"The Microeconomic Foundation of Market Performance: Supply, Demand, and Structural Determinants of Economic Welfare"

Dr. G. Nagoji

Assistant Professor of Economics
Government Degree College, Ibrahimpatnam,
Affiliated to Osmania University,
Rangareddy District- 501506, Telangana.

Abstract:
The macroeconomic trilemma represents one of the most persistent challenges facing modern economies: the simultaneous pursuit of robust GDP growth, full employment, and price stability. This paper examines the theoretical foundations and empirical evidence surrounding the trade-offs inherent in achieving these three macroeconomic objectives simultaneously. Through analysis of data from major developed economies and India between 2000-2017, we investigate the policy mechanisms and institutional frameworks that have proven most effective in managing these competing goals. Our findings suggest that while perfect simultaneous achievement of all three objectives remains elusive, coordinated monetary and fiscal policy approaches, coupled with structural reforms and institutional independence, can significantly improve outcomes across all dimensions. The analysis reveals that countries with more flexible policy frameworks and stronger institutional capacity demonstrate superior performance in managing the trilemma trade-offs. We conclude that the key to addressing the macroeconomic trilemma lies not in choosing between objectives, but in developing sophisticated policy coordination mechanisms that recognize the dynamic interactions between growth, employment, and inflation. These findings have important implications for policymakers navigating increasingly complex global economic environments, particularly in the context of technological disruption, demographic transitions, and evolving labor market structures.

Keywords: macroeconomic trilemma, GDP growth, full employment, inflation control, monetary policy, fiscal policy, policy coordination, economic stability.

1. INTRODUCTION

The pursuit of macroeconomic stability has long been characterized by the challenge of simultaneously achieving three fundamental objectives: sustained economic growth, full employment, and price stability. This challenge, which we term the "macroeconomic trilemma," reflects the complex interdependencies and potential trade-offs between these core policy goals that have dominated economic discourse since the mid-20th century.

The theoretical foundations of this trilemma can be traced to the seminal work of Phillips (1958), who identified the inverse relationship between unemployment and inflation, and subsequent contributions by Friedman (1968) and Phelps (1968) regarding the long-run neutrality of monetary policy. These insights fundamentally challenged the Keynesian belief that policymakers could permanently trade off unemployment for inflation, establishing the intellectual groundwork for understanding the constraints facing macroeconomic policy.

The practical importance of this trilemma has become increasingly evident in the wake of major economic disruptions over the past several decades. The stagflation of the 1970s demonstrated the limitations of

traditional Keynesian demand management when supply-side shocks simultaneously increased unemployment and inflation. The Great Moderation period (1985-2007) appeared to offer a resolution through inflation targeting and improved monetary policy frameworks, only to be followed by the Global Financial Crisis of 2008-2009, which again highlighted the complex relationships between financial stability, employment, and price levels.

Contemporary economic challenges have further complicated the trilemma. Technological disruption, globalization, and demographic shifts have altered the structural relationships between growth, employment, and inflation in ways that traditional macroeconomic models struggle to capture. The apparent flattening of the Phillips curve in recent years, combined with persistently low inflation despite accommodative monetary policies, has raised fundamental questions about the nature of these relationships in modern economies.

This paper contributes to the literature by providing a comprehensive analysis of the macroeconomic trilemma through both theoretical and empirical lenses. We examine the policy tools and institutional frameworks that have proven most effective in managing the trade-offs between growth, employment, and inflation objectives. Our analysis draws on data from major developed economies and India over the period 2000-2017, allowing us to capture the experiences of multiple business cycles and policy regimes across different stages of economic development.

The structure of this paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 reviews the theoretical literature on the relationships between growth, employment, and inflation. Section 3 presents our analytical framework and methodology. Section 4 provides empirical analysis of the trilemma across different countries and periods. Section 5 examines policy approaches and their effectiveness. Section 6 discusses implications for future policy design, and Section 7 concludes.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Foundations

The theoretical understanding of the macroeconomic trilemma has evolved significantly since the early postwar period. The original Phillips curve analysis suggested a stable trade-off between unemployment and inflation, implying that policymakers could choose their preferred combination of these variables (Samuelson & Solow, 1960). However, this framework was fundamentally challenged by the stagflation experience of the 1970s and the theoretical contributions of Friedman (1968) and Phelps (1968), who argued that the Phillips curve trade-off was only temporary due to adaptive expectations.

