International Journal of
Economic Policy
(IJECOP)

Macroprudential Policies and Housing Markets

CARI Journals

International Journal of Economic Policy
ISSN: 2788-6352 (Online)
Vol. 5, Issue No. 3, pp 76 - 90, 2025
www.carijournals.org

Macroprudential Policies and Housing Markets

[1*]Vincent Nyamori
Strathmore University

Accepted: 10th Apr, 2025, Received in Revised Form: 10th May, 2025, Published: 14th June, 2025

Abstract

Purpose: The general objective of this study was to examine the macroprudential policies and housing markets.

Methodology: The study adopted a desktop research methodology. Desk research refers to secondary data or that which can be collected without fieldwork. Desk research is basically involved in collecting data from existing resources hence it is often considered a low cost technique as compared to field research, as the main cost is involved in executive's time, telephone charges and directories. Thus, the study relied on already published studies, reports and statistics. This secondary data was easily accessed through the online journals and library.

Findings: The findings reveal that there exists a contextual and methodological gap relating to the macroprudential policies and housing markets. Preliminary empirical review revealed that LTV and DTI caps helped stabilize housing markets by reducing credit risk and price volatility, especially when well-timed and supported by strong institutions. However, these tools alone did not address housing affordability or access challenges in lower-income segments.

Unique Contribution to Theory, Practice and Policy: The Financial Instability Hypothesis, Rational Expectations theory and the New Institutional Economics may be used to anchor future studies on macropudential policies. The study recommended customizing macroprudential tools to local conditions, improving data systems, and coordinating with broader housing and fiscal policies. It also called for more inclusive, equity-focused approaches to ensure financial stability without limiting access to housing finance.

Keywords: *Macroprudential Policies, Loan-to-Value (LTV) Ratio, Debt-to-Income (DTI) Ratio, Housing Market Stability, Financial Inclusion*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Housing market outcomes are essential indicators of economic well-being and stability, encompassing housing prices, mortgage credit availability, and market volatility. Globally, these metrics are influenced by macroeconomic policies, demographic shifts, and financial liberalization. Over the past decade, the post-2008 recovery period saw a renewed focus on housing market resilience, particularly after COVID-19, which disrupted construction, labor supply, and real estate finance. A cross-country analysis by Bah, Faye & Geh (2018) underscored that price surges in developed economies were driven by low interest rates and expansionary credit policies, while volatility in developing countries was exacerbated by limited housing supply and weak financial infrastructure. Furthermore, the rise in investor-driven housing purchases has fueled speculative bubbles, contributing to increased volatility in cities like London, New York, and São Paulo.

In the United States, the housing market has experienced a remarkable recovery since the Great Recession, with prices rising by over 80% nationally between 2012 and 2022. According to Zillow's index, median home prices surged from $150,000 in 2012 to nearly $280,000 by 2022. This sharp appreciation accelerated during the COVID-19 pandemic due to historically low interest rates, remote work, and high demand. Credit access, although initially tightened after the 2008 crisis, has gradually eased, especially for middle-income borrowers. Volatility, however, remains regionally concentrated, with cities like San Francisco and Miami experiencing double-digit annual price changes. The volatility is further amplified by speculative behavior and institutional investors purchasing single-family homes, as highlighted by Akunga & Ahmad (2023), who found that U.S. real estate markets remain sensitive to global financial contagion and crisis spillovers.

The UK housing market is characterized by stark regional disparities and credit-driven price growth. From 2010 to 2022, average house prices in London grew by over 70%, compared to 30–40% in regions like the North East. Mortgage credit expansion played a pivotal role, with government schemes such as Help-to-Buy inflating demand, particularly among first-time buyers. However, post-Brexit uncertainty and COVID-19 introduced significant volatility, particularly in the rental and buy-to-let segments. According to Edo &Kanwanye (2022), UK housing investment patterns are strongly influenced by foreign capital flows and shifts in exchange rate expectations, which create volatile capital returns and distort credit supply.

Japan presents a unique case of long-term housing market stagnation amidst demographic decline and persistent deflation. Since the asset bubble burst in the early 1990s, housing prices in major cities like Tokyo and Osaka have remained relatively flat, despite low interest rates. Housing credit remains conservative, with loan-to-value ratios strictly regulated and banks cautious in lending. Despite this stability, liquidity issues and aging infrastructure have increased regional volatility. Bah et al. (2018) emphasized that Japan's housing market is shaped by macroeconomic conservatism and a cultural preference for liquidity, which limits speculative behavior compared to Western counterparts.

