Application and Limitation of Fisher Model

Yulun Han *

International Accounting and Financial Management, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom

* Corresponding Author Email: 2840641h@student.gla.ac.uk

Abstract. This essay explores the Fisher Effect hypothesis, which posits a direct relationship between nominal interest rates and expected inflation. It delves into the Fisher model's concept, its implications, and its significance in economics. The research question of the model's validity and applicability is examined through a review of current research findings, revealing mixed results. The essay highlights the diverse applications of the Fisher model in monetary policy, finance, and decision-making across various economic sectors. However, it also discusses the model's limitations, including its assumptions, data quality concerns, short-term focus, and neglect of risk premiums. Future research directions are proposed to enhance the model's accuracy and applicability. In conclusion, this essay emphasizes the importance of recognizing both the strengths and weaknesses of the Fisher Effect and the need for ongoing refinement in its application to navigate the complexities of the economic landscape.

Keywords: Fisher Model; Application; Limitation.

1. Introduction

According to the Fisher Effect hypothesis, nominal interest rates can be calculated by adding real interest rates and expected inflation [1]. This hypothesis states that any change in inflation that is permanent will also cause a change in nominal interest rates. The Fisher relationship is another name for the one-to-one link between nominal interest rates and anticipated inflation. There are two key implications of this hypothesis: First, it suggests that nominal interest rates and anticipated inflation rates have a long-term equilibrium association; secondly, it contends that real interest rates remain unaffected by changes in inflation rates, as they are solely determined by concrete economic factors like capital efficiency and investor time preferences [1].

The assessment of the soundness of the Fisher model has garnered significant scholarly interest. If the principles of the Fisher model are confirmed, it would suggest that nominal interest rates would vary in line with inflation rates. This would imply a noticeable weakening of the effectiveness of monetary policy on real interest rates. Nevertheless, it is evident that the driving force behind various economic behaviors, such as investment, savings, and consumption, is solely determined by real interest rates. Mishkin conducted an empirical investigation using the EG two-step cointegration test to examine the link between monthly inflation rates and government bond rates in the United States from 1964 to 1986 [2]. The investigation ultimately led to the identification of the persistent existence of the long-term Fisher model. Following their initial research, Wallace and Warner conducted more investigations that went beyond the intricacies of the Johansen cointegration test [3]. These further studies aimed to provide additional validation for both the Fisher model and the interest rate term structure expectations theory paradigm. Additional research endeavors, particularly the works of Crowder and Wohar, not only affirm but significantly strengthen the idea that nominal interest rates and inflation rates have a long-term equilibrium connection [4]. However, in a contrasting manner, the study conducted by MacDonald and Murphy yielded contrasting results [5]. After conducting a thorough analysis of quarterly data obtained from Belgium, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States, the researchers found no evidence to support the presence of cointegration between nominal interest rates and inflation rates in any of the above countries. In a subsequent study, Rose examined this domain using the Dickey-Fuller (DF) unit root test [6], undertaking a thorough research that included 18 member states of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

(OECD). The observations obtained from this study provide evidence that real interest rates in certain economic jurisdictions exhibit non-stationary characteristics.

The Fisher Effect theory has generated contradictory findings and differing interpretations, which has prompted the establishment of the following key research question: How well does the Fisher model work in explaining how nominal interest rates, real interest rates, and expected inflation are related to one another? The objective of this study is to provide a thorough assessment of the Fisher model, elucidating its merits, drawbacks, and ramifications for economic theory and policy. The research question's significance resides in its ability to enhance our comprehension of the intricate dynamics that underlie the interplay between interest rates and inflation. The evaluation of the Fisher model's validity holds significant importance for policymakers, economists, and market participants as it enables them to make well-informed judgments pertaining to monetary policy, investment strategies, and economic forecasts. Moreover, conducting a comprehensive analysis of the constraints of the Fisher model can enhance the precision of economic models and theories, hence guaranteeing their applicability in dynamic real-world situations.

2. The Application of Fisher Model

2.1. Definition and Derivation

The Fisher Model states that the nominal interest rate is composed of two components: the real interest rate and the expected inflation rate. Mathematically, it can be expressed as follows,

$$(1+i)=(1+r)\times(1+\pi) \tag{1}$$

Where, i represents the nominal interest rate, r represents the real interest rate, and π represents the expected inflation rate.

The equation expresses the relationship that the nominal interest rate is equal to the product of the real interest rate and the expected inflation rate, with the addition of one [7]. Taking into consideration the impact of inflation, the real interest rate represents the portion of the nominal interest rate that encompasses the actual buying power generated by lending or investing [7].

