

DYNAMIC BIPLLOT. EVOLUTION OF THE ECONOMIC FREEDOM IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a new method called 'Dynamic Biplot' that applies to the representation of 3-way data. The Dynamic Biplot method is undertaken in two stages: first, it carries out a biplot analysis of the situation that is considered more representative in our analysis, the reference situation (static analysis); in the second stage, the rest of the situations are represented onto the analysis (dynamic analysis), obtaining trajectories of individuals and variables. The Dynamic Biplot method is used to analyse the evolution of the economic freedom in the European Union. The main results are that the countries outside the euro zone enjoy greater economic freedom and the Rule of law area (Property Rights and Freedom from Corruption) are the ones that better discriminate EU countries. To provide operational support to the Dynamic Biplot, it has developed a package in R and it has been applied to describe the evolution of the economic freedom in the EU.

Keywords: Dynamic Biplot; Economic freedom; European Union; Multivariate; three-way.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BIPLLOT REVIEW

Among the various methods used for multivariate data analysis, Gabriel [1] Biplot methods are capable of representing more than two variables [2] using an approximation from the n -dimensional space to another of lower dimension, generally two. This method was introduced by Gabriel [1] in the context of principal component analysis (PCA). Specifically, the biplot is a joint graphical representation, in a low dimensional Euclidean space (usually a plane), of a multivariate data matrix by markers for its rows and columns, chosen in such a way that the inner (or scalar) product represents the elements of the data matrix. Due to the properties of the inner product, the biplot is a powerful data visualization tool, which can be viewed as a multivariate extension of the scatterplot.

The method used to obtain a reduced rank approximation of a matrix is the one proposed by Eckart and Young [3] and has been used by Householder and Young [4], Gabriel [1], Greenacre [5] and other authors. An algorithm to compute the decomposition is shown in Golub and Reinsch [6]. Galindo [7] developed the HJ-Biplot method to get high quality of representation for rows and columns simultaneously. These factorizations have formed the basis for the development of multiple approaches. The treatment of multiple tables with biplot methods has been discussed in Meta-Biplot [8], Canonical STATIS - CANOSTATIS [9] which generalizes discriminant analysis with STATIS.

The data that have been processed have a 3-way structure. In the literature, the treatment of a data cube has been performed in different ways: concatenating the matrices [10,11], comparing the main components of the groups [12,13], Lavit et al. [14] propose the diagonalization of a matrix, called 'common object' of the nature of the groups, Flury [15] considering different models of similarity between the components.

One of the most popular trends is based on obtaining a consensus subspace for all arrays, with different solutions like, e.g., STATIS and Dual STATIS [14,16,17] for the same set of

individuals or variables respectively, Pagès and Escoufier [18] proposed the Multiple Factor Analysis - MFA for the same individuals in several sets of variables, Chessel and Hanafi [19] proposed the Multiple Co-Inertia Analysis – MCOIA when the number of samples is low compared to the number of variables, and Dazy and Barzic [20] use Double Principal Component Analysis – DPCA for these individuals and the same variables. STATIS methods, have had many contributions; as e.g., Jaffrenou [21] use the Partial Triadic Analysis - PTA for the same variables measured on the same observations; Simier et al. [22] proposed the STATICO method; Suazay et al. [23] presented a PTA on series of cross product tables, external STATIS – (K+1)-STATIS with one external data set; Abdi et al. [24] used DISTATIS for distance matrices; Sabatier and Vivien [25] implement STATIS-4 for more than two sets of data; Vivien and Sune [26] used Double-STATIS (DO-ACT) to (K+1)-STATIS for two sets of data; Thioulouse [27] developed COVSTATIS for covariance matrices and COSTATIS, a co-inertia analysis of the compromises computed by the PTA; Bâenassâeni and Bennani Dosse [28] used Power STATIS-ACT to set weights to the matrices; Corrales and Rodriguez [29] developed INTERSTATIS for interval valued data. A review of the STATIS methods is shown in Abdi et al. [30].

This paper proposes the use of a new technique for representing 3-way data: the Dynamic Biplot. It is given that the term Dynamic Biplot has been already used by Sparks et al. [31] for quality control processing, considering a 2-way array. To provide operational support to the theory of Dynamic Biplot, it has developed a package in R with a graphic user interface (GUI) that has been called 'dynBiplotGUI'.

The structure of this paper is as follows. First it is performed a review of the Biplot methods. In the next two sections it makes the working approach and it develops the Dynamic Biplot. In another section it presents the R package developed to support Dynamic Biplot. Finally, it presents data on Economic Freedom in the European Union and the results obtained by applying the technique exposed.