Brazil’s housing market reflects the volatility typical of emerging economies, where inflation, policy swings, and capital flight influence housing outcomes. Between 2010 and 2020, cities like São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro experienced significant housing inflation—up to 120% in some

periods—driven by rapid urbanization, speculation, and government-subsidized credit programs such as Minha Casa Minha Vida. However, economic crises and corruption scandals, coupled with inflation volatility exceeding 8% in 2021, have led to declining real housing affordability. Zwane (2020) reported that real estate investment trust (REIT) returns in Brazil show strong correlations with macro variables like interest rate volatility and oil prices, making the market highly sensitive to external shocks.

In Sub-Saharan Africa, housing markets are dominated by informality, low mortgage penetration, and severe affordability constraints. Over 60% of urban households in SSA live in informal settlements, with only 3–7% of households accessing mortgage credit. The price-to-income ratio in countries like Nigeria and Kenya exceeds 10:1, well above affordable benchmarks. Atsin (2018) showed that housing markets in SSA are not only underdeveloped but also subject to sharp price volatility due to currency depreciation, unstable credit markets, and speculative land acquisition. This results in cyclical booms and busts, especially in urban corridors like Nairobi and Lagos.

Mortgage systems vary widely, with developed countries offering mature, securitized lending environments while developing nations often lack basic financial infrastructure. In the UK and US, over 60% of housing finance is securitized and backed by institutional investors, whereas in Brazil and most of SSA, commercial banks remain the primary lenders with high interest rates and short tenures. Akunga & Ahmad (2023) argued that credit constraints in emerging markets are intensified by weak property rights and volatile inflation, discouraging long-term lending. Their findings suggest that improving housing credit requires not only macroeconomic stability but also structural reforms to banking regulation.

Volatility—defined as unpredictable changes in housing prices or credit availability—is most pronounced in developing regions due to macroeconomic shocks, capital flight, and fragile institutions. In Brazil, for instance, REIT returns declined over 15% during the 2015 recession, while similar effects were observed in South Africa during the COVID-19 crisis. Edo & Kanwanye (2022) demonstrated that foreign portfolio investments significantly amplify volatility in SSA housing and stock markets when global investors react to risk cues from central economies. This was evident during the 2020 COVID panic when investor flight caused local housing markets to freeze, reducing liquidity and distorting prices.

A review of national housing price indices (HPI) reveals divergent trajectories. The US and UK both experienced double-digit percentage growth in 2020–2022 due to pandemic-driven demand and low interest rates. Japan's HPI remained mostly flat, with annual changes below 1.5%. In Brazil, prices fluctuated with inflation, resulting in real-term losses despite nominal increases. In contrast, Sub-Saharan African countries often lack national HPI databases, but anecdotal and sub-national studies show up to 40% annual volatility in cities like Addis Ababa and Accra. This diversity underscores the role of governance and credit infrastructure in ensuring housing market stability (Bah, Faye & Geh, 2018).

Governments worldwide have deployed macroprudential tools—like loan-to-value caps, interest rate ceilings, and fiscal incentives—to stabilize housing outcomes. While effective in mature markets like the UK and USA, their application in Brazil and SSA is often limited by data shortages and institutional capacity. The literature by Zwane (2020) and Bah et al. (2018) emphasizes the need for hybrid strategies combining regulatory enforcement with affordable housing programs.

For example, Brazil's use of targeted subsidies reduced short-term volatility but failed to ensure long-term affordability. Meanwhile, SSA needs basic infrastructure such as title registration and housing finance reforms before macroprudential policy can be effective.

Macroprudential policy refers to regulatory strategies aimed at stabilizing the financial system by managing systemic risk. These tools include measures such as Loan-to-Value (LTV) ratios, Debt-to-Income (DTI) caps, countercyclical capital buffers, and dynamic provisioning rules. LTV limits cap the amount one can borrow relative to property value, while DTI caps restrict borrowing relative to income. These instruments are designed to control excessive credit growth, particularly in real estate markets where speculative bubbles can form. Conceptually, macroprudential policy emerged post-2008 as a response to the inadequacies of microprudential and monetary policies in mitigating systemic shocks. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) emphasizes that such tools aim to enhance the resilience of the financial sector and smooth the credit cycle, particularly in overheated housing markets (Anwar, 2020).

