The Health–Income Nexus for Malaysia: ARDL Cointegration and Rao's F-test for Causality

Chor Foon Tang (Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Administration, University of Malaya)

Citation: Chor Foon Tang (2012): "The Health–Income Nexus for Malaysia: ARDL Cointegration and Rao's F-test for Causality" Asian Journal of Empirical Research, Vol.2, No.1, pp.1-8.

Received: 11 August 2011 / Accepted: 2 December 2011

Acknowledgement: The author would like to thank anonymous referees and Muhammad Shahbaz (Editor) of the *Asian Journal of Empirical Research* for their insightful comments and suggestions. In addition, the author would also like to thank Lee-Fang Ng for her valuable contributions to this research. The usual disclaimer applies.

Asian Journal of Empirical Research, 2(1), pp.1-8

The Health–Income Nexus for Malaysia: ARDL Cointegration and Rao's F-test for Causality

Abstract

This study re-visits the health-income nexus for Malaysia using alternative econometric techniques which addressed on the small sample problem. This study covers the period of 1970-2009. Based on the appealing small sample properties, we apply the bounds testing approach to cointegration and the system-wise Rao's F-test with bootstrap simulation procedure. The bounds test suggests close relationship between health care expenditure and real income in the long-run. In addition, the long-run income elasticity is also estimated using four long-run estimators, namely OLS, DOLS, FMOLS, and ARDL. Interestingly, the estimators suggest that the long-run income elasticity is more than unity. Therefore, our findings support the health care luxury hypothesis in Malaysia. From policy view point, the system-wise Rao's F-test reveals unilateral causality running from real income to health care expenditure in Malaysia.

Author

ChorFoon Tang
Department of Economics,
Faculty of Economics and Administration,
University of Malaya
Email: tcfoon@yahoo.com

Keywords:Cointegration, Causality; Health-income nexus; Malaysia; Rao's F-test

JEL Classification: C22; I10

Introduction

After the seminal papers by Mushkin (1962) and Newhouse (1977), many empirical studies have been conducted to investigate the relationship between health care expenditure and income (e.g. Hansen and King, 1996; Clemente et al., 2004). In these papers, health is regarded as a capital and hence investment on health is necessary for income growth. In addition, the income elasticity should be positive and greater than unity (see Gerdtham et al., 1992; Murray et al. 1994).[1]The existing research failed to providea clear picture of income elasticityof the demand for health care as well as the direction of causality between health care expenditure and income.[2]Some empirical studies found that income growth bring about changes in health care expenditure (Rao et al., 2008). However, some published articles argued the reverse causation, in that health care expenditure induces income growth (Mushkin, 1962; Grossman, 1972).

Retrospectively, there are various empirical works on this topic, and the studies also varied widely in terms of scope of study and methodology. However, most of these studies focused on developed countriesbyusing panel data (e.g. Roberts, 1999; Freeman, 2003;Gerdtham and Lothgren, 2000; Sen, 2005; Wang and Rettenmaier, 2007).In contrast, a country-specific study on developing countries such as Malaysia is relatively scarce. To the best of our knowledge, only few studies such as Rao et al. (2008), Samudram et al. (2009), Tang (2009), Tang and Ch'ng (2011) and Tang (2011) have investigated thehealth-income nexus for Malaysia using the cointegration and causality tests.However, the empirical evidence between health care expenditure and real income for Malaysia remains controversial. For example, Rao et al. (2008) used the annual data from 1981 to 2005 to analyse the causal relationship between health care expenditure and real income in five ASEAN countries using the standard Granger causality tests, with mixed results.Specifically, the study observed that there is bilateral causality between health care expenditure and real income in Indonesia and Thailand, while only unilateral causality running from real income to health care expenditure was detected in Malaysia and Singapore. Nevertheless, the causal relationship between health care expenditure and income is neutral for the Philippines. Apart from that, Samudram et al. (2009) examined the long-run as well as the causal relationship between health care expenditure and realincome in Malaysia usingthe cointegration tests alone. For the sake of brevity, the study covered the annual sample from 1970 to 2004 and they found that health care expenditure and real income are positively related in the long-

[1]However, there are some studies such as Parkin et al. (1987) and Blomqvist and Carter (1997) claimed that income elasticity is positive but slightly below unity.