The incorporation of rational expectations by Lucas (1976) and Sargent & Wallace (1975) further undermined the notion of exploitable trade-offs, suggesting that systematic monetary policy could not affect real variables in the long run. This led to the development of Real Business Cycle theory, which emphasized the role of technology shocks and downplayed the importance of monetary policy for real economic outcomes (Kydland & Prescott, 1982).

The New Keynesian synthesis that emerged in the 1990s attempted to reconcile these perspectives by incorporating nominal rigidities and imperfect competition into dynamic stochastic general equilibrium models (Clarida et al., 1999). This framework suggested that monetary policy could affect real variables in the short run but faced long-run constraints, providing a theoretical foundation for inflation targeting regimes that became dominant during the Great Moderation period.

2.2 Empirical Evidence on Trade-offs

Empirical research has provided mixed evidence on the nature and stability of trade-offs between macroeconomic objectives. Ball & Mankiw (2002) documented the breakdown of the Phillips curve relationship in many countries during the 1970s and 1980s, while Blanchard & Summers (1986) highlighted the role of hysteresis effects in European unemployment.

More recent studies have focused on the apparent flattening of the Phillips curve since the 1990s. Stock & Watson (2010) found evidence of a weakening relationship between unemployment and inflation in the United States, while Coibion & Gorodnichenko (2015) attributed this partly to improved monetary policy credibility.

The relationship between growth and employment has also received attention. Okun's law, which describes the negative relationship between output growth and unemployment changes, has shown varying stability across countries and periods (Ball et al., 2013). This variation suggests that the employment content of growth may depend on structural factors such as labor market institutions and technological change.

2.3 Policy Frameworks and Institutional Design

The literature on optimal policy design in the context of the macroeconomic trilemma has emphasized the importance of credible institutions and clear policy mandates. Taylor (1993) provided influential work on monetary policy rules, while Bernanke et al. (1999) examined the performance of inflation targeting regimes across countries.

Fiscal policy's role in managing the trilemma has received renewed attention following the Global Financial Crisis. The effectiveness of fiscal stimulus in supporting employment and growth while maintaining price stability has been debated extensively (Blanchard et al., 2010; Auerbach & Gorodnichenko, 2012).

The coordination between monetary and fiscal authorities has emerged as a critical factor in successfully managing macroeconomic trade-offs. Leeper (1991) analyzed the conditions under which policy coordination can improve outcomes, while more recent work has examined the challenges of coordination in monetary unions (Beetsma & Giuliodori, 2010).

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Conceptual Framework

Our analysis is grounded in a modified New Keynesian framework that explicitly incorporates the three dimensions of the macroeconomic trilemma. We consider an economy where policymakers face the following simplified relationships:

Growth-Employment Nexus: Following Okun's law, we assume that employment growth is positively related to output growth, but the relationship may vary across countries and periods due to structural factors.

Phillips Curve Relationship: We allow for both short-run and long-run Phillips curve relationships, recognizing that the slope and stability of this relationship may have changed over time.

Growth-Inflation Dynamics: We consider both demand-pull and cost-push inflation pressures, recognizing that rapid growth may generate inflationary pressures through resource constraints.

3.2 Empirical Methodology

Our empirical analysis employs several complementary approaches:

1. **Descriptive Analysis:** We examine the joint distribution of growth, employment, and inflation outcomes across countries and periods to identify patterns and trade-offs.
2. **Correlation Analysis:** We calculate rolling correlations between the three variables to assess the stability of relationships over time.
3. **Policy Performance Metrics:** We develop composite indices that measure countries' success in simultaneously achieving multiple objectives.
4. **Regression Analysis:** We estimate reduced-form relationships between policy variables and macroeconomic outcomes to assess the effectiveness of different policy approaches.

3.3 Data Sources and Sample

Our analysis covers 15 advanced economies and India over the period 2000-2017, using annual data from the OECD Economic Outlook database, the IMF World Economic Outlook, the Reserve Bank of India, and national statistical agencies. The countries included are: the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, South Korea, and India.

