working paper 0007R

Home Production Meets Time-to-build

by Paul Gomme, Finn Kydland, and Peter Rupert

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF CLEVELAND

Working Paper 00-07 R

Home Production Meets Time-to-Build

by Paul Gomme, Finn Kydland and Peter Rupert

Paul Gomme and Peter Rupert are at the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.
Finn Kydland is at Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

June 2000

Home Production Meets Time-to-Build

by Paul Gomme, Finn Kydland and Peter Rupert

An innovation in this paper is to introduce a time-to-build technology for the production of market capital into a model with home production. Our main finding is that the two anomalies that have plagued all household production models—the positive correlation between business and household investment, and household investment leading business investment over the business cycle—are resolved when time-to-build is added.

Home Production Meets Time-to-build*

Paul Gomme, Finn Kydland and Peter Rupert

December 1999

Abstract: An innovation in this paper is to introduce a time-to-build technology for the production of market capital into a model with home production. Our main finding is that the two anomalies that have plagued all household production models—the positive correlation between business and household investment, and household investment leading business investment over the business cycle—are resolved when time-to-build is added.

Keywords: home production, time-to-build, business cycles, investment

*Affiliations: Gomme, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland and CREFE/UQAM; Kydland, Carnegie-Mellon University and Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; Rupert, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. The views stated herein are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland or of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

1 Introduction

The household sector is large. For example, Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991) report that household capital actually exceeds market capital. Further, Benhabib, Rogerson, and Wright (1991) estimate that the output of the household sector may be as much as half that of the market sector, and that labor hours in the home sector are almost as great as in the market sector. Additionally, home investment (purchases of consumer durables and residential housing) exceeds that of market investment (purchases of nonresidential structures, equipment and inventories). Consequently, as suggested by Benhabib et al. (1991) and Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991), it seems plausible that accounting for home production and its interaction with market production may be important for understanding many macroeconomic phenomena. Yet, it seems fair to say that household production has not really taken hold in the profession despite the many papers that have pursued that idea and refined the necessary measurements. A reason may be that, in light of household-production theory, there are too many anomalies in the data. This paper attempts to settle the issue of the importance of household production for understanding the business cycle.

One key anomaly is that there is a *positive* correlation between market and home investment in the U.S. data, while the basic home production models of Benhabib et al. (1991) and Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991) predict a *negative* comovement. Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991) obtain a positive correlation by assuming: (a) that the household production function exhibits strong complementarity between home capital and home labor; (b) that preferences allow a high degree of substitutability between market and home consumption goods; and (c) that the shocks to market and home productivity are perfectly correlated.[1]

[1] As shown in Greenwood, Rogerson, and Wright (1995), perfect correlation in the shocks is not necessary to

More importantly, the U.S. data reveal that household investment *leads* the cycle by about one quarter while market investment *lags* by about a quarter. As shown below, both the Benhabib et al. (1991) and Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991) models predict exactly the opposite pattern: that home investment *lags* the cycle and that market investment *leads*. This phase shift pattern is such an interesting and striking feature of the data that home production models that cannot replicate this phase shift must be considered a failure.

The principal innovation of this paper is to introduce a time-to-build technology for the production of market capital into an otherwise standard household production model. With time-to-build, initiating a market investment project in the current period yields useful capital several periods hence. Furthermore, starting a project today implies a commitment of resources to this project not only in the current period, but in all periods leading to project completion. By way of contrast, home production is subject to a standard one period time-to-build; that is, investment today yields home capital in the next period.

In the basic home production model, an improvement in market productivity leads, on impact, to a sharp rise in market investment, and a fall in home investment. This pattern arises because market investment allows greater future market output. As a result, it is only in subsequent periods that home investment rises. With time-to-build, only a fraction of the total resources for market investment are needed in the impact period. That is, the impact response on market investment is spread out over the length of time it takes to complete a project. Loosely speaking, time-to-build makes it prohibitively costly to quickly bring on line new units of market capital. At the same time, time-to-build reduces the cost (in terms of consumption and leisure) of increasing

generate the positive correlation in market and home investment, although the shocks must be *very highly* correlated.

the market capital stock at longer horizons. These two effects induce a positive comovement between market and home investment. The same mechanisms also operate in regard to the lead-lag patterns of the two investment series. So, it appears that time-to-build is an essential feature of reasonably calibrated household production models to match the cyclical properties of market and home investment.

