LEX
LOCALIS

# INTERLINKAGES OF INVESTMENT, CONSUMPTION, AND SAVING IN DETERMINING SHORT-RUN EQUILIBRIUM: AN AGGREGATE DEMAND (AD) – AGGREGATE SUPPLY (AS) FRAMEWORK

## Tushar Dhiman[1], Kumari Deepa Rani[2], Divya Sharma[3], Jennie Prajith[4], Sachin Kurade[5]

[1]Research Scholar, Faculty of Management Studies, Gurukula Kangri (Deemed to be University) Haridwar, Uttarakhand
[2]Assistant Professor, University Department of Economics, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, Bihar
[3]Assistant Professor, ITM Gwalior, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh
[4]Assistant Professor, Pillai College of Arts, Commerce and Science (Autonomous), University of Mumbai, New Panvel, Maharashtra
[5]Research Scholar, Department of Economics, Karnatak University, Dharwad, Karnataka

tushardhiman.gkv@gmail.com[1]
prof.kdeeparani@gmail.com[2]
divya.sharma.mba@itmgoi.in[3]
jennieprajith10@gmail.com[4]
sachinkurade@kud.ac.in[5]

**Abstract**
This paper examines the interlinkages of investment, consumption, and saving in determining short-run equilibrium within the Aggregate Demand–Aggregate Supply (AD–AS) framework. Using a synthesis of Keynesian, neoclassical, and New-Keynesian perspectives, the study emphasizes the dynamic feedback loops among these three macroeconomic variables and their implications for output, income, and employment. Consumption is identified as the largest and most stable component of aggregate demand, with its fluctuations deeply influenced by liquidity constraints, precautionary saving behavior, and consumer confidence. Investment, in contrast, is the most volatile component, driven largely by expectations, profitability, and financial conditions. Saving, while essential for long-term capital accumulation, demonstrates a paradoxical short-run role, often dampening demand and reinforcing downturns. The findings highlight that short-run equilibrium is a result of the simultaneous interaction of these forces rather than the dominance of one variable. Consumption generates immediate demand; investment amplifies growth through multiplier and accelerator effects; and saving, although restraining in the short run, provides the resources for future growth. Policy interventions, particularly fiscal and monetary measures, play a critical role in mediating these interactions and restoring equilibrium during crises. The paper concludes that understanding these interdependencies is crucial for designing effective macroeconomic policies that balance short-term stability with long-term growth objectives.

**Keywords:** Investment, Consumption, Saving, Short-Run Equilibrium, AD–AS Framework.

## 1. Introduction:

Macroeconomic analysis of short-run equilibrium has long been centered on understanding the interplay between aggregate demand (AD) and aggregate supply (AS). Within this framework, consumption, investment, and saving constitute the core drivers of fluctuations in income, output, and employment. The aggregate demand - aggregate supply (AD–AS) framework remains one of the most widely taught and applied models in modern economics because of its ability to represent the short-run dynamics of output and price determination (Dutt, 2002). Although initially developed as a pedagogical tool, the AD–AS framework has evolved into a powerful analytical model used to examine both theoretical issues and real-world macroeconomic policies. Its strength lies in the integration of demand-side determinants, such as investment and consumption, with supply-side constraints, which together shape equilibrium

outcomes. At the center of macroeconomic dynamics, investment, consumption, and saving function as interconnected variables that reflect household and firm decisions under conditions of uncertainty, income constraints, and policy interventions. The Keynesian tradition emphasizes that fluctuations in investment drive changes in aggregate demand and thus employment and output, while saving adjusts passively through changes in income. By contrast, neoclassical perspectives often stress the importance of intertemporal optimization, where saving is the foundation of capital accumulation and investment, and equilibrium is established through interest rate adjustments (Abel & Blanchard, 1983). Modern approaches, including New-Keynesian and stock-flow consistent (SFC) models, recognize the complementarities and feedback effects across these three variables, acknowledging the roles of expectations, behavioral biases, and institutional frameworks (Davis, 2022; Benigno, 2009). The importance of investment, consumption, and saving is not merely theoretical but highly practical. Policymakers frequently confront trade-offs when attempting to stimulate demand through investment incentives, boost consumption via fiscal transfers, or encourage saving for long-term capital formation. The short-run equilibrium of the economy hinges on how these three components interact, particularly in contexts of shocks, crises, or structural transformations. For instance, during downturns, higher precautionary savings reduce consumption, which depresses aggregate demand and, by extension, discourages investment (Ragot, Matheron, & Rubio-Ramirez, 2015). In contrast, confidence-driven investment booms can trigger higher consumption and income, leading to multiplier effects that reinforce short-run growth (Gillespie, 2019).

The historical development of the AD–AS framework demonstrates its adaptability in explaining the interlinkages of investment, consumption, and saving. Early Keynesian models highlighted the instability of investment and the paradox of thrift, whereby higher saving at the aggregate level reduces demand and lowers output in the short run (Keynes, 1936/2010; Palley, 1996). Later refinements attempted to reconcile demand-side insights with neoclassical principles of supply and capital accumulation. Abel and Blanchard (1983) formulated an intertemporal model linking saving and investment with adjustment costs, showing how consumption depends on household wealth while investment is tied to firm valuations. Critics have pointed to internal inconsistencies in the AD–AS framework, particularly concerning the derivation of the aggregate demand curve and the role of expectations (Boyd, 2010). Nevertheless, defenders argue that the framework remains internally consistent and empirically useful when contextualized within different schools of thought, including monetarist, rational expectations, and post-Keynesian traditions (Skott, 1996). More recently, dynamic general equilibrium formulations have integrated AD–AS with Ramsey-type models, allowing the analysis of tax policies, productivity shocks, and capital flows in determining short-run equilibria (Gillman, Benk, & Csabafi, 2023). Consumption is the largest component of aggregate demand and thus a critical determinant of short-run equilibrium. Classical consumption models, such as the permanent income hypothesis and the life-cycle hypothesis, suggest that consumption decisions are based on expectations of lifetime income rather than current income alone (Abel, 1990; Carroll, 2014). However, empirical research during periods of financial instability demonstrates that consumption is strongly influenced by liquidity constraints, precautionary saving motives, and behavioral biases (Carroll, 2014; Challe, Matheron, & Ragot, 2015). Evidence shows that household consumption patterns are sensitive to structural and behavioral factors that deviate from rational optimization. For instance, behavioral economics highlights the tendency of households to undersave, overspend, or delay necessary adjustments in response to shocks (Household Consumption and

Saving, 2023). Furthermore, the extensive margin of consumption where households add or remove products from their consumption baske plays an important role in explaining cyclical fluctuations (Michelacci, Paciello, & Pozzi, 2021).