[2]Devlin and Hansen (2001) found that the direction of causality between health care expenditure and income is inconclusive among 20 OECD countries. Rao et al. (2008) also finds similar results for the Association of South East Asia Nations (ASEAN).

run. In addition, they also surmised that health care expenditure and real income are bilateral causality in Malaysia. Subsequently, Tang (2009) used the annual data from 1960 to 2007 to re-assess the relationship between health care expenditure and real income in Malaysia. Unfortunately, the author found that health care expenditure and real income are not cointegrated, but the author foundthe evidence of two-ways causality between the variables.

The major problems with much of the earlier studies on Malaysia can be classified into two parts. First, they failed to provide true causal relationship because the variables are not cointegrated and they used inappropriate methodology. For example, Rao et al. (2008), Tang (2009) and Tang and Ch'ng (2011) found some evidences of causality, but their results showed that the variables are not cointegrated.[3]Moreover, Samudram et al. (2009) obtained the causality results using cointegration test is inappropriate because the presence of cointegrating relationship does not necessarily imply the direction of causality. Therefore, causality results provided by earlier studies may not exhibit the true causal relationship and may also be meaningless for both the economists and policymakers. Extracting the true causal relationship is important not just for understanding the flows, but it is also important for determining appropriate policy (Deaton, 1995). Second, as far as we know, no empirical work thus far had paid tribute on income elasticity of the demand for health care in Malaysia. Understanding of income electricity of the demand for health care is required to determine whether health care in Malaysia is a necessity or luxury goods. Additionally, it is directly link to the future formulation of health care financing, the development of health care services, and growth policies in Malaysia. Motivated by these lacunas, this study attempts to re-investigate the relationship between health care expenditure and real income in Malaysia.

This study fills the lacuna with various ways. First, we apply the bounds testing approach for cointegration to determine the presence of a long-runequilibrium relationship between health care expenditure and real income in Malaysia.Second, we employ the system-wise Rao's F-test in association with the residuals-based bootstrap simulation procedure to test for causality between health care expenditure and income.The choice of these econometric tests is motivated by two factors. At best, these methods are applicable and valid even when the variables are stationary at different orders (Pesaran et al., 2001; Dolado and Lütkepohl, 1996). In addition, these methods have superior properties in small samples (Pesaran and Shin, 1999; Shukur and Mantalos, 2000). Therefore, the findings of this study may avoid the sizedistortion and low power problems in testing the health-income relationship for Malaysia.

The remaining of this paper is organised as follows. The next section will briefly explain the data source and econometric techniques use in this study. Section-II will report the empirical finding of this study and finally Section-IV will present the concluding remarks.

II. Data and Methodology

This study uses the secondary annual data of real government expenditure on health care and real Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This study covers the annual sample from 1970 to 2009. The data is collected from the Malaysian Economic Reports. The GDP deflator (2000 = 100) is used to derive the real term.

There is an abundance of econometric methods designed for testing the cointegrating relationship. Nevertheless, we use the bounds testing approach (Pesaran et al., 2001) within the autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) framework because of its superior performance in small sample.[4] In addition, it is applicable irrespective of whether the underlying explanatory variables are purely *I*(0), purely *I*(1), or mutually cointegrated. In other words, this cointegration approach released the assumption of uni-formally *I*(1) process. To perform the ARDL cointegration test, Pesaran et al. (2001) suggested to estimates the following unrestricted error-correction model (UECM).

$$\Delta \ln HE_t = \alpha_0 + \theta_1 \ln HE_{t-1} + \theta_2 \ln Y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \delta_i \Delta \ln HE_{t-i} + \sum_{j=0}^{k} \phi_i \Delta \ln Y_{t-j} + \varepsilon_t \quad (1)$$

Here Δ is the first difference operator and ln denotes the natural logarithm. $\ln HE_t$ is the real health care expenditure, $\ln Y_t$ is the real income and ε_t is the disturbance term. To test the

[3]Masih and Masih (1998) noted that the Granger causality test is strictly represents correlation rather than causality if the variables are not cointegrated.