2 The Economic Environment

2.1 Households

The representative household has preferences over market consumption, c_{Mt}, home consumption, c_{Ht}, market hours, h_{Mt}, and home hours, h_{Ht}, summarized by

$$E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t U(c_{Mt}, c_{Ht}, h_{Mt}, h_{Ht}), \quad 0 < \beta < 1. \tag{1}$$

The momentary utility function has the following form:

$$U(c_M, c_H, h_M, h_H) = \begin{cases} \omega \ln C(c_M, c_H) + (1-\omega)\ln(1-h_M-h_H) & \text{if } \gamma = 1, \\ \frac{[C(c_M,c_H)^{\omega}(1-h_M-h_H)^{1-\omega}]^{1-\gamma}-1}{1-\gamma} & \text{if } 0 < \gamma < 1 \text{ or } \gamma > 1, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where the consumption aggregator is

$$C(c_M, c_H) = \begin{cases} c_M^{\psi} c_H^{1-\psi} & \text{if } \xi = 0, \\ \left[\psi c_M^{\xi} + (1-\psi) c_H^{\xi}\right]^{1/\xi} & \text{if } \xi < 0 \text{ or } 0 < \xi < 1. \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Households face a number of constraints. First, its budget constraint is

$$c_{Mt} + x_{Mt} + x_{Ht} = (1-\tau_K) r_t k_{Mt} + (1-\tau_H) w_t h_{Mt} + \delta_M \tau_K k_{Mt} + \tau_t. \tag{4}$$

Here, k_{Mt} is the household's stock of market capital, r_t is the rental price of capital, w_t is the real wage rate, and x_{Mt} and x_{Ht} are investment in market and home capital, respectively. Capital income is taxed at the rate τ_K while labor income is taxed at the rate τ_H. Notice that in (4) the tax rate τ_K

applies to gross capital income. The term $\delta_M \tau_K k_{Mt}$ captures the depreciation allowance built into the U.S. tax code. Finally, τ_t is a lump-sum transfer from the government.

Second, as in Kydland and Prescott (1982), capital projects are subject to a J-period time-to-build technology constraint. Specifically, starting a project at date t requires investment of resources at dates t, $t+1$, ... $t+J-1$, with the capital finally being ready for use at date $t+J$. A project j periods from completion requires a fraction ϕ_j of the total resources required for that project. Let s_{jt} be the number of projects which are j periods from completion at date t. Then, total market investment is

$$x_{Mt} = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \phi_j s_{jt}. \tag{5}$$

Further, the project commitments evolve according to

$$s_{j-1,t+1} = s_{jt}, \quad j = 2, \ldots, J. \tag{6}$$

That is, a project which is j periods from completion at date t will be $j-1$ periods from completion in the next period.

Third, the household's capital stocks evolve according to

$$k_{Mt+1} = (1-\delta_M)k_{Mt} + s_{1t}, \text{ and} \tag{7}$$

$$k_{Ht+1} = (1-\delta_H)k_{Ht} + x_{Ht} \tag{8}$$

where δ_M and δ_H are the depreciation rates of market and home capital, respectively. Recall that s_{1t} represents the number of projects which are one period from completion as of the beginning of period t.

Finally, home production is described by

$$c_{Ht} = H(k_{Ht}, h_{Ht}; z_{Ht}). \tag{9}$$

The home production function has the form

$$H(k_h, h_H; z_H) = \begin{cases} e^{z_H} k_H^{\eta} h_H^{1-\eta} & \text{if } \zeta = 0 \\ e^{z_H} \left[\eta k_H^{\zeta} + (1-\eta) h_H^{\zeta}\right]^{1/\zeta} & \text{if } \zeta < 0 \text{ or } 0 < \zeta < 1. \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

The home productivity shock evolves as

$$z_{H,t+1} = \rho_H z_{Ht} + \varepsilon_{Ht}, \quad \varepsilon_{Ht} \sim N(0, \sigma_H^2). \tag{11}$$

2.2 Firms

Goods producing firms act competitively and seek to maximize profits,

$$F(K_{Mt}, H_{Mt}; z_{Mt}) - r_t K_{Mt} - w_t H_{Mt}. \tag{12}$$

The production function is Cobb-Douglas,

$$F(K_M, H_M; z_M) = e^{z_M} K_M^{\alpha} H_M^{1-\alpha} \tag{13}$$

and the market productivity shock evolves according to

$$z_{Mt+1} = \rho_M z_{Mt} + \varepsilon_{Mt}, \quad \varepsilon_{Mt} \sim N(0, \sigma_M^2). \tag{14}$$

2.3 Government

In this economy, the government raises revenue via labor and capital taxes, lump-sum rebating the proceeds to households:

$$\tau_t = \tau_K r_t K_{Mt} + \tau_H w_t H_{Mt} - \delta_M \tau_K K_{Mt}. \tag{15}$$

As discussed in Greenwood et al. (1995), the reason for including taxes is that they have important implications for the calibration procedure; this issue is discussed in more detail in Section 3.

