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Abstract: The last decade has been a period of accelerated integration in Europe. A manifestation of this was the biggest ever enlargement of the EU in 2004. Therefore the aim of this study is an evaluation of integration process in EU in the sphere of economic institutional order. The analysis concentrates on the institutional factors that affects the ability of country to utilize potential of competitive global economy. In this study some taxonomic tools were used - a hierarchical classification procedure (Ward's method with Euclidean and Manhattan distance). The study was based on annual data from the period 2000-2008. It allowed to capture a period of four years before and after the biggest enlargement of the EU. The research problem of this study amounted to the question: whether in the analyzed period can one speak about the process of growing similarities in the sphere of business institutional order for “old” and “new” EU countries? The study confirms existence of integration processes in relation to institutional order. However, it also proves the existence of group of countries that can be described by homogenous institutional factors especially effective in supporting utilization of the potential of competitive global economy.
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INTRODUCTION

The last two decades were a period of fundamental institutional change in Europe. For the countries of Central and Eastern Europe these changes relate to both the political sphere as well as to fundamental rebuilding of the foundations of economic life. Each of the countries in the region by choosing the transformation towards market economy and European integration has had to take the trouble of radical rebuilding of the existing institutional order. However, the fundamental institutional changes in the economic sphere have not been only limited to so-called transformation countries of Central and Eastern Europe. For the past two decades the developed countries of “Old Europe” have been also forced to take the trouble of institutional reforms relating to the economic order. On the one hand, it was necessitated by the intensification of globalization and increasing economic competition in the international dimension, the most tangible manifestation of these has been the growing international role of Asian countries. On the other hand, the need for intuitional reforms has been the result of the mentioned political and economic changes in Central and Eastern Europe.

Another significant phenomenon of recent years, which must have had a significant impact on institutional changes in Europe can be called “information explosion”. Probably never before there have been the technological and social infrastructure which would allow such a rapid diffusion of knowledge and so-called good governance practices or institutional rules that are conducive to improving economic growth or that can become a significant obstacle to improving the level of social welfare.

These phenomena undoubtedly can be treated as the drivers of the integration processes in the economic sphere in Europe as only strong and big integrated European market can face the globalization challenges. Therefore, the purpose of this analysis is formalized assessment of the phenomenon of institutional integration in the sphere of economic order in the European Union in the first decade of the twentieth century.

An attempt to measure institutional phenomena is associated with many methodological issues that relate to the problem of quantification of phenomena whose essence is the qualitative and multidimensional nature. Therefore, this study used commonly accepted taxonomic tools.
INTEGRATION AS A CONSEQUENCE OF EFFORTS TO IMPROVE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INSTITUTIONAL ORDER IN THE REALITY OF HIGHLY COMPETITIVE GLOBAL ECONOMY

North defines institutions as the constraints of human behavior that affect the quality of interaction. The institutions include formal rules and regulations of behavior, informal constraints (norms of behavior, conventions, and patterns of conduct). As a result the institutions can be the source of restrictions on contracts between the actors of economic life. In this way institutions affect the economic effectiveness and determine transaction costs (North, 1994, pp. 359 and passim). Therefore, from the perspective of long-term prospects the occurrence of all the factors influencing economic growth and improving social welfare, such as the intensification of technological progress, improvement of the quality of human capital and development of entrepreneurship, is only possible to achieve under the conditions of threshold efficiency of the institutional system, which ensures sufficiently low level of transaction costs in the economy (North, 1993).

Institutional conditions, in particular relating to the informal rules rooted in the social consciousness, are usually the consequence of long-term historical process of formation, which may take tens or even hundreds of years (Williamson, 2000, pp. 595-613). Reformulation of these institutional rules and the emergence of integration processes in this area are always very difficult. This is a particular problem if certain informal rules are important obstacles for development processes in a given country. On the other hand, many elements of institutional arrangements relating to so-called positive rules, such as legal restrictions and requirements relating to economic activity, formal regulations affecting the characteristics of competition intensity in specific industries or in given markets, are a consequence of some recently adopted and current political decisions and social choices. These elements of institutional order can usually be modified in a few years. Thus, they are subject to relatively rapid changes as a result of diffusion of knowledge concerning good governance, or are changed by the presence of strong exogenous stimuli, such as the growing international competitive pressures (Balcerzak and Rogalska, 2010, pp. 49-55). This means that these elements of institutional order may be influenced by relatively rapid process of integration.

