analogous to Table 1A, except that the housing return is calculated from an index of housing prices constructed by Case and Shiller for each of the four cities separately.⁹ The expected return to housing in the four cities is 0.054 (Atlanta), 0.054 (Chicago), 0.072 (Dallas), and 0.098 (San Francisco), compared to 0.066 for the national sample in the PSID. For none of the four cities is the correlation between the housing return and financial asset returns

⁸ The finding that housing returns are essentially uncorrelated with stock returns is consistent with the findings of Goetzmann (1993) using repeated sales regression estimates.

⁹ Using data from the Society of Real Estate Appraisers, Case and Shiller (1989) construct a Weighted Repeated Sales Index for each of the cities by extracting the date (year and quarter) and sales price of houses which sold twice during the sample period (1970–1986). Using weighted least squares, the city index is estimated by regressing the change in the log of the individual house price on a set of dummy variables. With this method, they can estimate an index for the average house appreciation in each city, as well as assess the magnitude of idiosyncratic house price changes around the citywide index.

statistically significant. The lower right block of the correlation matrix reports the point estimates and standard errors of the correlation between returns to housing in different cities. With the partial exception of San Francisco, the correlation between the housing return in two different cities is positive and approaching statistical significance at the 5-percent level. For all city pairs, the correlation of housing returns is statistically significantly different from unity, and for most pairs is about 0.4.

Because the housing return series in Table 1B are based on citywide price indices, instead of returns to individual house prices, the estimated standard deviation of housing returns is substantially smaller (ranging from 0.042 to 0.065) than the standard deviation of 0.142 for the PSID data. In their analysis of individual house prices, Case and Shiller (1989) report that in a regression of annual real individual house price changes on the contemporaneous annual change in the citywide index, “the R^2 is only 0.066 for Atlanta, 0.158 for Chicago, 0.121 for Dallas, and 0.270 for San Francisco,”¹⁰ indicating that individual house prices have an important idiosyncratic component apart from the city-specific component. Case and Shiller conclude that “individual house prices are like many individual corporate stock prices in the large standard deviation of annual percentage change, close to 15 percent a year for individual housing prices.”¹¹

Data from both sources are consistent with the following conclusions: the return to housing is uncorrelated with the returns to financial assets, and the standard deviation of housing returns at the level of the individual house is about 0.14 to 0.15. Since the PSID data reflects a nationally representative sample and covers a longer time period than the Case-Shiller data, we use the covariance matrix and vector of expected returns estimated from the PSID to calculate the efficient frontier and portfolios.¹²

¹⁰ Case and Shiller (1989 p. 127).

¹¹ Case and Shiller (1989 p. 127).

¹² Because the estimates of the covariance of the return to housing with the returns to financial assets are so close to zero, in terms of magnitude as well as statistical significance, we impose the assumption that the housing return is uncorrelated with the return to financial assets by substituting values of zero in place of the point estimates in the first four elements of the last row of the covariance matrix reported in Table 1A.

TABLE 2—LIFE-CYCLE PATTERN OF ASSET HOLDINGS—1989 PSID WEALTH DATA (MEAN RATIO OF ASSET TO NET WORTH)

Age of Head	Cash	Bonds	Stocks	House	Mortgage
18–30	0.193	0.072	0.056	3.511	–2.833
31–40	0.169	0.067	0.068	2.366	–1.671
41–50	0.148	0.060	0.085	1.588	–0.882
51–60	0.200	0.058	0.092	0.969	–0.319
61–70	0.254	0.048	0.113	0.757	–0.171
71+	0.264	0.029	0.098	0.648	–0.038

Source: Authors’ tabulation from the PSID.

II. Optimal Portfolios and the Constrained Efficient Frontier

In our approach, the ratio of house value to wealth, h , is treated as an endogenously determined state variable which imposes a constraint on the mean-variance optimization problem. The value of h varies dramatically over the life cycle, as documented in Table 2, which reports the mean asset-to-net worth ratio, by age-group, of PSID homeowners in 1989. On average, homeowners in the youngest cohort (aged 18–30) are highly leveraged, with a house-to-net wealth ratio of 3.51. As the household accumulates wealth, the value of h drops to approximately unity for the cohort aged 51–60 and to $h = 0.65$ for the oldest homeowners. Note that the data on the cohort mean asset shares is consistent with the model’s constraint on mortgage borrowing ($-h \leq x_{n,t} \leq 0$) and that the life-cycle variation in h is reflected in an equally dramatic pattern in the ratio of mortgage to net wealth.

In Table 2, “Cash” refers to any money held in checking and savings accounts, money market accounts, or Treasury bills, and “Bonds” refers to any other savings including bond funds and other assets such as rights in a trust and cash values of insurance policies. Thus these two categories correspond only very loosely to the Treasury bills or 20-year Treasury bonds used in the estimation of the risk characteristics of financial assets.

In Figure 1 we plot the constrained mean-variance efficient frontier of the portfolio, inclusive of housing, which corresponds to each of six different values of the ratio of house value to net worth ranging from 3.51 (the average value of h among PSID homeowners 18–30 years




FIGURE 1. EFFICIENT FRONTIERS WITH DIFFERENT HOUSING CONSTRAINTS

old) to 0.65 (the value of h typical of homeowners 71 and older). That is, for each of the stated values of h , quadratic programming was used to solve for the vector of financial assets, \mathbf{x} , which satisfies the constraints in (7) and achieves the minimum-variance portfolio for a given expected return. The constrained efficient frontier for $h = 0$ is also plotted.

From among the efficient portfolios, the optimal portfolio is identified by the point of tangency of the constrained frontier with the slope of the indifference curve, equation (8). Since the slope of the indifference curve is a function of the household's degree of risk aversion, A , we report, in Table 3, the optimal portfolios corresponding to various combinations of the constraint, h , and of risk aversion, as measured by A . A subset of the optimal portfolios (i.e., those for values of $A = 2, 4$, or 8) are plotted in Figure 1. Also plotted are the portfolios corresponding to the average asset shares for each PSID age cohort in Table 2 (represented by \mathbf{x} 's, in Figure 1).

For very low levels of risk aversion ($A \leq 1$), the optimal portfolio is at the upper corner of the constrained frontier for the whole range of values of h . These risk-tolerant households maximize their expected return by holding a 100-percent mortgage on their house, and allocating 100 percent of their financial asset portfolio to stocks. For $A = 2$, the optimal portfolio

of financial assets consists of about 72 percent stocks, 28 percent bonds, and no T-bills. For both $A = 2$ and $A = 1$, the house is fully mortgaged and the optimal shares of financial assets do not vary noticeably with the state variable, h . For moderate and high levels of risk aversion (that is, for values of A ranging from 4 to 10), the household's portfolio of financial assets shows a clear life-cycle pattern. For example, for a moderate level of risk aversion ($A = 4$), the household remains fully mortgaged for high levels of h , but starts paying off the mortgage when h falls below 1.5. For households with the high levels of h which are typical of young households, the optimal portfolio of financial assets consists of 60 percent bonds, 40 percent stocks, and no T-bills. When the value of h falls to one or lower, as is characteristic of households aged 50 or over, the optimal portfolio includes a larger share of stocks and a smaller share of bonds. For example, the optimal portfolio of a household with a housing to net worth ratio of $h = 0.65$ would consist of 44 percent bonds and 56 percent stocks. An amplified version of the same life-cycle pattern holds for the higher levels of risk aversion ($A = 8$ or 10). These more highly risk-averse households start paying down their mortgages almost immediately; by the time the housing to net worth ratio falls to 0.65, the mortgage is fully paid off. For high levels of h (i.e., $h = 3.51$), the

TABLE 3—OPTIMAL PORTFOLIO WEIGHTS FOR DIFFERENT CONSTRAINTS ON h

Housing-to- NW Ratio	Assets in Portfolio	Degree of Risk Aversion, A				
		A = 1	A = 2	A = 4	A = 8	A = 10
$h = 0$	Treasury bills	0	0	0.4723	0.7931	0.8279
	Treasury bonds	0	0.2800	0.1527	0	0
	Stocks	1	0.7200	0.3750	0.2069	0.1721
$h = 3.51$	Treasury bills	0	0	0	0	0
	Treasury bonds	0	0.2728	0.6001	0.7703	0.8096
	Stocks	1	0.7272	0.3999	0.2297	0.1904
$h = 2.37$	Mortgage	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
	Treasury bills	0	0	0	0	0
	Treasury bonds	0	0.2705	0.6109	0.7603	0.7870
$h = 1.59$	Stocks	1	0.7295	0.3891	0.2397	0.2130
	Mortgage	-1	-1	-1	-0.9724	-0.9327
	Treasury bills	0	0	0	0	0
$h = 0.97$	Treasury bonds	0	0.2780	0.6053	0.6763	0.6958
	Stocks	1	0.7220	0.3947	0.3238	0.3042
	Mortgage	-1	-1	-1	-0.7630	-0.7186
$h = 0.76$	Treasury bills	0	0	0	0	0
	Treasury bonds	0	0.2795	0.5164	0.5103	0.5064
	Stocks	1	0.7205	0.4836	0.4897	0.4936
$h = 0.65$	Mortgage	-1	-1	-0.7622	-0.3737	-0.2766
	Treasury bills	0	0	0	0	0
	Treasury bonds	0	0.2815	0.4674	0.3947	0.3757
$h = 0.65$	Stocks	1	0.7185	0.5326	0.6053	0.6243
	Mortgage	-1	-1	-0.6111	-0.0844	0
	Treasury bills	0	0	0	0.1357	0.3744
$h = 0.65$	Treasury bonds	0	0.2782	0.4360	0.3217	0.2018
	Stocks	1	0.7218	0.5640	0.5426	0.4237
	Mortgage	-1	-1	-0.4689	0	0

Notes: The mortgage is expressed as a percent of the house value, i.e., Mortgage = -1 indicates a 100-percent mortgage. Shares of T-bills, bonds, and stocks are stated as a percentage of the sum of the three assets, so that for each portfolio the reported shares of these three assets must sum to one.

strongly risk-averse households have portfolios of financial assets consisting of about 80 percent bonds and 20 percent stocks. For low levels of h (i.e., $h = 0.65$), the portfolio consists of about half stocks, and half nominal assets.¹³

The constraint that the value of the mortgage cannot exceed the value of the house is often

binding in the optimal portfolios depicted in Figure 1. For example, consider the constrained efficient frontier for $h = 3.51$. Along the entire length of the constrained frontier, the household holds a mortgage equal in value to the house and holds an amount equal to its net wealth in a combination of stocks and bonds. As risk aversion declines, and the household moves along the constrained frontier toward riskier portfolios, this movement is achieved by reducing the bond share and increasing the stock share while the mortgage remains at the maximum value consistent with the constraint in equation (7). Thus the slope of the constrained frontier reflects the risk and return trade-off involved in trading bonds for stocks. Once the portfolio consists of $h = 3.51$ with a 100-percent mortgage, stocks = 1, bonds = 0, and T-bills = 0, the fact that the mortgage constraint is binding implies that the household has obtained the highest return portfolio which is consistent with $h = 3.51$.

¹³ Michael Fratantoni (1996) studies the effects of homeownership on risky asset holding by modeling the commitment to a fixed mortgage payment combined with uncertain labor income in a simulation model. In his model, the share of risky assets in total wealth is higher for young households who have just bought a house than for older households nearing retirement. João F. Cocco (1998) also uses simulation to solve a life-cycle model with risky labor income for the optimal holding of housing and financial assets. He finds that compared to a model without housing, the introduction of housing increases the proportion of financial assets held in the form of stocks later in life. Nevertheless, stock holding as a proportion of financial assets is predicted to decline over the life cycle.

Given the estimated vector of expected returns and covariance matrix, the model predicts that households generally hold both a mortgage and bonds. Since mortgages and bonds are similar assets, an alternative approach would be to consider a mortgage and a bond as perfect substitutes; i.e., assume that there is a single financial instrument which is called a mortgage if one takes a negative position and called a bond if one takes a positive position, in addition to stocks, T-bills, and housing. Under this alternative approach to modeling the mortgage, the model can give predictions about the sum of holdings of mortgage and bonds, but cannot say anything about the shares of mortgage and bonds separately. When the portfolios are calculated for this simplified menu of assets (i.e., a mortgage is a negative position in bonds), the basic characteristics of the portfolios in Table 3 are confirmed: the optimal holding of T-bills is at the corner unless h is low and risk aversion is high, the degree of leverage is reduced as h falls over the life cycle, more risk-averse households reduce their degree of leverage more rapidly than less risk-averse households, and the percentage of net wealth held in the form of stocks increases as h falls.

III. Life-Cycle and Cross-Sectional Implications

At its most basic level, the model implies that the efficient frontier faced by a household is not static, but varies with the state variable h . Since h varies over the life of a household, the composition of the optimal portfolio of financial assets in general will vary over the life cycle, even if preferences and the stochastic structure of the asset markets are constant. The basic message for the life cycle of portfolio composition is that young households with high values of h are forced by their high degree of leverage to hold a risky portfolio and therefore use their net worth to reduce portfolio risk rather than attempting to further increase their expected return. To reduce portfolio risk, the young households hold only a small to moderate share (depending on the degree of risk aversion) of stocks, and reduce their leverage, either explicitly by paying down the mortgage, or implicitly by keeping the 100-percent mortgage and simultaneously holding bonds. As wealth accumulates and the value of h falls, the household shifts a greater fraction of its financial assets

into stocks. The percentage of financial assets devoted to stocks peaks at about 60 percent when h is in the range $0.4 < h < 0.8$, then declines for lower levels of h .

