

## Inertia of Forward-Looking Expectations

By STEPHEN MORRIS AND HYUN SONG SHIN\*

Macroeconomic variables exhibit inertia. On the face of it, such inertia sits uncomfortably with the behavior of rational, forward-looking agents who form expectations on the basis of the best information available at the time. Christopher Sims (2003, sect. 8) offers a three-fold taxonomy of attempts to rationalize inertia. The first is the idea of Robert Lucas (1973) and Edmund Phelps (1970) that agents face a signal extraction problem, so that their actions react only partially to shifts in fundamentals due to the residual uncertainty. The second is the sticky expectations approach of N. Gregory Mankiw and Ricardo Reis (2002), where otherwise rational and forward-looking agents receive information with some delay.<sup>1</sup> The third is the rational inattention approach favored by Sims himself, where agents with information-processing constraints choose the optimal coarsening of their information (Sims, 2003).

Our approach is a variation on the signal-extraction theme but has implications for the sticky-expectations and rational-inattention approaches. As explained recently by Michael Woodford (2003), the original contribution of Lucas (1973) had limited success in explaining the persistence of macroeconomic aggregates due to the feature that the underlying fundamentals are fully revealed after a delay of one pe-

riod. Without this simplifying feature, however, the complexity of the problem increases rapidly as expectations of others' expectations become relevant in one's calculations (Robert Townsend, 1983; Phelps, 1983).<sup>2</sup>

Tractability aside, the approach holds much promise. When agents are differentially informed, events in the distant past are "more common knowledge" than events in the recent past. Not only has enough time elapsed for the agents to ascertain the facts in the distant past, but more importantly, enough time has elapsed for each agent to be more confident that *other* agents have ascertained the facts. When common knowledge is important (as in coordination problems, for example) events in the distant past take on significance. Paradoxically, the farther the agents peer into the future, the farther they must look into the past to establish the informational platform for their actions. To an outside observer, the aggregate action betrays all the outward signs of adaptive expectations. In order to demonstrate this principle in a transparent way, we employ other drastic simplifications but do not assume that realizations are revealed after a delay of one period. We thereby preserve the nontrivial nature of dynamic, higher-order beliefs and show how persistence arises as a natural consequence of the original Lucas and Phelps insight.

### I. Decision Rule

We consider the decision rule

$$(1) \quad a_{it} = \gamma E_{it}(\theta_t) + \beta E_{it}(a_{t+1})$$

<sup>†</sup> *Discussants:* Nobuhiro Kiyotaki, London School of Economics; Marios Angeletos, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Andrew Atkeson, University of California-Los Angeles.

\* Morris: Department of Economics, Princeton University, 211 Fisher Hall, Prospect Street, Princeton, NJ 08544 (e-mail: smorris@princeton.edu); Shin: Department of Economics, Bendheim Center for Finance, 26 Prospect Avenue, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544 (e-mail: hsshin@princeton.edu). We thank Nobu Kiyotaki for his illuminating comments as discussant.

<sup>1</sup> See also Christopher Carroll (2003) who provides empirical estimates of shifts in expectations.

<sup>2</sup> This approach was further developed by Thomas Sargent (1991). More recently, there has been a revival of the approach in macroeconomics. See Woodford (2003), Klaus Adam (2003), Jeffery Amato and Shin (2006), Christian Hellwig (2002), Guido Lorenzoni (2003), Takashi Ue (2003), and Kristoffer P. Nimark (2004).

where  $a_{it}$  is agent  $i$ 's action at date  $t$ ,  $E_{it}(\cdot)$  is the expectation with respect to  $i$ 's information set at  $t$ ,  $\beta$  is a parameter that lies strictly between zero and one, and  $\gamma > 0$ . We suppose that there is a continuum of agents indexed by the unit interval  $[0, 1]$ , and  $a_t$  (without the subscript  $i$ ) is the average action at date  $t$ , defined as  $a_t = \int_0^1 a_{it} di$ . The random variable  $\theta_t$  is the underlying "fundamental" quantity in the economy that individuals care about. Taking the average across individuals, the average action at date  $t$  is

