A New Keynesian Model with Endogenous Technological Change

Shunsuke Shinagawa[a,*], Inoue Tomohiro[a]

[a] *Faculty of Political Science and Economics, Waseda University, 1-6-1 Nishiwaseda, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo, 169-8050, Japan*

Abstract

In this study, we introduce endogenous technological change based on R&D into the new Keynesian model in which nominal wages are presumed to be sticky. This study examines how money growth affects long-run economic growth. We find that there exists a unique balanced growth path for sufficiently high rates of money growth and the economy exhibits sustained growth based on sustained R&D. Faster money growth results in larger employment and faster economic growth along such a balanced growth path. Furthermore, under some parameter restrictions, no balanced growth path exists for small rates of money growth, and the economy is trapped in the steady state without long-run growth. These results suggest that money growth may be an important factor for long-run economic growth.

JEL classification: O11, O42, E12, E31

Keywords: endogenous growth, R&D-based growth model, new Keynesian Phillips curve, nominal wage rigidities, money growth

1. Introduction

Macroeconomists discuss *the long-run theory* and *the short-run theory* separately. The central underpinning of the former is the optimal growth theory[1] or the endogenous growth theory, which analyzes the supply side of the economy. The foundation of the latter is new Keynesian theory, in which prices or nominal wages are supposedly sticky and the price adjustment process is analyzed.[2]

Such a divided framework is justified by the natural rate hypothesis.[3] The conventional wisdom among macroeconomists is that the natural rate hypothesis is valid. However, if price stickiness remains during the steady state of the short-run model, money

*Corresponding author. Tel.: +81-3-3202-8353; fax: +81-3-3204-8957.

Email addresses: `shinagawa@aoni.waseda.jp` (Shunsuke Shinagawa), `inouetomo@gmail.com` (Inoue Tomohiro)

[1] See Ramsey (1928), Cass (1965), and Koopmans (1965).

[2] For details on the new Keynesian theory, see Woodford (2003) and Gali (2008). For the endogenous growth theory, see Barro and Sala-i Martin (2004).

[3] For the natural rate hypothesis, see Friedman (1968) and Lucas (1972).

is not superneutral in the long run and the natural rate hypothesis loses its validity.[4] In this situation, price stickiness must be considered in the long-run model.

In view of that situation, this paper proposes a new theoretical model in which the long-run theory and the short-run theory are integrated by introducing technological change into a new Keynesian model. Note that we derive the new Keynesian Phillips curve (NKPC), under which the natural rate hypothesis does not hold, by assuming a Rotemberg-type adjustment cost in the labor market.[5]

Tsuzuki and Inoue (2010) and Inoue and Tsuzuki (2011) have proposed the Dynamic General Equilibrium (DGE) model with the NKPC and technological change. In their model, the natural rate hypothesis did not hold, and the output gap existed when the money growth rates was lower than the rate of technological change. However, their analyses assumed exogenous technological change, as did the Solow model.[6]

This study provides the new Keynesian DGE model based on Inoue and Tsuzuki (2011) with endogenous technological progress rather than exogenous growth, by introducing the explicit R&D activities. That is, in this study, the new Keynesian theory that represents the short-run theory, is integrated with the endogenous growth theory that represents the long-run theory. Using such a model, we examine how money growth affects long-run output, employment, and economic growth along the balanced growth path.

We focus on the steady-state economic growth rate and the employment rate. For sufficiently high money growth rates, there is a unique balanced growth path, and the economy exhibits sustained growth based on sustained R&D. The faster money growth larger employment and faster economic growth along the balanced growth path. Further, under some parameter restrictions, there is no balanced growth path for small money growth rates, and the economy is trapped in the steady state without long-run growth. These results suggest that money growth may be an important factor for long-run economic growth. That is, financial authorities are required to maintain high money growth rates to achieve sustained and faster economic growth.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The next section sets up the model used in our theoretical investigation. Section 3 derives the law of motion and the steady state, which characterize the equilibrium path of the economy. It also investigates the existence and the uniqueness of the steady state. Section 4 examines the local determinacy of the steady state. Section 5 concludes.

2. Model

We consider the continuous time version of the dynamic model based on Inoue and Tsuzuki (2011) and Grossman and Helpman (1991, Chap.3). Let us assume an economy

[4] Akerlof et al. (1996) have proposed a long-run Phillips curve on which long-run superneutrality holds for the inflation rates that exceed 3%, whereas money is not superneutral for lesser inflation rates. This study discusses the latter situation.

[5] That is, our NKPC is downward sloping in the long run as the traditional Keynesian's Phillips curve. On the contrary, the other type NKPC based on the spirit of Friedman's expectations-augmented Phillips curve is conceivable. Such NKPC is vertical at the natural rate of unemployment in the long run, i.e., the natural rate hypothesis holds. Also see footnote 12 below.

[6] See Solow (1956). Tsuzuki and Inoue (2011) have proposed a new Keynesian model in which sustained growth becomes endogenous through human capital accumulations.

populated by many infinitely-lived households under monopolistic competition in the labor market and nominal wage rigidity. There is a single final good, which is produced using intermediate goods and supplied competitively. A new variety of intermediate goods is invented by allocating labor for R&D activities, and inventors enjoy infinitely-lived monopoly power.[7] The available intermediate goods are produced by multiple intermediate firms using labor. Finally, financial authorities adopt the k-percent rule and expand money supply at a constant rate.[8]

2.1. Employment agency

The manufacturing and R&D sectors regard each household's labor as an imperfect substitute for any other household's labor. To simplify the analysis, we assume that an employment agency combines differentiated labor forces into a composite labor force according to the Dixit-Stiglitz function[9]

$$\ell = \left[\int_0^1 \ell_j^\beta dj \right]^{\frac{1}{\beta}}, \quad \beta \in (0,1),$$

and supplies composite labor to the intermediate goods and the R&D sectors. ℓ_j denotes differentiated labor supplied by household j, and ℓ is the composite labor force. The number of households is normalized to 1. $\eta = 1/(1-\beta)(>1)$ is the elasticity of substitution between each pair of differentiated labor inputs.