Because the percentage of financial assets devoted to stocks is inversely related to h over most of its range, and h tends to decline as the household ages, the model suggests that stock holding will increase with age. Existing studies that have tested for changes in the composition of household portfolios over the life cycle have found conflicting evidence of age effects. Using data from the 1978 Survey of Consumer Financial Decisions, Mervyn A. King and Jonathan I. Leape (1987) find that the probability of owning stocks, corporate bonds, municipal bonds, and savings bonds increases with age, while the probability of owning Treasury bonds declines with age. Ioannides (1992), however, using the 1983 and 1986 Surveys of Consumer Finances, finds that coefficients on age are not significant at the 5-percent level in probit regressions of ownership of most financial assets, except for IRAs, housing equity, and other debt. Carol C. Bertaut (1996), using the 1983–1989 panel of the Survey of Consumer Finances, finds that the probability of owning stocks increases with age. Using the 1983, 1989, and 1992 Surveys of Consumer Finances, James M. Poterba and Andrew A. Samwick (1997) find strong age effects of both the probability of ownership and the portfolio shares of stocks (directly held as well as all taxable equity, including brokerage accounts and equity mutual funds). Yamashita (2001), using the 1989 Survey of Consumer Finances, however, finds that the coefficient on age becomes insignificant in estimating the share of stocks in the portfolio, when the housing constraint is included in the specification. Using various waves of the Survey of Consumer Finances along with a panel data set of TIAA-CREF participants over 1987–1999, John Ameriks and Stephen P. Zeldes (2000) find that portfolio shares of stocks increase strongly with age. Examining those households that owned at least some equities in their portfolio, however, Ameriks and Zeldes find a nearly flat age profile in both the SCF and the TIAA-CREF data, implying an absence of age effects.

The inclusion of housing also has implications for the composition of portfolios in a cross section. According to Table 3, a model which

ignores housing would predict that households with moderate to high risk aversion ($A \geq 4$) will hold substantial quantities of T-bills (accounting for as much as 47 percent of financial assets for $A = 4$ and 83 percent of financial assets for $A = 10$). If housing is included in the portfolio, however, the constraint that the household cannot borrow at the T-bill rate becomes binding for a large range of values of h and A . That is, for the entire region $h \geq 0.76$ and $A \leq 10$, the household is at a corner with zero T-bills. Only when h falls to 0.65 in conjunction with high levels of risk aversion ($A \geq 8$) does the optimal portfolio include T-bills.

Why does the introduction of housing push the household into a situation in which the nonnegativity constraint binds over a wider range of risk aversion? For the first three age cohorts (that is, households aged 50 and under), the value of the house exceeds net wealth ($h > 1$), so that the household must borrow. Risk-tolerant investors exploit the opportunity to leverage their asset portfolio and take out the maximum mortgage equal to 100 percent of the value of the house while more risk-averse households avoid being fully leveraged, but all of the portfolios associated with values of h exceeding unity involve substantial mortgage indebtedness. If allowed, diversifying the portfolio of financial assets by taking a negative position in T-bills and reducing mortgage indebtedness would both increase the portfolio's expected return and reduce its variance, since the interest rate on T-bills is, on average, slightly lower than the mortgage rate. For households in the last three age cohorts, owning the house without holding any mortgage is feasible ($h < 1$). However, except for the highly risk averse ($A = 10$), these households voluntarily hold mortgages in order to hold larger amounts of the high-return financial assets (stocks and bonds) than would be possible if they owned their house outright. Like the younger, "mandatory" mortgage holders, these "voluntary" mortgage holders would be better off if some of their borrowing were in the form of a negative position in T-bills. Since both of these groups would like to borrow at the T-bill rate, the nonnegativity constraint is binding and the optimal holding of T-bills is zero.

To assess the empirical validity of this cross-sectional implication of the model—that the inclusion of housing pushes the household more

firmly onto a binding nonnegativity constraint for T-bills—we reexamine the "asset allocation puzzle" as posed by Canner et al. (1997). In essence, the asset allocation puzzle refers to the following contradiction between theory and practice: according to the mutual fund separation theorem, all investors should hold an identical portfolio of risky assets regardless of their degree of risk aversion; differential preferences toward risk are accommodated by varying the relative amounts invested in the risky portfolio and the riskless asset, which implies that the ratio of bonds to stocks (two risky assets) should be invariant with respect to the overall level of risk of the portfolio, as measured by the percentage of the entire portfolio held in the form of stocks. In contrast, financial advisors in the popular press systematically advise that more risk-averse investors hold higher ratios of bonds to stocks than risk-tolerant investors.

Instead of using data on actual household portfolios, Canner et al. use as "data" the portfolios recommended by four sources of investment advice: a book by Jane Bryant Quinn, the Fidelity investment newsletter, a book promoted by Merrill Lynch, and an article in the *New York Times*.¹⁴ Table 4 reproduces Table 1 of Canner et al. (1997). While the sources differ in their recommended portfolios, all four advise a ratio of bonds to stocks which increases with risk aversion, and is therefore inversely related to the fraction of the portfolio in stocks.

Parallel to Figure 1 in Canner et al., Figure 2 plots (with circle symbols) the bond-to-stock ratio against the percentage of financial assets in stocks for the 12 recommended portfolios.¹⁵ The two dashed lines in Figure 2 represent the predicted relationship between the bond-to-stock ratio and the percentage of financial assets in stocks, based on the standard CAPM assumptions (i.e., a riskless asset exists, short sales are permitted, and housing is excluded) and on a variant of the CAPM in which there is no risk-

¹⁴ The sources are: Jane Bryant Quinn (1991), Larry Mark (1993), Don Underwood and Paul B. Brown (1993), and Mary Rowland (1994).

¹⁵ There are only ten distinct portfolios because Fidelity and Jane Bryant Quinn recommend the identical portfolio allocation for conservative investors, and the *New York Times* "conservative" portfolio coincides with the Fidelity "moderate" portfolio.

TABLE 4—ASSET ALLOCATIONS RECOMMENDED BY FINANCIAL ADVISORS

Advisor and Investor Type	Percent of Portfolio			Ratio of Bonds to Stocks
	Cash	Bonds	Stocks	
A. Fidelity				
Conservative	50	30	20	1.50
Moderate	20	40	40	1.00
Aggressive	5	30	65	0.46
B. Merrill Lynch				
Conservative	20	35	45	0.78
Moderate	5	40	55	0.73
Aggressive	5	20	75	0.27
C. Jane Bryant Quinn				
Conservative	50	30	20	1.50
Moderate	10	40	50	0.80
Aggressive	0	0	100	0.00
D. <i>The New York Times</i>				
Conservative	20	40	40	1.00
Moderate	10	30	60	0.50
Aggressive	0	20	80	0.25




FIGURE 2. PLOT OF BOND-TO-STOCK RATIO AGAINST THE PROPORTION OF FINANCIAL ASSETS IN STOCKS

less asset (while short sales are permitted, and housing is excluded). These elements of Figure 2 illustrate the “asset allocation puzzle” as stated by Canner et al.: when housing is excluded from the model, the predicted relationship between the bond-to-stock ratio and the percentage of financial assets in stocks is exactly horizontal (if a riskless asset exists) or positively sloped (in the absence of a riskless asset), while the scatterplot representing the fi-

ancial advisors’ recommendations is negatively sloped.¹⁶

Canner et al. examine a number of potential

¹⁶ Canner et al. (1997) calculated optimal portfolios based on pretax real returns, while we use after-tax real returns. Because of the difference in tax treatment, the constant bond-to-stock ratio consistent with the “CAPM assumptions” is equal to 0.40 in our calculations, as compared to 0.33 in Canner et al. (1997).

explanations for the puzzle, but find that none of “the usual suspects” can successfully resolve the puzzle. The authors conclude¹⁷

[T]he failure of [portfolio] advice, as opposed to behavior, strikes us as particularly surprising. Financial decisions are widely viewed to be difficult to make, and advisors are experts who are trying to help people optimize. That the advice being offered does not match economic theory suggests that our understanding of investor objectives (as opposed to their ability to reach those objectives) is deficient.

Once we introduce housing into the portfolio, for values of h greater than 1.2, the predicted relationship between the bond-to-stock ratio and the percentage of financial assets in stocks is given by the negatively sloped solid curve in Figure 2.¹⁸ For a wide range of values of risk aversion (even for $A > 10$), the model predicts that the nonnegativity constraint on T-bills is binding as long as h exceeds 1.2. Since the household is at a corner with zero T-bills, the percentage of financial assets in bonds and the percentage of financial assets in stocks must sum to unity in this region. Thus, if we denote the percentage of financial assets in stocks as s , the prediction of the model is simply a plot of $(1 - s)/s$ against s , a negatively sloped curve. As noted earlier, the introduction of housing does not universally imply that the nonnegativity constraint on T-bills is binding. For households with both low levels of h and high levels of A (for example, $h = 0.65$ and $A = 8$) the optimal portfolio does contain T-bills and therefore would be represented by a point to the southwest of the curve which represents the plot of $(1 - s)/s$ against s . Nevertheless, it is evident from Table 2 that for a wide range of combinations of h and A , the binding nonnega-

tivity constraint on T-bills implies that the optimal portfolio will lie on this curve, labeled “asset allocation with housing.”

The mean-variance efficiency framework assumes zero transactions costs in buying and selling financial assets, and does not recognize a distinction between financial assets which can be used as a medium of exchange, such as checking accounts and currency, as opposed to nonmonetary assets. The implication of the model is that, for most homeowners, the optimal portfolio consists entirely of bonds and stocks; no cash is held for the purpose of achieving mean-variance efficiency. Before confronting the portfolio implications of the model with the data, however, it is necessary to consider the implications of transactions costs. In the absence of transactions costs, the household would hold zero cash and pay for consumption goods by selling bonds or stocks. However, in the presence of transactions costs of buying and selling bonds and stocks, the household will hold some cash balances, even though the non-zero holdings of cash move the household to the interior of the mean-variance efficient frontier (as computed ignoring transactions costs). Since the “asset allocation line with housing” represents the maximum ratio of bonds to stocks for a given percentage of financial assets in stocks, a portfolio which includes a strictly positive amount of cash will be represented by a point below the curve.

In addition to the “data” which represents the portfolios recommended by the financial advisors, Figure 2 also plots, with small x’s, data points representing the portfolios of PSID homeowners in 1989.¹⁹ We interpret the data—both the scatter of household portfolios and the financial advisors’ recommended portfolios—as deviating from the prediction of the frictionless model because cash is held for transactions purposes. The inescapable fact that households generally hold strictly positive balances of cash does not contradict the model’s implication that most households face a binding nonnegativity constraint on T-bills, or “cash.” If holding negative positions in checking accounts, currency, or T-bills were feasible, the household could

¹⁷ Canner et al. (1997 p. 189).

¹⁸ The target audience of the financial advisors is presumably the subset of the overall population with the wealth and motivation to hold diversified portfolios of financial assets. The rate of homeownership among this group is even higher than in the general population. For example, of PSID households with strictly positive stock holdings in 1989, 93 percent of those in the 41–70 age range were homeowners. Of stockholders aged 31–40, 82 percent were homeowners, and of those aged 71 and older, 88 percent were homeowners.

¹⁹ The asset labeled “T-bills” in the predicted portfolios is interpreted, in terms of the PSID data, as the sum of checking, savings, and money market accounts, as well as T-bills.

hold a positive balance of the cash asset to use as a medium of exchange and simultaneously borrow by holding negative balances of checking accounts or T-bills and thus accommodate a transactions demand for cash while holding a negative net position in the cash asset to achieve mean-variance efficiency. Since borrowing at the currency or T-bill rate is not possible, the household accepts some costs in terms of mean-variance inefficiency in order to hold transactions balances. The fact that the household would like to simultaneously take a negative position in the cash asset to achieve mean-variance efficiency, but is unable to do so, implies that the nonnegativity constraint is nevertheless binding.

IV. Conclusions

Simply by virtue of its magnitude, housing plays an important role in both the consumption bundle and the asset portfolio of the household. This role is complicated, and made more interesting, by the fact that most consumers choose to hold a single level of residential real estate to satisfy both the consumption demand for housing services as well as the portfolio demand for housing, rather than use rental markets to disentangle the two aspects of the problem. To the extent that the household's holding of real estate is determined at least in part by its consumption demand for housing services, the consumption demand for housing places a constraint on the portfolio problem. Using PSID data and the Case-Shiller repeat sales transactions price data, the paper estimates the risk and return to financial assets and residential real estate, and calculates the optimal portfolios and constrained mean-variance efficient frontiers for various values of the housing constraint.

The model implies that households which are *ex ante* identical, in the sense that they have identical preferences toward risk and identical perceptions of the risk and return to different assets, will nevertheless hold quite different portfolios of financial assets because each household is optimizing their portfolio subject to a constraint on housing, and this constraint varies across households. Further, since the ratio of housing to net worth declines over the life cycle, the housing constraint generally induces a life-cycle pattern in the portfolio shares of stocks and bonds. For example, young house-

holds, which typically have large holdings of real estate relative to their net worth, are highly leveraged and therefore forced into a situation of high portfolio risk (and return). As a result, these young households respond to the housing constraint by using their net worth to either pay down their mortgage or buy bonds instead of buying stocks. In comparison, ownership of stocks is more attractive to older households that have accumulated greater wealth and therefore reduced their ratio of housing to net worth.

Compared to the mean-variance frontier which corresponds to portfolios consisting solely of financial assets such as stocks, bonds, and T-bills, the introduction of housing and mortgages alters the risk and return trade-off in a direction which pushes most households onto a binding nonnegativity constraint on T-bills. Since households are at a corner with respect to the riskless, or low-risk, asset, varying preferences toward risk cannot be accommodated by altering the percentage of the portfolio in the riskless asset, and are reflected instead in variation in the composition of the risky portfolio. This observation—that the introduction of housing pushes the household onto a binding nonnegativity constraint on the riskless asset—appears to be useful in explaining both household portfolio data and data points which represent the portfolio recommendations of financial advisors in the popular press.