In terms of macroeconomic equilibrium, consumption both responds to and stimulates investment. Empirical studies demonstrate a long-run causal nexus from consumption to investment, with consumption growth leading to sustained investment activity (Pérez-Montiel & Manera, 2019). This interdependence highlights the multiplier effect: increased consumption generates higher demand for goods, which induces firms to expand capacity and undertake new investment projects. Investment is the most volatile element of aggregate demand and often the primary source of fluctuations in output and employment (Gillespie, 2019). In the short run, investment decisions are influenced by profit expectations, interest rates, fiscal incentives, and technological opportunities. Keynes emphasized the role of "animal spirits" and business confidence in driving investment, while later theories, such as Tobin's q model, linked investment to the market valuation of firms relative to replacement costs (Abel & Blanchard, 1983). The volatility of investment stems from its sensitivity to expectations and financial conditions. For example, during recessions, declining profits and tighter credit reduce investment spending, which further lowers aggregate demand. Conversely, during expansions, investment booms reinforce demand growth, creating cyclical amplification (Soebyakto & Bashir, 2017). Modern evidence from supply-side models suggests that policy interventions, such as productivity-enhancing reforms or capital tax cuts, can significantly shift the AS curve outward and raise investment levels (Gillman et al., 2023).

Importantly, investment not only responds to current consumption patterns but also shapes future saving and income distribution. Long-term productivity gains from capital formation lay the foundation for sustained output, but short-run equilibrium remains highly sensitive to investment shocks. Saving plays a dual role in macroeconomic analysis: while necessary for long-term capital formation and growth, in the short run it can dampen demand and lead to recessionary pressures. The paradox of thrift illustrates this tension, demonstrating that higher aggregate saving reduces income and output, leaving total saving unchanged or even lower (Chamley, 2012; Palley, 1996). Empirical studies reveal that personal saving often negatively impacts investment, whereas government saving exerts little influence, aligning with Keynesian theory (Palley, 1998). Blanchard (1983) further demonstrated that an increase in saving may initially depress demand and investment, though it eventually raises the sustainable capital stock in the long run. Theoretical models also highlight that excessive saving can push the economy into underconsumption equilibria, where output falls short of potential despite high productive capacity (Chirco & Colombo, 1996). At the household level, precautionary savings driven by uncertainty about employment or income can destabilize aggregate demand by reducing consumption (Ragot et al., 2015). Conversely, in neoclassical models, higher saving rates are associated with increased capital accumulation and higher output per capita (Kwok, 2006, 2007). The reconciliation of these perspectives underscores the importance of time horizons: saving may hinder equilibrium in the short run but enable growth in the long run.

The interlinkages of consumption, investment, and saving are best understood through their role in shaping aggregate demand and supply interactions. Consumption stimulates demand directly, investment amplifies it through multiplier and accelerator effects, and saving provides the resources for capital accumulation but may suppress demand if excessive. Together, these variables determine output, employment, and price levels in the short run. Recent research

emphasizes the feedback loops between these components. For example, higher consumption fosters investment, which in turn raises income and consumption, creating a virtuous cycle (Pérez-Montiel & Manera, 2019). On the other hand, rising precautionary savings may weaken both consumption and investment, trapping the economy in low-demand equilibrium (Ragot et al., 2015). The balance among these factors, mediated by policy, institutions, and behavioral responses, defines short-run outcomes. Moreover, shocks such as financial crises, pandemics, or supply disruptions—reshape the equilibrium by altering consumption propensities, investment confidence, and saving behaviors. For instance, during the COVID-19 pandemic, supply-side disruptions outweighed demand shocks in India, but fiscal stimulus through capital formation proved effective in restoring equilibrium (Gopakumar, 2022). Understanding the interlinkages among consumption, investment, and saving provides critical insights for macroeconomic policy. Fiscal measures such as tax cuts or transfers can boost consumption in the short run, but their sustainability depends on investment responses. Similarly, policies promoting saving must account for potential contractionary effects on demand unless offset by strong investment incentives. Monetary policy also plays a vital role in balancing these components by influencing interest rates, credit conditions, and expectations. New-Keynesian models highlight the importance of fiscal multipliers and policy trade-offs between output stability and inflation control (Benigno, 2009). Dynamic AS–AD frameworks integrated with stock-flow consistency have advanced the analysis of disequilibrium scenarios, emphasizing the need to address both demand-side and supply-side dynamics simultaneously (Davis, 2022). Furthermore, macro-financial linkages such as the relationship between household savings, investment financing, and asset prices add complexity to short-run equilibria (Claessens & Kose, 2018). Business confidence, financial stability, and global shocks amplify or dampen the effects of investment and consumption on aggregate demand (Tamborini, 2012; Business Confidence and Finance, 2023).

The short-run equilibrium of an economy is intricately shaped by the interconnections between investment, consumption, and saving, all situated within the AD–AS framework. Consumption drives aggregate demand, investment amplifies and sustains economic activity, while saving ensures resources for future growth but often restrains short-term demand. Their interactions, influenced by expectations, policy, and behavioral factors, generate the dynamics that determine income, output, and employment in the short run. The literature demonstrates that no single perspective Keynesian, neoclassical, or New-Keynesian fully captures these dynamics in isolation. Instead, a comprehensive understanding emerges from recognizing the complementarities, contradictions, and feedback loops across these variables. This study builds upon these insights to analyze how the interlinkages of investment, consumption, and saving collectively determine short-run equilibrium, with the AD–AS framework providing the analytical lens.