Cost minimization of the employment agency yields the following demand functions for differentiated labor $j \in [0,1]$:

$$\ell_j = \left(\frac{W_j}{W} \right)^{-\frac{1}{1-\beta}} \ell,$$

where W_j denotes the nominal wage rate of labor force j, and W denotes the nominal wage rate of the composite labor force, which is given by

$$W = \left[\int_0^1 W_j^{-\frac{\beta}{1-\beta}} dj \right]^{-\frac{1-\beta}{\beta}}.$$

2.2. Final goods sector

We assume that perfect competition prevails in the final goods market. The final goods firm produces the quantity y according to the Dixit-Stiglitz function as follows:

$$y = \left[\int_0^N x_i^\alpha d_i \right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \quad \alpha \in (0,1),$$

where x_i is the quantity of intermediate goods indexed by $i \in [0,N]$, and $\phi = 1/(1-\alpha)$ (>1) represents the elasticity of substitution between every pair of intermediate goods.

[7] The analyses of patent duration using a variety-expanding framework was presented by Kwan and Lai (2003), Futagami and Iwaisako (2003, 2007) and Furukawa (2007b).

[8] See Friedman (1969).

[9] See Dixit and Stiglitz (1977) and Blanchard and Kiyotaki (1987).

N is the number of available intermediate goods, and represents the technology level of the economy. The final goods firm faces diminishing returns with each intermediate good; therefore, larger values N imply higher productivity.

Cost minimization by the final-goods producing firm yields the following demand functions for intermediate goods $i \in [0, N_t]$:

$$x_i = \left(\frac{p_i}{p}\right)^{-\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} y, \tag{1}$$

where p_i is the price of intermediate goods i, and p is the price of the final good or the price level, which is given by

$$p = \left[\int_0^N p_i^{-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} di\right]^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}.$$

2.3. Intermediate goods sector

Each intermediate good is produced using one unit of composite labor; thus, marginal cost is equal to the nominal wage level, W. Because patents have an infinite-life, all intermediate goods are supplied monopolistically. Maximization of the monopoly profit $\Pi_i = (p_i - W)x_i$ subject to the demand function (1) yields

$$p_i = p_x \equiv \frac{1}{\alpha}W, \quad x_i = x \equiv \frac{\ell_x}{N}, \quad \forall i \in [0, N]. \tag{2}$$

where ℓ_x represents the amount of composite labor allocated to the production of the intermediate goods. All intermediate goods enter symmetrically into production of the final good. Moreover, the maximized monopoly profit is

$$\Pi_i = \Pi = \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}Wx_i = \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}W\frac{\ell_x}{N}, \quad \forall i \in [0, N]. \tag{3}$$

From (2), the market equilibrium levels of output y and the price of the final good p are obtained as

$$y = N^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}x = N^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}\ell_x, \tag{4}$$

$$p = N^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}p_x = N^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}\frac{1}{\alpha}W. \tag{5}$$

We can rewrite (5) as

$$w \equiv \frac{W}{p} = \alpha N^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}. \tag{6}$$

2.4. R&D sector

The number of intermediate goods, N, expands according to the following equation:[10]

$$\frac{\dot{N}}{N} = \mu\ell_n, \quad N(0) > 0, \tag{7}$$

[10]Here, we retain the linear relation between increase in knowledge and stock of knowledge based on the first-generation R&D-based endogenous growth model (Romer, 1990). However, Jones (1995a,b) argued that assuming this linearity is problematic. Surveys of this issue are presented by Jones (1999, 2005) and Li (2000, 2002).

where $\mu(>0)$ is the parameter that reflects the productivity of R&D. ℓ_n represents the amount of composite labor allocated to R&D, and clearing the labor market requires $\ell = \ell_x + \ell_n$.

In equilibrium, the following free-entry condition must be satisfied:

$$V \leq \frac{W}{\mu N}, \quad \text{with an equality whenever } \dot{N} > 0. \tag{8}$$

The right-hand side is the nominal unit cost of R&D. V represents the value of the patent, which is given by the discounted stream of the monopoly profit:

$$V(t) = \int_t^\infty \Pi(\tau) e^{-\int_t^\tau R(\iota)d\iota} d\tau, \tag{9}$$

where R is the nominal interest rate. Differentiating (9) with respect to time, t, yields the following no-arbitrage condition:

$$R = \frac{\Pi + \dot{V}}{V} \tag{10}$$

2.5. Households

Household j possesses nominal money balances, M_j, and share of the monopoly firms, S_j. The share S_j yields returns at rate R. Thus, the budget constraint of household j is given by

$$\dot{A}_j = \dot{M}_j + \dot{S}_j = W_j \ell_j + RS_j - pc_j, \quad \forall j \in [0,1],$$

where A_j is the nominal assets of household j, ℓ_j is labor supplied elastically by household j, and c_j is consumption of household j. The final goods market clears when $y = c \equiv \int_0^1 c_j dj$. We can rewrite the budget constraint in real terms as

$$\dot{a}_j = \frac{W_j}{p}\ell_j + ra_j - Rm_j - c_j,$$

where $r \equiv R - \pi$ is the real interest rate, $\pi \equiv \dot{p}/p$ is the inflation rate, $m_j \equiv M_j/p$ is real money balances, and $a_j \equiv A_j/p$ is the stock of assets in real terms.

Household j obtains utility from consumption, c_j, and real money balances, m_j, and it encounters disutility from the labor supply, ℓ_j, and wage negotiations. Thus, the instantaneous utility function of household j is as follows:[11]

$$u(c_j, m_j, \ell_j, \omega_j) = \ln c_j + \ln m_j - \frac{\ell_j^{1+\psi}}{1+\psi} - \frac{\gamma}{2}\omega_j^2,$$

where $\psi(>0)$ is the elasticity of the marginal disutility of labor supply. $\gamma(\geq 0)$ denotes the scale of the nominal wage adjustment cost from wage negotiations and $\omega_j \equiv \dot{W}_j/W_j$.[12] If $\gamma = 0$, the nominal wage is flexible; however, if $\gamma > 0$, the nominal wage is sticky.