2. WORKING APPROACH

In Biplot methods, variables are generally represented by vectors where the direction responds to the one that best represents the change in each variable. There are infinite possible factorizations in low-level decompositions to produce rows and columns markers: depending on the chosen one, different properties are obtained. Among the biplot methods developed by Gabriel [1], GH-Biplot provides high-quality for columns and JK-Biplot representing rows. Galindo [7] developed the HJ-Biplot which performs high quality for rows and columns simultaneously.

The approach presented in this paper is radically different to the method used by Sparks et al. [31] for the Dynamic Biplot, which is a table of 2-way data where one adds the number of cases that occur. It aims to study the relationship of a set of data that occurs more than once, i.e. of a 3-way dataset. It is common, when working with economic data, to study a certain magnitude (GDP, production ...) concerning different entities (countries, companies...) in repetitive situations (year, production cycles...).

The STATIS method puts its focus on the analysis of individuals while in the Dual STATIS focus are the variables [14,17]. Both methods treat the data in three steps. (i) Computing the interstructure of the data matrices, diagonalizing a matrix of scalar products between tables. (ii) Computing the compromise matrix, a linear combination of the initial tables with the aim of constructing a mean table of maximum inertia. (iii) Performing the analysis of the intrastructure and trajectories, summarizing the variability of the tables in comparison to the common structure defined by the compromise matrix.

Compared to STATIS methods that achieve the common part of all matrices and calculate the trajectories of individuals or variables, the Dynamic Biplot method proposed for us starts with the best representation of a given situation and simultaneously obtains both trajectories.

The nomenclature used is: $\mathbf{C}$ is a data cube of dimension $n \times p \times q$; the 3rd way are the situations and t is the reference situation; the $n \times p$ data matrix $\mathbf{Y}$ represents the baseline t , and its decomposition is $\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{AB}'=\mathbf{UDV}'$; $\mathbf{z}$, $\mathbf{x}$ are generic vectors and $\mathbf{s}$, $\mathbf{o}$, are their projections; $\mathbf{J}=\mathbf{UD}$, $\mathbf{K}=\mathbf{V}$, $\mathbf{G}=\mathbf{U}$, $\mathbf{H}=\mathbf{VD}$ call to different decompositions of matrix $\mathbf{Y}$. $\mathbf{Z}$ is a general matrix with elements to be projected and $\mathbf{L}$, $\mathbf{M}$ corresponding to the row and column projections. The $n \times q$ matrix $\mathbf{Z}_j$, contains the values of the variable j in different situations, being $1 \leq j \leq p$. The $p \times q$ matrix $\mathbf{X}_i$, contains values of the individual i in different situations, with $1 \leq i \leq n$.


3. THE DYNAMIC BIPLLOT

Let $\mathbf{C}$ be a 3-way data matrix: individuals are entered in rows, variables in columns, and situations for various occasions; usually correspond to the same subjects and variables but measured at different times. Is set t as the base situation according to which will be represented the dynamism of the rest; t is the situation that wants to analyze and it is considered to have the more explanatory information for our analysis.

The proposed technique, the Dynamic Biplot, performs a multivariate analysis of the baseline using biplot analysis, providing us with the best multivariate information between variables, individuals and relationships between them. The first step corresponds to the static analysis of our procedure, according the biplot criterion. The second step, the dynamic analysis, projects the rest of the situations it wants to analyze on the biplot graph obtained in the previous step. The result is the set of trajectories of individuals and variables on the reference situation biplot.

3.1 Step 1, static analysis

Let $\mathbf{C}$ be the data matrix, data cube, of dimension $n \times p \times q$ (Figure 1a). They are extracted from these data those corresponding to a time t , which will be used as a reference, obtaining a matrix $\mathbf{Y}$ of dimension $n \times p$. Factorizing matrix $\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{AB}'$ through the singular values decomposition proposed by Eckart and Young [3] aiming to achieve a low rank approximation of the matrix in the sense of least squares, is obtains $\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{UDV}'$. Matrices $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ contain markers of rows and columns respectively. Matrices $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ contain the eigenvectors, and the matrix $\mathbf{D}$, the eigenvalues. Depending on the chosen factorization and adapting the nomenclature $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ to the customary name, named $\mathbf{J}=\mathbf{UD}$, $\mathbf{K}=\mathbf{V}$, $\mathbf{G}=\mathbf{U}$, $\mathbf{H}=\mathbf{VD}$, which creates the different types of biplot: JK-Biplot, GH-Biplot y HJ-Biplot. With markers calculated, it is produced the biplot graph of the reference situation t .



