

Discussion Paper No.261

Numerical Analysis of Three Time Delays in Monetary
Policy: The Case of a Sticky-Price Model

Eiji Tsuzuki	Chiba Keizai University
Futoshi Kurokawa	Chiba Keizai University
Shunsuke Shinagawa	Waseda University

February 2016



INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
Chuo University
Tokyo, Japan

Numerical Analysis of Three Time Delays in Monetary Policy: The Case of a Sticky-Price Model

Eiji Tsuzuki,^{*} Futoshi Kurokawa,[†] and Shunsuke Shinagawa[‡]

Abstract

In this study, we develop a New Keynesian model that includes the policy rule with which the nominal interest rate's responses are induced according to fluctuations in three economic variables, namely output, the inflation rate, and asset prices. In this model, we also assume that there is a time lag in the interest rate's response to each variable. The model economy is represented as a “differential equation system with three delays.” For the determinacy analysis, we use the numerical method developed by Gu and Naghnaeian [K. Gu and M. Naghnaeian, *Stability crossing set for systems with three delays*, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 56 (2011), pp. 11–26] to find the parameter regions that achieve local determinacy in order to examine the effects of the three policy lags on local equilibrium determinacy. This is the first such application of this method to New Keynesian economics. We demonstrate that implementations of monetary policy should be “purposefully” delayed to achieve local equilibrium determinacy. Hence, the central bank should determine its target variables by considering not only the responsiveness of the nominal interest rate to output, the inflation rate, and asset prices but also the lag lengths associated with policy implementations.

JEL Classification Codes: E32; E52

Keywords: New Keynesian model, policy lag, interest rate rule, equilibrium determinacy, delay-differential equation

^{*}Corresponding author. Faculty of Economics, Chiba Keizai University, Chiba 263-0021, Japan; Tel.: +81-43-253-9745; Fax: +81-43-254-6600; E-mail: tsuzukie5@gmail.com

[†]Faculty of Economics, Chiba Keizai University, Chiba 263-0021, Japan

[‡]Faculty of Political Science and Economics, Waseda University, Tokyo 169-8050, Japan

1 Introduction

Optimizing models that consider price stickiness are referred to as New Keynesian (NK) models. The standard NK model comprises three equations: an Euler equation, Phillips curve, and monetary policy rule.¹ Benhabib et al. (2003) assume the backward-looking monetary policy rule wherein the nominal interest rate responds to the weighted mean of past inflation rates (i.e., lagged inflation rates).

Generally, time lags can be classified into two types, namely distributed lag models and fixed lag models, of which Benhabib et al.'s (2003) model can be considered to be the former. In this study, we develop an NK model that includes fixed time lags. This is, we assume that the nominal interest rate responds to target variables evaluated at fixed points in time. Conceptually, fixed lag models can be regarded as limiting cases of distributed lag models wherein the weighting factor for each target variable is unity at a certain point in time. Algebraically, however, it is impossible to treat fixed lags as special cases of distributed lags. Accordingly, spatial methods must be used.

In the simplest case where the system includes only one fixed lag, its characteristic function can generally be expressed as follows: $\Delta(\lambda) = p_0(\lambda) + p_1(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau}$, where λ is a root, $\tau > 0$ is the lag length, and $p_0(\lambda)$ and $p_1(\lambda)$ are polynomials of λ . Owing to the existence of the exponential function $e^{-\lambda\tau}$, the equation $\Delta(\lambda) = 0$ includes an infinite number of roots. Bellman and Cooke (1963), among others, have characterized the solutions of this type of function.

Recently, more complex configurations of characteristic functions have been examined:

- Beretta and Kuang (2002): lag-dependent parameters; $\Delta(\lambda) = p_0(\lambda, \tau) + p_1(\lambda, \tau)e^{-\lambda\tau}$.
- Gu et al. (2005): two lags; $\Delta(\lambda) = p_0(\lambda) + p_1(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau_1} + p_2(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau_2}$.
- Deng et al. (2006): time-dependent lag; $\Delta(\lambda) = p_0(\lambda) + p_1(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau(t)}$.
- Gu and Naghnaeian (2011): three lags; $\Delta(\lambda) = p_0(\lambda) + p_1(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau_1} + p_2(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau_2} + p_3(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau_3}$.
- Lin and Wang (2012): two lags (where one of the exponential functions includes the sum of lags); $\Delta(\lambda) = p_0(\lambda) + p_1(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau_1} + p_2(\lambda)e^{-\lambda\tau_2} + p_3(\lambda)e^{-\lambda(\tau_1+\tau_2)}$.

¹Introductory textbooks for NK economics are presented by Woodford (2003), Walsh (2010), and Galí (2015).

In economics (especially in the context of NK economics), however, few works have examined the effects of fixed time lags,² especially compared with the many applications of these mathematical studies in biology.

Tsuzuki (2014, 2015) develops NK models that include only one fixed lag in the monetary policy rule. Here, the nominal interest rate is assumed to change in response to fluctuations in the inflation rate with a time lag, which represents an inflation targeting policy with delay. Tsuzuki's models can thus be considered to be fixed lag versions of Benhabib et al.'s (2003) model. According to Tsuzuki (2014, 2015), an increase in the lag time necessarily increases the number of roots with positive real parts. Accordingly, a policy lag may resolve the problem of equilibrium indeterminacy. However, in a system with two fixed lags, as in the model of Tsuzuki et al. (2015) that includes monetary and fiscal policy lags, an increase in the lag may raise the number of roots with negative real parts. This finding implies that a policy lag may resolve the problem of instability rather than that of indeterminacy.

In the present study, we consider the coexistence of three fixed lags in monetary policy responses. The model economic system is developed based on the model of Carlstrom and Fuerst (2007). In their model, the central bank was assumed to manipulate the nominal interest rate according to variations in both the inflation rate and asset prices. We add output as the third variable of the policy rule in accordance with the formulation in Bullard and Mitra (2002).

In the simplest NK model that does not include a time lag and in which the nominal interest rate responds only to the inflation rate, the necessary and sufficient condition for achieving local equilibrium determinacy is that the nominal interest rate increases by more than one unit when a one-unit increase in the inflation rate occurs; in other words, a monetary policy must be "active." This is the well-known policy norm referred to as the "Taylor principle." However, some notable studies have demonstrated that even if the Taylor principle is not satisfied, equilibrium determinacy can be achieved. Meng and Yip (2004), Bilbiie (2008), and Glikberg (2009) show that equilibrium determinacy can be achieved when endogenous investment, limited asset market participation, and the

²In economics, Guerrini and Sodini (2013) and Tsuzuki and Shinagawa (2015) apply Beretta and Kuang's (2002) method, while Matsumoto and Szidarovszky (2015b) apply Lin and Wang's (2012) method. In addition, Matsumoto and Szidarovszky (2015a) present an application of Gu et al.'s (2005) method.

existence of capital adjustment costs, respectively, are assumed.³ Furthermore, Bullard and Mitra (2002) and Carlstrom and Fuerst (2007) demonstrate that in discrete-time sticky-price models, an increase in the responsiveness of the nominal interest rate to both the inflation rate and output increases the possibility of the Taylor principle holding, whereas an increase in the responsiveness of the nominal interest rate to asset prices decreases this possibility.