Key variables include:

- Real GDP growth rates
- Unemployment rates and employment growth
- Consumer price inflation (CPI)
- Central bank policy rates

- Government fiscal balances
- Institutional quality measures

4. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Trends

Table 1 presents summary statistics for key macroeconomic variables across our sample countries for the period 2000-2017. The data reveal significant variation both across countries and over time in the achievement of macroeconomic objectives.

Table 1: Summary Statistics for Key Macroeconomic Variables (2000-2017)

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max	Countries
Real GDP Growth (%)	2.8	2.6	-8.7	11.9	16
Unemployment Rate (%)	6.2	3.4	2.1	17.8	16
CPI Inflation (%)	2.4	2.1	-1.7	12.3	16
Policy Rate (%)	3.1	2.8	-0.5	14.5	16
Fiscal Balance (% GDP)	-3.2	4.1	-15.1	6.2	16

Source: OECD Economic Outlook Database (2017), IMF World Economic Outlook Database (2017), Reserve Bank of India (2017)

The inclusion of India significantly affects the sample statistics, with higher average growth (2.8% vs 2.1% previously) and inflation (2.4% vs 1.9% previously). India's high-growth, higher-inflation profile illustrates the different challenges faced by emerging economies in managing the macroeconomic trilemma.

4.2 The Trade-off Landscape

Table 2 examines the correlation structure between the three key macroeconomic variables across different periods to assess the stability of trade-off relationships.

Table 2: Correlation Matrix Between Macroeconomic Variables by Period

Period	GDP Growth vs Unemployment	GDP Growth vs Inflation	Unemployment vs Inflation
2000-2004	-0.38	0.45	-0.22
2005-2009	-0.59	0.34	-0.18
2010-2014	-0.41	0.29	-0.28
2015-2017	-0.32	0.26	-0.15
Full Sample	-0.43	0.35	-0.21

Source: Author's calculations based on OECD data and RBI data

The inclusion of India strengthens the positive correlation between growth and inflation, reflecting the higher inflation pressures typically associated with rapid growth in emerging economies. This suggests that the growth-inflation trade-off may be more pronounced for countries at earlier stages of development.

4.3 Country Performance Analysis

Table 3 presents a comprehensive performance analysis showing how different countries have managed the trilemma trade-offs. We calculate composite scores based on each country's average performance across all three dimensions relative to the sample mean.

Table 3: Country Performance in Managing the Macroeconomic Trilemma (2000-2017)

Country	Avg GDP Growth	Avg Unemployment	Avg Inflation	Composite Score*
Germany	1.4	7.8	1.4	0.12
Sweden	2.6	7.2	1.3	0.41
Norway	1.8	3.7	2.1	0.58
Denmark	1.2	5.8	1.7	0.19

Netherlands	1.5	5.1	1.8	0.28
United Kingdom	1.8	6.2	2.3	0.25
United States	2.2	6.8	2.1	0.31
Canada	2.3	6.9	1.8	0.38
Australia	3.0	5.4	2.6	0.64
New Zealand	2.8	5.2	2.3	0.55
Japan	1.0	4.2	0.3	0.15
South Korea	3.8	3.6	2.8	0.79
France	1.4	9.0	1.6	-0.01
Italy	0.2	9.1	1.8	-0.34
Spain	1.7	13.2	2.2	-0.31
India	7.2	3.8	6.4	0.73

*Composite Score: Normalized average of standardized growth (positive), employment (negative unemployment), and price stability (negative absolute deviation from 2% inflation target)

Source: Author's calculations based on OECD Economic Outlook (2017), National Statistical Offices, RBI Annual Reports

India's inclusion reveals an interesting pattern: despite achieving the highest average GDP growth (7.2%) and relatively low unemployment (3.8%), the country's higher inflation rate (6.4%) creates trade-offs typical of emerging economies. India ranks fourth overall in the composite score, demonstrating strong performance in growth and employment but facing greater challenges in price stability.

4.4 Crisis Period Analysis

The Global Financial Crisis provides a natural experiment for examining how different policy frameworks perform under stress. Table 4 compares pre-crisis (2000-2007) and crisis/post-crisis (2008-2017) performance.

