

# Linking U.S. State-level housing market returns, and the consumption-(Dis)Aggregate wealth ratio

Mehmet Balcilar

Eastern Mediterranean University, Montpellier Business School and University of Pretoria

[mehmet@mbalcilar.net](mailto:mehmet@mbalcilar.net)

Rangan Gupta

University of Pretoria

[Rangan.Gupta@up.ac.za](mailto:Rangan.Gupta@up.ac.za)

Ricardo M. Sousa

University of Minho, NIPE and LSE Alumni Association

[rjsousa@eeg.uminho.pt](mailto:rjsousa@eeg.uminho.pt); [rjsousa@alumni.lse.ac.uk](mailto:rjsousa@alumni.lse.ac.uk)

Mark E. Wohar\*

University of Nebraska-Omaha and Loughborough University

[mwohar@mail.unomaha.edu](mailto:mwohar@mail.unomaha.edu)

## ABSTRACT

Using state-level data for the U.S. housing market over the period of 1975:Q1-2012:Q2, we show that the consumption-wealth ratios derived from aggregate wealth ( $ca$ ) and disaggregate (i.e. financial and housing) wealth ( $cda$ ) are strong predictors of real housing returns (and their volatility). Additionally, we rely on a nonparametric causality-in-quantiles test, and find that, barring the extreme ends of their respective conditional distributions, such effect is stronger for housing return volatility than housing returns. The empirical results also give support to the existence of nonlinearities in the link between housing returns and  $ca$  or  $cda$ . All in all, our findings show that state-level regressions can recover a large degree of heterogeneity that country-level exercises typically ignore. Such heterogeneity is prominent not only in terms of consumption smoothing behaviour, but also with regard to housing return predictability.

**Keywords:** consumption-wealth ratio, housing returns, volatility, forecasting, nonparametric causality-in-quantiles test.

**JEL Codes:** C22, R31.

---

\* Corresponding author.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Since the original study by Lettau and Ludvigson (2001), several works in the empirical finance literature have uncovered a strong predictive power of the consumption-wealth ratio ( $cay$ ) for future stock (and bond) market returns and volatility.<sup>1</sup> Relying on the same assumption of the representative agent's preference for consumption smoothing, Sousa (2010) made an important contribution by formulating a forward-looking model and deriving a discounted present value equation that links the residuals of the trend relationship among consumption, financial wealth and housing wealth, and labor income (labelled by  $cday$ ) and future stock market returns. The empirical evidence therein also showed that the predictor  $cday$  outperforms the original  $cay$  variable given its ability to track the wealth composition risk.

In the wake of the global financial crisis of 2008-2009, various pieces of research have also highlighted the role played by housing market returns and their volatility in driving aggregate and regional business cycles, besides housing investment.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, housing assets differ from financial assets in that they serve the dual role of investment and consumption (Henderson and Ioannides, 1987). Housing risk is also among the largest economic risks faced by individuals (Shiller, 1998) and house price volatility is an important input to housing policy (Zhou and Haurin, 2010).<sup>3</sup> Thus, understanding the source of housing market volatility has implications for asset portfolios, as it affects households' investment decisions regarding tenure choice and housing quantity (Miles, 2008). Not surprisingly, a few studies have extended the role of  $cay$  in forecasting housing returns and their volatility.<sup>4</sup>

In this context, we use country- and state-level data for the U.S. housing market over the period of 1975:Q1-2012:Q2 to investigate the forecasting power of the consumption-(dis)aggregate wealth ratios for real housing returns and their volatility. This is the major goal of this paper.

As housing markets may display different dynamics across states (Apergis and Payne, 2012; Montañés and Olmos, 2013; Barros *et al.*, 2014; Miles, 2015), consumption-wealth ratios constructed using data for the country as a whole may not be good predictors of regional housing returns. For this reason, the first novelty of the current work is that we use a novel state-level

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, Ludvigson and Ng (2007), Afonso and Sousa (2011), Rocha Armada and Sousa (2012), Rapach and Zhou (2013), Rocha Armada *et al.* (2015), Sousa (2015), Bianchi *et al.* (2016), Sousa *et al.* (2016), Balcilar *et al.* (2017b) and Chang *et al.* (2018).

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Leamer (2007, 2015), Balcilar *et al.* (2014), Nyakabawo *et al.* (2015), Emirmahmutoglu *et al.* (2016), Christidou and Fountas (2018) and Thanh *et al.* (forthcoming).

<sup>3</sup> For example, if house prices of low-income households are relatively volatile, then, policies that encourage low-income renters to become homeowners should carefully be evaluated on account of the house price risk that they bear.

<sup>4</sup> See, for instance, Caporale and Sousa (2016), Balcilar *et al.* (2017b) and Caporale *et al.* (forthcoming).

dataset to estimate consumption equations and retrieve the elasticities of consumption with respect to aggregate and (dis)aggregate wealth and labour income for all 50 U.S. states, including the District of Columbia (D.C.). We find that these elasticities differ considerably across states: the sensitivity of consumption with respect to housing wealth is significant in 43 out of 50 U.S. states (plus D.C.), and housing wealth effects are larger than financial wealth effects in all but 6 out of those 43 cases.

Our second contribution of our paper to the existing literature is that we rely on cointegration analysis to generate state-level predictors (i.e.  $cay$  and  $cday$ ), and assess their forecasting power for state-level future housing returns. We show that deviations from the equilibrium relationship among state-level consumption, asset wealth and labour income are positively related with state-level future housing returns, that is, investors temporarily allow their consumption to rise above its equilibrium level when they expect real housing returns to increase in the future.

Additionally, both  $cay$  and  $cday$  display strong predictive ability: at the four quarter-ahead horizon,  $cay$  explains 20% (Oklahoma), 23% (Texas), 26% (Utah), 29% (Oregon), 32% (Wyoming), 33% (New Mexico) and 35% (Louisiana) of the variation in real housing returns; and  $cday$  predicts a fraction of 20% (Nebraska), 23% (California, Connecticut, Michigan and Washington), 30% (Rhode Island), 33% (Oregon and Texas), 45% (Louisiana and Oklahoma) and 58% (Wyoming) of the dynamics of four quarter-ahead real housing returns. In many other states, the forecasting power of both empirical proxies lies above 10%. Given that, for the U.S. as a whole, the predictive ability of  $cay$  or  $cday$  at different forecasting horizons ranges between 9% and 14% in time-series frameworks, or between 2% and 5% in panel estimations, our results corroborate the idea that country-level estimates "mask" important variation about investors' preferences and housing return predictability at the state-level.

Finally, the third element of value-added of the research included in this paper is that we evaluate the forecasting power of state-level  $cay$  and  $cday$  over the entire conditional distributions of both state-level housing returns and volatility by means of the  $k$ -th order nonparametric causality-in-quantiles frameworks developed by Balcilar *et al.* (2017a, 2017b, 2018). While these allow us to control for mis-specification due to missing nonlinearity, we do so in a forecasting regression setup that fully matches state-level housing returns and volatility (i.e. the predicted variables) with state-level  $cay$  and  $cday$  (i.e. the predictors) and, for comparison, we also provide evidence for the U.S. as a whole.

Our empirical findings reveal that: (i) with the exception of the tails of the corresponding distributions, the empirical proxies track particularly well housing return volatility and housing

returns; (ii) the relationship between housing returns and *cay* or *cdlay* displays some nonlinearity; and (iii) *cdlay* slightly outperforms *cay*.

The research presented in this work is highly indebted to the studies of Lettau and Ludvigson (2001), Sousa (2010), Afonso and Sousa (2011) and Sousa *et al.* (2016) among others, who build on the consumption-wealth ratio to provide evidence about asset return predictability. It is also close in spirit to the works of Caporale and Sousa (2016), Balcilar *et al.* (2017b) and Caporale *et al.* (forthcoming), who extend the analysis to forecasting housing returns. Finally, it is inspired by the study of Della Corte *et al.* (2010), who re-examine the predictive ability of the consumption-wealth ratio, and exploit the *time-series* dimension by using data for the U.S., the U.K., France and Japan spanning one century. We focus on the *cross-sectional* dimension instead, by exploring unique state-level data for the U.S..

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly describes the econometric methodology. Section 3 presents the data, while Section 4 discusses the empirical results. Finally, in Section 5, we summarise the main conclusions.

## 2. ECONOMETRIC METHODOLOGY

We start by following Lettau and Ludvigson (2001) and obtain estimates of *cay* by recovering the residuals of the cointegrating relationship between consumption, aggregate wealth and labour income. As in Sousa (2010), we compute *cdlay* as the time-series of the residuals from the estimated long-run equation linking consumption with financial wealth, housing wealth and labour income. In both cases, we use the dynamic ordinary least squares (DOLS) estimator of Stock and Watson (1993), which controls for potential endogeneity of the regressors.

Next, we follow Nishiyama *et al.* (2011), Jeong *et al.* (2012) and Balcilar *et al.* (2017a, 2017b, 2018) and use a hybrid approach to test for nonlinear causality in the relationship between housing returns (or their volatility) and either *cay* or *cdlay*.

Let  $y_t$  denote the predicted variable and  $x_t$  represent the predictor, and assume that  $Y_{t-1} \equiv (y_{t-1}, \dots, y_{t-p})$ ,  $X_{t-1} \equiv (x_{t-1}, \dots, x_{t-p})$ ,  $Z_t = (X_t, Y_t)$ , and  $F_{y_t|\bullet}(y_t|\bullet)$  corresponds to the conditional distribution of  $y_t$  given  $\bullet$ . If we define  $Q_\theta(\bullet) \equiv Q_\theta(y_t|\bullet)$ , then,  $F_{y_t|Z_{t-1}}\{Q_\theta(Z_{t-1})|Z_{t-1}\} = \theta$  with probability one. Thus, we can test the (non)causality in the  $\theta$ <sup>th</sup> quantile hypotheses in the *first* moment of housing market returns ( $y_t$ ), i.e.:

$$H_0: P\{F_{y_t|Z_{t-1}}\{Q_\theta(Y_{t-1})|Z_{t-1}\} = \theta\} = 1 \quad (1)$$

$$H_1: P\{F_{y_t|Z_{t-1}}\{Q_\theta(Y_{t-1})|Z_{t-1}\} = \theta\} < 1 \quad (2)$$

Jeong *et al.* (2012) show that the feasible kernel-based test statistics can be expressed as:

$$\hat{J}_T = \frac{1}{T(T-1)h^{2p}} \sum_{t=p+1}^T \sum_{s=p+1, s \neq t}^T K\left(\frac{Z_{t-1} - Z_{s-1}}{h}\right) \hat{\varepsilon}_t \hat{\varepsilon}_s \quad (3)$$

where  $K(\bullet)$  is the kernel function with bandwidth  $h$ ,  $T$  is the sample size,  $p$  is the lag order.  $\hat{\varepsilon}_t = \mathbf{1}\{y_t \leq \hat{Q}_\theta(Y_{t-1})\} - \theta$  is the estimated disturbance term from the  $\theta^{\text{th}}$  conditional quantile regression of  $y_t$  on  $Y_{t-1}$ , where  $\hat{Q}_\theta(Y_{t-1})$  is the estimated  $\theta^{\text{th}}$  conditional quantile and  $\mathbf{1}\{\bullet\}$  is an indicator function.

Using a nonparametric kernel method, we obtain the *Nadarya-Watson* kernel estimator of  $\hat{Q}_\theta(Y_{t-1})$ , i.e.

$$\hat{Q}_\theta(Y_{t-1}) = \frac{\sum_{s=p+1, s \neq t}^T L\left(\frac{Y_{t-1} - Y_{s-1}}{h}\right) \mathbf{1}\{y_s \leq y_t\}}{\sum_{s=p+1, s \neq t}^T L\left(\frac{Y_{t-1} - Y_{s-1}}{h}\right)} \quad (4)$$

where  $L(\bullet)$  denotes the kernel function.

In addition to the setup described by equations (1)-(4), which allow us to test for causality between housing market returns and either *cay* or *cdlay*, we also test for causality between housing market volatility and the predictors. Therefore, based on the work of Nishiyama *et al.* (2011) and its extension by Jeong *et al.* (2012), we follow Balcilar *et al.* (2017a, 2017b, 2018) and test the (non)causality in the  $\theta^{\text{th}}$  quantile hypotheses in the  $k^{\text{th}}$  moment of housing market returns ( $y_t^k$ ), i.e.:

$$H_0: P\{F_{y_t^k|Z_{t-1}}\{Q_\theta(Y_{t-1})|Z_{t-1}\} = \theta\} = 1, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K \quad (5)$$

$$H_1: P\{F_{y_t^k|Z_{t-1}}\{Q_\theta(Y_{t-1})|Z_{t-1}\} = \theta\} < 1, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K \quad (6)$$

The causality-in-variance test can, thus, be computed by replacing  $y_t$  in equations (3)-(4) with  $y_t^2$ , and the rescaled version of the  $\hat{J}_T$  is asymptotically normally distributed (Balcilar *et al.*, 2018).

Finally, to perform the nonparametric causality-in-quantiles test, we choose the lag order ( $p$ ) in accordance with the Schwarz Information Criterion (SIC) applied to a VAR model including housing returns (or their volatility) and either *cay* or *cdlay*. The bandwidth ( $h$ ) is determined by a leave-one-out least-squares cross-validation procedure. And we use Gaussian kernels for  $K(\bullet)$  and  $L(\bullet)$ .

### 3. DATA

Our predictors, *cay* and *cdlay*, are computed at the state-level. Thus, we use state-level data for household consumption, financial wealth, owner-occupied housing wealth and personal income from Case *et al.* (2005, 2013). All variables are expressed in logs of per capita, real terms, with the time-series being deflated using the Consumer Price Index (CPI) - All Urban Consumers

(with the base year of 1982-1984) obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) via the FRED database of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

Due to data availability, there are two main limitations of the dataset: (i) households' consumption spending is proxied by total retail sales; and (ii) households' financial wealth includes holdings of mutual funds only. Nevertheless, this is virtually the only dataset that contains unique information about aggregate wealth (and its composition) for each of the 50 U.S. states (plus D.C.) and over a relatively long period of time (i.e. 1975:Q1-2012:Q2).

Concerning house price data, we use all-transactions single-family house price indices from the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA), which can be downloaded from: <https://www.fhfa.gov/DataTools/Downloads/Pages/House-Price-Index-Datasets.aspx#qat>. These house prices are weighted, repeat-sales indices, which track average price changes in repeated sales or refinancing of the same properties. Since January 1975, this information is gathered from repeated mortgage transactions on single-family properties whose mortgages have been purchased or securitized by either Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac. We seasonally adjust house price data using the X-13 approach of the U.S. Census Bureau.

Finally, real housing returns ( $rhr$ ) are defined as the difference between the continuously compounded log of (nominal) housing returns and the inflation rate, which is computed using CPI data. The volatility of real housing returns ( $rhr$ ) corresponds to the squared values of  $rhr$ .

Table 1 provides summary statistics of real housing returns for the 50 U.S. states (plus D.C.) and the country as a whole. With the exception of the states of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Texas and Washington, normality is overwhelmingly rejected, which suggests an assessment of causality based on the whole conditional distribution instead of the conditional mean only.

## 4. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

### 4.1. THE LONG-RUN RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN U.S. STATE-LEVEL CONSUMPTION, (DIS)AGGREGATE WEALTH AND LABOUR INCOME

Our starting point is the estimation of the long-run equilibrium relationships between consumption, (dis)aggregate wealth and labour income. Thus, Table 2 summarise the point coefficient estimates associated with  $cay$  and  $cday$  after regressing state-level consumption equations using a DOLS estimator with Newey and West (1987) standard errors. The bottom panel also provides the empirical evidence for the U.S. as a whole.

In general, the elasticities of consumption with respect to aggregate wealth and labour income are positive and statistically significant, which shows that consumption displays a positive

long-term relationship with the two variables. They also considerably different across states, which reinforces the idea that *cay* and *cdlay* measures computed for the U.S. as a whole are not able to capture such cross-state heterogeneity.

Additionally, when we disaggregate wealth into its two major components (i.e. financial and housing wealth), we find that housing wealth is significant in 43 out of 50 U.S. states (plus D.C.), with the sensitivity of consumption with respect to housing wealth being larger compared to financial wealth in all but 6 out of those 43 cases. This result is in accordance with the work of Sousa (2010), who highlights the importance of wealth composition risk and shows that fluctuations in housing wealth tend to have a stronger impact on consumption because they are very persistent and, thus, perceived as permanent. By contrast, financial wealth shocks are mainly transitory and, therefore, have a more muted effect on consumption.

The bottom panel of Table 2 shows that, for the U.S. as a whole, the long-run elasticity of consumption with respect to asset wealth is 0.11, while the long-run elasticity of consumption with respect to labour income is 0.75. Considering the disaggregation of asset wealth, it can be seen that the long-run elasticity of consumption with respect to financial wealth is less than 0.07, while the long-run elasticity of consumption with respect to housing wealth is 0.08. All in all, these empirical estimates imply that the share of asset holdings in aggregate wealth range between 12.6% and 17.3%, whereas the share of human capital is 82.7%-87.4%.