[4]Interested readers may consult Pesaran and Shin (1999), Panopoulou and Pittis (2004), and Caporale and Pittis (2004) for Monte Carlo evidence on the performance of the bounds testing approach in comparison with other cointegration tests.

presence of cointegrating relationship, we can apply the standard F-test on the coefficients of lagged level variables $[\theta_1, \theta_2]$. If the calculated F-statistic is exceeds the critical values, we reject the null hypothesis of no cointegration $[\theta_1 = \theta_2 = 0]$. Otherwise, no meaningful long-run relationship can be formed from between these variables.

Subsequently, we proceed to determine the direction of causality between health care expenditure and income using the causality method advocated by Dolado and Lütkepohl (1996). Shukur and Mantalos (2000) examined the size and power of eight generalisations of tests for the Granger-causality in the augmented-VAR system. In short, the Monte Carlo experiment exhibited that the performance of modified Wald tests is poor in small sample, and amongst eight tests under consideration the system-wise Rao's F-test demonstrate the best performance in small sample (see also Hatemi-J and Shukur, 2002). Given the small sample size of this study (T = 40 observations), the system-wise Rao's F-test is used for the Granger causality within the following augmented-VAR system with $p = (k+1)$ lag structure:

$$z_t = a_0 + A_1 z_{t-1} + \cdots + A_p z_{t-p} + \upsilon_t \quad (2)$$

Where $A_p = (n \times n)$ dimensional matrix of parameters for p lag structure while z_t, υ_t and a_0 consists of m-dimensional vectors. The disturbances term υ_t is assumed to be spherically distributed and white noise. Next, we partition z_t into two sub-vectors z_t^1 and z_t^2 as given below in Equation (3).

$$z_t = \begin{bmatrix} z_t^1 \\ z_t^2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} A_{11,1} & A_{12,1} \\ A_{21,1} & A_{22,1} \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} z_{t-1}^1 \\ z_{t-1}^2 \end{bmatrix} + \cdots + \begin{bmatrix} A_{11,p} & A_{12,p} \\ A_{21,p} & A_{22,p} \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} z_{t-p}^1 \\ z_{t-p}^2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \upsilon_{1t} \\ \upsilon_{2t} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

From the above augmented-VAR system, z_t^2 Granger-causes z_t^1 if the null hypothesis $A_{12,p-1} = 0 \forall_{p-1}$ is rejected, while $A_{12,p-1} \neq 0 \forall_{p-1}$ exhibit that z_t^1 Granger-causes z_t^2. Before defining the system-wise Rao's F-test, let us define:

$Z := (z_1, \ldots, z_T)$ $(k \times T)$ matrix,

$B := (a, A_1, \ldots, A_p)$ $(k \times (kp+1))$ matrix,

$$W_t := \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ z_t \\ z_{t-1} \\ \vdots \\ z_{t-p+1} \end{bmatrix} \quad ((kp+1) \times 1) \text{ matrix},$$

$W := (W_0, \ldots, W_{T-1})$ $((kp+1) \times T)$ matrix,

and

$\varpi := (\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_T)$, $(k \times T)$ matrix

Based on the above notations, the augmented-VAR(p) system can be written compactly as follow:

$$Z = BW + \varpi \quad (4)$$

The estimated $(k \times T)$ matrix of the disturbances term from the unrestricted and restricted regression model (4) can be denoted as $(\hat{\varpi}_{UR})$ and $(\hat{\varpi}_R)$, respectively. Then the variance-covariance matrix of the estimated residuals are generated by $H_{UR} = \hat{\varpi}'_{UR}\hat{\varpi}_{UR}$ and $H_R = \hat{\varpi}'_R\hat{\varpi}_R$. Ultimately, the system-wise Rao's F-test statistics for Granger causality can be calculated by the following equation:

$$RAO = (\phi/q)(U^{1/s} - 1) \quad (5)$$

Where, $s = \left[(q^2 - 4)/(k^2(G^2+1) - 5)\right]^{1/2}$,

$\Delta = T - (k(kp+1) - Gm) + \frac{1}{2}[(G-1) - 1]$,

$\phi = \Delta s - r$, $r = q/2 - 1$, and

$U = \det H_R / \det H_{UR}$. $q = Gm^2$ is the number of restrictions imposed by the null hypothesis, G is the p restriction in Equation (2) and finally m is the dimension of the sub-vector z_t^1. *RAO* statistic is approximately distributed as $F(q, \phi)$ under the null hypothesis, and reduces to the standard F-statistic when $k = 1$.

Table 1: The results of unit root tests

Variables	ADF	PP	KPSS
$\ln HE_t$	–4.761 (3)***	–2.998 (3)	0.071 (1)
$\Delta \ln HE_t$	–4.620 (3)***	–4.294 (5)***	0.059 (5)
$\ln Y_t$	–2.265 (0)	–2.131 (1)	0.127 (4)*
$\Delta \ln Y_t$	–4.319 (0)***	–4.302 (1)***	0.070 (1)

Note: The asterisks *** and * denote significant at the 1 per cent level. The figure in the parenthesis is the optimal lag order for ADF test or the bandwidth for PP and KPSS unit root tests. The optimal lag order is determined by AIC statistics, while the optimal bandwidth is determined byBartlett Kernel Newey-West procedure. The model specification for these unit root tests are determined by the procedure suggested by Enders (2004).

III. Empirical Findings

This study employs three unit root tests such as Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF), Phillips-Perron (PP) and Kwaitkowski-Phillips-Schmidt-Shin (KPSS) to examine the order of integration for each series. Table 1 exhibit that the variables are integrated at different order, but none of the variablesis integrated higher than order one process or beyond. Hence, the bounds testing approach to cointegration is very suitablein comparison to the conventional cointegration tests (e.g. Engle and Granger, 1987).[5]

Table 2: The results of cointegration test

Calculated F-statistic for bounds test		
$F\left(\ln HE \mid \ln Y\right)$	9.999***	
#Critical values bounds (F-test):		
Significance Level	Lower $I(0)$	Upper $I(1)$
1 per cent	7.625	8.825
5 per cent	5.260	6.160
10 per cent	4.235	5.020
Conclusion:	Cointegrated	

Note: *** denote significant at the 1 percent level.
Unrestricted intercept and trend (k = 1, T = 40) critical values are obtained from Narayan (2005).
R-squared: 0.551; Adjusted R-squared: 0.438;
F-Statistic: 4.900 (0.001); Jarque-Bera: 1.600 (0.449);
Ramsey RESET [1]: 0.121 (0.727), [2]: 1.986 (0.370);Breusch-Godfrey LM test [1]: 0.006 (0.939), [2]: 0.044 (0.978); ARCH LM test [1]: 0.330 (0.566); [2]: 0.525 (0.770)
[ ] refer to the diagnostics tests order;
( ) refer to thep-values

Given the unit root results are in favour of ARDL cointegration test, we next employed the AIC statistic to determine the optimal lag structure for the ARDL model because of its best performance in small sample (Lütkepohl, 1991). The AIC statistics suggest that ARDL[3, 1] is the best model and this lag structure is also in tandem with the conventional wisdom that optimal lag for annual data should range between 1 to 3 years (see Enders, 2004). Additionally, numbers of diagnostic tests areconducted on the final ARDL model to ensure that the selected model is correct and valid. The Jarque-Bera normality test cannot reject the null hypothesis of normality, indicating that the estimated residuals are normally distributed. Hence, the conventional tests statistics such as t-statistic and F-statistics are valid. Moreover, the Breusch-Godfrey Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test and also the Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (ARCH) LM test exhibit that the model is free from autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity problems up to first and second orders. In addition, the Ramsey RESET test indicates that the selected ARDL model is also free from the specification error problem. In the same caveat of analysis, the plots of CUSUM and CUSUM of statistics in Figure 1 illustrate that the estimated parameters are stable over the analysis period. Finally, the results of bounds testing approach to cointegration together with the diagnostic tests are reported in Table 2.