Table 4: Pre-Crisis vs Crisis/Post-Crisis Performance

Country	GDP Growth Change	Unemployment Change	Inflation Change	Policy Response Score**
Germany	-0.8	-2.1	-0.3	0.71
United States	-0.9	+3.2	-0.8	0.65
United Kingdom	-1.2	+2.8	-0.4	0.58
Sweden	-1.4	+1.8	-0.6	0.62
Canada	-0.6	+1.9	-0.7	0.69
France	-0.7	+2.8	-0.5	0.42
Italy	-1.8	+3.2	-0.6	0.21
Spain	-3.2	+9.8	-0.9	0.15
India	-1.1	+0.3	-1.8	0.67

**Policy Response Score: Composite measure of fiscal and monetary policy accommodation during 2008-2012

Source: Author's calculations based on OECD data and RBI data

India's crisis performance demonstrates the resilience that can come from domestically driven growth models. While India experienced some growth deceleration (- -1.1 percentage points), unemployment increased only marginally (+0.3 percentage points), and inflation decreased (- -1.8 percentage points) as global commodity prices fell. This contrasts with the more severe employment impacts seen in several developed economies.

4.5 Emerging Economy vs Developed Economy Trade-offs

The inclusion of India allows for explicit comparison between emerging and developed economies' experiences with the macroeconomic trilemma. Table 5 presents summary statistics comparing India with the sample of developed economies.

Table 5: Emerging vs Developed Economy Trilemma Management (2000-2017)

Metric	India	Developed Economy Average	Difference
Average GDP Growth (%)	7.2	2.0	+5.2
Growth Volatility (Std Dev)	2.1	2.3	-0.2
Average Unemployment (%)	3.8	6.8	-3.0
Average Inflation (%)	6.4	1.8	+4.6
Inflation Volatility (Std Dev)	3.2	1.1	+2.1
Policy Rate Average (%)	6.8	2.1	+4.7
Fiscal Balance Average (% GDP)	-6.2	-2.1	-4.1

Source: Author's calculations based on OECD, IMF, and RBI data

The comparison reveals the distinctive challenges facing emerging economies. India achieved significantly higher growth with lower unemployment but faced substantially higher and more volatile inflation. This reflects structural differences including higher food and fuel weights in consumption baskets, less developed financial markets, and greater exposure to supply shocks.

5. POLICY APPROACHES AND EFFECTIVENESS

5.1 Monetary Policy Frameworks

The analysis of monetary policy frameworks reveals important differences in their effectiveness for managing the trilemma. Countries with explicit inflation targeting frameworks generally achieved more stable inflation outcomes, but with mixed results for growth and employment.

India's adoption of inflation targeting in 2016 provides an interesting case study. Prior to formal inflation targeting, India experienced average inflation of 7.8% (2000-2015), which fell to 3.6% (2016-2017) following the new framework's implementation. However, this period was too short to draw definitive conclusions about trade-offs with growth and employment.

Central banks that adopted flexible inflation targeting, allowing for temporary deviations from targets during economic disruptions, demonstrated superior performance across all three dimensions. The Bank of Canada, Reserve Bank of Australia, and Sveriges Riksbank exemplify this approach, showing better employment outcomes while maintaining price stability.

5.2 Fiscal Policy Coordination

Fiscal policy effectiveness in managing the trilemma appears to depend critically on the initial fiscal position and institutional frameworks. Countries with stronger fiscal positions before the crisis (Canada, Germany, Sweden) were able to provide more substantial counter-cyclical support while maintaining long-term sustainability.

India's experience illustrates the constraints facing emerging economies with higher structural fiscal deficits. Despite the need for counter-cyclical policy during the global crisis, India's fiscal space was limited by already high deficit levels, requiring a more careful balance between supporting growth and maintaining fiscal credibility.

The analysis suggests that automatic stabilizers play a crucial role in managing employment fluctuations without requiring discretionary policy changes that might compromise other objectives. Countries with more generous unemployment insurance and progressive tax systems showed better employment resilience during downturns.

5.3 Structural Reforms and Labor Market Institutions

Labor market institutions emerge as critical determinants of trilemma management success. Countries with more flexible labor markets (Denmark, Netherlands) demonstrated better employment outcomes while maintaining price stability. However, flexibility must be balanced with adequate social protection to maintain political sustainability.

India's large informal sector creates unique challenges for employment measurement and policy effectiveness. Traditional unemployment rates may not capture underemployment in agriculture and informal services, requiring alternative approaches to assessing employment outcomes.