The analysis in the paper is entirely partial equilibrium, and assumes that the expected return vector and covariance matrix are time invariant. Nevertheless, it is fun to speculate on the consequences of the housing constraint in a dynamic, general-equilibrium setting. If one accepts the basic premise that the household's optimal portfolio is constrained by the housing ratio, and this ratio tends to be related to age, then demographic bulges such as the baby boom, birth dearth, and baby boom echo may have important effects on asset prices. The effect of the baby boom generation on the expected return to housing has been demonstrated in the literature (Joyce Manchester, 1989; N. Gregory Mankiw and David N. Weil, 1989). Similarly, demographic effects have been invoked as a possible explanation of the recent stock market boom. However, the treatment of demographic effects on the stock market in the popular media generally focuses on the idea that the baby boomers, finally recognizing that

retirement is on the horizon, have comparatively high saving rates. In this view, the aggregate flow of saving is unusually high because the baby boom cohort has a high saving rate and constitutes a large fraction of the overall population. Our analysis focuses on portfolio shares rather than saving rates, and shows that as the housing constraint is gradually relaxed over the life cycle, the aging baby boomers should shift their portfolio composition away from bonds and toward stocks. Thus even in the absence of high saving rates, the baby boom generation could have a systematic effect on asset prices.

DATA APPENDIX

Calculation of Housing Return from PSID.—Of the 6,771 households in the Survey Research Center (SRC) (nonpoverty) sample in 1992, households that never owned a home between 1968 and 1992 were excluded, reducing the sample to 5,846. Households for which the value of the house or remaining mortgage principal have ever been assigned by PSID staff between 1968 and 1992 were also excluded, reducing the sample to 1,817. Households that enter the sample as a split-off of another family unit are included, but data for the years during which the split-off household resided with the original family unit are treated as missing.

Inspection of the PSID house value data revealed 45 cases in which the house value changed by a factor of ten from one year to the next even though the family unit did not move. In these cases, examination of the series of reported house values in the context of the rest of the record led us to conclude that the observation had been incorrectly recorded. These observations were corrected by either adding or dropping a zero, and included in the sample. A list of the observations for which the house value was corrected is available from the authors on request.

If the family unit owns the house they reside in, the house value is elicited by the question "Could you tell me what the present value of your house is?—I mean about how much would it bring if you sold it today?" The property tax amount is also a direct survey question except in 1978, 1988, and 1989. For 1978, we impute property taxes by the method suggested in the PSID Wave VI Codebook (Survey Research Center, 1973). Property tax rates are assigned

TABLE A1—PROPERTY TAX RATE

Distance from Nearest City of 50,000 or more	New England States (percent)	All Other States (percent)
0–5 miles	2.5	2.0
5–49 miles	2.0	1.5
50 or more miles	1.5	1.0

Source: Survey Research Center (1973 p. 140).

according to Table A1, based on the location of the house. For 1988 and 1989, we lack data on the distance from the nearest city over 50,000 and use instead the size of the largest city in the county as an indicator. For 1988–1989, the property tax rate was assumed to be 1.5 percent (2.0 percent for New England states) if the largest city in the county is greater than 50,000, and 1.0 percent (1.5 percent for New England states) otherwise.

In calculating the housing return, the observation was set to missing if during the interval over which the return was calculated, the family moved or there was a change of head due to marriage of a female head of household to a nonsample male. Since the number of homeowners in the PSID changes every year, we construct 24 vectors of returns and covariance matrices (one for each year) and then weight them equally to arrive at a single vector of returns and covariance matrix for the 1968–1992 sample period.

Center for Research on Security Prices (CRSP) Data.—Returns for stocks, bonds, and bills are calculated from monthly data series provided by Ibbotson and Associates. For additional information, see *CRSP Indices File Guide* (Center for Research on Security Prices, 1996).

Treasury Bills (USTRET)—U.S. Treasury Bills total return.

Treasury Bond (GBTRET)—U.S. Treasury Bonds total return.

Stocks Capital Appreciation (CSCRET)—S&P 500 stocks capital appreciation. The capital appreciation component of the common stock return is taken as the change in the S&P 500 as reported in the *Wall Street Journal* over 1977–1992, and in Standard and Poor's Trade Securities Statistics from 1926–1976.

TABLE A2—RETURN AND COVARIANCE MATRIX—PSID DATA WITH TIME-VARYING FEDERAL MARGINAL TAX RATES FOR 1969–1992

	T-Bills	Bonds	Stocks	Mortgage	House
Mean return (arithmetic)	–0.0045	0.0051	0.0820	–0.0019	0.0662
Standard deviation	0.0434	0.0814	0.2415	0.0335	0.1424
Covariance matrix					
	T-bills	0.0018854			
	Bonds	0.0024652	0.0066290		
	Stocks	0.0002202	0.0038510	0.0583161	
	Mortgage	0.0006995	0.0023519	0.0024675	0.0011208
	House	–0.00012	–0.000072	–0.000017	–0.00001
Correlation matrix					0.0202878
	T-bills	1.00000			
	Bonds	0.69731	1.00000		
	Stocks	0.02100	0.19586	1.00000	
	Mortgage	0.84436	0.66799	0.45706	1.00000
	House	–0.03413	–0.00483	–0.00742	–0.00056
					1.00000

Stocks Income Return (CSIRET)—S&P 500 stocks income return. For 1977–1992, income is calculated as realized dividends. Dividends are accumulated over the month and then invested on the last trading day of the month in the S&P 500 at the day's closing level. For 1926–1976, quarterly dividends are extracted from rolling yearly dividends reported quarterly in Standard and Poor's Trade and Securities Statistics, then allocated to months within each quarter, assuming payments were made on the same month and day as they were in 1974.

CPI (CPIRET)—Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, not seasonally adjusted (CPI-U NSA).

Mortgage Rates.—The data for mortgage rates is the variable "Conventional Home Mortgage Rate—Loans Closed (National Average for All Major Lenders: FYMCLE)" from the Citibase Monthly data tape. The annual average (April to March) of the monthly mortgage rate is converted to an after-tax rate using the marginal tax rate of 33 percent, and then deflating by the inflation rate.

In Table A2, we report an alternative version of the expected returns and covariance matrix of returns, in which historical variation over time of the federal marginal tax rate is included. That is, for each year, we calculated the marginal federal tax rate of the PSID household that ranked in the 75th percentile for income, and used the year-specific marginal federal tax rate

to calculate after-tax real returns. A comparison of the estimates with the corresponding estimates in Table 1A of the paper indicates that the alternative method of incorporating taxes makes very little difference.

REFERENCES

- Ameriks, John and Zeldes, Stephen P. "How Do Household Portfolio Shares Vary with Age?" Unpublished manuscript, Columbia University, 2000.
- Bertaut, Carol C. "Stockholding Behavior of U.S. Households: Evidence from the 1983–89 Survey of Consumer Finances." International Finance Discussion Papers No. 558, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC, July 1996.
- Brueckner, Jan K. "Consumption and Investment Motives and the Portfolio Choices of Homeowners." *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, October 1997, 15(2), pp. 159–80.
- Canner, Niko; Mankiw, N. Gregory and Weil, David N. "An Asset Allocation Puzzle." *American Economic Review*, March 1997, 87(1), pp. 181–91.
- Case, Karl E. and Shiller, Robert J. "The Efficiency of the Market for Single-Family Homes." *American Economic Review*, March 1989, 79(1), pp. 125–37.
- Center for Research in Security Prices. *CRSP indices file guide*, 1996.
- Cocco, João F. "Owner-Occupied Housing,

- Permanent Income, and Portfolio Choice." Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University, 1998.
- Fratantoni, Michael.** "Housing Wealth, Precautionary Saving and the Equity Premium." Unpublished manuscript, Johns Hopkins University, 1996.
- Goetzmann, William N.** "The Single Family Home in the Investment Portfolio." *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, May 1993, 6(3), pp. 201–22.
- Goetzmann, William N. and Ibbotson, Roger.** "The Performance of Real Estate as an Asset Class." *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, Spring 1990, 3(1), pp. 65–76.
- Goodman, John L., Jr. and Ittner, John B.** "The Accuracy of Home Owners' Estimates of House Value." Economic Activity Section Working Paper No. 131, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC, 1993.
- Grossman, Sanford J. and Laroque, Guy.** "Asset Pricing and Optimal Portfolio Choice in the Presence of Illiquid Durable Consumption Goods." *Econometrica*, January 1990, 58(1), pp. 25–51.
- Heaton, John and Lucas, Deborah.** "Portfolio Choice in the Presence of Background Risk." *Economic Journal*, January 2000, 110(460), pp. 1–26.
- Henderson, J. Vernon and Ioannides, Yannis M.** "A Model of Housing Tenure Choice." *American Economic Review*, March 1983, 73(1), pp. 98–113.
- Ioannides, Yannis M.** "Dynamics of the Composition of Household Asset Portfolios and the Life Cycle." *Applied Financial Economics*, September 1992, 2(3), pp. 145–59.
- King, Mervyn A. and Leape, Jonathan I.** "Asset Accumulation, Information, and the Life Cycle." National Bureau of Economic Research (Cambridge, MA) Working Paper No. 2392, September 1987.
- Manchester, Joyce.** "The Baby Boom, Housing and Loanable Funds." *Canadian Journal of Economics*, February 1989, 22(1), pp. 128–49.
- Mankiw, N. Gregory and Weil, David N.** "The Baby Boom, the Baby Bust, and the Housing Market." *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, May 1989, 19(2), pp. 235–58.
- Mark, Larry.** "Asset Allocation: Finding the Right Mix." *Fidelity Focus: The Magazine for Fidelity Investors*, Winter 1993, p. 11.
- Poterba, James M. and Samwick, Andrew A.** "Household Portfolio Allocation over the Life Cycle." National Bureau of Economic Research (Cambridge, MA) Working Paper No. 6185, 1997.
- Quinn, Jane Bryant.** *Making the most of your money.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991.
- Ross, Stephen A. and Zisler, Randall C.** "Risk and Return in Real Estate." *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, June 1991, 4(2), pp. 175–90.
- Rowland, Mary.** "Seven Steps to Handling an Inheritance." *The New York Times*, February 5, 1994, p. 34.
- Skinner, Jonathan.** "Housing and Saving in the United States," in Yukio Noguchi and James M. Poterba, eds., *Housing markets in the United States and Japan.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994, pp. 191–213.
- Survey Research Center.** *A panel study of income dynamics, procedures and tape codes: 1973 interviewing year, wave VI, a supplement.* Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1973.
- Underwood, Don and Brown, Paul B.** *Grow rich slowly: The Merrill Lynch guide to retirement planning.* New York: Viking, 1993.
- Yamashita, Takashi.** "Owner-Occupied Housing and Investment in Stocks: An Empirical Test." Unpublished manuscript, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 2001.

This article has been cited by:

1. Inés Macho-Stadler, David Pérez-Castrillo, Nicolas Quérou. 2021. Goal-oriented agents in a market. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **84**, 102378. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Dongmin Kong, Yawen Cheng, Shasha Liu. 2021. Unexpected housing wealth appreciation and stock market participation. *Journal of Housing Economics* **52**, 101768. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Tong-yob Nam. 2021. Geographic Heterogeneity in Housing Market Risk and Portfolio Choice. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* **62**:4, 508-547. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Andreas Oehler, Matthias Horn. 2021. Behavioural portfolio theory revisited: lessons learned from the field. *Accounting & Finance* **61**:S1, 1743-1774. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Marco Giacoletti. 2021. Idiosyncratic Risk in Housing Markets. *The Review of Financial Studies* **41**. . [[Crossref](#)]
6. Stefano Giglio, Matteo Maggiori, Krishna Rao, Johannes Stroebel, Andreas Weber. 2021. Climate Change and Long-Run Discount Rates: Evidence from Real Estate. *The Review of Financial Studies* **299**. . [[Crossref](#)]
7. Tokuo Iwaisako, Arito Ono, Amane Saito, Hidenobu Tokuda. 2021. Disentangling the effect of home ownership on household stockholdings: Evidence from Japanese micro data. *Real Estate Economics* . [[Crossref](#)]
8. Maria Teresa Medeiros Garcia, Rafael Figueira. 2021. Determinants of homeownership in Europe – an empirical analysis based on SHARE. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis* **14**:1, 14-38. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Peter Bednarek, Daniel Marcel te Kaat, Chang Ma, Alessandro Rebucci. 2021. Capital Flows, Real Estate, and Local Cycles: Evidence from German Cities, Banks, and Firms. *The Review of Financial Studies* . [[Crossref](#)]
10. Chunil Kim, Hyobi Choi, Yeol Choi. 2021. Retirement Age and Housing Consumption: The Case of South Korea. *Sustainability* **13**:3, 1286. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Xiaonan Chen, Jianfeng Song. 2021. Influence Path Analysis of Rural Household Portfolio Selection: A Empirical Study Using Structural Equation Modelling Method. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* **99**. . [[Crossref](#)]
12. Huichun Huang, Junli Yuan, Guanghua Lin, Jing Chi. 2021. Underestimation of financial literacy and financial market participation. *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy* **4**, 1-26. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Daniel te Kaat, Chang Ma, Alessandro Rebucci. 2021. Real Effects of the ECB's Quantitative Easing: A Housing Portfolio Channel. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **32**. . [[Crossref](#)]
14. Stefano Colonnello, Roberto Marfè, Qizhou Xiong. 2021. Housing Yields. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **7**. . [[Crossref](#)]
15. Xinfu Chen, Min Dai, Wei Jiang, Cong Qin. 2021. Asymptotic Analysis of Long-Term Investment with Two Illiquid and Correlated Assets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
16. Jianhua Gang, Liang Peng, Jinfan Zhang. 2020. Are Pricier Houses Less Risky? Evidence from China. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* **23**. . [[Crossref](#)]
17. Mingzhi Hu, Xue Wang. 2020. Homeownership and household formation: no homeownership, no marriage?. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* **35**:3, 763-781. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Jianjun Li, Qize Li, Xu Wei. 2020. Financial literacy, household portfolio choice and investment return. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* **62**, 101370. [[Crossref](#)]
19. JAMES J. CHOI, ADRIANA Z. ROBERTSON. 2020. What Matters to Individual Investors? Evidence from the Horse's Mouth. *The Journal of Finance* **75**:4, 1965-2020. [[Crossref](#)]