3 Calibration

The model is calibrated using the procedure set out by Kydland and Prescott (1982). In particular, as many parameters as possible are set in advance based on either *a priori* information concerning their magnitude, or so as to match certain long run averages observed in the postwar U.S. economy.

The set of parameters which need to be assigned values are summarized in Table 2.[2] Except for the parameters governing time-to-build, the values are either the same as in Model 1 of Greenwood et al. (1995) or calibrated to match the same long run averages. To start, a model period corresponds to one quarter. Setting the discount factor, β to $1.06^{-1/4}$ thus generates an annual real interest rate of 6 percent in steady state. The coefficient of relative risk aversion, γ, is set to one which implies logarithmic preferences. The home production function and consumption aggregator are assumed to be Cobb-Douglas; thus, $\xi = \zeta = 0$. Evidence on U.S. Solow residuals motivates setting $\rho_M = 0.95$ and $\sigma_M = 0.00763$; see Prescott (1986).

Absent hard evidence to guide the choice of the stochastic process describing the home technology shock, it is assumed that the home shock process is the same as that of the market shock, i.e., $\rho_H = 0.95$ and $\sigma_H = 0.00763$. The correlation between the innovations to the market and home shocks (i.e., between ε_{Mt} and ε_{Ht}) is set to $2/3$. In the home production literature to date, the value of this correlation has important implications for the cyclical behavior of home and market investment. In particular, Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991) require virtually a perfect correlation for their household production model to predict a positive correlation between the two investment series. The parameterization of our baseline model—in particular, the logarithmic preferences and

[2] Table 2 summarizes parameter values for the 4-period time-to-build model. For the benchmark home production model, the calibration procedure implies slightly different values for the parameters ω, ψ, η and α.

Cobb-Douglas home production function and consumption aggregator—imply enough separability that the home production shock only affects home consumption and aggregated consumption. That is, none of the market variables respond to a home productivity shock. Consequently, apart for home and aggregated consumption, none of the baseline model results would change if the home productivity shock were simply dropped from the model.

Following Kydland and Prescott (1982), when time-to-build is in play, it takes four quarters to complete a market investment project, and each period ¼ of the total resources are used. Thus, $J = 4$ and $\phi_j = 1/4$ for $j = 1,2,3,4$. Models without time-to-build correspond to a one period time-to-build. That is, $J = 1$ and $\phi_1 = 1$. The longer gestation time for market investment projects vis-à-vis home investment projects is motivated by empirical plausibility: construction of residential structures, for example, often take roughly a quarter while nonresidential structures such as office towers take a year or so to build, while factories may take longer.

The parameters ω, ψ, α, η, δ_H and δ_M are chosen such that in steady state:

1. Market hours, h_M, is $1/3$ and home hours, h_H, is $1/4$. These values are consistent with evidence from time use surveys.

2. Market capital, k_M, is four times market output while home capital, k_H, is five times market output.

3. Market investment, x_M, is 11.8% of market output while home investment, x_H, is 13.5% of market output.

The tax rates are set to $\tau_K = 0.70$ and $\tau_H = 0.25$. Along with the restrictions above, these tax rates imply the values for ω, ψ, α, η, δ_H and δ_M given in Table 2. At first blush, the tax rate on capital may seem quite high. It is, however, well within the range of *effective* capital income tax rates reported by Feldstein, Dicks-Mireaux, and Poterba (1983). Further, Greenwood et al. (1995) argue that τ_K should also incorporate the effects of the cornucopia of regulations faced by business. They also point out that τ_K is an important parameter for generating a reasonable capital share parameter in the market sector (given the restrictions above, in particular the market capital to market output ratio). Models without home production do not seem to have such a problem (related to income taxation) for they calibrate to a much higher capital-output ratio since market and home capital are lumped together.

4 Findings

Since the parameterization of the baseline model is chosen to be consistent with several other papers incorporating home production, it also shares their successes and failures. Although attention will be focused on the cyclical pattern of market and home investment, a fairly comprehensive set of business cycle moments can be found in Tables 3 (for the U.S. economy) and 4 (for the household production-only baseline model). For all tables of business cycle moments, the data has been detrended by taking logarithms and Hodrick-Prescott filtering. For a more complete assessment of the baseline model's strengths and weaknesses, see Model 1 of Greenwood et al. (1995).