In this study, we investigate the effects of monetary policy lags (i.e., the interaction between multiple policy lags) on the condition for local equilibrium determinacy. First, we consider the case where no policy lags are present. We demonstrate that the responses of the nominal interest rate to both the inflation rate and output increase the possibility of equilibrium determinacy, whereas responses to asset prices decrease that possibility, in line with the results shown by Carlstrom and Fuerst (2007) and Bullard and Mitra (2002). Next, we introduce three time lags to the monetary policy rule. For the determinacy analysis, we use the numerical method developed by Gu and Naghnaeian (2011) to find the parameter regions that achieve local determinacy. This is the first such application of this method to NK economics.

An extensional part of the discussion about the rights and wrongs of the central bank's response to fluctuations in asset prices pertains to the difference between the views of the Federal Reserve and the Bank for International Settlements. The Fed's view, which derives from a monetary policy perspective, is that the central bank should be dedicated to the stabilization of commodity prices and that it does not need to respond to fluctuations in asset prices. Bernanke and Gertler (2001) provide a theoretical ground with this view. Conversely, the Bank for International Settlements' view advocates a need for vigorous austerity measures when confronted with excessive increases in asset prices. Carlstrom and Fuerst (2007) establish the validity of the Fed's view in the presence of sticky prices. This is also confirmed in our model without a lag. However, if positive policy lags exist, how would this result change, if at all? The present study provides an answer to this question.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents a differential equation system that describes the dynamics of the model economy. Section 3 examines the case with no policy lags. Section 4 examines the case with three policy lags. Section

³Buffie (2013) demonstrates that Bilbiie's (2008) result strongly depends on the assumption of real wage flexibility. If the real wage rate is sufficiently sticky, the Taylor principle reasserts itself as the condition for determinacy.

5 concludes.

2 The model

In this section, we present the standard NK model. The model economy is constructed by firms, households, and the public sector. Each firm produces differentiated goods by using workers under monopolistic competition. Likewise, each household supplies differentiated workers to firms under monopolistic competition and consumes goods.

2.1 Intratemporal optimization of firms

Various types of differentiated workers indexed by j ($j \in [0, 1]$) exist. Firms first aggregate the differentiated workers l_j via the Dixit–Stiglitz function as follows:

$$l = \left[\int_0^1 l_j^{\frac{\eta-1}{\eta}} dj \right]^{\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}}, \quad (1)$$

where l is the composite labor and $\eta > 1$ is the elasticity of substitution among workers.

The first-order condition for cost minimization yields the demand function for worker l_j as follows:⁴

$$l_j = \left(\frac{W_j}{W} \right)^{-\eta} l, \quad (2)$$

where W_j is the nominal wage rate of worker l_j and W is the nominal wage rate of the whole economy, defined as $W = \left[\int_0^1 W_j^{1-\eta} dj \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}}$.

2.2 Intratemporal optimization of households

Various types of differentiated consumption goods indexed by i ($i \in [0, 1]$) exist. Households first aggregate their differentiated goods and then consume them as a composite good. As in the previous section, we express the aggregation of goods as the Dixit–Stiglitz function: $y = \left[\int_0^1 y_i^{\frac{\phi-1}{\phi}} di \right]^{\frac{\phi}{\phi-1}}$, where y is the amount of the composite good and $\phi > 1$ is the elasticity of substitution among goods. The first-order condition for cost minimization yields the demand function for good i as follows:

$$y_i = \left(\frac{p_i}{p} \right)^{-\phi} y, \quad (3)$$

⁴See Blanchard and Kiyotaki (1987).

where p_i is the price of good i and p is the price level, represented as $p = [\int_0^1 p_i^{1-\phi} di]^{\frac{1}{1-\phi}}$.

2.3 Intertemporal optimization of firms

We assume a linear technology and specify the production function of good i as follows:

$$y_i = l_i, \quad (4)$$

where y_i is the output of good i and l_i is the amount of composite labor used to produce good i .

Considering the constraints expressed in Equations (3) and (4), firm i solves the profit maximization problem as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize}_{\pi_i} \int_0^\infty \left[\frac{p_i y_i - W l_i}{p} - \frac{\gamma}{2} (\pi_i - \pi^*)^2 y \right] e^{-\int_0^t r(s) ds} dt, \\ & \text{subject to } \dot{p}_i = \pi_i p_i, \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_i = \dot{p}_i/p_i$ is the price change rate of good i , r is the real interest rate, and π^* is the steady-state value of the inflation rate. In addition, $\frac{\gamma}{2}(\pi_i - \pi^*)^2 y$ represents a price revision cost. Owing to the existence of this cost, the price becomes sticky. Hence, $\gamma > 0$ can be interpreted as a parameter that reflects the price stickiness measure; the larger the value of γ , the greater the stickiness. Here, we formulate the price revision cost in a quadratic function consistent with that outlined by Rotemberg (1982). Moreover, for simplicity, we assume that the price revision cost is a firm's payment to households that do not spend on goods. For example, it is considered to be a lump-sum payment to workers who handle price replacement tasks.

In the following discussion, we examine a ‘‘symmetric equilibrium’’ in which all firms' behavior is based on the same equations. In this case, we can drop subscript i from all the variables. Furthermore, as the number of goods is normalized to unity (see the Dixit–Stiglitz function), the following expressions hold: $p_i = p$, $\pi_i = \pi$, and $y_i = y$. By using these expressions along with the solutions to the optimization problem above, we can obtain

$$\dot{\pi} + (\pi - \pi^*) \frac{\dot{y}}{y} = r(\pi - \pi^*) - \frac{1 - \phi}{\gamma} - \frac{\phi W}{\gamma p}. \quad (5)$$

This equation is the NK Phillips curve. Furthermore, economically significant solutions would also require satisfying the transversality condition expressed as $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} p(t) e^{-\int_0^t r(s) ds} dt = 0$.

2.4 Intertemporal optimization of households

In every period, household j obtains utility from consumption c_j and real money holding m_j , and disutility from labor supply l_j . We specify the utility function as follows:

$$u(c_j, m_j, l_j) \equiv \ln c_j + \ln m_j - \frac{l_j^{1+\psi}}{1+\psi}, \quad (6)$$

where $\psi > 0$ is the disutility elasticity of labor supply.

Households possess assets that comprise money $M_j \equiv pm_j$, bond B_j , and a constant volume of stock. We standardize the measure of stock to unity. The stock price relative to the commodity price is denoted as Q and the stock yields dividend D in every period. Nominal asset level A_j can be expressed as follows: $A_j = M_j + B_j + pQ$. Assets can be increased based on income $W_j l_j$, bond interest RB_j (where $R \equiv r + \pi$ is the nominal interest rate), dividend D , capital gain \dot{Q} , lump-sum income from firms $T \equiv \frac{\gamma}{2}(\pi_i - \pi^*)^2 y$, and benefits from the government X , whereas assets can be decreased based on consumption c_j . Thus, we obtain

$$\dot{A}_j = W_j l_j + RB_j + pD + p\dot{Q} + pT + pX - pc_j. \quad (7)$$

By using the non-arbitrage condition, the nominal yields on stock represented as $\frac{\dot{Q}+D}{Q} + \pi$ must equal the nominal interest rate for bonds R , i.e.,

$$\dot{Q} = RQ - D - \pi Q. \quad (8)$$

By using this expression, Equation (7) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\dot{a}_j = w_j l_j + ra_j + T + X - c_j - Rm_j - \pi Q, \quad (9)$$

where $a_j \equiv A_j/p$ is the real asset level of household j and $w_j \equiv W_j/p$ is the real wage rate of worker l_j .