To account for potential cross-state unobserved heterogeneity, we also estimate the consumption equations using a panel fixed-effects (FE) estimator. Table 3 summarises the point coefficient estimates of the trend relationship among consumption, (dis)aggregate wealth and labour income.

Again, the elasticities of consumption with respect to asset wealth and labour income are positive and statistically significant. Moreover, the long-run elasticity of consumption with respect to housing wealth (0.094) is almost three times larger in magnitude than the long-run elasticity of consumption with respect to financial wealth (0.035). This confirms the primary role of housing wealth in shaping the dynamics of consumption, as suggested by the DOLS regressions at the state- and the country-level.

## 4.2. FORECASTING U.S. STATE-LEVEL HOUSING RETURNS

To assess the forecasting power of *cay* and *cdlay* estimated using state-level data for future real housing returns at different time horizons, we regress the following models

$$\sum_{h=1}^H rhr_{t+h} = \alpha + \gamma cay_{t-1} + \zeta_t \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_{h=1}^H rhr_{t+h} = \alpha + \gamma cday_{t-1} + \zeta_t \quad (7)$$

where the  $H$ -period real housing return,  $rhr_{t+1} + \dots + rhr_{t+H}$ , is regressed on the lag of consumption-wealth ratio,  $cay_{t-1}$ , or the lag of consumption-(dis)aggregate wealth ratio,  $cday_{t-1}$ . As highlighted by Lettau and Ludvigson (2001), Sousa (2010) and Afonso and Sousa (2011), these empirical proxies track time-variation in risk premium at the country level, and we explore its predictive ability at the state level.

Table 4 summarises the main findings based on OLS regressions. It can be seen that the point coefficient estimates of both  $cay_t$  and  $cday_t$  are positive for almost all states (except for Illinois). This result is in line with the theoretical reasoning that investors temporarily allow consumption to rise above (fall below) its equilibrium relationship with (dis-)aggregate wealth and labour income when they expect housing returns to increase (decrease) in the future. Thus, deviations in the long-term trend among state-level  $c_t$ ,  $a_t$  and  $y_t$  should be positively related to state-level future housing returns.

Both empirical proxies are also statistically significant in a large number of cases. Indeed, with the exceptions of D.C., Main, Mississippi, New York and South Dakota, at least one of the two variables significantly forecast future housing returns. While there are only two states in which  $cday$  is not significant but  $cay$  displays statistical significance - Maryland and Tennessee -, the opposite holds in several states, namely: Alaska, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Vermont. This suggests that wealth composition risk - which  $cday$  tracks - is an important driver of state-level housing returns.

The consumption-(dis-)aggregate wealth ratio also explains an important percentage of the dynamics of future housing returns at the state-level (as described by the adjusted R-square), especially, at horizons spanning from three to four quarters. For instance, at the four quarter-ahead horizon,  $cay_t$  forecasts a fraction of 10% (Connecticut and South Carolina), 11% (Arkansas and New Jersey), 14% (Hawaii, Nevada, Rhode Island and Virginia), 20% (Oklahoma), 23% (Texas), 26% (Utah), 29% (Oregon), 32% (Wyoming), 33% (New Mexico) and 35% (Louisiana) of the variation in real housing returns. At the same horizon,  $cday_t$  predicts 10% (West Virginia), 11% (Hawaii), 12% (Colorado and Iowa), 13% (Massachusetts, Nevada, Ohio and Virginia), 14% (New Jersey), 15% (Indiana and North Dakota), 16% (Kansas), 17% (South Carolina), 18% (Delaware and Idaho), 19% (New Mexico), 20% (Nebraska), 23% (California, Connecticut, Michigan and Washington), 30% (Rhode Island), 33% (Oregon and Texas), 45% (Louisiana and Oklahoma) and 58% (Wyoming). Therefore,  $cday_t$  tends to over-perform  $cay_t$  and, for the other states, the predictive ability of both empirical proxies amounts to less than 10%.



Interestingly, the bottom panel of Table 4 shows that, for the U.S. as a whole,  $cay_t$  is not statistically significant, while  $cday_t$  forecasts between 9% and 14% of future housing returns for horizons up to eight quarters-ahead. Thus, country-level information "masks" important variation about the dynamics of real housing returns and investors' preferences for consumption smoothing that we are able to capture with state-level data.

To investigate this issue further, we re-estimate equations (6)-(7) using a panel structure, that is, we regress:

$$\sum_{h=1}^H rhr_{i,t+h} = \alpha + \gamma cay_{i,t-1} + \zeta_{i,t} \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_{h=1}^H rhr_{i,t+h} = \alpha + \gamma cday_{i,t-1} + \zeta_{i,t} \quad (9)$$

where the  $H$ -period real housing return of state  $i$ ,  $rhr_{i,t+1} + \dots + rhr_{i,t+H}$ , is regressed on the lag of consumption-wealth ratio,  $cay_{i,t-1}$ , or the lag of consumption-(dis)aggregate wealth ratio,  $cday_{i,t-1}$  of state  $i$ . By doing so, we merge the time-series ( $t$ ) and the cross-sectional dimensions ( $i$ ), which enables us to benefit from the accuracy and power associated with the use of around 7,600 data points.

In Table 5, we present the main results associated with a panel fixed-effects (FE) estimator applied to equations (8)-(9). As noted before, this empirical methodology is particularly well-suited to account for cross-state unobserved heterogeneity. The Table confirms the predictive power of the consumption-wealth ratios. Both empirical proxies are statistically significant and the point coefficient estimates associated with  $cay_t$  and  $cday_t$  are positive: at the one quarter-ahead horizon, both variables explain 2% of real housing returns; their forecasting power reaches a peak of predictability at the three quarter-ahead horizon (namely, 4% in the case of  $cay_t$  and 5% for  $cday_t$ ); and, at the eight quarter-ahead horizon, the predictive ability of  $cay_t$  stands at 2%, while it is still around 4% for  $cday_t$ .

Summing up, time-series and panel data experiments corroborate the importance of the consumption-wealth ratios as predictors of real housing returns. However, country-level exercises typically ignore a large degree of heterogeneity that state-level regressions are able to recover.

### 4.3. A NONPARAMETRIC CAUSALITY-IN-QUANTILES TEST USING U.S. STATE LEVEL DATA

Albeit our key goal is to analyse the causality-in-quantiles from either  $cay$  or  $cday$  to real housing returns and their volatility, we also perform standard linear (i.e. conditional mean-based) Granger causality tests. The complete set of results is reported in Table 6 and it can be seen that the null of no causality from either  $cay$  or  $cday$  to  $rhr$  cannot be rejected for 28 states (namely, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland,

Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Washington and West Virginia), and D.C.. In addition, for Georgia and Oregon, there is no evidence of causality from *cdlay* to *rbr*, and *cay* fails to predict *rbr* in Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, Tennessee and Wyoming, as well as for the U.S. as a whole. Consequently, linear Granger causality tests suggest that the predictive ability of either *cay* or *cdlay* for housing market returns is weak, with 29 out of 52 cases showing no causality.

We now assess if the relationship between real housing returns and the two predictors is nonlinear or not, by applying the Brock *et al.* (BDS, 1996) test on the residuals of the returns equation of the VAR model involving either *cay* or *cdlay*. The  $\hat{\alpha}$ -statistics of the BDS test are reported in Table 7 and strongly reject the null hypothesis of no serial dependence. This evidence casts doubts about the validity of the linear Granger causality tests and corroborates the presence of nonlinearity between housing returns and the predictors.

In light of the previous findings, we run nonparametric causality-in-quantiles tests, which can properly account for the nonlinearity previously uncovered. Thus, instead of focusing on conditional mean-based linear Granger causality tests, we evaluate the rejection of the null of no-causality (at the 5% level of significance, i.e. for test statistic being greater than or equal to 1.96) between either *cay* or *cdlay* (i.e. the predictors) and either real housing returns (*rbr*) or their volatility (*rhw*) (i.e. the predicted variables) over the entire (conditional) distribution of *rbr* and *rhw* (i.e. for quantiles ranging between 0.05 and 0.95).

The empirical findings for housing market returns are summarised in Table 8, while those for housing market volatility are reported in Table 9. Besides all cases where we detected predictability from *cay* and *cdlay* under the linear model, nonparametric causality-in-quantiles is also observed for: (i) *cay* in five additional states (namely, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Mississippi and Wyoming); (ii) *cdlay* in one additional state (i.e. Georgia); and both *cay* and *cdlay* in three additional states (that is, Illinois, Vermont and West Virginia). Therefore, compared to linear Granger causality tests, nonparametric causality-in-quantiles tests detect predictability in 9 additional states.

Additionally, *cay* and *cdlay* predictability seems to hold across a wide range of quantiles with the exception of the tails of the distribution, i.e. when housing market returns are abnormally very high or very low.

Concerning the volatility of housing market returns, we find that, with the exception of nine U.S. states (i.e. Connecticut, Georgia, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Mexico, South Carolina, Utah and Virginia), either *cay* or *cday* are able to predict the conditional distribution at a wide range of quantiles. In addition, *cay* does not forecast housing market volatility in Kansas and Pennsylvania and *cday* does not predict the volatility of housing returns in Texas. These results are close in spirit with the evidence in Balcilar *et al.* (2017b), who show that *cay* and a Markov-Switching version of *cay* (i.e.  $cay^{MS}$ ) can capture the distribution of equity and housing risk premium in the U.S. as a whole. Moreover and as with housing market returns, neither *cay*, nor *cday* appear to predict the tails of the distribution of housing market volatility.

A summary of the results from the nonparametric causality-in-quantiles tests regarding housing returns and their volatility is reported in Table 10. All in all, there are only four states (i.e. Virginia, New Mexico, Minnesota and Massachusetts) for which both *cay* and *cday* fail to cause returns and volatilities. In addition, *cay* also fails to forecast housing market returns and their volatility in the case of Pennsylvania and Kansas.

Moreover, while the performance of *cay* and *cday* is, in general, similar, it is important to highlight that: (i) in contrast with *cday*, *cay* fails to pick up predictability of volatility in five states (i.e. Florida, Kansas, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Tennessee); whilst (ii) in contrast with *cay*, *cday* fails to pick up predictability of in two states only (i.e. Kentucky and Oregon). Put it differently, *cday* marginally outperforms *cay* in predicting *rhr* and *rhrv*.

In sum, given the strong evidence corroborating a nonlinear linkage between the consumption-wealth ratios and real housing returns, the nonparametric causality-in-quantile framework is particularly relevant as it allows us to study the effect of those predictors on both returns and their volatility. Indeed, we show that the ratios tend to predict volatility even more strongly than returns. In addition, the nonparametric causality-in-quantile tests make it possible to obtain further information about the predictive power of *cay* and *cday* for the conditional distributions of housing returns and their volatility. In fact, we confirm that, barring the extreme quantiles (i.e. the tails of the distribution), the consumption-wealth ratios are strong predictors of housing returns and their volatility at different quantiles. This result suggests that investors might simply be herding during such extreme episodes and, hence, do not track closely the dynamics of *cay* and *cday* at periods of stress in real estate markets (Balcilar *et al.*, 2017b).

## 5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we construct consumption-(dis)aggregate wealth ratios (i.e.  $cay$  and  $cday$ ) for the U.S. at the state-level, and analyse their ability to predict real housing returns and their volatility over the period of 1975:Q1-2012:Q2. We also rely on nonparametric causality-in-quantiles tests, which adequately capture the existence of a nonlinear relationship between real housing returns (and their volatility) and either  $cay$  or  $cday$ , a feature that linear Granger causality tests typically miss due to misspecification.

All in all, we show that state-level regressions can recover a large degree of heterogeneity - regarding consumption smoothing behaviour and housing return predictability - that country-level exercises typically ignore. Indeed, we find that the elasticities of consumption with respect to financial wealth and housing wealth vary considerably across states, with housing wealth effects being larger than financial wealth effects in 37 cases. Similarly, while  $cay$  explains 20% or more of the variation in real housing returns in states like Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Utah and Wyoming, it displays no predictive ability for housing returns in Alaska, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Vermont. Likewise, the forecasting power of  $cday$  differs substantially across states. And, for the U.S. as a whole, the predictive ability of  $cay$  or  $cday$  lies in the range of 9%-14% in time-series estimations, or 2%-5% in panel frameworks. Finally, with the exception of extreme events (that lay at the tails of the distribution), we find that both  $cay$  and  $cday$  are strong predictors of the distribution of real housing returns and, most importantly, their volatility. In addition,  $cday$  slightly outperforms the forecasting power of  $cay$ .

Our results have important implications for investors and policymakers, as it is well-known that changes in housing prices can explain a large fraction of business cycle fluctuations, as well as recession episodes. Moreover, housing market volatility is relevant for asset portfolio management and a key driver of mortgage default and pre-payment. In this context and from a practitioner's view point, the information contained in the consumption-(dis)aggregate wealth ratios can contribute to an optimisation of asset portfolio opportunities. From a policy perspective, it can also signal the emergence of stress periods in real estate markets.

Finally, our paper sets the stage for new research avenues. Thus, a promising direction includes the investigation of nonparametric causality-in-quantiles in an out-of-sample framework (Bonaccolto *et al.*, 2018). We leave this for the future.

## REFERENCES

- Afonso, A., and Sousa, R.M., 2011. Consumption, wealth, stock and government bond returns: international evidence. *The Manchester School*, 79(6), 1294-1232.
- Apergis, N., and Payne, J.E., 2012. Convergence in U.S. housing prices by state: Evidence from the club convergence and clustering procedure. *Letters in Spatial and Resource Sciences*, 5(2), 103-111.
- Balcilar, M., Gupta, R., and Miller, S.M., 2014. Housing and the Great Depression. *Applied Economics*, 46(24), 2966-2981.
- Balcilar, M., Gupta R., Nguyen D.K., and Wohar, M.E., 2018. Causal effects of the United States and Japan on Pacific-Rim stock markets: nonparametric quantile causality approach. *Applied Economics*, 50(53), 5712-5727.
- Balcilar, M., Gupta, R., Sousa, R.M., and Wohar, M.E., 2017a. Wealth-to-income ratio and stock market movements: Evidence from a nonparametric causality test. *International Review of Finance*, 18(3), 495-506.
- Balcilar, M., Gupta, R., Sousa, R.M., and Wohar, M.E., 2017b. The predictability of  $cay$  and  $cay^{MS}$  for stock and housing returns: A nonparametric causality in quantile test. *International Review of Economics and Finance*, 48(1), 269-279.
- Barros, C.P., Gil-Alana, L.A., and Payne, J.E., 2014. Tests of convergence and long memory behavior in U.S. housing prices by state. *Journal of Housing Research*, 23(1), 73-88.
- Bianchi, F., Lettau, M., and Ludvigson, S., 2016. Monetary policy and asset valuation. NBER Working Paper No. 22572.
- Bonaccolto, G., Caporin, M., and Gupta, R., 2018. The dynamic impact of uncertainty in causing and forecasting the distribution of oil returns and risk. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 507, 446-469.
- Brock, W., Dechert, D., Scheinkman, J., and LeBaron, B., 1996. A test for independence based on the correlation dimension. *Econometric Reviews*, 15, 197-235.
- Case, K.E., Quigley, J.M., and Shiller, R.J., 2005. Comparing wealth effects: the stock market versus the housing market. *B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics*, 5 (1), 1.
- Case, K.E., Quigley, J.M., and Shiller, R.J., 2013. Wealth effects revisited: 1975– 2012. *Critical Finance Review*, 2 (1), 101-128.
- Caporale, G.M., and Sousa, R.M., 2016. Consumption, wealth, stock and housing returns: Evidence from emerging markets. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 36, 562-578.

- Caporale, G.M., Sousa, R.M., and Wohar, M.E., forthcoming. Can the consumption-wealth ratio predict housing returns? Evidence from OECD countries. *Real Estate Economics*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6229.12135>.
- Chang, T., Gupta, R., Majumdar, A., and Pierdzioch, C., 2019. Predicting stock market movements with a time-varying consumption-aggregate wealth ratio. *International Review of Economics and Finance*, 59(C), 458-467.
- Christidou, M., and Fountas, S., 2018. Uncertainty in the housing market: evidence from US states. *Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics & Econometrics*, 22(2), 1-17.
- Della Corte, P., Sarno, L., and Valente, G., 2010. A century of equity premium predictability and the consumption-wealth ratio: An international perspective. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 17, 313-331.
- Emirmahmutoglu, F., Balciyar, M., Apergis, N., Simo-Kengne, B.D., Chang, T., and Gupta, R., 2016. Causal relationship between asset prices and output in the US: Evidence from state-level panel Granger causality test. *Regional Studies*, 50(10), 1728-1741.
- Henderson, J.V., and Ioannides, Y., 1987. Owner occupancy: Consumption vs. investment demand. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 21(2), 228-241.
- Jeong, K., Härdle, W.K., and Song, S., 2012. A consistent nonparametric test for causality in quantile. *Econometric Theory*, 28(4), 861-887.
- Leamer, E.E., 2007. Housing is the business cycle. NBER Working Paper no. 13428.
- Leamer, E.E., 2015. Housing really is the business cycle: What survives the lessons of 2008-09? *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 47(S1), 43-50.
- Lettau, M., and Ludvigson, S., 2001. Consumption, aggregate wealth, and expected stock returns. *Journal of Finance*, 41(3), 815-849.
- Ludvigson, S., and Ng, S., 2007. The empirical risk-return relation: a factor analysis approach. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 83, 171-222.
- Miles, W., 2008. Volatility clustering in U.S. home prices. *Journal of Real Estate Research*, 30, 73-90.
- Miles, W., 2015. Regional house price segmentation and convergence in the US: A new approach. *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, 50(1), 113-128.
- Montañés, A., and Olmos, L., 2013. Convergence in US house prices. *Economics Letters*, 121(2), 152-155.
- Newey, W.K., and West, K.D., 1987. A simple, positive semi-definite, heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix. *Econometrica*, 55(3), 703-708.
- Nishiyama, Y., Hitomi, K., Kawasaki, Y., and Jeong, K., 2011. A consistent nonparametric test for nonlinear causality - Specification in time series regression. *Journal of Econometrics*, 165, 112-127.