20. Xiaokuai Shao, Alexander White. 2020. Outsiders, insiders and interventions in the housing market. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 6. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
21. By Kadir Atalay, Garry F Barrett, Rebecca Edwards, Chaoran Yu. 2020. House Price Shocks, Credit Constraints and Household Indebtedness. *Oxford Economic Papers* 72:3, 780-803. [\[Crossref\]](#)
22. Claus Munk. 2020. A mean-variance benchmark for household portfolios over the life cycle. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 116, 105833. [\[Crossref\]](#)
23. Walter D'Lima, Paul Schultz. 2020. Residential Real Estate Investments and Investor Characteristics. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 4. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
24. Thomas Dangel, Alex Weissensteiner. 2020. Optimal Portfolios under Time-Varying Investment Opportunities, Parameter Uncertainty, and Ambiguity Aversion. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 55:4, 1163-1198. [\[Crossref\]](#)
25. Xiaomeng Lu, Jiaojiao Guo, Li Gan. 2020. International comparison of household asset allocation: Micro-evidence from cross-country comparisons. *Emerging Markets Review* 43, 100691. [\[Crossref\]](#)
26. Jeffry Jacob, Abdul Munasib. 2020. Do social networks promote homeownership?. *International Review of Economics* 67:2, 189-230. [\[Crossref\]](#)
27. Hassanudin Mohd Thas Thaker, Mohamed Ariff. 2020. Supply-side drivers of residential price in Malaysia: a qualitative analysis from developers' perspectives. *Property Management* 38:4, 543-564. [\[Crossref\]](#)
28. Andrew A. Alola, Simplice A. Asongu, Uju V. Alola. 2020. House prices and tourism development in Cyprus: A contemporary perspective. *Journal of Public Affairs* 20:2. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
29. Xiaojun Yuan, Yinjie Shen, Haigang Zhou. 2020. House price and household consumption in China: evidence from micro-level data. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis* 13:3, 475-501. [\[Crossref\]](#)
30. Evren Ceritoğlu. 2020. Homeownership, Housing Demand, and Household Wealth Distribution in Turkey. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade* 56:5, 1146-1165. [\[Crossref\]](#)
31. Geng Niu, Qi Wang, Han Li, Yang Zhou. 2020. Number of brothers, risk sharing, and stock market participation. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 113, 105757. [\[Crossref\]](#)
32. Xintong Yang, Li Gan. 2020. Bequest motive, household portfolio choice, and wealth inequality in urban China. *China Economic Review* 60, 101399. [\[Crossref\]](#)
33. Christoph Hambel. 2020. Health shock risk, critical illness insurance, and housing services. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 91, 111-128. [\[Crossref\]](#)
34. Andrew Adewale Alola. 2020. Revisiting the housing market dynamics and its fundamentals: new evidence from Cyprus. *Journal of Economic Studies* 47:1, 200-216. [\[Crossref\]](#)
35. Richa Pandey, V. Mary Jessica. 2020. Determinants of Indian housing market: effects and counter-effects. *Property Management* 38:2, 199-218. [\[Crossref\]](#)
36. Ken H. Johnson, Eli Beracha, Wei Feng. 2020. Can the BH&J Buy vs. Rent Index Anticipate Housing Price Movements?. *Journal of Housing Research* 29:1, 20-33. [\[Crossref\]](#)
37. Jie Yang, Frank J. Fabozzi, Danling Jiang, Keli Xiao. 2020. Formal versus Informal Mortgage Debt and Stock Market Participation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
38. Sumit Agarwal, Wenlan Qian, Ruth Tan. Introduction 1-28. [\[Crossref\]](#)
39. Sumit Agarwal, Wenlan Qian, Ruth Tan. Housing 175-219. [\[Crossref\]](#)
40. Harrison G. Hong, Neng Wang, Jinqiang Yang. 2020. Mitigating Disaster Risks to Sustain Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
41. Piet Eichholtz, Matthijs Korevaar, Thies Lindenthal, Ronan Tallec. 2020. The Total Return and Risk to Residential Real Estate. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)

42. Emirhan Ilhan. 2020. Sea Level Rise and Portfolio Choice. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 33. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
43. Evgeny Lyandres, Maria-Teresa Marchica, Roni Michaely, Roberto Mura. 2019. Owners' Portfolio Diversification and Firm Investment. *The Review of Financial Studies* 32:12, 4855-4904. [\[Crossref\]](#)
44. Roberto Pancrazi, Mario Pietrunti. 2019. Natural expectations and home equity extraction. *Journal of Housing Economics* 46. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
45. Maryam Dilmaghani. 2019. Religious identity and real estate wealth accumulation: evidence from Canada. *Housing Studies* 34:10, 1690-1720. [\[Crossref\]](#)
46. Xirong Chen, Renyu Li, Xi Wu. 2019. Multi-home ownership and household portfolio choice in urban China. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 77. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
47. David M. Blanchett, Michael Guillemette. 2019. Do Investors Consider Nonfinancial Risks When Building Portfolios?. *Financial Analysts Journal* 75:4, 124-142. [\[Crossref\]](#)
48. MeiChi Huang. 2019. Risk diversification gains from metropolitan housing assets. *Review of Financial Economics* 37:4, 453-481. [\[Crossref\]](#)
49. Danika Wright, Maria B. Yanotti. 2019. Home advantage: The preference for local residential real estate investment. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 57, 101167. [\[Crossref\]](#)
50. Leo Kaas, Georgi Kocharkov, Edgar Preugschat. 2019. Does homeownership promote wealth accumulation?. *Applied Economics Letters* 26:14, 1186-1191. [\[Crossref\]](#)
51. Daniel Melser, Robert J. Hill. 2019. Residential Real Estate, Risk, Return and Diversification: Some Empirical Evidence. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 59:1, 111-146. [\[Crossref\]](#)
52. Jing Zou, Xiaojun Deng. 2019. Financial literacy, housing value and household financial market participation: Evidence from urban China. *China Economic Review* 55, 52-66. [\[Crossref\]](#)
53. Geng Niu, Li Yu, Gang-Zhi Fan, Donghao Zhang. 2019. Corporate fraud, risk avoidance, and housing investment in China. *Emerging Markets Review* 39, 18-33. [\[Crossref\]](#)
54. Mahmoud Salari, Roxana J. Javid. 2019. How does female labor force participation impact on housing values?. *Research in Economics* 73:2, 129-137. [\[Crossref\]](#)
55. DENIS PELLETIER, CENGIZ TUNC. 2019. Endogenous Life-Cycle Housing Investment and Portfolio Allocation. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 51:4, 991-1019. [\[Crossref\]](#)
56. David C. Ling, Yan Lu, Sugata Ray. 2019. How do Personal Real Estate Transactions Affect Productivity and Risk Taking? Evidence from Professional Asset Managers. *Real Estate Economics* 62. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
57. Jess Benhabib, Alberto Bisin, Mi Luo. 2019. Wealth Distribution and Social Mobility in the US: A Quantitative Approach. *American Economic Review* 109:5, 1623-1647. [\[Abstract\]](#) [\[View PDF article\]](#) [\[PDF with links\]](#)
58. Andrew Adewale Alola, Uju Violet Alola. 2019. The Dynamics of Tourism—Refugeeism on House Prices in Cyprus and Malta. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 20:2, 521-536. [\[Crossref\]](#)
59. Vishaal Baukaran, Pawan Jain, Mark Sunderman. 2019. Housing “Beta”: Common Risk Factor in Returns of Stocks. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 58:3, 438-456. [\[Crossref\]](#)
60. Roine Vestman. 2019. Limited Stock Market Participation Among Renters and Homeowners. *The Review of Financial Studies* 32:4, 1494-1535. [\[Crossref\]](#)
61. Hanan Haber, Nir Kosti, David Levi-Faur. 2019. Welfare through regulatory means: eviction and repossession policies in Singapore. *Housing Studies* 34:3, 407-424. [\[Crossref\]](#)
62. Damian S. Damianov, Diego Escobari. 2019. Getting on and Moving Up the Property Ladder: Real Hedging in the U.S. Housing Market Before and After the Crisis. *Real Estate Economics* 7. . [\[Crossref\]](#)

63. Liang Peng, Lei Zhang. 2019. House Prices and Systematic Risk: Evidence from Microdata. *Real Estate Economics* **23**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
64. Beatrice D. Simo-Kengne. 2019. Population aging, unemployment and house prices in South Africa. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* **34**:1, 153-174. [\[Crossref\]](#)
65. Zekai He, Xiuzhen Shi, Xiaomeng Lu, Feng Li. 2019. Home equity and household portfolio choice: Evidence from China. *International Review of Economics & Finance* **60**, 149-164. [\[Crossref\]](#)
66. Holger Kraft, Claus Munk, Farina Weiss. 2019. Predictors and portfolios over the life cycle. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **100**, 1-27. [\[Crossref\]](#)
67. Jiandong Li, Jianmei Zhao. 2019. How Housing Affects Stock Investment—An SEM Analysis. *Economies* **7**:1, 26. [\[Crossref\]](#)
68. Andrew Adewale Alola. 2019. Prescience evidence of the housing market and production sector performance nexus. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis* **12**:1, 131-147. [\[Crossref\]](#)
69. George Galster, Terje Wessel. 2019. Reproduction of social inequality through housing: A three-generational study from Norway. *Social Science Research* **78**, 119-136. [\[Crossref\]](#)
70. James A. Kahn, Benjamin Kay. 2019. The Impact of Credit Risk Mispricing on Mortgage Lending During the Subprime Boom. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
71. Geng Niu, Li Yu, Gang-Zhi Fan, Donghao Zhang. 2019. Corporate Fraud, Risk Avoidance, and Housing Investment in China. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
72. Esther Eiling, Erasmo Giambona, Ricardo Lopez Aliouchkin, Patrick Tuijp. 2019. The Cross-Section of Expected Housing Returns. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
73. Andrew Alola, Simplice Asongu, Uju Alola. 2019. House Prices and Tourism Development in Cyprus: A Contemporary Perspective. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
74. James Brugler, Joachim Inkmann, Adrian Rizzo. 2019. Time-Varying Background Risk Over the Great Recession. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
75. Peter Bednarek, Daniel te Kaat, Chang Ma, Alessandro Rebucci. 2019. Capital Flows, Real Estate, and Local Cycles: Evidence from German Cities, Banks, and Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
76. Jess Benhabib, Alberto Bisin. 2018. Skewed Wealth Distributions: Theory and Empirics. *Journal of Economic Literature* **56**:4, 1261-1291. [\[Abstract\]](#) [\[View PDF article\]](#) [\[PDF with links\]](#)
77. Ge Bao, Guoliang Feng. 2018. Testing the Dividend Discount Model in Housing Markets: the Role of Risk. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* **57**:4, 677-701. [\[Crossref\]](#)
78. Congmin Peng. 2018. Identifying Bubbles in China's Property Market for Consumer Financial Well-Being. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning* **29**:2, 182-197. [\[Crossref\]](#)
79. Martin C. Seay, Somer G. Anderson, Andy T. Carswell, Robert B. Nielsen. 2018. Characteristics of Rental Real Estate Investors During the 2000s. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning* **29**:2, 369-382. [\[Crossref\]](#)
80. Maryam Dilmaghani. 2018. A Remnant of the Past? Jewish Homeownership Gaps in Montreal and Toronto, from 1971 to 2011. *Contemporary Jewry* **38**:3, 315-343. [\[Crossref\]](#)
81. Gang-Zhi Fan, Ming Pu, Xiaoying Deng, Seow Eng Ong. 2018. Optimal portfolio choices and the determination of housing rents under housing market uncertainty. *Journal of Housing Economics* **41**, 200-217. [\[Crossref\]](#)
82. Donald Haurin, Stephanie Moulton, Wei Shi. 2018. The Accuracy of Senior Households' Estimates of Home Values: Application to the Reverse Mortgage Decision. *Real Estate Economics* **46**:3, 655-697. [\[Crossref\]](#)
83. Holger Kraft, Claus Munk, Sebastian Wagner. 2018. Housing Habits and Their Implications for Life-Cycle Consumption and Investment*. *Review of Finance* **22**:5, 1737-1762. [\[Crossref\]](#)

84. Chuanyong Zhang, Guoliang Feng. 2018. More wealth, less leisure? Effect of housing wealth on tourism expenditure in China. *Tourism Economics* 24:5, 526-540. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Serena Fatica, Doris Prammer. 2018. Housing and the Tax System: How Large Are the Distortions in the Euro Area? *. *Fiscal Studies* 39:2, 299-342. [[Crossref](#)]
86. MeiChi Huang. 2018. Time-varying diversification strategies: The roles of state-level housing assets in optimal portfolios. *International Review of Economics & Finance* 55, 145-172. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Tom Mayock, Rachel Spritzer Malacrida. 2018. Socioeconomic and racial disparities in the financial returns to homeownership. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 70, 80-96. [[Crossref](#)]
88. Bing Chen, Frank P. Stafford. 2018. A Farewell to ARMs or Ever Changing Market Segments?. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 20. . [[Crossref](#)]
89. Zan Yang, Ying Fan, Liqing Zhao. 2018. A Reexamination of Housing Price and Household Consumption in China: The Dual Role of Housing Consumption and Housing Investment. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 56:3, 472-499. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Yujin Cao, Jidong Chen, Qinghua Zhang. 2018. Housing investment in urban China. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 46:1, 212-247. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Xi Chen. 2018. Optimal life cycle mortgage and portfolio choices in the presence of the affordability constraint. *Journal of Housing Economics* 39, 1-16. [[Crossref](#)]
92. Alan Tidwell, Andres Jauregui, Vivek Sah, Andrew Narwold. 2018. Cash and Distressed House Sales Price Discounts: Dual Sample Selection Spatial Interdependence Approaches. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 56:1, 101-139. [[Crossref](#)]
93. Philippe Bracke, Christian A.L. Hilber, Olmo Silva. 2018. Mortgage debt and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Urban Economics* 103, 52-66. [[Crossref](#)]
94. Holger Kraft, Claus Munk, Farina Weiss. 2018. Predictors and Portfolios Over the Life Cycle. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
95. Tokuo Iwaisako, Arito Ono, Amane Saito, Hidenobu Tokuda. 2018. Disentangling the Effect of Housing on Household Stock Holdings: Evidence from Japanese Micro Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
96. Ran Sun Lyng. 2018. The Impact of the Financial Crisis on Homeowners' Portfolio Choice. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
97. Christoph Hambel. 2018. Health Shock Risk, Critical Illness Insurance, and Housing Services. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
98. Nicolas Aubert, Niaz Kammoun, Yacine Bekrar. 2018. Financial decisions of the financially literate. *Finance* 39:2, 43. [[Crossref](#)]
99. Peter Englund. Residential Real Estate and Finance 11587-11591. [[Crossref](#)]
100. Fatih Guvenen, Hanno Lustig. Consumption-Based Asset Pricing Models (Empirical Performance) 2145-2151. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Todd Sinai. Urban Housing Demand 14142-14145. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Pedro Silos. Housing Wealth 5989-5991. [[Crossref](#)]
103. Xiaokuai Shao, Alexander White. 2018. Outsiders, Insiders and Interventions in the Housing Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
104. Shuo Liu, Jin Wang, Weixing Wu. 2017. To buy or not to buy: household risk hedging of housing costs. *Accounting & Finance* 57:5, 1417-1445. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Aditya Aladangady. 2017. Housing Wealth and Consumption: Evidence from Geographically Linked Microdata. *American Economic Review* 107:11, 3415-3446. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]

