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#### Abstract

Using single and multivariate OLS regressions, this study examines how the listing price of a two bedroom home is affected by the monthly rental price of a comparable home in the same city. We do this in order to provide some direction to young families looking to purchase their first home. Our data encompasses each state's most populated city within the United States. This study reveals that as the monthly rental price of a comparable home (especially condos) increases, and/or as the price-to-rent ratio increases, so does the listing price of a two bedroom home. Therefore, a frugal home buyer should keep an eye on both comparable rental prices, and on the price-to-rent ratio within their city of interest. When rental prices drop, or when the price-to-rent ratio decreases, that is when a homebuyer should begin to consider the purchase of a two-bedroom home.
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## 1. Introduction

The purpose of this study is to predict the price of a two bedroom home located in one of the United States' most populated cities ${ }^{1}$. Specifically, we wish to see how the listing price of a two bedroom home is affected by the monthly rental price of a comparable home ${ }^{2}$ in the same city.

Our specific choice of real-estate (two bedroom home) and location (major United States city) fits the needs of our target purchaser: a young family ${ }^{3}$ looking to plant roots in a metropolis where job opportunities are abundant ${ }^{4}$. This family can either be moving from a non-major city within the United States, or coming from a different country. We have decided to focus on renting versus purchasing because a large down payment, or insufficient credit history, may prevent a young family from purchasing a home, and therefore renting versus purchasing becomes a legitimate decision.

## 2. Data selection

To predict how the listing price of a two bedroom home is affected by the monthly rental price of a comparable home in the same city, we began by extracting data from Zillow's online database (Zillow, 2016). Zillow's database included real estate data for the majority of cities throughout the United States, measuring

[^0]multiple spectrums such as listing price, rental price, and changes in home value. The variables we selected for our analysis are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Selected variables

| Dependent variable (per city of interest) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Med_LstP_2B | The median listing price of a two bedroom home. |
| Explanatory variables (per city of interest) |  |
| Med_RnP_1B | The median rental price per month of a one bedroom home. |
| Med_RnP_2B | The median rental price per month of a two bedroom home. |
| Med_RnP_3B | The median rental price per month of a three bedroom home. |
| Med_RnP_Condo | The median rental price per month of a condo. |
| PR_Ratio | The price-to rent-ratio for all homes. The price-to rent-ratio is defined as the median listing price for all homes, divided by twelve times the median monthly rental price for all similar homes. The lower the ratio, the smaller the gap between rental costs and listing prices, and therefore the decision to buy a home versus renting a similar one becomes more attractive (Humphries, 2010). |
| Inv_Measure | The inventory measure. The inventory measure is defined as the number of single-family, condominium and cooperative housing units for sale. This data has been smoothed and seasonally adjusted. |
| Incr_Val050; | The percentage of homes increasing in value (expressed as four dummy |
| Incr_Val5070; variables). ${ }^{5}$ |  |
| Incr_Val7090; |  |
| Incr_Val90100 |  |

There are three important details worth noting about our data. First, for all variables, we used the average of the twelve month period spanning April 2015 to March 2016. Second, as previously noted, our data focused on the one most populated city of each state. Third, due to data availability, we have omitted four states: Maine, North Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming. Therefore, our sample size is forty-six rather than fifty.

## 3. Descriptive statistics

Table 2 provides the mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum for both our dependent and explanatory variables.

Table 2: Summary statistics

| Variable | Observations | Mean | Standard Deviation | Minimum | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Med_LstP_2B | 46 | 208574.50 | 154271.40 | 71545.83 | 761625.00 |
| Med_RnP_1B | 46 | 1013.35 | 438.00 | 450.00 | 2257.08 |
| Med_RnP_2B | 46 | 1224.56 | 563.00 | 647.92 | 2603.75 |
| Med_RnP_3B | 46 | 1437.67 | 629.45 | 750.00 | 3426.58 |
| Med_RnP_Condo | 46 | 1391.65 | 544.70 | 659.79 | 3166.25 |
| PR_Ratio | 46 | 10.91 | 3.58 | 4.23 | 20.14 |
| Inv_Measure | 46 | 2402.11 | 3031.17 | 35.92 | 17669.83 |
| Incr_Val50 | 46 | 0.239 | 0.431 | 0 | 1 |
| Incr_Val5070 | 46 | 0.500 | 0.506 | 0 | 1 |
| Incr_Val7090 | 46 | 0.196 | 0.401 | 0 | 1 |
| Incr_Val90100 | 46 | 0.065 | 0.250 | 0 | 1 |