[11] The money-in-utility-function approach was initiated by Sidrauski (1967).

[12] We specify the adjustment cost function as a quadratic expression following Rotemberg (1982). The adjustment cost can be defined as $\gamma\frac{(\omega_j - \omega^*)^2}{2}$ instead of $\gamma\frac{\omega_j^2}{2}$, where ω^* is the steady-state value of ω_j. If we choose such an expression, wage stickiness will vanish in the long run, and the natural rate hypothesis will be valid.

Summarizing the above, household j faces the following dynamical optimization problem:

$$\max_{c_j, m_j, \omega_j} \int_0^\infty \left[\ln c_j + \ln m_j - \frac{\ell_j^{1+\psi}}{1+\psi} - \frac{\gamma}{2}\omega_j^2 \right] e^{-\rho t} dt,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{subject to} \quad & \dot{a}_j = r a_j + \frac{W_j}{p}\ell_j - c_j - R m_j, \\ & \dot{W}_j = \omega_j W_j, \\ & \ell_j = \left(\frac{W_j}{W}\right)^{-\frac{1}{1-\beta}} \ell, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $\rho(>0)$ is the subjective discount rate. Since all households behave symmetrically according to the same equations, $W_j = W$, $c_j = c$, $w_j = w$, $\ell_j = \ell$, and $m_j = m$ hold. When $\gamma > 0$, the solution to the optimization problem above is characterized by the Euler equation and the wage version of the NKPC, as follows:[13]

$$\frac{\dot{c}}{c} + \rho + \pi = R = \frac{c}{m}, \tag{12}$$

$$\frac{\dot{\omega}}{\omega} = \rho + \frac{\beta}{1-\beta}\frac{\ell w}{c\gamma\omega} - \frac{1}{1-\beta}\frac{\ell^{1+\psi}}{\gamma\omega}, \tag{13}$$

where $m \equiv \int_0^1 m_j dj$ is real money balances for the entire economy. The transversality condition for the households is given by

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{a(t)}{c(t)} e^{-\rho t} = 0. \tag{14}$$

On the other hand, when $\gamma = 0$ the following equation holds instead of the NKPC (13):

$$\beta \frac{w}{c} = \ell^\psi. \tag{15}$$

2.6. Money growth

Financial authorities are assumed to expand money supply M at a constant rate θ. That is, the financial policy rule is given by $\dot{M}/M = \theta$. Therefore, the following equation holds:

$$\frac{\dot{m}}{m} = \theta - \pi.$$

3. Equilibrium Path

When the nominal wage is sticky ($\gamma > 0$), and the positive composite labor is allocated to R&D at any time ($\ell_n > 0$), the equilibrium path is characterized by the transversality

[13] Appendix A provides detailed derivations.

condition (14) and the following differential equations:[14]

$$\frac{\dot{R}}{R} = R - \theta - \rho, \tag{16}$$

$$\frac{\dot{\chi}}{\chi} = R - \rho - \omega, \tag{17}$$

$$\frac{\dot{\omega}}{\omega} = \rho + \left(\frac{\ell}{\chi} - \ell^{1+\psi}\right)\frac{\eta}{\gamma\omega}, \tag{18}$$

where $\chi \equiv \ell_x/(\alpha\beta)$ and

$$\ell = \ell(R, \chi, \omega) = \frac{\omega - R}{\mu} + \beta\chi. \tag{19}$$

When R, χ, and ω are given, we obtain the ℓ_x, ℓ_n, and π as follows:

$$\ell_x = \alpha\beta\chi, \tag{20}$$

$$\ell_n = \frac{\omega - R}{\mu} + (1-\alpha)\beta\chi, \tag{21}$$

$$\pi = \pi(R, \chi, \omega) = \omega - \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\mu\ell_n. \tag{22}$$

3.1. Steady State

If the law of motion (16) – (18) has fixed points, they are derived as follows:

$$R^* = \theta + \rho, \quad \omega^* = \theta, \quad \chi^* \equiv \chi^*(\ell^*), \quad \ell^* > \underline{\ell} \equiv \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\frac{\rho}{\mu},$$

where $\chi^*(\ell^*)$ is the increasing function of ℓ^* defined as

$$\chi^*(\ell^*) = \frac{\ell^*}{\beta} + \frac{\rho}{\beta\mu}. \tag{23}$$

When ℓ^* is given, the steady-state value of χ is derived according to (23). We obtain the steady-state value of the employment level ℓ^* as the root of the following implicit function:[15]

$$\Lambda(\ell^*) \equiv \frac{\gamma\theta\rho}{\eta} + \frac{\ell^*}{\chi^*(\ell^*)} - (\ell^*)^{1+\psi} = 0. \tag{24}$$

The steady-state values of ℓ_x and ℓ_n are

$$\ell_x^*(\ell^*) = \alpha\ell^* + \alpha\frac{\rho}{\mu}, \tag{25}$$

$$\ell_n^*(\ell^*) = (1-\alpha)\ell^* - \alpha\frac{\rho}{\mu}$$

[14]Full derivations are given in Appendix B. We can show that the similar differential equations system is derived from the *lab equipment model* based on Rivera-Batiz and Romer (1991).

[15]See Appendix C.1.

However, to guarantee that ℓ_n^* is positive, ℓ^* must be larger than $\underline{\ell}$.