The Fisher model is derived from the conceptual framework of temporal valuation of monetary assets and the impact of inflation on the intrinsic value of currency. The explication will be conducted in a systematic and orderly fashion. Beginning with the concept of the Time Value of Money, the fundamental concept of the time value of money is that a monetary amount in the present has a higher worth compared to an equivalent amount in the future. This statement arises from the intrinsic ability of currency units to generate returns depending on interest or investments. This fundamental principle can be succinctly expressed by employing the following equation,

$$(1+i)=\frac{1}{(1+r)^t}, \tag{2}$$

Where t represents the time period.

Considering inflation impact, inflation reduces the purchasing power of money over time. If π represents the expected inflation rate, then the value of money in the future will be reduced by$(1+\pi)^t$. Therefore, the real value of money after accounting for inflation can be represented as,

$$Real\ \ Value=\frac{1}{(1+\pi)^t} \tag{3}$$

Combining the concepts of time value of money and inflation impact:

$$(1+i)=\frac{1}{(1+r)^t}+(1+\pi)^t \tag{4}$$

Therefore, the Fisher model can be derivate as:

$$(1+i)=(1+r)\times(1+\pi) \tag{5}$$

2.2. The Application

2.2.1. The Application in Economic

The application of the Fisher model is primarily concentrated within the domain of economics. King et al. extended this framework to scrutinize four long-run neutrality propositions [8], notably: (i) the neutrality of money, and (ii) the superneutrality of money. Employing an expectations-based model of the term structure of interest rates, the authors established the conditions under which innovations in short-term inflation would propagate to both short-term and long-term interest rates, as expounded by Wallace et al... And Kuosmanen et al. pioneered the development of a precise decomposition for the Fisher ideal Total Factor Productivity (TFP) index [9, 10]. Remarkably, this decomposition obviated contentious mixed-period components or residuals, contributing to the index's robustness. Ahn et al. embarked on a quest to ascertain the optimal level of quantitative easing required to surmount economic crises [11]. They pursued a strategic evaluation to identify the most effective extent of quantitative easing necessary to navigate through turbulent economic circumstances. Ongan et al. approached the Fisher effect from a fresh methodological perspective, deviating from prior studies that relied on the prevalent linear representation of the Fisher equation [12]. Their study aimed to investigate the existence of the Fisher effect in the United States, employing innovative methodological techniques. Economists also harness the Fisher model for macroeconomic forecasting, a process critical to policymakers and businesses alike. Giacomini and Rossi and Stock and Watson attest to the model's utility in predicting future interest rates and inflation rates, enabling accurate macroeconomic predictions [13, 14]. These forecasts provide essential insights for strategic planning and decision-making, fostering economic stability.

2.2.2. Application in Stock Markets

Breaking down the research areas of the Fisher model, some scholars have emphasized the application of the Fisher model in the stock market. The study of the Fisher effect in the stock market began in the 1970s. Bodie utilized monthly, quarterly, and annual data from the United States spanning from 1953 to 1972 [15]. Lintner used annual data covering the years 1901 to 1970 in the United States [16]. Nelson conducted a regression analysis using monthly data from January 1953 to June 1974 in the United States [17]. All these studies found a negative correlation between the inflation rate and (nominal) stock returns. Another research direction regarding the Fisher effect in the stock market examines the relationship between inflation rate and stock returns over longer time spans. Boudoukh and Richardson examined data spanning from 1802 to 1990 for the United States and the United Kingdom in 5-year intervals [18]. The results indicated a positive correlation between both real and expected inflation rates and stock returns, suggesting the presence of the Fisher effect over the long term. Engsted and Tanggaard performed empirical analyses using 1-year and 5-year data from the United States (1926-1997) and Denmark (1922-1996) [19]. They found that the Fisher effect was more apparent in Denmark's stock market using 5-year data, whereas the opposite was observed for the United States. Anari and Kolari argued that the computation of stock returns and inflation rates might lead to the loss of long-term information [20]. Therefore, they conducted their research by substituting stock prices and price indices for stock returns and inflation rates, respectively. Using monthly data from January 1953 to December 1998, they empirically tested six countries and found that the Fisher effect held and was statistically significant in all six countries' stock markets.

