

Replication of 'The Power of Forward Guidance Revisited'

December 2, 2018

Outline

1. Motivation
2. MNS's heterogenous agent NK model
3. Steady state
4. Dynamics: forward guidance

Motivation

- ▶ In the basic NKM, output/inflation response to forward guidance is implausibly large.
- ▶ A potential reason is the complete markets assumption.

Motivation

- ▶ In the basic NKM, output/inflation response to forward guidance is implausibly large.
- ▶ A potential reason is the complete markets assumption.
- ▶ Is the output response to forward guidance smaller in a model with idiosyncratic income risk and incomplete markets?

Forward guidance in the basic NKM

Consider the plain vanilla NKM studied in class

$$y_t = \mathbb{E}_t[y_{t+1}] - \sigma(i_t - \mathbb{E}_t[\pi_{t+1}] - r_t^n) \quad \text{'NK IS curve'}$$

$$\pi_t = \beta \mathbb{E}_t[\pi_{t+1}] + \kappa y_t \quad \text{'NKPC'}$$

Forward guidance in the basic NKM

Consider the plain vanilla NKM studied in class

$$y_t = \mathbb{E}_t[y_{t+1}] - \sigma(i_t - \mathbb{E}_t[\pi_{t+1}] - r_t^n) \quad \text{'NK IS curve'}$$

$$\pi_t = \beta \mathbb{E}_t[\pi_{t+1}] + \kappa y_t \quad \text{'NKPC'}$$

with monetary policy rule:

$$r_t = i_t - \mathbb{E}_t[\pi_{t+1}] = r_t^n + \epsilon_{t,t-j},$$

where $\epsilon_{t,t-j}$ is a monetary shock in period t that is announced in period $t-j$.

AIM implementation

$$\tilde{r}_t = a_1 MA_t^1 + a_2 MA_t^2 + a_3 MA_t^3 + a_4 MA_t^4 + a_5 MA_t^5$$

with


$$MA_t^1 = \epsilon_{t+5,t} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and

$$MA_t^j = MA_{t-1}^{j-1}$$

and $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = a_4 = 0$, $a_5 = 1$

Forward guidance in the basic NKM



Forward guidance in the basic NKM

Why is the output response so big?

\implies Euler equation ($\sigma = 1$):

$$\mathbb{E}_t[\Delta \tilde{c}_{t+1}] = \beta \tilde{r}_t$$

Forward guidance in the basic NKM

Why is the output response so big?

\implies Euler equation ($\sigma = 1$):

$$\mathbb{E}_t[\Delta \tilde{c}_{t+1}] = \beta \tilde{r}_t$$

No borrowing constraint \implies agent takes full advantage of intertemporal substitution.

MNS's HANK model

MNS's HANK model

Household's problem

$$\max_{\{c, \ell, b_{t+1}\}} \mathbb{E}_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \left(\frac{c_{h,t}^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma} - \frac{\ell_{h,t}^{1+\psi}}{1+\psi} \right)$$

$$\text{s.t. } c_{h,t} + \frac{b_{h,t+1}}{1+r_t} = b_{h,t} + W_t z_{h,t} \ell_{h,t} - \tau_t \bar{\tau}(z_{h,t}) + D_t$$

$$\& \ b_{h,t+1} \geq 0.$$

Calibration

$z_{h,t}$ follows a 3-point Markov chain with transition matrix

$$\mathbf{\Gamma} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.966 & 0.0338 & 0.00029 \\ 0.017 & 0.966 & 0.017 \\ 0.0003 & 0.0337 & 0.966 \end{bmatrix}$$

Other parameter values are standard.

Solving for steady state

- ▶ Solve for the household's policy function using the 'endogenous grid method'.

Solving for steady state

- ▶ Solve for the household's policy function using the 'endogenous grid method'.
- ▶ Basic idea is to iterate on the Euler equation:


$$c^{-\gamma} = \beta(1 + \bar{r}) \sum_{z'} \Pr(z'|z)(g^0(z', b'))^{-\gamma}$$

and use the budget constraint to back out today's bond holdings.

Solving for steady state


1. Guess an initial level of s.s dividends and taxes $X^0 = [\bar{D}^0, \bar{\tau}^0]$.
2. Using this guess and other steady state prices, compute the HH's policy function.
3. Simulate the distribution of bond holdings, using the policy function.
4. Compute aggregate consumption, \bar{C}^0 .
5. Compute the implied level of dividends and taxes consistent w/ mkt clearing, $\tilde{X}^0 = [\tilde{D}^0, \tilde{\tau}^0]$
6. Update the guess of dividends and taxes:
 $X^1 = \omega \tilde{X}^0 + (1 - \omega) X^0$. I set $\omega = 0.5$.
7. Iterate until convergence: $X^n = X^{n-1}$.

Some results




Some results

Law of Motion for Bond Holdings



Some results



Problems with my 'solution'