134
135

Figure 1: Data cube representing the reference situation t (a); matrix situations for variable y_j (b) and the individual y_i (c)

136 Galindo [7] shows us how the HJ-Biplot methods are interpreted, which is based on simple
137 geometric concepts. Below those basic interpretational rules are presented: (i) the distances
138 among row markers are interpreted as an inverse function of similarities, in such a way that
139 closer markers (objects) are more similar; (ii) the lengths of the column markers (vectors)
140 approximate the standard deviation of the variables; (iii) the cosines of the angles among the
141 column vectors approximate the correlations among variables in such a way that small acute
142 angles are associated with variables with high positive correlations; obtuse angles near to
143 the straight angle are associated with variables with high negative correlations and right
144 angles are associated with non-correlated variables. In the same way, the cosines of the
145 angles among the variable markers and the axes (Principal Components) approximate the
146 correlations between them; (iv) the order of the orthogonal projections of the row markers
147 (points) onto a column marker (vector) approximates the order of the row elements (values)
148 in that column.

149

150 3.2 Step 2, Representation of elements onto the biplot

151

152 The goal in this second step is to project, onto the biplot obtained in the previous step, the
153 rest of situations included in the cube C , retaining structures previously computed in t . These
154 data should not be taken into account when calculating the biplot reference markers
155 because they correspond to past situations that do not have to change the context under
156 consideration. However, it is important to represent their positions and evolution in order to
157 observe the dynamic of its evolution. To incorporate new information in the graph, must be
158 found the markers in the reduced dimension space representing the element to be projected.
159 Those markers must be optimal in the sense of least squares. Our proposal works in a
160 similar way as Graffelman and Aluja-Banet [32].

161

162 3.2.1 Representation of variables onto the reference biplot

163

164 Let z be a column vector with n values of a variable to be incorporated into the biplot already
165 obtained and s the projection vector as discussed above. The best fitting projection vector to
166 z will be that minimizing the sum of the squared differences between them. Is obtained
167 a vector performing the scalar product between the orthogonal matrix A , with row markers,
168 and vector z . This vector is optimum if the sum of squared errors is minimum. Calculating
169 and setting to zero the first order derivative, is obtained the solution to the minimization
170 problem:

171

$$s = (A'A)^{-1}A'z \quad (1)$$

172 The solution to (1) are the regression coefficients obtained from the regression of the
173 variable to be projected and the columns of the matrix with row markers obtained in the
174 singular value decomposition of the data matrix in the reference situation t . As the regression
175 variables are orthogonal, their coefficients are independent.

176

177 3.2.2 Representation of individuals onto the reference biplot

178

179 If you expect to add the position of an individual, i.e., a row, in the previously calculated
180 biplot, the procedure is similar. Let x be a column vector with p values of the individual to be
181 incorporated and let o be the point in the biplot plane that represents it. It is assumed that
182 the vector x' is centered by the reference situation mean vector. Is obtained the
183 vector for the additional point by calculating the scalar product of o with all the variables'

184 vectors represented in the biplot, which define the rows of the matrix $\mathbf{B}$. This value is
 185 optimum if the sum of squared errors is minimum. Calculating and setting to zero the first
 186 order derivative **is obtained** the solution to the minimization problem:
 187

$$\mathbf{o} = (\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{B})^{-1}\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{x} \quad (2)$$

188 The solution to (2) is again the regression coefficients between the point **to be projected** and
 189 the columns of the matrix $\mathbf{B}$. The coefficients are independent since the columns of the
 190 matrix $\mathbf{B}$ are orthogonal.

191
 192 Generalizing the foregoing, if $\mathbf{Z}$ is the matrix with several variables or individuals that **it is**
 193 **intended** to project in the biplot and $\mathbf{LM}$ is its decomposition, **they can be obtained** for
 194 equations (1) and (2) respectively: $\mathbf{L}' = (\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{Z}$; $\mathbf{M}' = (\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{B})^{-1}\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{Z}$.

195 196 **3.2.3 Trajectories**

197
 198 Being t the reference situation, **they can be extracted** from the data cube $\mathbf{C}$ as many two-
 199 dimensional arrays as variables **they** have, i.e., p matrices of dimension $n \times q$; the scalar n
 200 corresponds to the number of individuals (rows) of $\mathbf{Y}$, and q to the number of values that the
 201 variable has had along the q situations. Let $\mathbf{Z}_j$ be each of the matrices thus obtained, with $1 \leq$
 202 $j \leq p$, once the data has been centered. On Figure 1b, **it can be seen** the representation of
 203 one of the matrices. Let us proceed to project $\mathbf{Z}_j$ in the biplot graph obtained in step 1 as
 204 seen previously. If **are joined** each of the points representing the values that the variable has
 205 had in different situations, and in the right order, **can be obtained** the path followed by this
 206 variable in relation to the variables and points represented at time t . By varying j
 207 conveniently, **is obtained** the representation of the trajectories of all variables.