[5] The conventional cointegration tests can only applied when the variables are purely $I(1)$.



Figure 1: *The plots of CUSUM and CUSUM of Squares statistics*

To test for the presence of cointegrating relationship between health care expenditure and real income in Malaysia, a joint significance F-test is conducted on the lagged level variables in Equation (1). The calculated F-statistics [9.999] is greater than the 1 per cent upper bounds critical values [8.825] simulated by Narayan (2005). Contrary with the findings of Rao et al. (2008), Tang (2009) and Tang and Ch'ng (2011), but consistent with Tang (2011), we found that health care expenditure and real income in Malaysia are cointegrated and there must be a meaningful long-run relationship. Once the variables are found to be cointegrated, the short- and long-run income elasticities of the demand for health care should be estimated. We employ four different cointegrating estimators to estimate the long-run elasticities of health care expenditure function. Among them are the Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) approach suggested by Pesaran and Shin (1999), the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) approach suggested by Engle and Granger (1987), the Fully-Modified OLS (FMOLS) approach suggested by Phillips and Hansen (1990) and the Dynamic OLS (DOLS) approach suggested by Stock and Watson (1993). The reason for doing this is to examine the robustness of the estimation results and also to provide more efficient results in our relatively small sample study.

Table 3: The results of long-run elasticities

Cointegrating estimators	Cointegrating vector	
	$\ln Y_t$	Constant
ARDL	1.394***	–10.967***
OLS	1.336***	–10.202***
FMOLS	1.383***	–10.762***
DOLS	1.329***	–10.091***

Note: The asterisk *** denotes significant level at the 1 per cent level.

Table 3 shows the long-run income elasticities of the demand for health care in Malaysia. We notice that the four cointegrating estimators provide very similar long-run elasticities results and hence the estimated results are robust.To be more specific, all the estimated coefficients are statistically significant at the 1 per cent level and they also have a correct signs. On average, the long-run income elasticity is greater than unity and range from 1.33 to 1.39. For example, a 1 per cent increase in real income, on average health care expenditure in Malaysia will increase by more than 1.3 per cent. Apparently, our findings support the presence of luxury health care hypothesis in Malaysia, meaning that change of health care expenditure is faster than real income growth. This result is corroborated to the findings of Gerdtham et al. (1992) and Murray et al. (1994).

Table 4: The results of Granger causality test

	Null Hypothesis	
	$\ln Y_t \not\rightarrow \ln HE_t$	$\ln HE_t \not\rightarrow \ln Y_t$
Rao's F-statistics	8.265*	5.179
Bootstrapped p-values	0.0580	0.1810
Bootstrapped critical values		
5 percent	8.649	8.711
10 percent	7.163	6.779

Note: The asterisk * denotes significant at the 10 per cent level. $\not\rightarrow$ represents "does not Granger-cause". The system-wise AIC was used to determine the best lag order. The bootstrap is based on 1000 replication.

The presence of long-run relationship does not implies a direction of causality, but it confirmed that testing for Granger causality is meaningful and not just a predictability test (Masih and Masih, 1998). From policy view point, the direction of causality between health care expenditure and real income has important policy implication. Table 4 presents the Granger causality tests based on the

