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About the EIB Investment Survey (EIBIS)
The EIB Group Survey on Investment and Investment Finance is a unique, EU-wide, annual survey of some 12,300 firms. It collects data on firm characteristics and performance, past investment activities and future plans, sources of finance, financing issues and other challenges that businesses face. Using a stratified sampling methodology, EIBIS is representative across all 28 member States of the EU, as well as for firm size classes (micro to large) and 4 main sectors. It is designed to build a panel of observations to support time series analysis, observations that can also be linked to firm balance sheet and profit and loss data. EIBIS has been developed and is managed by the Economics Department of the EIB, with support to development and implementation by Ipsos MORI. For more information see: http://www.eib.org/eibis.

About this publication
This Country Overview is one of a series covering each of the 28 EU Member States, plus an EU-wide overview. These are intended to provide an accessible snapshot of the data. For the purpose of these publications, data is weighted by value-added to better reflect the contribution of different firms to economic output. Contact: eibis@eib.org.

About the Economics Department of the EIB
The mission of the EIB Economics Department is to provide economic analyses and studies to support the Bank in its operations and in the definition of its positioning, strategy and policy. The Department, a team of 40 economists, is headed by Debora Revoltella, Director of Economics.

Main contributors to this publication
Miroslav Kollar, EIB.

Disclaimer
The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of the EIB.

About Ipsos Public Affairs
Ipsos Public Affairs works closely with national governments, local public services and the not-for-profit sector, as well as international and supranational organizations. Its c.200 research staff in London and Brussels focus on public service and policy issues. Each has expertise in a particular part of the public sector, ensuring we have a detailed understanding of specific sectors and policy challenges. This, combined with our methodological and communications expertise, helps ensure that our research makes a difference for decision makers and communities.
This country overview presents selected findings based on telephone interviews with 400 firms in Slovakia in 2018 (carried out between April and July).

### Key results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macroeconomic context:</th>
<th><strong>Aggregate Investment in Slovakia stands firmly above pre-crisis levels,</strong> mainly thanks to the government sector. Corporate investment has also started to recover. Machinery and equipment has been the main driver of the investment pick-up in recent years, while infrastructure investment still stands significantly below its pre-crisis levels.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment outlook:</td>
<td><strong>Firms’ investment outlook remains positive</strong> with more firms expecting a (further) expansion of investment activities than a contraction for the current financial year. Looking ahead to the next three years, investment in capacity expansion is most commonly cited by firms as their investment priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment activity:</td>
<td><strong>81% of firms invested in the last financial year,</strong> a slight increase compared to the previous wave, EIBIS 2017, though still below the EU average (87%). Firms in the manufacturing sector are more likely than others to report innovation activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived investment gap:</td>
<td><strong>14% of firms report investing too little over the last three years,</strong> slightly below the EU average (16%), but slightly higher than the share reported in EIBIS 2017. The average share of state-of-the-art machinery and equipment in firms is lower the EU average (34% versus 44%). This share of building stock satisfying high efficiency standards is similar to the EU (41% versus 37%) across the EU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment barriers:</td>
<td><strong>Around 80% of firms consider business regulations and availability of skilled staff as barriers to investment.</strong> Availability of finance is more likely to be mentioned as an obstacle in this wave of the survey. <strong>Skill mismatches are more pressing in lower level occupations, particularly in large firms, and in firms in the infrastructure and service sectors.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External finance:</td>
<td><strong>The share of finance constrained firms remains at 6%, similar to the 5% EU average.</strong> SMEs face particularly high obstacles to funding. Overall, firms are relatively less happy to use exclusively internal funds than in EIBIS 2017, and share of external finance has increased. <strong>The highest proportions of dissatisfaction are with the cost of finance and the collateral required.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm performance:</td>
<td><strong>Productivity remains below the EU average</strong> though service sector firms performs well relative to other sectors. Large and manufacturing firms contribute a higher share of value added than EU-wide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INVESTMENT DYNAMICS**

**INVESTMENT ACTIVITY IN LAST FINANCIAL YEAR**

Eight in ten firms in Slovakia invested in the last financial year (81%, four percentage points higher than in EIBIS 2017). The proportion that invested remains below the EU average (87%).

Firms in the infrastructure sector were more likely to invest (94%), and service sector firms less likely to invest (65%), compared to the country average.

SMEs were more likely to invest than large firms (88% versus 75%).

Investment per employee reduced in the last financial year and remains below the EU average.

*The blue bars indicate the proportion of firms who have invested in the last financial year. A firm is considered to have invested if it spent more than EUR 500 per employee on investment activities. Investment intensity is the median investment per employee of investing firms. Investment intensity is reported in real terms using the Eurostat GFCF deflator (indexed to the 2016 wave).*

**Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)**

**INVESTMENT CYCLE**

Slovakia remains in the ‘low investment expanding’ quadrant on the investment cycle.