$$(2) \quad a_t = \gamma \bar{E}_t(\theta_t) + \beta \bar{E}_t(a_{t+1})$$

where  $\bar{E}_t(\cdot)$  is average of the expectations taken across all agents, defined as  $\bar{E}_t(\cdot) = \int_0^1 E_{it}(\cdot) di$ . Equation (2) resembles the New Keynesian Phillips curve derived from rational expectations models with sticky prices, where  $a_t$  is inflation and  $\theta_t$  is marginal cost. In this context,  $\beta$  is the discount factor used by price-setting firms and  $\gamma$  is a parameter that depends on the stickiness of prices and other fundamentals of the economy.<sup>3</sup>

Another way to rationalize (2) is in terms of a decision problem with spillover effects where the objective is to choose an action today that balances two objectives. The first is to choose an action that matches the realization of current fundamentals  $\theta_t$ . The second is to match the average action  $a_{t+1}$  next period. For instance, the agents may be firms deciding on investment levels where  $a_{it}$  is  $i$ 's investment at date  $t$  and where the reward to the agent's investment depends on the fundamentals at the time of the decision, as well as the overall investment level at this following date, due to positive spillover effects. Since  $\beta$  is strictly between zero and one, we can iterate (2) forward to obtain

$$(3) \quad a_t = \gamma \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j \bar{E}_t \bar{E}_{t+1} \dots \bar{E}_{t+j}(\theta_{t+j}).$$

If there were no differential information, the iterated expectations would collapse to the sin-

gle expectation at date  $t$ . Thus, in the absence of differential information we would have

$$(4) \quad a_t = \gamma \bar{E}_t \left( \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j \theta_{t+j} \right).$$

With differential information, however, (3) will not, in general, be the same as (4).<sup>4</sup> The impact of differential information arises as the result of the divergence of (3) from (4). We examine an example where the divergence is quite stark.

### II. Uncertainty and Information

Time is indexed by the integers  $\{\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ . The fundamentals  $\{\theta_t\}$  are fixed at a known value  $y$  until date 0. At date 1, there is an innovation to the fundamentals that comes from the realization of a zero-mean, random variable  $\eta$ . Thereafter, the fundamentals are fixed at its new value forever. Thus, the fundamentals evolve in the following simple fashion:

$$(5) \quad \theta_t = \begin{cases} y & \text{for } t \leq 0 \\ y + \eta & \text{for } t \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Most of the agents observe the realization of  $\eta$  immediately, but not all of them do so. Over time, even those agents who did not immediately observe the realization of  $\eta$  gradually learn of its realized value. At date  $t \geq 1$ , proportion  $\mu_t$  of the agents know the true value of  $\theta_t$ , where  $\mu_t$  is strictly increasing in  $t$  and  $\mu_t \rightarrow 1$  as  $t$  becomes large. Thus, eventually everyone learns the true value of fundamentals. We envisage  $\mu_1$  being close to 1, so that the informational friction is small relative to the benchmark case of perfectly informed agents.

At date  $t > 1$ , the informed agents know the future values of  $\theta$  perfectly. Hence, if agent  $i$  is informed,  $E_{it}(\theta_{t+h}) = \theta_{t+h}$  for all  $h > 0$ , so that

$$(6) \quad E_{it} \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \theta_{t+h} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \theta_{t+h} \end{bmatrix}.$$

<sup>3</sup> See Julio Rotemberg (1982), Jordi Galí and Mark Gertler (1999), or Mankiw and Reis (2002). Staggered price setting in the manner of John Taylor (1980) gives analogous expressions (see Jeffrey Fuhrer and George Moore, 1995).

<sup>4</sup> See Morris and Shin (2002) for a simple illustration in the static case.