leveraged bootstrapped simulation approach of the system-wise Rao's F-test and *p*-values. From the causality results, we find that for the null hypothesis of real income does not Granger-causes health care expenditure, the *p*-value for the system-wise Rao's F-test statistic is less than 0.10. This exhibits that the null hypothesis can be rejected and there is Grangercausality running from real income to health care expenditure in Malaysia. Nevertheless, the *p*-value for the null hypothesis of health care expenditure does not Granger-causes real income is more than 0.10. This indicates that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected and no evidence of Granger causality running from real health care expenditure to real income. Overall, our findings suggest unilateral causality running from real income to real health care expenditure rather than reversal causation. Apparently, our empirical result is contrary with the findings of Samudram et al. (2009) and Tang (2009), who found evidence of bilateral causation based on the cointegration and/or MWALD causality tests. There are at least three potential explanations of why our causality results differ from those suggested by Samudram et al. (2009) and Tang (2009). First, we employ different time span of data. Second, we use the system-wise Rao's F-test rather than MWALD test because Shukur and Mantalos (2000) demonstrated that for small sample analysis the MWALD test may suffer from the size distortion and low power. Third, the presence of cointegration is not a proper indicator of the direction of causality. Therefore, our causality test results are valid, albeit different direction of causality has occurred.[6]

IV. Concluding Remarks

The objective of this study is to re-investigates the relationship between health care expenditure and real income in Malaysia using the more robust econometric methods. This study employs the annual sample from 1970 to 2009 to achieve the objective of this study. The results of the bounds testing approach to cointegration reveal that real health care expenditure and real income in Malaysia are cointegrated. Four long-run estimators are employed to estimate the long-run income elasticity of the demand for health care. Interestingly, thefour long-run estimators consistently show that income elasticity is greater than unity. Therefore, health care in Malaysia is a luxury goods. In our empirical analysis, we also ascertain the direction of the causality between health care expenditure and real income. The results of system-wise Rao's F-test reveal unilateral causality running from real income to health care expenditure, but no evidence of reversal causality. This affirms that the real income is a prominent source for health care expenditure in Malaysia rather than the other way around.

[6]One may suspect that the income elasticity and also the causal relationship between health care expenditure and real income may be varied over time either due to omission of relevant variables and/or structural breaks. To overcome the sceptical, we re-estimate the long-run income elasticity and also the causality test with the recursive regression procedure to affirm the results (see Tang, 2008). Remarkably, the recursive regression results makes no different where the long-run income elasticity and also the causality inferences are stables over the respective sample period. To conserve space, the results are not reported here, but it is available upon request.

References

Blomqvist, Å.G. and Carter, R.A.L. (1997) "Is health care really a luxury?"Journal of Health Economics,Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 207-229.

Caporale, G.M. andPittis, N. (2004) "Estimator choice and Fisher's paradox: A Monte Carlo study"Econometric Reviews,Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 25-52.

Clemente, J.,Marcuello, C., Montanes, A. andPueyo, F. (2004) "On the international stability of health care expenditure functions: Are government and private function similar?"Journal of Health Economics,Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 589-613.

Deaton, A. (1995) "Growth and saving: What do we know, what do we need to know, and what might we learn?" Mimeo, Princeton University

Devlin, N. and Hansen, P. (2001) "Health care spending and economic output: Granger causality" Applied Economics Letters, Vol. 8, No. 8, pp. 561-564.

Dolado, J.J. andLütkepohl, H. (1996) "Making Wald tests work for cointegrated VAR system"Econometric Review,Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 369-386.

Enders, W. (2004) Applied Econometric Time Series 2nded., New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Engle, R.F. and Granger, C.W.J. (1987) "Co-integration and error-correction: Representation, estimation and testing" Econometrica,Vol. 55, No. 2, pp. 987-1008.

Freeman, D.G. (2003) "Is health care a necessity or a luxury? Pooled estimates of income elasticity from US State-level data" Applied Economics, Vol. 35, No. 5, pp. 495-502.

Gredtham, Ulf-G.andLothgren, M. (2000) "On stationarity and cointegration of international health expenditure and GDP" Journal of Health Economics, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 461-475.

Gerdtham, Ulf-G., Søgaard, J., Andersson, F. andJönsson, B. (1992) "An econometric analysis of health care expenditure: A cross-section study of the OECD countries" Journal of Health Economics, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 63-84.

Grossman, M. (1972) "On the concept of health capital and the demand for health" Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 80, No. 2, pp. 223-255.

Hatemi-J, A. andShukur, G. (2002) "Multivariate-based causality tests of twin deficits in the US"Journal of Applied Statistics, Vol. 29, No. 6, pp. 817-824.

