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A jobless recovery is a situation in which:

- Output growth recovers,

- but employment does not.

Bernanke (2009).
A liquidity trap is a situation in which:

- The nominal interest rate is zero; and

- Expected inflation is below target.
Two historical examples of great contractions with a liquidity trap and a jobless recovery:

- Great Contraction of 2008 in the United States.
- Double Dip Recession of Japan in the 1990s.
U.S. Real Per Capita GDP Growth: 2005-2012

Source: Bureau of Economic Activity.
The U.S. recovery from the Great Contraction of 2008 was jobless.
U.S. Federal Funds Rate: 2005-2012

Source: Federal Reserve Board.
U.S. 10-Year Expected Inflation: 2005Q1-2012Q4

Source: Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.
The Great Contraction of 2008 pushed the U.S. economy into a liquidity trap.
Japan

The Double-Dip Recession
1989 - 2001
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The recovery from the recessions of the 1990s in Japan was **jobless**.
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⇒ In the 1990s Japan fell into a **liquidity trap**.
This paper develops a theoretical model that predicts that a confidence shock can lead the economy into a liquidity trap with a jobless recovery.
Four Key Elements of the Argument:

1. Downward Nominal Wage Rigidity.

2. Monetary Policy follows a Taylor Rule.

3. The Zero Lower Bound On Nominal Interest Rates.

4. A Downward Revision in Inflation Expectations.
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Element 1: Downward Nominal Wage Rigidity.

\[ W_t \geq \gamma(u_t) W_{t-1}, \]

where

- \( W_t \) nominal wage rate
- \( u_t \), unemployment rate

**Assumption:** \( \gamma'(u) < 0 \)
Empirical Evidence on
Downward Nominal Wage Rigidity
## Probability of Decline, Increase, or No Change in Nominal Wages Between Interviews

U.S. data, SIPP panel 1986-1993, within-job changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interviews One Year apart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gottschalk (2005)

Note. Male and female hourly workers not in school, 18 to 55 at some point during the panel. All nominal-wage changes are within-job wage changes, defined as changes while working for the same employer.
Distribution of Non-Zero Wage Changes, Hourly Workers, 1996-99

Distribution of Nominal Wage Changes, 2011, USA

Source: Daly et al. (2012). Workers in the same industry and occupation.
Distribution of Nominal Wage Changes, 2011, USA

Source: Elsby et al. (2013). Hourly workers in the same employer.
Elements 2 and 3

- Monetary Policy Follows a Taylor Rule.

- The Zero Lower Bound on Nominal Interest Rates.

\[ R_t = \max \left\{ 1, R^* + \alpha_\pi (\pi_t - \pi^*) + \alpha_y \ln \left( \frac{Y_t}{Y_t^*} \right) \right\} \]

\[ \alpha_\pi > 1, \quad \alpha_y > 0 \]
Households

Preferences:

\[ E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e^{\xi_t \beta^t} U(C_t) \]

Budget constraint:

\[ P_t C_t + B_t + T_t = W_t h_t + R_{t-1} B_{t-1} + \Phi_t \]

Inelastic Labor Supply:

\[ h_t \leq \bar{h} \]
Firms

Production function:

\[ Y_t = X_tF(h_t); \text{ with } X_t/X_{t-1} = \mu > 1 \]

Labor demand:

\[ P_t X_tF'(h_t) = W_t \]
The Labor Market

\[ h_t \leq \bar{h} \]

\[ W_t \geq \gamma(u_t)W_{t-1} \]

\[ (\bar{h} - h_t) (W_t - \gamma(u_t)W_{t-1}) = 0 \]
Equilibrium: Let $w_t \equiv \frac{W_t}{P_tX_t}$ and $c_t \equiv C_t/X_t$

\[
e^{\xi_t}U'(c_t) = \tilde{\beta} R_t E_t \left( \frac{e^{\xi_{t+1}}U'(c_{t+1})}{\pi_{t+1}} \right)
\]

\[
R_t = \max \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi^*}{\tilde{\beta}} + \alpha \pi (\pi_t - \pi^*) + \alpha y \ln \left( \frac{F(h_t)}{F(\bar{h})} \right) \right\}
\]

\[
c_t = F(h_t)
\]

\[
w_t = F'(h_t)
\]

\[
h_t \leq \bar{h} \quad \text{and} \quad w_t \geq \frac{\gamma(u_t)}{\pi_t \mu} w_{t-1}; \quad \text{where} \ u_t \equiv \frac{\bar{h} - h_t}{\bar{h}}
\]