If it is the case that ℓ^* ($> \underline{\ell}$), at this fixed point, y and N grow at constant rates. That is, the economy achieves balanced growth. We shall define this steady state as the *balanced growth path*. From (4) and (7), the balanced growth rate of output is derived as

$$g_y^*(\ell^*) = \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\mu\ell_n^*(\ell^*).$$

From (22), the inflation rate along the balanced growth path is given by the difference between the money growth rate and the long-run growth rate, as shown by Siegel (1983). That is,

$$\pi^* = \theta - g_y^*(\ell^*). \tag{26}$$

However, the long-run growth rate is exogenous and constant in Siegel (1983).[16]

3.1.1. Existence and uniqueness of the balanced growth path

Case of non-negative money growth. If money growth rate θ is non-negative, we can show the existence and uniqueness of the balanced growth path in the following way.

Proposition 1 *Let $\theta \geq 0$. If and only if $\theta > \theta_1$, the implicit function $\Lambda(\ell) = 0$ has a unique root such that $\ell = \ell^* > \underline{\ell}$. On the other hand, if $\theta \leq \theta_1$, $\Lambda(\ell) = 0$ has no root in $(\underline{\ell}, \infty)$. θ_1 is a constant defined as follows:*

$$\theta_1 \equiv \frac{\eta}{\gamma\rho}\left\{\left[\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\frac{\rho}{\mu}\right]^{1+\psi} - \alpha\beta\right\}.$$

Proof. See Appendix C.2.

$\theta > \theta_1$ is a necessary and sufficient condition for $\Lambda(\underline{\ell}) > 0$. When the parameters satisfy

$$\frac{\rho}{\mu} < \Gamma_1 \equiv \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}(\alpha\beta)^{\frac{1}{1+\psi}},$$

$\theta_1 < 0$ holds; thus, $\theta \geq 0 > \theta_1$ always holds. If $\rho/\mu \geq \Gamma_1$, the existence of the balanced growth path requires that money growth rate θ is sufficiently large. When θ is small and the balanced growth path does not exist, there is only the no-growth steady state mentioned below.

Case allowing negative money growth. When we allow the negative value of θ, Proposition 1 is rewritten to a weaker proposition as follows.

Proposition 2 *If $\theta > \theta_1$, $\Lambda(\ell) = 0$ has a unique root such that $\ell > \underline{\ell}$.*

[16] Siegel's equation includes the positive population growth rate, which is assumed to be zero in our model.

Proof. See Appendix C.3.

That is, $\theta > \theta_1$ is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the existence of a unique balanced growth path. To satisfy the sufficiency, the following parameter restriction is required:

Assumption 1

$$\frac{\rho}{\mu} \geq \Gamma_2 \equiv \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\left[\frac{\alpha\beta(1-\alpha)}{1+\psi}\right]^{\frac{1}{1+\psi}}.$$

$\Gamma_1 > \Gamma_2$ always holds. Assumption 1 is a necessary and sufficient condition for $\Lambda'(\underline{\ell}) \leq 0$.

Proposition 3 *Let the parameters satisfy Assumption 1. If and only if $\theta > \theta_1$, the implicit function, $\Lambda(\ell) = 0$, has a unique root, such that $\ell = \ell^* > \underline{\ell}$. In contrast, if $\theta \leq \theta_1$, $\Lambda(\ell) = 0$ has no root in $(\underline{\ell}, \infty)$.*

Proof. See Appendix C.4.

That is, under Assumption 1, $\theta > \theta_1$ is a necessary and sufficient condition for a unique balanced growth path, again. Sufficiently high money growth rates are required to achieve sustained economic growth.

On the other hand, when parameters do not satisfy Assumption 1, it is possible that multiple balanced growth paths exist for negative money growth rates.

Proposition 4 *Let $\rho/\mu < \Gamma_2$ hold. There exists the threshold of θ, $\theta_2 (< \theta_1)$, and $\Lambda(\ell) = 0$ has two roots, ℓ_1^* and ℓ_2^*, which belong to $(\underline{\ell}, \infty)$ if and only if $\theta_2 < \theta < \theta_1$ holds.*[17]

Proof. See Appendix C.5.

Letting $\ell_1^* < \ell_2^*$, we obtain $g_y^*(\ell_n^*(\ell_1^*)) < g_y^*(\ell_n^*(\ell_2^*))$. Therefore, when the money growth rate θ is negative and belongs to (θ_2, θ_1), balanced growth paths with a high growth rate and a low growth rate coexist. Since R, χ, and ω are jump variables, our model has no mechanism to choose between them. That is, global indeterminacy arises.[18] The behavior of the economy is determined by agents' expectations.

The arguments of Propositions 1 through 4 are summarized in Table 1.

3.2. Money growth, inflation, and economic growth

Let $\theta > \theta_1$ hold and a unique balanced growth path exist. Then we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 5 *Let $\theta > \theta_1$ hold. In response to a permanent increase in the money growth rate, θ, the economy experiences larger employment, and faster economic growth along the unique balanced growth path.*

[17] Since $\Gamma_1 > \Gamma_2$, θ_1 is negative as long as Assumption 1 is not satisfied.

[18] As for local indeterminacy, section 4 provides detailed analyses.

	$\theta > \theta_1$	$\theta = \theta_1$	$\theta < \theta_1$
$\theta \geq 0$	1	0 (–)	0 (–)
$\theta \in (\theta_2, 0)$	1	0 (1)	0 (2)
$\theta = \theta_2$	–	0	0 (1)
$\theta < \theta_2$	–	–	0

Table 1: The number of balanced growth paths.
The number in each cell indicates the number of balanced growth paths. The case that Assumption 1 is not fulfilled corresponds to the number in parenthesis. "–' shows that no such combinations of parameters exist.