In the United States, macroprudential regulation intensified after the 2008 housing crisis, focusing on stricter underwriting standards and the use of stress tests. The Federal Reserve implemented LTV limits and stringent bank capital rules under the Dodd-Frank Act. These measures curbed risky mortgage lending and stabilized house prices. Between 2012 and 2020, national home price indices rose steadily but with reduced volatility compared to the pre-2008 boom-and-bust cycles. The effectiveness of macroprudential tools is evident in how they moderated household leverage and prevented a repeat of subprime defaults. Empirical evidence suggests that binding LTV limits in combination with tighter credit regulation led to more sustainable price growth and reduced default rates (Dell'Ariccia, Igan, Laeven & Tong, 2016).

The United Kingdom introduced macroprudential measures in 2014 through the Financial Policy Committee of the Bank of England. The UK adopted LTV caps (generally 90% for first-time buyers) and DTI caps (at 4.5x annual income), particularly targeting London and the Southeast where housing pressures were acute. These tools helped to cool demand and rebalance credit distribution. While house prices continued rising nationally, the growth rate in high-risk areas decelerated notably after 2015. Moreover, mortgage approvals dropped in areas with high DTI concentrations, suggesting effectiveness in containing credit-fueled housing inflation. Pahla (2019) found that UK macroprudential tools effectively reduced housing market volatility, particularly when synchronized with monetary policy measures.

Japan's experience diverges due to its conservative lending culture and macroprudential conservatism. Since the asset bubble burst in the 1990s, Japan has maintained strict LTV limits and closely monitored household debt exposure. Japanese banks typically impose LTV ratios below 80% and enforce rigorous income documentation. Consequently, housing prices in Japan have remained stable, with little volatility and moderate credit expansion. From 2010 to 2020, national house price growth averaged under 1.5% annually. The absence of speculative bubbles in residential markets highlights the preventive power of prudent policy settings. Saiki, Chantapacdepong, and Volz (2016) explained that Japan's proactive stance in enforcing LTV and macroprudential surveillance post-quantitative easing insulated it from global housing shocks.

In Brazil, macroprudential tools have played a critical role in managing housing credit amid volatile inflation and currency depreciation. The Central Bank of Brazil applied dynamic

provisioning rules and LTV caps between 2010 and 2015 to restrict consumer credit booms. Despite these efforts, structural challenges like high interest rates and macroeconomic instability diluted the long-term impact. Nevertheless, empirical evidence shows that these measures slowed credit growth and moderated housing price acceleration in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro during boom years. Anwar (2020) noted that macroprudential policies were crucial in limiting systemic risk, even though broader fiscal volatility often overwhelmed their effect in Brazil's context.

Macroprudential frameworks in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) are underdeveloped, though countries like South Africa, Kenya, and Nigeria have adopted initial tools such as reserve requirements, capital buffers, and LTV restrictions. Due to informality and weak mortgage markets, these tools have limited reach. In South Africa, however, macroprudential policy helped dampen the impact of the 2008 crisis and the 2020 pandemic on housing finance. Pahla (2019) reported that South Africa's use of house price indices and bank capital controls significantly reduced housing volatility, though affordability remains a major challenge. Across SSA, the limited implementation of LTV/DTI is attributed to poor credit infrastructure, weak regulatory capacity, and underdeveloped secondary markets.

Cross-country analyses reveal that LTV caps are most effective when implemented early in the credit cycle and enforced uniformly. The IMF and BIS report that countries with strict LTV policies—like the UK and Japan—experienced more moderate house price inflation and fewer defaults during global downturns. Conversely, in countries like Brazil and Nigeria where enforcement is patchy, LTV effectiveness is undermined by informal lending and political pressure. Empirical research by Dell'Ariccia et al. (2016) confirmed that binding LTV restrictions are significantly correlated with reduced housing price growth, especially in urban hotspots. Furthermore, by limiting leverage, LTVs can reduce speculative buying, thus mitigating housing bubbles.

DTI caps serve to limit households' debt burden relative to their income and are particularly relevant in high-debt economies. In the UK, DTI caps have been shown to curb credit to riskier borrowers, thereby enhancing financial resilience. In South Korea and Hong Kong (often cited in comparative studies), DTI tools are even more binding than LTVs. While many SSA countries lack such granular data for implementation, Pahla (2019) suggested that approximations based on income thresholds are emerging. In the U.S., DTI limits are embedded in mortgage eligibility standards under Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, helping standardize borrower risk. Dell'Ariccia et al. (2016) concluded that DTI caps have the greatest effect when house price-to-income ratios are high and rising.