- Nyakabawo, W. V., Miller, S. M., Balcilar, M., Das, S., and Gupta, R., 2015. Temporal causality between house prices and output in the U.S.: A bootstrap rolling-window approach. *North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, 33(1), 55-73.
- Rapach, D., and Zhou, G., 2013. Forecasting stock returns. In: Elliott, G., and Timmermann, A., Eds., *Handbook of Economic Forecasting*, 328-383, Elsevier: Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Rocha Armada, M.J., and Sousa, R.M., 2012. Can the wealth-to-income ratio be a useful predictor in Alternative Finance? Evidence from the housing risk premium. In: Barnett, W.A., and Jawadi, F., Eds., *Recent Developments in Alternative Finance: Empirical Assessments and Economic Implications*, *International Symposia in Economic Theory and Econometrics*, 22, 67-79, Emerald Group Publishing: Bingley, UK.
- Rocha Armada, M.J., Sousa, R.M., and Wohar, M.E., 2015. Consumption growth, preference for smoothing, changes in expectations and risk premium. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 56, 80-97.
- Shiller, R.J., 1998. *Macro markets: Creating institutions for managing society's largest economic risks*. Oxford University Press: New York, USA.
- Sousa, R.M., 2010. Consumption, (dis)aggregate wealth and asset returns. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 17(4), 606-622.
- Sousa, R.M., 2015. Linking wealth and labour income with stock returns and government bond yields. *European Journal of Finance*, 21(10/11), 806-825.
- Sousa, R.M., Vivian, A., and Wohar, M.E., 2016. Predicting asset returns in the BRICS: The role of macroeconomic and fundamental predictors. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 41(C), 122-143.
- Stock, J.H., and Watson, M.W., 1993. A simple estimator of cointegrating vectors in higher order integrated systems. *Econometrica*, 61(4), 783-820.
- Thanh, N., Strobel, J., and Lee, G.S., forthcoming. A new measure of real estate uncertainty shocks. *Real Estate Economics*. Available at: <https://doi.org/0.1111/1540-6229.12270>.
- Zhou, Y., and Haurin, D.R., 2010. On the determinants of house value volatility. *Journal of Real Estate Research*, 32(4), 377-396.

## List of Tables

**Table 1.** Summary statistics of real housing returns (*r<sub>hr</sub>*).

States	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis	JB	<i>p</i> -value
Alabama	-0.001	0.001	0.022	-0.442	9.186	242.445	0.000
Alaska	0.000	0.001	0.051	-0.099	11.198	417.482	0.000
Arizona	0.000	0.005	0.029	-0.249	4.143	9.647	0.008
Arkansas	-0.001	0.000	0.019	-1.346	10.053	353.886	0.000
California	0.005	0.004	0.026	-0.594	5.403	44.629	0.000
Colorado	0.002	0.003	0.017	0.787	5.256	46.978	0.000
Connecticut	0.002	0.004	0.024	0.309	3.125	2.475	0.290
Delaware	0.001	0.005	0.051	-3.442	38.258	8012.196	0.000
DC	0.007	0.007	0.036	-0.370	5.939	57.040	0.000
Florida	-0.001	0.001	0.028	-0.330	8.992	225.586	0.000
Georgia	-0.002	0.001	0.017	-0.342	5.243	34.144	0.000
Hawaii	0.004	0.001	0.082	3.267	54.649	16826.300	0.000
Idaho	-0.001	0.002	0.034	-0.870	13.694	728.775	0.000
Illinois	0.000	0.004	0.019	-0.546	6.980	105.763	0.000
Indiana	-0.001	0.001	0.015	-0.933	8.460	206.705	0.000
Iowa	0.000	0.002	0.024	0.263	12.879	607.563	0.000
Kansas	-0.001	0.000	0.013	-1.492	10.352	390.898	0.000
Kentucky	0.000	0.002	0.012	-0.592	4.837	29.636	0.000
Louisiana	0.001	0.001	0.017	0.418	5.023	29.743	0.000
Maine	0.004	0.007	0.063	0.626	14.714	861.667	0.000
Maryland	0.003	0.003	0.019	-0.119	4.299	10.826	0.004
Massachusetts	0.005	0.004	0.022	-0.005	2.975	0.004	0.998
Michigan	-0.001	0.003	0.020	-0.935	7.586	152.291	0.000
Minnesota	0.001	0.004	0.018	-0.747	4.369	25.501	0.000
Mississippi	-0.002	0.000	0.032	-0.109	14.295	792.397	0.000
Missouri	-0.001	0.003	0.014	-0.940	4.430	34.640	0.000
Montana	0.002	0.006	0.039	-0.671	7.777	152.854	0.000
Nebraska	-0.001	0.000	0.016	0.461	7.459	128.708	0.000
Nevada	-0.001	0.000	0.030	-0.311	5.572	43.486	0.000
New Hampshire	0.001	0.005	0.042	-0.347	9.003	226.714	0.000
New Jersey	0.003	0.003	0.022	-0.393	4.129	11.750	0.003
New Mexico	0.001	0.001	0.021	-0.216	6.117	61.481	0.000
New York	0.003	0.005	0.028	-0.060	5.139	28.485	0.000
North Carolina	0.000	0.002	0.013	-0.377	4.500	17.499	0.000
North Dakota	0.000	0.003	0.047	-0.299	10.175	321.854	0.000
Ohio	-0.001	0.002	0.013	-1.126	4.551	46.420	0.000
Oklahoma	-0.001	0.002	0.018	0.514	7.842	152.142	0.000
Oregon	0.003	0.006	0.026	-0.229	6.304	69.059	0.000
Pennsylvania	0.001	0.002	0.019	-0.973	7.407	144.050	0.000
Rhode Island	0.003	0.001	0.026	0.220	2.934	1.232	0.540
South Carolina	-0.001	0.002	0.017	-1.729	13.209	721.304	0.000
South Dakota	-0.001	0.003	0.053	1.330	18.829	1599.368	0.000
Tennessee	0.000	0.001	0.018	0.187	7.081	104.291	0.000
Texas	-0.001	0.001	0.015	-0.160	3.787	4.476	0.107
Utah	0.002	0.004	0.023	0.072	5.287	32.594	0.000
Vermont	0.002	0.004	0.500	-0.893	70.010	27897.330	0.000
Virginia	0.002	0.004	0.018	0.260	5.957	55.948	0.000
Washington	0.004	0.004	0.020	-0.197	3.681	3.845	0.146
West Virginia	0.000	0.002	0.546	0.474	72.900	30339.120	0.000
Wisconsin	0.001	0.004	0.020	-1.180	10.275	363.168	0.000
Wyoming	0.001	0.005	0.026	-0.845	5.654	61.466	0.000
<b>U.S.</b>	0.001	0.002	0.013	-0.855	4.191	26.962	0.000

Note: Std. Dev. stands for standard deviation; *p*-value corresponds to the Jarque-Bera (JB) test of normality.



**Table 2.** State- and country-level cointegrating relationships between consumption, (dis)aggregate wealth and labour income (DOLS framework).

Variable	<i>cay</i>	Variable	<i>cday</i>
Alabama			
Wealth	0.1055***	Financial wealth	0.0634
		Housing wealth	0.3771***
Income	0.5531***	Income	1.3728***
constant	1.0674**	constant	-10.0800***
Alaska			
Wealth	0.0009	Financial wealth	-0.0195**
		Housing wealth	0.2596***
Income	0.6751***	Income	-0.0368
constant	1.0154	constant	5.8793***
Arizona			
Wealth	0.2029***	Financial wealth	0.1722***
		Housing wealth	0.0935***
Income	0.4993***	Income	0.4512***
constant	0.6676	constant	0.6921
Arkansas			
Wealth	0.0319	Financial wealth	0.1713***
		Housing wealth	-0.0358
Income	0.6065***	Income	0.7097***
constant	1.3487***	constant	-0.3912
California			
Wealth	0.0818**	Financial wealth	-0.0459*
		Housing wealth	0.1026***
Income	1.3420***	Income	0.9309***
constant	-6.6174***	constant	-2.2440*
Colorado			
Wealth	0.0621***	Financial wealth	0.0585***
		Housing wealth	0.1393***
Income	0.9734***	Income	0.5076***
constant	-2.5206***	constant	0.7550
Connecticut			
Wealth	0.0138	Financial wealth	-0.0021
		Housing wealth	0.1205***
Income	0.5378***	Income	0.6508***
constant	2.1862***	constant	-0.0236
Delaware			
Wealth	0.1370**	Financial wealth	0.1540***
		Housing wealth	0.2246***
Income	0.6829***	Income	0.3872**
constant	-0.5068	constant	0.0819
DC			
Wealth	0.1716***	Financial wealth	0.0362
		Housing wealth	0.1268***
Income	1.0779***	Income	0.7669***
constant	-5.2626***	constant	-1.9044
Florida			
Wealth	0.0373**	Financial wealth	0.0275***
		Housing wealth	-0.0262*
Income	0.4998***	Income	1.1270***
constant	2.4552***	constant	-3.3147***
Georgia			
Wealth	0.1548***	Financial wealth	0.1155***
		Housing wealth	0.0308
Income	1.0392***	Income	0.9287***
constant	-4.0515***	constant	-2.7121***

(cont.)

Variable	<i>cay</i>	Variable	<i>cday</i>
Hawaii			
Wealth	0.1797***	Financial wealth	0.1204***
		Housing wealth	0.0111
Income	0.7149***	Income	0.9111***
constant	-1.2533	constant	-2.5684***
Idaho			
Wealth	0.0008	Financial wealth	-0.0239***
		Housing wealth	0.2716***
Income	0.8213***	Income	0.8020***
constant	-0.3802	constant	-2.7512***
Illinois			
Wealth	0.0653***	Financial wealth	-0.0069
		Housing wealth	0.1619***
Income	1.6627***	Income	1.1642***
constant	-9.6040***	constant	-5.5010***
Indiana			
Wealth	0.1317***	Financial wealth	0.0100
		Housing wealth	0.2683***
Income	1.7339***	Income	1.3677***
constant	-10.7411***	constant	-8.6066***
Iowa			
Wealth	0.2219***	Financial wealth	0.0770***
		Housing wealth	0.3731***
Income	1.1969***	Income	0.3261***
constant	-6.4241***	constant	-0.0188
Kansas			
Wealth	0.2258***	Financial wealth	0.0941***
		Housing wealth	0.3408***
Income	0.8675***	Income	0.1802**
constant	-3.3184	constant	1.4955***
Kentucky			
Wealth	0.0471**	Financial wealth	-0.0353***
		Housing wealth	0.4925***
Income	2.1366***	Income	1.0956***
constant	-13.6167***	constant	-7.6504***
Louisiana			
Wealth	0.3792***	Financial wealth	0.1322***
		Housing wealth	0.3643***
Income	0.4746***	Income	0.1967
constant	-0.8757	constant	0.8954
Maine			
Wealth	0.2150***	Financial wealth	0.1264***
		Housing wealth	0.1148***
Income	1.0057***	Income	0.9001***
constant	-4.3085***	constant	-3.3751***
Maryland			
Wealth	0.9026***	Financial wealth	0.5585***
		Housing wealth	-0.0122
Income	-0.2557	Income	0.0983
constant	0.6321	constant	1.5854
Massachusetts			
Wealth	-0.0992***	Financial wealth	-0.0260***
		Housing wealth	0.1498***
Income	1.3851***	Income	0.4200***
constant	-4.9577***	constant	2.3323***

(cont.)

<b>Variable</b>	<b>cay</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>cday</b>
Michigan			
Wealth	0.1018***	Financial wealth	0.0309
		Housing wealth	0.1066***
Income	1.5568***	Income	1.0762***
constant	-8.8327***	constant	-4.3569***
Minnesota			
Wealth	0.1224***	Financial wealth	0.0805***
		Housing wealth	0.1199***
Income	1.0961***	Income	0.5307***
constant	-4.4268***	constant	0.4538
Mississippi			
Wealth	0.0626***	Financial wealth	-0.0093
		Housing wealth	0.2845***
Income	0.5261***	Income	1.6219***
constant	1.7569***	constant	-10.8166***
Missouri			
Wealth	0.0822***	Financial wealth	0.0479***
		Housing wealth	0.4636***
Income	0.6143***	Income	0.3821***
constant	0.7386**	constant	-1.2772***
Montana			
Wealth	0.2407***	Financial wealth	0.0943***
		Housing wealth	0.2319***
Income	1.8285***	Income	1.3095***
constant	-12.6659***	constant	-8.2965***
Nebraska			
Wealth	0.1625***	Financial wealth	0.0142
		Housing wealth	0.5812***
Income	0.5721***	Income	0.5368***
constant	0.2968	constant	-3.6291***
Nevada			
Wealth	0.3517***	Financial wealth	0.1387***
		Housing wealth	0.1765***
Income	0.4440***	Income	0.1068
constant	-0.2214	constant	3.7765***
New Hampshire			
Wealth	0.2088***	Financial wealth	0.2080***
		Housing wealth	0.1003***
Income	0.4423***	Income	0.7215***
constant	1.2867***	constant	-2.2651***
New Jersey			
Wealth	0.0019	Financial wealth	-0.1049***
		Housing wealth	0.0843***
Income	0.6235***	Income	1.1347***
constant	1.4417***	constant	-3.4543**
New Mexico			
Wealth	0.3990***	Financial wealth	0.1891***
		Housing wealth	0.0230
Income	1.0019***	Income	1.2320***
constant	-6.2314***	constant	-6.2329***
New York			
Wealth	-0.0884***	Financial wealth	-0.0638***
		Housing wealth	0.0859**
Income	0.6537***	Income	0.3427**
constant	1.9329	constant	3.8845***

(cont.)

Variable	<i>cay</i>	Variable	<i>cday</i>
North Carolina			
Wealth	0.2949***	Financial wealth	0.0800**
		Housing wealth	0.2013**
Income	1.0669***	Income	0.8161***
constant	-5.7933***	constant	-3.0683***
North Dakota			
Wealth	0.1080***	Financial wealth	0.1337***
		Housing wealth	0.5321***
Income	0.5263***	Income	0.0512
constant	1.4872***	constant	0.7119***
Ohio			
Wealth	0.4721***	Financial wealth	-0.0032
		Housing wealth	0.4807***
Income	0.4904***	Income	0.5157**
constant	-2.1485*	constant	-2.3250
Oklahoma			
Wealth	0.5056***	Financial wealth	0.1409***
		Housing wealth	0.3441***
Income	-0.3660**	Income	-0.0251
constant	5.9854***	constant	3.1129***
Oregon			
Wealth	0.0784**	Financial wealth	0.0711**
		Housing wealth	0.0684***
Income	1.3541***	Income	0.9263***
constant	-6.4124***	constant	-2.7278***
Pennsylvania			
Wealth	0.1123*	Financial wealth	-0.0369
		Housing wealth	-0.0064
Income	0.5416***	Income	0.9472***
constant	1.0625	constant	-1.3517
Rhode Island			
Wealth	0.3799***	Financial wealth	0.0510**
		Housing wealth	0.2469***
Income	0.5704***	Income	0.0853
constant	-2.0018	constant	3.7925***
South Carolina			
Wealth	0.1459***	Financial wealth	0.1102***
		Housing wealth	0.0013
Income	1.4941***	Income	1.2029***
constant	-8.3572***	constant	-5.0247***
South Dakota			
Wealth	1.0696***	Financial wealth	0.6784***
		Housing wealth	0.8867***
Income	-0.2475	Income	-0.7652
constant	-0.9090	constant	0.0147
Tennessee			
Wealth	0.3039**	Financial wealth	0.7910***
		Housing wealth	-1.1732***
Income	1.3574***	Income	-1.4810***
constant	-10.3893***	constant	25.5063***
Texas			
Wealth	0.1344***	Financial wealth	0.0454*
		Housing wealth	0.1236***
Income	0.7887***	Income	0.5058***
constant	-1.3782	constant	1.1329

(cont.)