208
 209 Similarly, once the reference situation t has been set in the data cube $\mathbf{C}$, **they** can get as
 210 many two-dimensional arrays as individuals, i.e., n matrices of dimension $p \times q$ where the
 211 scalar p corresponds to the number of variables (columns) of $\mathbf{Y}$ and q to the number of
 212 values that individuals have had along the q situations. Let $\mathbf{X}_i$ be each of the matrices thus
 213 obtained, with $1 \leq i \leq n$, once the data have been centered with the value of the mean of the
 214 variables. On Figure 1c **it can be seen** the representation of one of the matrices. Projecting
 215 $\mathbf{X}_i$ in the biplot graph obtained in step 1 and joining every point representing the values that
 216 an individual has had in different situations, and in the right order, **is obtained** the path
 217 followed by the individual in relation to the variables and points represented by situation t .
 218 Varying i conveniently **is obtained** the representation of the trajectories of all individuals.

219 220 **3.2.4 Dynamic Biplot properties**

221
 222 The biplot analysis of a reference context has all the properties of its chosen factorization.
 223 The correct interpretation will give us knowledge of the static situation t . The elements
 224 projected in different situations retain properties similar to those of the chosen factorization
 225 regarding the reference situation.

226 227 **4. THE DYNBILOT SOFTWARE**

228
 229 To provide operational support to the theory behind the Dynamic Biplot method, **it has**
 230 developed a package in R with a Graphical User Interface (GUI) that it has been called
 231 dynBiplotGUI. It covers everything one may need to make and represent the Dynamic Biplot.
 232 Figure 2 shows the appearance of the program window with the loaded data cube.
 233




Figure 2: Window of dynBiplot with the loaded data

The package dynBiplotGUI contains the program dynBiplot, which performs the Dynamic Biplot. All processing is carried out with GUI, and can be done using Spanish, English, French and Portuguese. The outcome is graphical and numerical results of the analysis.

The program dynBiplot contains four panels that allow us to carry out each of the tasks required for the analysis, including guiding the user to minimize errors. The first panel, namely 'Data Panel', allows to load the data onto the module and to prepare its structure depending on whether they are 2-way or 3-way data. The format of the individuals and variables is done in the 'Format Panel'. In the 'Variables Panel' **you can be selected** items, individuals and variables, which **they can be used** in the calculation of the model. Finally, the 'Analysis Panel' contains all the necessary options to customize the analysis and the chart.

Once the graph is obtained, it is possible to change the settings and get a new one as many times as necessary, without having to close the program and run it again. On the chart itself, one can make the zoom needed to get more detail.

5. EVOLUTION OF THE ECONOMIC FREEDOM IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

5.1 Introduction

As result of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU), signed in 1992 by the Maastricht Treaty, the European Union (EU) has a set of economic and monetary policies that apply to its 27 member countries [33]. This treaty gave rise to the single currency, the euro, used by the 17 EU countries forming the 'euro area'. On July 1st, 2013, Croatia has become part of the EU.

Every year, since 1995, The Heritage Foundation in association with The Wall Street Journal releases the *Economic Freedom Index* [34], which follows the theory of Adam Smith (1776). The Heritage Foundation considers that if the score of the *Index of Economic Freedom* of a country is higher than 80, it has 'truly free' economic policies; if the score is between 70-80, those policies are 'mostly free', if between 60-70, they are 'moderately free', if between 50-60, 'mostly unfree' and if the score is less than 50, it is considered a country whose economy is 'repressed'. In the EU there are neither 'truly free' countries nor economically 'repressed' ones. Greece is the only EU country that reaches the level of 'mostly unfree' economic policies.

5.2 Materials and Methods

The data were used for this study has been obtained from 'The Heritage Foundation' website (www.heritage.org). It is an array of data which includes the *Index of Economic Freedom* and the ten specific indices that measure each of its components for the countries of the European continent, from which are selected the 28 countries comprising the EU. The result is a matrix that can be converted into a data cube with 28 countries (rows), and 11 variables (columns) measured in 9 periods, corresponding to the years between 2005 and 2013, both included. It was added a variable to distinguish the countries belonging to the euro area and another to qualify the score on the overall index. All scores of the freedom index range between 0 and 100.

The names used for the variables are listed below. The overall index is *Index of Economic Freedom*; in the area *Rule of law: Property Rights, Freedom from Corruption*; in the area *Limited Government: Fiscal Freedom, Government Spending*; in the area *Regulatory Efficiency: Business Freedom, Labor Freedom, Monetary Freedom*; in the area *Open Markets: Trade Freedom, Investment Freedom, Financial Freedom*.

Subsequently, using the technique of Dynamic Biplot presented above, it has been analyzed the relationship of each of the EU countries with the index of economic freedom in 2013 and the changes that took place, indices and countries, to reach that situation, obtaining their trajectories. It has been used in 2013 to be the closest of the data processed. The method allows to set the baseline for any of the periods.