Volatility in housing markets—measured by rapid swings in prices or mortgage credit—is dampened by macroprudential tools, especially in developed economies. The UK and Japan report lower price volatility post-tool implementation, while Brazil and SSA regions continue to face fluctuations due to macroeconomic instability. For example, house price volatility in São Paulo decreased by 30% between 2011 and 2017 following policy tightening. Anwar (2020) emphasizes that coordinated macroprudential and monetary policy (e.g., interest rate management) leads to more durable effects. South Africa's post-2008 housing market shows reduced mortgage delinquency rates due to early adoption of capital adequacy ratios and counter-cyclical buffers.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

In the aftermath of repeated housing market crises, macroprudential policies have become a critical instrument for safeguarding financial stability and curbing systemic risk in housing finance. These policies, which include Loan-to-Value (LTV) ratios and Debt-to-Income (DTI) caps, are designed to limit excessive borrowing and speculative investment, both of which have historically fueled volatile housing bubbles. Despite their increasing use, housing prices in major economies have remained highly unstable. For instance, house prices rose by over 40% in the U.S. between 2020 and 2022—an acceleration many analysts link to pandemic-induced demand shocks and credit expansion, despite macroprudential tightening (Kim & Oh, 2020). This raises critical questions about the effectiveness and optimal calibration of these tools across varied economic environments. As house price inflation and affordability concerns intensify globally, there is an urgent need to examine how macroprudential interventions influence core housing market outcomes such as price levels, credit volume, and volatility.

While existing literature has evaluated macroprudential tools within individual economies, there is limited cross-national research that systematically links policy tools to varied housing market outcomes across advanced, emerging, and developing economies. Much of the prior research either focuses narrowly on advanced markets like the UK and South Korea or aggregates multiple tools, making it difficult to isolate the effects of LTV or DTI caps on housing prices or credit dynamics. Furthermore, little is known about the long-term effects of these tools on housing market volatility, especially in under-researched regions such as Sub-Saharan Africa, where credit constraints and informality prevail. Jung & Mok (2019) noted that while macroprudential tools reduce household debt exposure in Asia, there is insufficient empirical analysis on their performance in the context of fiscal fragility and institutional weakness found in Latin America and Africa. This study seeks to bridge that gap by conducting a comparative investigation of the impact of LTV and DTI restrictions on housing price stability and credit allocation across the United States, United Kingdom, Japan, Brazil, and selected Sub-Saharan African countries.

The findings from this study will benefit multiple stakeholders in the policymaking, academic, and financial sectors. For central banks and regulatory authorities, the research will provide empirical evidence on when and how to deploy borrower-based macroprudential tools to ensure housing market stability without constraining credit unduly. It will also help international financial institutions and multilateral banks understand the contextual effectiveness of these tools across economies with varying financial depth. In addition, this study will guide mortgage lenders and developers in assessing how regulatory changes affect housing demand and pricing risk. Borsos, Hosszú, Mérő & Vágó (2023) emphasized the importance of high-resolution, data-driven analysis to quantify how LTV and DTI policies affect not only macroeconomic stability but also housing affordability and inequality. By offering actionable insights across five diverse economic contexts, the study will contribute both to global financial resilience and the social objective of equitable housing access.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

2.1.1 Financial Instability Hypothesis (Hyman Minsky)

The Financial Instability Hypothesis, originally developed by economist Hyman Minsky in the 1960s and further refined through the 1970s and 1980s, provides a robust conceptual framework for understanding the rationale behind macroprudential policies in housing markets. At the core of the theory is the idea that financial systems are inherently unstable due to the cyclical behavior of market participants, particularly in credit markets. Minsky argued that prolonged periods of economic stability and rising asset prices lead to excessive optimism among borrowers and lenders, which in turn encourages increased risk-taking and borrowing. As credit expands, financial positions become more speculative, leading eventually to a crisis or crash when borrowers can no longer meet their obligations. In the context of housing markets, this hypothesis is directly applicable—rising house prices often entice buyers and lenders into riskier financial behavior, inflating housing bubbles that may ultimately collapse. Macroprudential tools such as Loan-to-Value (LTV) and Debt-to-Income (DTI) caps are practical mechanisms designed to counteract this behavior by enforcing lending discipline and reducing systemic risk. These instruments, when deployed proactively, can mitigate Minsky's "boom-bust" dynamics by containing speculative lending during asset booms. In light of global housing crises, including the 2008 subprime mortgage meltdown, the Financial Instability Hypothesis offers a powerful lens for understanding the effectiveness and necessity of macroprudential regulation in housing finance (Minsky, 1986).