Probably one of the most important phenomena of recent decades, influencing the evolution of these "economic rules" is the emergence of highly competitive global economy. Currently, economists agree that the last two decades has been the time of extremely rapid, profound transformation of almost all economic sectors and economies as a whole in case of all developed countries and also most developing countries. The main factor leading to these changes is the growing importance of technological innovation in telecommunications and information processing. This change of technological paradigm in the field of information and communication is accompanied by reorganization of businesses practices, development and rising dynamics and importance of capital markets, the growing role of individual entrepreneurship as a driver of economic growth, increasing volatility of labor markets, and last but not least globalization leading to continuous and increasing competition at national and international level. It can be argued that these new conditions represent a fundamental departure from the national corporate economy based on mass production of goods, which was dominant in developed countries since the late forties till the end of the seventies of the twentieth century. The current economy is a global, knowledge-based and entrepreneurial economy, in which the key factors of success is the extent to which knowledge, technology and innovation are embedded in products and services (Atkinson and Correa, 2007, p. 3).

The above described realities has forced the adjustment of many areas of institutional order in accordance with the requirements of the new global economic conditions in all countries, where the objective of socio-economic policy is to use the potential of the highly competitive global economy. The most important segments of the institutional order that affect the development potential of the country in realities of global economic transformation presented above are: a) the effectiveness of national regulations that support private entrepreneurship, b) the role of competitive environment and the institutional order of the labor market; c) the institutional order that affects the efficiency of financial markets in supporting the development of enterprises with high growth potential; d) the institutional rules that facilities the accumulation of knowledge and intellectual property. Naturally, the proposed selection is in a way arbitrary, which must be remembered during interpretation of the research results. It is the result of attempts to synthesize the lessons learned from the literature of the subject and widely accepted international research programs that are basis for such studies as the Economic Freedom of
the World, prepared by economists working under the auspices of the Fraser Institute, Index of Economic Freedom created with support from The Wall Street Journal and Heritage Foundation, or a global survey of business conditions prepared annually by the World Bank (See. also Balcerzak, 2009, pp. 289 and passim).

Currently there is no controversy in regard to the statement that the level of entrepreneurship is one of the most important intangible factors of economic growth of a country (Holcombe, 1998, pp. 45-62; Acs, 2006, pp. 97-107). It depends on many informal institutional factors shaped in the course of many decades, such as public perception and public acceptance for individual entrepreneurship. But on the other hand, the experience of recent decades confirms that the national level of entrepreneurship is significantly negatively correlated with institutional factors of a legal nature, which increase the scope of the regulation and are sources of additional burdens and restrictions on freedom of economic activity (Ardagna and Lusardi, 2008; Stel et al., 2007, pp. 171-186). As a result, in recent years in many countries one can notice significant institutional reforms aimed at so-called “simplifying” and improving the conditions of running individual business.

Empirical studies conducted in recent years have shown that in the case of countries obtaining considerable success in exploiting the potential associated with the processes of global transformation state regulatory activity was mainly focused on creating a highly competitive market order. High competitive pressure on domestic markets is a key source of incentives for innovation in the sphere of high technology and organization, and increases the rate of diffusion of the most effective business solutions, which is an important stimulator of raising the productivity growth rate of the economy. The state regulatory activity with respect to labor markets should not lead to increased rigidity of the market. It should not focus on the administrative protection of existing jobs in any given industries. Labour market policy should rather increase its efficiency in connecting the demand side and the supply side of the market by reducing transaction costs. Activities of the state should provide assistance for people losing their jobs during the transitional period and increase their chances of finding new employment, while in the same time reducing the likelihood of addiction on that state aid of the beneficiary (Balcerzak, 2009, pp. 71-102).

An important factor that accelerates economic growth in developed countries, whose role has significantly increased its importance in recent years, is the functioning of the new highly innovative companies with high growth potential. These companies are becoming an important carrier of both the development and diffusion of new technologies and contribute to the acceleration of technological change. The potential for development and functioning of such companies is closely related to the effectiveness of the institutional governance of financial markets, which should contribute to the rapid reallocation of capital from so-called traditional-mature industries with low growth potential to industries with high development potential (Balcerzak, 2009, pp. 30-39).

Contemporary global economy is also increasingly dependent on production of “intangible products”, where the main source of added value is accumulated in the “product” knowledge and intellectual values. Therefore, the development of the countries that intend to take advantage of highly competitive global economy is closely linked with the shape and effectiveness of institutional order in the sphere of protection of intellectual property rights (Okoñ-Horodyńska and Wista (ed.), 2009).

As a result, in case of the empirical part of this work the analysis of integration processes in European Union countries will refer to the above outlined areas of institutional order.

METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

The discussion carried out in the previous section leads to the conclusion that on the one hand the institutional order is a phenomenon difficult to measure, on the other hand any attempt to measure it must take into account its multidimensional character. This means that in case of any proposals of formal empirical analysis that aim at international comparisons in relation to specific changes of institutional systems of individual countries it is necessary to use multidimensional analysis tools. In the case of this study some well recognized taxonomic tools were used. In the literature a similar approach was applied to study the institutional framework of monetary policy (Pietrucha, 2008, pp. 228-236) and institutional conditions for supporting the innovative potential of the country (Piech, 2009, pp. 287-394).

In the present study the tools of hierarchical classification method were used to achieve taxonomic
In the first phase of the research diagnostic variables meeting the formal criteria were selected, which allow to evaluate different aspects of institutional order in the countries surveyed in accordance with the convention based on the considerations from the previous section. On this basis, the sets of potential diagnostic variables were selected that were classified into four groups:

a) The government regulation that is aimed at increasing entrepreneurship:
   \[ x_{11} \] - Administrative Conditions/Entry of New Business;
   \[ x_{12} \] - Time with government bureaucracy;
   \[ x_{13} \] - Starting a new business;
   \[ x_{14} \] - Irregular payments;
   \[ x_{15} \] - Judiciary independence;
   \[ x_{16} \] - Impartial courts;
   \[ x_{17} \] - Law and Order.

b) The importance of a competitive environment and labor market flexibility:
   \[ x_{18} \] - Price controls;
   \[ x_{19} \] - Regulatory Trade Barriers;
   \[ x_{110} \] - Impact of minimum wage;
   \[ x_{111} \] - Hiring and firing practices;
   \[ x_{112} \] - Labor force share with wages set by centralized collective bargaining.

c) The financial market and growth of companies with high growth potential:
   \[ x_{113} \] - Competition in domestic banking;
   \[ x_{114} \] - Extension of credit;

d) The institutional order influencing the accumulation of knowledge and intellectual property:
   \[ x_{115} \] - Protection of intellectual property.

---

1 Profound methodological analysis on classification methods one can find in the works of Milligan and Cooper (1987, pp. 329-354), Everitt and Dunn (2001) or Everitt et al. (2011).

2 The entire data set used in the study comes from the Fraser Institute database created for the report Economic Freedom of the World. The year 2008 was the last year for which a full set of data was available in the latest available study published in 2010 (see Gwartney et al., 2010). An alternative source of data for this study could be the base of the World Bank used to create a report on Doing Business. Fraser Institute database was chosen for study because it offers the possibility to extend the test period and is characterized by greater methodological stability than the base of the World Bank (see Doing Business 2011, 2010).

3 These criteria include: versatility and measurability of variables, the availability and quality of the data, the ability to interpret the variable (see Zelia (ed.), 2000, pp. 37-38).
These variables have been assessed due to the criteria of information value of variables. According to these criteria, diagnostic variables should have a sufficiently large spatial variability, validity and low correlation.

The first criterion means that the variables should not be similar to each other in terms of information about objects. Spatial variability of features can be assessed using the coefficient of variation. The variable for which the coefficient is lower than the adopted value is eliminated. Typically, the variables for which the value of the coefficient of variation is lower than or equal 10% are eliminated from the research (Ostasiewicz, 1998, pp. 115-116).

Potential diagnostic variables are considered as valid if in case of a given variable it is difficult to reach its high values. To assess the validity of the variable skewness coefficient can be used. Assuming that the variable is a stimulus, in case of valid variable its distribution should be right-skewed. In case of stimulus left-skewed distribution means that most of the objects reach high values for a given variable. Thus, this feature does not differentiate sufficiently the objects; therefore it should be eliminated from the research (Ostasiewicz, 1998, pp. 115-116).

A strong correlation between the diagnostic variables can lead to repetition of information. In case of too high degree of correlation of variables the representative variables are usually selected. To do this, the parametric method of Hellwig was used here, where the maximum value of correlation coefficient equals to \( r^* = 0.8 \) (Strzała and Przechlewski, 1995, pp. 154-156).