One feature, emphasized by Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991) and Greenwood et al. (1995), is the contemporaneous correlation between market and home investment. Table 6 reports that for the U.S. economy, this correlation is 0.41 while the "standard" household production model predicts a value of -0.10. It was this failure of the standard model that led Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991) to make the following assumptions: (1) the market and home shocks are perfectly correlated; (2)

a high degree of substitutability in the consumption aggregator ($\xi = 2/3$); and a high degree of complementarity in the home production function ($\zeta = -1/2$). These assumptions are problematic. For instance, while there is little direct evidence on the size of the correlation between the market and home shocks, indirect evidence suggests that it is less than perfect. Regulatory changes, by way of example, are unlikely to have the same effect on market and home production. Furthermore, as pointed out by Kydland (1995), it is hard to reconcile any deviation from Cobb-Douglas (for either the home production function or consumption aggregator) with the fact that the price of durable goods relative to nondurables has exhibited a secular decline while the expenditure share of durables has remained fairly constant.[3] Benhabib et al. (1991) face similar challenges in regard to their parameter choices.[4]

Less attention has been placed on the lead-lag patterns of the investment series. In the U.S. data, home investment *leads* the cycle by one quarter while market investment *lags* by one quarter. By way of contrast, the baseline model predicts that home investment *lags* output by a quarter and that market investment is coincident-to-leading. That is, the baseline home production model predicts that investment is *out of phase* relative to the U.S. data.

4.1 Reintroducing Time-to-build

As stated in Section 3, the time-to-build version of the baseline model has a time-to-build for market investment of four quarters, and a standard one quarter time-to-build for home investment. Business cycle moments for this model are contained in Tables 5 and 6. Regarding the business

[3]It would be fairly straightforward to add to our model a relative price of durables, $q_t = q_0 e^{q_1 t}$. For $q_1 < 0$, the relative price of durables falls over time. It is well-known that Cobb-Douglas preferences imply constant expenditure shares. Consequently, given the utility function, (2), we would require that both the consumption aggregator and home production function to be of the Cobb-Douglas variety.

[4]McGrattan, Rogerson, and Wright (1997) cannot address this issue since they ignore the price data.

cycle behavior of the two investment series, two results stand out. First, the correlation between home and market investment matches that observed in the U.S. data. Second, home investment is now coincident-to-leading (the U.S. data displays a lead of one quarter) while market investment is coincident with the cycle (the U.S. data displays a lag of one quarter). In both regards, the time-to-build version of the model more closely conforms with the U.S. data than the baseline model with household production only.

Figure 1, which plots the response of output and the two investment series to a one standard deviation innovation to the market shock, clearly demonstrates why time-to-build makes such a difference with respect to the behavior of the investment series.[5] For the baseline household production model, the immediate response is for the two investment series to move in opposite directions. The reason for this is the production asymmetry assumed in all home production models: market output can be used to augment the home capital stock, but home output can only be used as home consumption. Consequently, on impact the market capital stock is built up in order to produce more future output which is then used to build up the home capital stock. The initial increase in market investment occurs at the cost of lower home investment. Only in subsequent periods do the two investment series move in tandem.

The effect of time-to-build is to mute the impact effect of the shock on market investment by drawing out the response over the four quarters it takes to build market capital. The smaller impact effect results from the fact that initiating a market investment project in the current period requires only ¼ of the total resources used by the project. As a result, home investment need not take such a big hit in the initial period of the shock. In fact, as seen in Figure 1, the parameterization for

[5]Responses to the home shock are not presented because, as mentioned in Section 3, the baseline parameterization implies that these variables do not respond to the home shock.

the baseline time-to-build model implies that home investment *rises* on impact, with diminishing effects in the three subsequent quarters as subsequent market investment projects are initiated. Intuitively, time-to-build reduces the cost, in terms of consumption and leisure, of market investment, thereby permitting greater home investment.

4.2 Other Home Production Models Meet Time-to-build

This section anaylzes how incorporating time-to-build affects the results of the models discussed in the Introduction, namely, Benhabib et al. (1991), McGrattan et al. (1997) and Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991). The business cycle properties of market and home investment for each of these models, along with the U.S. data and the baseline model, are summarized in Table 6.

The Benhabib et al. (1991) specification corresponds to $\xi = 2/3$ (increased substitutability between market and home consumption) with all other parameters calibrated as in Section 3. It should not be too surprising that without time-to-build, this model shares many of the same deficiencies as the baseline home production model. In particular, the investment series are out of phase relative to the data, and the two investment series are strongly negatively correlated. Furthermore, the volatility of the individual investment series is grossly counterfactual. Adding time-to-build to the Benhabib et al. (1991) specification has the following effects: (1) it lessens the negative correlation between home and market investment; (2) it reduces the volatility of both these series; and (3) home investment is now coincident with the cycle while market investment still leads. While not as successful as the baseline model, time-to-build nonetheless improves the coherence between the Benhabib et al. (1991) model and the U.S. data.