5.3 Dynamic Biplot

5.3.1 Step 1: static analysis

It has been made the first step of the Dynamic Biplot with the data cube containing the indices of economic freedom (variables), the member countries of the EU (individuals) and index scores between 2005 and 2013, both included (situations). In this study, it is taken as reference situation the one corresponding to year 2013. Obviously, this reference matrix can be changed.

This first step corresponds to the static analysis of the data and the results are shown in Figure 3, where it presents the HJ-Biplot analysis of the centered data. The plane 1-2 accounts for 78% of the variability. Those elements, rows and columns, which do not accumulate sufficient level inertia (<300) have been hidden. Different marks have been used for countries belonging (□) or not (•) to the eurozone. Variables that are not well represented in this plane and that have been hidden are the *Monetary Freedom* and *Trade Freedom* indices. The countries that have been hidden are Cyprus, Malta and Spain.




Figure 3: Results of Step 1 - Static HJ-Biplot analysis of economic freedom indices, year 2013. It distinguishes between countries in the euro area (□) and non-euro area (●).

Plane axis 1 (62.3%) is highly correlated with variables of the *Rule of law* (Property, Corruption) area. Axis 2 (16.12%) is correlated with *Labor Freedom* and, to a lesser extent, by the *Index of Economic Freedom*. Variables of the *Limited Government* (Fiscal, Gov. Spending) area, *Financial Freedom* and *Investment Freedom* are plane variables. The *Index of Economic Freedom* is correlated with variables of the *Open Markets* (Trade, Investment, Financial) and *Rule of law* (Property, Corruption) areas and with the *Labor Freedom* index, being independent of the *Business Freedom* and *Limited Government* (Fiscal, Gov. Spending) area variables.

Regarding the position of different countries according to variables they can be observed different groups; a group of countries are well positioned in relation to the *Index of Economic Freedom* and the *Open Markets* (Investment, Financial) area variables, like Ireland (IRL), Estonia (EST), UK (GBR) and Austria (AUT). Most countries with a good score on the overall index are also well positioned in the *Rule of law* area (Property, Corruption), highlighting Denmark (DNK); however, some countries with good overall score as Czech Republic (CZE) and Lithuania (LTU), have a poor score in this area, like most countries outside the eurozone, which are well positioned in the *Limited Government* area. Another group of countries stand out regarding *Business Freedom*, like Denmark (DNK), Sweden (SWE), Finland (FIN), Netherlands (NLD), Belgium (BEL) and Germany (DEU). Countries like Croatia (HRV), Italy (ITA), Portugal (PRT), Slovenia (SVN) and Greece (GRC) get bad scores in almost all areas and especially in *Labor Freedom*. France (FRA) meets poorly in the *Limited Government* area (Fiscal, Gov. Spending) and *Labor Freedom* index getting its best score in *Business Freedom*.

5.3.2 Step 2: dynamic analysis

The second step of the Dynamic Biplot analysis allows us to study the dynamics of the model by observing the trajectories of both, economic freedom (Figure 4) and countries (Figure 6). Each trajectory is the path followed by every element up to the position corresponding to the reference situation, in 2013.




Figure 4: Step 2 Dynamic Biplot: Trajectory of indices of economic freedom, ending in the reference year, 2013.

Zooming in Figure 4 allows us to have a better look at the trajectories (Figure 5). Similarly one could perform zoom rest of the figure.

In Figure 5 there is a short path for the *Index of Economic Freedom* with a decrease up to year 2007 followed by a slight recovery. There is also a departure from *Rule of law* (Property, Corruption) area variables. *Freedom from Corruption* and *Property Rights* (Property) variables show a decline up to 2010 and a subsequent recovery to the current situation; it is also seen a shift towards the global index variable.




Figure 5: Zoom to better see the trajectories of the variables, each path ends in the reference year 2013.

The trajectory of the *Financial Freedom* index which, up to year 2009, has decreased and shifted towards axis 1 followed by a decline in freedom until 2012. The *Labor Freedom* variable grew throughout the studied period. The *Investment Freedom* variable shows a decrease in almost all the studied time periods. The *Business Freedom* variable appears displaced towards the independence of the *Index of Economic Freedom*.

The variables of the *Limited Government* area, *Government Spending* freedom grew until 2007, declining after up to 2010 and recovering ever since; *Fiscal Freedom* has had an erratic trajectory with a trend to growth, although in the last period has decreased slightly.

Country trajectories are represented in Figure 6. The label for every country is located on the reference situation, in this case, at the end point.