Table 1 shows the diagnostic variables, which in subsequent years did not meet the criterion of high spatial variability. According to the formal criterion used due to the frequency of occurrence of variables \( x_{i3} \) and \( x_{i9} \) in the sets that do not meet the criterion of spatial variability one should consider elimination of these variables from further research (Zeliaś (ed.), 2000, pp. 126-133). However, referring to the aim of the research, which is to assess the occurrence of integration processes in the institutional sphere, already at this stage an interesting phenomenon should be pointed out. In May 2004 the European Union had the biggest enlargement. The consequences of this enlargement associated with the harmonization of regulations affecting the cost of starting new business and restricting the freedom of trade are strongly visible in the case of the analyzed indicators for the EU countries. Since 2005 there has been a reduction in variability of variables, which can be interpreted as consequences of the implementation of European Union legislation. Thus it can be regarded as a manifestation of the integration processes in relation to the economic legal order.

Table 1: Diagnostic Variables that do not Fulfill the Criterion of High Spatial Variability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>( x_{i3}, x_{i9} )</td>
<td>( x_{i3}, x_{i9} )</td>
<td>( x_{i3}, x_{i9} )</td>
<td>( x_{i3}, x_{i9} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own elaboration.

4Variable is a stimulus when for every two values \( x_{ij}, x_{kj} \) corresponding to two objects \( A_i, A_k \) the following relation is valid \( x_{ij}\cdot x_{kj} \Rightarrow A_i > A_k \) where \( > \) means that object \( A_i \) is preferred to object \( A_k \) (Walesiak, 2002, pp. 16-19).
consistent assessment of the institutional systems of the European countries, for the period under consideration, was relatively difficult. Thus, due to dominant role of merit criteria in the research it was necessary to abandon the use of a formal criterion concerning the distribution of diagnostic variables\(^5\).

For the last criterion of information validity (the assessment of correlation of variables) and after the application of Hellwig’s parametric methods in order to select the representative variables in subsequent years the variables shown in Table 2 should be eliminated.

Analysis of the results for the information validity criterion leads to a similar conclusions as in case of the criterion of high spatial variability. Also in this case there are visible signs of faster integration processes in relation to the various segments of the institutional system of the countries after the EU enlargement in 2004.

Thus, due to the aim of the research and merit interpretation of the results of the validity criteria for the potential variables, despite the formal indications of the analysis it was decided to not eliminate any of the variables from the set of potential diagnostic variables.

In the next stage of the research, the comparability of diagnostic variables was achieved. For this purpose, a classical normalization procedure based on the arithmetic mean and standard deviation (equation 1) was implemented. It resulted in achieving variables with arithmetic mean equal to 0 and variance equal to 1.

\[ x_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij} - \bar{x}_j}{s_j} \]  

Where:

- \( x_{ij} \) - Value of \( j \) variable for \( i \) object,
- \( \bar{x}_j \) - Arithmetic mean of \( j \) variable,
- \( s_j \) - Standard deviation of \( j \)-variable.

The last step of the analysis was the grouping of the countries based on Ward’s method first with Euclidean and then with Manhattan distance. In case of Manhattan distance not as with Euclidean distance where the distance between two points is the length of the line conceding them, the distance between two points is the sum of the absolute differences of their coordinates. These procedures are considered as ones of the most widely used hierarchical classification methods, and the Euclidean and Manhattan distance were used because of their good mathematical properties. In Ward’s method to extract the cluster the analysis of variance is used, which gives the possibility of formation of clusters of relatively small size and relatively large distances between their centers. This method involves the sequential reduction of the number of clusters by combining them into groups of higher order until obtaining their full hierarchy. The starting point of the whole procedure is a matrix of distance \( D \) between the objects, each of which initially makes a separate cluster. A pair of clusters with the smallest distance from each other is combined into a new cluster, and then its distance from other clusters is determined. From the matrix \( D \) the distances associated with the objects appearing in the new cluster are eliminated, and the distance of the new cluster from other clusters is inserted there, thus a new distance matrix id obtained. This algorithm is repeated until all objects form one cluster. Differences between the hierarchical methods of agglomeration arise from different ways of determining the distance between the clusters. In the case of Ward’s method it is defined as the difference between the sums of squared deviations of individual points from center of groups to which they belong (Ostasiewicz, 1998, pp. 88-96). Results of grouping for 2000, 2004 and 2008 are presented in the Figures 1 to 3 for Euclidean distance and 4 to 6 for Manhattan distance.

Table 2: Diagnostic Variables that do not Fulfill the Criterion of High Information Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables that are eliminated.</td>
<td>( x_{i6}, x_{i9} )</td>
<td>( x_{i6}, x_{i9} )</td>
<td>( x_{i4}, x_{i6}, x_{i9} )</td>
<td>( x_{i4}, x_{i6}, x_{i9} )</td>
<td>( x_{i4}, x_{i6}, x_{i9}, x_{i10} )</td>
<td>( x_{i4}, x_{i6}, x_{i9}, x_{i10} )</td>
<td>( x_{i4}, x_{i6}, x_{i9}, x_{i10} )</td>
<td>( x_{i4}, x_{i6}, x_{i9}, x_{i10} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own elaboration.