2.2.3. Application in Monetary Policy

Some scholars have also applied the Fisher model to the study of monetary policy. Wallace and Warner employed the Johansen maximum likelihood statistical method to demonstrate a proportionate adjustment relationship between nominal interest rates and inflation rates [21]. Mishkin and Simon, using data from the United States and Australia, empirically showed the presence of significant long-term Fisher effects in certain periods in both countries [22], despite the absence of short-term Fisher effects. Central banks across the globe rely on the Fisher model's central tenets for

monetary policy design, particularly in the context of inflation targeting. This approach, backed by research from Taylor, capitalizes on the model's incorporation of inflation expectations, enabling central banks to strategically adjust nominal interest rates to achieve their inflation targets [23]. By dissecting the complex interplay between nominal and real interest rates, the Fisher model offers insights critical to the formulation of effective monetary policies.

For businesses navigating capital budgeting decisions, the Fisher model emerges as a guiding light. Brealey, Myers, and Allen emphasize its role in factoring expected inflation into cost of capital calculations [24]. Such considerations equip firms with the ability to make informed judgments concerning capital projects and investments, ensuring alignment with broader economic conditions.

2.2.4. Application in Other Areas

The Fisher model finds application in the real estate market. Malpezzi highlight its relevance in assessing the impact of expected inflation on mortgage rates [25], influencing housing affordability and market trends. Furthermore, the model's insights extend to the international arena, aiding in the understanding of exchange rate movements and their repercussions on international trade and finance, as studied by Engel and West [26]. Financial institutions also draw upon the Fisher model for risk management and hedging strategies. Hull emphasize its role in assessing interest rate risk and guiding the design of effective risk mitigation measures [27]. By integrating expected inflation into risk assessments, institutions can proactively manage potential losses arising from interest rate fluctuations.

Moreover, the Fisher model's implications extend to individual savers and investors. Tobin and Modigliani and Brumberg demonstrate its value in assessing the real return on investments by comparing real interest rates to expected inflation [28, 29]. This aids individuals in making informed decisions concerning their savings and investments.

In summary, the Fisher model's applications span a wide range of economic analysis. It is commonly used in monetary policy discussions, financial market analysis, investment decision-making, and macroeconomic forecasting. By examining the interrelation between nominal and real variables, the Fisher model provides insights into the behavior of interest rates and their implications for economic stability and growth.

3. Limitations of the Fisher Model

The Fisher model, while serving as a valuable tool in economic analysis, is not without its limitations. These constraints encompass both theoretical assumptions and empirical challenges, which warrant careful consideration when interpreting its implications.

3.1. Model Limitations

The assumptions underlying the Fisher model have been subjects of scrutiny. Researchers such as Johnson et al. have highlighted the model's inability to account for abrupt changes in inflation expectations [30]. This assumption undermines the model's ability to accurately capture shifts in nominal and real interest rates caused by varying economic conditions. Consequently, the Fisher model may struggle to provide accurate predictions in dynamic economic environments.

3.2. Data Quality Concerns

Empirical challenges arise from the accuracy of data used in the Fisher model. Gali et al. underscore the vulnerability of the model's results to measurement errors in inflation expectations data [31]. The precision of these expectations is crucial for the model's reliability, as inaccuracies can lead to distorted relationships between nominal and real interest rates. This limitation casts doubt on the robustness of the model's predictions, particularly when based on imperfect data.

3.3. Short-Term Focus

The Fisher model predominantly captures short-term interest rate dynamics, potentially neglecting the influence of long-term structural factors. Lustig and Verdelhan suggest that this short-term focus may not adequately account for persistent economic trends [32]. By failing to consider broader economic forces that shape interest rate behavior over extended periods, the Fisher model's explanatory power in certain contexts can be limited.

3.4. Unrealistic Assumption of Rational Expectations

The model assumes rational expectations, implying perfect foresight of future inflation by economic agents. However, Mankiw and Reis argue that this assumption might not align with empirical evidence [33]. Agents' expectations can be influenced by behavioral factors and psychological biases, suggesting that the model's rational expectations premise might not hold true in all cases. This disconnect raises questions about the model's ability to accurately capture the complexity of expectation formation.

3.5. Inflation Volatility

While the Fisher model assumes stable expected inflation rates, real-world inflation can exhibit considerable volatility. Coibion and Gorodnichenko highlight how this volatility can affect the model's reliability in forecasting interest rates. Fluctuations in inflation can lead to unexpected shifts in nominal and real interest rates [34], challenging the model's predictive accuracy in periods of heightened economic uncertainty.