Considering Equations (2) and (9), household j solves the utility maximization problem as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize}_{c_j, m_j, W_j} \int_0^\infty \left[\ln c_j + \ln m_j - \frac{l_j^{1+\psi}}{1+\psi} \right] e^{-\rho t} dt, \\ & \text{subject to } \dot{a}_j = w_j l_j + ra_j + T + X - c_j - Rm_j - \pi Q, \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho > 0$ is the subjective discount rate of households.

Under the assumption of the symmetry condition, the following equations hold: $c_j = c$, $W_j = W$, and $l_j = l$. By using these expressions along with the solutions to the optimization problem above,⁵ we obtain

$$\frac{\dot{c}}{c} = r - \rho, \quad (10)$$

$$w = \frac{\eta}{\eta - 1} cl^\psi. \quad (11)$$

Equation (10) is an Euler equation, which is one of the optimal conditions for a Ramsey-type utility maximization problem. Equation (11) is a labor supply function. If the labor market is perfectly competitive, the real wage rate w should equal the marginal disutility of labor measured in terms of goods cl^ψ .⁶ However, in the present model, the labor market is monopolistically competitive. Hence, the real wage rate becomes equal to the marginal disutility of labor multiplied by the markup $\eta/(\eta - 1) > 1$, as in Equation (11). Furthermore, economically significant solutions would require satisfying the transversality condition expressed as $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} a(t)e^{-\rho t} dt = 0$.

Finally, the profits of firms are paid to households in the form of a dividend; therefore,

$$D = y - \frac{W}{p}l - \frac{\gamma}{2}(\pi - \pi^*)^2 y. \quad (12)$$

2.5 Central bank

The central bank manipulates nominal interest rate R according to fluctuations in output y , inflation rate π , and asset price Q , which implies that it targets output, inflation, and asset prices simultaneously. In this case, the monetary policy rule is expressed as follows:

$$R = R(y, \pi, Q); \quad \alpha_y \equiv \frac{\partial R}{\partial y} > 0; \quad \alpha_\pi \equiv \frac{\partial R}{\partial \pi} > 0; \quad \alpha_q \equiv \frac{\partial R}{\partial Q} > 0; \quad \bar{R} = R(y^*, \pi^*, Q^*), \quad (13)$$

where α_y , α_π , and α_q are the responsiveness of the nominal interest rate to output, the inflation rate, and asset prices, respectively. In addition, $\bar{R} > 0$ is the target level of the

⁵One of the conditions for optimality is given by $\frac{1}{m_j} - \mu R = 0$. The dynamics of the model economic system can be examined without using this condition. Therefore, we ignore it from the simultaneous equation system of the model economy.

⁶The inverse of the marginal utility of consumption is expressed as $\partial c / \partial u = c$. In addition, the marginal disutility of labor is expressed as $\partial u / \partial l = -l^\psi$. Therefore, the marginal disutility of labor measured in terms of goods is given by $\frac{dc}{dl} = -\frac{\partial u / \partial l}{\partial u / \partial c} = cl^\psi$.

nominal interest rate that corresponds to the target levels of these three variables (we regard their steady-state values here).

When delays are present in the central bank's responses to economic fluctuations, Equation (13) can be rewritten as follows:

$$R(t) = R(y(t - \tau_1), \pi(t - \tau_2), Q(t - \tau_3)), \quad (14)$$

where τ_1 , τ_2 , and τ_3 are delays in the output, inflation rate, and asset-price targeting policies, respectively.

3 Case with no policy lags

To emphasize the effects of policy lags on equilibrium determinacy, we first consider the case with no policy lags (i.e., $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_3 = 0$).

In this case, the model economic system comprises Equations (4), (5), (8), and (10)–(13). By using the goods market equilibrium condition $y = c$, the system can be summarized in the following three equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y} &= [R(y, \pi, Q) - \pi - \rho]y, \\ \dot{\pi} &= \rho(\pi - \pi^*) - \frac{1 - \phi}{\gamma} - \frac{\phi\eta}{\gamma(\eta - 1)}y^{1+\psi}, \\ \dot{Q} &= R(y, \pi, Q)Q - \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\eta - 1}y^{1+\psi} - \frac{\gamma}{2}(\pi - \pi^*)^2\right)y - \pi Q. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The non-trivial solutions to this system are expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} y^* &= \left[\frac{(\phi - 1)(\eta - 1)}{\phi\eta} \right]^{\frac{1}{1+\psi}}, \\ \pi^* &= \bar{R} - \rho, \\ Q^* &= \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\eta - 1}y^{*1+\psi}\right) \frac{y^*}{\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The Jacobian matrix of System (15) evaluated at the steady state can be given by

$$J \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_y y^* & (\alpha_\pi - 1)y^* & \alpha_Q y^* \\ -P_1 & \rho & 0 \\ \alpha_y Q^* + P_2 & (\alpha_\pi - 1)Q^* & \alpha_Q Q^* + \rho \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 &\equiv \frac{\phi\eta(1+\psi)}{\gamma(\eta-1)}y^{*\psi} > 0, \\
P_2 &\equiv -\left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\eta-1}y^{*1+\psi}\right) + \frac{\eta(1+\psi)}{\eta-1}y^{*1+\psi} \\
&= -\left(1 - \frac{\eta(2+\psi)}{\eta-1}y^{*1+\psi}\right) \\
&= -\left(1 - \frac{(2+\psi)(\phi-1)}{\phi}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

For plausible parameter values, $P_2 > 0$ holds.⁷ Hence, in the following discussion, we assume that this inequality holds.

Thus, the characteristic equation of the above system can be represented as

$$\Delta_1(x) \equiv |xI - J| = x^3 + b_1x^2 + b_2x + b_3 = 0, \quad (17)$$

where x is a characteristic root, I is an identity matrix,

$$\begin{aligned}
b_1 &\equiv -\text{trace}J \\
&= -(\alpha_y y^* + \alpha_q Q^* + 2\rho) < 0, \\
b_2 &\equiv \text{sum of the second-order principal minors of } J \\
&= -(P_2 y^* - \rho Q^*)\alpha_q + \rho^2 + 2\alpha_y y^* \rho + P_1(\alpha_\pi - 1)y^*, \\
b_3 &\equiv -\det J \\
&= \alpha_q y^* \rho P_2 - \alpha_y y^* \rho^2 - P_1(\alpha_\pi - 1)y^* \rho.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha_q = 0$, Jacobian matrix J becomes decomposable. In other words, the dynamics of y and π are unaffected by those of Q (whereas the dynamics of Q are affected by y and π). Therefore, in this case, the dynamic structure of the system is consistent with that of a simple NK model. Hence, the Taylor principle would hold as the necessary and sufficient condition for determinacy. However, as demonstrated by Bullard and Mitra (2002), when the nominal interest rate responds not only to the inflation rate but also to output, the condition for determinacy becomes more complicated; in this case, the condition is expressed as $\alpha_y \rho + P_1(\alpha_\pi - 1) > 0$. If $\alpha_y = 0$, then the well-known determinacy condition, $\alpha_\pi > 1$, can be obtained. When $\alpha_q > 0$, the following lemma holds:

⁷If $\psi > \phi/(\phi-1) - 2$, $P_2 > 0$; therefore, if specifically $\phi > 2$, $P_2 > 0$ holds for all $\psi > 0$.