If agent  $i$  is one of the uninformed agents, then  $E_{it}(\theta_{t+h}) = E(y + \eta) = y$ , so that

$$(7) \quad E_{it} \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \theta_{t+h} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \theta_{t+h} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since proportion  $\mu_t$  are informed at date  $t$ , the average expectation is

$$(8) \quad \bar{E}_t \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \theta_{t+h} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 - \mu_t & \mu_t \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \theta_{t+h} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{E}_{t-1} \bar{E}_t \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \theta_{t+h} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \bar{E}_{t-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 - \mu_t & \mu_t \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \theta_{t+h} \end{bmatrix} \\ (9) \quad &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 - \mu_t & \mu_t \end{bmatrix} \bar{E}_{t-1} \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \theta_{t+h} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 - \mu_t & \mu_t \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 - \mu_{t-1} & \mu_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \theta_{t+h} \end{bmatrix} \\ (10) \quad &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 - \mu_{t-1} \mu_t & \mu_{t-1} \mu_t \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \theta_{t+h} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

where (9) follows from the linearity of average expectations. Iterating (10), we have

$$(11) \quad \bar{E}_1 \bar{E}_2 \cdots \bar{E}_t \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \theta_{t+h} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 - \prod_{s=1}^t \mu_s & \prod_{s=1}^t \mu_s \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \theta_{t+h} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The higher-order iterated expectation  $\bar{E}_1 \bar{E}_2 \cdots \bar{E}_t(\theta_{t+h})$  in the limiting case as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  depends on the limiting property of  $\prod_{s=1}^t \mu_s$ . For illustrative purposes, let

$$(12) \quad \mu_s = \alpha^{-(1/s)}$$

where  $\alpha > 1$ , but where  $\alpha$  is close to 1. The fact that  $\alpha$  is close to 1 implies that almost all agents are informed from the outset. Even those agents that start out being uninformed learn over time. However,

$$(13) \quad \ln \prod_{s=1}^t \mu_s = -\ln \alpha \cdot \sum_{s=1}^t \frac{1}{s}$$

and the sum  $\sum_{s=1}^t (1/s)$  increases without bound as  $t$  becomes large.<sup>5</sup> Hence,  $\prod_{s=1}^t \mu_s \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . In other words, when  $\{\mu_s\}$  is given by (12), we have

$$(14) \quad \bar{E}_1 \bar{E}_2 \cdots \bar{E}_t(\theta_{t+h}) \rightarrow y \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

In the process of forming progressively higher-order expectations, all the information in the population is lost. The limit is the expectation of the least informed individual. Note the contrast between the case where  $\mu_s = 1$  and where  $\mu_s < 1$ . If  $\mu_s = 1$ , then  $\bar{E}_1 \bar{E}_2 \cdots \bar{E}_t(\theta_{t+h}) = \bar{E}_1(\theta_{t+h}) = \theta_{t+h}$ , so that expectations adjust immediately. But when  $\mu_s < 1$ , the situation can be very different. As seen in (14), very-high-order expectations do not adjust by much. In this sense, there is a discontinuity as we move from the case where everyone is fully informed to one where *virtually* everyone is fully informed.

### III. Inertia

We now examine the implications of our observations for the behavior of average actions  $\{a_t\}$ . It is helpful to set  $\gamma = 1 - \beta$  for this purpose and denote  $\mu(t, t+j) \equiv \prod_{s=t}^{t+j} \mu_s$ . Let us also set  $y = 0$ . Then at  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} a_t &= (1 - \beta) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j \bar{E}_t \bar{E}_{t+1} \cdots \bar{E}_{t+j}(\theta_{t+j}) \\ &= (1 - \beta) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j \mu(t, t+j) \cdot \eta. \end{aligned}$$

In the special case where all agents are fully

<sup>5</sup> Note, for instance, that  $\sum_{s=1}^t (1/s) = \int_1^t f(x) dx$  where  $f(\cdot)$  is the step function that takes value  $1/n$  in the interval  $[n, n+1)$ , so that  $\sum_{s=1}^t (1/s)$  is bounded below by  $\ln t$ .

informed, we have  $\mu_s = 1$  for all  $s$ , so that (15) is just

$$(16) \quad a_t = (1 - \beta) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j \eta = \eta$$

for all  $t \geq 1$ . Actions adjust immediately and there is no inertia. Contrast this with the case where  $\mu_s$  is given by (12). Then, the coefficient on  $\eta$  in (15) is the weighted average of  $\{\mu(t, t+j)\}$  where the weights sum to 1. The weights are determined by the discount factor  $\beta$ . Note that  $\mu(t, t+j) \rightarrow 0$  as  $j$  becomes large. As the discount factor  $\beta$  gets closer to 1, the weight placed on smaller values of  $\mu$  increases. In the limit,

$$(17) \quad a_t \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \beta \rightarrow 1,$$

so that there is total inertia. For values of  $\beta$  close to 1, the inertia will be very large in the sense that  $a_t$  is close to its former value  $y$ .