This proposition can be proved as follows. First, applying the implicit function theorem to (24), we show

$$\frac{d\ell^*}{d\theta} = -\frac{\Lambda_\theta}{\Lambda_{\ell^*}} > 0, \tag{27}$$

where Λ_X denotes a partial derivative of Λ with respect to X. Λ_θ is equal to $\gamma\rho/\eta$ and positive, and Λ_{ℓ^*} is negative as shown in Appendix C.2. Therefore, $d\ell^*/d\theta$ is positive. Since $(\ell_x^*)'(\ell^*) > 0$ and $(\ell_n^*)'(\ell^*) > 0$, an increase in ℓ^* raises labor allocated to each sector.[19] As a result, since $(g_y^*)'(\ell_n^*) > 0$, the larger value of θ raises g_y^*. That is, economic growth accelerates with money growth.

The positive relation between θ and g_y^* has been shown in Proposition 5. Therefore, even if financial authorities add 0.1% to the money growth rate, the rise in the long-run inflation rate is smaller than 0.1% because of the rise in the long-run growth rate g_y^* (See (26)). Furthermore, for the high productivity of R&D, which is captured by large values of μ, the inflation rate might even decrease.

Proposition 6 *Let $\theta > \theta_1$ hold. In response to a permanent increase in the money growth rate, θ, the long-run inflation rate π^* decreases for sufficiently large values of μ.*

Proof. See Appendix C.6.

3.3. Output Gap

We refer to the output and the employment level in the flexible price economy (i.e., when $\gamma = 0$) as the *natural output level* and the *natural employment level*, respectively. The *output gap* is the difference between the actual output level and the natural output level.

In the flexible-price economy, the employment level, ℓ, is characterized by (15) instead of NKPC(13). Then, substituting (6), (4), (25), and $y = c$ into (15), we obtain the natural employment level along the balanced growth path ℓ^{**} as the root of the following implicit function:

$$\Lambda|_{\gamma=0}(\ell^{**}) \equiv \frac{\ell^{**}}{\chi^*(\ell^{**})} - (\ell^{**})^{1+\psi} = 0.$$

[19] In addition, ℓ_n/ℓ_x increases.

When $\theta = 0$, $\Lambda(\ell)$ becomes the identical form with $\Lambda_{\gamma=0}(\ell)$. Therefore, when the financial authorities apply the monetary policy with $\theta = 0$, $\ell^* = \ell^{**}$ holds and the output gap caused by price stickiness is eliminated. However, if $\rho/\mu \geq \Gamma_1$, the implicit function, $\Lambda|_{\gamma=0}(\ell) = 0$, has no root larger than $\underline{\ell}$.

3.4. No-growth steady state

There exists a different steady state from the balanced growth path at which no labor is allocated to R&D and long-run growth never occurs. We refer to such a steady state as the *no-growth steady state*. At the no-growth steady state, since the free-entry condition (8) does not hold with an equality, (19), (20), and (21) are not fulfilled, and $\ell_n = 0$ and $\ell = \ell_x$ hold instead of them.

The value of each variable at this steady state is derived as follows:

$$R^0 = \theta + \rho, \quad \pi^0 = \omega^0 = \theta, \quad \chi^0 = \frac{l_x^0}{\alpha\beta}, \quad \ell^0 = \ell_x^0 = \left[\frac{\gamma\theta\rho}{\eta} + \alpha\beta\right]^{\frac{1}{1+\psi}}.$$

Under Assumption 1, the no-growth steady state (R^0, χ^0, ω^0) is a unique steady state of the economy for $\theta \leq \theta_1$, whereas it coexists with the balanced growth path (R^*, χ^*, ω^*) for $\theta > \theta_1$. Along the balanced growth path, the economy exhibits sustained growth at the rate g_y^*, while at the no-growth steady state, it exhibits no sustained growth. Furthermore, for $\theta > \theta_1$, since $\Lambda(\ell^0) > 0$ holds, we can show that $\ell^0 < \ell^*$. That is, the no-growth steady state has a lower employment level than the balanced growth path. Since R, χ, and ω are jump variables, our model has no mechanism to choose between them. That is, global indeterminacy arises again.[20]

4. Local determinacy of balanced growth paths

In order to examine the local stability, we linearize the system (16) through (18) around the fixed point (R^*, χ^*, ω^*).

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{R} \\ \dot{\chi} \\ \dot{\omega} \end{bmatrix} = \boldsymbol{J} \begin{bmatrix} R - R^* \\ \chi - \chi^* \\ \omega - \omega^* \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad \boldsymbol{J} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \theta + \rho & 0 & 0 \\ \chi^* & 0 & -\chi^* \\ 0 & \frac{\eta\beta}{\gamma}\Lambda'(\ell^*) & \rho \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\Lambda'(\ell)$ has been derived as (C.1). One of three eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix, $\boldsymbol{J}$, is $\theta + \rho (> 0)$, and the other two eigenvalues are equal to the eigenvalues of the following sub matrix:

$$\boldsymbol{J}_1 \equiv \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\chi^* \\ \frac{\eta\beta}{\gamma}\Lambda'(\ell^*) & \rho \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here, $\operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{J}_1 = \rho > 0$ and $\det \boldsymbol{J}_1 = \frac{\eta\beta}{\gamma}\chi^*\Lambda'(\ell^*)$ holds.

[20] If two balanced growth paths exist as shown in Proposition 4, there are three steady states in all, and global indeterminacy arises among them.

4.1. For the unique balanced growth path

First, we study the dynamic property of the unique balanced growth path, which is mentioned in Propositions 1 through 3. Since $\Lambda'(\ell^*) < 0$ holds, $\det \boldsymbol{J}_1$ is negative. Therefore, $\boldsymbol{J}_1$ has two real eigenvalues with opposite signs. As a result, the Jacobian matrix $\boldsymbol{J}$ has one negative real root and two positive real roots. Since R, χ, and ω are jump variables, the fixed point is locally indeterminate.[21]

4.2. For the multiple balanced growth path

Next, we analyze the case of the multiple equilibrium, which is argued in Proposition 4. Let ℓ_1^* and ℓ_2^* denote the roots of $\Lambda(\ell) = 0$ and $\ell_1^* < \ell_2^*$. Then $\Lambda'(\ell_1^*) > 0$ and $\Lambda'(\ell_2^*) < 0$ hold. For ℓ_1^*, $\operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{J}_1 > 0$ and $\det \boldsymbol{J}_1 > 0$ hold, so that both roots of J_1 have positive real parts. Since all eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{J}$ have positive real parts, this fixed point is locally determinate.[22]

On the other hand, as for ℓ_2^*, since $\det \boldsymbol{J}_1 < 0$, $\boldsymbol{J}_1$ or $\boldsymbol{J}$ has one negative real root. Therefore, the fixed point is locally indeterminate.