Lemma 1 The equilibrium is locally determinate if and only if

$$\alpha_q < \alpha_{q3} \equiv \frac{\alpha_y \rho + P_1(\alpha_\pi - 1)}{P_2}. \quad (18)$$

Proof. Matrix J includes three roots. For equilibrium determinacy, all these roots must have positive real parts. The necessary and sufficient conditions for all roots to have positive real parts (Inverse Routh–Hurwitz theorem) are given by $b_1 < 0$, $b_2 > 0$, and $b_3 < 0$.⁸ Irrespective of the value of α_q , $b_1 < 0$ holds. Furthermore, $b_3 < 0$ if and only if the condition in Equation (18) is satisfied. A necessary condition for Equation (18) to hold is that $\alpha_y \rho + P_1(\alpha_\pi - 1) > 0$. Under this condition, b_2 is ensured to become positive if $P_2 y^* < \rho Q^*$; however, if $P_2 y^* > \rho Q^*$, it becomes positive only when

$$\alpha_q < \alpha_{q2} \equiv \frac{\rho^2 + 2\alpha_y y^* \rho + P_1(\alpha_\pi - 1)y^*}{P_2 y^* - \rho Q^*}.$$

As $\alpha_{q2} > \alpha_{q3}$, if Equation (18) is satisfied, $\alpha_q < \alpha_{q2}$ is also satisfied. Thus, $b_2 > 0$ and $b_3 < 0$ if and only if $\alpha_q < \alpha_{q3}$. \square

The economic implications of this result can be explained as follows. In our model, an increase in the inflation rate increases the real wage rate, which is a marginal cost of firms. This change further results in decreases in profits and asset prices (by $P_2 > 0$). The central bank responds not only to the variation in the inflation rate but also to the variation in asset prices. Therefore, the response of the nominal interest rate to the inflation rate is partly offset by the response to asset prices. This fact implies that the Taylor principle becomes less likely to be satisfied. Thus, the larger the value of α_q , the more likely is the occurrence of indeterminacy. Carlstrom and Fuerst (2007) use a discrete-time sticky-price model to demonstrate the equivalent result.⁹

⁸See Asada et al. (2007) and Tsuzuki (2013).

⁹See Proposition 1 in Carlstrom and Fuerst (2007). They also consider the cases where (i) nominal wages are sticky and (ii) both prices and nominal wages are sticky. In this study, we examine the standard case where only prices are sticky.

4 Case with positive policy lags

The model economic system when Equation (14) is used as the policy rule is expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{y}(t) &= [R(y(t - \tau_1), \pi(t - \tau_2), Q(t - \tau_3)) - \pi(t) - \rho]y(t), \\
 \dot{\pi}(t) &= \rho(\pi(t) - \pi^*) - \frac{1 - \phi}{\gamma} - \frac{\phi\eta}{\gamma(\eta - 1)}y(t)^{1+\psi}, \\
 \dot{Q}(t) &= R(y(t - \tau_1), \pi(t - \tau_2), Q(t - \tau_3))Q(t) \\
 &\quad - \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\eta - 1}y(t)^{1+\psi} - \frac{\gamma}{2}(\pi(t) - \pi^*)^2\right)y(t) - \pi(t)Q(t).
 \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

This is a differential equation system with three delays.

The steady-state values of System (19) are given by Equation (16). We linearize this system at the steady state to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{\hat{y}}(t) &= [\alpha_y \hat{y}(t - \tau_1) + \alpha_\pi \hat{\pi}(t - \tau_2) + \alpha_q \hat{Q}(t - \tau_3) - \hat{\pi}(t)]y^*, \\
 \dot{\hat{\pi}}(t) &= \rho \hat{\pi}(t) - P_1 \hat{y}(t), \\
 \dot{\hat{Q}}(t) &= \alpha_y Q^* \hat{y}(t - \tau_1) + \alpha_\pi Q^* \hat{\pi}(t - \tau_2) + \alpha_q Q^* \hat{Q}(t - \tau_3) + P_2 \hat{y}(t) - Q^* \hat{\pi}(t) + \rho \hat{Q}(t),
 \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where $\hat{y}(t) \equiv y(t) - y^*$, $\hat{\pi}(t) \equiv \pi(t) - \pi^*$, and $\hat{Q}(t) \equiv Q(t) - Q^*$. Assuming that the exponential functions $\hat{y}(t) = C_1 e^{xt}$, $\hat{\pi}(t) = C_2 e^{xt}$, and $\hat{Q}(t) = C_3 e^{xt}$ are the solutions to this system, where C_1 , C_2 , and C_3 are arbitrary constants, and plugging these functions into System (20), we get the following:

$$\begin{bmatrix} x - \alpha_y y^* e^{-\tau_1 x} & y^* - \alpha_\pi y^* e^{-\tau_2 x} & -\alpha_q y^* e^{-\tau_3 x} \\ P_1 & x - \rho & 0 \\ -P_2 - \alpha_y Q^* e^{-\tau_1 x} & Q^* - \alpha_\pi Q^* e^{-\tau_2 x} & x - \rho - \alpha_q Q^* e^{-\tau_3 x} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}(t) \\ \hat{\pi}(t) \\ \hat{Q}(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The determinant of the left-hand side matrix must equal zero for non-trivial solutions to exist:

$$\Delta_2(x) \equiv s_0(x) + s_1(x)e^{-\tau_1 x} + s_2(x)e^{-\tau_2 x} + s_3(x)e^{-\tau_3 x} = 0, \tag{21}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
s_0(x) &\equiv x^3 - 2\rho x^2 + (\rho^2 - P_1 y^*)x + P_1 y^* \rho, \\
s_1(x) &\equiv -\alpha_y y^* x^2 + 2\alpha_y y^* \rho x - \alpha_y y^* \rho^2, \\
s_2(x) &\equiv P_1 \alpha_\pi y^* x - P_1 \alpha_\pi y^* \rho, \\
s_3(x) &\equiv -\alpha_q Q^* x^2 + (\rho \alpha_q Q^* - P_2 \alpha_q y^*)x + \alpha_q y^* \rho P_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Equation (21) is the characteristic equation of System (19).

Owing to the existence of the terms that contain the exponential functions $e^{-\tau_1 x}$, $e^{-\tau_2 x}$, and $e^{-\tau_3 x}$, Equation (21) has an infinite number of roots.¹⁰ Furthermore, unlike in the case of ordinary differential equations, delay differential equations require the initial values of $y(t)$, $\pi(t)$, and $Q(t)$ evaluated not only at time zero (t_0 ; present time) but also at $t_0 - \tau_1 \leq t < t_0$, $t_0 - \tau_2 \leq t < t_0$, and $t_0 - \tau_3 \leq t < t_0$. However, the only values that economic agents can determine at time t_0 are $(y(t_0), \pi(t_0), Q(t_0))$ because “past values” must be considered as given. Therefore, equilibrium determinacy can be achieved only when there are exactly three roots with positive real parts among the infinite number of roots. The equilibrium is indeterminate if fewer than three roots have positive real parts and it is unstable if more than three roots have positive real parts (i.e., an equilibrium path does not exist).

4.1 Method of analysis

The following analysis is performed based on the numerical method developed by Gu and Naghnaeian (2011). The procedure is given as follows:

1. The set of the imaginary part of the roots that generates pure imaginary roots (crossing frequency set: Ω) is characterized. The crossing frequency set is broadly grouped into two types: Grashof and Non-Grashof sets.
2. The set of lags corresponding to the crossing frequency set (stability crossing set: $\mathcal{T} \in (\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3)$) is characterized.
3. By assuming plausible parameter values, we depict the stability crossing set as a surface in a 3D space.