McGrattan et al. (1997) is more-or-less an estimated version of Benhabib et al. (1991). In this case, $\xi = 0.4$ (still more substitutability between market and home consumption than the baseline model), and $\text{corr}(\varepsilon_{Mt}, \varepsilon_{Ht}) = 0$ (the innovations to the market and home shocks are uncorrelated). Qualitatively, this model's performance is quite similar to the previous model—at least in regard to the cyclical behavior of the investment series. As above, adding time-to-build brings the investment volatilities closer to the data, and lessens the negative correlation between the investment series. As well, market and home investment are both coincident with the cycle. Once more, time-to-build brings the model closer to matching U.S. business cycle experience.

Our parameterization of Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991) nearly matches that in Greenwood et al. (1995) (see Model 4). Specifically, $\xi = {}^2\!/_3$, $\zeta = -{}^1\!/_2$ (implying greater complementarity between home capital and labor than is present in the baseline model), and $\text{corr}(\varepsilon_{Mt}, \varepsilon_{Ht}) = 0.995$ which implies that the market and home shocks (z_{Mt} and z_{Ht}) will be nearly perfectly correlated. Relative to the other straight home production models, the Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991) specification performs quite well with regards to the cyclical behavior of home and market investment. For example, the correlation between these series nearly matches the U.S. data, the investment volatilities are close to that in the data, as is their phase pattern (market investment is coincident with the cycle rather than lagging while home investment is coincident-to-leading as opposed to a definite lead in the data). Adding time-to-build worsens the correlation between home and market investment slightly. However, this is the only model that matches the lag in market investment seen in the data. Furthermore, the other home production models tend to predict that market investment is more volatile than home investment whereas the opposite is true in the data. Adding time-to-build to the Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991) model helps on this dimension as well.

4.3 Sensitivity Analysis

The results of a further set of experiments is summarized in Table 7. In particular, we explore the sensitivity of our results to a higher coefficient of relative risk aversion ($\gamma = 2$), a higher discount factor ($\beta = 0.99$) and a lower tax rate on capital income ($\tau_K = 0.50$). Qualitatively, the results for each experiment are quite similar to those seen for the baseline model. In particular, time-to-build has the following effects: (1) it improves the correlation between market and home investment; and (2) it brings the phase pattern of both investment series closer to that seen in the data. These results suggest that the improvements obtained by adding time-to-build to the baseline model are fairly general and are not artifacts of a judicious choice of parameter values.

5 Conclusion

The standard home production model makes two counterfactual predictions: market and home investment are negatively correlated while the data exhibits a positive correlation; and that market and home investment are out of phase relative to the data. On this second point, in the data market investment lags the cycle by about one quarter while the basic home production model predicts that market investment is coincident-to-leading, and in the data home investment leads the cycle whereas the model predicts that a lagging pattern. These anomalies are largely resolved when time-to-build is added to the home production model. In particular, adding time-to-build produces a positive correlation between market and home investment (for our parameterization, it actually matches the U.S. data), and brings the phase pattern of the investment series more closely in line with the data. The slight leading pattern of market investment in the baseline home production model is coincident under time-to-build while the lagging behavior of home investment becomes coincident-to-leading. The parameterization is otherwise standard. Specifically, the home production function is Cobb-Douglas as is the aggregator of market and home consumption. Kydland (1995) argued that any deviation from Cobb-Douglas is difficult to reconcile in the fact of key balanced growth facts, in particular the secular decline in the price of durables relative to nondurables and the constant expenditure share of durables.

The successes of existing home production models has come at a high cost. For example, Benhabib et al. (1991) emphasis the role of household production in generating procyclical movement in the labor input in different sectors. This and other modest improvements in business cycle behavior is bought at the cost of the anomalies listed above. Further, as shown in Table 6, the volatility of market and home investment is grossly at variance with the data. Much the same can be said of McGrattan et al. (1997) As discussed in Subsection 4.2, adding time-to-build to these models moves each of them to greater conformance with the observed cyclical properties of market and home investment. Although the Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991) model has fewer problems—at least with regards to the cyclical pattern of the investment series—even here time-to-build makes positive contributions.

References

Benhabib, Jess, Rogerson, Richard, and Wright, Randall. "Homework in Macroeconomics: Household Production and Aggregate Fluctuations." *The Journal of Political Economy* 99 (December 1991): 1166.

Feldstein, Martin, Dicks-Mireaux, Louis, and Poterba, James. "The Effective Tax Rate and the Pretax Rate of Return." *Journal of Public Economics* 21 (July 1983): 129–158.

Greenwood, Jeremy, and Hercowitz, Zvi. "The Allocation of Capital and Time over the Business Cycle." *The Journal of Political Economy* 99 (December 1991): 1188.