5. Conclusions

This study has developed a new Keynesian model by introducing R&D activities and endogenous technological change. When the money growth rate is sufficiently high, the economy has a unique balanced growth path, and can sustain long-run positive growth based on sustained R&D. Furthermore, faster money growth brings larger employment and faster economic growth along a balanced growth path. In contrast, under some parameter restrictions, when the money growth rate is sufficiently small, there is no balanced growth path, and the economy is trapped in the no-growth steady state. These results suggest that money growth may be an important factor for long-run economic growth.

Appendices

A. Dynamical Optimization of Households

Let us define the Hamiltonian function of the optimal problem (11) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} = &\ln c_j + \ln m_j - \frac{1}{1+\psi}\left[\left(\frac{W_j}{W}\right)^{-\frac{1}{1-\beta}} \ell\right]^{1+\psi} - \frac{\gamma}{2}\omega_j^2 \\ &+ \xi_1\left[ra_j + \frac{W_j}{p}\left(\frac{W_j}{W}\right)^{-\frac{1}{1-\beta}} \ell - c_j - Rm_j\right] + \xi_2\omega_j W_j,\end{aligned}$$

[21] Such local indeterminacy can be connected with sunspots or business cycles. An analysis of indeterminacy (both local and global) using the variety-expanding framework was presented by Benhabib and Perli (1994), Evans et al. (1998), Furukawa (2007a,b), and Haruyama (2009).

[22] However, there are two balanced growth paths and a no-growth steady state. Therefore, global indeterminacy remains.

where ξ_1 and ξ_2 are co-state variables of a_j and W_j, respectively. A set of necessary conditions for optimality can be written as follows:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial c_j} = \frac{1}{c_j} - \xi_1 = 0, \tag{A.1}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial m_j} = \frac{1}{m_j} - \xi_1 R = 0, \tag{A.2}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial \omega_j} = -\gamma\omega_j + \xi_2 W_j = 0, \tag{A.3}$$

$$\dot{\xi}_1 = \rho\xi_1 - \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial a_j} = (\rho - r)\xi_1, \tag{A.4}$$

$$\dot{\xi}_2 = \rho\xi_2 - \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial W_j} = \rho\xi_2 - \left[\frac{\ell_j^{1+\psi}}{(1-\beta)W_j} - \frac{\beta}{1-\beta}\xi_1\frac{\ell_j}{p} + \xi_2\omega_j\right]. \tag{A.5}$$

Furthermore, the transversality condition is given by $\lim_{t\to\infty} \xi_1(t)a_j(t)e^{-\rho t} = 0$.

Derivation of (12). From (A.1) and (A.2), we get $R = c_j/m_j$. In addition, from (A.2) and (A.4), we get $-\dot{c}_j/c_j = \rho - r$. Substituting $c = c_j$,$m = m_j$,$\forall j$, and $r = R - \pi$ into these equations yields (12).

Derivation of (13) *and* (15). When $\gamma > 0$, from (A.3), $\xi_2 > 0$ holds. Therefore, we can divide both sides of (A.5) by ξ_2 as follows:

$$\frac{\dot{\xi}_2}{\xi_2} = \rho - \left[\frac{\ell_j^{1+\psi}}{(1-\beta)W_j} - \frac{\beta}{1-\beta}\xi_1\frac{\ell_j}{p}\right]\xi_2^{-1} - \omega_j.$$

Substituting $\xi_1 = 1/c_j$ and $\xi_2 = \gamma\omega_j/W_j$ into above equation, we obtain

$$\frac{\dot{\omega}_j}{\omega_j} - \frac{\dot{W}_j}{W_j} = \rho - \left[\frac{\ell_j^{1+\psi}}{(1-\beta)W_j} - \frac{\beta}{1-\beta}\frac{\ell_j}{pc_j}\right]\left(\frac{W_j}{\gamma\omega_j}\right) - \omega_j.$$

Since $W_j = W$, $\omega_j = \omega$, $\ell_j = \ell$, $c_j = c$、$\forall j$, (13) holds.

On the other hand, when $\gamma = 0$, ξ_2 and $\dot{\xi}_2$ are equal to 0 from (A.3). Then from (A.5) and $\xi_1 = 1/c_j$, we obtain $\beta\frac{(W_j/p)}{c_j} = \ell_j^{\psi}$. Therefore, (15) holds.

B. Derivation of the law of motion

B.1. Derivation of (22)

From (6),

$$\frac{\dot{w}}{w} = \omega - \pi = \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\frac{\dot{N}}{N},$$

or

$$\pi = \omega - \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\mu\ell_n.$$

B.2. Derivation of (19) *and* (21)

From the free-entry condition (8),

$$\frac{\dot{V}}{V} = \omega - \mu\ell_n.$$

From (10), (3), and (8),

$$\frac{\dot{V}}{V} = R - \frac{\Pi}{V} = R - \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\ell_x\mu.$$

Eliminating $\dot{V}/V$ from the two equations above, we obtain

$$\ell_n = \frac{\omega - R}{\mu} + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\ell_x,$$

and substituting $\ell_x = \alpha\beta\chi$, we get (21). Moreover, substituting (21) and (20) into the labor market clearing condition $\ell = \ell_x + \ell_n$ yields (19).