¹⁰See Chapter 3 in Bellman and Cooke (1963).

The notations used in the following sections are defined as follows: \mathbb{R} = set of all real numbers; \mathbb{C} = set of all complex numbers; $\mathbb{Z}_3^+ = \{1, 2, 3\}$; i = imaginary unit. Furthermore, let $u' = (u \bmod 3) + 1$ for $u \in \mathbb{Z}_3^+$; that is, $1' = 2$, $2' = 3$, and $3' = 1$. In addition, let $u'' = (u')' = [(u + 1) \bmod 3] + 1$. Then, $\{u, u', u''\} = \mathbb{Z}_3^+$.

4.2 Preliminaries

First, to apply Gu and Naghnaeian's (2011) method, some preconditions should be examined. The polynomials $s_u(x)$, $u = 0, 1, 2, 3$, must satisfy the following conditions (non-triviality assumptions):

Assumption 1 $\deg(s_0(x)) \geq \max\{\deg(s_u(x)) | u \in \mathbb{Z}_3^+\}$,

Assumption 2 $s_0(0) + s_1(0) + s_2(0) + s_3(0) \neq 0$,

Assumption 3 $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|s_1(x)| + |s_2(x)| + |s_3(x)|}{|s_0(x)|} < 1$.

Assumption 1 ensures the existence of a set $(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3$ that establishes perfect stability, wherein a root with a positive real part does not exist. However, this study examines equilibrium determinacy, which is different from the concept of stability used in mathematics. Hence, the existence of a perfectly stable state is not necessarily required; nevertheless, we adopt this assumption only to apply Gu and Naghnaeian's (2011) method. Because $\deg(s_0(x)) = 3$ and $\max\{\deg(s_u(x)) | u \in \mathbb{Z}_3^+\} = 2$, this assumption is satisfied. Assumption 2 implies that $\Delta_2(0) \neq 0$; i.e., zero is not a root. For the same reason as for Assumption 1, we adopt this assumption, while it also plays the only role of a necessary condition to ensure the existence of a perfectly stable state. We should assume $\det J \neq 0$ because $\Delta_2(0) = -\det J$. Finally, Assumption 3 is required to ensure the continuity of roots over (τ_1, τ_2, τ_3) . Because $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|s_1(x)| + |s_2(x)| + |s_3(x)|}{|s_0(x)|} = 0$, Assumption 3 is satisfied.

Under these assumptions, we can state the following: as the lags (τ_1, τ_2, τ_3) continuously vary within \mathbb{R}_+^3 , the number of roots of $\Delta_2(x) = 0$ lying on \mathbb{C}_+ can change if a root appears on or crosses the imaginary axis (Lemma 1 in Gu and Naghnaeian (2011)).

4.3 Crossing frequency set

Denote a pure imaginary root as $x = i\omega$, where $\omega > 0$ is the imaginary part.¹¹ In this section, we characterize the values of $\omega > 0$ that satisfy $\Delta_2(i\omega) = 0$ (crossing frequency).

Let

$$a_u(x) = \frac{s_u(x)}{s_0(x)}, \quad u = 0, 1, 2, 3. \quad (22)$$

Obviously, $a_0(x) = 1$. Moreover, we also define that

$$f_0(x) = |a_1(x)| + |a_2(x)| + |a_3(x)|, \quad (23)$$

$$f_u(x) = |a_{u'}(x)| + |a_{u''}(x)| - |a_u(x)|, \quad u = 1, 2, 3. \quad (24)$$

By using Equation (22), $\Delta_2(i\omega) = 0$ can be rewritten as follows:

$$\Delta_3(i\omega) = 1 + a_1(i\omega)e^{-i\omega\tau_1} + a_2(i\omega)e^{-i\omega\tau_2} + a_3(i\omega)e^{-i\omega\tau_3} = 0. \quad (25)$$

Furthermore, by considering each term of Equation (25) as a vector depicted on the complex plane, the four terms form a rectangle, as shown in Figure 1.¹²




Figure 1: Rectangle formed by the four vectors

From the geometric fact that a rectangle can be formed only when the length of one side does not exceed the sum of the other lengths, we can postulate that a crossing frequency set comprises $\omega > 0$ that satisfy the following four inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(i\omega) &\geq 1 \\ f_u(i\omega) &\geq -1, \quad u = 1, 2, 3. \end{aligned}$$

¹¹We can assume that $\omega > 0$ without loss of generality because the complex roots will always be conjugated.

¹²Note that the length of each vector is independent of (τ_1, τ_2, τ_3) . $((\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3)$ determine the direction of the vector.)

Thus, when we depict $f_u(i\omega)$, $u = 0, 1, 2, 3$, against ω , the crossing frequency set Ω comprises all $\omega > 0$ that the curve $f_0(i\omega)$ is above 1 and the curves $f_1(i\omega)$, $f_2(i\omega)$, and $f_3(i\omega)$ are above -1 .

Moreover, if the sum of the longest side and the shortest side of a rectangle is smaller than that of the other two sides, the rectangle is recognized as a Grashof rectangle. By using this definition, we can classify $\omega \in \Omega$ into the following four types:

Type 0 Grashof set: Ω_G^0

Set of $\omega \in \Omega$ that satisfies

$$f_u(i\omega) > 1, \quad u = 1, 2, 3. \quad (26)$$

Type u Grashof set: Ω_G^u

Set of $\omega \in \Omega$ that satisfies

$$f_u(i\omega) > 1, \quad u = 1, 2, 3, \quad (27)$$

$$f_{u'}(i\omega) < 1, \quad (28)$$

$$f_{u''}(i\omega) < 1. \quad (29)$$

Type 0 Non-Grashof set: Ω_N^0

Set of $\omega \in \Omega$ that satisfies

$$f_u(i\omega) \leq 1, \quad u = 1, 2, 3. \quad (30)$$

Type u Non-Grashof set: Ω_N^u

Set of $\omega \in \Omega$ that satisfies

$$f_u(i\omega) \leq 1, \quad u = 1, 2, 3, \quad (31)$$

$$f_{u'}(i\omega) \geq 1, \quad (32)$$

$$f_{u''}(i\omega) \geq 1. \quad (33)$$

Ω_G^u , $u = 0, 1, 2, 3$, are open intervals and Ω_N^u , $u = 0, 1, 2, 3$, are closed intervals. (However, Ω_N^u , $u = 0, 1, 2, 3$, become semi-open intervals when $\omega = 0$ is a solution of Equations 31–33 or Equation 30. See Proposition 3 in Gu and Naghnaeian (2011) for details.)

Following Fujiwara (2008), we set the structural parameter values as shown in Table 1. Further, we set the target inflation rate at a realistic value of 2%, which implies that

$\bar{R} = 0.03$. Finally, the monetary policy reaction parameters are set at their typical values, as shown in Table 2, where the value of τ_q is set so that Equation 18 is satisfied (i.e., if a policy lag is not present, the equilibrium is determinate).