Interestingly, the maximum listing price of a two bedroom home is roughly ten times the minimum listing price; however, the maximum rental price for all units is roughly five times the minimum rental price. Therefore, one could argue that the housing price disparity across states is greater for purchasing a home than it is for renting one.

To capture the pricing differences across cities, figure 1 graphs each city's listing price for a two bedroom home. The cost of housing in New York, New York is substantially greater than that of the United States' other major cities (roughly $30 \%$ more expensive than its predecessor, Boston, Massachusetts); therefore, it is on the verge of becoming an outlier ${ }^{6}$.

[^1]Figure 1: Listing price of a two bedroom home
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Table 3: Explanatory variable correlation

|  | Med_RnP_1B | Med_RnP_2B | Med_RnP_3B | Med_RnP_Condo | PR_Ratio | Inv_Measure | Incr_Val50 | Incr_Val5070 | Incr_Val7090 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Incr_Val90100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Med_RnP_1B | 1.000 | 0.951 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Med_RnP_2B | 0.872 | 0.950 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Med_RnP_3B | 0.878 | 0.868 | 0.864 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Med_RnP_Condo | 0.630 | 0.711 | 0.754 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PR_Ratio | 0.460 | 0.398 | 0.369 | 0.606 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |
| Inv_Measure | -0.341 | -0.282 | -0.301 | 0.443 | 0.274 | 1.000 |  |  |  |
| Incr_Val50 | 0.038 | -0.055 | -0.082 | -0.179 | -0.390 | -0.141 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Incr_Val5070 | 0.135 | 0.156 | 0.207 | -041 | -0.005 | 0.063 | -0.561 | 1.000 |  |
| Incr_Val7090 | 0.294 | 0.346 | 0.353 | 0.135 | 0.298 | 0.045 | -0.277 | -0.493 |  |
| Incr_Val90100 |  | 0.174 | 0.205 | 0.044 | -0.148 | -0.264 | -0.130 |  |  |

## 4. Data discussion and model specification

### 4.1 Data discussion

As seen in table 1, to account for housing that is comparable to a two bedroom home, we included the monthly rental price of a one bedroom home, two bedroom home, three bedroom home and condominium, under the assumption that these are realistic alternatives to purchasing a two bedroom home. To further capture the difference between purchasing and renting, we included the price-to-rent ratio for all homes. Additionally, we added two explanatory variables to sketch the health of each city's real estate market. These included each city's inventory measure, and percentage of homes increasing in value.

Our decision to include these variables were not only to account for rental costs and to measure the health of each city's real estate market, but also to alleviate omitted variable bias. Our regressors help us to alleviate omitted variable bias for two reasons. Each of them, intuitively, are "a determinant of the dependent variable", and all of them are correlated with at least one other regressor, as shown in table 3 (Stock \& Watson, 2015).

Moving on, as shown earlier in table 1, our explanatory variable explaining "the percentage of homes increasing in value" was transformed into four dummy variables, now explained in table 4.

Table 4: Percentage of homes increasing in value (per city of interest)

| Incr_Val050 | $0 \geq$ [\% of homes increasing in value] $<50 \%$ | Indicator $=1$ if the percentage of homes increasing in value is greater than or equal to $0 \%$, but less than $50 \%$. Otherwise indicator $=0$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Incr_Val5070 | $50 \geq$ [\% of homes increasing in value] $<70$ | Indicator $=1$ if the percentage of homes increasing in value is greater than or equal to $50 \%$, but less than $70 \%$. Otherwise indicator $=0$. |
| Incr_Val7090 | $70 \geq$ [ $\%$ of homes increasing in value] $<90 \%$ | Indicator $=1$ if the percentage of homes increasing in value is greater than or equal to $70 \%$, but less than $90 \%$. Otherwise indicator $=0$. |
| Incr_Val90100 | $90 \geq$ [\% of homes increasing in value] $\leq 100 \%$ | Indicator $=1$ if the percentage of homes increasing in value is greater than or equal to $90 \%$, but less than or equal to $100 \%$. Otherwise indicator $=0$. |