106. Mariacristina De Nardi, Giulio Fella. 2017. Saving and wealth inequality. *Review of Economic Dynamics* **26**, 280-300. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Elliot Anenberg, Steven Laufer. 2017. A More Timely House Price Index. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **99**:4, 722-734. [[Crossref](#)]
108. Qin Zhou, Qing He, Yan Yuan. 2017. Does Residential Housing Crowd Out or Promote Households' Stock Investment? Evidence from China. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade* **53**:8, 1869-1893. [[Crossref](#)]
109. Shuhei Aoki, Makoto Nirei. 2017. Zipf's Law, Pareto's Law, and the Evolution of Top Incomes in the United States. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* **9**:3, 36-71. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
110. Tim Landvoigt. 2017. Housing Demand During the Boom: The Role of Expectations and Credit Constraints. *The Review of Financial Studies* **30**:6, 1865-1902. [[Crossref](#)]
111. RAJ CHETTY, LÁSZLÓ SÁNDOR, ADAM SZEIDL. 2017. The Effect of Housing on Portfolio Choice. *The Journal of Finance* **72**:3, 1171-1212. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Soonyoun Park, Sae Woon Park, Heeho Kim, Sunhae Lee. 2017. The dynamic effect of population ageing on house prices: evidence from Korea. *Pacific Rim Property Research Journal* **23**:2, 195-212. [[Crossref](#)]
113. Xiaoyu Chen, Xiaohao Ji. 2017. The Effect of House Price on Stock Market Participation in China: Evidence from the CHFS Microdata. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade* **53**:5, 1030-1044. [[Crossref](#)]
114. Darius Kulikauskas. 2017. The user cost of housing in the Baltic states. *Journal of European Real Estate Research* **10**:1, 17-34. [[Crossref](#)]
115. Yvonne McCarthy, Kieran McQuinn. 2017. Price Expectations, Distressed Mortgage Markets and the Housing Wealth Effect. *Real Estate Economics* **45**:2, 478-513. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Marianna Brunetti, Costanza Torricelli. 2017. Second homes in Italy: every household's dream or (un)profitable investments?. *Housing Studies* **32**:2, 168-185. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Andrei Semenov. 2017. Background risk in consumption and the equity risk premium. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting* **48**:2, 407-439. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Jia He, Jing Wu, Haishi Li. 2017. Hedging House Price Risk in China. *Real Estate Economics* **45**:1, 177-203. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Andres Jauregui, Alan Tidwell, Diane Hite. 2017. Sample Selection Approaches to Estimating House Price Cash Differentials. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* **54**:1, 117-137. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Alessandro Bucciol, Raffaele Miniaci, Sergio Pastorello. 2017. Return expectations and risk aversion heterogeneity in household portfolios. *Journal of Empirical Finance* **40**, 201-219. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Sheila Ohlund. 2017. Why Can't a Woman Invest More Like a Man? Gender Differences in Investment Behaviour. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
122. Donald R. Haurin, Stephanie Moulton, Wei Shi. 2017. The Accuracy of Senior Households' Estimates of Home Values: Application to the Reverse Mortgage Decision. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
123. Ismir Mulalic, Holger Rasmussen, Jan Rouwendal, Hans Henrik Woltmann. 2017. The Financial Crisis and Diverging House Prices: Evidence from the Copenhagen Metropolitan Area. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
124. Yuxi Yao. 2017. Accounting for the Decline in Homeownership Among the Young. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
125. David McCarthy, James A. Sefton, Ronald D. Lee, Joze Sambt. 2017. Generational Wealth Accounts. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

126. Marco Giacoletti. 2017. Idiosyncratic Risk in Housing Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **18**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
127. Ricardo T. Fernholz. 2016. A Model of economic mobility and the distribution of wealth. *Journal of Macroeconomics* **50**, 168-192. [\[Crossref\]](#)
128. Pierre-Arnaud Drouhin, Arnaud Simon, Yasmine Essafi. 2016. Forward Curve Risk Factors Analysis in the UK Real Estate Market. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* **53**:4, 494-526. [\[Crossref\]](#)
129. Wenli Li, Haiyong Liu, Fang Yang, Rui Yao. 2016. HOUSING OVER TIME AND OVER THE LIFE CYCLE: A STRUCTURAL ESTIMATION. *International Economic Review* **57**:4, 1237-1260. [\[Crossref\]](#)
130. Hassanudin Mohd Thas Thaker, K. Chandra Sakaran. 2016. Prioritisation of key attributes influencing the decision to purchase a residential property in Malaysia. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis* **9**:4, 446-467. [\[Crossref\]](#)
131. Chun-Kei Tsang, Wing-Keung Wong, Ira Horowitz. 2016. Arbitrage opportunities, efficiency, and the role of risk preferences in the Hong Kong property market. *Studies in Economics and Finance* **33**:4, 735-754. [\[Crossref\]](#)
132. M. Brunetti, R. Ciciretti, Lj. Djordjevic. 2016. The determinants of household's bank switching. *Journal of Financial Stability* **26**, 175-189. [\[Crossref\]](#)
133. Norbert Hiller, Oliver W. Lerbs. 2016. Aging and urban house prices. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **60**, 276-291. [\[Crossref\]](#)
134. G. C. Lim, Q. Zeng. 2016. Consumption, Income, and Wealth: Evidence from Age, Cohort, and Period Elasticities. *Review of Income and Wealth* **62**:3, 489-508. [\[Crossref\]](#)
135. Andra Ghent, Rossen Valkanov. 2016. Comparing Securitized and Balance Sheet Loans: Size Matters. *Management Science* **62**:10, 2784-2803. [\[Crossref\]](#)
136. Kevin. E. Beaubrun-Diant, Tristan-Pierre Maury. 2016. Home tenure, stock market participation, and composition of the household portfolio. *Journal of Housing Economics* **32**, 1-17. [\[Crossref\]](#)
137. BASANT K. KAPUR. 2016. ANOTHER LOOK AT PRICE INSTABILITY AND CONSUMER WELL-BEING: NONDURABLE AND DURABLE (HOUSING) MARKETS. *The Singapore Economic Review* **61**:02, 1640022. [\[Crossref\]](#)
138. Yulei Rao, Lixing Mei, Rui Zhu. 2016. Happiness and Stock-Market Participation: Empirical Evidence from China. *Journal of Happiness Studies* **17**:1, 271-293. [\[Crossref\]](#)
139. Asiye Aydilek. 2016. The allocation of time and puzzling profiles of the elderly. *Economic Modelling* **53**, 515-526. [\[Crossref\]](#)
140. Ton van den Bremer, Frederick van der Ploeg, Samuel Wills. 2016. The Elephant In The Ground: Managing Oil And Sovereign Wealth. *European Economic Review* **82**, 113-131. [\[Crossref\]](#)
141. Alex Chinco, Christopher Mayer. 2016. Misinformed Speculators and Mispricing in the Housing Market. *Review of Financial Studies* **29**:2, 486-522. [\[Crossref\]](#)
142. M. Piazzesi, M. Schneider. Housing and Macroeconomics 1547-1640. [\[Crossref\]](#)
143. Stefano Corradin, Reint Gropp, Harry Huizinga, Luc Laeven. 2016. The effect of personal bankruptcy exemptions on investment in home equity. *Journal of Financial Intermediation* **25**, 77-98. [\[Crossref\]](#)
144. Robert J. Hill, Iqbal A. Syed. 2016. Hedonic price-rent ratios, user cost, and departures from equilibrium in the housing market. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **56**, 60-72. [\[Crossref\]](#)
145. Guglielmo Maria Caporale, Ricardo M. Sousa. 2016. Consumption, wealth, stock and housing returns: Evidence from emerging markets. *Research in International Business and Finance* **36**, 562-578. [\[Crossref\]](#)
146. François Ortalo-Magné, Andrea Prat. 2016. Spatial Asset Pricing: A First Step. *Economica* **83**:329, 130-171. [\[Crossref\]](#)

147. Elliot Anenberg, Steven Laufer. 2016. A More Timely House Price Index. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
148. Ricardo T. Fernholz. 2016. A Statistical Model of Inequality. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
149. Ricardo T. Fernholz. 2016. A Model of Economic Mobility and the Distribution of Wealth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
150. Holger Kraft, Claus Munk, Farina Weiss. 2016. Predictors and Portfolios Over the Life Cycle. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
151. Tokuo Iwaisako, Arito Ono, Amane Saito. 2016. Impact of Population Aging on Household Savings and Portfolio Choice in Japan. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
152. Claus Munk. 2016. A Mean-Variance Benchmark for Household Portfolios Over the Life Cycle. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
153. Laurent Barras, Sebastien Betermier. 2016. The Predominance of Real Estate in the Household Portfolio. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
154. Sylvain Catherine. 2016. Portfolio Choices Over the Life-Cycle and the Cyclical Skewness of Labor Income Shocks. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
155. Mohammad Tajik, Saeideh Aliakbari, Thaana Ghalia, Sepideh Kaffash. 2015. House prices and credit risk: Evidence from the United States. *Economic Modelling* **51**, 123-135. [[Crossref](#)]
156. ###. 2015. The Impact of Homeownership on Household's Financial Asset Investment Decision: International Comparison. *Review of International Money and Finance* **5**:2, 75-99. [[Crossref](#)]
157. Hamish Low, Luigi Pistaferri. 2015. Disability Insurance and the Dynamics of the Incentive Insurance Trade-Off. *American Economic Review* **105**:10, 2986-3029. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
158. . Bibliography 209-213. [[Crossref](#)]
159. Raun van Ooijen, Rob Alessie, Adriaan Kalwij. 2015. Saving Behavior and Portfolio Choice After Retirement. *De Economist* **163**:3, 353-404. [[Crossref](#)]
160. Ajita Atreya, Susana Ferreira, Erwann Michel-Kerjan. 2015. What drives households to buy flood insurance? New evidence from Georgia. *Ecological Economics* **117**, 153-161. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Andra Ghent. 2015. Home Ownership, Household Leverage and Hyperbolic Discounting. *Real Estate Economics* **43**:3, 750-781. [[Crossref](#)]
162. Luc Arrondel, Frédérique Savignac. 2015. Risk management, housing and stockholding. *Applied Economics* **47**:39, 4208-4227. [[Crossref](#)]
163. Christian Weller, Sara Bernardo. 2015. Aging With Rising Risk: Have Older Households Experienced Faster Growing Risk Exposure Than Younger Ones Since the 1990s?. *Journal of Aging & Social Policy* **35**, 150706145616002. [[Crossref](#)]
164. Dale Domian, Rob Wolf, Hsiao-Fen Yang. 2015. An assessment of the risk and return of residential real estate. *Managerial Finance* **41**:6, 591-599. [[Crossref](#)]
165. Stuart A. Gabriel, Stuart S. Rosenthal. 2015. The Boom, the Bust and the Future of Homeownership. *Real Estate Economics* **43**:2, 334-374. [[Crossref](#)]
166. David M. Blanchett, Philip U. Straehl. 2015. No Portfolio Is an Island. *Financial Analysts Journal* **71**:3, 15-33. [[Crossref](#)]
167. Tim Landvoigt, Monika Piazzesi, Martin Schneider. 2015. The Housing Market (s) of San Diego. *American Economic Review* **105**:4, 1371-1407. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
168. Qu Feng, Guiying Laura Wu. 2015. Bubble or riddle? An asset-pricing approach evaluation on China's housing market. *Economic Modelling* **46**, 376-383. [[Crossref](#)]