\(^5\)A similar problem occurred in a research of institutional effectiveness of OECD countries in terms of support for the development of the new global knowledge-based economy (see Balcerzak, 2009, pp. 289-290).
Institutional Integration in the Sphere of Business Infrastructure

Figure 1: Grouping of European Union Countries based on the similarities of institutional systems based on Ward method with Euclidean distance for the year 2000.
Source: own elaboration based on Fraser Institute data base (see Gwartney et al., 2010).

Figure 2: Grouping of European Union Countries based on the similarities of institutional systems based on Ward method with Euclidean distance for the year 2004.
Source: own elaboration based on Fraser Institute data base (see Gwartney et al., 2010).

Figure 3: Grouping of European Union Countries based on the similarities of institutional systems based on Ward method with Euclidean distance for the year 2008.
Source: own elaboration based on Fraser Institute data base (see Gwartney et al., 2010).
Figure 4: Grouping of European Union Countries based on the similarities of institutional systems based on Ward method with Manhattan distance for the year 2000.
Source: own elaboration based on Fraser Institute data base (see Gwartney et al., 2010).

Figure 5: Grouping of European Union Countries based on the similarities of institutional systems based on Ward method with Manhattan distance for the year 2004.
Source: own elaboration based on Fraser Institute data base (see Gwartney et al., 2010).

Figure 6: Grouping of European Union Countries based on the similarities of institutional systems based on Ward method with Manhattan distance for the year 2008.
Source: own elaboration based on Fraser Institute data base (see Gwartney et al., 2010).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Euclidean Distance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster I</strong></td>
<td>Cluster I</td>
<td>Cluster I</td>
<td>Cluster I</td>
<td>Cluster I</td>
<td>Cluster I</td>
<td>Cluster I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Nethelands</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Nethelands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherland</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Netherland</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster II</strong></td>
<td>Cluster II</td>
<td>Cluster II</td>
<td>Cluster II</td>
<td>Cluster II</td>
<td>Cluster II</td>
<td>Cluster II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Rep.</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster III</strong></td>
<td>Cluster III</td>
<td>Cluster III</td>
<td>Cluster III</td>
<td>Cluster III</td>
<td>Cluster III</td>
<td>Cluster III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster IV</strong></td>
<td>Cluster IV</td>
<td>Cluster IV</td>
<td>Cluster IV</td>
<td>Cluster IV</td>
<td>Cluster IV</td>
<td>Cluster IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 presents the separate clusters for the year 2000, 2004 and 2008 for both methods with Euclidean and Manhattan distance.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The empirical research based on hierarchical taxonomic clustering procedures with Ward’s method confirms the presence of institutional integration processes in the countries of the European Union in relation to institutional economic order. Already at the stage of the information validity of potential variables analysis one can indicate evidence of growing institutional integration of the EU countries. It could be seen in decreasing volatility and increasing correlation of some diagnostic variables that has got stronger since 2004. Similar conclusions can be drawn from a cluster analysis for the years 2000, 2004 and 2008. For example, in case of research with Euclidean distance in 2000, one will find that with the exception of France and Italy, leading economies of the EU and candidate countries into the EU formed separate homogeneous clusters. Analysis for the year 2004 in the case of the so-called “new member” countries participating in the process of European integration one could see a clear distinction between the countries joining the EU this year, and Romania and Bulgaria which have been incorporated into the Union three years later. For the year 2008, this division has not occurred any more, but there was a new cluster grouping such countries as Belgium, France, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, and Czech Republic, Latvia or Hungary. The analysis with Manhattan distance leads to similar conclusions.

It should be also noted that despite the institutional integration processes in the analyzed period, one can still point to a fairly homogeneous group of countries in relation to the institutional support of potential highly competitive global economy, which in all three annualized years and basically in case of both methodological approaches were always grouped in the first cluster, such as Austria, Ireland, the Netherlands, Germany, Finland and Sweden. This can be explained by the fact that serious institutional changes especially in case of informal rules, which can still significantly influence formal institutions, the serious reforms and changes usually take quite a long time.

**REFERENCES**


Kapitał intelektualny i jego ochrona, Warszawa: Instytut Wiedzy i Innowacji.


DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6000/1929-7092.2013.02.11

© 2013 Adam P. Balcerzak; Licensee Lifsescience Global.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.