These four dummy variable "buckets" indicate the strength of the housing market. The higher the percentage of homes increasing in value, the stronger the housing market per city. For our analysis, in order to avoid perfect multicollinearity, we will drop the fourth bucket representing $90 \geq$ [ $\%$ of homes increasing in value] $\leq 100 \%$. We chose this bucket because it represents the least amount of cities ${ }^{7}$.

### 4.2 OLS assumptions and limitations

Our project attempts to follow the four ordinary least squares (OLS) assumptions for multivariate regression (Stock \& Watson, 2015). The first OLS assumption states that the conditional distribution of the error term is expected to equal zero. Naturally, this is a fairly unrealistic assumption, and therefore our analysis is slightly limited in this sense; however, we have done our best to include a number of variables ${ }^{8}$ that realistically capture the complete error term. Second, we attempted to keep our dependent and explanatory variables independently and identically disrupted. Nonetheless, the variables of our analysis were not particularly selected independently (i.e. randomly). In order to pinpoint specific cities (those most populated per state), we "cherrypicked" specific cities, and therefore our analysis was not random. However, our variables were identically distributed (e.g. all coming from a single large population, the United States).

The third OLS assumption claims that "large outliers are unlikely" (Stock \& Watson, 2015). The graphs in figure 2 plot the median listing price of a two-bedroom home on the $y$-axis, and the median monthly rental price of a one-bedroom home, two-bedroom home, three bedroom home, and condo on the x -axis (starting from the top left, going clockwise).

Based on figure 2, we argue that our data maintains the third OLS assumption ${ }^{9}$. As seen in figure 2, there are a few data points that are a bit "out there" (for example, New York, New York being at the far upper right of each graph); however, we have decided to include these points because they are relevant to the discussion at hand - we want to predict how the listing price of a two-bedroom home is affected by the monthly rental price of a comparable home in the same city across the United States, not within an isolated geography or city economy.

The fourth and final OLS assumption says that there can be no perfect multicollinearity. Our regression holds this assumption - no regressor is a linear function of another regressor (Wei, 2016). Regarding our complete

[^2]set of dummy variables, as mentioned earlier, in order to avoid perfect multicollinearity we chose to drop the dummy variable representing $90 \geq[\%$ of homes increasing in value $] \leq 100 \%$.

Figure 2: Median listing price of a two bedroom home against the median rental price of a comparable home


Aside from our OLS assumptions, there are two important limitations worth noting. First, our sample size of forty-six is rather small; therefore, we do not gain the statistical benefits of a large sample size such as data variability. Second, even though each city is the most populated of its' state, they all have meaningfully different economies and living standards. In light of this, we are attempting to capture a significantly broad range of data, which is damaging because it becomes difficult to pinpoint a meaningful finding. However, that is the nature of our study; as mentioned earlier, we want to predict how the listing price of a two bedroom home is affected by the monthly rental price of a comparable home in the same city across the United States, not within a geographically isolated economy.

### 4.3 Model specification

We use OLS single and multivariate regression analysis to predict how the listing price of a two bedroom home is affected by the monthly rental price of a comparable home in the same city, paired with the health of the real estate market for that city.

Our dependent variable is always the median listing price of a two bedroom home, and the explanatory variables that we use vary with our analysis. ${ }^{10}$ Robust standard errors are used in each equation in order to control for heteroscedasticity. With all variables included, our regression builds as follows:

## 5. Data analysis and results

Table 5 presents the results of our regression. According to regressions (1) through (4), the monthly rental price of a residence comparable to a two-bedroom home is a reasonable measure of a two-bedroom home's listing price - at least when used as a single variate regression. For each of our first four regressions, as the monthly rental price of a comparable home increases by one dollar, the listing price of a two-bedroom home increases by an amount in the $\$ 200$ to $\$ 300$ dollar range. However, as shown in regressions (5) through (8), when the prices of our four comparable living spaces are simultaneously used to determine our listing price, the majority

[^3](aside from condos) become insignificant. However, even though regressions (5) through (8) are fairly insignificant, both the rental price of a condo and the price-to-rent ratio stay consistently significant at the $99 \%$ level.