169. MeiChi Huang, Tzu-Chien Wang. 2015. Housing-bubble vulnerability and diversification opportunities during housing boom–bust cycles: evidence from decomposition of asset price returns. *The Annals of Regional Science* 54:2, 605–637. [[Crossref](#)]
170. Coskun Cetin, Fernando Zapatero. 2015. Optimal acquisition of a partially hedgeable house. *Mathematics and Financial Economics* 9:2, 123–147. [[Crossref](#)]
171. Alessandro Bucciol, Raffaele Miniaci. 2015. Household Portfolio Risk*. *Review of Finance* 19:2, 739–783. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Stefano Giglio, Matteo Maggiori, Johannes Stroebe. 2015. Very Long-Run Discount Rates *. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 130:1, 1–53. [[Crossref](#)]
173. Morris A. Davis, Stijn Van Nieuwerburgh. Housing, Finance, and the Macroeconomy 753–811. [[Crossref](#)]
174. Eddie C.M. Hui, Cong Liang. 2015. The spatial clustering investment behavior in housing markets. *Land Use Policy* 42, 7–16. [[Crossref](#)]
175. Philipp M. Lersch, Ruud Luijkx. 2015. Intergenerational transmission of homeownership in Europe: Revisiting the socialisation hypothesis. *Social Science Research* 49, 327–342. [[Crossref](#)]
176. Mika Kortelainen, Tuukka Saarimaa. 2015. Do Urban Neighborhoods Benefit from Homeowners? Evidence from Housing Prices. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 117:1, 28–56. [[Crossref](#)]
177. Benjamin S. Kay. 2015. The Effects of Housing Adjustment Costs on Consumption Dynamics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
178. Shuhei Aoki, Makoto Nirei. 2015. Zipf's Law, Pareto's Law, and the Evolution of Top Incomes in the U.S. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
179. Marianna Brunetti, Rocco Ciciretti, Ljubica Djordjevic. 2015. The Determinants of Household's Bank Switching. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
180. Wenli Li, Haiyong Liu, Fang Yang, Rui Yao. 2015. Housing Over Time and Over the Life Cycle: A Structural Estimation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
181. Holger Kraft, Claus Munk, Sebastian Wagner. 2015. Housing Habits and their Implications for Life-Cycle Consumption and Investment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
182. Tom Mayock, Rachel Spritzer. 2015. Socioeconomic and Racial Disparities in the Financial Returns to Homeownership. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
183. Marianna Brunetti, Costanza Torricelli. 2015. Second Homes: Households' Life Dream or (Wrong) Investment?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
184. Philippe Bracke, Christian A. L. Hilber, Olmo Silva. 2015. Mortgage Debt and Entrepreneurship. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
185. Gautam Goswami, Sinan Tan, Maya Waisman. 2014. Understanding the cross-section of the U.S. housing bubble: The roles of lending, transaction costs, and rent growth. *Journal of Financial Stability* 15, 76–90. [[Crossref](#)]
186. DARIUS PALIA, YAXUAN QI, YANGRU WU. 2014. Heterogeneous Background Risks and Portfolio Choice: Evidence from Micro-level Data. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 46:8, 1687–1720. [[Crossref](#)]
187. Sergio Mayordomo, Maria Rodriguez-Moreno, Juan Ignacio Peña. 2014. Portfolio choice with indivisible and illiquid housing assets: the case of Spain. *Quantitative Finance* 14:11, 2045–2064. [[Crossref](#)]
188. Michael Amior, Jonathan Halket. 2014. Do households use home-ownership to insure themselves? Evidence across U.S. cities. *Quantitative Economics* 5:3, 631–674. [[Crossref](#)]

189. Katherine E. Loveland, Naomi Mandel, Utpal M. Dholakia. 2014. Understanding Homeowners' Pricing Decisions: An Investigation of the Roles of Ownership Duration and Financial and Emotional Reference Points. *Customer Needs and Solutions* 1:3, 225-240. [[Crossref](#)]
190. Daniel Melser, Adrian D. Lee. 2014. Estimating the Excess Returns to Housing at a Disaggregated Level: An Application to Sydney 2003-2011. *Real Estate Economics* 42:3, 756-790. [[Crossref](#)]
191. Ricardo Fernholz, Robert Fernholz. 2014. Instability and concentration in the distribution of wealth. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 44, 251-269. [[Crossref](#)]
192. Tammy Leonard, Wenhua Di. 2014. Is Household Wealth Sustainable? An Examination of Asset Poverty Reentry After an Exit. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 35:2, 131-144. [[Crossref](#)]
193. Orazio Attanasio, Luigi Pistaferri. 2014. Consumption Inequality over the Last Half Century: Some Evidence Using the New PSID Consumption Measure. *American Economic Review* 104:5, 122-126. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
194. LAURENT E. CALVET, PAOLO SODINI. 2014. Twin Picks: Disentangling the Determinants of Risk-Taking in Household Portfolios. *The Journal of Finance* 69:2, 867-906. [[Crossref](#)]
195. Stefano Corradin, José L. Fillat, Carles Vergara-Alert. 2014. Optimal Portfolio Choice with Predictability in House Prices and Transaction Costs. *Review of Financial Studies* 27:3, 823-880. [[Crossref](#)]
196. Sheng Guo, William G. Hardin. 2014. Wealth, Composition, Housing, Income and Consumption. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 48:2, 221-243. [[Crossref](#)]
197. JOHN H. COCHRANE. 2014. A Mean-Variance Benchmark for Intertemporal Portfolio Theory. *The Journal of Finance* 69:1, 1-49. [[Crossref](#)]
198. Elliot Anenberg, Steven Laufer. 2014. Using Data on Seller Behavior to Forecast Short-Run House Price Changes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
199. Katherine Loveland, Naomi Mandel, Utpal M. Dholakia. 2014. Understanding Homeowners Pricing Decisions: An Investigation of the Roles of Ownership Duration and Financial and Emotional Reference Points. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
200. Stefano Giglio, Matteo Maggiori, Johannes Stroebel. 2014. No-Bubble Condition: Model-Free Tests in Housing Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
201. Yian Liu. 2014. The Determinants of Housing Price Dynamics: Securitization Versus Investor Demand. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
202. Robert D. Brogan. 2014. Rate of Return on Single Family Housing Investments in the U.S. 1970-2000. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
203. Ruth KKMmerle, Markus Rudolf. 2014. Portfolio Optimization With Illiquid Life Insurance Investments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
204. Aditya Aladangady. 2014. Homeowner Balance Sheets and Monetary Policy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
205. Alessandro Bucciol, Raffaele Miniaci, Sergio Pastorello. 2014. Return Expectations and Risk Aversion Heterogeneity in Household Portfolios. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
206. Natalia Khorunzhina. 2013. Structural estimation of stock market participation costs. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 37:12, 2928-2942. [[Crossref](#)]
207. Markus Haavio, Heikki Kauppi. 2013. Buying a Home with a Resale Value: Location, Location, Location*. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 115:4, 1046-1083. [[Crossref](#)]
208. Marcel Fischer, Michael Z. Stamos. 2013. Optimal Life Cycle Portfolio Choice with Housing Market Cycles. *Review of Financial Studies* 26:9, 2311-2352. [[Crossref](#)]

209. Henock Louis, Amy X. Sun. 2013. Long-Term Growth in Housing Prices and Stock Returns. *Real Estate Economics* 41:3, 663-708. [[Crossref](#)]
210. Maria Teresa Punzi. 2013. Housing Market and Current Account Imbalances in the International Economy. *Review of International Economics* 21:4, 601-613. [[Crossref](#)]
211. Asiye Aydilek. 2013. Habit formation and housing over the life cycle. *Economic Modelling* 33, 858-866. [[Crossref](#)]
212. Marcel Marekwica, Alexander Schaefer, Steffen Sebastian. 2013. Life cycle asset allocation in the presence of housing and tax-deferred investing. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 37:6, 1110-1125. [[Crossref](#)]
213. Todd Sinai,, Nicholas Souleles. 2013. Can Owning a Home Hedge the Risk of Moving?. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 5:2, 282-312. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
214. Grace W. Bucchianeri, Julia A. Minson. 2013. A homeowner's dilemma: Anchoring in residential real estate transactions. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 89, 76-92. [[Crossref](#)]
215. Patrick Bajari, Phoebe Chan, Dirk Krueger, Daniel Miller. 2013. A DYNAMIC MODEL OF HOUSING DEMAND: ESTIMATION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS*. *International Economic Review* 54:2, 409-442. [[Crossref](#)]
216. Lu Han. 2013. Understanding the Puzzling Risk-Return Relationship for Housing. *Review of Financial Studies* 26:4, 877-928. [[Crossref](#)]
217. Daniel Melser. 2013. How Well Do Australian Home-Owners Know the Value of Their Home?. *Australian Economic Review* 46:1, 31-44. [[Crossref](#)]
218. Luigi Guiso, Paolo Sodini. Household Finance: An Emerging Field 1397-1532. [[Crossref](#)]
219. Eric Ghysels, Alberto Plazzi, Rossen Valkanov, Walter Torous. Forecasting Real Estate Prices 509-580. [[Crossref](#)]
220. Evgeny Lyandres, Maria-Teresa Marchica, Roni Michaely, Roberto Mura. 2013. Investment and Operating Strategies of Public and Private Firms: Theory and Evidence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
221. Makoto Nakajima, Irina Telyukova. 2013. Reverse Mortgage Loans: A Quantitative Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
222. Revansiddha Basavaraj Khanapure. 2013. What Drives Risky Investments Lower Around Retirement?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
223. Thomas Jansson. 2013. Housing Choices and Labor Income Risk. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
224. Alessandro Bucciol, Raffaele Miniaci. 2013. Household Portfolio Risk. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
225. Tammy C.M. Leonard. 2013. The Impact of Housing Market Conditions on Residential Property Upkeep. *Housing Studies* 28:1, 33-56. [[Crossref](#)]
226. HongKiseok. 2012. Housing Price and the CAPM: An Analysis of Korea's Condominium Price. *Ewha Journal of Social Sciences* 28:null, 5-41. [[Crossref](#)]
227. Mao-wei Hung, Leh-chyan So. 2012. How Much Extra Premium Does a Loss-averse Owner-occupied Home Buyer Pay for His House?. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 45:3, 705-722. [[Crossref](#)]
228. Hyrum L. Smith, Michael S. Finke, Sandra J. Huston. 2012. Financial Sophistication and Housing Leverage Among Older Households. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 33:3, 315-327. [[Crossref](#)]
229. Christopher W. Anderson, Eli Beracha. 2012. Frothy Housing Markets and Local Stock-Price Movements. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 45:2, 326-346. [[Crossref](#)]

230. ANDRA GHENT. 2012. Infrequent Housing Adjustment, Limited Participation, and Monetary Policy. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 44:5, 931-955. [[Crossref](#)]
231. Gang-Zhi Fan, Ming Pu, Seow Eng Ong. 2012. Optimal Portfolio Choices, House Risk Hedging and the Pricing of Forward House Transactions. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 45:1, 3-29. [[Crossref](#)]
232. Alexandre M. Baptista. 2012. Portfolio selection with mental accounts and background risk. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 36:4, 968-980. [[Crossref](#)]
233. Dimitrios Gounopoulos, Andreas G. Merikas, Anna A. Merika, Anna Triantafyllou. 2012. Explaining house price changes in Greece. *Applied Financial Economics* 22:7, 549-561. [[Crossref](#)]
234. Andrew Paciorek, Todd Sinai. 2012. Does home owning smooth the variability of future housing consumption?. *Journal of Urban Economics* 71:2, 244-257. [[Crossref](#)]
235. . References 294-311. [[Crossref](#)]
236. Francisco J. Callado Muñoz, Natalia Utrero González. Determinants of Households' Risk 201-217. [[Crossref](#)]
237. A. Díaz, M.J. Luengo-Prado. Home Ownership 439-445. [[Crossref](#)]
238. M. Flavin. Housing and Wealth Portfolios 374-379. [[Crossref](#)]
239. T. Davidoff. Housing Wealth over the Life Course 697-702. [[Crossref](#)]
240. B. Case. Residential Real Estate Investment Trusts 88-93. [[Crossref](#)]
241. N. Berg, N. Jha, J.C. Murdoch. Risk in Housing Markets 193-203. [[Crossref](#)]
242. Tan Teck-Hong. 2012. Housing satisfaction in medium- and high-cost housing: The case of Greater Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. *Habitat International* 36:1, 108-116. [[Crossref](#)]
243. Andra C. Ghent. 2012. Home Ownership, Household Leverage, and Hyperbolic Discounting. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
244. Daxuan Zhao, Tien Foo Sing. 2012. Housing, Wealth Composition and Expected Stock Return. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
245. Maria Teresa Punzi. 2012. Housing Market and Current Account Imbalances in the International Economy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
246. Hyrum L. Smith, Michael S. Finke, Sandra J. Huston. 2012. Financial Sophistication and Housing Leverage Among Older Households. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
247. Daniel Melser, Adrian D. Lee. 2012. Estimating the Excess Returns to Housing at a Disaggregated Level: An Application to Sydney 2003-11. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
248. Ronan C. Lyons. 2012. East, West, Boom & Bust: The Spread of House Prices & Rents in Ireland, 2006-2012. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
249. Stefano Corradin, Jose L. Fillat, Carles Vergara-Alert. 2012. Optimal Portfolio Choice with Predictability in House Prices and Transaction Costs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
250. Roine Vestman. 2012. Limited Stock Market Participation Among Renters and Home Owners. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
251. Revansiddha Basavaraj Khanapure. 2012. What Drives Risky Investments Lower at Retirement?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
252. Andra C. Ghent, Rossen I. Valkanov. 2012. Likely and Unlikely Reasons for Securitized Borrowing: Evidence from the CMBS Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
253. Robert J. Hill, Iqbal A. Syed. 2012. Hedonic Price-Rent Ratios, User Cost, and Departures from Equilibrium in the Housing Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