## 2. Literature Review:

The Aggregate Demand–Aggregate Supply (AD–AS) framework has been at the center of macroeconomic theory for decades, serving as a bridge between Keynesian and neoclassical perspectives. Initially developed as a pedagogical model, it became a standard approach in undergraduate teaching due to its ability to represent output and price fluctuations simultaneously (Dutt, 2002). However, the model has also faced criticisms, particularly concerning its internal consistency and the derivation of the AD curve (Boyd, 2010). Despite

these criticisms, scholars have defended its usefulness, arguing that variations across Keynesian, monetarist, rational expectations, and Kaleckian formulations preserve its analytical strength (Skott, 1996). Refinements in the 1980s and 1990s incorporated intertemporal optimization and firm behavior into the framework. Abel and Blanchard (1983) developed an intertemporal model of saving and investment, linking household consumption to wealth and firm investment to Tobin's q. This formulation aligned AD–AS analysis with optimal growth models. Similarly, Carlberg (1992) applied Cobb–Douglas technology to short-run equilibrium, showing that output is determined by the interplay of consumption and investment under conditions of profit maximization. More recent approaches integrate AD–AS into Ramsey-type dynamic general equilibrium models, allowing the analysis of tax policies, productivity shocks, and fiscal reforms (Gillman, Benk, & Csabafi, 2023).

Other contributions emphasize disequilibrium perspectives, showing that discontinuities in AD–AS curves may arise and generate underconsumption equilibria (Chirco & Colombo, 1996). Likewise, Asada, Chen, and Chiarella (2006) introduced a nonlinear AD–AS model with Keynesian feedback mechanisms, demonstrating how instability features can explain business cycle fluctuations. Together, these developments reveal that the AD–AS framework has been continuously reshaped to reflect the complexity of real-world macroeconomics, particularly in contexts of saving, consumption, and investment linkages. Consumption remains the largest component of aggregate demand and is central to short-run macroeconomic outcomes. Traditional models such as the permanent income hypothesis and the life-cycle hypothesis suggested that consumption depends on lifetime resources rather than current income (Abel, 1990). Yet empirical evidence indicates that households often deviate from these rational models. Carroll (2014) argued that aggregate consumption cannot be explained without micro-level heterogeneity in household incomes, assets, and expectations, especially during crises like the Great Recession. Precautionary saving behavior has been highlighted as a destabilizing factor for aggregate demand. Ragot, Matheron, and Rubio-Ramirez (2015) showed that time-varying precautionary savings affect macroeconomic fluctuations by simultaneously stabilizing aggregate supply through increased capital availability while destabilizing aggregate demand through reduced consumption. Similar findings by Challe, Matheron, and Ragot (2015) confirmed that precautionary saving magnifies demand-side downturns, especially during recessions. The composition of consumption also plays a crucial role. Michelacci, Paciello, and Pozzi (2021) found that nearly half of cyclical changes in U.S. nondurable consumption are due to changes in the extensive margin that is, the addition or removal of goods in households' consumption baskets. Such findings underline that consumption patterns extend beyond aggregate income levels and include behavioral responses to product availability and preferences.

Empirical evidence from Pérez-Montiel and Manera (2019) demonstrated a long-run causal relationship from consumption to investment in the United States between 1947 and 2018, with consumption growth leading investment activity. This finding confirms the Keynesian view that strong consumption demand encourages firms to expand capacity. Similarly, studies in emerging economies, such as Indonesia, underscore the role of consumption in influencing national income and sustaining investment (Soebyakto & Bashir, 2017). Investment is widely recognized as the most volatile component of aggregate demand and a critical determinant of short-run equilibrium. Gillespie (2019) stressed that investment influences equilibrium prices, output, and employment, and its fluctuations often trigger business cycle movements. Keynes (1936/2010) highlighted the role of "animal spirits," where investment is driven more by business confidence

than by interest rate dynamics. This insight remains relevant, as recent work emphasizes that business confidence, profit expectations, and financial stability drive cycles more strongly than exogenous monetary conditions (Business Confidence and Finance, 2023). In the neoclassical tradition, investment decisions are explained through models such as Tobin's q, where firms invest when the market valuation of capital exceeds its replacement cost (Abel & Blanchard, 1983). Blanchard (1983) further showed that while increased savings can initially depress investment, in the long run they support capital accumulation and sustainable output growth. Supply-side extensions of AD–AS frameworks indicate that capital tax cuts and productivity increases significantly shift aggregate supply outward and stimulate investment (Gillman et al., 2023). Empirical findings also confirm the multiplier and accelerator effects of investment. Pierce (2009) conceptualized short-run GDP as the sum of multiplier effects, emphasizing how investment spending triggers additional rounds of income and consumption. In Indonesia, government spending has been found to positively influence investment levels, highlighting the role of fiscal policy in stabilizing demand (Soebyakto & Bashir, 2017).

The role of saving in short-run equilibrium is deeply contested. Keynesian models emphasize the paradox of thrift, where increased aggregate saving reduces demand, income, and output (Palley, 1996). Chamley (2012) formalized this paradox in a general equilibrium model, showing that even when savings increase, the resulting equilibrium may be suboptimal due to insufficient demand. Empirical evidence by Palley (1998) found that personal saving negatively impacts investment spending, while government saving has little influence. By contrast, neoclassical models stress the positive role of saving in capital accumulation and long-run growth. Kwok (2006, 2007) demonstrated that higher saving rates raise output per capita in neoclassical growth models, although they may lead to short-term recessions when viewed from a Keynesian perspective. Blanchard (1983) similarly argued that while saving initially depresses investment, it ultimately increases the capital stock and sustainable growth. Behavioral insights complicate the picture further. The 2023 volume on household consumption and saving highlights that structural constraints and behavioral biases often prevent households from aligning saving with optimal models. Precautionary saving, in particular, may become destabilizing when uncertainty about income and employment is high (Ragot et al., 2015). This dual role of saving—constraining demand in the short run while enabling growth in the long run—remains one of the central tensions in macroeconomic theory.