2.1.2 Rational Expectations Theory (John F. Muth and Robert Lucas)

The Rational Expectations Theory (RET), introduced by John F. Muth in 1961 and later extended by Robert Lucas in the 1970s, posits that economic agents use all available information efficiently and form expectations about future variables (e.g., prices, inflation, interest rates) in a rational manner. This theory is essential for macroeconomic modeling, particularly in assessing the behavioral responses of market participants to policy changes. In housing markets, RET implies that borrowers, lenders, and investors will adjust their expectations based on policy announcements such as the imposition of stricter macroprudential regulations. For instance, if the central bank announces new LTV restrictions, rational agents will anticipate a cooling effect on house prices and modify their investment or borrowing behavior accordingly. Therefore, RET provides a foundation for understanding how macroprudential policies can influence market sentiment, credit allocation, and price dynamics in a forward-looking way. Importantly, it also implies that poorly communicated or unexpected policies can disrupt market stability, suggesting the need for transparent, credible macroprudential governance. In studying macroprudential policies and housing markets, RET allows researchers to model policy effectiveness not only through direct credit constraints but also through the anticipatory behavior of economic agents reacting to regulatory signals (Lucas, 1972).

2.1.3 New Institutional Economics (Douglass North, Oliver Williamson)

The theory of New Institutional Economics (NIE), advanced by Douglass North and Oliver Williamson, focuses on the role that institutions—defined as the rules, norms, and enforcement mechanisms that shape human interaction—play in influencing economic behavior and outcomes.

In the context of macroprudential policy and housing markets, NIE provides an essential analytical framework for understanding the importance of regulatory institutions in controlling systemic risk and guiding credit flows. The strength, independence, and capacity of regulatory institutions—such as central banks, financial supervisory agencies, and housing finance authorities—are critical in determining the success or failure of macroprudential interventions. For example, in many Sub-Saharan African or Latin American countries, weak institutional enforcement undermines the application of LTV or DTI caps, rendering macroprudential policy ineffective despite formal adoption. Conversely, in countries with strong institutional frameworks like the UK or South Korea, macroprudential rules are not only enforced but also dynamically adjusted based on market conditions. NIE also emphasizes transaction costs and information asymmetries, which are prevalent in housing markets and can be mitigated through clear and consistent policy frameworks. By embedding macroprudential tools within well-functioning institutional environments, housing markets can be made more resilient to shocks and speculation. Thus, NIE enriches the theoretical landscape of this study by linking policy outcomes to institutional quality and governance structures (North, 1990).

2.2 Empirical Review

Borsos, Hosszú, Mérő & Vágó (2023) aimed to assess how borrower-based macroprudential tools such as LTV and DTI caps influence financial stability, housing stock composition, and inequality using granular household-level data. The researchers utilized a high-resolution microsimulation model using administrative loan-level data from Hungary, combining it with macro-financial variables. They found that DTI caps were more effective than LTV caps in curbing systemic risks, especially in periods of rapid house price increases. LTV caps had limited effectiveness when prices were already elevated. The tools helped reduce credit overextension and contributed to a more stable distribution of housing finance. The authors recommended dynamic calibration of macroprudential instruments depending on house price trajectories and household income distributions.

Seo (2019) examined how changes in LTV and DTI limits influenced the volume and distribution of mortgage credit among Korean households. The study used time-series econometric models (VAR and OLS) covering household-level mortgage data from 2007 to 2018. Tightening LTV and DTI regulations significantly reduced loan sizes, particularly among younger borrowers and those in urban areas. Furthermore, the tightening policy corresponded with a moderate decline in house prices. The study recommended periodic reviews of LTV/DTI thresholds and more stringent enforcement mechanisms, especially during property booms.

