

MONETARY POLICY & ANCHORED EXPECTATIONS

WHY SHOULD WE CARE?

Laura Gáti

Boston College

October 3, 2019

IN THE TRANSITION TO RE, DYNAMICS DEVIATE FROM RE

- ① Once expectations have converged to RE, no difference between RE and AM
 - The difference is in the transition. Can't assume transition away because that = assuming that all agents are born with knowledge of the model
 - ② What's happening in the transition and why do we care?
 - In NK model, current variables depend on expectations of future variables (self-referentiality)
 - In transition, AM expectations do not coincide with RE expectations
- ⇒ Law of motion of endogenous variables will be different!

MONETARY POLICY BASED ON RE GETS THINGS WRONG

Monetary policy based on the RE model will in the transition

- ① Have the wrong expectations
- ② Conduct policy based on the wrong model of the endogenous variables (wrong law of motion)

More concretely, it will

- ① respond to shocks according to Taylor-rule and states of the RE model (none in NK)
- ② will therefore ignore that the economy's law of motion is characterized by a novel state variable: expectations
- ③ and use the wrong optimal Taylor-rule parameters (CGG parameters optimal for RE law of motion)

⇒ smooth the wrong output gap, unemployment, inflation

CONCRETE EXAMPLE

Uncertainty shock: $x \downarrow$, econ otherwise in a boom

- ① If state variable beliefs is anchored (at Fed's target) and it's been there for a while with no sign of moving
→ RE NK dynamics is a good model, Fed can base decision of whether to lower $i \downarrow$ on business cycle indicators (u, π).
Assume: no need to lower interest rates.
- ② If beliefs far below target consistently for a while, then that will amplify $x \downarrow$ (self-referentiality)
→ need to $i \downarrow$ a lot
- ③ Key: if expectations anchored, but drifting down, then even though the RE dynamics is a good description, Fed still needs to make sure that it stays that way:
 $i \downarrow$ **only to keep expectations anchored**