Hansen, P. and King, A. (1996) "The determinants of health care expenditure: A cointegration approach"Journal of Health Economics, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 127-137.

Lütkepohl, H. (1991) Introduction to multiple time series analysis, Germany: Springer-Verlag.

Masih, A.M.M. andMasih, R. (1998) "Does money cause prices, or the other way around? Multi-country econometric evidence including error-correction modelling from South-east Asia"Journal of Economic Studies, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 138-160.

Murray, C.J.L., Govindaraj, R. and Musgrove, P. (1994) "National health expenditures: A global analysis"Bulletin of the World Health Organization,Vol. 72, No. 4, pp. 623-637.

Mushkin, S.J. (1962) "Health as an investment"Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 70, No. 5, pp. 129-157.

Narayan, P.K. (2005) "The saving and investment nexus for China: Evidence from cointegration tests"Applied Economics, Vol. 37, No. 17, pp. 1979-1990.

Newhouse, J.P. (1977) "Medical-care expenditure: A cross-national survey" Journal of Human Resources, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 115-125.

Parkin, D., Mcquire, A. and Yule, B. (1987) "Aggregate health care expenditures and national income: Is health a luxury good?" Journal of Health Economics, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 109-127.

Panopoulou, E. andPittis, N. (2004) "A comparison of autoregressive distributed lag and dynamic OLS cointegration estimators in the case of a serially correlated cointegration error"Econometrics Journal, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 585-617.

Pesaran, M.H. and Shin, Y. (1999) "An autoregressive distributed lag modelling approach to cointegration analysis" in Econometrics and Economic Theory in the 20th Century. The Ragnar Frisch Centennial Symposium bySteinar Strom, Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pesaran, M.H., Shin, Y. and Smith, R.J. (2001) "Bounds testing approaches to the analysis of the level relationships" Journal of Applied Econometrics, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 289-326.

Phillips, P.C.B. and Hansen, B. (1990) "Statistical inference in Instrumental variables regression with *I*(1) processes"Review of Economic Studies, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 99-125.

Rao, R.R., Jani, R. andSanjivee, P. (2008) "Health, quality of life and GDP: An ASEAN experience"Asian Social Science, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 70-76.

Roberts, J. (1999) "Sensitivity of elasticity estimates for OECD health care spending: Analysis of a dynamic heteroskedasticity data field"Health Economics, Vol. 8, No. 5, pp. 459-472.

Samudram, M., Nair, M. andVaithilingam, S. (2009) "Keynes and Wagner on government expenditures and economic development: The case of a developing economy"Empirical Economics, Vol. 36, No. 3, pp. 697-712.

Sen, A. (2005) "Is health care a luxury? New evidence from OECD data"International Journal of Health Care Finance and Economics, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 147-164.

Shukur, G. andMantalos, P. (2000) "A simple investigation of the Granger-causality test in integrated-cointegrated VAR systems"

Stock, J.H. and Watson, M.W. (1993) "A simple estimator of cointegrating vectors in higher order integrated systems"Econometrica, Vol. 61, No. 4, pp. 783-820.

Tang, C.F. (2008) "Wagner law and Keynesian hypothesis: New evidence from recursive regression-based causality approaches"IUP Journal of Public Finance, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 29-38.

Tang, C.F. (2009) "An examination of the government spending and economic growth nexus for Malaysia using the leveraged bootstrap simulation approach"Global Economic Review, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 215-227.

Tang, C.F. (2011) "Multivariate Granger causality and the dynamic relationshipbetween health care spending, income andrelative price of health care in Malaysia" Hitotsubashi Journal of Economics, Vol. 52, No. 2, pp. 199-214.

Tang, C.F. and Ch'ng, K.S. (2011) "The Granger causality between health expenditure and income in Southeast Asia economies" African Journal of Business Management, Vol. 5, No. 16, pp. 6814-6824.

Wang, Z. andRettenmaier, A.J. (2007) "A note on cointegration of health expenditures and income"Health Economics, Vol. 16, No. 6, pp. 559-578.