

Comments on “A Behavioral New-Keynesian Model” by Xavier Gabaix

John H. Cochrane¹

October 2016

¹Hoover Institution, Stanford University, and NBER.

What the paper does

People pay attention $M \leq 1$ to future income / inflation

$$x_t = M E_t x_{t+1} - \sigma(i_t - E_t \pi_{t+1}) \quad (1)$$

$$\pi_t = M^f \beta E_t \pi_{t+1} + \kappa x_t \quad (2)$$

$$i_t = \phi \pi_t + \hat{i}_t. \quad (3)$$

Write as

$$E_t x_{t+1} = \frac{1}{M} [x_t + \sigma(i_t - E_t \pi_{t+1})] \quad (4)$$

$$E_t \pi_{t+1} = \frac{1}{M^f} \frac{1}{\beta} [\pi_t - \kappa x_t] \quad (5)$$

$M < 1$ induces *instability* to get *determinacy* in place of $\phi > 1$.

A more careful statement

Write model in standard dynamic form

$$E_t \begin{bmatrix} x_{t+1} \\ \pi_{t+1} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\beta M^f M} \begin{bmatrix} \beta M^f + \sigma \kappa & \sigma (\beta M^f \phi - 1) \\ -\kappa M & M \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_t \\ \pi_t \end{bmatrix} + \frac{\sigma}{M} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{i}_t \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$


$$E_t z_{t+1} = A z_t + v_t = Q \Lambda Q^{-1} z_t + v_t$$

Both eigenvalues $\lambda > 1$ if

$$\phi + \frac{(1 - M)(1 - M^f \beta)}{\kappa \sigma} > 1.$$


- ▶ With $\phi < 1$, $M = 1$, A has one stable, one unstable eigenvalue.
- ▶ Stability + only restrict $E_t \pi_{t+1} \rightarrow$ multiple stable sunspot equilibria.
- ▶ $M < 1$ raises eigenvalues, can give two unstable $\lambda > 1$ even with $\phi = 0$.
- ▶ \rightarrow One non-explosive equilibrium, “determinacy.”

Why this paper is important




- ▶ Hit ZLB *and nothing happened*.
- ▶ Old K models predict spiral. New K models predict 1) sunspot volatility, 2) topsy turvy policy, 3) Fisherian response.
- ▶ Gabaix fixes! Restores standard NK $\phi > 1$ results with $\phi = 0$.

1. Standard model sunspots




- ▶ Standard NK model with $M = 1$, $\phi = 0$, $i = 0$. Multiple stable equilibria, indeterminacy, sunspot volatility.

1. Gabaix fixes sunspots




- ▶ $M < 1$ can make multiple equilibria explode, only $\pi = 0$ remains non-explosive.
- ▶ Determinacy despite $\phi = 0$.

2. Standard model magic




- ▶ Stability, multiple eq. → small future changes have big effects today.
- ▶ Less stickiness = faster dynamics, effects *further* from frictionless.

2. Gabaix fixes magic



- ▶ Gabaix $M < 1$ instability fixes magic, just like $\phi > 1$!

3. Standard model is Fisherian – Gabaix fixes



- ▶ $M = 1, \phi = 0$ NK model is Fisherian. $i \nearrow \Rightarrow \pi \nearrow$.
- ▶ (OK, unless you can arrange a δ shock. But that's independent of i .)
- ▶ (Maybe true, but is there a model of temporary lower π to test?)
- ▶ Gabaix fixes! $M = 0.4$ works just like $\phi = 1.48$!

How it works – M in place of ϕ

Review:

$$x_t = M E_t x_{t+1} - \sigma r_t$$


Both $\lambda > 1$ (unstable, determinate) if

$$\phi + \frac{(1 - M)(1 - M^f \beta)}{\kappa \sigma} > 1.$$

Lower M can substitute for $\phi > 1$ to make $\lambda > 1$, restoring standard NK model even at ZLB, $\phi = 0$ peg, passive M !

- ▶ Determinacy, stationarity, saddle-path stability
- ▶ Future promises have smaller effects.
- ▶ Conventional - sign of i on π
- ▶ No $\phi > 1$ theoretical problems.
- ▶ This paper is important!

Doubts: the paper is too important to be true!



$$(x_t = M E_t x_{t+1} - \sigma r_t)$$

- ▶ M near 1 do not work. κ near frictionless do not work.
- ▶ To change λ from < 1 to > 1 you can't change M a little bit.

Doubts – too important!


- ▶ Not: a *little* behavioralism is *sufficient* to better fit correlations.
- ▶ Yes: a *lot* of behavioralism is *necessary* for basic sign and stability of monetary policy.
- ▶ Can't nibble behavioralism – swallow it whole or not at all.
- ▶ Not: simple S&D get idea, wrinkles for dynamics.
- ▶ Yes: Monetary policy is *all about* deeply irrational behavior. *We do not* build on a simple rational story.
- ▶ Always and everywhere. Gabaix is right \Rightarrow Clarida Galí and Gertler are wrong.

Too important: The foundations matter

$$x_t = M E_t x_{t+1} - \sigma(i_t - E_t \pi_{t+1}).$$

- ▶ *Not* Irrational (adaptive) expectations, ambiguity, rule of thumb, small utility cost, hyperbolic discounting, etc.
- ▶ React < 1 to some state variables, fully to others (i_t). Which ones? Hard!
- ▶ (Test: Grad students. Read last 3 papers, produce “the” behavioral NK model. I can’t do it.)
- ▶ *Do not* just cite Gabaix, use as one more ad-hoc patch. Too important! This is the *basic foundation* of monetary policy.
- ▶ You will anyway. I did.
- ▶ So does Gabaix...

Long run



- ▶ Like NK $\phi > 1$, Gabaix produces a *permanent* decline in π when i rises. Long run neutrality?

Long run neutrality

- ▶ Gabaix “extends the model to have backward looking terms.. ”

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_t &= \beta M^f E_t \pi_{t+1} + \alpha \pi_t^d + \kappa \chi_t \\ \pi_{t+1}^d &= \pi_t + \gamma (\pi_t^{CB} + (1 - \zeta) \pi_t - \pi_t^d)\end{aligned}$$

π_t^d is “‘default inflation’ coming from indexation, and π_t^{CB} , the ‘inflation guidance’ by the central bank.”

- ▶ + Delicate balance of parameters.
- ▶ Abandoned “take behavioral microfoundations seriously”
- ▶ Need epicycles to get what should be easy, long-run neutrality of money.

Sufficient or Necessary?

- ▶ Important! Standard models *utterly* fail to explain quiet ZLB.
- ▶ Important! Fundamental change of the *basic story* of monetary economics. All or nothing.
- ▶ Sufficient, or Necessary? Locally necessary. Globally too?
- ▶ Standard NK, $M = 1, \phi = 0$: stable, indeterminate, rational, sunspots and puzzles.
- ▶ Gabaix: $M \ll 1, \phi = 0$: unstable, determinate, bounded away from rational & frictionless, needs epicycles for long run neutrality.
- ▶ NK + FTPL: $M = 1, \phi = 0$: stable, determinate, rational (robust to small irrationality), works in frictionless case, with smooth sticky price limit, gives short run negative and long run neutrality.
- ▶ Both fundamentally change stability and determinacy properties of the model, and basic story of monetary economics.
- ▶ Today: There is another! Gabaix is sufficient, but not globally necessary.