The interdependencies of consumption, investment, and saving define the path of short-run equilibrium within the AD–AS framework. Consumption generates demand, investment amplifies it through multiplier and accelerator effects, and saving provides resources for capital accumulation but can undermine immediate demand. The feedback loops among these components determine whether the economy stabilizes at full employment or falls into underutilization. Pérez-Montiel and Manera (2019) provide evidence of a unidirectional Granger causality from consumption to investment, indicating that strong consumption is a prerequisite for sustained investment. Conversely, rising saving rates often suppress consumption and reduce investment incentives (Palley, 1998). During crises, precautionary savings can reinforce downturns, while fiscal stimulus through public investment may offset these effects (Gopakumar, 2022). Macroeconomic shocks further highlight these interlinkages. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, India's aggregate supply was more negatively affected than demand, but capital formation through fiscal stimulus was identified as the most effective policy intervention (Gopakumar, 2022). Similarly, Hartman (2024) found that negative aggregate demand shocks

can have long-lasting consequences, often exacerbated by rising economic inequality. These findings underscore the need for coordinated policy interventions that address not only consumption but also saving and investment dynamics. Modern approaches extend the analysis to include macro-financial linkages. Claessens and Kose (2018) stressed that richer models incorporating financial variables are necessary to understand the connections between household saving, investment financing, and asset markets. Stock-flow consistent models similarly attempt to integrate these channels into the AD–AS framework (Davis, 2022).

The literature reveals that consumption, investment, and saving are deeply interconnected, with each exerting critical influence on short-run equilibrium outcomes. Consumption serves as the foundation of aggregate demand, investment amplifies and sustains economic activity, and saving, while essential for long-term growth, often dampens demand in the short run. The AD–AS framework, despite its criticisms, remains a powerful analytical tool for exploring these interlinkages, particularly when extended with behavioral, financial, and policy considerations. Overall, the balance among these three variables mediated by expectations, policies, and shocks determines the trajectory of short-run equilibrium. While Keynesian, neoclassical, and New-Keynesian approaches provide different emphases, their integration offers the most comprehensive understanding of macroeconomic dynamics.

Table 1: Authors Elucidation

| Author(s) / Source | Focus of Study |
|---|---|
| Dutt (2002) | History and pedagogical use of AD–AS framework; criticisms and contributions. |
| Abel & Blanchard (1983) | Intertemporal model linking saving, investment, and consumption with adjustment costs. |
| Carlberg (1992) | Short-run equilibrium using Cobb–Douglas technology; role of consumption and investment. |
| Gillespie (2019) | Volatility of investment as a driver of AD and equilibrium outcomes. |
| Gillman, Benk, & Csabafi (2023) | AS–AD in Ramsey model; effects of tax cuts and productivity on output and investment. |
| Boyd (2010) | Critique of AD–AS derivation; stability of equilibrium. |
| Pierce (2009) | Multiplier effects in short-run GDP determination. |
| Benigno (2009) | New-Keynesian AD–AS analysis; fiscal multipliers and policy trade-offs. |
| Davis (2022) | Stock-flow consistent view of AD–AS; disequilibrium analysis. |
| Skott (1996) | Defense of AD–AS framework; consistency across traditions. |
| Claessens & Kose (2018) | Macro-financial linkages in saving, investment, and consumption. |
| Blanchard (1983) | Dynamic effects of saving shifts on investment and capital stock. |
| Kwok (2006, 2007) | Links between saving, consumption, and growth; neoclassical vs. Keynesian outcomes. |
| Pérez-Montiel & Manera (2019) | Long-run causality from consumption to investment in the U.S. |
| Soebyakto & Bashir (2017) | Aggregate demand components in Indonesia; government spending and investment. |

| Ragot, Matheron, & Rubio-Ramirez (2015) | Precautionary saving effects on AD–AS dynamics. |
|---|---|
| Carroll (2014) | Need for micro-level heterogeneity to explain aggregate consumption. |
| Chamley (2012) | Paradox of thrift formalized in general equilibrium. |
| Palley (1996, 1998) | Saving–investment nexus; paradox of thrift; VAR evidence. |
| Gopakumar (2022) | AD–AS modeling for India; effects of COVID-19 and fiscal stimulus. |
| Hartman (2024) | Long-term effects of negative AD shocks and inequality. |
| Michelacci, Paciello, & Pozzi (2021) | Role of extensive margin in consumption fluctuations. |

## 3. Concept of Short Run in Macroeconomics:

The concept of the short run is central to Keynesian macroeconomic theory and has important implications for how we understand fluctuations in output, employment, and demand in an economy. Unlike the long run, where technological progress, capital accumulation, and structural shifts play a dominant role in determining growth, the short run is characterized by fixed technology and existing productive capacity. In this context, output is determined not by potential production or technological possibilities but by the level of employment and the aggregate demand in the economy.

### Technology as Constant in the Short Run

In Keynesian economics, the short run is defined as the period during which technology is considered fixed. This assumption means that firms cannot instantly alter their production techniques, improve productivity, or expand their capacity to produce goods and services. As a result, production is bound by the available resources and the efficiency of existing methods. Because technology is constant, the short-run analysis excludes the role of innovation, capital deepening, or long-term productivity enhancements. Instead, attention is focused on how the current labor force and existing capacity are utilized to generate output.

### Output Determination Through Employment

Keynes argued that in the short run, output is directly proportional to employment. If more people are employed, they produce more goods and services, raising the gross domestic product (GDP). Conversely, if fewer people are employed, output contracts. Thus, there exists a one-to-one relationship between output and employment, assuming technology and productivity per worker remain constant. For example, if the economy has 50% unemployment and firms start hiring workers, output will expand at the same rate as employment, since each additional worker produces a predictable amount of output using the same technology. This linear relationship highlights the importance of employment policies, as stimulating job creation directly boosts output.

### The Role of Aggregate Demand

While employment determines output, employment itself is determined by aggregate demand. Keynes emphasized that firms hire workers based on their expectations of demand for goods and services. If aggregate demand is low, firms will not expand production, even if workers are available. Therefore, in the short run, output is constrained not by resources or technology but by the level of demand. This demand-driven view contrasts sharply with classical economics, where supply-side factors dominate.

### The Ceiling of Full Employment

One of the critical insights of Keynesian economics is that output in the short run cannot exceed full employment. Once all available labor is employed, the economy reaches its capacity, and additional demand cannot produce higher output. Instead, it results in inflationary pressures, as too much money chases too few goods. Thus, the short-run output is capped by full employment, beyond which further increases in demand do not lead to higher real GDP.

For instance, during periods of economic recovery, output can grow rapidly as unemployed resources are put to use. However, once the economy nears full employment, further growth becomes constrained unless there are technological improvements or increases in productive capacity which, by definition, occur only in the long run.