Table 5: Regression results

| Dependent variable: Med_LstP_2B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Med_RnP_1B | 289.9071** |  |  |  | -65.61 | -47.49 | -67.82 | -81.71 |
| ( $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ ) | (38.34) |  |  |  | (106.85) | (115.12) | (119.97) | (132.81) |
| Med_RnP_2B |  | 235.26** |  |  | 127.00 | 106.82 | 119.03 | 134.57 |
| ( $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ ) |  | (27.42) |  |  | (115.48) | (117.45) | (114.13) | (123.37) |
| Med_RnP_3B |  |  | 209.44** |  | 29.81 | - 52.06 | - 52.42 | - 51.87 |
| ( $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ ) |  |  | (27.09741) |  | (55.08) | (48.95) | (48.12) | (51.66) |
| Med_RnP_Co |  |  |  | 246.42** | 149.11** | 166.70** | 161.73** | 160.65** |
| ndo ( $\mathrm{X}_{4}$ ) |  |  |  | (26.00) | (48.17) | (41.64) | (40.21) | (41.55) |
| PR_Ratio ( $\mathrm{X}_{5}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 17435.19 * * \\ & (3880.384) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17252.13^{* *} \\ (3820.37) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16479.19 * * \\ (3772.42) \end{array}$ |
| Inv_Measure |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.84 | 3.80 |
| ( $\mathrm{X}_{6}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  | (4.07) | (4.23) |
| Incr_Val050 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12839.06 |
| ( $\mathrm{X}_{7}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (57310.37) |
| Incr_Val5070 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22530.24 |
| ( $\mathrm{X}_{8}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (51776.08) |
| Incr_Val7090 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22849.52 |
| ( X 9 ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (54910.2) |
| Intercept | - 85201.84* | - 79509.59** | - 92526.69** | - 134357.5** | - 130806.8** | - 221414.7** | - 215548.6** | -230043.7** |
|  | (35124.57) | (30459.62) | (35202.96) | (33154.48) | (38482.61) | (38653.71) | (35917.38) | 77021.88 |
| Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MSER | 88602 | 79997 | 81033 | 76909 | 71089 | 57697 | 57411 | 59380 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.6775 | 0.7371 | 0.7302 | 0.7570 | 0.8065 | 0.8757 | 0.8800 | 0.8815 |
| n | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 |

*The individual coefficient is statistically significant at the 5\% significance level using a two-sided test.
${ }^{* *}$ The individual coefficient is statistically significant at the $1 \%$ significance level using a two-sided test.
We were curious, as shown in regressions (5) through (8), why do the majority of comparable rental spaces become insignificant when used simultaneously? As an intuitive answer, it would not make sense to use the monthly rental prices of all comparable units to predict the single listing price of a two-bedroom home, especially when one comparable unit (i.e. condos ${ }^{11}$ ) is a more accurate predictor than others. Our inventory measure may be insignificant simply because the distribution, as shown in figure 3 , is non-linear and contains a large outlier.

Figure 3: Listing price of a two bedroom home based on inventory measure


[^4]Moving on, we found it rather odd that our binary buckets expressing the percentage of homes increasing in value were proven insignificant in regression (8). Intuitively, the health of the housing market should be a strong determinant of housing prices. As shown in table 7, they proved insignificant even as a stand-alone multivariate regression explaining the price of a two bedroom home.

