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ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between education and economic growth. The study is based on annually time series data range from period 1970 until 2010. The indicators for education are government operating expenditure and government development expenditure in education sector. Following the endogenous growth theory, log linear model is build based on Cobb Douglas production function. In order to answer the three objectives in this study, the tests been carried out included Augment Dikey Fuller test (ADF) test to test unit root, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) test to estimate how dependent variable changes when there is an increase in independent variables, Johansen cointegration test to investigate the existence of long run relationship in the model and Granger causality test to determine the direction of causality between all variables. The finding of the study is consistent with most of the empirical studies and theory where there is a long run relationship between education and economic growth. Besides that, the estimated results show that operating expenditure is relatively bring more impact to gross domestic product compared to development expenditure. In addition, the empirical evidence demonstrates that operating expenditure exits bilateral causality relationship with economic growth.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The relationship between education and economic growth has become an issue in the macroeconomic field. The relationship between these two variables remains controversial in theory and empirical findings. There are two things to be determined. The first is the nature of the relationship between the two, if one exists. The second is the direction of causality between education and economic growth. While several researchers and academicians have surveyed the theme, the results obtained are not consistent with some studies suggesting a positive relationship and others a negative or indeterminate relationship.

The ultimate goal of a country is to achieve economic development through economic growth, which is distinct from the former. Economic growth refers to rises in national income per capita from increasing production of goods and services in a country, while economic development refers to benefits from structural changes in economy and society. Examples of structural changes in the Malaysian context are the transition from an agricultural to an industrial economy, reduction in gender inequality, equity of income distribution and reduction of poverty rate. Economic growth alone is necessary but not sufficient for economic development. It is important because the increase in the incomes of the people and increase in government income allow greater expenditure on public services which raise the standard of living of the nation. While this may not benefit every
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