Results show that Sweden (SWE) has increased its *Business Freedom* until 2009 declining thereafter but increasing the *Index of Economic Freedom*. Finland (FIN) and Belgium (BEL) have trajectories with ups and downs but in opposite directions. Germany (DEU) has also improved its global index, like France (FRA), although at different levels. Portugal (PRT) suffers decline. The trajectories of Italy (ITA) and Greece (GRC) show a strong decrease in economic freedom, while the newly incorporated Croatia (HRV), Poland (POL) and Romania (ROU) have great increments. Slovenia (SVN) has ups and downs. The Czech Republic (CZE) shows the long trajectory, increasing the *Index of Economic Freedom*, *Labor Freedom*, *Fiscal Freedom* and *Government Spending* scores. Trajectories of other countries have ups and downs.




Figure 6: Step 2 Dynamic Biplot: Trajectory of countries, ending in the reference year, 2013.

Zooming in Figure 6 allows us to have a better look at the trajectories (Figure 7). Similarly one could perform zoom rest of the figure.

Figure 7 corresponds to countries with more economic freedom. While Denmark (DNK) and the Netherlands (NLD) are stable, Austria (AUT) has a shift to *Investment Freedom*, *Financial Freedom* and the *Index of Economic Freedom*. United Kingdom (GBR) and Ireland (IRL) have major setbacks in the *Index of Economic Freedom* and in *Labor Freedom*.

6. DISCUSSION

In this paper it has been analyzed the relationships between the indices that measure the various expressions of economic freedom and the positioning of the EU member countries regarding to them. Although most EU countries get good scores in the *Index of Economic Freedom*, not all the areas are equally developed. The *Rule of law* area (zone non-euro), especially the indicator *Government Spending* (both areas), and the *Labor Freedom* (eurozone) are those with lower scores.

It has been seen in our analysis that the EU has well developed *Property Rights*, being this index one of the indicators that helps to discriminate among different countries. However, concerning intellectual property policies, a law reform is needed in order to adapt to the reality we are living in, being a unique opportunity for the economic development of the EU [35].

The anticorruption policy, which is another indicator that contributes to discrimination among countries, also gives the desired results [36]. Clark Williams and Seguí-Mas [37] say that corruption is one problem that must be cut down in all societies. The EU, European Council

416 [38], aims to promote policies against corruption by adopting the 'Stockholm Programme'
 417 although not all EU countries get the same results against corruption as showed in this study
 418 and in those carried out by other authors [39–41].
 419




Figure 7: Zoom to better see the trajectories of the countries, each path ends in the reference year 2013.

422 The EU hosts some of the most advanced economies, whereas, even with common EU
 423 policies, some others are not very developed. But as you can see in Europa-Press Releases
 424 [42], the Commission is imposing to most countries an Excessive Deficit Procedure (EDP).
 425 For the EU, our analysis shows that economic freedom is barely influenced by measures to
 426 restrict governments. We should not forget that all countries except Greece, have a good
 427 score on the *Index of Economic Freedom*.
 428

429 As indicated by Miller et al. [34] in the *2013 Index of Economic Freedom*, France, Greece,
 430 Italy, Portugal and the UK had similar scores two decades ago, while Sweden, Germany,
 431 Czech Republic, Poland, Romania and Bulgaria had their best values in 2013. In our
 432 analysis we have seen that, for the analyzed period, France and Portugal improve their
 433 score, while Greece, Italy and Britain worsen it.
 434

435 The *Index of Economic Freedom* of The Heritage Foundation has been used to apply
 436 various techniques. Tausch [43] used it along with other variables with ordinary least square
 437 standard regression analysis to analyze the four freedoms: goods, capital, labor and
 438 services of EU. Yerelí [44] discussed the economic freedom of countries aspiring to EU
 439 membership, concluding that “most of the transition economies which joined the EU after
 440 2004, have a regular improvement on their level of economic freedom” an issue that we
 441 have seen with the case of Croatia.
 442
 443

444 In addition to the *Index of Economic Freedom* developed by The Heritage Foundation, there
445 are other similar indices, as the one developed by the Fraser Institute of Canada or The
446 European Economic Freedom Index [45]. Using these indices, authors as Sell [46] make a
447 classification of EU countries after the 2004 expansion. Hall et al. [47] discussed the
448 differences in economic freedom, concluding that “we find evidence that the European Union
449 was, on net, positive for economic freedom... Further research is needed to understand
450 exactly how EU membership affects economic freedom”. Our study poses an advance on
451 this line of research.

452

453 7. CONCLUSIONS

454

455 The Dynamic Biplot developed in this paper and applied to the data presented allows us to
456 reach the following conclusions:

457

458 The Dynamic Biplot method has proven to be a new approach to data processing 3-way. Its
459 use in conjunction with the developed dynBiplotGUI package, obtains results easy to
460 represent and interpret.