Table 7: Regression results

$$
\text { Dependent variable: } \text { Med_LstP_2B }
$$

|  | Dependent variable: Med_LstP_2B |
| :--- | ---: |
| Regressor | $(10)$ |
| Incr_Val050 ( $\mathrm{X}_{7}$ ) | -177008.4 |
| Incr_Val5070 $\left(\mathrm{X}_{8}\right)$ | $(101527.8)$ |
| Incr_Val7090 $\left(\mathrm{X}_{9}\right)$ | -103274.4 |
|  | $(104663.2)$ |
| Intercept | -36440.69 |
|  | $(114668)$ |
|  | $309669.4^{* *}$ |
| MSER | $(99015.36)$ |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | Summary Statistics |
| n | $1.5 \mathrm{e}+05$ |

**The individual coefficient is statistically significant at the $1 \%$ significance level using a two-sided test.

In fact, even as tested single variate regressions, all but one ${ }^{12}$ of our four binary buckets were insignificant. Our argument for this phenomena was that this statistic captured all homes ${ }^{13}$ (not only two bedroom homes), which may or may not be increasing in value in that particular city.

## 6. Conclusions

According to our results, the purveyor who wishes to predict the price of a two bedroom home, based on the monthly rental payments of a comparable home in the same city, should either use one of the single variate regressions with monthly rental payments as the explanatory variable (expressed in regressions (1) through (4) in table 5); or multivariate regression (8), bearing only the rental price of a condo and the price-to-rent ratio into consideration as their significant explanatory variables. Generally speaking, multivariate regression (8) is the best estimator for our study primarily to alleviate omitted variable bias.

Conferring with our multivariate regression reveals that as the monthly rental price of a condo increases by $\$ 1.00$ (holding all other variables constant), the listing price of a two bedroom home will increase by $\$ 160.65$. Likewise, holding all other variables constant, as the price-to-rent ratio increases by one, the listing price of a two bedroom home will increase by $\$ 16,479.19 .14$ Two additional, broad conclusions can be drawn from our analysis. First, if the rental price of a condo is going up, so is the listing price of a two bedroom home. Therefore, a frugal home buyer should keep an eye on the rental price of condos; when rental prices decrease, that is when they should consider purchasing a home. Second, as the price-to-rent ratio decreases ${ }^{15}$, so will the price of a two bedroom home.

## References

Humphries, S. (2010, September 21). A Better Price-Rent Ratio. Retrieved from http://www.zillow.com/research/a-better-price-rent-ratio-280/
Stock, J. H., Watson, M.W. (2015). Introduction to econometrics: Updated third edition. Essex, England: Pearson Education.
Wei X., lecture, May 9, 2016.
Zillow (2016, May). Zillow data. Seattle, WA. Retrieved from Zillow database.

[^5]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ To encompass the United States' most populated cities, our study focused on the top populated city for each state.
    ${ }^{2}$ Comparable home: an accommodation that is either two bedroom or similar in size.
    ${ }^{3}$ Young family: a domestic partnership or newlywed couple, with no more than one child under the age of thirteen.
    ${ }^{4}$ The abundance of jobs must take location into consideration. For example, Anchorage, Alaska may not be teeming with jobs; however, in respect to other Alaskan cities, the number of job opportunities is fairly high.

[^1]:    ${ }^{5}$ For more on our dummy variables, see table 4.
    ${ }^{6}$ For more on outliers, see our section titled OLS Assumptions \& Limitations.

[^2]:    ${ }^{7}$ Seattle, Washington and Denver, Colorado.
    ${ }^{8}$ This also aided our alleviation of omitted variable bias.
    ${ }^{9}$ Additionally, our data appears to be definitively linear.

[^3]:    ${ }^{10}$ For a detailed breakdown of specific variables used, see the table 5 .

[^4]:    ${ }^{11}$ Single variate regressions (1) through (4) revealed that condos, when used as our explanatory variable for the listing price of a two bedroom home, delivered the lowest standard error, MSER, and highest $r$-squared.

[^5]:    ${ }^{12}$ Incr_Val050 was significant at the $99 \%$ level.
    ${ }^{13}$ This added four bedroom homes, five bedroom homes, duplexes and triplexes.
    ${ }^{14}$ Vice versa for a decrease of one for each variable. As the monthly rental price of a condo decreases by $\$ 1.00$ (holding all other variables constant), the listing price of a two bedroom home will decrease by $\$ 160.65$. Likewise, holding all other variables constant, as the price-to-rent ratio decreases by one, the listing price of a two bedroom home will decreases by $\$ 16,479.19$. ${ }^{15}$ Particularly the median listing price for all homes.