Greenwood, Jeremy, Rogerson, Richard, and Wright, Randall. "Household Production in Real Business Cycle Theory." In Thomas Cooley, editor, "Frontiers of Business Cycle Research," Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press (1995): 157–174.

Kydland, Finn. "Business Cycles and Aggregate Labor Market Fluctuations." In Thomas Cooley, editor, "Frontiers of Business Cycle Research," Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press (1995): 126–156.

Kydland, Finn E., and Prescott, Edward C. "Time to Build and Aggregate Fluctuations." *Econometrica* 50 (November 1982): 1345–1370.

McGrattan, Ellen R., Rogerson, Richard, and Wright, Randall. "An Equilibrium Model of the Business Cycle with Household Production and Fiscal Policy." *International Economic Review* 38 (May 1997): 267–90.

Prescott, Edward C. “Theory Ahead of Business Cycle Measurement.” *Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis Quarterly Review* 10 (Fall 1986): 9–22.

Appendix: Data Reference

Table 1: Data sources

Series	Haver Analytics Mnenomic
Gross Domestic Product	GDPH
Consumption	
Non-durables	CNH
Services	CSH
Housing Services	CSRH
Durables	CDH
Private Non-residential Fixed Investment	FNH
Private Residential Fixed Investment	FRH
Hours	LHTPRIVA

All data quarterly and seasonally adjusted at annual rates. Apart from hours, all data is real chained 1992 dollars. Hours corresponds to the Bureau of Labor Statistics aggregate hours, private non-agricultural wage and salary workers.

$$\text{Consumption} = \text{Non-durables} + \text{Services} - \text{Housing Services}$$

$$\text{Market Investment} = \text{Private Non-resiential Fixed Investment}$$

$$\text{Househole Investment} = \text{Durables} + \text{Private Residential Fixed Investment}$$

$$\text{Productivity} = \text{Gross Domestic Product} \div \text{Hours}$$

Table 2: Baseline Parameters

Preferences		
β	0.9855	discount factor
ω	0.6755	consumption-leisure weight
γ	1.0	coefficient of relative risk aversion
ψ	0.5583	market-home consumption weight
ξ	0.0	CES parameter in consumption aggregator
Home Production		
η	0.3526	capital-labor weight
ζ	0.0	CES parameter
δ_H	0.027	depreciation rate
Time-to-build		
J	4	number of project periods
ϕ_j	0.25	fraction of resources used at stage j
Market Production		
α	0.3267	capital share
δ_M	0.0295	depreciation rate
Government		
τ_H	0.25	tax rate on labor income
τ_K	0.70	tax rate on capital income
Shocks		
ρ_M	0.95	market shock autocorrelation
ρ_H	0.95	home shock autocorrelation
σ_M	0.00763	standard deviation of market shock innovation
σ_H	0.00763	standard deviation of home shock innovation
$\text{corr}(\varepsilon_{Mt}, \varepsilon_{Ht})$	0.6667	correlation of the innovations

Table 3: US Economy: Selected Moments

	Standard Deviation	Cross Correlation of Real Output With								
		x_{t-4}	x_{t-3}	x_{t-2}	x_{t-1}	x_t	x_{t+1}	x_{t+2}	x_{t+3}	x_{t+4}
Gross Domestic Product	1.66	0.13	0.37	0.62	0.85	1.00	0.85	0.62	0.37	0.13
Market Consumption	0.95	0.34	0.53	0.68	0.79	0.80	0.67	0.48	0.28	0.07
Market Investment	4.73	−0.14	0.04	0.29	0.56	0.80	0.87	0.82	0.68	0.46
Market Investment	4.73	−0.14	0.04	0.29	0.56	0.80	0.87	0.82	0.68	0.46
Household Investment	6.74	0.47	0.61	0.74	0.80	0.76	0.52	0.24	−0.03	−0.25
Total Investment	4.95	0.29	0.47	0.68	0.84	0.90	0.76	0.53	0.26	−0.00
Aggregate Hours	1.79	−0.11	0.11	0.38	0.66	0.88	0.91	0.80	0.63	0.41
Productivity	0.86	0.49	0.48	0.41	0.26	0.10	−0.26	−0.48	−0.59	−0.59