461

462 The *Index of Economic Freedom* is correlated with the *Regulatory Efficiency* and *Rule of law*
463 areas and *Labor Freedom* index, being independent of the *Business Freedom* and *Limited*
464 *Government* area variables. The variables of the *Rule of law* area (*Property Rights* and
465 *Freedom from Corruption*) are the ones that better discriminate among EU countries. Both
466 variables have a shift toward the *Index of Economic Freedom*.

467

468 Countries outside the eurozone enjoy higher economic freedom although some of them have
469 weaker economies than others in the eurozone, such as France and Italy. Most countries
470 with good score on the overall index, have also a good performance in the *Rule of law* area
471 and most countries in the non-euro zone are well positioned in the area of *Limited*
472 *Government*.

473

474 Countries like Italy, Portugal, Slovenia and Greece have bad scores in most areas,
475 especially in *Labor Freedom*. France and Croatia also have little *Labor Freedom* but perform
476 better in *Business Freedom* and the *Limited Government* area respectively.

477

478 Croatia, recently incorporated to the EU, shows an improvement in its economic freedom
479 trajectory.

480

481 REFERENCES

482

483 1. Gabriel KR. The Biplot Graphic Display of Matrices with Application to Principal
484 Component Analysis. *Biometrika*; 58(3):453-67.

485 2. Gabriel KR, Odoroff CL. Biplots in Biomedical Research. *Stat Med Stat Med*.
486 1990;9(5):469-85.

487 3. Eckart C, Young G. A Principal Axis Transformation for Non-hermitian Matrices. *Bull*
488 *Amer Math Soc Bull Am Math Soc*. 1939; 45(2):118-22.

489 4. Householder AS, Young G. Matrix Approximation and Latent Roots. *Am Math Mon*.
490 1938; 45(3):165-71.

491 5. Greenacre M. Theory and applications of correspondence analysis. London; Orlando
492 Fla.: Academic Press; 1984

- 493 6. Golub GH, Reinsch C. Singular Value Decomposition and Least Squares Solutions.
494 Numer Math Numer Math. 1970;14(5):403-20.
- 495 7. P. Galindo An Alternative simultaneous Representation: HJ-Biplot. Question. 1986; 10
496 (1).
- 497 8. Martín-Rodríguez J, Galindo-Villardón MP, Vicente-Villardón JL. Comparison and
498 Integration of Subspaces from a Biplot Perspective. J Stat Plan Inference;102(2):411-
499 23.
- 500 9. Vallejo-Arboleda A, Vicente-Villardón JL, Galindo-Villardón MP. Canonical STATIS:
501 Biplot Analysis of Multi-table Group Structured Data Based on STATIS-ACT
502 Methodology. Comput Stat Data Anal;51(9):4193-205.
- 503 10. Escoufier Y. The Vector Processing Variables. Biometrics, 29 (4): 751-60.
- 504 11. Escoufier Y. The Joint Analysis of Multiple Data Matrices. Biometrics Time. 1980; 59-
505 72.
- 506 12. Krzanowski WJ. Between-Groups Comparison of Principal Components. J Am Stat
507 Assoc. 1979;74(367):703-7.
- 508 13. Krzanowski WJ. Between-group Comparison of Principal Components some Sampling
509 Results. J Stat Comput Simul. 1982;15(2-3):141-54.
- 510 14. Lavit C, Bernard M-C, Pérez-Hugalde C, Escoufier Y. Analyse Conjointe de Tableaux
511 Quantitatifs. Paris; Barcelone [etc.]: Masson; 1988.
- 512 15. Flury BN. Common Principal Components in K Groups. J Am Stat Assoc.
513 1984;79(388):892-8.
- 514 16. The Hermier H. Plants at Three Tables Structuring indices Statistics: Theory and
515 Application of Joint Analysis Method. [[Montpellier]]: University of Science and
516 Technology of Languedoc; 1976.
- 517 17. Lavit C, Escoufier Y, Sabatier R, Traissac P. The ACT (STATIS Method). 1994.
- 518 18. Pagès J, Escoufier B. Multiple Factor Analysis. Paris: Institute of Statistics, University
519 Pierre and Marie Curie; 1984.
- 520 19. Chessel D, Mr Hanafi Analyses Co-inertia K Points Clouds. Applied Rev Stat. 1996;
521 44: 35-60.
- 522 20. Dazy F, JF Barzic. Scalable Data analysis: Methods and Applications. Paris: Editions
523 Technip; 1996.
- 524 21. Jaffrenou PA. On the Families Gone Variables and Vector Analysis: Basics and
525 Application to the Algebraic Description Statistics. 1978.
- 526 22. Simier M, M Hanafi, Chessel D. Simultaneous Approach K Tables torques. Book of
527 Abstracts of the 28th Days of Communications Statistics. Québec: Laval University;
528 1996. p. 673-6.