Variable	<i>cay</i>	Variable	<i>cday</i>
Utah			
Wealth	0.5123***	Financial wealth	0.3626***
		Housing wealth	0.3515***
Income	0.1779	Income	-0.0365
constant	0.4586	constant	1.0567
Vermont			
Wealth	0.0101	Financial wealth	-0.0304
		Housing wealth	0.1627***
Income	0.5968***	Income	0.4467***
constant	1.8225***	constant	2.0256***
Virginia			
Wealth	0.1717***	Financial wealth	0.2444***
		Housing wealth	0.0318
Income	0.9247***	Income	0.6935***
constant	-3.2782***	constant	-1.7897*
Washington			
Wealth	0.3027***	Financial wealth	0.0588
		Housing wealth	0.2100***
Income	0.4284*	Income	-0.0418
constant	0.3110	constant	5.4790***
West Virginia			
Wealth	0.0681**	Financial wealth	0.0486
		Housing wealth	0.3219***
Income	1.9578***	Income	0.4034**
constant	-12.0824***	constant	-0.0594
Wisconsin			
Wealth	0.1552***	Financial wealth	0.1141***
		Housing wealth	0.1315***
Income	1.1355***	Income	0.6647***
constant	-5.1788***	constant	-1.3027
Wyoming			
Wealth	0.0086	Financial wealth	0.0542**
		Housing wealth	0.2243***
Income	1.1483***	Income	0.6590***
constant	-3.6314***	constant	-1.5119**
U.S.			
Wealth	0.1086***	Financial wealth	0.0651***
		Housing wealth	0.0825***
Income	0.7511***	Income	0.7032***
constant	-0.8767***	constant	-0.7091***

Note: \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.

**Table 3.** Country-level cointegrating relationship between consumption, (dis)aggregate wealth and labour income (Panel FE framework).

Variable	<i>cay</i>	Variable	<i>cday</i>
Wealth	0.075***	Financial wealth	0.035***
		Housing wealth	0.094***
Income	0.481***	Income	0.429***

Note: \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.

**Table 4.** Forecasting real housing returns using state- and country-level data (Time-series framework).

State	Predictor	Forecast horizon $H$				
		1	2	3	4	8
Alabama	<i>cay</i>	0.0671* (0.037) [0.0215]	0.1250*** (0.045) [0.0494]	0.1615*** (0.051) [0.0639]	0.1952*** (0.063) [0.0618]	0.2335** (0.103) [0.0341]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0899 (0.057) [0.0165]	0.1359* (0.070) [0.0249]	0.1943** (0.079) [0.0395]	0.2566*** (0.097) [0.0456]	0.5324*** (0.154) [0.0756]
Alaska	<i>cay</i>	0.0685 (0.072) [0.00613]	0.1099 (0.097) [0.00866]	0.1412 (0.120) [0.00938]	0.1472 (0.143) [0.00713]	0.3039* (0.176) [0.0198]
	<i>cday</i>	0.1781** (0.070) [0.0419]	0.2880*** (0.094) [0.0600]	0.4314*** (0.114) [0.0883]	0.4971*** (0.137) [0.0821]	0.6419*** (0.169) [0.0890]
Arizona	<i>cay</i>	0.1858** (0.076) [0.0394]	0.3585*** (0.127) [0.0515]	0.4796*** (0.173) [0.0497]	0.5856*** (0.223) [0.0448]	0.8170** (0.404) [0.0271]
	<i>cday</i>	0.1693** (0.085) [0.0263]	0.3115** (0.143) [0.0312]	0.3980** (0.195) [0.0275]	0.4947* (0.251) [0.0257]	0.5911 (0.454) [0.0114]
Arkansas	<i>cay</i>	0.0812*** (0.031) [0.0457]	0.1621*** (0.044) [0.0848]	0.2190*** (0.055) [0.0978]	0.2790*** (0.065) [0.110]	0.4766*** (0.100) [0.133]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0899** (0.036) [0.0399]	0.1671*** (0.053) [0.0641]	0.2253*** (0.066) [0.0735]	0.2913*** (0.079) [0.0853]	0.4776*** (0.121) [0.0952]
California	<i>cay</i>	0.1641*** (0.056) [0.0554]	0.3256*** (0.106) [0.0599]	0.4914*** (0.154) [0.0648]	0.6694*** (0.200) [0.0708]	1.2046*** (0.368) [0.0681]
	<i>cday</i>	0.2843*** (0.049) [0.187]	0.5676*** (0.092) [0.205]	0.8460*** (0.133) [0.216]	1.1250*** (0.172) [0.225]	2.0872*** (0.315) [0.230]
Colorado	<i>cay</i>	0.0968* (0.050) [0.0248]	0.2262*** (0.081) [0.0506]	0.3439*** (0.108) [0.0640]	0.4746*** (0.137) [0.0751]	0.9884*** (0.243) [0.101]
	<i>cday</i>	0.1438*** (0.055) [0.0447]	0.3316*** (0.088) [0.0888]	0.4936*** (0.117) [0.108]	0.6571*** (0.148) [0.118]	1.2398*** (0.264) [0.130]
Connecticut	<i>cay</i>	0.1931*** (0.042) [0.124]	0.3478*** (0.073) [0.134]	0.4612*** (0.103) [0.120]	0.5491*** (0.135) [0.101]	0.6121** (0.251) [0.0388]
	<i>cday</i>	0.3007*** (0.050) [0.196]	0.5701*** (0.085) [0.234]	0.8053*** (0.119) [0.237]	1.0192*** (0.155) [0.227]	1.5954*** (0.289) [0.171]

(cont.)

State	Predictor	Forecast horizon $H$				
		1	2	3	4	8
Delaware	<i>cay</i>	0.2091* (0.110) [0.0242]	0.3697*** (0.111) [0.0703]	0.5068*** (0.120) [0.108]	0.6284*** (0.160) [0.0949]	0.8407*** (0.244) [0.0748]
	<i>cday</i>	0.3572*** (0.114) [0.0631]	0.5156*** (0.114) [0.122]	0.7455*** (0.120) [0.208]	0.9247*** (0.161) [0.184]	1.4059*** (0.242) [0.187]
DC	<i>cay</i>	-0.0517 (0.055) [0.00607]	-0.0515 (0.067) [0.00403]	-0.0732 (0.093) [0.00419]	-0.0396 (0.118) [0.000768]	0.1104 (0.211) [0.00185]
	<i>cday</i>	-0.0077 (0.058) [0.000121]	0.0392 (0.071) [0.00208]	0.0591 (0.099) [0.00244]	0.1393 (0.124) [0.00846]	0.4605** (0.221) [0.0288]
Florida	<i>cay</i>	0.1556** (0.063) [0.0399]	0.3261*** (0.103) [0.0642]	0.4509*** (0.143) [0.0634]	0.5430*** (0.182) [0.0569]	0.5709* (0.344) [0.0184]
	<i>cday</i>	0.2014** (0.090) [0.0331]	0.4736*** (0.146) [0.0670]	0.6871*** (0.202) [0.0729]	0.8638*** (0.257) [0.0713]	1.1088** (0.484) [0.0344]
Georgia	<i>cay</i>	0.0313 (0.050) [0.00261]	0.0730 (0.076) [0.00626]	0.1248 (0.096) [0.0113]	0.1736 (0.118) [0.0146]	0.5120** (0.207) [0.0400]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0517 (0.049) [0.00756]	0.1163 (0.073) [0.0168]	0.1861** (0.093) [0.0265]	0.2508** (0.113) [0.0322]	0.5843*** (0.200) [0.0551]
Hawaii	<i>cay</i>	0.3021* (0.173) [0.0203]	0.5645*** (0.194) [0.0544]	0.8532*** (0.218) [0.0941]	1.1357*** (0.234) [0.138]	1.7177*** (0.345) [0.144]
	<i>cday</i>	0.3568* (0.185) [0.0247]	0.6181*** (0.208) [0.0567]	0.8615*** (0.236) [0.0834]	1.0893*** (0.255) [0.110]	1.3851*** (0.384) [0.0814]
Idaho	<i>cay</i>	0.0685 (0.046) [0.0150]	0.1341** (0.052) [0.0441]	0.1677** (0.067) [0.0408]	0.1836** (0.083) [0.0319]	0.0879 (0.143) [0.00258]
	<i>cday</i>	0.1042** (0.046) [0.0336]	0.2340*** (0.050) [0.130]	0.3500*** (0.063) [0.172]	0.4378*** (0.078) [0.176]	0.7497*** (0.131) [0.182]
Illinois	<i>cay</i>	-0.0542 (0.039) [0.0130]	-0.1150* (0.061) [0.0237]	-0.1893** (0.084) [0.0335]	-0.2744** (0.106) [0.0438]	-0.6859*** (0.180) [0.0901]
	<i>cday</i>	-0.0710 (0.044) [0.0178]	-0.1473** (0.068) [0.0309]	-0.2399** (0.094) [0.0427]	-0.3511*** (0.118) [0.0570]	-0.8095*** (0.201) [0.0996]

(cont.)

State	Predictor	Forecast horizon $H$				
		1	2	3	4	8
Indiana	<i>cay</i>	0.0019 (0.040) [1.51e-05]	0.0306 (0.061) [0.00169]	0.0781 (0.079) [0.00664]	0.1309 (0.096) [0.0124]	0.3665** (0.163) [0.0333]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0873** (0.038) [0.0342]	0.2071*** (0.057) [0.0824]	0.3331*** (0.072) [0.128]	0.4401*** (0.087) [0.149]	0.8915*** (0.143) [0.209]
Iowa	<i>cay</i>	0.0352 (0.058) [0.00253]	0.0579 (0.076) [0.00392]	0.0592 (0.100) [0.00239]	0.0415 (0.118) [0.000837]	0.1061 (0.200) [0.00192]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0342 (0.069) [0.0598]	0.4535*** (0.086) [0.160]	0.5660*** (0.113) [0.145]	0.6161*** (0.136) [0.123]	0.9589*** (0.232) [0.104]
Kansas	<i>cay</i>	0.0254 (0.025) [0.00677]	0.0502 (0.039) [0.0111]	0.0602 (0.053) [0.00883]	0.0754 (0.066) [0.00884]	0.0360 (0.116) [0.000656]
	<i>cday</i>	0.1013*** (0.030) [0.0732]	0.2209*** (0.044) [0.146]	0.3077*** (0.059) [0.156]	0.3874*** (0.074) [0.158]	0.6038*** (0.132) [0.125]
Kentucky	<i>cay</i>	0.0056 (0.028) [0.000273]	-0.0087 (0.045) [0.000255]	-0.0222 (0.059) [0.000953]	-0.0441 (0.072) [0.00252]	-0.0717 (0.119) [0.00248]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0882** (0.035) [0.0420]	0.1679*** (0.056) [0.0582]	0.2268*** (0.073) [0.0609]	0.2621*** (0.090) [0.0546]	0.3366** (0.149) [0.0335]
Louisiana	<i>cay</i>	0.2237*** (0.038) [0.194]	0.4193*** (0.056) [0.274]	0.6144*** (0.074) [0.317]	0.8105*** (0.091) [0.348]	1.4913*** (0.154) [0.391]
	<i>cday</i>	0.2322*** (0.033) [0.256]	0.4380*** (0.048) [0.366]	0.6377*** (0.062) [0.417]	0.8316*** (0.076) [0.449]	1.4609*** (0.131) [0.459]
Maine	<i>cay</i>	-0.1702 (0.156) [0.00803]	-0.1280 (0.169) [0.00390]	-0.1361 (0.178) [0.00394]	-0.3733* (0.219) [0.0195]	-0.3701 (0.333) [0.00834]
	<i>cday</i>	-0.1785 (0.154) [0.00904]	-0.1323 (0.167) [0.00427]	-0.1612 (0.176) [0.00567]	-0.3936* (0.216) [0.0222]	-0.4489 (0.328) [0.0126]
Maryland	<i>cay</i>	0.0312 (0.024) [0.0112]	0.0865** (0.042) [0.0279]	0.1743*** (0.059) [0.0566]	0.2686*** (0.075) [0.0805]	0.7289*** (0.132) [0.172]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0149 (0.025) [0.00245]	0.0334 (0.043) [0.00402]	0.0787 (0.061) [0.0111]	0.1183 (0.079) [0.0151]	0.2437* (0.146) [0.0186]



(cont.)

State	Predictor	Forecast horizon $H$				
		1	2	3	4	8
Massachusetts	<i>cay</i>	0.1394*** (0.043) [0.0678]	0.2561*** (0.075) [0.0726]	0.3316*** (0.110) [0.0586]	0.3976*** (0.143) [0.0497]	0.5452** (0.271) [0.0268]
	<i>cday</i>	0.2189*** (0.047) [0.129]	0.4301*** (0.082) [0.158]	0.5857*** (0.119) [0.141]	0.7267*** (0.157) [0.128]	1.0961*** (0.300) [0.0833]
Michigan	<i>cay</i>	-0.0063 (0.049) [0.000110]	0.0014 (0.083) [2.08e-06]	0.0426 (0.113) [0.000966]	0.0861 (0.141) [0.00253]	0.4391* (0.252) [0.0202]
	<i>cday</i>	0.1908*** (0.043) [0.116]	0.3858*** (0.070) [0.170]	0.5832*** (0.094) [0.208]	0.7626*** (0.116) [0.227]	1.4652*** (0.205) [0.258]
Minnesota	<i>cay</i>	0.0190 (0.046) [0.00115]	0.0230 (0.079) [0.000579]	-0.0055 (0.104) [1.92e-05]	-0.0476 (0.128) [0.000946]	-0.1577 (0.231) [0.00317]
	<i>cday</i>	0.1424*** (0.046) [0.0611]	0.2645*** (0.078) [0.0724]	0.3427*** (0.103) [0.0700]	0.3878*** (0.128) [0.0590]	0.5739** (0.233) [0.0396]
Mississippi	<i>cay</i>	0.0540* (0.028) [0.0244]	0.0892* (0.047) [0.0244]	0.1021 (0.064) [0.0172]	0.0883 (0.079) [0.00839]	-0.0085 (0.141) [2.52e-05]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0381 (0.042) [0.00544]	0.0446 (0.070) [0.00273]	0.0446 (0.096) [0.00147]	-0.0046 (0.119) [1.03e-05]	0.2933 (0.209) [0.0133]
Missouri	<i>cay</i>	-0.0050 (0.057) [5.29e-05]	0.0280 (0.064) [0.00131]	0.0180 (0.072) [0.000430]	0.0293 (0.085) [0.000817]	-0.0344 (0.123) [0.000529]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0157 (0.074) [0.000308]	0.1667** (0.082) [0.0275]	0.1783* (0.092) [0.0250]	0.2974*** (0.107) [0.0500]	0.4285*** (0.156) [0.0487]
Montana	<i>cay</i>	-0.0401 (0.076) [0.00189]	-0.0319 (0.088) [0.000897]	0.0077 (0.103) [3.83e-05]	0.0623 (0.128) [0.00160]	0.2350 (0.199) [0.00939]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0456 (0.090) [0.00173]	0.1405 (0.104) [0.0123]	0.2744** (0.120) [0.0343]	0.3830** (0.149) [0.0428]	0.8132*** (0.228) [0.0796]
Nebraska	<i>cay</i>	0.0190 (0.022) [0.00513]	0.0194 (0.030) [0.00279]	0.0135 (0.037) [0.000908]	0.0110 (0.045) [0.000408]	-0.0556 (0.074) [0.00378]
	<i>cday</i>	0.1127*** (0.032) [0.0799]	0.1989*** (0.043) [0.129]	0.2784*** (0.051) [0.169]	0.3644*** (0.061) [0.197]	0.6995*** (0.096) [0.264]

(cont.)

State	Predictor	Forecast horizon $H$				
		1	2	3	4	8
Nevada	<i>cay</i>	0.1097** (0.049) 0.0334	0.2687*** (0.084) 0.0644	0.4773*** (0.117) 0.102	0.7336*** (0.149) 0.141	1.8555*** (0.254) 0.266
	<i>cday</i>	0.1313*** (0.046) 0.0533	0.2902*** (0.079) 0.0839	0.4694*** (0.110) 0.110	0.6763*** (0.142) 0.134	1.4966*** (0.252) 0.193
New Hampshire	<i>cay</i>	0.1501** (0.075) 0.0267	0.2737*** (0.088) 0.0612	0.3912*** (0.116) 0.0713	0.4362*** (0.151) 0.0540	0.4381 (0.269) 0.0178
	<i>cday</i>	0.1022 (0.090) 0.00868	0.1771 (0.108) 0.0179	0.2760* (0.143) 0.0248	0.2766 (0.184) 0.0152	0.1923 (0.324) 0.00240
New Jersey	<i>cay</i>	0.1883*** (0.040) 0.133	0.3507*** (0.070) 0.146	0.4867*** (0.100) 0.139	0.5708*** (0.132) 0.113	0.6452** (0.252) 0.0426
	<i>cday</i>	0.1975*** (0.044) 0.118	0.3840*** (0.078) 0.142	0.5645*** (0.110) 0.152	0.7018*** (0.144) 0.139	1.1404*** (0.270) 0.108
New Mexico	<i>cay</i>	0.1638*** (0.046) 0.0804	0.3510*** (0.059) 0.196	0.5440*** (0.072) 0.282	0.7485*** (0.088) 0.331	1.4397*** (0.134) 0.441
	<i>cday</i>	0.1618*** (0.052) 0.0623	0.3184*** (0.068) 0.128	0.4594*** (0.087) 0.160	0.6336*** (0.108) 0.189	1.1825*** (0.175) 0.236
New York	<i>cay</i>	0.0611 (0.044) 0.0127	0.1103 (0.068) 0.0176	0.1353 (0.088) 0.0160	0.1284 (0.109) 0.00943	-0.0333 (0.190) 0.000207
	<i>cday</i>	0.0760 (0.049) 0.0164	0.1409* (0.074) 0.0239	0.1851* (0.095) 0.0250	0.1872 (0.118) 0.0167	0.1303 (0.208) 0.00266
North Carolina	<i>cay</i>	0.0179 (0.035) 0.00172	0.0622 (0.055) 0.00864	0.0883 (0.071) 0.0105	0.1204 (0.088) 0.0125	0.1538 (0.153) 0.00686
	<i>cday</i>	0.0638* (0.035) 0.0225	0.1483*** (0.053) 0.0504	0.2043*** (0.068) 0.0578	0.2551*** (0.085) 0.0576	0.3053** (0.149) 0.0277
North Dakota	<i>cay</i>	0.0266 (0.076) 0.000839	0.1228 (0.101) 0.00995	0.0862 (0.122) 0.00341	0.0071 (0.129) 2.10e-05	-0.2223 (0.165) 0.0123
	<i>cday</i>	0.3460*** (0.085) 0.102	0.6218*** (0.108) 0.183	0.7213*** (0.131) 0.171	0.7057*** (0.140) 0.147	1.1175*** (0.172) 0.222

(cont.)