### Short Run vs. Long Run

The distinction between short run and long run is essential in understanding macroeconomic fluctuations. In the short run:

- Technology is fixed.
- Output is demand-driven.
- Employment is the key determinant of production.
- Unemployment may persist due to insufficient aggregate demand.

In contrast, in the long run, output is determined by supply-side factors such as capital accumulation, labor force growth, and technological innovation. Demand plays a secondary role, primarily influencing prices rather than output.

### Policy Implications

The Keynesian short-run framework has direct policy implications. Since output depends on employment and employment depends on demand, policies that boost aggregate demand—such as government spending, tax cuts, or monetary expansion—can raise employment and output when the economy is below full employment. Conversely, contractionary policies can exacerbate unemployment and reduce output. For example, during the Great Depression, Keynes argued that the failure to stimulate demand was the main reason for persistent unemployment. By contrast, classical economists believed that markets would self-correct, a view Keynes strongly challenged.

### Real-World Applications

In practice, the concept of the short run is crucial in analyzing business cycles. Recessions occur when aggregate demand falls, reducing employment and output, while recoveries happen when demand is restored. Short-run policies such as stimulus packages during crises are designed to restore demand and push the economy toward its potential. The COVID-19 pandemic provides a clear example: when demand collapsed due to lockdowns, unemployment soared. Governments worldwide responded with fiscal and monetary measures to restore demand, consistent with Keynesian short-run analysis.

The Keynesian short run highlights the primacy of demand in determining economic activity. With technology fixed and output tied to employment, the economy's performance in the short run depends largely on how effectively aggregate demand supports job creation. This framework explains why unemployment can persist despite available labor and why policy interventions are often necessary to restore equilibrium.

### 4. Concept of Equilibrium Output (GDP):

The concept of equilibrium output, also referred to as equilibrium GDP or equilibrium income, is one of the most important ideas in macroeconomics. It explains how the total output in an economy is determined when aggregate demand (AD) equals aggregate supply (AS). The equilibrium output ensures that what producers plan to produce equals what buyers plan to purchase, eliminating both excess supply and excess demand. Equilibrium GDP occurs when the goods produced by firms (aggregate supply) exactly match the goods demanded by households, firms, government, and external sectors (aggregate demand). Formally:

$Y = AD = AS$

*Where: Y is the national income or GDP, AD is aggregate demand and AS is aggregate supply.*

At this equilibrium, firms' production decisions are validated by consumers' spending, so there are no unintended inventories or shortages.

### Ex-Ante Aggregate Demand and Supply

In Keynesian analysis, both AD and AS are ex-ante concepts—that is, they represent planned values. Producers plan to produce a certain level of output (AS), and buyers plan to purchase a certain level of goods and services (AD). Equilibrium occurs when these plans are consistent. If planned demand falls short of planned supply, unsold stocks accumulate, forcing firms to cut back production. Conversely, if planned demand exceeds planned supply, shortages emerge, leading firms to increase production.

### Alternative Approach: The Saving–Investment Equality

In a simple two-sector economy consisting of households and producers, equilibrium can also be understood through the equality of saving (S) and investment (I). Here:

$Y = C + S$

$AD = C + I$

*Where C = consumption, I = Investment, S = Saving, AD = Aggregate Demand*

Equating the two sides gives:

$C + S = C + I$

$S = I$

Thus, equilibrium output occurs when planned saving equals planned investment. This condition reflects the flow of funds in the economy: households save part of their income, and firms borrow these savings to finance investment. If saving exceeds investment, demand falls short of output, causing a downturn. If investment exceeds saving, demand exceeds output, creating inflationary pressures.

### Disequilibrium Situations

If AS does not equal AD, the economy experiences disequilibrium:

- *Excess Supply (Recessionary Gap):* When AS > AD, firms accumulate unsold inventories. To adjust, they reduce production and employment, leading to lower output and income.
- *Excess Demand (Inflationary Gap):* When AD > AS, shortages occur. Firms respond by raising prices and increasing production. If the economy is already near full employment, additional demand leads mainly to inflation rather than higher output.

### Importance of the S = I Condition

The condition S = I is crucial for understanding equilibrium. If households save more than firms invest, there is a leakage from the income-expenditure stream, reducing demand. This results in declining output until saving falls back in line with investment. Conversely, if investment

exceeds saving, injections into the income-expenditure stream stimulate higher demand, raising output until equilibrium is restored.

### Role of Multiplier

The concept of equilibrium GDP is closely tied to the Keynesian multiplier, which shows how changes in investment or autonomous spending lead to larger changes in equilibrium income. For example, an increase in investment not only raises AD directly but also generates secondary increases in consumption as households spend additional income. This multiplier effect ensures that equilibrium GDP adjusts significantly in response to changes in spending.

### Real-World Applications

The idea of equilibrium GDP helps explain fluctuations in business cycles. During recessions, equilibrium GDP falls below potential GDP due to insufficient demand. In such cases, government intervention is necessary to boost investment or consumption. Conversely, during booms, equilibrium GDP may exceed sustainable levels, leading to inflationary pressures.For example, during the 2008 global financial crisis, equilibrium GDP in many countries declined sharply as investment collapsed. Governments used fiscal stimulus to restore demand and push GDP back toward equilibrium. Similarly, during the COVID-19 pandemic, fiscal transfers and monetary easing were used to sustain demand and prevent further contraction.

### Policy Implications

The equilibrium output framework highlights the role of both fiscal and monetary policies in stabilizing the economy. Fiscal policy can increase AD through government spending or tax cuts, shifting equilibrium GDP upward. Monetary policy influences interest rates, which affect investment and consumption. However, the effectiveness of these tools depends on the economy's proximity to full employment.Equilibrium output represents the balancing point where aggregate demand equals aggregate supply. In Keynesian economics, it underscores the importance of demand in determining short-run output. The alternative saving–investment equality provides another perspective, showing how financial flows underpin this balance. Understanding equilibrium GDP is crucial for analyzing business cycles, diagnosing recessions and inflations, and designing effective policies to stabilize the economy.