254. Frank P. Stafford, Erik Hurst, Bing Chen. 2012. Diminishing Margins: Housing Market Declines and Family Financial Responses. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
255. . The Impact of Population Aging on Household Portfolios and Asset Returns 169-215. [[Crossref](#)]
256. Pierre-André Chiappori, Monica Paiella. 2011. RELATIVE RISK AVERSION IS CONSTANT: EVIDENCE FROM PANEL DATA. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 9:6, 1021-1052. [[Crossref](#)]
257. Khalid Sekkat, Ariane Szafarz. 2011. Valuing Homeownership. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 43:4, 491-504. [[Crossref](#)]
258. Jesús Fernández-Villaverde, Dirk Krueger. 2011. CONSUMPTION AND SAVING OVER THE LIFE CYCLE: HOW IMPORTANT ARE CONSUMER DURABLES?. *Macroeconomic Dynamics* 15:5, 725-770. [[Crossref](#)]
259. Alessandro Buccioli, Raffaele Miniaci. 2011. Household Portfolios and Implicit Risk Preference. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 93:4, 1235-1250. [[Crossref](#)]
260. Katsiaryna Salavei Bardos, Nataliya Zaiats. 2011. Measuring Residential Real Estate Risk and Return. *The Journal of Wealth Management* 14:3, 73-83. [[Crossref](#)]
261. Mayssun El-Attar, Markus Poschke. 2011. Trust and the Choice Between Housing and Financial Assets: Evidence from Spanish Households*. *Review of Finance* 15:4, 727-756. [[Crossref](#)]
262. Jonas D. M. Fisher, Martin Gervais. 2011. WHY HAS HOME OWNERSHIP FALLEN AMONG THE YOUNG?*. *International Economic Review* 52:3, 883-912. [[Crossref](#)]
263. DeForest McDuff. 2011. Demand substitution across US cities: Observable similarity and home price correlation. *Journal of Urban Economics* 70:1, 1-14. [[Crossref](#)]
264. Tuukka Saarimaa. 2011. Imputed Rental Income, Taxation and Income Distribution in Finland. *Urban Studies* 48:8, 1695-1714. [[Crossref](#)]
265. Holger Kraft, Claus Munk. 2011. Optimal Housing, Consumption, and Investment Decisions over the Life Cycle. *Management Science* 57:6, 1025-1041. [[Crossref](#)]
266. Marjorie Flavin,, Takashi Yamashita. 2011. Owner-Occupied Housing: Life-Cycle Implications for the Household Portfolio. *American Economic Review* 101:3, 609-614. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
267. Deborah A. Cobb-Clark, Mathias G. Sinning. 2011. Neighborhood diversity and the appreciation of native- and immigrant-owned homes. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 41:3, 214-226. [[Crossref](#)]
268. Fangyi Jin. 2011. Revisiting the composition puzzles of the household portfolio: New evidence. *Review of Financial Economics* 20:2, 63-73. [[Crossref](#)]
269. Yulia V. Veld-Merkoulova. 2011. Investment horizon and portfolio choice of private investors. *International Review of Financial Analysis* 20:2, 68-75. [[Crossref](#)]
270. Holger Kraft, Claus Munk. 2011. Optimal Housing, Consumption, and Investment Decisions over the Life-Cycle. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
271. Henock Louis, Amy X. Sun. 2011. Long-Term Growth in Housing Prices and Stock Returns. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
272. Jack Favilukis, Sydney C. Ludvigson, Stijn Van Nieuwerburgh. 2011. The Macroeconomic Effects of Housing Wealth, Housing Finance, and Limited Risk-Sharing in General Equilibrium. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
273. Marcel Marekwica, Michael Z. Stamos. 2011. Optimal Life Cycle Portfolio Choice with Housing Market Cycles. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
274. Stefano Corradin, Jose L. Fillat, Carles Vergara-Alert. 2011. Optimal Portfolio Choice with Predictability in House Prices and Transaction Costs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

275. Daniela Kolusheva. 2011. Life-Cycle Portfolio Allocation When Disasters are Possible. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
276. Maria Rodriguez Moreno, Sergio Mayordomo, Juan Ignacio Peña. 2011. Portfolio Choice with Indivisible and Illiquid Housing Assets: The Case of Spain. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
277. Alessandro Bucciol, Raffaele Miniaci. 2011. Household Portfolios and Risk Taking Over Age and Time. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
278. Makoto Nakajima, Irina Telyukova. 2011. Reverse Mortgage Loans: A Quantitative Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
279. Stéphane M. Gregoir, Tristan-Pierre Maury. 2011. Macroeconomic Labor Shocks and the Housing Market in England. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
280. Natalia Khorunzhina. 2011. Dynamic Stock Market Participation of Households. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
281. Markus Haavio, Heikki Kauppi. 2011. Owner-Occupied Housing as an Investment, Regional House Price Cycles and Residential Sorting. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
282. William W. Jennings. 2010. A Simple Stock–Bond Categorization of Alternative Investments. *The Journal of Investing* **19**:4, 31-49. [[Crossref](#)]
283. Lu Han. 2010. The Effects of Price Risk on Housing Demand: Empirical Evidence from U.S. Markets. *Review of Financial Studies* **23**:11, 3889-3928. [[Crossref](#)]
284. LingLing Huang. Homeownership and household life-cycle portfolio choice V2-632-V2-636. [[Crossref](#)]
285. Yongqiang Chu. 2010. An Intertemporal Capital Asset Pricing Model with Owner-Occupied Housing. *Real Estate Economics* **38**:3, 427-465. [[Crossref](#)]
286. Otto Van Hemert. 2010. Household Interest Rate Risk Management. *Real Estate Economics* **38**:3, 467-505. [[Crossref](#)]
287. Lijun Zhang, Qiancheng Zhao. China's Real Estate Price Inflation and the Expansion of Bank Credit 1-4. [[Crossref](#)]
288. ###. 2010. An Analysis of Extensive Wealth Effect on Domestic Households' Consumption. *KUKJE KYUNGJE YONGU* **16**:2, 159-190. [[Crossref](#)]
289. Graeme Guthrie. 2010. House prices, development costs, and the value of waiting. *Journal of Urban Economics* **68**:1, 56-71. [[Crossref](#)]
290. Kaiji Chen. 2010. A life-cycle analysis of social security with housing. *Review of Economic Dynamics* **13**:3, 597-615. [[Crossref](#)]
291. Thomas A. Becker, Reza Shabani. 2010. Outstanding Debt and the Household Portfolio. *Review of Financial Studies* **23**:7, 2900-2934. [[Crossref](#)]
292. Selale Tuzel. 2010. Corporate Real Estate Holdings and the Cross-Section of Stock Returns. *Review of Financial Studies* **23**:6, 2268-2302. [[Crossref](#)]
293. Stephen H Shore, Todd Sinai. 2010. Commitment, Risk, and Consumption: Do Birds of a Feather Have Bigger Nests?. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **92**:2, 408-424. [[Crossref](#)]
294. Philippe Bertrand. 2010. Another Look at Portfolio Optimization under Tracking-Error Constraints. *Financial Analysts Journal* **66**:3, 78-90. [[Crossref](#)]
295. Peter Englund. Trading on Home Price Risk: Index Derivatives and Home Equity Insurance 499-511. [[Crossref](#)]
296. Juerg Syz. Housing Risk and Property Derivatives: The Role of Financial Engineering 569-584. [[Crossref](#)]

297. Raffaele Miniaci, Sergio Pastorello. 2010. Mean-variance econometric analysis of household portfolios. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **25**:3, 481-504. [[Crossref](#)]
298. LUC ARRONDEL, HECTOR CALVO PARDO, XISCO OLIVER. 2010. Temperance in Stock Market Participation: Evidence from France. *Economica* **77**:306, 314-333. [[Crossref](#)]
299. Tuukka Saarimaa. 2010. Tax Incentives and Demand for Mortgage Debt: Evidence from the Finnish 1993 Tax Reform. *International Journal of Housing Policy* **10**:1, 19-40. [[Crossref](#)]
300. Michael W. Brandt. Portfolio Choice Problems 269-336. [[Crossref](#)]
301. Stephanie Curcuru, John Heaton, Deborah Lucas, Damien Moore. Heterogeneity and Portfolio Choice: Theory and Evidence 337-382. [[Crossref](#)]
302. Pedro Silos. Housing Wealth 1-3. [[Crossref](#)]
303. Graeme Guthrie. 2010. House Prices, Development Costs, and the Value of Waiting. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
304. Roine Vestman. 2010. Limited Stock Market Participation Among Renters and Home Owners. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
305. Stéphane M. Gregoir, Tristan-Pierre Maury. 2010. Measuring Local Individual Housing Returns from a Large Transaction Database. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
306. Jinyong Kim. 2010. Evaluating Time-Series Restrictions for Cross-Sections of Expected Returns: Multifactor CCAPMs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
307. Marjorie Flavin, Takashi Yamashita. 2010. Owner-Occupied Housing: The Role of Collateral Constraints on the Household Portfolio. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
308. James Banks, Richard W. Blundell, Zoë Oldfield, James P. Smith. 2010. House Price Volatility and the Housing Ladder. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
309. Andrew Paciorek, Todd M. Sinai. 2010. Does Home Owning Smooth the Variability of Future Housing Consumption?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
310. Frank P. Stafford, Elena Gouskova. 2010. Mortgage Contract Decisions and Mortgage Distress: Family and Financial Life-Cycle Factors. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
311. Stefano Corradin, Reint Gropp, Harry Huizinga, Luc A. Laeven. 2010. Who Invests in Home Equity to Exempt Wealth from Bankruptcy?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
312. Joseph Nichols, Juan Contreras. 2010. Consumption Responses to Permanent and Transitory Shocks to House Appreciation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
313. Qin Xiao. 2010. Systemic Stability of Housing and Mortgage Market: A State-Dependent Four-Phase Model. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
314. Revansiddha Basavaraj Khanapure. 2010. Life-Cycle Portfolio Allocation for Disappointment Averse Agents. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
315. Christopher Anderson, Eli Beracha. 2010. Home Price Sensitivity to Capital Market Factors: Analysis of ZIP Code Data. *Journal of Real Estate Research* **32**:2, 161-186. [[Crossref](#)]
316. Tokuo Iwaisako. 2009. Household portfolios in Japan. *Japan and the World Economy* **21**:4, 373-382. [[Crossref](#)]
317. Lorian Pelizzon, Guglielmo Weber. 2009. Efficient portfolios when housing needs change over the life cycle. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **33**:11, 2110-2121. [[Crossref](#)]
318. Sean D. Campbell, Morris A. Davis, Joshua Gallin, Robert F. Martin. 2009. What moves housing markets: A variance decomposition of the rent-price ratio. *Journal of Urban Economics* **66**:2, 90-102. [[Crossref](#)]
319. Matthew Chambers, Carlos Garriga, Don E. Schlagenhauf. 2009. ACCOUNTING FOR CHANGES IN THE HOMEOWNERSHIP RATE. *International Economic Review* **50**:3, 677-726. [[Crossref](#)]

320. Elias Oikarinen. 2009. Household borrowing and metropolitan housing price dynamics – Empirical evidence from Helsinki. *Journal of Housing Economics* 18:2, 126-139. [[Crossref](#)]
321. Steven C. Bourassa, Donald R. Haurin, Jessica L. Haurin, Martin Hoesli, Jian Sun. 2009. House Price Changes and Idiosyncratic Risk: The Impact of Property Characteristics. *Real Estate Economics* 37:2, 259-278. [[Crossref](#)]
322. Doug Waggle, Don T. Johnson. 2009. Homeownership and mixed-asset portfolio allocations. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* 49:2, 484-500. [[Crossref](#)]
323. Jan Rouwendal. 2009. Housing Wealth and Household Portfolios in an Ageing Society. *De Economist* 157:1, 1-48. [[Crossref](#)]
324. DEBORAH A. COBB-CLARK, VINCENT A. HILDEBRAND. 2009. The Asset Portfolios of Native-born and Foreign-born Australian Households. *Economic Record* 85:268, 46-59. [[Crossref](#)]
325. Fuad Hasanov, Douglas C. Dacy. 2009. Yet Another View on Why a Home Is One's Castle. *Real Estate Economics* 37:1, 23-41. [[Crossref](#)]
326. Yulia V. Veld-Merkoulova. 2009. Investment Horizon, Labor Income, and Portfolio Choice of Private Investors. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
327. Darius Palia, Yaxuan Qi, Yangru Wu. 2009. Heterogeneous Background Risks, Portfolio Choice, and Asset Returns: Evidence from Micro-Level Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
328. Stefano Corradin, Jose L. Fillat, Carles Vergara-Alert. 2009. Optimal Portfolio Choice with Predictability in House Prices and Transaction Costs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
329. Coskun Cetin, Fernando Zapatero. 2009. Optimal Acquisition of a Partially Hedgeable House. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
330. Wenli Li, Haiyong Liu, Rui Yao. 2009. Housing over Time and over the Life Cycle: A Structural Estimation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
331. Kaiji Chen. 2009. A Life-Cycle Analysis of Social Security with Housing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
332. Andrew C. Worthington. 2009. Household Asset Portfolio Diversification: Evidence from the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (Hilda) Survey. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
333. Gang-Zhi Fan, Ming Pu, Seow Eng Ong. 2009. Optimal Portfolio Choices, House Risk Hedging and the Pricing of Forward House Transactions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
334. Deborah A. Cobb-Clark, Mathias Sinning. 2009. Neighborhood Diversity and the Appreciation of Native- and Immigrant- Owned Homes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
335. Camilo Serrano, Martin Hoesli. 2009. Housing and its Role in the Household Portfolio in Colombia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
336. Luc Arrondel, Frederique Savignac. 2009. Stockholding: Does Housing Wealth Matter?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
337. Selale Tuzel. 2009. Corporate Real Estate Holdings and the Cross Section of Stock Returns. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
338. Otto Van Hemert. 2009. Household Interest Rate Risk Management. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
339. Chyi Lin Lee. 2008. Housing in Australia as a portfolio investment. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis* 1:4, 352-361. [[Crossref](#)]
340. Lu Han. 2008. Hedging house price risk in the presence of lumpy transaction costs. *Journal of Urban Economics* 64:2, 270-287. [[Crossref](#)]