\[
(\bar{h} - h_t) \left( w_t - \frac{\gamma(u_t)}{\pi_t \mu} w_{t-1} \right) = 0
\]
A Key Inflation Threshold

$$\bar{\pi} \equiv \frac{\gamma(0)}{\mu}$$

$$\pi_t < \bar{\pi} \Rightarrow \text{involuntary unemployment.}$$
Steady State Equilibria:

\[ c_t = c, \ h_t = h, \ w_t = w, \ \pi_t = \pi, \ R_t = R \]

\[ R = \frac{\pi}{\beta} \]

\[ R = \max \left\{ 1, \ R^* + \alpha_\pi (\pi - \pi^*) + \alpha_y \ln \left( \frac{F(h)}{F(\bar{h})} \right) \right\} \]
Two Steady States

\[ \beta \]

\[ \pi^* \]

\[ \tilde{\beta} R_t(\pi_t) \]

\[ 45^\circ\text{-line} \]
Multiple Steady States

Proposition 1 (Existence of a Full-Employment Steady State)
There exists a unique full-employment steady state \( u = 0 \). Moreover, at the full-employment steady state the inflation rate equals the inflation target \( \pi^* \).

Proposition 2 (Existence of an Unemployment Steady State)
There exists a unique unemployment steady state \( u = \bar{u} > 0 \). Moreover, at the unemployment steady state the economy is in a liquidity trap \( (R = 1 \text{ and } \pi = \bar{\beta} < \pi^*) \).
Element 4: A Downward Revision in Inflation Expectations (or confidence shock)

\[ \pi_0 < \pi^* \]
Proposition 3 (Liquidity Trap) Suppose that $\xi_t = 0$ and deterministic for $t \geq 0$. Further, assume that $\pi_0 < \pi^*$. Then, in any perfect foresight equilibrium,

$$
\pi_{t+1} = \begin{cases} 
\pi_t < \pi^* & \text{if } \pi_t \geq \frac{\gamma(0)}{\mu} \\
\frac{\gamma(0)}{\mu} < \pi^* & \text{if } \pi_t < \frac{\gamma(0)}{\mu}
\end{cases}, \text{ for all } t \geq 0.
$$

Furthermore, there exists a finite integer $T \geq 0$ such that $\pi_T < \frac{\gamma(0)}{\mu}$.

Proposition 4 (Chronic Involuntary Unemployment) Suppose that $\xi_t = 0$ and deterministic for $t \geq 0$. Further, assume that $\pi_0 < \pi^*$. Then, in any perfect foresight equilibrium $u_t > 0$ for all $t \geq T$, where $T \geq 0$ is the finite integer defined in proposition 3.
Calibrated Example:

\[ F(h) = h^\alpha; \text{ with } \alpha = 0.75 \]

\[ u(c) = c^{1-\sigma}/(1 - \sigma); \text{ with } \sigma = 2 \]

\[ X_t = 1.015^{1/4}X_{t-1}; \]

\[ \tilde{\beta} = 1.04^{-1/4}; \text{ real rate of 4 percent} \]

\[ \pi^* = 1.02^{1/4}; \text{ inflation target of 2 percent} \]

\[ \alpha_{\pi} = 1.5 \]

\[ \alpha_y = 0.125 \]

\[ \gamma(u_t) = \gamma_1 \cdot (1 - u_t)^{\gamma_2}; \quad \gamma_1 = 1.02^{1/4}; \quad \gamma_2 = 0.19. \]
Calibration of the Degree of Downward Wage Rigidity, 
\[ \gamma(u) = \gamma_1 (1 - u)^{\gamma_2} \]

- Set \( \gamma_1 = 1.02^{1/4} \) \( \Rightarrow \) At the full-employment steady state, nominal wages must grow at a rate of 2% per year or higher. Weak restriction: due to productivity growth, lower bound on nominal wages does not bind in the intended steady state.

- Set \( \gamma_2 \) so that if unemployment is 5 percent above the natural rate, then wages can fall frictionlessly by up to 2 percent per year.

This is a conservative criterion: Between 2008 and 2010, US unemployment increased from 5 to 10 percent, but nominal hourly wages did not fall. They actually grew by 3 percent per year.
Dynamics Under Lack of Confidence Shock
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A Lack of Confidence Shocks Leads to

• A Great Contraction

• A Liquidity Trap

• A Jobless Recovery
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Alternative Hypothesis:

What if **inflationary expectations are well anchored** (i.e., loss of confidence shocks are ruled out by assumption)?