Table 4: Home Production Only: Selected Moments

	Standard Deviation	Cross Correlation of Real Output With								
		x_{t-4}	x_{t-3}	x_{t-2}	x_{t-1}	x_t	x_{t+1}	x_{t+2}	x_{t+3}	x_{t+4}
Output	1.43	0.10	0.27	0.47	0.73	1.00	0.73	0.47	0.27	0.10
Market Consumption	0.58	−0.02	0.15	0.38	0.67	0.97	0.76	0.57	0.40	0.26
Home Consumption	0.88	0.02	0.12	0.24	0.38	0.52	0.37	0.27	0.19	0.11
Aggregated Consumption	0.63	0.00	0.15	0.34	0.58	0.83	0.62	0.46	0.32	0.20
Market Investment	7.45	0.19	0.32	0.46	0.64	0.78	0.16	0.03	−0.05	−0.11
Home Investment	4.58	−0.02	0.07	0.19	0.33	0.53	0.96	0.66	0.40	0.21
Total Investment	4.03	0.15	0.31	0.51	0.75	0.99	0.71	0.43	0.20	0.03
Market Hours	0.58	0.18	0.33	0.52	0.76	0.99	0.69	0.40	0.17	−0.01
Home Hours	0.29	−0.18	−0.33	−0.52	−0.76	−0.99	−0.69	−0.40	−0.17	0.01
Total Hours	0.21	0.18	0.33	0.52	0.76	0.99	0.69	0.40	0.17	−0.01
Market Capital	0.51	−0.31	−0.16	0.04	0.32	0.65	0.70	0.69	0.64	0.57
Home Capital	0.37	−0.49	−0.45	−0.37	−0.25	−0.06	0.27	0.49	0.61	0.67
Total Capital	0.40	−0.48	−0.42	−0.32	−0.16	0.06	0.35	0.54	0.64	0.68
Productivity	0.85	0.05	0.22	0.43	0.71	0.99	0.75	0.52	0.33	0.17

Table 5: Home Production with Time-to-build: Selected Moments

	Standard Deviation	Cross Correlation of Real Output With								
		x_{t-4}	x_{t-3}	x_{t-2}	x_{t-1}	x_t	x_{t+1}	x_{t+2}	x_{t+3}	x_{t+4}
Output	1.29	0.16	0.25	0.41	0.66	1.00	0.66	0.41	0.25	0.16
Market Consumption	0.55	0.05	0.16	0.34	0.61	0.97	0.75	0.55	0.38	0.24
Home Consumption	0.91	0.07	0.14	0.24	0.38	0.56	0.43	0.29	0.17	0.05
Aggregated Consumption	0.63	0.07	0.17	0.32	0.54	0.83	0.64	0.45	0.29	0.15
Market Investment	4.79	0.22	0.30	0.44	0.64	0.86	0.63	0.39	0.10	−0.26
Home Investment	3.82	0.13	0.17	0.29	0.49	0.80	0.39	0.18	0.21	0.50
Total Investment	3.59	0.21	0.29	0.43	0.67	0.99	0.61	0.34	0.18	0.12
Market Hours	0.52	0.24	0.31	0.45	0.67	0.98	0.58	0.30	0.14	0.10
Home Hours	0.25	−0.24	−0.30	−0.45	−0.67	−0.98	−0.58	−0.29	−0.14	−0.10
Total Hours	0.18	0.24	0.31	0.45	0.67	0.98	0.58	0.29	0.14	0.10
Market Capital	0.51	−0.41	−0.36	−0.28	−0.12	−0.02	0.16	0.45	0.83	0.63
Home Capital	0.29	−0.42	−0.35	−0.23	−0.05	0.25	0.38	0.43	0.49	0.66
Total Capital	0.36	−0.47	−0.44	−0.38	−0.27	−0.09	0.10	0.27	0.47	0.74
Productivity	0.79	0.11	0.21	0.38	0.64	0.99	0.71	0.48	0.31	0.20