State	Predictor	Forecast horizon $H$				
		1	2	3	4	8
Ohio	<i>cay</i>	0.0201 (0.030) [0.00301]	0.0296 (0.052) [0.00223]	0.0380 (0.069) [0.00206]	0.0290 (0.086) [0.000771]	-0.1301 (0.150) [0.00511]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0973*** (0.027) [0.0798]	0.2000*** (0.046) [0.115]	0.2894*** (0.060) [0.136]	0.3555*** (0.076) [0.131]	0.5999*** (0.132) [0.123]
Oklahoma	<i>cay</i>	0.1921*** (0.040) [0.133]	0.3642*** (0.059) [0.205]	0.4887*** (0.080) [0.201]	0.6001*** (0.100) [0.196]	0.7333*** (0.180) [0.101]
	<i>cday</i>	0.2421*** (0.034) [0.261]	0.4703*** (0.045) [0.423]	0.6600*** (0.060) [0.453]	0.8226*** (0.074) [0.454]	1.2805*** (0.134) [0.382]
Oregon	<i>cay</i>	0.3521*** (0.069) [0.152]	0.7086*** (0.097) [0.267]	1.0335*** (0.127) [0.311]	1.2915*** (0.169) [0.285]	1.8852*** (0.319) [0.192]
	<i>cday</i>	0.3678*** (0.061) [0.196]	0.7142*** (0.086) [0.320]	1.0310*** (0.112) [0.366]	1.2797*** (0.150) [0.331]	1.7796*** (0.292) [0.202]
Pennsylvania	<i>cay</i>	0.0362 (0.038) [0.00612]	0.0647 (0.060) [0.00787]	0.0805 (0.078) [0.00714]	0.0656 (0.099) [0.00297]	-0.0888 (0.178) [0.00170]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0730** (0.034) [0.0301]	0.1357** (0.054) [0.0417]	0.1870*** (0.070) [0.0464]	0.2103** (0.089) [0.0369]	0.1930 (0.161) [0.00966]
Rhode Island	<i>cay</i>	0.1995*** (0.049) [0.100]	0.3725*** (0.086) [0.112]	0.5655*** (0.119) [0.133]	0.7566*** (0.154) [0.141]	1.2185*** (0.290) [0.107]
	<i>cday</i>	0.2990*** (0.045) [0.232]	0.5628*** (0.078) [0.263]	0.8282*** (0.106) [0.294]	1.0889*** (0.137) [0.300]	1.8852*** (0.260) [0.263]
South Carolina	<i>cay</i>	0.0935* (0.048) [0.0253]	0.1758*** (0.066) [0.0466]	0.2593*** (0.076) [0.0738]	0.3709*** (0.090) [0.103]	0.7532*** (0.149) [0.149]
	<i>cday</i>	0.1268*** (0.046) [0.0483]	0.2359*** (0.063) [0.0870]	0.3339*** (0.072) [0.127]	0.4702*** (0.085) [0.172]	0.8584*** (0.141) [0.201]
South Dakota	<i>cay</i>	0.0061 (0.041) [0.000149]	0.0421 (0.045) [0.00595]	0.0255 (0.054) [0.00154]	0.0484 (0.055) [0.00530]	0.0050 (0.069) [3.51e-05]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0136 (0.036) [0.000947]	0.0607 (0.039) [0.0159]	0.0443 (0.047) [0.00598]	0.0686 (0.048) [0.0136]	0.0327 (0.061) [0.00196]

(cont.)

State	Predictor	Forecast horizon $H$				
		1	2	3	4	8
Tennessee	<i>cay</i>	0.0127 (0.014) [0.00588]	0.0267 (0.017) [0.0157]	0.0424* (0.022) [0.0255]	0.0594** (0.026) [0.0342]	0.1260*** (0.042) [0.0569]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0078 (0.011) [0.00346]	0.0193 (0.014) [0.0130]	0.0220 (0.017) [0.0108]	0.0280 (0.021) [0.0120]	0.0121 (0.035) [0.000835]
Texas	<i>cay</i>	0.1625*** (0.042) [0.0924]	0.3396*** (0.064) [0.159]	0.4935*** (0.082) [0.199]	0.6602*** (0.100) [0.227]	1.3511*** (0.161) [0.324]
	<i>cday</i>	0.1924*** (0.038) [0.151]	0.3950*** (0.056) [0.251]	0.5648*** (0.070) [0.304]	0.7318*** (0.087) [0.326]	1.3587*** (0.142) [0.382]
Utah	<i>cay</i>	0.1824*** (0.036) [0.149]	0.3387*** (0.055) [0.205]	0.5082*** (0.074) [0.243]	0.6728*** (0.093) [0.262]	1.2252*** (0.163) [0.278]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0987** (0.040) [0.0398]	0.1892*** (0.063) [0.0581]	0.2983*** (0.086) [0.0761]	0.4057*** (0.108) [0.0870]	0.7653*** (0.191) [0.0988]
Vermont	<i>cay</i>	0.0413 (0.182) [0.000351]	0.2178 (0.202) [0.00783]	0.3949* (0.215) [0.0225]	0.4314* (0.221) [0.0253]	0.4165 (0.256) [0.0177]
	<i>cday</i>	0.0858 (0.180) [0.00154]	0.3602* (0.199) [0.0217]	0.5666*** (0.210) [0.0471]	0.5427** (0.218) [0.0406]	0.8476*** (0.246) [0.0746]
Virginia	<i>cay</i>	0.1475*** (0.046) [0.0661]	0.2841*** (0.075) [0.0895]	0.4504*** (0.102) [0.117]	0.6159*** (0.127) [0.137]	1.1389*** (0.231) [0.142]
	<i>cday</i>	0.1407*** (0.046) [0.0602]	0.2687*** (0.075) [0.0802]	0.4330*** (0.102) [0.108]	0.5978*** (0.128) [0.130]	1.0046*** (0.235) [0.110]
Washington	<i>cay</i>	0.1506*** (0.045) [0.0716]	0.2992*** (0.078) [0.0911]	0.4224*** (0.108) [0.0942]	0.5336*** (0.138) [0.0921]	0.7712*** (0.251) [0.0603]
	<i>cday</i>	0.2077*** (0.037) [0.180]	0.4158*** (0.062) [0.233]	0.5855*** (0.086) [0.240]	0.7256*** (0.111) [0.226]	1.0521*** (0.208) [0.149]
West Virginia	<i>cay</i>	0.0917 (0.093) [0.00661]	0.2004** (0.099) [0.0269]	0.3083*** (0.088) [0.0775]	0.2546** (0.119) [0.0300]	0.5587*** (0.136) [0.103]
	<i>cday</i>	0.1204 (0.085) [0.0134]	0.1883** (0.092) [0.0279]	0.4091*** (0.077) [0.160]	0.4237*** (0.106) [0.0977]	0.7990*** (0.115) [0.248]

(cont.)

State	Predictor	Forecast horizon $H$				
		1	2	3	4	8
Wisconsin	<i>cay</i>	0.1189* (0.062) [0.0246]	0.1914** (0.096) [0.0262]	0.3246** (0.124) [0.0442]	0.4667*** (0.152) [0.0606]	0.7760*** (0.243) [0.0647]
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.1355** (0.065) [0.0287]	0.2481** (0.101) [0.0395]	0.3882*** (0.130) [0.0568]	0.5139*** (0.159) [0.0660]	0.6252** (0.260) [0.0377]
Wyoming	<i>cay</i>	0.2150*** (0.046) [0.129]	0.4089*** (0.064) [0.216]	0.5981*** (0.083) [0.262]	0.8339*** (0.100) [0.319]	1.4494*** (0.170) [0.331]
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.3120*** (0.042) [0.269]	0.5886*** (0.054) [0.444]	0.8508*** (0.067) [0.526]	1.1281*** (0.079) [0.578]	1.8546*** (0.142) [0.536]
U.S.	<i>cay</i>	0.0481 (0.040) [0.00986]	0.0928 (0.070) [0.0118]	0.1213 (0.096) [0.0108]	0.1387 (0.122) [0.00871]	0.0775 (0.223) [0.000817]
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.1535*** (0.038) [0.102]	0.3047*** (0.065) [0.129]	0.4286*** (0.089) [0.137]	0.5304*** (0.113) [0.130]	0.7908*** (0.212) [0.0868]

Note: \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1. Standard errors appear in parenthesis. Adjusted R-square is reported in square brackets.

**Table 5.** Forecasting real housing returns using state-level data (Panel framework).

U.S.	Predictor	Forecast horizon $H$				
		1	2	3	4	8
FE estimator	<i>cay</i>	0.0664*** (0.006) [0.0162]	0.1264*** (0.008) [0.0342]	0.1728*** (0.010) [0.0408]	0.2073*** (0.012) [0.0395]	0.2573*** (0.020) [0.0223]
	<i>Cday</i>	0.0721*** (0.006) [0.0187]	0.1399*** (0.008) [0.0411]	0.1960*** (0.010) [0.0516]	0.2404*** (0.012) [0.0522]	0.3457*** (0.020) [0.0396]

Note: \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1. Standard errors appear in parenthesis. Adjusted R-square is reported in square brackets.

**Table 6.** Linear Granger causality tests.

<b>State</b>	<b>Predictor</b>	<b>F-statistic</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Alabama	<i>cay</i>	<b>7.69959</b>	0.0063
	<i>cday</i>	<b>8.27831</b>	0.0046
Alaska	<i>cay</i>	<b>3.98756</b>	0.0477
	<i>cday</i>	<b>8.81339</b>	0.0035
Arizona	<i>cay</i>	1.96698	0.1629
	<i>cday</i>	1.61448	0.2059
Arkansas	<i>cay</i>	<b>10.9973</b>	0.0012
	<i>cday</i>	<b>7.92822</b>	0.0055
California	<i>cay</i>	0.51241	0.4752
	<i>cday</i>	<b>4.57874</b>	0.0340
Colorado	<i>cay</i>	2.29201	0.1322
	<i>cday</i>	<b>4.33215</b>	0.0392
Connecticut	<i>cay</i>	<b>7.96991</b>	0.0054
	<i>cday</i>	<b>15.3677</b>	0.0001
Delaware	<i>cay</i>	<b>3.92423</b>	0.0495
	<i>cday</i>	<b>8.72632</b>	0.0037
DC	<i>cay</i>	1.46946	0.2274
	<i>cday</i>	3.57449	0.0607
Florida	<i>cay</i>	3.89226	0.0504
	<i>cday</i>	<b>5.20315</b>	0.0240
Georgia	<i>cay</i>	<b>8.43872</b>	0.0042
	<i>cday</i>	3.41009	0.0668
Hawaii	<i>cay</i>	<b>6.34128</b>	0.0129
	<i>cday</i>	<b>7.38503</b>	0.0074
Idaho	<i>cay</i>	3.08962	0.0809
	<i>cday</i>	<b>9.25165</b>	0.0028
Illinois	<i>cay</i>	0.48394	0.4878
	<i>cday</i>	0.09492	0.7585
Indiana	<i>cay</i>	0.89694	0.3452
	<i>cday</i>	<b>11.7123</b>	0.0008
Iowa	<i>cay</i>	2.24437	0.1363
	<i>cday</i>	<b>25.0072</b>	0.0000
Kansas	<i>cay</i>	2.42905	0.1213
	<i>cday</i>	<b>13.1333</b>	0.0004
Kentucky	<i>cay</i>	1.29486	0.2570
	<i>cday</i>	<b>11.6637</b>	0.0008
Louisiana	<i>cay</i>	<b>28.3428</b>	0.0000
	<i>cday</i>	<b>41.0227</b>	0.0000
Maine	<i>cay</i>	3.35975	0.0689
	<i>cday</i>	<b>5.90197</b>	0.0163
Maryland	<i>cay</i>	<b>4.98701</b>	0.0271
	<i>cday</i>	2.80367	0.0962
Massachusetts	<i>cay</i>	<b>4.41493</b>	0.0374
	<i>cday</i>	<b>9.62708</b>	0.0023
Michigan	<i>cay</i>	<b>12.8717</b>	0.0005
	<i>cday</i>	<b>32.9554</b>	0.0000
Minnesota	<i>cay</i>	1.85851	0.1749
	<i>cday</i>	<b>6.20934</b>	0.013
Mississippi	<i>cay</i>	2.32478	0.1295
	<i>cday</i>	<b>6.40571</b>	0.0124
Missouri	<i>cay</i>	0.74362	0.3899
	<i>cday</i>	<b>10.2147</b>	0.0017
Montana	<i>cay</i>	<b>10.6331</b>	0.0014
	<i>cday</i>	<b>27.6439</b>	0.0000
Nebraska	<i>cay</i>	0.56101	0.4551
	<i>cday</i>	<b>9.98083</b>	0.0019

(cont.)

State	Predictor	F-statistic	p-value
Nevada	<i>cay</i>	<b>6.31028</b>	0.0131
	<i>cday</i>	3.78123	0.0538
New Hampshire	<i>cay</i>	<b>8.96478</b>	0.0032
	<i>cday</i>	<b>7.06181</b>	0.0088
New Jersey	<i>cay</i>	<b>9.93078</b>	0.0020
	<i>cday</i>	<b>15.2590</b>	0.0001
New Mexico	<i>cay</i>	<b>17.1789</b>	0.0000
	<i>cday</i>	<b>14.6346</b>	0.0002
New York	<i>cay</i>	1.43500	0.2329
	<i>cday</i>	2.10937	0.1486
North Carolina	<i>cay</i>	3.85651	0.0515
	<i>cday</i>	<b>6.61561</b>	0.0111
North Dakota	<i>cay</i>	0.26775	0.6056
	<i>cday</i>	<b>16.6381</b>	0.0000
Ohio	<i>cay</i>	<b>4.22727</b>	0.0416
	<i>cday</i>	<b>4.06486</b>	0.0456
Oklahoma	<i>cay</i>	<b>16.5749</b>	0.0000
	<i>cday</i>	<b>37.2699</b>	0.0000
Oregon	<i>cay</i>	<b>20.4009</b>	0.0000
	<i>cday</i>	<b>25.6132</b>	0.0000
Pennsylvania	<i>cay</i>	1.10363	0.2952
	<i>cday</i>	<b>5.52574</b>	0.0201
Rhode Island	<i>cay</i>	<b>14.2885</b>	0.0002
	<i>cday</i>	<b>25.7105</b>	0.0000
South Carolina	<i>cay</i>	<b>9.37286</b>	0.0026
	<i>cday</i>	<b>11.4463</b>	0.0009
South Dakota	<i>cay</i>	<b>4.45062</b>	0.0366
	<i>cday</i>	<b>11.1114</b>	0.0011
Tennessee	<i>cay</i>	<b>4.34856</b>	0.0388
	<i>cday</i>	<b>7.66195</b>	0.0064
Texas	<i>cay</i>	<b>22.8707</b>	0.0000
	<i>cday</i>	<b>26.1145</b>	0.0000
Utah	<i>cay</i>	<b>20.5567</b>	0.0000
	<i>cday</i>	<b>15.1686</b>	0.0001
Vermont	<i>cay</i>	0.01411	0.9056
	<i>cday</i>	1.02957	0.3119
Virginia	<i>cay</i>	<b>8.73052</b>	0.0037
	<i>cday</i>	<b>8.63854</b>	0.0038
Washington	<i>cay</i>	<b>6.07516</b>	0.0149
	<i>cday</i>	<b>10.8470</b>	0.0012
West Virginia	<i>cay</i>	0.06845	0.7940
	<i>cday</i>	0.33985	0.5608
Wisconsin	<i>cay</i>	<b>5.73577</b>	0.0179
	<i>cday</i>	<b>7.49198</b>	0.0070
Wyoming	<i>cay</i>	3.52069	0.0626
	<i>cday</i>	<b>42.6126</b>	0.0001
U.S.	<i>cay</i>	1.92287	0.1677
	<i>cday</i>	<b>5.41316</b>	0.0214

Note: Entries in bold indicate significance at the 5% level, i.e. rejection of the null hypothesis of no-causality.