## 5. Discussion:

The analysis of investment, consumption, and saving within the Aggregate Demand–Aggregate Supply (AD–AS) framework highlights the complexity of short-run equilibrium in modern macroeconomics. While the introduction and literature review outline the theoretical and empirical foundations, the discussion section synthesizes these insights, contextualizes them against real-world phenomena, and evaluates their policy implications. This section emphasizes three central themes: (1) the interdependencies among investment, consumption, and saving, (2) the tensions between short-run dynamics and long-run outcomes, and (3) the importance of macroeconomic policy in mediating these relationships.

### Interdependencies Among Consumption, Investment, and Saving

The central argument of this study rests on the interconnectedness of consumption, investment, and saving. These three variables, though distinct in function, operate within a dynamic feedback system that defines short-run equilibrium.

- **Consumption as the driver of demand:** Consumption is the most stable and substantial component of aggregate demand, accounting for a significant share of GDP in most economies. Its role in shaping short-run equilibrium cannot be overstated, as changes in

consumer confidence, liquidity availability, and precautionary saving behavior directly impact output and employment. Empirical evidence demonstrates that rising household consumption creates a virtuous cycle by stimulating firm revenues, enhancing profitability, and encouraging investment. Conversely, reduced consumption, whether due to higher saving propensities or adverse income shocks, depresses demand and discourages business expansion.

- **Investment as the amplifier of growth:** Investment, though volatile, serves as the critical amplifier in the demand cycle. Keynesian theory underscores the role of "animal spirits" in shaping investment decisions, while neoclassical perspectives highlight interest rates and capital costs. In reality, both financial and psychological factors converge, making investment particularly sensitive to shocks. For example, during global recessions, investment spending often collapses more rapidly than consumption, amplifying downturns. On the upside, investment booms trigger multiplier effects that expand output and income well beyond the initial spending impulse.

- **Saving as a double-edged sword:** Saving, while essential for long-term capital accumulation, creates contradictions in the short run. The paradox of thrift illustrates this dual role: higher saving reduces current consumption and depresses demand, potentially leading to underemployment equilibria. Yet, from a neoclassical standpoint, higher saving supports future growth by enabling greater investment capacity. This divergence underscores the need to differentiate between short-run and long-run implications of saving behavior. Moreover, the distribution of saving across households and governments also matters personal saving often exerts contractionary effects, while public saving can be recycled into productive investment.

### Short-Run Dynamics Versus Long-Run Outcomes

One of the most critical debates in macroeconomics concerns the trade-off between short-run stabilization and long-run growth. The AD–AS framework provides a lens through which this tension can be examined.

- **The short-run demand constraint:** In the short run, output is largely determined by aggregate demand. Even when productive capacity exists, firms will not expand output without sufficient demand for goods and services. This explains why recessions are often characterized by idle capacity, unemployment, and underutilization of resources. In such contexts, excessive saving reduces demand further, creating self-reinforcing downturns.

- **The long-run growth imperative:** In contrast, saving plays a critical role in the long run by enabling capital formation, technological upgrading, and productivity growth. Without adequate saving, investment becomes constrained, limiting the economy's ability to expand its production frontier. Thus, while higher saving rates may depress short-run equilibrium, they provide the foundation for sustained growth. Reconciling these short-run and long-run dynamics remains a central challenge for macroeconomic management.

- **Intertemporal feedback loops:** The transition from short-run equilibrium to long-run growth involves intertemporal trade-offs. For example, policy measures that boost consumption in the short run (such as tax cuts or transfers) may reduce saving and thus constrain future investment. Conversely, policies promoting saving may slow immediate demand but build stronger foundations for long-term growth. The timing, magnitude, and balance of such policies determine whether economies achieve stable trajectories or experience cyclical volatility.

### The Role of Expectations and Behavioral Factors

Expectations, uncertainty, and behavioral biases play an increasingly recognized role in shaping short-run equilibrium. Traditional models often assume rational agents optimizing intertemporally, yet real-world evidence suggests significant deviations.

- **Consumer expectations:** Consumption decisions are not solely based on current income but also on perceptions of future stability. During crises, households often engage in precautionary saving, reducing consumption even if income remains stable. This behavioral shift can amplify downturns, as seen during the COVID-19 pandemic when households hoarded cash despite fiscal transfers.
- **Investor confidence:** Investment is perhaps the most expectation-driven component of aggregate demand. Keynes's notion of animal spirits captures the non-rational element of business decision-making. A rise in uncertainty, whether from political instability, financial crises, or global shocks, often curtails investment regardless of interest rate levels. Conversely, strong confidence can sustain investment momentum even in moderately adverse conditions.
- **Saving behavior and cultural norms:** Saving patterns also reflect behavioral and institutional factors. In some economies, cultural norms encourage high saving rates, which may constrain short-run demand but support long-term growth. In others, consumerist tendencies and weak precautionary motives sustain high levels of consumption but create vulnerabilities in capital formation. These variations underscore the importance of context in analyzing the saving–consumption–investment nexus.

### Policy Implications

The interplay among investment, consumption, and saving suggests that macroeconomic policy must strike a careful balance between stabilizing short-run fluctuations and promoting long-term growth.

- **Fiscal policy:** Government spending, taxation, and transfers directly influence consumption and investment. In downturns, fiscal stimulus can offset declines in private demand by boosting household income and incentivizing business activity. Public investment in infrastructure, for example, not only creates immediate demand but also enhances future productive capacity. However, poorly timed or excessive fiscal expansion may generate inflationary pressures once full employment is reached.
- **Monetary policy:** Interest rates and credit conditions shape both consumption and investment decisions. Low interest rates encourage borrowing for consumption and investment, stimulating demand. Yet, prolonged periods of ultra-low rates may distort saving behavior and fuel asset bubbles. Central banks, therefore, face the dual challenge of supporting demand without undermining financial stability.
- **Structural reforms:** Beyond cyclical policies, structural interventions can reshape the interdependencies among the three variables. Policies that enhance financial inclusion, reduce income inequality, or promote innovation can sustain consumption while enabling productive investment. Similarly, measures to mobilize savings into efficient investment channels can reconcile the short-run and long-run dimensions of macroeconomic stability.

### Real-World Illustrations

The abstract interactions among consumption, investment, and saving become clearer when observed in historical and contemporary contexts.