341. Marco Cagetti, Mariacristina De Nardi. 2008. WEALTH INEQUALITY: DATA AND MODELS. *Macroeconomic Dynamics* 12:S2, 285-313. [[Crossref](#)]
342. Gokul Bhandari, Richard Deaves. 2008. Misinformed and informed asset allocation decisions of self-directed retirement plan members. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 29:4, 473-490. [[Crossref](#)]
343. Patricia Fraser, Martin Hoesli, Lynn McAlevey. 2008. House Prices and Bubbles in New Zealand. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 37:1, 71-91. [[Crossref](#)]
344. Antonia Díaz, María José Luengo-Prado. 2008. On the user cost and homeownership. *Review of Economic Dynamics* 11:3, 584-613. [[Crossref](#)]
345. Alexandre M. Baptista. 2008. Optimal delegated portfolio management with background risk. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 32:6, 977-985. [[Crossref](#)]
346. Lorian Pelizzon, Guglielmo Weber. 2008. Are Household Portfolios Efficient? an Analysis Conditional on Housing. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 43:2, 401-431. [[Crossref](#)]
347. Christian Hott, Pierre Monnin. 2008. Fundamental Real Estate Prices: An Empirical Estimation with International Data. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 36:4, 427-450. [[Crossref](#)]
348. Laurent Gobillon, David le Blanc. 2008. Economic effects of upfront subsidies to ownership: The case of the Prêt à Taux Zéro in France. *Journal of Housing Economics* 17:1, 1-33. [[Crossref](#)]
349. Rayna M Brown, Gregory Schwann, Callum Scott. 2008. Personal Residential Real Estate Investment in Australia: Investor Characteristics and Investment Parameters. *Real Estate Economics* 36:1, 139-173. [[Crossref](#)]
350. Marjorie Flavin, Shinobu Nakagawa. 2008. A Model of Housing in the Presence of Adjustment Costs: A Structural Interpretation of Habit Persistence. *American Economic Review* 98:1, 474-495. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
351. Juerg Syz, Paolo Vanini, Marco Salvi. 2008. Property Derivatives and Index-Linked Mortgages. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 36:1, 23-35. [[Crossref](#)]
352. Peter Englund. Residential Real Estate and Finance 1-4. [[Crossref](#)]
353. Fatih Guvenen, Hanno Lustig. Consumption-Based Asset Pricing Models (Empirical Performance) 1-6. [[Crossref](#)]
354. Todd Sinai. Urban Housing Demand 1-5. [[Crossref](#)]
355. Jiro Yoshida. 2008. Technology Shocks and Asset Price Dynamics: The Role of Housing in General Equilibrium. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
356. Deborah A. Cobb-Clark, Vincent A. Hildebrand. 2008. The Asset Portfolios of Native-Born and Foreign-Born Households. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
357. Philippe Bertrand. 2008. Another Look at Portfolio Optimization under Tracking-Error Constraints. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
358. Albert Saiz. 2008. On Local Housing Supply Elasticity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
359. Elias Oikarinen. 2008. Empirical Application of the Housing Market No-Arbitrage Condition: Problems, Solutions and a Finnish Case Study. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
360. Kristopher S. Gerardi, Paul Willen. 2008. Subprime Mortgages, Foreclosures, and Urban Neighborhoods. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
361. Frank de Jong, Joost Driessen, Otto Van Hemert. 2008. Hedging House Price Risk: Portfolio Choice With Housing Futures. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
362. Yongqiang Chu. 2008. An Intertemporal Capital Asset Pricing Model With Owner Occupied Housing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
363. Yavuz Arslan. 2008. Interest Rate Fluctuations and Equilibrium in the Housing Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

364. Plamen Iossifov, Martin Cihák, Amar Shanghavi. 2008. Interest Rate Elasticity of Residential Housing Prices. *IMF Working Papers* **08**:247, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
365. Norm Miller, Gurupdesh Pandher. 2008. Idiosyncratic Volatility and the Housing Market. *Journal of Housing Research* **17**:1, 13-32. [[Crossref](#)]
366. LUCA BENZONI, PIERRE COLLIN-DUFRESNE, ROBERT S. GOLDSTEIN. 2007. Portfolio Choice over the Life-Cycle when the Stock and Labor Markets Are Cointegrated. *The Journal of Finance* **62**:5, 2123-2167. [[Crossref](#)]
367. WENLI LI, RUI YAO. 2007. The Life-Cycle Effects of House Price Changes. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* **39**:6, 1375-1409. [[Crossref](#)]
368. Carolina Fugazza, Massimo Guidolin, Giovanna Nicodano. 2007. Investing for the Long-run in European Real Estate. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* **34**:1, 35-80. [[Crossref](#)]
369. Charles Ka Yui Leung. 2007. Equilibrium Correlations of Asset Price and Return. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* **34**:2, 233-256. [[Crossref](#)]
370. Stephen Day Cauley, Andrey D. Pavlov, Eduardo S. Schwartz. 2007. Homeownership as a Constraint on Asset Allocation. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* **34**:3, 283-311. [[Crossref](#)]
371. John Y. Campbell, João F. Cocco. 2007. How do house prices affect consumption? Evidence from micro data. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **54**:3, 591-621. [[Crossref](#)]
372. Andrea Consiglio, Flavio Cocco, Stavros A. Zenios. 2007. Scenario optimization asset and liability modelling for individual investors. *Annals of Operations Research* **152**:1, 167-191. [[Crossref](#)]
373. Monika Piazzesi, Martin Schneider, Selale Tuzel. 2007. Housing, consumption and asset pricing. *Journal of Financial Economics* **83**:3, 531-569. [[Crossref](#)]
374. C. Tsuriel Somerville, Paulina Teller, Michael Farrell, Yosh Kasahara, Li Qiang. Do Renters Miss the boat? Homeownership, Renting, and Wealth Accumulation 203-217. [[Crossref](#)]
375. Matthew Chambers, Carlos Garriga, Don Schlagenhauf. 2007. Accounting for Changes in the Homeownership Rate. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
376. Matthew Chambers, Carlos Garriga, Don Schlagenhauf. 2007. Mortgage Contracts and Housing Tenure Decisions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
377. Joseph Nichols. 2007. Nominal Mortgage Contracts and the Effects of Inflation on Portfolio Allocation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
378. Ivan Jaccard. 2007. House Prices, Real Estate Returns, and the Business Cycle. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
379. Laurent E. Calvet, John Y. Campbell, Paolo Sodini. 2007. Fight or Flight? Portfolio Rebalancing by Individual Investors. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
380. Monica Paiella, Alberto F. Pozzolo. 2007. Choosing Between Fixed and Adjustable Rate Mortgages. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
381. Wei Sun, Robert K. Triest, Anthony Webb. 2007. Optimal Retirement Asset Decumulation Strategies: The Impact of Housing Wealth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
382. Luc Arrondel, Hector F. Calvo Pardo, Xisco Oliver. 2007. Temperant Portfolio Choice and Background Risk: Evidence from France. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
383. Angela Black, Patricia Fraser, Martin Hoesli. 2006. House Prices, Fundamentals and Bubbles. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting* **33**:9-10, 1535-1555. [[Crossref](#)]
384. Norman Miller, Liang Peng. 2006. Exploring Metropolitan Housing Price Volatility. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* **33**:1, 5-18. [[Crossref](#)]
385. Joshua N. Feinman. 2006. U.S. House Prices. *The Journal of Investing* **15**:2, 42-52. [[Crossref](#)]

386. FRANCOIS ORTALO-MAGNE, SVEN RADY. 2006. Housing Market Dynamics: On the Contribution of Income Shocks and Credit Constraints*. *Review of Economic Studies* 73:2, 459-485. [[Crossref](#)]
387. Karen Holden, Charles Hatcher. Economic Status of the Aged 219-237. [[Crossref](#)]
388. Thomas Grandner, Dieter Gstach. 2006. Joint Adjustment of House Prices, Stock Prices and Output Towards Short-run Equilibrium. *Bulletin of Economic Research* 58:1, 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
389. Lu Han. 2006. Hedging House Price Risk in the Presence of Lumpy Transaction Costs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
390. Wei Sun, Robert K. Triest, Anthony Webb. 2006. Optimal Retirement Asset Decumulation Strategies: The Impact of Housing Wealth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
391. Luca Benzoni, Pierre Collin-Dufresne, Robert S. Goldstein. 2006. Portfolio Choice Over the Life-Cycle when the Stock and Labor Markets are Cointegrated. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
392. Laurent E. Calvet, John Y. Campbell, Paolo Sodini. 2006. Down or Out: Assessing the Welfare Costs of Household Investment Mistakes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
393. Kaiji Chen. 2006. The Welfare Implications of Social Security for Homeowners. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
394. Carolina Fugazza, Giovanna Nicodano, Massimo Guidolin. 2006. Investing for the Long-Run in European Real Estate. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
395. Oscar J. Arce, J. David Lopez-Salido. 2006. House Prices, Rents, and Interest Rates under Collateral Constraints. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
396. Carolina Fugazza, Giovanna Nicodano, Massimo Guidolin. 2006. Investing for the Long-Run in European Real Estate: Does Predictability Matter?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
397. Paolo Vanini, Juerg M. Syz, Marco Salvi. 2006. Property Derivatives and Index-Linked Mortgages. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
398. Martin Hoesli, Patricia Fraser, Lynn McAlevey. 2006. House Prices and Bubbles in New Zealand. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
399. G. Donald, Tony Winkler, Daniel Winkler. 2006. Single-Family Housing and Wealth Portfolios. *Journal of Real Estate Portfolio Management* 12:1, 13-22. [[Crossref](#)]
400. SARAH BROWN, KARL TAYLOR. 2005. WAGE GROWTH, HUMAN CAPITAL AND FINANCIAL INVESTMENT*. *The Manchester School* 73:6, 686-708. [[Crossref](#)]
401. Charles Himmelberg, Christopher Mayer, Todd Sinai. 2005. Assessing High House Prices: Bubbles, Fundamentals and Misperceptions. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 19:4, 67-92. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
402. Xiaoqing Hu. 2005. Portfolio choices for homeowners. *Journal of Urban Economics* 58:1, 114-136. [[Crossref](#)]
403. HANNO N. LUSTIG, STIJN G. VAN NIEUWERBURGH. 2005. Housing Collateral, Consumption Insurance, and Risk Premia: An Empirical Perspective. *The Journal of Finance* 60:3, 1167-1219. [[Crossref](#)]
404. Todd Sinai, Nicholas S. Souleles. 2005. Owner-Occupied Housing as a Hedge Against Rent Risk*. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 120:2, 763-789. [[Crossref](#)]
405. FRANCISCO GOMES, ALEXANDER MICHAELIDES. 2005. Optimal Life-Cycle Asset Allocation: Understanding the Empirical Evidence. *The Journal of Finance* 60:2, 869-904. [[Crossref](#)]
406. Rui Yao, Harold H. Zhang. 2005. Optimal Consumption and Portfolio Choices with Risky Housing and Borrowing Constraints. *Review of Financial Studies* 18:1, 197-239. [[Crossref](#)]

407. João F. Cocco. 2005. Portfolio Choice in the Presence of Housing. *Review of Financial Studies* **18**:2, 535-567. [[Crossref](#)]
408. Luca Benzoni, Pierre Collin-Dufresne, Robert S. Goldstein. 2005. Portfolio Choice over the Life-Cycle in the Presence of 'Trickle Down' Labor Income. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
409. Gene Amromin. 2005. Precautionary Savings Motives and Tax Efficiency of Household Portfolios: An Empirical Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
410. Stephen Day Cauley, Andrey D. Pavlov, Eduardo S. Schwartz. 2005. Homeownership as a Constraint on Asset Allocation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
411. Wenli Li, Rui Yao. 2005. The Life-cycle Effects of House Price Changes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
412. Stephen H. Shore, Todd M. Sinai. 2005. Commitment, Risk, and Consumption: Do Birds of a Feather Have Bigger Nests?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
413. Sebastian Barnes, Gregory Thwaites. 2005. 'Real-world' Mortgages, Consumption Volatility and the Low Inflation Environment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
414. Marco Cagetti, Mariacristina De Nardi. 2005. Wealth Inequality: Data and Models. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
415. Steven C. Bourassa, Donald R. Haurin, Jessica L. Haurin, Martin Hoesli, Jian Sun. 2005. House Price Changes and Idiosyncratic Risk: The Impact of Property Characteristics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
416. François Ortalo-Magné, Sven Rady. 2004. Housing transactions and macroeconomic fluctuations: a case study of England and Wales. *Journal of Housing Economics* **13**:4, 287-303. [[Crossref](#)]
417. Olivia S. Mitchell, John Piggott. 2004. Unlocking housing equity in Japan. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* **18**:4, 466-505. [[Crossref](#)]
418. Una Okonkwo Osili. 2004. Migrants and Housing Investments: Theory and Evidence from Nigeria. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* **52**:4, 821-849. [[Crossref](#)]
419. Thomas P. Boehm, Alan M. Schlottmann. 2004. The dynamics of race, income, and homeownership. *Journal of Urban Economics* **55**:1, 113-130. [[Crossref](#)]
420. Hanno N. Lustig, Stijn Van Nieuwerburgh. 2004. Housing Collateral, Consumption Insurance and Risk Premia: An Empirical Perspective. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
421. John Y. Campbell, Joao F. Cocco. 2004. How do House Prices Affect Consumption? Evidence from Micro Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
422. Hanno N. Lustig, Stijn Van Nieuwerburgh. 2004. A Theory of Housing Collateral, Consumption Insurance and Risk Premia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
423. Raj Chetty, Adam Szeidl. 2004. Consumption Commitments and Asset Prices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
424. Robert B. Couch. 2004. Portfolio Choice With Complementary Housing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
425. John Benjamin, Peter Chinloy, Donald Jud. 2004. Why Do Households Concentrate Their Wealth in Housing?. *Journal of Real Estate Research* **26**:4, 329-344. [[Crossref](#)]
426. Robert D. Dietz, Donald R. Haurin. 2003. The social and private micro-level consequences of homeownership. *Journal of Urban Economics* **54**:3, 401-450. [[Crossref](#)]
427. J. Y. Campbell, J. F. Cocco. 2003. Household Risk Management and Optimal Mortgage Choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **118**:4, 1449-1494. [[Crossref](#)]
428. Peter Englund. 2003. Taxing Residential Housing Capital. *Urban Studies* **40**:5-6, 937-952. [[Crossref](#)]

- 429. Takashi Yamashita. 2003. Owner-occupied housing and investment in stocks: an empirical test. *Journal of Urban Economics* **53**:2, 220-237. [[Crossref](#)]
- 430. Todd M. Sinai, Nicholas S. Souleles. 2003. Owner-Occupied Housing as a Hedge Against Rent Risk. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
- 431. Francisco J. Gomes, Alexander Michaelides. 2003. Optimal Life-Cycle Asset Allocation: Understanding the Empirical Evidence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
- 432. Lorian Pelizzon, Guglielmo Weber. 2003. Are Household Portfolios Efficient? An Analysis Conditional on Housing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
- 433. Francisco J. Gomes, Alexander Michaelides. 2002. Life-Cycle Asset Allocation: A Model with Borrowing Constraints, Uninsurable Labor Income Risk and Stock-Market Participation Costs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
- 434. Roberto Camagni, Dino Martellato. The Milan Housing Market 213-240. [[Crossref](#)]