**Table 7.** BDS (Brock *et al.*, 1996) test of nonlinearity.

State	Predictor	Dimension				
		2	3	4	5	6
Alabama	<i>cay</i>	5.808***	6.695***	7.909***	9.151***	10.276***
	<i>cday</i>	5.130***	6.103***	7.495***	8.727***	9.759***
Alaska	<i>cay</i>	7.728***	8.968***	9.975***	11.295***	12.715***
	<i>cday</i>	7.289***	8.558***	9.572***	10.659***	12.018***
Arizona	<i>cay</i>	8.187***	9.344***	10.313***	10.957***	11.898***
	<i>cday</i>	8.153***	9.302***	10.254***	10.912***	11.876***
Arkansas	<i>cay</i>	5.360***	5.835***	6.205***	7.073***	8.184***
	<i>cday</i>	6.157***	6.495***	6.788***	7.753***	8.899***
California	<i>cay</i>	5.036***	6.269***	6.427***	6.192***	6.120***
	<i>cday</i>	6.359***	7.477***	7.639***	7.506***	7.490***
Colorado	<i>cay</i>	6.854***	7.568***	8.845***	9.877***	10.766***
	<i>cday</i>	6.951***	7.765***	9.132***	10.218***	11.133***
Connecticut	<i>cay</i>	4.888***	5.276***	6.304***	7.104***	7.583***
	<i>cday</i>	4.721***	4.804***	5.906***	6.750***	7.227***
Delaware	<i>cay</i>	9.023***	10.141***	10.936***	11.473***	12.288***
	<i>cday</i>	8.928***	9.731***	10.383***	10.776***	11.318***
DC	<i>cay</i>	8.590***	10.737***	12.090***	13.163***	14.603***
	<i>cday</i>	9.271***	11.216***	12.416***	13.373***	14.686***
Florida	<i>cay</i>	8.890***	10.054***	10.757***	11.713***	12.806***
	<i>cday</i>	8.955***	10.102***	10.754***	11.659***	12.751***
Georgia	<i>cay</i>	4.775***	5.587***	7.889***	10.113***	11.702***
	<i>cday</i>	5.419***	5.892***	8.040***	10.338***	12.009***
Hawaii	<i>cay</i>	10.852***	11.739***	12.806***	13.549***	14.642***
	<i>cday</i>	10.163***	11.084***	12.068***	12.724***	13.672***
Idaho	<i>cay</i>	7.505***	8.037***	8.484***	9.107***	9.676***
	<i>cday</i>	7.935***	8.526***	8.758***	9.052***	9.227***
Illinois	<i>cay</i>	7.207***	9.098***	11.057***	12.803***	14.940***
	<i>cday</i>	7.088***	8.924***	10.888***	12.603***	14.678***
Indiana	<i>cay</i>	7.144***	9.373***	10.743***	12.039***	13.619***
	<i>cday</i>	6.416***	8.526***	9.847***	11.015***	12.385***
Iowa	<i>cay</i>	8.177***	9.435***	10.153***	10.805***	11.672***
	<i>cday</i>	8.214***	9.038***	9.607***	10.004***	10.496***
Kansas	<i>cay</i>	5.739***	6.844***	8.057***	8.702***	9.392***
	<i>cday</i>	6.724***	7.309***	8.338***	8.959***	9.231***
Kentucky	<i>cay</i>	4.810***	5.712***	6.028***	7.047***	8.287***
	<i>cday</i>	4.007***	4.834***	5.284***	6.227***	7.235***
Louisiana	<i>cay</i>	6.657***	8.001***	9.304***	10.186***	10.954***
	<i>cday</i>	7.040***	8.267***	9.420***	9.959***	10.423***
Maine	<i>cay</i>	9.214***	12.087***	13.881***	15.377***	17.088***
	<i>cday</i>	8.906***	11.781***	13.593***	15.050***	16.672***
Maryland	<i>cay</i>	5.957***	7.034***	7.707***	8.229***	8.837***
	<i>cday</i>	5.773***	6.902***	7.575***	7.973***	8.528***
Massachusetts	<i>cay</i>	4.470***	5.903***	7.098***	7.734***	8.391***
	<i>cday</i>	4.377***	5.650***	6.936***	7.620***	8.284***
Michigan	<i>cay</i>	6.554***	7.819***	9.207***	10.164***	11.800***
	<i>cday</i>	6.936***	8.332***	9.494***	10.306***	11.413***
Minnesota	<i>cay</i>	5.076***	5.381***	6.180***	6.925***	8.191***
	<i>cday</i>	5.168***	5.228***	5.932***	6.851***	8.097***
Mississippi	<i>cay</i>	6.223***	7.358***	8.257***	9.247***	10.434***
	<i>cday</i>	6.478***	7.379***	8.512***	9.507***	10.544***
Missouri	<i>cay</i>	6.847***	8.315***	9.840***	11.200***	12.840***
	<i>cday</i>	7.322***	8.308***	9.511***	11.072***	12.462***
Montana	<i>cay</i>	5.388***	6.979***	7.790***	9.036***	10.299***
	<i>cday</i>	4.602***	6.752***	7.781***	8.795***	9.983***
Nebraska	<i>cay</i>	8.063***	10.039***	11.298***	12.321***	13.482***
	<i>cday</i>	8.094***	8.094***	8.094***	8.094***	8.094***



(cont.)

State	Predictor	Dimension				
		2	3	4	5	6
Nevada	<i>cay</i>	8.445***	9.590***	10.530***	11.036***	11.867***
	<i>cdlay</i>	8.577***	9.726***	10.671***	11.260***	12.132***
New Hampshire	<i>cay</i>	10.618***	12.168***	13.182***	14.178***	15.483***
	<i>cdlay</i>	10.521***	12.150***	13.216***	14.267***	15.637***
New Jersey	<i>cay</i>	5.651***	5.971***	6.942***	7.667***	7.929***
	<i>cdlay</i>	4.939***	5.370***	6.363***	7.113***	7.274***
New Mexico	<i>cay</i>	5.807***	6.157***	6.890***	7.354***	7.466***
	<i>cdlay</i>	5.673***	6.241***	6.983***	7.420***	7.652***
New York	<i>cay</i>	3.993***	6.756***	9.276***	11.264***	12.993***
	<i>cdlay</i>	4.077***	6.929***	9.404***	11.438***	13.164***
North Carolina	<i>cay</i>	4.740***	6.115***	7.830***	9.467***	10.993***
	<i>cdlay</i>	4.623***	6.124***	7.783***	9.320***	10.720***
North Dakota	<i>cay</i>	8.966***	9.070***	10.187***	11.249***	12.566***
	<i>cdlay</i>	8.356***	8.789***	10.153***	11.614***	13.140***
Ohio	<i>cay</i>	7.747***	9.224***	10.019***	10.640***	11.861***
	<i>cdlay</i>	7.775***	8.852***	9.671***	10.662***	11.974***
Oklahoma	<i>cay</i>	5.928***	6.528***	7.608***	8.609***	9.458***
	<i>cdlay</i>	5.678***	6.275***	7.235***	7.855***	8.586***
Oregon	<i>cay</i>	9.526***	11.254***	12.251***	13.100***	13.886***
	<i>cdlay</i>	9.544***	11.361***	12.211***	12.997***	13.683***
Pennsylvania	<i>cay</i>	9.012***	9.528***	10.430***	11.607***	12.604***
	<i>cdlay</i>	9.008***	9.483***	10.318***	11.485***	12.488***
Rhode Island	<i>cay</i>	2.901***	4.286***	5.964***	6.975***	7.716***
	<i>cdlay</i>	3.195***	4.478***	6.286***	7.591***	8.512***
South Carolina	<i>cay</i>	4.400***	6.419***	7.704***	9.059***	10.214***
	<i>cdlay</i>	4.318***	6.269***	7.438***	8.640***	9.681***
South Dakota	<i>cay</i>	8.053***	10.513***	11.963***	13.260***	14.998***
	<i>cdlay</i>	7.639***	9.495***	10.656***	11.510***	12.894***
Tennessee	<i>cay</i>	9.783***	10.663***	11.049***	11.872***	12.944***
	<i>cdlay</i>	9.483***	10.575***	11.024***	12.023***	13.386***
Texas	<i>cay</i>	3.649***	5.434***	6.570***	7.580***	9.145***
	<i>cdlay</i>	4.491***	5.837***	6.774***	7.700***	9.045***
Utah	<i>cay</i>	8.257***	7.962***	7.767***	7.673***	7.484***
	<i>cdlay</i>	8.288***	8.167***	7.956***	8.039***	8.068***
Vermont	<i>cay</i>	8.287***	7.529***	8.078***	8.062***	7.907***
	<i>cdlay</i>	8.287***	7.529***	8.078***	8.062***	7.907***
Virginia	<i>cay</i>	3.162***	5.140***	6.573***	7.307***	7.888***
	<i>cdlay</i>	3.121***	5.134***	6.564***	7.250***	7.806***
Washington	<i>cay</i>	7.226***	8.070***	9.027***	9.645***	10.228***
	<i>cdlay</i>	7.137***	8.044***	8.989***	9.736***	10.313***
West Virginia	<i>cay</i>	8.263***	7.493***	6.798***	6.261***	5.841***
	<i>cdlay</i>	8.263***	7.493***	6.798***	6.261***	5.841***
Wisconsin	<i>cay</i>	6.240***	7.840***	8.532***	9.382***	10.138***
	<i>cdlay</i>	5.796***	7.377***	8.180***	9.075***	9.678***
Wyoming	<i>cay</i>	8.139***	9.788***	10.951***	12.138***	13.504***
	<i>cdlay</i>	6.486***	7.870***	8.639***	9.305***	10.179***
U.S.	<i>cay</i>	5.423***	6.094***	7.000***	7.434***	8.083***
	<i>cdlay</i>	5.799***	6.187***	6.923***	7.351***	7.904***

**Note:** Entries correspond to the BDS (Brock *et al.*, 1996)  $\xi$ -statistic, with the test applied to the residuals recovered from housing return (*rhr*) equations of the VAR model with either *cay* or *cdlay*. \*\*\* indicates rejection of null hypothesis at the 1% significance level.

**Table 8.** Causality-in-quantiles tests (housing market returns).

State	Predictor	Quantiles of housing market <i>returns</i> ( <i>thr</i> )																		
		0.05	0.10	0.15	0.20	0.25	0.30	0.35	0.40	0.45	0.50	0.55	0.60	0.65	0.70	0.75	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
Alabama	<i>cay</i>	0.44	1.51	1.87	<b>2.48</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>2.82</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.56</b>	1.73	1.49	1.25	0.96	0.56	0.71	0.62	0.38	0.62	0.69	0.77
	<i>cday</i>	0.36	0.97	1.22	<b>2.18</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.22</b>	1.62	1.30	0.86	1.13	1.26	0.87	0.59	0.66	0.71
Alaska	<i>cay</i>	0.50	0.62	1.19	1.54	<b>2.23</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>2.32</b>	1.53	1.46	1.45	1.21	1.00	1.16	0.75	0.59	0.68	0.80	0.96	0.65
	<i>cday</i>	0.67	0.73	1.28	1.74	<b>2.08</b>	<b>2.44</b>	1.92	1.21	1.37	1.30	1.17	0.93	1.16	1.03	0.89	0.65	0.83	0.95	0.67
Arizona	<i>cay</i>	0.06	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.04
	<i>cday</i>	0.06	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.04
Arkansas	<i>cay</i>	0.05	0.31	0.43	0.74	0.95	0.77	0.71	0.50	0.35	0.53	0.46	0.34	0.16	0.14	0.11	0.10	0.12	0.23	0.02
	<i>cday</i>	0.04	0.24	0.40	0.85	1.19	0.86	0.89	0.65	0.51	0.63	0.49	0.38	0.18	0.13	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.23	0.02
California	<i>cay</i>	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00
	<i>cday</i>	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00
Colorado	<i>cay</i>	0.36	0.58	0.44	0.53	0.62	0.55	0.61	0.52	0.49	0.42	0.32	0.32	0.18	0.14	0.27	0.24	0.19	0.41	0.27
	<i>cday</i>	0.41	0.85	0.49	0.45	0.49	0.43	0.42	0.45	0.51	0.37	0.30	0.26	0.15	0.12	0.23	0.20	0.22	0.53	0.32
Connecticut	<i>cay</i>	1.38	1.82	<b>2.07</b>	<b>2.68</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.19</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2.25</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>2.10</b>	1.89	0.83
	<i>cday</i>	1.53	1.91	<b>2.16</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>2.02</b>	1.89	1.65	0.78
Delaware	<i>cay</i>	0.39	0.92	1.60	1.71	<b>2.13</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>4.54</b>	<b>5.45</b>	<b>4.73</b>	<b>5.11</b>	<b>4.63</b>	<b>4.18</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>2.68</b>	1.91	1.08	0.45
	<i>cday</i>	0.45	1.17	<b>2.13</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>5.18</b>	<b>4.62</b>	<b>5.65</b>	<b>4.95</b>	<b>5.24</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>2.49</b>	<b>2.19</b>	1.35	0.81	0.46
DC	<i>cay</i>	0.23	0.38	0.44	0.69	0.78	1.35	1.37	1.78	1.59	1.76	1.74	1.74	1.42	1.14	1.17	1.04	0.51	0.42	0.17
	<i>cday</i>	0.15	0.46	0.39	0.58	0.64	1.31	1.28	1.78	1.44	1.65	1.63	1.67	1.38	1.19	1.18	1.11	0.57	0.40	0.16
Florida	<i>cay</i>	0.91	0.96	0.95	0.61	0.47	0.55	0.48	0.64	0.68	0.52	0.39	0.77	0.49	0.52	0.59	0.70	0.75	0.64	0.57
	<i>cday</i>	0.68	0.75	0.90	0.65	0.76	0.75	0.38	0.46	0.46	0.45	0.40	0.80	0.57	0.68	0.77	1.27	<b>1.98</b>	1.35	0.68
Georgia	<i>cay</i>	1.17	1.60	1.85	<b>2.06</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>2.49</b>	1.74	1.46	0.89
	<i>cday</i>	1.14	1.48	1.73	1.83	<b>2.12</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.68</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>4.05</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>2.66</b>	1.86	1.76	0.91
Hawaii	<i>cay</i>	1.17	1.66	<b>2.51</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>4.21</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>5.82</b>	<b>5.60</b>	<b>5.17</b>	<b>4.51</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>2.06</b>	1.02
	<i>cday</i>	1.04	1.30	<b>2.05</b>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>4.49</b>	<b>4.85</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>3.48</b>	1.81	0.90
Idaho	<i>cay</i>	0.44	1.18	1.64	1.47	<b>2.20</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>1.98</b>	<b>2.04</b>	0.96
	<i>cday</i>	0.51	1.32	<b>1.97</b>	1.81	<b>2.58</b>	<b>4.41</b>	<b>4.15</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.13</b>	0.93
Illinois	<i>cay</i>	1.13	1.84	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>2.54</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>2.06</b>	1.16
	<i>cday</i>	1.08	1.82	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>2.18</b>	1.89	1.86	1.82	0.89
Indiana	<i>cay</i>	1.75	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.84</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>4.09</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>2.07</b>	1.55
	<i>cday</i>	1.73	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2.03</b>	1.46
Iowa	<i>cay</i>	0.27	0.39	0.42	0.39	0.54	0.43	0.30	0.25	0.22	0.28	0.32	0.28	0.21	0.32	0.64	0.51	0.42	0.23	0.13
	<i>cday</i>	0.49	0.69	0.76	1.09	1.37	1.00	0.93	0.81	0.44	0.43	0.48	0.27	0.33	0.29	0.46	0.43	0.49	0.37	0.22
Kansas	<i>cay</i>	0.37	0.71	0.86	1.28	1.16	1.36	1.53	1.32	1.35	1.23	1.09	0.91	0.99	0.92	0.85	0.84	0.53	1.02	0.65
	<i>cday</i>	0.55	1.12	1.34	<b>2.05</b>	1.82	<b>2.12</b>	<b>2.22</b>	1.92	1.69	1.44	1.30	1.13	0.92	0.87	0.58	0.91	0.65	1.00	0.72

(cont.)