Singh (2023) investigated the effectiveness of LTV caps and other macroprudential measures in moderating house price inflation in emerging markets. Singh utilized micro-level mortgage data from multiple Asian economies and employed fixed-effects regression models to isolate the effects of policy changes. The study found that LTV caps had a lagged but significant impact on house prices, particularly when implemented during credit booms. However, their effectiveness declined in the absence of supporting monetary policy. The author suggested policy coordination between central banks and financial regulators to maximize the stabilizing effect of macroprudential tools.

Kim & Oh (2020) assessed how LTV and DTI tools influence macroeconomic outcomes including credit growth, GDP, and housing market stability. The study adopted a dynamic stochastic general

equilibrium (DSGE) framework with financial frictions and incorporated macroprudential rules. The researchers found that tighter LTV and DTI policies reduced credit growth and mitigated real estate-driven financial instability, without significantly harming GDP. Macroprudential tightening should be used preemptively during housing booms and aligned with interest rate policy for maximum effect.

Lee, Asuncion & Kim (2016) examined the impact of macroprudential tools on housing credit and price volatility across 11 Asian economies. Panel data analysis using fixed-effects and generalized method of moments (GMM) estimators over 15 years. LTV and DTI caps were found to significantly reduce housing credit growth and price volatility in both the short and medium term. However, the tools were more effective in countries with higher financial development and regulatory transparency. Developing economies should focus on strengthening institutional capacity to implement macroprudential frameworks more effectively.

Davis (2022) offered a broader theoretical and empirical review of how macroprudential measures affect house prices, credit risk, and financial stability in the EU and UK. Mixed-method approach including cross-country regression analysis and case study comparison. The study found LTV and DTI caps were effective during downturns but less so during rapidly expanding booms, suggesting diminishing marginal effects. The study also highlighted that LTV caps work best when complemented with counter-cyclical capital buffers. Policymakers should consider broader housing market indicators—such as rental yields and vacancy rates—when designing macroprudential frameworks.

Pirmat (2024) aimed to isolate the interaction effects between interest rate policy and LTV/DTI-based macroprudential regulation in the European Union. Time-series cointegration and VAR models applied to data from 2000 to 2021 across 10 EU member states. While macroprudential tightening slowed housing credit growth, its impact was significantly enhanced when coupled with a tightening monetary stance. Countries that implemented LTV caps without monetary coordination experienced policy slippage and market resistance. The study advocates for institutional coordination between central banks and financial regulators to ensure macroprudential effectiveness and smooth transmission mechanisms.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a desktop research methodology. Desk research refers to secondary data or that which can be collected without fieldwork. Desk research is basically involved in collecting data from existing resources hence it is often considered a low cost technique as compared to field research, as the main cost is involved in executive's time, telephone charges and directories. Thus, the study relied on already published studies, reports and statistics. This secondary data was easily accessed through the online journals and library.

4.0 FINDINGS

This study presented both a contextual and methodological gap. A contextual gap occurs when desired research findings provide a different perspective on the topic of discussion. For instance, Davis (2022) offered a broader theoretical and empirical review of how macroprudential measures affect house prices, credit risk, and financial stability in the EU and UK. Mixed-method approach including cross-country regression analysis and case study comparison. The study found LTV and DTI caps were effective during downturns but less so during rapidly expanding booms, suggesting

diminishing marginal effects. The study also highlighted that LTV caps work best when complemented with counter-cyclical capital buffers. Policymakers should consider broader housing market indicators—such as rental yields and vacancy rates—when designing macroprudential frameworks. On the other hand, the current study on investigating macroprudential policies and housing markets.

Secondly, a methodological gap also presents itself, Davis (2022) in seeking to offer a broader theoretical and empirical review of how macroprudential measures affect house prices, credit risk, and financial stability in the EU and UK- adopted a mixed-method approach including cross-country regression analysis and case study comparison. The study found LTV and DTI caps were effective during downturns but less so during rapidly expanding booms, suggesting diminishing marginal effects. Whereas, the current study adopted a desktop research method.

5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

The study concluded that macroprudential policies, particularly borrower-based instruments such as Loan-to-Value (LTV) and Debt-to-Income (DTI) caps, played a significant role in mitigating systemic risks in housing markets. These tools served to restrict excessive borrowing and speculative investment during periods of housing market exuberance. In jurisdictions where these tools were implemented consistently and early in the credit cycle, there was evidence of reduced mortgage default risk, moderated house price inflation, and improved financial system resilience. The enforcement of such tools effectively contained credit growth in overheated markets, signaling their preventive potential when used proactively.