3.6. Neglect of Risk Premiums

The Fisher model's simplicity often leads to the omission of factors like risk premiums and market uncertainties. Bansal and Shaliastovich emphasize that risk premiums play a crucial role in shaping interest rate dynamics [35]. By overlooking these critical elements, the model's predictions may not fully capture the complexities of real-world financial markets and the factors that influence interest rates.

In summation, the Fisher model's limitations encompass theoretical assumptions and empirical challenges that can affect its accuracy and applicability. By acknowledging these constraints, researchers can navigate the model's utility with greater awareness of its potential shortcomings.

4. Future Research Considerations

4.1. Refinement of Inflation Expectations

A promising avenue for future research involves enhancing the Fisher model by incorporating time-varying inflation expectations. This adjustment would better capture the dynamic nature of inflation forecasts, allowing the model to adapt more effectively to changing economic conditions. Exploring techniques such as incorporating survey data, financial market indicators, and machine learning approaches can contribute to a more accurate representation of inflation expectations, thereby improving the model's overall predictive performance.

4.2. Cross-Country Analysis of Effectiveness

An intriguing area of investigation is the examination of cross-country variations in the Fisher model's effectiveness. Researchers can delve into the factors that contribute to differences in the model's performance across various economic contexts. This could involve considering structural variations, institutional differences, and the extent to which underlying assumptions hold in different countries. Comparative studies could shed light on the model's applicability and provide insights into potential adjustments needed for its successful use across diverse economies.

These future research directions have the potential to further advance our understanding of the Fisher model's limitations and its ability to accurately capture the complex dynamics of inflation, interest rates, and their implications for economic decision-making. By addressing these considerations, researchers can contribute to the ongoing refinement of the Fisher model and its applicability in real-world economic analyses.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the Fisher Effect hypothesis, which posits a direct relationship between nominal interest rates and expected inflation, has been a subject of extensive research and analysis. This essay has explored the concept of the Fisher Effect, reviewed current research findings, and highlighted its significance in the field of economics. The research question, "To what degree can the Fisher model be deemed valid and applicable in comprehending the connection between nominal interest rates, real interest rates, and anticipated inflation?" has been central to this investigation. The diverse range of studies reviewed has revealed mixed results, indicating that the Fisher Effect is not universally applicable and may depend on various economic factors and contexts.

Despite its limitations, the Fisher model has found wide-ranging applications in economics, finance, and policy-making. It has been instrumental in guiding monetary policy decisions, aiding businesses in capital budgeting, facilitating macroeconomic forecasting, and informing individual investment choices. Furthermore, its relevance extends to areas such as the stock market, real estate, international trade, and risk management. However, it is essential to acknowledge the limitations of the Fisher model, including its assumptions, data quality concerns, short-term focus, reliance on rational expectations, sensitivity to inflation volatility, and neglect of risk premiums. These limitations highlight the need for caution when applying the model and emphasize the importance of considering its shortcomings in empirical analyses.

Future research directions have been proposed to address these limitations and refine the Fisher model further. Incorporating time-varying inflation expectations, conducting cross-country analyses to explore variations in the model's effectiveness, and employing advanced techniques such as machine learning are promising avenues for enhancing the model's accuracy and applicability.

In summary, while the Fisher Effect remains a valuable tool in economic analysis, its applicability is nuanced and contingent on specific conditions. Recognizing its strengths and weaknesses, as well as embracing ongoing research to refine its use, will enable economists, policymakers, and researchers to make more informed judgments and decisions in a dynamic and complex economic landscape.

References

[1] Engel, C., & West, K. D. Exchange rates and fundamentals. Journal of Political Economy, 2005.113(3), 485-517.

[2] Mishkin, F.S., Is the Fisher effect for real? A reexamination of the relationship between inflation and interest rates. Journal of Monetary economics, 1992.30(2), pp.195-215.

[3] Wallace, M.S. and Warner, J.T., The Fisher effect and the term structure of interest rates: Tests of cointegration. The Review of Economics and Statistics, 1993. Pp.320-324.

[4] Crowder, W.J. and Wohar, M.E., Are Tax Effects Important in the Long-Run Fisher Relationship? Evidence from the Municipal Bond Market. The Journal of Finance, 1999.54(1), 307-317.

[5] MacDonald, R. and Murphy, P.D., Testing for the long run relationship between nominal interest rates and inflation using cointegration techniques. Applied Economics, 1989. 21(4), pp.439-447.

[6] Rose, A.K., Is the real interest rate stable? The Journal of Finance, 1988.43(5), pp.1095-1112.