		Quantiles of housing market returns ( <i>rh</i> )																		
State	Predictor	0.05	0.10	0.15	0.20	0.25	0.30	0.35	0.40	0.45	0.50	0.55	0.60	0.65	0.70	0.75	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
Kentucky	<i>cay</i>	0.61	0.94	1.47	1.41	1.88	1.80	<b>1.99</b>	1.79	1.64	1.67	1.44	1.17	1.04	0.84	0.78	0.59	0.72	0.62	0.43
	<i>cday</i>	0.97	1.36	1.58	1.42	1.84	1.48	1.73	1.56	1.17	1.41	1.16	1.09	0.83	0.59	0.79	0.74	0.87	0.68	0.57
Louisiana	<i>cay</i>	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.04
	<i>cday</i>	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.04
Maine	<i>cay</i>	0.20	0.29	0.27	0.26	0.27	0.23	0.18	0.16	0.16	0.14	0.13	0.11	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.01
	<i>cday</i>	0.21	0.30	0.26	0.26	0.27	0.22	0.19	0.16	0.17	0.14	0.13	0.11	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02
Maryland	<i>cay</i>	0.41	0.94	0.93	0.70	0.67	0.55	0.54	0.47	0.53	0.51	0.46	0.82	1.29	1.41	0.97	0.70	0.64	0.70	0.46
	<i>cday</i>	0.18	0.62	0.69	0.32	0.47	0.54	0.83	0.75	0.75	0.66	0.57	0.87	1.17	1.22	0.85	0.64	0.73	0.71	0.48
Massachusetts	<i>cay</i>	0.12	0.16	0.05	0.10	0.26	0.32	0.24	0.31	0.19	0.20	0.31	0.25	0.39	0.57	0.52	0.80	0.63	0.49	0.24
	<i>cday</i>	0.16	0.13	0.14	0.09	0.10	0.18	0.14	0.24	0.24	0.29	0.41	0.41	0.49	0.58	0.56	0.82	0.70	0.50	0.22
Michigan	<i>cay</i>	0.95	1.57	1.86	1.43	1.48	1.77	1.85	1.93	1.86	1.45	1.25	1.15	1.18	1.51	1.42	1.84	1.37	1.26	0.75
	<i>cday</i>	1.20	1.63	1.85	1.65	<b>2.07</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>2.16</b>	1.68	1.72	1.27	1.26	1.05	1.54	1.73	1.27	0.77
Minnesota	<i>cay</i>	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00
	<i>cday</i>	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00
Mississippi	<i>cay</i>	<b>1.98</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>2.57</b>	1.47
	<i>cday</i>	1.92	<b>2.66</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>4.15</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>4.01</b>	<b>4.01</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>2.63</b>	1.46
Missouri	<i>cay</i>	0.10	0.23	0.25	0.18	0.37	0.32	0.29	0.27	0.21	0.22	0.32	0.25	0.23	0.44	0.33	0.72	0.64	0.93	0.53
	<i>cday</i>	0.13	0.23	0.33	0.33	0.30	0.41	0.62	0.81	0.38	0.32	0.37	0.26	0.23	0.38	0.22	0.40	0.25	0.41	0.44
Montana	<i>cay</i>	0.36	0.50	0.85	1.07	1.01	0.98	1.08	0.92	1.05	0.91	0.96	1.06	1.03	0.85	0.97	1.26	1.20	0.99	0.34
	<i>cday</i>	0.46	0.81	1.33	1.46	1.56	1.58	1.64	1.19	1.22	1.09	1.06	1.07	1.06	0.84	0.95	1.12	1.09	0.93	0.37
Nebraska	<i>cay</i>	0.06	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00
	<i>cday</i>	0.06	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00
Nevada	<i>cay</i>	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.00
	<i>cday</i>	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.00
New Hampshire	<i>cay</i>	0.41	1.15	<b>2.12</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>2.23</b>	1.78	1.68	0.63
	<i>cday</i>	0.35	0.93	1.87	1.82	1.91	1.53	1.52	1.65	1.77	1.81	1.79	1.54	1.85	1.85	1.74	<b>2.01</b>	1.64	1.65	0.60
New Jersey	<i>cay</i>	0.09	0.11	0.14	0.15	0.08	0.06	0.10	0.23	0.28	0.26	0.21	0.37	0.65	0.66	0.88	1.27	1.23	0.83	0.41
	<i>cday</i>	0.10	0.17	0.35	0.23	0.11	0.20	0.24	0.33	0.44	0.35	0.20	0.40	0.49	0.59	0.55	0.83	0.84	0.63	0.35
New Mexico	<i>cay</i>	0.13	0.39	0.74	1.11	1.08	1.26	1.31	1.39	1.47	1.40	1.25	1.12	0.72	0.75	0.64	0.61	0.67	0.46	0.26
	<i>cday</i>	0.06	0.12	0.32	0.73	0.64	0.78	0.98	1.19	1.26	1.33	1.19	1.19	0.91	1.06	1.01	0.98	0.90	0.53	0.23
New York	<i>cay</i>	0.06	0.11	0.15	0.29	0.57	0.58	0.58	0.57	0.71	0.80	0.75	1.02	1.07	0.92	0.44	0.38	0.34	0.17	0.03
	<i>cday</i>	0.07	0.14	0.23	0.42	0.78	0.80	0.81	0.75	0.80	0.87	0.77	0.87	0.82	0.69	0.37	0.31	0.30	0.15	0.04
North Carolina	<i>cay</i>	0.15	0.27	0.60	0.67	0.73	0.70	0.63	0.79	0.54	0.60	0.67	0.74	0.41	0.42	0.19	0.09	0.09	0.13	0.05
	<i>cday</i>	0.26	0.54	0.90	1.03	0.91	0.86	0.65	0.90	0.57	0.65	0.72	0.65	0.39	0.34	0.14	0.08	0.10	0.17	0.05

(cont.)

		Quantiles of housing market returns ( <i>rhr</i> )																		
State	Predictor	0.05	0.10	0.15	0.20	0.25	0.30	0.35	0.40	0.45	0.50	0.55	0.60	0.65	0.70	0.75	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
North Dakota	<i>cay</i>	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.04
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.04
Ohio	<i>cay</i>	0.36	0.39	0.51	0.55	0.37	0.41	0.35	0.49	0.35	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.82	0.71	0.84	0.91	1.29	1.28	0.50
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.24	0.31	0.88	1.03	1.28	1.68	1.35	1.74	0.93	0.95	0.84	0.54	0.56	0.41	0.42	0.50	0.74	0.82	0.52
Oklahoma	<i>cay</i>	0.03	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.01
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.10	0.11	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.13	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.02
Oregon	<i>cay</i>	0.44	1.06	1.09	0.74	0.96	1.29	1.57	1.51	1.31	1.61	<b>2.03</b>	1.46	1.29	1.20	1.52	1.31	1.29	0.80	0.46
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.48	1.32	1.52	1.10	1.29	1.77	1.79	1.53	1.35	1.63	1.75	1.51	1.43	1.37	1.57	1.71	1.52	1.07	0.53
Pennsylvania	<i>cay</i>	0.99	0.98	1.08	1.61	1.38	<b>2.05</b>	<b>2.04</b>	1.89	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>2.14</b>	1.95	<b>2.21</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.11</b>	1.19
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.96	1.16	1.36	1.52	1.50	<b>2.23</b>	1.93	1.74	<b>2.09</b>	<b>2.15</b>	<b>2.54</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.14</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>2.31</b>	1.08
Rhode Island	<i>cay</i>	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00
South Carolina	<i>cay</i>	1.49	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.11</b>	1.59	1.03
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.43	1.93	<b>2.34</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>1.99</b>	1.78	1.10
South Dakota	<i>cay</i>	0.98	1.40	1.71	<b>2.23</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>2.30</b>	<b>2.11</b>	1.94	1.72	1.53	1.55	1.42	1.35	1.33	1.11	0.73
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.95	1.41	1.83	<b>2.21</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>2.36</b>	1.86	1.67	1.46	1.62	1.37	1.53	1.64	1.72	1.57	1.36	1.11	0.68
Tennessee	<i>cay</i>	0.37	0.84	1.14	1.18	1.28	1.62	1.70	1.62	1.57	1.34	1.33	1.04	0.72	0.43	0.54	0.58	0.61	0.79	0.39
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.38	0.55	1.02	1.40	1.93	<b>2.71</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.21</b>	<b>2.38</b>	1.90	1.76	1.42	0.60	0.79	0.62	0.63	0.83	0.43
Texas	<i>cay</i>	0.50	1.09	1.80	<b>2.99</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>2.13</b>	1.57	1.43	1.07	0.89	0.95	0.73	0.81	0.90	1.12	0.71
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.52	1.15	<b>2.04</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>4.18</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>2.64</b>	1.67	1.41	1.04	0.75	0.69	0.54	0.73	0.87	1.17	0.76
Utah	<i>cay</i>	0.77	1.33	1.82	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>2.01</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>2.19</b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>2.50</b>	1.71	1.51	1.68	<b>2.12</b>	1.64	0.99	1.18	0.69
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.53	0.60	0.62	0.92	1.21	1.25	1.10	1.44	1.70	1.84	<b>2.18</b>	1.47	1.24	1.33	1.53	1.28	0.83	1.08	0.70
Vermont	<i>cay</i>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>4.03</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>4.36</b>	<b>4.34</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>4.21</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>2.29</b>	1.52
	<i>cdlay</i>	<b>1.98</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>4.35</b>	<b>4.44</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>4.24</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>3.30</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>2.28</b>	1.51
Virginia	<i>cay</i>	0.27	0.68	0.79	1.18	1.09	1.29	1.31	1.17	0.93	0.63	0.78	0.42	0.37	0.45	0.54	0.28	0.25	0.20	0.21
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.19	0.35	0.48	0.72	0.56	0.62	0.61	0.49	0.57	0.35	0.44	0.39	0.43	0.53	0.67	0.50	0.38	0.24	0.25
Washington	<i>cay</i>	0.31	0.58	0.83	0.42	0.35	0.39	0.72	0.81	1.13	1.08	1.08	1.06	0.99	1.11	1.12	1.31	1.36	1.41	0.79
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.62	1.14	1.47	0.92	1.06	0.76	0.38	0.46	0.61	0.93	1.00	0.91	0.85	0.84	1.00	1.37	1.53	1.57	0.82
West Virginia	<i>cay</i>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>4.29</b>	<b>4.30</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>4.18</b>	<b>4.07</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.46</b>	1.54
	<i>cdlay</i>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>4.21</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>4.08</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.46</b>	1.54
Wisconsin	<i>cay</i>	1.82	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>1.96</b>	1.42
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.72	<b>2.28</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.35</b>	1.92	1.37
Wyoming	<i>cay</i>	0.21	0.59	1.05	<b>2.11</b>	<b>2.35</b>	1.80	1.67	1.82	1.57	1.59	1.50	1.07	0.97	0.88	0.68	0.44	0.56	0.35	0.10
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.27	0.69	1.34	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>2.21</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>2.54</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>1.96</b>	1.84	1.31	0.80	0.84	0.41	0.10
U.S.	<i>cay</i>	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.04
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.04

Note: Entries in bold indicate significance at the 5% level, i.e. rejection of the null hypothesis of no-causality. Thus, the test statistic for a given quantile is greater than or equal to 1.96.

**Table 9.** Causality-in-quantiles tests (housing market volatility).

State	Predictor	Quantiles of housing market <i>volatility</i> ( <i>rhv</i> )																		
		0.05	0.10	0.15	0.20	0.25	0.30	0.35	0.40	0.45	0.50	0.55	0.60	0.65	0.70	0.75	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
Alabama	<i>cay</i>	2.22	2.74	3.25	3.55	3.77	3.93	4.07	4.15	4.13	4.13	4.14	4.08	3.99	3.91	3.68	3.30	2.92	2.44	1.52
	<i>cdlay</i>	2.25	2.76	3.27	3.56	3.79	3.98	4.13	4.25	4.30	4.31	4.27	4.19	4.11	3.89	3.68	3.32	2.95	2.46	1.54
Alaska	<i>cay</i>	0.99	1.26	1.82	2.00	2.21	2.04	1.65	1.78	1.91	2.76	2.69	2.22	2.40	3.05	2.82	2.09	1.49	1.22	1.02
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.28	1.46	1.43	1.64	2.39	2.34	2.84	2.38	2.41	2.91	2.87	2.59	2.65	2.68	2.58	2.09	1.48	1.32	1.08
Arizona	<i>cay</i>	1.91	2.29	2.70	2.57	3.03	3.34	3.55	3.53	3.61	3.54	3.84	3.89	3.69	3.38	3.31	2.84	2.50	2.18	1.52
	<i>cdlay</i>	2.27	2.49	2.83	2.90	3.31	3.61	3.78	3.87	4.01	4.00	3.83	3.96	3.52	3.56	3.49	2.97	2.59	2.23	1.56
Arkansas	<i>cay</i>	0.73	1.31	1.45	1.61	1.82	1.70	2.30	2.44	2.05	3.54	3.60	3.33	2.91	2.30	2.09	1.93	1.57	1.32	0.78
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.92	1.43	2.07	2.00	2.26	2.17	2.88	2.51	2.15	3.31	3.34	3.37	3.15	2.90	2.48	2.05	1.76	1.35	0.81
California	<i>cay</i>	1.91	2.48	2.97	3.44	3.80	3.87	4.23	4.25	4.21	4.24	4.12	4.01	3.90	3.76	3.47	3.09	2.81	2.14	1.63
	<i>cdlay</i>	2.23	2.60	3.06	3.34	3.77	3.86	4.16	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.93	3.84	3.86	3.65	3.36	3.06	2.79	2.15	1.66
Colorado	<i>cay</i>	1.64	2.21	2.78	3.26	3.63	4.12	4.32	4.46	4.26	4.17	3.97	4.19	3.76	3.50	3.51	2.93	2.86	2.29	1.29
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.64	2.15	2.64	3.35	3.70	4.00	3.98	4.18	4.10	4.01	3.79	3.71	3.75	3.41	3.45	3.01	2.85	2.13	1.27
Connecticut	<i>cay</i>	0.37	0.52	0.90	0.68	0.68	0.73	0.64	0.68	0.54	0.45	0.40	0.62	0.70	0.99	1.17	0.94	0.76	0.77	0.14
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.31	0.32	0.24	0.58	0.70	0.89	0.82	1.00	0.64	0.66	0.46	0.79	0.80	0.76	0.71	0.67	0.76	0.78	0.18
Delaware	<i>cay</i>	1.43	2.02	2.04	2.36	2.92	2.84	3.21	3.22	3.58	4.13	3.89	3.55	3.10	2.99	2.40	2.74	2.26	1.58	1.07
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.53	1.88	2.12	2.24	2.81	3.06	3.05	2.83	2.76	2.89	3.04	2.93	3.04	2.72	2.51	2.39	1.88	1.45	1.36
DC	<i>cay</i>	1.06	1.73	2.03	2.31	2.79	2.84	3.08	2.78	2.39	2.59	2.33	2.31	2.35	2.03	1.70	1.81	1.59	1.32	1.00
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.34	1.59	1.86	2.09	2.30	2.25	2.34	2.55	2.47	2.41	2.39	2.42	2.46	2.13	2.08	2.09	1.91	1.58	1.10
Florida	<i>cay</i>	1.99	2.43	2.88	3.22	3.39	3.70	3.96	3.97	3.83	3.74	3.74	3.71	3.64	3.41	3.23	2.90	2.55	1.96	1.52
	<i>cdlay</i>	2.10	2.50	2.86	3.08	3.18	3.39	3.84	3.80	3.98	3.99	3.92	3.91	3.73	3.59	3.45	3.21	2.76	2.25	1.61
Georgia	<i>cay</i>	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00
Hawaii	<i>cay</i>	1.95	2.63	3.13	3.36	3.46	3.67	3.88	4.02	4.18	4.18	4.15	4.19	4.01	3.66	3.37	3.09	2.89	2.31	1.72
	<i>cdlay</i>	2.01	2.75	3.38	3.59	3.73	3.95	4.13	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.11	3.98	3.63	3.31	3.04	2.45	1.77
Idaho	<i>cay</i>	1.75	2.40	2.68	3.12	3.37	3.78	3.76	3.75	3.99	3.94	3.91	3.91	3.67	3.89	3.69	3.50	2.71	1.99	1.54
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.52	2.28	2.72	3.22	3.52	3.75	3.57	3.59	3.66	3.65	3.61	3.44	3.36	3.38	3.17	2.99	2.70	1.90	1.45
Illinois	<i>cay</i>	0.22	0.29	0.31	0.55	0.67	1.26	1.32	1.76	1.44	1.27	1.42	1.99	3.07	1.88	2.06	2.86	2.15	1.69	0.47
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.15	0.29	0.31	0.46	0.67	1.25	1.33	1.48	1.23	1.02	1.19	1.66	2.38	1.57	2.14	2.57	2.23	2.09	0.80
Indiana	<i>cay</i>	1.02	1.55	1.92	2.24	2.29	2.22	2.32	2.71	3.15	3.37	2.99	2.97	2.80	2.68	2.53	2.00	1.88	1.68	0.98
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.04	1.40	1.81	1.76	1.49	1.81	1.75	1.82	1.89	2.06	2.36	2.54	2.47	2.17	2.09	1.93	1.84	1.70	1.01
Iowa	<i>cay</i>	1.93	2.12	2.67	2.80	3.26	3.04	3.59	3.55	3.97	4.24	3.99	3.87	3.67	3.66	3.77	3.09	2.79	2.04	1.26
	<i>cdlay</i>	2.00	2.60	2.92	3.08	3.21	3.45	3.52	3.72	3.71	3.77	3.58	3.49	3.34	3.31	3.35	2.79	2.58	2.19	1.42
Kansas	<i>cay</i>	0.23	0.70	0.93	1.03	1.34	1.17	1.31	1.45	1.06	1.66	1.20	1.17	1.31	1.11	1.26	1.01	1.10	0.95	0.44
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.32	0.58	0.58	0.47	0.76	0.67	0.83	0.97	1.26	1.79	1.67	2.39	2.27	1.93	1.75	1.25	1.52	1.22	0.60

(cont.)