B.3. Derivation of (16)

From (12),

$$\frac{\dot{R}}{R} = \frac{\dot{c}}{c} - \frac{\dot{m}}{m} = R - \rho - \theta.$$

B.4. Derivation of (17)

From (4),

$$\frac{\dot{y}}{y} = \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\frac{\dot{N}}{N} + \frac{\dot{\ell}_x}{\ell_x}.$$

From the Euler equation (12) and the final goods market clearing condition, $y = c$,

$$R - \rho - \pi = \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\mu\ell_n + \frac{\dot{\ell}_x}{\ell_x}.$$

Using (22) and $\dot{\chi}/\chi = \dot{l}_x/l_x$, we obtain (17).

B.5. Derivation of (18)

From (4) and (6), $(\ell/c)w = (\ell/y)w = \alpha\ell/\ell_x$ holds, and substituting this equation into (13) yields

$$\frac{\dot{\omega}}{\omega} = \rho + \left[\alpha\beta\frac{\ell}{\ell_x} - \ell^{1+\psi}\right]\frac{\eta}{\gamma\omega}.$$

Using $l_x = \alpha\beta\chi$, we get (18).



Figure C.1: A unique balanced growth path (for $\theta > 0$).

C. Balanced growth path

C.1. Derivation of ℓ^*

At the steady state, $\omega^* - R^* = -\rho$ holds. Substituting into (19) yields (23). Moreover, from (18), we obtain

$$\frac{\dot{\omega}}{\omega} = \rho + \left(\frac{\ell^*}{\chi^*(\ell^*)} - (\ell^*)^{1+\psi} \right) \frac{\eta}{\gamma\theta} = 0.$$

Therefore, we show that $\Lambda(\ell^*) = 0$ holds at the steady state.

C.2. Proof of Proposition 1

The derivative of $\Lambda(\ell)$ is given by

$$\Lambda'(\ell) = \frac{1}{[\chi^*(\ell)]^2} \frac{\rho}{\beta\mu} - (1+\psi)\ell^{\psi}. \tag{C.1}$$

Since $(\chi^*)'(\ell) = 1/\beta > 0$, $\Lambda''(\ell) < 0$. $\Lambda'(0) = \beta\mu/\rho > 0$, then $\Lambda(\ell)$ is concave and a unimodal form for $\ell > 0$. Furthermore, since $\Lambda(0) = \gamma\theta\rho/\eta \geq 0$ and $\lim_{\ell^* \to \infty} \Lambda(\ell^*) = -\infty$ hold for $\theta > 0$, $\Lambda(\ell) = 0$ has a unique positive root.

$\Lambda(\underline{\ell}) > 0$ is satisfied for $\theta > \theta_1$. In this case, $\Lambda(\ell) = 0$ has a unique root, ℓ^*, which is larger than $\underline{\ell}$, and $\Lambda'(\ell^*) < 0$ always holds. In contrast, since $\Lambda(\underline{\ell}) \leq 0$ is satisfied for $\theta \leq \theta_1$, $\Lambda(\ell) = 0$ has no root in $(\underline{\ell}, \infty)$. (See Figure C.1.) □

C.3. Proof of Proposition 2

$\Lambda(\underline{\ell}) > 0$ holds for $\theta > \theta_1$. Since $\lim_{\ell^* \to \infty} \Lambda(\ell^*) = -\infty$, $\Lambda(\ell) = 0$ has a unique root that belongs to $(\underline{\ell}, \infty)$.[23] □

[23] However, when $\theta < 0$, we cannot rule out the possibility that balanced growth paths exist in spite of $\theta \leq \theta_1$ or $\Lambda(\underline{\ell}) < 0$.



Figure C.2: Multiple balanced growth paths.

C.4. Proof of Proposition 3

Some algebra shows that

$$\Lambda'(\underline{\ell}) = \frac{1+\psi}{\underline{\ell}}\left[\frac{1}{1+\psi}\alpha\beta(1-\alpha) - \underline{\ell}^{1+\psi}\right].$$

Therefore, if and only if Assumption 1 is fulfilled, $\Lambda'(\underline{\ell}) \leq 0$ holds. $\Lambda''(\ell) < 0$ guarantees that $\Lambda(\ell)$ is a decreasing function for $\ell > \underline{\ell}$. Since $\Lambda(\underline{\ell}) < 0$ for $\theta \leq \theta_1$, $\Lambda(\ell) = 0$ has no root in $(\underline{\ell}, \infty)$. □

C.5. Proof of Proposition 4

Since $\Lambda(\ell)$ is concave and unimodal for positive ℓ, there uniquely exists $\ell^{\max} > 0$ such that $\Lambda'(\ell^{\max}) = 0$, and $\Lambda(\ell)$ is maximal at $\ell^{\max}$. $\ell^{\max}$ does not depend on θ, while $\Lambda(\ell^{\max})$ is increasing in θ. Therefore, there uniquely exists a threshold value of θ, θ_2, such that $\Lambda(\ell^{\max}) = 0$ holds for $\theta = \theta_2$ and $\Lambda(\ell^{\max}) > 0$ for $\theta > \theta_2$. Thus, $\Lambda(\ell) = 0$ has two positive root for $\theta > \theta_2$. Since $\Lambda'(\underline{\ell}) > 0$ for $\rho/\mu < \Gamma_2$, both roots are larger than $\underline{\ell}$.(See Figure C.2.) □

C.6. Proof of Proposition 6

Differentiating (26) with respect to θ yields

$$\frac{\partial \pi^*}{\partial \theta} = 1 - \frac{\partial g_y^*}{\partial \theta} = 1 - \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{\alpha}\mu\frac{\partial \ell^*}{\partial \theta}.$$

Our purpose is to show that this equation becomes negative for large values of μ. Substituting (27) into the above equation, we obtain the following condition:

$$-\frac{(1-\alpha)^2\gamma\rho}{\alpha\eta}\mu < \Lambda'(\ell^*). \tag{C.2}$$

We can calculate ℓ^* as $\mu \to \infty$ as follows:[24,25]

$$\ell^* = \left(\frac{\gamma\theta\rho}{\eta} + \beta\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\psi}}.$$