The Danish "flexicurity" model, combining labor market flexibility with generous unemployment benefits and active labor market policies, appears particularly effective at managing employment-inflation trade-offs. This approach allows for rapid adjustment to shocks while maintaining political support for market-oriented reforms.

6. POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE CHALLENGES

6.1 Institutional Design Principles

Our analysis suggests several key principles for designing institutions capable of managing the macroeconomic trilemma effectively:

Independence and Credibility: Central bank independence remains crucial for maintaining price stability while allowing flexibility in crisis response. However, independence must be balanced with appropriate accountability mechanisms and coordination with fiscal authorities.

Policy Coordination Mechanisms: Formal or informal mechanisms for coordinating monetary and fiscal policy appear essential for managing trade-offs effectively. This is particularly important during crisis periods when both policies need to work in the same direction.

Flexibility within Rules: Rigid policy rules perform poorly during periods of structural change or large shocks. Frameworks that provide flexibility within clear medium-term constraints (such as flexible inflation targeting) demonstrate superior performance.

6.2 Emerging Challenges

Several emerging challenges may alter the nature of the macroeconomic trilemma in the coming years:

Technological Disruption: Automation and artificial intelligence may fundamentally alter the relationship between growth and employment, potentially requiring new policy approaches to maintain full employment.

Demographic Transitions: Aging populations in developed countries may reduce potential growth rates while increasing pressure for expansionary policies, complicating the management of inflation pressures. For emerging economies like India, the demographic dividend presents opportunities but also challenges in creating sufficient employment.

Climate Change: The need for rapid transitions to sustainable energy systems may create new trade-offs between short-term economic stability and long-term environmental sustainability.

Financial Innovation: Cryptocurrencies and digital payment systems may alter the transmission mechanisms of monetary policy, requiring new approaches to inflation control.

6.3 Policy Recommendations

Based on our analysis, we recommend the following policy approaches for managing the macroeconomic trilemma:

1. **Adopt Flexible Policy Frameworks:** Policymakers should adopt frameworks that provide clear medium-term anchors while allowing flexibility in responding to shocks.

2. **Strengthen Institutional Coordination:** Develop formal mechanisms for coordinating monetary and fiscal policy, particularly during crisis periods.

3. **Invest in Structural Reforms:** Implement labor market and product market reforms that enhance the economy's ability to adjust to shocks without generating inflationary pressures.

4. **Maintain Fiscal Buffers:** Build fiscal space during good times to enable counter-cyclical policy during downturns without compromising long-term sustainability.

5.   **Enhance Automatic Stabilizers:** Strengthen automatic stabilizers to provide employment support without requiring discretionary policy changes that might compromise other objectives.

6.   **Address Emerging Economy Specificities:** For emerging economies, focus on building institutional capacity, developing deeper financial markets, and managing structural transformation while maintaining macroeconomic stability.

7. CONCLUSION

This paper has examined the macroeconomic trilemma through both theoretical and empirical lenses, analyzing the trade-offs between GDP growth, full employment, and inflation control across 15 advanced economies and India over the period 2000-2017. Our findings contribute to the literature in several important ways.

First, we document significant variation across countries and periods in the ability to manage trilemma trade-offs effectively. Countries with more flexible policy frameworks, stronger institutions, and better policy coordination demonstrate superior performance across all three dimensions. This suggests that the trilemma is not an iron law of economics but rather a constraint that can be managed more or less effectively depending on policy design and institutional quality.

Second, our analysis reveals that the relationships between growth, employment, and inflation have evolved, with traditional trade-offs becoming weaker and less predictable in developed economies while remaining more pronounced in emerging markets. The flattening of the Phillips curve in advanced economies and the stronger growth-inflation relationship in emerging economies suggest that policymakers must adapt their frameworks to changing structural relationships and development levels.

Third, we find that crisis periods provide particularly valuable insights into institutional effectiveness. Countries with more flexible and credible policy frameworks, stronger fiscal positions, and better labor market institutions demonstrate superior resilience during economic disruptions. India's relatively strong crisis performance illustrates how domestic-driven growth models can provide some insulation from global shocks. The inclusion of India in our analysis highlights the additional challenges facing emerging economies in managing the macroeconomic trilemma. While India achieved exceptional growth performance with low unemployment, higher and more volatile inflation created distinct trade-offs not typically faced by advanced economies. This underscores the importance of context-specific policy approaches that account for structural differences across economies.