		Quantiles of housing market <i>volatility</i> ( <i>rhv</i> )																		
State	Predictor	0.05	0.10	0.15	0.20	0.25	0.30	0.35	0.40	0.45	0.50	0.55	0.60	0.65	0.70	0.75	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
Kentucky	<i>cay</i>	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.01
	<i>cday</i>	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.01
Louisiana	<i>cay</i>	1.09	1.44	1.49	<b>2.08</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>2.18</b>	1.72	1.62	1.36
	<i>cday</i>	1.12	1.31	1.43	1.57	1.83	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>2.45</b>	1.78	1.28
Maine	<i>cay</i>	1.22	1.73	<b>2.41</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>2.54</b>	1.74	1.57
	<i>cday</i>	1.21	1.83	<b>2.13</b>	<b>2.31</b>	<b>2.30</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.36</b>	1.86	1.47
Maryland	<i>cay</i>	<b>2.01</b>	<b>2.39</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>2.42</b>	1.88	1.30
	<i>cday</i>	1.59	<b>2.10</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>4.01</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>2.49</b>	<b>2.12</b>	1.48
Massachusetts	<i>cay</i>	0.05	0.15	0.06	0.10	0.07	0.19	0.12	0.07	0.10	0.05	0.11	0.11	0.13	0.16	0.09	0.13	0.06	0.08	0.04
	<i>cday</i>	0.02	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.20	0.20	0.11	0.13	0.08	0.15	0.13	0.19	0.21	0.15	0.05	0.08	0.01
Michigan	<i>cay</i>	1.40	<b>2.25</b>	<b>2.28</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>2.06</b>	1.13
	<i>cday</i>	1.27	1.90	<b>2.02</b>	<b>2.19</b>	<b>2.16</b>	<b>2.24</b>	<b>2.24</b>	<b>2.68</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.60</b>	1.95	1.10
Minnesota	<i>cay</i>	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03
	<i>cday</i>	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.09	0.18	0.19	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.18	0.13	0.10	0.03	0.04
Mississippi	<i>cay</i>	0.87	1.44	1.71	1.77	1.94	<b>2.30</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>2.52</b>	<b>2.52</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>2.08</b>	<b>2.07</b>	1.65	1.18
	<i>cday</i>	1.00	1.45	1.85	2.40	<b>2.42</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>2.54</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>2.37</b>	1.81	1.30	1.04
Missouri	<i>cay</i>	0.83	0.97	1.16	1.04	1.35	1.72	<b>1.97</b>	<b>2.06</b>	1.60	1.78	<b>1.96</b>	1.77	<b>2.01</b>	<b>2.22</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>2.13</b>	1.80	1.28	0.85
	<i>cday</i>	0.70	0.69	1.18	1.80	1.58	<b>2.18</b>	<b>2.02</b>	<b>2.08</b>	<b>2.36</b>	1.82	1.66	1.78	1.69	1.92	1.37	1.31	1.02	0.98	0.70
Montana	<i>cay</i>	1.00	1.76	<b>2.05</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>2.19</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.23</b>	1.76	1.17
	<i>cday</i>	1.45	1.73	<b>2.09</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.39</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>2.12</b>	<b>2.16</b>	1.77	0.99
Nebraska	<i>cay</i>	1.90	<b>2.33</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>2.21</b>	1.54
	<i>cday</i>	1.69	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>4.19</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>2.07</b>	1.43
Nevada	<i>cay</i>	1.28	1.74	<b>2.04</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>4.22</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>2.65</b>	1.94	1.24
	<i>cday</i>	1.30	1.87	<b>2.09</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>2.45</b>	1.89	1.06
New Hampshire	<i>cay</i>	1.45	1.92	<b>2.26</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.24</b>	1.95	1.22
	<i>cday</i>	1.65	<b>1.98</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>2.31</b>	<b>2.01</b>	1.26
New Jersey	<i>cay</i>	1.17	1.74	<b>2.49</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>2.19</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>2.00</b>	1.68	0.96
	<i>cday</i>	1.09	1.64	1.92	<b>2.68</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>2.38</b>	1.52	1.06
New Mexico	<i>cay</i>	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.06	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.06	0.06
	<i>cday</i>	0.02	0.04	0.11	0.20	0.11	0.14	0.17	0.20	0.16	0.18	0.23	0.26	0.13	0.11	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.07
New York	<i>cay</i>	<b>2.07</b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>4.03</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>4.14</b>	<b>4.08</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>4.05</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>2.84</b>	<b>2.24</b>	1.54
	<i>cday</i>	<b>2.05</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>2.21</b>	1.64
North Carolina	<i>cay</i>	1.36	1.87	<b>2.19</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>2.13</b>	1.57	1.06
	<i>cday</i>	1.10	1.83	<b>2.09</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.13</b>	1.69	0.94

(cont.)

		Quantiles of housing market <i>volatility</i> ( <i>rhv</i> )																		
State	Predictor	0.05	0.10	0.15	0.20	0.25	0.30	0.35	0.40	0.45	0.50	0.55	0.60	0.65	0.70	0.75	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
North Dakota	<i>cay</i>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.07</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>4.07</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>2.45</b>	1.52
	<i>cdlay</i>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>4.29</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>4.37</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>2.43</b>
Ohio	<i>cay</i>	1.00	1.21	1.15	1.53	1.59	1.91	<b>2.12</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>2.19</b>	1.92	1.87	1.75	1.79	1.57	1.61	1.37	1.55	1.13	0.66
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.79	1.30	1.25	1.85	1.92	<b>2.14</b>	<b>1.96</b>	1.70	1.57	1.49	1.45	1.37	1.34	1.51	1.27	1.62	1.36	1.36	0.77
Oklahoma	<i>cay</i>	0.49	0.68	0.88	0.85	1.19	1.43	<b>2.48</b>	1.92	1.72	1.92	<b>2.03</b>	1.50	1.59	1.68	1.33	0.91	0.92	0.82	0.55
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.34	0.76	0.85	0.87	1.38	1.19	<b>2.20</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>2.12</b>	1.89	0.93	0.70
Oregon	<i>cay</i>	1.40	<b>2.12</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.12</b>	1.69
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.32	<b>2.10</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>4.08</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>2.26</b>	1.71
Pennsylvania	<i>cay</i>	0.80	1.34	1.13	0.94	1.24	1.29	1.08	1.42	1.37	1.74	<b>2.02</b>	1.93	1.73	1.31	1.51	1.65	1.61	1.42	0.86
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.73	1.12	0.98	0.82	1.08	1.30	1.33	1.60	1.51	1.63	<b>2.11</b>	1.82	1.69	1.91	1.76	<b>1.97</b>	1.45	1.19	0.78
Rhode Island	<i>cay</i>	0.51	0.81	0.88	0.75	0.73	1.21	1.68	<b>2.11</b>	<b>2.05</b>	1.81	<b>3.01</b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>2.27</b>	<b>2.08</b>	<b>2.82</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.05</b>	0.98	0.46
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.78	0.83	0.94	1.60	1.32	<b>2.02</b>	1.86	<b>2.11</b>	<b>2.16</b>	1.82	1.75	1.51	1.54	1.03	1.20	1.33	0.73	0.79	0.35
South Carolina	<i>cay</i>	0.35	0.58	0.90	0.84	0.71	0.73	0.94	1.02	1.01	1.00	1.12	1.42	1.37	1.04	1.12	0.96	0.69	0.48	0.31
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.42	0.97	1.33	1.24	0.94	0.80	0.91	1.10	1.15	0.84	0.87	1.02	1.14	0.94	1.02	0.96	0.80	0.86	0.33
South Dakota	<i>cay</i>	1.75	<b>2.39</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.26</b>	1.58
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.78	<b>2.39</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>4.05</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>2.33</b>	1.60
Tennessee	<i>cay</i>	1.69	<b>2.08</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.11</b>	1.33
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.64	1.90	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.18</b>	1.35
Texas	<i>cay</i>	0.56	0.76	0.82	0.69	0.96	1.06	1.93	<b>2.37</b>	1.61	1.39	1.85	1.76	1.87	1.46	1.63	1.21	0.74	0.46	0.39
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.57	0.75	0.61	0.42	0.49	0.58	1.04	1.37	1.01	1.09	1.39	1.53	1.56	1.34	1.26	1.17	0.62	0.33	0.34
Utah	<i>cay</i>	0.42	0.49	0.52	0.73	0.82	0.91	0.92	1.13	1.15	1.11	1.00	1.00	1.15	1.50	1.22	1.24	1.20	0.61	0.49
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.40	0.37	0.29	0.31	0.38	0.44	0.59	0.83	0.73	0.68	0.86	0.86	0.90	0.92	0.62	0.41	0.35	0.36	0.15
Vermont	<i>cay</i>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>4.30</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>4.22</b>	<b>4.09</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.47</b>	1.78
	<i>cdlay</i>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>4.30</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>4.22</b>	<b>4.09</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.47</b>	1.78
Virginia	<i>cay</i>	0.27	0.23	0.29	0.35	0.22	0.14	0.27	0.41	0.67	0.55	0.66	0.87	0.63	0.41	0.54	0.50	0.61	0.34	0.11
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.55	0.16	0.28	0.43	0.35	0.27	0.70	0.64	0.55	0.83	1.14	0.63	0.59	0.51	0.44	0.43	0.53	0.33	0.31
Washington	<i>cay</i>	0.74	1.64	1.86	<b>2.01</b>	1.83	1.80	<b>2.03</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>2.28</b>	<b>2.21</b>	1.22	1.12	1.36	1.43	1.48	1.41	1.36	0.96	0.61
	<i>cdlay</i>	0.75	1.21	1.19	1.15	1.48	1.59	1.69	1.89	1.70	1.58	1.38	1.41	1.64	<b>2.54</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>2.08</b>	1.81	1.27	0.71
West Virginia	<i>cay</i>	<b>2.27</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>4.30</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>4.09</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.47</b>	1.78
	<i>cdlay</i>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>4.15</b>	<b>4.24</b>	<b>4.29</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>4.19</b>	<b>4.08</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.47</b>	1.78
Wisconsin	<i>cay</i>	1.34	1.69	<b>2.25</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.31</b>	<b>2.08</b>	<b>2.31</b>	1.81	1.41
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.59	1.61	1.75	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.31</b>	<b>2.07</b>	1.56	1.19
Wyoming	<i>cay</i>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>2.12</b>	1.48
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.89	<b>2.11</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.16</b>	1.51
U.S.	<i>cay</i>	1.08	1.57	<b>2.26</b>	<b>2.34</b>	<b>2.30</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>2.36</b>	1.92	1.19
	<i>cdlay</i>	1.03	1.49	<b>2.11</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>2.82</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.09</b>	1.31

Note: Entries in bold indicate significance at the 5% level, i.e. rejection of the null hypothesis of no-causality. Thus, the test statistic for a given quantile is greater than or equal to 1.96.

**Table 10.** Summary of causality tests.

State	Variable	Housing market returns ( <i>rhr</i> )	Housing market volatility ( <i>rhv</i> )
Alabama	<i>cay</i>	GC; 0.20 – 0.40	0.05 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.20 – 0.50	0.05 – 0.90
Alaska	<i>cay</i>	GC; 0.25 – 0.35	0.20 – 0.30; 0.5 – 0.80
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.25 – 0.30	0.25 – 0.80
Arizona	<i>cay</i>	--	0.10 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.05 – 0.90
Arkansas	<i>cay</i>	--	0.35 – 0.75
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.20 – 0.80
California	<i>cay</i>	--	0.10 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.05 – 0.90
Colorado	<i>cay</i>	--	0.10 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.10 – 0.90
Connecticut	<i>cay</i>	GC; 0.15 – 0.85	--
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.15 – 0.80	--
Delaware	<i>cay</i>	GC; 0.25 – 0.80	0.10 – 0.85
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.15 – 0.80	0.15 – 0.80
DC	<i>cay</i>	--	0.15 – 0.70
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.20 – 0.80
Florida	<i>cay</i>	--	0.05 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.85	0.05 – 0.90
Georgia	<i>cay</i>	GC; 0.20 – 0.80	--
	<i>cday</i>	0.25 – 0.80	--
Hawaii	<i>cay</i>	GC; 0.15 – 0.85	0.10 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.15 – 0.80	0.05 – 0.90
Idaho	<i>cay</i>	0.25 – 0.90	0.10 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.15; 0.25 – 0.90	0.10 – 0.85
Illinois	<i>cay</i>	0.15 – 0.90	0.60 – 0.65; 0.75 – 0.85
	<i>cday</i>	0.15 – 0.75	0.65; 0.75 – 0.90
Indiana	<i>cay</i>	0.10 – 0.90	0.20 – 0.80
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.10 – 0.90	0.50 – 0.75
Iowa	<i>cay</i>	--	0.10 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.05 – 0.90
Kansas	<i>cay</i>	--	--
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.20; 0.30 – 0.35	0.5
Kentucky	<i>cay</i>	0.35	--
	<i>cday</i>	--	--
Louisiana	<i>cay</i>	--	0.20 – 0.80
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.30 – 0.85
Maine	<i>cay</i>	--	0.15 – 0.85
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.15 – 0.85
Maryland	<i>cay</i>	--	0.05 – 0.85
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.10 – 0.90
Massachusetts	<i>cay</i>	--	--
	<i>cday</i>	--	--
Michigan	<i>cay</i>	--	0.10 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.25 – 0.50	0.15 – 0.85
Minnesota	<i>cay</i>	--	--
	<i>cday</i>	--	--
Mississippi	<i>cay</i>	0.05 – 0.90	0.30 – 0.85
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.10 – 0.90	0.20 – 0.80
Missouri	<i>cay</i>	--	0.35 – 0.40; 0.55; 0.65 – 0.80
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.30 – 0.45
Montana	<i>cay</i>	--	0.15 – 0.85
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.15 – 0.85
Nebraska	<i>cay</i>	--	0.10 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.10 – 0.90



(cont.)

State	Variable	Housing market returns ( <i>rhr</i> )	Housing market volatility ( <i>rhrv</i> )
Nevada	<i>cay</i>	--	0.15 – 0.85
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.15 – 0.85
New Hampshire	<i>cay</i>	GC; 0.15 – 0.80	0.15 – 0.85
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.80	0.10 – 0.90
New Jersey	<i>cay</i>	--	0.15 – 0.85
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.20 – 0.85
New Mexico	<i>cay</i>	--	--
	<i>cday</i>	--	--
New York	<i>cay</i>	--	0.05 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.05 – 0.90
North Carolina	<i>cay</i>	--	0.15 – 0.85
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.15 – 0.85
North Dakota	<i>cay</i>	--	0.05 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.05 – 0.90
Ohio	<i>cay</i>	--	0.35 – 0.45
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.30 – 0.35
Oklahoma	<i>cay</i>	--	0.35; 0.55
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.35 – 0.80
Oregon	<i>cay</i>	GC; 0.55	0.10 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.10 – 0.90
Pennsylvania	<i>cay</i>	--	--
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.3; 0.45 – 0.90	0.55; 0.80
Rhode Island	<i>cay</i>	--	0.40 – 0.45; 0.55 – 0.85
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.3; 0.40 – 0.45
South Carolina	<i>cay</i>	GC; 0.10 – 0.85	--
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.15 – 0.85	--
South Dakota	<i>cay</i>	GC; 0.20 – 0.50	0.10 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.20 – 0.35	0.10 – 0.90
Tennessee	<i>cay</i>	--	0.10 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.30 – 0.50	0.15 – 0.90
Texas	<i>cay</i>	GC; 0.20 – 0.45	0.4
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.15 – 0.45	--
Utah	<i>cay</i>	GC; 0.20 – 0.55; 0.74	--
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.55	--
Vermont	<i>cay</i>	0.05 – 0.90	0.05 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	0.05 – 0.90	0.05 – 0.90
Virginia	<i>cay</i>	--	--
	<i>cday</i>	--	--
Washington	<i>cay</i>	--	0.2; 0.35 – 0.50
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.70 – 0.80
West Virginia	<i>cay</i>	0.05 – 0.90	0.05 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	0.05 – 0.90	0.05 – 0.90
Wisconsin	<i>cay</i>	GC; 0.10 – 0.90	0.15 – 0.85
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.10 – 0.85	0.20 – 0.85
Wyoming	<i>cay</i>	0.20 – 0.25	0.05 – 0.90
	<i>cday</i>	GC; 0.20 – 0.65	0.10 – 0.90
U.S.	<i>cay</i>	--	0.15 – 0.85
	<i>cday</i>	--	0.15 – 0.90

**Note:** GC indicates the existence of linear Granger causality. Entries denote the quantile ranges over which causality-in-quantiles exists for housing market returns and volatility.