In the New Keynesian Phillips curve interpretation of our decision rule, the discount factor  $\beta$  is the firm's discount factor in calculating the present value of its stream of profit. If dates are interpreted as quarters and firms discount at around 1 percent per quarter, then  $\beta$  is approximately 0.99. Thus, values of  $\beta$  close to 1 would seem plausible and the limiting case (17) may be of more than just theoretical interest.

#### IV. Markov Chain Interpretation

Although the example we have chosen in this illustration is deliberately stark, the arguments are more general. The calculation of higher-order expectations can be given a Markov chain interpretation, as we see from equation (10). The matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 - \mu_{t-1}\mu_t & \mu_{t-1}\mu_t \end{bmatrix}$$

is the two step transition matrix over the set  $\{y, \theta_{t+h}\}$ , which is the product of the one-step transition matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 - \mu_t & \mu_t \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 - \mu_{t-1} & \mu_{t-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The Markov chain is "nonhomogeneous" in the sense that the transition probabilities change over time. The weights associated with higher-order expectations arise from the multistage transition probabilities. Note that  $y$  is an absorbing state, since, if the system starts at  $y$ , it will remain there. If all agents are fully informed, then  $\mu_t = 1$ , so that  $\theta$  would also be an absorbing state. The Markov transition would then be the trivial one associated with the identity matrix.

If  $\mu_t < 1$  for all  $t$ , however, then it is possible (as in our example) that  $\theta$  is a *transient state* in the Markov chain. Over long horizons, the probability that it will return to  $\theta$  becomes smaller. In the limit as the horizon becomes infinite, the probability that it will be in  $\theta$  goes to zero.

The discontinuity as we go from  $\mu_t = 1$  to  $\mu_t < 1$  arises from the fact that  $\theta$  changes from being a persistent state to a transient state. Whether it does so or not depends on the limiting property of the transition probabilities in the Markov chain. In general, any random variable that is not common knowledge has the potential to become transient in the Markov chain (see Amato and Shin, 2006, for more discussion of this point; see Franklin Allen et al., 2002, for an example of how the Markov chain argument can be used to show that asset prices place "too much weight" on publicly available information including past prices, relative to the statistically optimal weights in forecasting the fundamentals of an asset).

#### V. Concluding Remarks

Forward-looking expectations can exhibit considerable inertia when agents are differentially informed about the future path of fundamentals. Iterated average expectations of events in the far future behave like adaptive expectations that put weight on outcomes in the distant past.

We have examined an example where agents' information sets are totally ordered (some are better informed than others). The argument extends to more realistic settings, however, where agents' information sets are only partially ordered, and where they each have their own "window" on the world. Each window gives a

partial view of the world, of a particular sector of the economy, or of a particular geographical region. Each agent has a view of his or her small “sliver” of the economy that, when pieced together mosaic fashion, reveals the full picture. In Friedrich Hayek’s words, information in the economy exists “solely as the dispersed bits of incomplete and frequently contradictory knowledge, which all the separate individuals possess” (1945, p. 519). No agent has a privileged view of the complete picture. The Lucas-Phelps island economy metaphor captures this feature. In this respect, we take the differential information literally. It’s just a feature of the world that agents have their own window on the world.

In spite of the different starting points, our approach has implications for the sticky information and rational inattention approaches. One of the debates surrounding macroeconomic persistence is on the incidence of “backward-looking” behavior that is necessary to explain the observed degree of persistence (see Galí and Gertler, 1999). Galí and Gertler report a high figure, around 35 percent or so. A key message of our analysis is that a very small incidence of uninformed agents can generate large amounts of persistence. It is this *discontinuity* that is the distinctive feature of our approach. The incidence of sticky information or rational inattention that is necessary to account for the observed degree of persistence may be quite small when embedded in a world of differential information.