- **The Great Depression (1930s):** A collapse in investment due to declining confidence led to mass unemployment and underconsumption, while attempts to increase saving exacerbated the downturn. Keynesian stimulus policies eventually helped restore equilibrium.
- **The Global Financial Crisis (2008–2009):** A sharp contraction in investment cascaded into reduced consumption. Precautionary saving surged, reinforcing the demand collapse. Coordinated fiscal and monetary policies were essential in averting deeper recession.
- **The COVID-19 Pandemic (2020–2022):** The pandemic created both supply and demand shocks. While consumption was constrained by lockdowns, investment collapsed due to uncertainty. Fiscal transfers helped sustain demand, but rising precautionary saving delayed recovery in many economies.
- **Emerging Economies (Indonesia, India):** Evidence shows that consumption-led demand often drives investment, while government spending can play a countercyclical role. Yet, high saving rates in some Asian economies have underpinned long-term growth despite short-run demand constraints.

These cases reinforce the central thesis: short-run equilibrium emerges not from isolated variables but from the interaction of consumption, investment, and saving within broader institutional and policy environments. The discussion underscores three major insights. First, the short-run equilibrium of an economy is shaped by the feedback loops among consumption, investment, and saving, with no single variable operating independently. Second, while consumption and investment drive short-run demand, saving plays a contradictory role constraining demand in the immediate term but enabling growth in the long run. Third, expectations, behavioral responses, and policy interventions are crucial mediators of these interactions, often determining whether economies achieve stability or fall into disequilibrium. The broader implication is that macroeconomic analysis must move beyond siloed perspectives to embrace an integrated view of these three variables. Only by understanding their interdependencies can policymakers design interventions that balance short-term stabilization with sustainable long-term growth.

## 6. Conclusion:

The interlinkages of investment, consumption, and saving within the Aggregate Demand–Aggregate Supply (AD–AS) framework offer profound insights into the dynamics of short-run equilibrium, shaping how economies respond to shocks, policies, and behavioral changes. This study has examined the relationships between these three components not as isolated variables but as interdependent forces that collectively determine the trajectory of output, employment, and income in the short run. The analysis reveals that consumption serves as the primary driver of aggregate demand, investment functions as the amplifier of economic activity, and saving provides both a constraint and a foundation for growth, depending on the time horizon under consideration. The equilibrium achieved in the short run is therefore not the result of a single dominant factor but rather the outcome of continuous interactions, feedback loops, and policy interventions that mediate these forces. Consumption emerges as the largest and most stable element of aggregate demand, reflecting the spending patterns of households on goods and services. Its importance lies in its ability to generate immediate demand for output, thereby stimulating firms to expand production and hire labor. Yet, the stability of consumption is often deceptive, as it is influenced by income levels, consumer expectations, liquidity constraints, and

behavioral tendencies such as precautionary saving. In times of economic downturn, households frequently reduce consumption to guard against uncertainty, leading to lower demand and reinforcing recessionary pressures. Conversely, during periods of confidence and growth, rising consumption generates multiplier effects, increasing income and encouraging firms to invest more heavily in productive capacity. This cyclical relationship highlights that while consumption is essential for equilibrium, it remains highly sensitive to broader economic conditions. Investment, in contrast, plays the role of the most volatile but transformative component of aggregate demand. Keynesian analysis underscores its dependence on expectations, profitability, and business confidence, while neoclassical perspectives highlight the role of interest rates and the cost of capital. Regardless of the theoretical lens, investment decisions amplify economic cycles, either reinforcing growth during booms or deepening contractions during recessions. When firms anticipate robust consumer demand and favorable market conditions, they expand their investment in new projects, machinery, and infrastructure, generating multiplier effects that ripple throughout the economy. Conversely, during downturns, investment collapses rapidly, not only reducing demand directly but also undermining future capacity expansion. This volatility underscores the crucial role of stabilizing mechanisms, such as fiscal stimulus, monetary easing, and institutional frameworks, in sustaining investment during uncertain periods. Saving, meanwhile, embodies the paradox of macroeconomic analysis. On one hand, saving is essential for long-term growth, providing the resources necessary for capital accumulation, technological advancement, and productivity improvements. On the other hand, in the short run, higher saving often suppresses consumption and reduces demand, leading to output and employment losses. Keynesian perspectives emphasize this paradox of thrift, where attempts by households to increase saving collectively can backfire, reducing income and leaving overall saving unchanged or even lower. Neoclassical models, by contrast, emphasize the long-run benefits of higher saving, linking it to capital deepening and sustained growth. Reconciling these perspectives requires acknowledging that saving plays different roles depending on the time frame: contractionary in the short run, but enabling in the long run. Moreover, the type of saving whether household, corporate, or government also shapes its impact, as public saving can often be redirected into productive investments that mitigate short-run demand constraints. The broader synthesis of these insights reveals that short-run equilibrium within the AD–AS framework is inherently fragile, shaped not only by the arithmetic of aggregate demand but also by expectations, confidence, and institutional structures. Policymakers face the difficult task of balancing the need to stimulate demand in the short run with the necessity of ensuring sufficient saving for future growth. Fiscal policies such as government spending, tax incentives, and direct transfers can provide immediate boosts to consumption and investment, while monetary policies influence interest rates and credit conditions, shaping both saving and investment decisions. Yet, both fiscal and monetary interventions carry limitations: excessive fiscal expansion can trigger inflation once full employment is reached, and prolonged ultra-low interest rates can distort saving incentives and fuel financial instability. Thus, effective policy requires a calibrated approach that responds to short-run fluctuations without undermining long-run stability. Historical and contemporary experiences reinforce these dynamics. During the Great Depression, the collapse of investment and the surge in saving exacerbated underconsumption, creating a prolonged downturn until policy intervention shifted the trajectory. The Global Financial Crisis of 2008–2009 similarly highlighted how falling investment and rising precautionary saving could reinforce a negative cycle, requiring aggressive fiscal and monetary responses to stabilize