Table 6: Model Comparisons

Model	Corr.	Standard Deviation	Cross Correlation of Real Output With								
			x_{t-4}	x_{t-3}	x_{t-2}	x_{t-1}	x_t	x_{t+1}	x_{t+2}	x_{t+3}	x_{t+4}
US Data	0.41	4.73	−0.14	0.04	0.29	0.56	0.80	0.87	0.82	0.68	0.46
		6.74	0.47	0.61	0.74	0.80	0.76	0.52	0.24	−0.03	−0.25
HP Only	−0.10	7.45	0.19	0.32	0.46	0.64	0.78	0.16	0.03	−0.05	−0.11
		4.58	−0.02	0.07	0.19	0.33	0.53	0.96	0.66	0.40	0.21
HP TTB	0.41	4.79	0.22	0.30	0.44	0.64	0.86	0.63	0.39	0.10	−0.26
		3.82	0.13	0.17	0.29	0.49	0.80	0.39	0.18	0.21	0.50
BRW	−0.87	23.02	0.15	0.22	0.30	0.41	0.24	−0.09	−0.10	−0.11	−0.11
		20.51	−0.09	−0.10	−0.10	−0.13	0.13	0.35	0.25	0.18	0.12
BRW TTB	−0.76	10.30	0.33	0.24	0.25	0.30	0.26	0.21	0.12	−0.04	−0.23
		11.56	−0.18	−0.07	−0.00	0.11	0.37	0.17	0.09	0.15	0.29
MRW	−0.82	16.25	0.18	0.26	0.37	0.50	0.46	−0.10	−0.12	−0.14	−0.14
		12.74	−0.10	−0.10	−0.09	−0.10	0.08	0.55	0.40	0.28	0.18
MRW TTB	−0.59	8.40	0.33	0.32	0.39	0.51	0.59	0.36	0.15	−0.09	−0.39
		7.19	−0.10	−0.07	−0.03	0.05	0.28	0.16	0.16	0.31	0.62
GH	0.37	5.25	0.13	0.26	0.43	0.64	0.86	0.62	0.38	0.18	0.03
		3.97	0.14	0.25	0.39	0.54	0.77	0.44	0.24	0.09	−0.03
GH TTB	0.23	3.71	0.02	0.12	0.25	0.45	0.71	0.81	0.74	0.55	0.23
		5.21	0.15	0.22	0.36	0.57	0.83	0.26	−0.10	−0.23	−0.17

Notes: A "TTB" suffix to a model denotes the time-to-build version of that model. "HP Only" refers to the baseline model. "BRW" refers to the Benhabib et al. (1991) home production model. "MRW" denotes the McGrattan et al. (1997) parameterization. "GH" denotes the Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991) parameterization.

The "Corr." column refers to the correlation between market and home investment.

For *each* model, the first row of leads and lags with output is for market investment while the second is for home investment.

Table 7: Sensitivity Analysis

Model	Corr.	Standard Deviation	Cross Correlation of Real Output With x_{t-4}	x_{t-3}	x_{t-2}	x_{t-1}	x_t	x_{t+1}	x_{t+2}	x_{t+3}	x_{t+4}
US Data	0.41	4.73	−0.14	0.04	0.29	0.56	0.80	0.87	0.82	0.68	0.46
		6.74	0.47	0.61	0.74	0.80	0.76	0.52	0.24	−0.03	−0.25
HP Only	−0.10	7.45	0.19	0.32	0.46	0.64	0.78	0.16	0.03	−0.05	−0.11
		4.58	−0.02	0.07	0.19	0.33	0.53	0.96	0.66	0.40	0.21
HP TTB	0.41	4.79	0.22	0.30	0.44	0.64	0.86	0.63	0.39	0.10	−0.26
		3.82	0.13	0.17	0.29	0.49	0.80	0.39	0.18	0.21	0.50
$\gamma = 2$	0.13	6.19	0.18	0.31	0.46	0.65	0.83	0.26	0.11	0.01	−0.08
		3.63	−0.00	0.11	0.25	0.43	0.65	0.95	0.65	0.40	0.20
$\gamma = 2$, TTB	0.46	4.44	0.19	0.28	0.43	0.63	0.87	0.67	0.43	0.16	−0.20
		3.50	0.12	0.18	0.31	0.53	0.83	0.39	0.16	0.17	0.41
$\beta = 0.99$	0.10	7.37	0.18	0.31	0.47	0.66	0.83	0.23	0.09	−0.01	−0.09
		4.21	−0.00	0.10	0.24	0.40	0.62	0.98	0.67	0.40	0.20
$\beta = 0.99$, TTB	0.49	5.06	0.19	0.29	0.43	0.64	0.89	0.68	0.44	0.16	−0.21
		3.99	0.14	0.19	0.31	0.52	0.83	0.38	0.14	0.15	0.42
$\tau_K = 0.50$	−0.60	12.71	0.19	0.29	0.41	0.56	0.61	−0.05	−0.11	−0.13	−0.16
		8.69	−0.08	−0.04	0.02	0.08	0.25	0.81	0.58	0.37	0.22
$\tau_K = 0.50$, TTB	0.07	6.75	0.27	0.33	0.45	0.62	0.80	0.53	0.26	−0.03	−0.39
		4.65	0.05	0.09	0.19	0.36	0.64	0.38	0.27	0.38	0.72

Notes: A "TTB" suffix to a model denotes the time-to-build version of that model. "HP Only" refers to the baseline model. γ refers to the coefficient of relative risk aversion (see equation (2)); β refers to the discount factor (see equation (1)) and τ_K refers to the tax rate on capital income (see equation (4))

The "Corr." column refers to the correlation between market and home investment.

For *each* model, the first row of leads and lags with output is for market investment while the second is for home investment.

Figure 1: Response of Investment to a Market Shock



(a) Home Production only



(b) Home Production with Time-to-build