Then, we obtain

$$\Lambda'(\ell^*) = \frac{\rho\beta}{\ell^*\mu} - (1+\psi)(\ell^*)^{\psi} = -(1+\psi)\left(\frac{\gamma\theta\rho}{\eta} + \beta\right)^{\frac{\psi}{1+\psi}}, \quad \text{as } \mu \to \infty.$$

As $\mu \to \infty$, the right-hand side of (C.2) converges the finite negative value as shown above, whereas the left-hand side continues to decrease toward $-\infty$. Taking the continuity of both sides into consideration, we can argue that (C.2) holds for sufficiently large μ. □

References

Akerlof, G. A., Dickens, W. T., Perry, G. L., Gordon, R. J., Mankiw, N. G., 1996. The macroeconomics of low inflation. Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 1–76.

Barro, R. J., Sala-i Martin, X., 2004. Economic Growth, 2nd Edition. MIT Press, New York.

Benhabib, J., Perli, R., 1994. Uniqueness and indeterminacy : On the dynamics of endogenous growth. Journal of Economic Theory 63, 113–142.

Blanchard, O. J., Kiyotaki, N., 1987. Monopolistic competition and the effects of aggregate demand. American Economic Review 77, 647–666.

Cass, D., 1965. Optimum growth in an aggregative model of capital accumulation. Review of Economic Studies 32, 233–240.

Dixit, A. K., Stiglitz, J. E., 1977. Monopolistic competition and optimum product diversity. American Economic Review 67, 297–308.

Evans, G. W., Honkapohja, S., Romer, P. M., 1998. Growth cycles. American Economic Review 88, 495–515.

Friedman, M., 1968. The role of monetary policy. American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings 58, 1–17.

Friedman, M., 1969. The optimum quantity of money and other essays. Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago.

Furukawa, Y., 2007a. Endogenous growth cycles. Journal of Economics 91, 69–96.

Furukawa, Y., 2007b. Indeterminacy in a variety expansion model of endogenous growth. Economics Bulletin 4, 1–7.

Futagami, K., Iwaisako, T., 2003. Patent policy in an endogenous growth model. Journal of Economics 78, 239–258.

Futagami, K., Iwaisako, T., 2007. Dynamic analysis of patent policy in an endogenous growth model. Journal of Economic Theory 132, 306–334.

Gali, J., 2008. Monetary Policy, Inflation, and the Business Cycle : An introduction to the New Keynesian Framework. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Grossman, G. M., Helpman, E., 1991. Innovation and Growth in the Global Economy. MIT Press.

Haruyama, T., 2009. R&D policy in a volatile economy. Journal of Economic Dynamics & control 33, 1761–1778.

[24] Since $\chi^* = 1/\lambda^*$, we can rewrite the implicit function as

$$\Lambda|_{\mu\to\infty}(\ell^*) = \frac{\gamma\theta\rho}{\eta} + \beta - (\ell^*)^{1+\psi} = 0.$$

[25] Since $\Lambda_\mu > 0$, $\partial\ell^*/\partial\mu = -\Lambda_\mu/\Lambda'(\ell^*) > 0$ holds by applying the implicit function theorem.

Inoue, T., Tsuzuki, E., 2011. A new keynesian model with technological change. Economics Letters 110, 206–208.
Jones, C. I., 1995a. R&D-based models of economic growth. Journal of Political Economy 103, 759–784.
Jones, C. I., 1995b. Time series tests of endogenous growth models. Quarterly Journal of Economics 110, 495–525.
Jones, C. I., 1999. Growth: With or without scale effect? American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings 89, 139–144.
Jones, C. I., 2005. Growth and ideas. In: Aghion, P., Durlauf, S. (Eds.), Handbook of Economic Growth. Vol. 1B. Amsterdam, Elsevier North-Holland, Ch. 16, pp. 1063–1111.
Koopmans, T., 1965. On the concept of optimal economic growth. Pontificae Academiae Scientiarum Scripta Varia 28, 225–300.
Kwan, Y. K., Lai, E. L.-C., 2003. Intellectual property rights protection and endogenous economic growth. Journal of Economic Dynamics & Control 27, 853–873.
Li, C. W., 2000. Endogenous vs semi-endogenous growth in a two-r&d-sector model. Economic Journal 110, C109–C122.
Li, C. W., 2002. Growth and scale effects: The role of knowledge spillovers. Economics Letters 74, 177–185.
Lucas, R. E. J., 1972. Econometric testing of the natural rate hypothesis. In: Eckstein, O. (Ed.), The Econometrics of Price Determination Conference. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC, pp. 50–59.
Ramsey, F. P., 1928. A mathematical theory of saving. Economic Journal 38, 543–559.
Rivera-Batiz, L., Romer, P. M., 1991. Economic integration and endogenous growth. Quarterly Journal of Economics 106, 531–555.
Romer, P. M., 1990. Endogenous technological change. Journal of Political Economy 98, s71–102.
Rotemberg, J. J., 1982. Sticky prices in the united states. Journal of Political Economy 90, 1187–1211.
Sidrauski, M., 1967. Rational choice and patterns of growth in a monetary economy. American Economic Review 57, 534–544.
Siegel, J. J., 1983. Technological change and the superneutrality of money. Money, Credit, and Banking 15, 363–367.
Solow, R. M., 1956. A contribution to the theory of economic growth. Quarterly Journal of Economics 70, 65–94.
Tsuzuki, E., Inoue, T., 2010. Policy trade-off in the long run: A new keynesian model with technological change and money growth. Economic Modeling 27, 943–950.
Tsuzuki, E., Inoue, T., 2011. Technological change and monetary policy in a sticky-price model. Research in Economics 65, 180–194.
Woodford, M., 2003. Interest and Prices : Foundations of a Theory of Monetary Policy. Princeton University Press, Princeton.