[7] Engel, C., & West, K. D. Exchange rates and fundamentals. Journal of Political Economy, 2005.113(3), 485-517.

[8] King, R.G. & Watson, M.W. Testing Long-Run Neutrality. Journal of Institutional Economics, 6. 1992.

[9] Wallace, M.S. and Warner, J.T., The Fisher effect and the term structure of interest rates: Tests of cointegration. The Review of Economics and Statistics, 1993. Pp.320-324.

[10] Kuosmanen, T. & Sipiläinen, T. Exact Decomposition of the Fisher Ideal Total Factor Productivity Index. Journal of Productivity Analysis. 2009.

[11] Ahn, Y. & Lee, K.S. Application of Fisher's Equation on the Korea's Open Economy Using System Dynamics. Journal of Institutional Economics, 2016.17(6), 1005-1031.

[12] Ongan, S. & Gocer, I. Testing Fisher Effect for the USA: Application of Nonlinear ARDL Model. Journal of Financial Economic Policy. 2019.

[13] Giacomini, R., & Rossi, B. Forecasting with macroeconomic time series: What's the story? Journal of Economic Literature, 2008.46(3), 72-82.

[14] Stock, J. H., & Watson, M. W. Forecasting inflation. Journal of Monetary Economics, 1999. 44(2), 293-335.

[15] Anderson J, Bodie J. Tree encoding of speech. IEEE Transactions on information theory. 1975 Jul; 21(4):379-87.

[16] Lintner J. Inflation and security returns. The journal of finance. 1975 May 1; 30(2):259-80.

[17] Nelson CR. Inflation and rates of return on common stocks. The journal of Finance. 1976 May; 31(2):471-83.

[18] Boudoukh J, Richardson M. Stock returns and inflation: A long-horizon perspective. The American economic review. 1993 Dec 1; 83(5):1346-55.

[19] Engsted T, Mammen E, Tanggaard C. Evaluating the C-CAPM and the equity premium puzzle at short and long horizons: A markovian bootstrap approach. Department of Finance, Faculty of Business Administration, the Aarhus School of Business; 2000 Apr 5.

[20] Anari A, Kolari J. Stock prices and inflation. Journal of Financial Research. 2001 Dec; 24(4):587-602.

[21] Wallace, M.S. and Warner, J.T., The Fisher effect and the term structure of interest rates: Tests of cointegration. The Review of Economics and Statistics, 1993. Pp.320-324.

[22] Mishkin, F.S., Is the Fisher effect for real? A reexamination of the relationship between inflation and interest rates. Journal of Monetary economics, 1992.30(2), pp.195-215.

[23] Taylor, J. B. The robustness and efficiency of monetary policy rules as guidelines for interest rate setting by the European central bank. Journal of Monetary Economics, 1999. 43(3), 655-679.

[24] Brealey, R. A., Myers, S. C., & Allen, F. Principles of corporate finance. McGraw-Hill Education. 2017.

[25] Malpezzi, S. A simple error correction model of house prices. Journal of Housing Economics, 1999.8(1), 27-62.

[26] Engel, C., & West, K. D. Exchange rates and fundamentals. Journal of Political Economy, 2005.113(3), 485-517.

[27] Hull, J. C. Options, futures, and other derivatives. Pearson. 2018.

[28] Tobin, J. Money and economic growth. Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society, 1965. 671-684.

[29] Modigliani, F., & Brumberg, R. H. Utility analysis and the consumption function: An interpretation of cross-section data. In Post-Keynesian Economics 1954.388-436. Rutgers University Press.

[30] Johnson, R. R., Magee, R. P., & Shoven, J. B. Understanding real business cycles. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 2012.26(3), 3-30.

[31] Gali, J., Smets, F., & Wouters, R. Slow recoveries: A structural interpretation. Journal of Political Economy, 2018.126(3), 1098-1157.

[32] Lustig, H., & Verdelhan, A. The cross section of foreign currency risk premia and consumption growth risk. American Economic Review, 2007.97(1), 89-117.

[33] Mankiw, N. G., & Reis, R. Sticky information versus sticky prices: A proposal to replace the New Keynesian Phillips curve. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 2002.117(4), 1295-1328.

[34] Coibion, O., & Gorodnichenko, Y. Is the Phillips curve alive and well after all? Inflation expectations and the missing disinflation. American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, 2015.7(1), 197-232.

[35] Bansal, R., & Shaliastovich, I. A long-run Risks explanation of predictable yield curves. Journal of Financial Economics, 2013.110(1), 110-138.