η	ϕ	γ	ψ	ρ
21	6.0	27.454	1.0	0.01

Table 1: Structural parameters

α_y	α_π	α_q
0.5	1.5	0.01

Table 2: Policy reaction parameters

Under these assumptions, we investigate the effects of policy lags on equilibrium determinacy. The functions $f_u(i\omega)$, $u = 0, 1, 2, 3$, are depicted as shown in Figure 2. This figure indicates that

$$\Omega = [\omega_1, \omega_4] = [0.2203, 0.8176].$$




Figure 2: $f_u(i\omega)$, $u = 0, 1, 2, 3$

Moreover, the crossing frequency set Ω can be resolved into the following three com-

ponents:

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{h=1}^3 \Omega^h$$

$$\Omega^1 = [\omega_1, \omega_2] = [0.2203, 0.3054] \subset \Omega_N^2,$$

$$\Omega^2 = (\omega_2, \omega_3) = (0.3054, 0.5922) \subset \Omega_G^3,$$

$$\Omega^3 = [\omega_3, \omega_4] = [0.5922, 0.8176] \subset \Omega_N^0.$$

Gu and Naghnaeian (2011) show the geometric configurations of the stability crossing sets (\mathcal{T}^h , $h = 1, 2, 3$) that correspond to all possible types of crossing frequency sets (Ω^h , $h = 1, 2, 3$) (see Theorem 1 in Gu and Naghnaeian (2011)). According to their study, \mathcal{T}^1 and \mathcal{T}^3 shape caps and \mathcal{T}^2 shapes wavy sheets in the (τ_1, τ_2, τ_3) space.

4.4 Concretization of the stability crossing sets

To illustrate the stability crossing sets \mathcal{T}^h , $h = 1, 2, 3$, in the (τ_1, τ_2, τ_3) space, we present their specific expressions.

Let $\{u, v, w\} = \mathbb{Z}_3^+$; then, Equation (25) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\Delta_3(i\omega) = a_v(i\omega)e^{-i\omega\tau_v} + a_w(i\omega)e^{-i\omega\tau_w} + a_d(i\omega, \tau_u) = 0, \quad (34)$$

where

$$a_d(i\omega, \tau_u) = 1 + a_u(i\omega)e^{-i\omega\tau_u}. \quad (35)$$

Considering the three terms in Equation (34) as vectors on the complex plane and depicting them, a triangle can be formed, as shown in Figure 3.¹³

This figure indicates that θ_v and θ_w can be expressed as follows:

$$\mp\theta_v = \arg(a_v(i\omega)) - \omega\tau_v - \arg(a_d(i\omega, \tau_u)) + 2r_v\pi,$$

$$\pm\theta_w = \arg(a_w(i\omega)) - \omega\tau_w - \arg(a_d(i\omega, \tau_u)) + 2r_w\pi,$$

¹³For details of the discussion here, see Section 3 in Gu et al. (2005).




Figure 3: Triangle formed by $|a_d(i\omega, \tau_u)|$, $|a_v(i\omega)|$, and $|a_w(i\omega)|$

where $r_v, r_w = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_v &= \tau_v^\pm(\omega, \tau_u, r_v) \\ &= \frac{\arg(a_v(i\omega)) - \arg(a_d(i\omega, \tau_u)) \pm \theta_v + 2r_v\pi}{\omega},\end{aligned}\quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_w &= \tau_w^\mp(\omega, \tau_u, r_w) \\ &= \frac{\arg(a_w(i\omega)) - \arg(a_d(i\omega, \tau_u)) \mp \theta_w + 2r_w\pi}{\omega}.\end{aligned}\quad (37)$$

By using the cosine theorem, θ_v and θ_w can also be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_v &= \cos^{-1}\left(\frac{|a_d(i\omega, \tau_u)|^2 + |a_v(i\omega)|^2 - |a_w(i\omega)|^2}{2|a_d(i\omega, \tau_u)| \cdot |a_v(i\omega)|}\right), \\ \theta_w &= \cos^{-1}\left(\frac{|a_d(i\omega, \tau_u)|^2 + |a_w(i\omega)|^2 - |a_v(i\omega)|^2}{2|a_d(i\omega, \tau_u)| \cdot |a_w(i\omega)|}\right),\end{aligned}$$

which are substituted into Equations (36) and (37), respectively.

A similar procedure derives the following expression from Equation (35):

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_u &= \tau_u(\omega, r_u) \\ &= \frac{\arg(a_u(i\omega)) + (2r_u - 1)\pi}{\omega}, \quad r_u = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\end{aligned}\quad (38)$$

Equations (36)–(38) are used to express the stability crossing sets.

Incidentally, for the triangle shown in Figure 3 to exist, the following condition must hold:

$$||a_v(i\omega)| - |a_w(i\omega)|| \leq |a_d(i\omega, \tau_u)| \leq |a_v(i\omega)| + |a_w(i\omega)|. \quad (39)$$

These inequalities define the motion range of τ_u for the given values of ω . The motion range depends on the type of Ω^h . Hence, the representation of \mathcal{T}^h also differs accordingly.

When Ω^h is a Grashof set ($\Omega_G = \bigcup_{u=0}^3 \Omega_G^u$), the motion range of τ_u can be defined as follows (see Appendix A.1):

$$\mathcal{T}_u(\omega, r_u) = [\tau_u(\omega, r_u), \tau_u(\omega, r_u + 1)].$$

On the contrary, when Ω^h is a Non-Grashof set ($\Omega_N = \bigcup_{u=0}^3 \Omega_N^u$), the motion range of τ_u can be defined as follows (see Appendix A.2):

$$\mathcal{T}_u(\omega, r_u) = [\tau_{um}(\omega, r_u), \tau_{uM}(\omega, r_u)],$$

where

$$\theta_{um} = \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{1 + |a_u(i\omega)|^2 - (|a_v(i\omega)| + |a_w(i\omega)|)^2}{2|a_u(i\omega)|} \right), \quad (40)$$

$$\tau_{um}(\omega, r_u) = \frac{\arg(a_u(i\omega)) + 2r_u\pi - \theta_{um}}{\omega},$$

$$\tau_{uM}(\omega, r_u) = \frac{\arg(a_u(i\omega)) + 2r_u\pi + \theta_{um}}{\omega}.$$

Thus, by defining the set $\mathcal{T}^{h\pm}$ as

$$\mathcal{T}^{h\pm} = \left\{ (\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3) \left| \begin{array}{l} \tau_u \in \mathcal{T}_u(\omega, r_u), \\ \tau_v = \tau_v^\pm(\omega, \tau_u, r_v), \\ \tau_w = \tau_w^\mp(\omega, \tau_u, r_w) \end{array} \right. \right\}, \quad (41)$$

the stability crossing sets \mathcal{T}^h , $h = 1, 2, 3$, can be represented for the given (r_u, r_v, r_w) and $\{(\omega, \tau_u) | \omega \in \Omega^h, \tau_u \in \mathcal{T}_u(\omega, r_u)\}$, as follows:

$$\mathcal{T}^h = (\mathcal{T}^{h+} \cup \mathcal{T}^{h-}) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^3. \quad (42)$$

4.5 Drawing the stability crossing sets

Under the assumptions in Tables 1 and 2, \mathcal{T}^1 , \mathcal{T}^2 , and \mathcal{T}^3 are drawn, as shown in Figures 4–6, respectively.¹⁴

¹⁴In the case of $\Omega^1 \subset \Omega_N^2$, $u = 2$, $v = 1$, and $w = 3$. Figure 4 shows the case of $(r_u, r_v, r_w) = (0, 0, 0)$. In the case of $\Omega^2 \subset \Omega_G^3$, $u = 3$, $v = 2$, and $w = 1$. Figure 5 shows the case of $r_u = 0, 1, 2$; $r_v = 1$; and $r_w = 1$. Finally, in the case of $\Omega^3 \subset \Omega_N^0$, $u = 1$, $v = 3$, and $w = 2$. Figure 6 shows the case of $(r_u, r_v, r_w) = (1, 1, 1)$.