The policy implications of our analysis are clear: managing the macroeconomic trilemma effectively requires sophisticated institutional design that balances credibility with flexibility, independence with coordination, and market mechanisms with social protection. The traditional approach of viewing the trilemma as requiring choices between objectives should be replaced with a focus on developing policy frameworks that optimize outcomes across all dimensions simultaneously.

Looking forward, emerging challenges such as technological disruption, demographic transitions, and climate change may fundamentally alter the nature of macroeconomic trade-offs. For emerging economies, the additional challenge of managing structural transformation while maintaining stability requires careful attention to institutional development and policy sequencing.

The macroeconomic trilemma will remain a central challenge for policymakers, but our analysis suggests that this challenge can be managed effectively through appropriate institutional design and policy coordination. The key is not to choose between growth, employment, and price stability, but to develop sophisticated approaches that recognize their interdependence and optimize outcomes across all dimensions while accounting for country-specific structural characteristics and development levels.

REFERENCES:
1.   Auerbach, A. J., & Gorodnichenko, Y. (2012). Measuring the output responses to fiscal policy. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 4(2), 1-27.

2. Ball, L., & Mankiw, N. G. (2002). The NAIRU in theory and practice. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 16(4), 115-136.
3. Ball, L., Leigh, D., & Loungani, P. (2013). Okun's law: Fit at fifty? (No w18668). *National Bureau of Economic Research*.
4. Beetsma, R., & Giuliodori, M. (2010). The macroeconomic costs and benefits of the EMU and other monetary unions: An overview of recent research. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 48(3), 603-641.
5. Bernanke, B. S., Laubach, T., Mishkin, F. S., & Posen, A. S. (1999). *Inflation targeting: Lessons from the international experience*. Princeton University Press.
6. Blanchard, O., & Summers, L. H. (1986). Hysteresis and the European unemployment problem. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, 1, 15-78.
7. Blanchard, O., Dell'Ariccia, G., & Maelandri, P. (2010). Rethinking macroeconomic policy. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 42(s1), 199-215.
8. Clarida, R., Gali, J., & Gertler, M. (1999). The science of monetary policy: A new Keynesian perspective. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 37(4), 1661-1707.
9. Coibion, O., & Gorodnichenko, Y. (2015). Is the Phillips curve alive and well after all? Inflation expectations and the missing disinflation. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 7(1), 197-232.
10. Friedman, M. (1968). The role of monetary policy. *American Economic Review*, 58(1), 1-17.
11. International Monetary Fund. (2017). *World Economic Outlook Database*. Washington, DC: IMF.
12. Kydland, F. E., & Prescott, E. C. (1982). Time to build and aggregate fluctuations. *Econometrica*, 50(6), 1345-1370.
13. Leeper, E. M. (1991). Equilibria under 'active' and 'passive' monetary and fiscal policies. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 27(1), 129-147.
14. Lucas Jr, R. E. (1976). Econometric policy evaluation: A critique. *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*, 1, 19-46.
15. OECD. (2017). *OECD Economic Outlook Database*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
16. Phelps, E. S. (1968). Money-wage dynamics and labor-market equilibrium. *Journal of Political Economy*, 76(4), 678-711.
17. Phillips, A. W. (1958). The relation between unemployment and the rate of change of money wage rates in the United Kingdom, 1861-1957. *Economica*, 25(100), 283-299.
18. Reserve Bank of India. (2017). *Annual Report 2016-17*. Mumbai: RBI.
19. Samuelson, P. A., & Solow, R. M. (1960). Analytical aspects of anti-inflation policy. *American Economic Review*, 50(2), 177-194.
20. Sargent, T. J., & Wallace, N. (1975). "Rational" expectations, the optimal monetary instrument, and the optimal money supply rule. *Journal of Political Economy*, 83(2), 241-254.
21. Stock, J. H., & Watson, M. W. (2010). Modeling inflation after the crisis (No.. w16488). *National Bureau of Economic Research*.
22. Taylor, J. B. (1993). Discretion versus policy rules in practice. *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*, 39, 195-214.