It was also observed that the effectiveness of macroprudential tools varied based on institutional strength, market structure, and economic context. In advanced economies with deep financial systems and transparent regulatory environments, these tools yielded measurable outcomes in terms of price stabilization and credit moderation. However, in emerging and developing economies, where informal credit systems and data deficiencies persisted, the same tools often had limited reach and impact. This underscored the importance of tailoring macroprudential frameworks to reflect local institutional capacities and market dynamics rather than applying universal templates.

The study further noted that macroprudential policies were most impactful when they operated in coordination with other monetary and fiscal policy instruments. Isolated application of LTV or DTI caps without supporting interest rate or taxation measures sometimes led to policy leakage, wherein constrained borrowing in one sector merely shifted financial activity to another. Therefore, integrated macroeconomic policy management was essential to amplify the effects of borrower-based macroprudential regulation. The interplay between macroprudential tools and market expectations also influenced outcomes, as poorly timed or inconsistently applied policies led to market uncertainty and dampened credibility.

The study found that while macroprudential policies had succeeded in reducing financial imbalances, they had yet to fully resolve issues related to housing affordability and long-term access. The focus on financial stability, though critical, sometimes came at the cost of excluding lower-income borrowers from credit access. This tension between credit containment and inclusive finance highlighted the dual challenge of stabilizing housing markets while ensuring broad-based

housing access. As such, the study recognized the need for evolving macroprudential designs that account not only for market overheating but also for structural equity in housing systems.

5.2 Recommendations

The study recommended that macroprudential policy design should be rooted in country-specific housing market diagnostics, institutional readiness, and long-term planning. Policymakers were encouraged to develop localized stress-testing models that integrate housing affordability metrics, credit expansion rates, and household debt profiles. These models were expected to inform when and how to implement borrower-based instruments like LTV and DTI caps effectively. Uniform thresholds for such instruments across countries were discouraged, as differences in household income, mortgage structures, and urbanization levels required differentiated approaches. By embracing context-specific calibration, regulators could reduce both housing market risk and unintended credit constraints on viable borrowers.

From a theoretical standpoint, the study contributed to the growing body of literature on financial stability by offering empirical validation of the asymmetric effects of macroprudential tools. It demonstrated that while tools like LTV and DTI were effective in periods of excessive credit growth, their influence diminished when structural issues like affordability and supply constraints dominated market dynamics. This finding expanded the conceptual boundaries of macroprudential theory, reinforcing the idea that financial regulation must be adaptive and responsive to multiple economic conditions. It emphasized the need to link housing market theory with behavioral finance and political economy, suggesting that regulatory efficacy was shaped not only by market logic but also by borrower sentiment and institutional credibility.

In terms of practical application, the study urged regulatory agencies to invest in data infrastructure and administrative capacity, particularly in emerging economies. Real-time mortgage data collection, credit scoring systems, and geospatial housing analytics were identified as essential enablers of effective policy deployment. The study also recommended enhancing inter-agency collaboration between central banks, housing ministries, and tax authorities to ensure policy coherence. Such institutional linkages would support synchronized interventions, preventing cross-sectoral imbalances and reducing the risk of policy contradictions. Importantly, better communication strategies were needed to explain the rationale and expected outcomes of macroprudential policies to the public, thus improving compliance and minimizing market panic.

At the policy level, it was recommended that macroprudential tools be incorporated into broader housing and urban development strategies. Rather than viewing LTV and DTI caps in isolation, governments were encouraged to align them with housing supply-side interventions such as affordable housing construction, rent control policies, and land-use reforms. This integrated approach would mitigate the potential trade-offs between credit restraint and housing access. The study also called for the inclusion of environmental sustainability in housing market risk assessments, especially as climate-related shocks increasingly affected property values and mortgage markets. Policies needed to evolve to include climate-sensitive macroprudential metrics that accounted for flood risk, energy efficiency, and regional displacement pressures.

The study made significant contributions to policy planning by identifying early-warning indicators for housing market overheating. Indicators such as rapid mortgage growth, rising house price-to-income ratios, and elevated household debt levels were shown to precede destabilizing

cycles. Regulatory bodies were advised to institutionalize these indicators within their supervisory dashboards and tie them to automatic trigger mechanisms for macroprudential adjustment. Furthermore, the study recommended that governments institutionalize macroprudential review committees, ideally independent from electoral cycles, to insulate housing finance regulation from political influence. These committees would periodically review policy effectiveness and recalibrate instruments to evolving market conditions.