Figure 4: \mathcal{T}^1 : Cap




Figure 5: \mathcal{T}^2 : Wavy sheets




Figure 6: \mathcal{T}^3 : Cap




Figure 7: Stability crossing sets

The complete figure of \mathcal{T}^h , $h = 1, 2, 3$, corresponding to all combinations of $r_u = 0, 1, 2$; $r_v = 0, 1, 2$; and $r_w = 0, 1, 2$ (27 patterns) can be drawn as shown in Figure 7. *At least* for positive values of (τ_1, τ_2, τ_3) lying inside the surface of \mathcal{T}^h , $h = 1, 2, 3$, that enclose the origin, the equilibrium is determinate. To capture the size and shape of the determinacy region more clearly, we show some cross-section diagrams when τ_1 , τ_2 , or τ_3 is fixed at certain values (0, 10, and 20), as in Figures 8–16. Whenever τ_1 , τ_2 , or τ_3 crosses these curves (which we call the stability crossing curves), the sign of the real part of the complex roots changes.

The direction of the change (i.e., whether it runs from positive to negative or vice versa) can be examined as follows. In the case of a change in τ_1 , the direction is confirmed by determining the sign of the following expression:

$$\operatorname{Re} \left[\frac{\partial x}{\partial \tau_1} \right]_{(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3) = (\tau_1^*, \tau_2^*, \tau_3^*), x = i\omega^*}, \quad (43)$$

where $(\tau_1^*, \tau_2^*, \tau_3^*)$ is a point lying on the surface of a stability crossing set and $x = i\omega^*$ is a pure imaginary root that corresponds to the point. In addition, $\partial x / \partial \tau_1$ can be derived

from the implicit function $\Delta_2(x, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3) = 0$ as follows:

$$\frac{\partial x}{\partial \tau_1} = \frac{s_1(x)xe^{-\tau_1 x}}{s'_0(x) + \sum_{j=1}^3 \{s'_j(x) - s_j(x)\tau_j\}e^{-\tau_j x}}. \quad (44)$$

If $\text{Re} \left[\frac{\partial x}{\partial \tau_1} \right] > 0$, a pair of complex roots moves from left to right on the complex plane when τ_1 crosses τ_1^* ; therefore, the real part of the complex roots changes from negative to positive. Conversely, if the inequality runs in the opposite direction, a pair of complex roots moves from right to left on the complex plane; in this case, the real part of the complex roots changes from positive to negative.

For example, at the point $(\tau_1^*, \tau_2^*, \tau_3^*) = (6.9689, 12.0174, 0)$ (see Figure 8), $\omega^* = 0.5395$ and $\text{Re}[\partial x / \partial \tau_1] = 0.0158 > 0$. Accordingly, when τ_1 crosses this point from left to right, the number of roots with positive real parts increases by two. We have already shown that there are exactly three roots with positive real parts in the left-hand side of this point (the equilibrium is determinate when policy lags are not present). Therefore, in the right-hand side region of that point, there are five roots with positive real parts, implying that the equilibrium is unstable. As for the other areas, we can reveal the number of roots with positive real parts by using the same procedure. The values written in each area of Figures 8–16 indicate the number of roots with positive real parts.




Figure 8: $\tau_3 = 0$




Figure 9: $\tau_3 = 10$




Figure 10: $\tau_3 = 20$




Figure 11: $\tau_2 = 0$




Figure 12: $\tau_2 = 10$




Figure 13: $\tau_2 = 20$




Figure 14: $\tau_1 = 0$




Figure 15: $\tau_1 = 10$




Figure 16: $\tau_1 = 20$

In each of these figures, an increase in the value of some lag parameter may cause any one of the following: determinacy, indeterminacy, or instability. For example, in Figure 11, if $\tau_3 = 10$, the dynamic property of the system changes with an increase in τ_1 as follows: determinate—indeterminate—determinate—unstable. Specifically, the regions of τ_1 that achieve determinacy are given by $\tau_1 \in [0, 5.13]$ and $\tau_1 \in [6.73, 16.4]$, which implies that if an implementation lag does not present in inflation targeting and a lag of approximately five years exists in asset-price targeting, then lags in output targeting must be approximately 0–2.5 or 3.4–8.2 years.

Furthermore, moving on the vertical axis of Figures 11–16 does not change the number of roots with positive real parts. This finding implies that a lag in asset-price targeting does not affect equilibrium determinacy, at least when τ_1 or τ_2 is sufficiently small.

In addition, as shown in Section 3, in the case where a lag is not present, if the condition in Equation (18) does not hold, the equilibrium is indeterminate. In this case, the signs of the real parts of the three roots are necessarily $++-$ (the case of $+--$ cannot occur). Accordingly, in the above case, there is no possibility that equilibrium determinacy is achieved by introducing a lag in a policy response because the number of roots with positive real parts necessarily changes by two in any case.

Moreover, cycles or other complex fluctuations may exist around the steady state because on the stability crossing curves and thus all conditions for a Hopf bifurcation are satisfied.

5 Conclusion

In this study, we used the NK model to analyze the effects of three policy lags on local equilibrium determinacy. Unlike Tsuzuki (2014, 2015), who only studies the effect of inflation targeting, the existence of multiple target variables in monetary policy (i.e., not only the inflation rate but also output and asset prices) provides a new possibility for a lag. In other words, even if the system includes only one lag, the lag can resolve the problem of instability. For example, when τ_1 , which represents a lag in output targeting, moves on the horizontal axis of Figures 8 and 11, the equilibrium changes as follows: determinate—unstable—determinate. However, increases in τ_2 and τ_3 , which denote lags in inflation and asset-price targeting, respectively, do not have such an effect. In this case, an increase in τ_2 necessarily causes instability, whereas that in τ_3 does not affect the dynamic property.

In cases where multiple policy lags coexist, the analysis becomes considerably more complicated. All lags can have a stabilizing effect on the equilibrium. Specifically, in Figures 13 and 16, τ_1 or τ_3 must be positive to achieve determinacy. If the values of these lags are zero, the equilibrium is unstable. This finding suggests that the central bank may be required to “purposefully” delay its policy implementation.

Moreover, the above results are valid only for the plausible parameter values assumed in Section 4. They do not have anything like generality. Depending on the parameter values, the type of Grashof set may change. Accordingly, the configuration of a stability crossing set may also dramatically alter.

A more theoretical investigation of the effects of policy lags requires an algebraic approach to differential equation systems with multiple delays. Unfortunately, such a method has not thus far been established. Nonetheless, the analysis performed in this study is helpful for policymakers. Indeed, the presented findings suggest that the central bank should determine its target variables by considering not only the responsiveness of the nominal interest rate to these variables but also the lag lengths associated with policy implementations.

In addition, the present study argues that (i) if a delay exists only in asset-price targeting, the Fed’s view would assert its validity at least for a slight change in policy responsiveness, as in the case with no policy lags; and (ii) if multiple policy lags coexist, the Bank of International Settlements’ view can become valid policy, depending on the lag parameter set.