- 529 23. Suazay L, Hanafi M, Qannari E, Schlich P. Analyse de K + 1 Tableaux à l'Aide de la
530 Méthode STATIS: Application en Évaluation Sensorielle. Montpellier (France); 2006. p.
531 1-23.
- 532 24. Abdi H, Valentin D, Chollet S, Chrea C. Analyzing Assessors and Products in Sorting
533 Tasks: DISTATIS, Theory and Applications. Food Qual Prefer. 2007;18(4):627-40.
- 534 25. Sabatier R, Vivien M. A New Linear Method for Analyzing Four-way Multiblock Tables:
535 STATIS-4. J Chemom [Internet]. 2008;22(6):399-407.
- 536 26. Vivien M, Sune F. Two Four-way Multiblock Methods Used for Comparing Two
537 Consumer Panels of Children. Food Qual Prefer. 2009;20(7):472-81.
- 538 27. Thioulouse J. Simultaneous Analysis of a Sequence of Paired Ecological Tables: A
539 Comparison of Several Methods. Ann Appl Stat. 2011;5(4):2300-25.
- 540 28. Bâenassâeni J, Bennani Dosse M. Analyzing Multiset Data by the Power STATIS-ACT
541 Method. Adv Data Anal Classif. 2012;6(1):49-65.
- 542 29. Corrales D, Rodríguez O. Interstatist: **statis method for data type interval**. Rev
543 Matemática Teoría Apl. 2014;21(1):73.
- 544 30. Abdi H, Williams LJ, Valentin D, Bennani-Dosse M. STATIS and DISTATIS: Optimum
545 Multitable Principal Component Analysis and Three Way Metric Multidimensional
546 Scaling. Wiley Interdiscip Rev Comput Stat. 2012;4(2):124-67.
- 547 31. Sparks R, Adolphson, Allan, Phatak, Aloke. Multivariate Process Monitoring Using the
548 Dynamic Biplot. Rev Int Stat. 1997;65(3):325.
- 549 32. Graffelman J, Aluja-Banet T. Optimal Representation of Supplementary Variables in
550 Biplots from Principal Component Analysis and Correspondence Analysis. Biom J
551 Biom Z. 2003;45(4):491.
- 552 33. Hitiris T. European Union Economics. 2003.
- 553 34. Miller T, Holmes K, Feulner EJ. 2013 Index of Economic Freedom. Washington, D.C.;
554 New York, N.Y.: Heritage Foundation; Wall Street Journal; 2013
- 555 35. Hargreaves I, UK Intellectual Property Office. Digital Opportunity a Review of
556 Intellectual Property and Growth: an Independent Report. 2011
- 557 36. Persson T. Do Political Institutions Shape Economic Policy? Econometrica. 2002;
558 70(3):883-905.
- 559 37. Clark Williams C, Seguí-Mas E. Corporate Governance and Business Ethics in the
560 European Union: a Cluster Analysis. J Glob Responsib. 2010;1(1):98-126.
- 561 38. European Council. The Stockholm Programme - An Open and Secure Europe Serving
562 and Protecting Citizens [Internet]. Official Journal of the European Union; 2010
- 563 39. Heywood PM. Corruption in Contemporary Spain. PS Polit Sci Polit. 2007;40(4):695-9.

- 564 40. Trejo Fuentes. Corruption and Inequality in the European Union. *Estud Rev Soc* 2010;
565 37: 106-20.
- 566 41. Jiménez A. Political Risk as a Determinant of Southern European FDI in Neighboring
567 Developing Countries. *Emerg Mark Finance Trade*. 2011;47(4):59-74.
- 568 42. Europa P releases. Commission Takes Steps Under the Excessive Deficit Procedure.
569 2013
- 570 43. Tausch A. The 'Four Economic Freedoms' and Life Quality: General Tendencies and
571 Some Hard Lessons for EU-27-Europe. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research
572 Network; 2011. Report No.: ID 1924133.
- 573 44. Yerelí AB. The Effects of the Enlargement of EU on the Economic Freedom Level of
574 Transitional Economies. *Sos Bilim Derg*. 2007;153-75.
- 575 45. Ronca G, Guggiola G, Bussi P, D. Donati Measure Economic Freedom: World, in
576 Europe, in Italy. Milan: Guerini and Associates; Lazard; Centre for Research and
577 Documentation "Luigi Einaudi"; 2004.
- 578 46. Sell CW. Economic Freedom in the 25-Member European Union: Insights Using
579 Classification Tools. En: Weihs PDC, Gaul PDW, editores. *Classification — the*
580 *Ubiquitous Challenge* [Internet]. Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2005
- 581 47. Hall JC, Lawson RA, Wogtsland R. The European Union and Economic Freedom. *Glob*
582 *Econ J*. 2011;11(3).

583

584

585