#### REFERENCES

- Adam, Klaus.** “Optimal Monetary Policy under Discretion with Imperfect Common Knowledge.” *Journal of Monetary Economics* (forthcoming).
- Allen, Franklin; Morris, Stephen and Shin, Hyun Song.** “Beauty Contests and Iterated Expectations in Asset Markets.” *Review of Financial Studies* (forthcoming).
- Amato, Jeffery and Shin, Hyun Song.** “Imperfect Common Knowledge and the Information Value of Prices.” *Economic Theory*, 2006, 27(1), pp. 213–41.
- Carroll, Christopher D.** “Macroeconomic Expectations of Households and Professional Forecasters.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2003, 118(1), pp. 269–98.
- Fuhrer, Jeff and Moore, George.** “Inflation Persistence.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1995, 110(1), pp. 127–59.
- Galí, Jordi and Gertler, Mark.** “Inflation Dynamics: A Structural Econometric Analysis.” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 1999, 44(2), pp. 195–222.
- Hayek, Friedrich A.** “The Use of Knowledge in Society.” *American Economic Review*, 1945, 35(4), pp. 519–30.
- Hellwig, Christian.** “Public Announcements, Adjustment Delays and the Business Cycle.” University of California, Los Angeles, Department of Economics, Economics Online Papers: No. 208, 2002.
- Lorenzoni, Guido.** “Imperfect Information, Consumers’ Expectations and Business Cycles.” Unpublished Paper, 2003.
- Lucas, Robert E.** “Some International Evidence on Output-Inflation Tradeoffs.” *American Economic Review*, 1973, 63(3), pp. 326–34.
- Mankiw, N. Gregory and Reis, Ricardo.** “Sticky Information versus Sticky Prices: A Proposal to Replace the New Keynesian Phillips Curve.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2002, 117(4), pp. 1295–328.
- Morris, Stephen and Shin, Hyun Song.** “The Social Value of Public Information.” *American Economic Review*, 2002, 92(5), pp. 1521–34.
- Nimark, Kristoffer P.** “Calvo Pricing and Imperfect Common Knowledge: A Forward Looking Model of Rational Inflation Inertia.” European Central Bank, Working Paper Series: No. 474, 2005.
- Phelps, Edmund S.** “Introduction,” in Edmund S. Phelps, et al., eds., *Microeconomic foundations of employment and information theory*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1970, pp. 1–23.
- Phelps, Edmund S.** “The Trouble with ‘Rational Expectations’ and the Problem of Inflation Stabilization,” in Roman Frydman and Edmund S. Phelps, eds., *Individual forecasting and aggregate outcomes*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983, chap. 2.
- Rotemberg, Julio J.** “Monopolistic Price Adjustment and Aggregate Output.” *Review of Economic Studies*, 1982, 49(4), pp. 517–31.
- Sargent, Thomas J.** “Equilibrium with Signal Extraction from Endogenous Variables.”

- Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 1991, 15(2), pp. 245–73.
- Sims, Christopher A.** “Implications of Rational Inattention.” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2003, 50(3), pp. 665–90.
- Taylor, John B.** “Staggered Price Setting in a Macro Model.” *American Economic Review*, 1980, 69(2), pp. 108–13.
- Townsend, Robert.** “Forecasting the Forecasts of Others.” *Journal of Political Economy*, 1983, 91(4), pp. 546–88.
- Ui, Takashi.** “A Note of the Lucas Model: Iterated Expectations and the Neutrality of Money.” Unpublished Paper, 2003.
- Woodford, Michael.** “Imperfect Common Knowledge and the Effects of Monetary Policy,” in Philippe Aghion, Roman Frydman, Joseph Stiglitz, and Michael Woodford, eds., *Knowledge, information, and expectations in modern macroeconomics: In honor of Edmund S. Phelps*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003, chap. 1.