A Appendix

A.1 Motion range of τ_u : the case of Grashof sets

In the case of $\Omega^h \subset \Omega_G^u$, $u = 0, 1, 2, 3$, the expression in Equation (39) holds with strict inequalities for all $\tau_u \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (see Equations 26 and 27–29). Therefore, \mathcal{T}^h can be defined for $(\omega, \tau_u) \in \Omega^h \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Thus, the motion range of τ_u can be defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_u(\omega, r_u) = [\tau_u(\omega, r_u), \tau_u(\omega, r_u + 1)].$$

A.2 Motion range of τ_u : the case of Non-Grashof sets

In the case of $\Omega^h \subset \Omega_N^u$, $u = 0, 1, 2, 3$, the first inequality in Equation (39) holds for all $\tau_u \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (see Equations 30 and 31–33). However, the second inequality, $|a_d(i\omega, \tau_u)| \leq |a_v(i\omega)| + |a_w(i\omega)|$, is not ensured to hold. This inequality is equivalent to the following expression: $\pi - \theta_{um} \leq \arg(a_u(i\omega)e^{-i\omega\tau_u}) + 2r_u\pi \leq \pi + \theta_{um}$, where

$$\theta_{um} = \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{1 + |a_u(i\omega)|^2 - (|a_v(i\omega)| + |a_w(i\omega)|)^2}{2|a_u(i\omega)|} \right).$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{um}(\omega, r_u) &= \frac{\arg(a_u(i\omega)) + 2r_u\pi - \theta_{um}}{\omega}, \\ \tau_{uM}(\omega, r_u) &= \frac{\arg(a_u(i\omega)) + 2r_u\pi + \theta_{um}}{\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

By using these expressions, the motion range of τ_u can be represented as follows:

$$\mathcal{T}_u(\omega, r_u) = [\tau_{um}(\omega, r_u), \tau_{uM}(\omega, r_u)].$$

Acknowledgments

This paper is a part of the outcome of research performed under a Waseda University Grant for Special Research Projects (Project number: 2015B-014).

References

- [1] Asada, Toichiro, Peter Flaschel, and Christian R. Proaño (2007). “Expectations and the real-wage feedback channel: Two competing baseline approaches,” University of Bielefeld, Germany.
- [2] Bellman, Richard Ernest, and Kenneth L. Cooke (1963). *Differential-Difference Equations*, Academic Press, New York.
- [3] Benhabib, Jess, Stephanie Schmitt-Grohé, and Martín Uribe (2003). “Backward-looking interest-rate rules, interest-rate smoothing, and macroeconomic instability,” *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 35(6), 1379–1412.

- [4] Beretta, Edoardo, and Yang Kuang (2002). “Geometric stability switch criteria in delay differential systems with delay dependent parameters,” *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 33(5), 1144–1165.
- [5] Bernanke, Ben S., and Mark Gertler (2001). “Should central banks respond to movements in asset prices?” *American Economic Review* 91(2), 253–257.
- [6] Bilbiie, Florin O. (2008). “Limited asset markets participation, monetary policy and (inverted) aggregate demand logic,” *Journal of Economic Theory* 140(1), 162–196.
- [7] Blanchard, Olivier Jean, and Nobuhiro Kiyotaki (1987). “Monopolistic competition and the effects of aggregate demand,” *American Economic Review* 77(4), 647–666.
- [8] Buffie, Edward F. (2013). “The Taylor principle fights back, part I,” *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 37(12), 2771–2795.
- [9] Bullard, James, and Kaushik Mitra (2002). “Learning about monetary policy rules,” *Journal of Monetary Economics* 49(6), 1105–1129.
- [10] Carlstrom, Charles T. and Timothy S. Fuerst (2007). “Asset prices, nominal rigidities, and monetary policy,” *Review of Economic Dynamics* 10(2), 256–275.
- [11] Deng, Weihua, Yujiang Wu, and Changpin Li (2006). “Stability analysis of differential equations with time-dependent delay,” *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos* 16(2), 465–472.
- [12] Fujiwara, Ippei (2008). “Growth expectation,” IMES Discussion Paper Series 08-E-21, Institute for Monetary and Economic Studies, Bank of Japan, 31 pages.
- [13] Galí, Jordi (2015). *Monetary Policy, Inflation, and the Business Cycle: An Introduction to the New Keynesian Framework and Its Applications*, Princeton University Press.
- [14] Glikberg, Baruch (2009). “Monetary policy and multiple equilibria with constrained investment and externalities,” *Economic Theory* 41(3), 443–463.
- [15] Gu, Keqin, and Mohammad Naghnaeian (2011). “Stability crossing set for systems with three delays,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 56(1), 11–26.

- [16] Gu, Keqin, Silviu-Iulian Niculescu, and Jie Chen (2005). “On stability crossing curves for general systems with two delays,” *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 311(1), 231–253.
- [17] Guerrini, Luca, and Mauro Sodini (2013). “Dynamic properties of the Solow model with increasing or decreasing population and time-to-build technology,” *Abstract and Applied Analysis* Vol. 2013, Article ID 280925, 7 pages.
- [18] Lin, Xihui, and Hao Wang (2012). “Stability analysis of delay differential equations with two discrete delays,” *Canadian Applied Mathematics Quarterly* 20(4), 519–533.
- [19] Matsumoto, Akio, and Ferenc Szidarovszky (2015a). “Nonlinear multiplier-accelerator model with investment and consumption delays,” *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 33, 1–9.
- [20] Matsumoto, Akio, and Ferenc Szidarovszky (2015b). “Nonlinear Cournot duopoly with implementation delays,” IERCU Discussion Paper Vol.240, Chuo University, Japan, 19 pages.
- [21] Meng, Qinglai, and Chong K. Yip (2004). “Investment, interest rate rules, and equilibrium determinacy,” *Economic Theory* 23(4), 863–878.
- [22] Rotemberg, Julio J. (1982). “Sticky prices in the United States,” *Journal of Political Economy* 90(6), 1187–1211.
- [23] Tsuzuki, Eiji (2013). “Unimodality of a weight function in backward-looking interest-rate rules and determinacy of equilibrium,” *Keizaironsyu* No. 100, The Economics Society, Daito Bunka University, Japan, 147–171.
- [24] Tsuzuki, Eiji (2014). “A New Keynesian model with delay: Monetary policy lag and determinacy of equilibrium,” *Economic Analysis and Policy* 44(3), 279–291.
- [25] Tsuzuki, Eiji (2015). “Determinacy of equilibrium in a New Keynesian model with monetary policy lag,” *International Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, Special Issue: Recent Developments of Economic Theory and Its Applications, 3 (2-1), 15–22.

- [26] Tsuzuki, Eiji, and Shunsuke Shinagawa (2015). “Dynamic analysis of fiscal policy lag in the New Keynesian model with exogenous growth,” Keynes Society Japan Working Paper No.3 (KSJ-WP-03), 30 pages.
- [27] Tsuzuki, Eiji, Shunsuke Shinagawa, and Tomohiro Inoue (2015). “Equilibrium determinacy in a continuous time New Keynesian model with monetary and fiscal policy lags,” WINPEC Working Paper Series No.E1503, Waseda University, Japan, 23 pages.
- [28] Walsh, Carl E. (2010). *Monetary Theory and Policy*, Third Edition, MIT Press.
- [29] Woodford, Michael (2003). *Interest and Prices: Foundations of a Theory of Monetary Policy*, Princeton University Press.