Specifically, consider the response to a decline in the natural rate of interest (following Eggertson and Woodford, 2003)

\[
\text{Natural Rate of Interest} = \beta^{-1} e^{\xi_t - \xi_{t+1}}
\]

**Exercise:** Assume that the natural rate falls from its steady-state value of 4 percent per year to -2 percent per year for 10 quarters and then returns to 4 percent forever.
A Contraction With A Job-Creating Recovery: Response to a Persistent Decline In The Natural Rate
• A negative natural rate shock leads to unemployment and a liquidity trap

• However, the recovery features job creation.

⇒ If inflationary expectations are well anchored, a persistent drop in the natural rate of interest cannot explain the observed jobless recovery.
Exiting The Slump with Truly Unconventional Monetary Policy

Interest rate policy:

\[ R_t = \begin{cases} 
\max \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi^*}{\beta} + \alpha_{\pi} (\pi_t - \pi^*) + \alpha_{y} \ln \left( \frac{F(h_t)}{F(h)} \right) \right\} & \text{if } s_t = 0 \\
R^* & \text{if } s_t = 1 
\end{cases} \]

\[ s_t = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } R_j = 1 \text{ for any } 0 \leq j < t \\
0 & \text{otherwise} 
\end{cases} \]
Exiting the Slump with Truly Unconventional Policy

- Interest Rate
- Inflation
- Output Growth Rate
- Employment Rate
Response of Real Wages, $W_t/(P_tX_t)$, and Inflation to a Nonfundamental Shock Under the Exit Strategy

Solid Line: Taylor Rule  
Dashed Line: Exit Strategy
Conclusions

- Great contraction of 2008 is characterized by a jobless recovery and a liquidity trap.

- When inflationary expectations are well anchored, standard model cannot explain jobless recoveries and a prolonged liquidity trap.

- U.S. could be suffering from a negative shock to inflation expectations.

- If so, conventional monetary policy, such as promising extended periods of low rates, is powerless.

- Instead, truly unconventional monetary policy, i.e., raising nominal rates, is needed to jolt the economy out of the slump.
Extras
Bernanke’s Definition of a Jobless Recovery:

“Given this weakness in the labor market, a natural question is whether we might be in for a so-called jobless recovery, in which output is growing but employment fails to increase.”

Avg real GDP per capita grew by 1.1 percent between 2012Q4 and 2009Q2. (avg since 1990: 1.2%)
U.S. Unemployment Rate: 2005-2012

Table 1: Demographic Factors and the Recent Evolution of the LFPR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Population Share</th>
<th>Labor Force Participation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007 Actual</td>
<td>2007 Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007 Projection</td>
<td>2007 Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 24 yrs</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 54 yrs</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64 yrs</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The columns labelled "Projection" refer to the BLS labor force projections published in November 2007.

Source: Erceg and Levin (2013)
“It was a relief just to find something,” said Amie Crawford, 56, of Chicago. After four months looking for a new job as an interior designer, which she had been for 30 years before the recession, she accepted a position as a part-time cashier at a quick-service health-food cafe called Protein Bar.

She keeps asking for more hours, but her manager's response is always the same.

“He tells me, 'I try to give you as many hours as I can, but everybody wants as many hours as they can,'” Ms. Crawford said.
Involuntary Part−Time Workers: 2002:Jan to 2013:March, LNS12032197

Data Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.
Real Wage Growth Held up Relatively Well During the 2008 Recession

**Figure 1**

Inflation and wage growth through business cycles

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics and authors’ calculations.

Source: Daly et al. April 2012.
Real Wage Growth relative to TFP Growth between 2008 and 2011 in the United States

Fernald, FRBSF Productivity Data Base: Average Annual TFP Growth from 2008 to 2011 was 0.65 percent

Daly et al. report that real wages grew by 1.1 percent per year on average between 2008 and 2011.

Hence real wage growth exceeded TFP growth by 0.45 percent per year, for a total of 1.35 percent over the period 2008-2011.
**Assumption 1** The function $\gamma(u_t)$ satisfies

$$\gamma'(u_t) < 0,$$

and

$$\gamma(0) > \tilde{\beta}\mu,$$

where $\tilde{\beta} \equiv \beta\mu^{-\sigma}$.

**Assumption 2** The parameters $R^*$, $\pi^*$, and $\alpha_{\pi}$ satisfy:

$$R^* \equiv \frac{\pi^*}{\tilde{\beta}} > 1,$$

$$\alpha_{\pi}\tilde{\beta} > 1,$$

$$\pi^* > \frac{\gamma(0)}{\mu}.$$
Dynamics Effects of a Fundamental Shock Under the Exit Strategy

Solid Line: Taylor Rule  Dashed Line: Exit Strategy
Actual and Expected CPI Inflation, Japan, 1989-2001