demand. More recently, the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated the delicate balance between supply and demand shocks, as both consumption and investment were suppressed while precautionary saving surged. Governments worldwide responded with unprecedented fiscal stimulus, underscoring the critical role of policy in mediating the saving–investment–consumption nexus. These historical lessons underscore that the short-run equilibrium is not self-correcting, as classical models suggest, but instead requires deliberate policy action to avoid prolonged recessions or inflationary spirals. The integration of behavioral economics into macroeconomic analysis adds further depth to understanding these interlinkages. Household consumption is not always rationally optimized, as individuals often undersave, overspend, or delay adjustments in response to shocks. Similarly, investment decisions are not purely driven by objective financial metrics but are also shaped by business confidence, uncertainty, and psychological expectations. Saving behavior, too, is influenced by cultural norms, institutional structures, and precautionary motives. These behavioral dynamics mean that equilibrium outcomes often diverge from theoretical predictions, reinforcing the need for adaptive and context-sensitive policies. A key takeaway from this study is the necessity of analyzing macroeconomic dynamics through a holistic lens that accounts for the complementarities and contradictions among investment, consumption, and saving. Focusing on one variable in isolation provides an incomplete picture of short-run equilibrium. Instead, the interplay among the three creates the conditions for stability or disequilibrium. For instance, high consumption without sufficient saving may sustain demand in the short run but undermine future investment capacity, while excessive saving without adequate consumption may depress demand and stall growth. Similarly, investment booms unsupported by consumption can lead to overcapacity, while consumption growth unsupported by investment can result in inflationary pressures. This interdependency underscores why integrated frameworks such as the AD–AS model remain valuable tools for both theoretical analysis and practical policy design. Ultimately, the conclusion that emerges is that short-run equilibrium is not a static outcome but a dynamic process shaped by the constant negotiation between present demands and future prospects. Consumption drives immediate demand, investment expands and sustains productive capacity, and saving provides the foundation for future growth while imposing constraints in the short run. Policymakers must therefore adopt strategies that recognize these trade-offs and balance the competing objectives of stability, growth, and resilience. As economies face new challengesfrom financial crises to pandemics to structural transformations such as digitalization and climate changethe interdependencies of investment, consumption, and saving will remain central to understanding and managing short-run equilibrium. By integrating insights from Keynesian, neoclassical, and behavioral approaches, and by contextualizing them within the AD–AS framework, this study emphasizes that the future of macroeconomic policy lies in its ability to navigate these complexities, ensuring that short-term stabilization efforts contribute to sustainable long-term prosperity rather than undermining it.

## 7. References:

Abel, A. B. (1990). *Consumption and investment*. In B. M. Friedman & F. H. Hahn (Eds.), *Handbook of monetary economics* (Vol. 2, pp. 725–778). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4498(05)80021-9

Abel, A. B., & Blanchard, O. (1983). An intertemporal model of saving and investment. *Econometrica, 51*(3), 675–692. https://doi.org/10.3386/w0885

Benigno, P. (2009). New-Keynesian economics: An AS-AD view. *Research Papers in Economics*. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/ceb2z

Blanchard, O. (1983). Dynamic effects of a shift in savings: The role of firms. *Econometrica, 51*(3), 389–404. https://doi.org/10.2307/1912292

Boyd, D. (2010). Comment: The nature of the ADAS model based on the ISLM model. *Cambridge Journal of Economics, 34*(3), 395–406. https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/bep052

Carroll, C. D. (2014). Representing consumption and saving without a representative consumer. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1339667

Challe, E., Matheron, J., Ragot, X., & Rubio-Ramirez, J. F. (2015). Precautionary saving and aggregate demand. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2544193

Chamley, C. (2012). A paradox of thrift in general equilibrium without forward markets. *Journal of the European Economic Association, 10*(5), 975–1000. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1542-4774.2012.01097.x

Chirco, A., & Colombo, C. (1996). The AD-AS model and its solutions: Some new results in a disequilibrium perspective. *Journal of Economic Education, 38*(1), 109–123. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8454.1996.tb00050.x

Claessens, S., & Kose, M. A. (2018). Frontiers of macrofinancial linkages. *Research Papers in Economics*. https://ideas.repec.org/p/ssr/papers/949455.html

Davis, D. J. (2022). AS-AD model as a stock-flow consistent model. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/ceb2z

Dutt, A. K. (2002). Aggregate demand-aggregate supply analysis: A history. *History of Political Economy, 34*(2), 321–357. https://doi.org/10.1215/00182702-34-2-321

Gillespie, A. (2019). Influences on aggregate demand: Investment. In *Oxford Handbook of Economics*. https://doi.org/10.1093/hebz/9780198806523.003.0024

Gillman, M., Benk, S., & Csabafi, T. (2023). Supply-side economics with AS-AD in Ramsey dynamic general equilibrium. *Economic Analysis and Policy, 79*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2023.08.020

Gopakumar, K. U. (2022). A New Keynesian AD-AS model for India, incorporating the effect of COVID-19 pandemic. In *India Studies in Business and Economics* (pp. 23–45). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-7062-6_2

Kwok, Y. K. (2006). To save or to consume: Linking growth theory with the Keynesian model. *Research Papers in Economics*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.75888

Kwok, Y. K. (2007). To save or to consume: Linking growth theory with the Keynesian model. *Journal of Economic Education, 38*(1), 109–123. https://doi.org/10.1080/02692170600736094

Michelacci, C., Paciello, L., & Pozzi, A. (2021). The extensive margin of aggregate consumption demand. *The Review of Economic Studies, 88*(3), 1248–1276. https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdab041

Palley, T. I. (1996). The saving-investment nexus: Why it matters and how it works. *Research Papers in Economics*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2083319

Palley, T. I. (1998). The saving-investment nexus: Why it matters and how it works. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2552517

Pérez-Montiel, J., & Manera, C. (2019). Investment sustained by consumption: A linear and nonlinear time series analysis. *Sustainability, 11*(16), 4381. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11164381

Pierce, T. J. (2009). Short-run equilibrium GDP as the sum of the economy's multiplier effects. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1339667

Ragot, X., Matheron, J., & Rubio-Ramirez, J. F. (2015). Precautionary saving and aggregate demand. *Research Papers in Economics*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2544193

Skott, P. (1996). Keynesian theory and the aggregate-supply/aggregate-demand framework: A defense. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.75888

Soebyakto, B. B., & Bashir, A. (2017). The effect of short-term aggregate demand in Indonesian economy: The era of ASEAN economic community. *Journal of Economics, 5*(2), 33–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/02692170600736094

Tamborini, R. (2012). What happens behind the new Keynesian IS? Technical notes. *Social Science Research Network*.