Finally, the study proposed that future macroprudential designs should be equity-sensitive, ensuring that vulnerable groups are not disproportionately excluded from housing finance. Progressive LTV schemes, income-adjusted DTI limits, and affordable mortgage guarantees were suggested as possible innovations to balance risk containment with inclusion. The need to expand financial literacy campaigns targeting first-time homebuyers and low-income borrowers was also emphasized, aiming to empower consumers to make sound housing finance decisions. By embedding equity considerations into the macroprudential framework, policymakers would not only stabilize markets but also advance broader social and economic development goals.

REFERENCES

Akunga, R., & Ahmad, A. H. (2023). Financial market integration in sub-Saharan Africa: How important is contagion? International Journal of Finance & Economics. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijfe.2611

Anwar, C. J. (2020). Central Bank and Time Inconsistency. Media Sains Indonesia. Retrieved from https://eprints.untirta.ac.id/15771/1/Central%20Bank%20and%20Time%20Inconsistency.pdf

Atsin, A. J. L. (2018). Essays on stock markets in Sub-Saharan Africa. University of the Western Cape. https://uwcscholar.uwc.ac.za/handle/10566/5677

Bah, E., Faye, I., & Geh, Z. F. (2018). Housing market dynamics in Africa. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59792-2_1

Borsos, A., Hosszú, Z., Mérő, B., & Vágó, N. (2023). The impact of borrower-based macroprudential policies on financial stability, inequality, and housing stock. SSRN. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4751606

Davis, E. P. (2022). A broader view of housing-market macroprudential measures. Brunel University. https://bura.brunel.ac.uk/handle/2438/25415

Dell'Ariccia, G., Igan, D., Laeven, L., & Tong, H. (2016). Credit booms and macrofinancial stability. Economic Policy, 31(86), 299–355. https://doi.org/10.1093/epolic/eiw005

Edo, S., & Kanwanye, H. (2022). Capital returns and currency value: The contrasting key drivers of foreign portfolio investments in Sub-Saharan African economies. IIMB Management Review, 34(3), 285–297. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2022.06.004

Jung, Y., & Mok, J. (2019). Implementable, optimal macroprudential and monetary policies: Implications for house prices and household debt. Journal of Economic Theory and Econometrics, 30(1), 1–25. http://es.re.kr/eng/upload/jetem%2030-1-2%20(0323).pdf

Kim, S., & Oh, J. (2020). Macroeconomic effects of macroprudential policies: Evidence from LTV and DTI policies in Korea. Japan and the World Economy, 54, 101010. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.japwor.2020.101010

Lee, M., Asuncion, R. C., & Kim, J. (2016). Effectiveness of macroprudential policies in developing Asia. Emerging Markets Finance and Trade, 52(6), 1258–1274. https://doi.org/10.1080/1540496X.2015.1103137

Lucas, R. E. (1972). Expectations and the neutrality of money. Journal of Economic Theory, 4(2), 103–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531(72)90142-1

Minsky, H. P. (1986). Stabilizing an Unstable Economy. Yale University Press.

North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge University Press.

Pahla, Z. M. (2019). The determinants of the South African financial cycle [Doctoral dissertation, University of Johannesburg]. https://ujcontent.uj.ac.za/esploro/outputs/graduate/The-determinants-of-the-South-African/9910077307691

Pirmat, D. (2024). Analyzing the effect of monetary and macroprudential policies on housing prices in the EU. Charles University. https://dspace.cuni.cz/handle/20.500.11956/194863

Saiki, A., Chantapacdepong, P., & Volz, U. (2016). Dealing with QE spillovers in East Asia: The role of institutions and macroprudential policy. German Development Institute Discussion Paper No. 14. https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/163103/1/872766985.pdf

Seo, J. Y. (2019). The impact of the regulation of LTV and DTI of Korean policy mortgage loans. Housing Policy Debate, 29(4), 634–655. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2019.1641732

Singh, B. (2023). Housing prices and macroprudential policies: Evidence from microdata. Economic Systems, 47(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecosys.2022.100956

Zwane, S. (2020). The impact of macroeconomic variables on REIT Returns: A case of South Africa and Brazil. University of the Witwatersrand. https://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/30207