The infrastructure sector has both a high share of firms investing and most confidence in expecting to increase investment in the current financial year.

Manufacturing and services firms have relatively low shares of firms investing, but are also likely on balance to plan to expand investment in 2018.

In contrast, the construction sector has a relatively high share of firms investing, but on balance expect a decrease in investment activity in 2018.

*Base: All firms
Share of firms investing shows the percentage of firms with investment per employee greater than EUR 500
The y-axis line crosses x-axis on the EU average for 2016*
INVESTMENT DYNAMICS

EVOLUTION OF INVESTMENT EXPECTATIONS

More firms in Slovakia increased than reduced their investment activities in 2017, but to a lesser extent than expected. For 2018, this positive outlook is expected to continue and improve modestly. The service sector is most likely on balance to expect an increase in investment in 2018, but more construction firms expect to reduce investment than increase it.

![Graph showing investment dynamics]

Realised/Expected change in investment

Base: All firms

*Realised change* is the share of firms who invested more minus those who invested less; *Expected change* is the share of firms who expect(ed) to invest more minus those who expect(ed) to invest less.

FUTURE INVESTMENT PRIORITIES (% of firms)

Looking ahead to the next three years, investment in capacity expansion for existing products and services is most commonly cited as a priority (46%), followed by investment in developing or introducing new products and services (27%).

Firms in the infrastructure and service sectors are most likely to prioritise investing in capacity expansion (52% and 51% respectively).

Large firms are more likely than SMEs to say investing in new products and services is their priority (36% versus 15%).

Large firms as well as manufacturing, construction and service sector firms are more likely than others to prioritise investing in developing new products and services.

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

Q. Looking ahead to the next three years, which is your investment priority (a) replacing existing buildings, machinery, equipment, IT; (b) expanding capacity for existing products/services; (c) developing or introducing new products, processes, services?
INVESTMENT FOCUS

INVESTMENT AREAS
The highest share of investment in Slovakia in the last financial year was allocated towards investments in machinery and equipment (54%), followed by land, business buildings and infrastructure (22%) and software, data and IT (8%).

The infrastructure sector has the highest share of investment in machinery and equipment (64%).

Service sector firms report the highest shares of investment in land, business buildings and infrastructure (32%) and organisation/business processes (35%) compared to the country averages (22% and 7% respectively).

Large and manufacturing firms have the highest shares of investment in R&D (5% and 6% respectively).

PURPOSE OF INVESTMENT IN LAST FINANCIAL YEAR (% of firms’ investment)

The largest share of investment in Slovakia is driven by the need to replace existing buildings, machinery, equipment and IT (43%), slightly below the EU average and EIBIS 2017 (both 47%).

This is followed by capacity expansion for existing products and services (accounting for a 33% share of investment, the same as in EIBIS 2017 and similar to the 31% EU average).

The share of investment for new products and services was higher among large firms than SMEs (22% versus 17%).

Base: All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Q. In the last financial year, how much did your business invest in each of the following with the intention of maintaining or increasing your company’s future earnings?

Base: All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Q. What proportion of total investment was for (a) replacing capacity (including existing buildings, machinery, equipment, IT) (b) expanding capacity for existing products/services (c) developing or introducing new products, processes, services?
INVESTMENT FOCUS

INNOVATION ACTIVITY

Among all firms, around two-fifths (39%) developed or introduced new products, processes or services as part of their investment activities (on a par with the result reported in EIBIS 2017).

Firms in the manufacturing sector are most likely to report high levels of innovation (50% innovated overall, and 35% said the products, processes or services were new to the country or world).

SMEs are less likely than large firms to have innovated.

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

Q. What proportion of total investment was for developing or introducing new products, processes, services?

Q. Were the products, processes or services new to the company, new to the country, new to the global market?

INVESTMENT ABROAD

Among firms in Slovakia that invested in the last financial year, only 5% said they had invested in another country, which is similar to EIBIS 2017 (6%) and still well below the EU average (12%).

There is much less variation by firm size and sector than in EIBIS 2017 when 13% of manufacturing firms and 9% of large firms claimed to have invested abroad.

Base: All firms who invested in the last financial year

Q. In the last financial year, has your company invested in another country?
PERCEIVED INVESTMENT GAP

Around eight in ten firms believe their investment over the last three years was about the right amount (78%), a slight fall vis-à-vis EIBIS 2017 (83%) but still in line with the EU average (77%).

Fourteen per cent report investing too little, slightly above the result from EIBIS 2017 (12%). The trend also broadly reflects the EU findings (16% of firms say they under-invested).

Under-investment is perceived to be highest in the manufacturing sector and among large firms (17% and 16%).

Around one in ten infrastructure firms (11%) believe they have invested too much in the last three years.

SHARE OF FIRMS AT OR ABOVE FULL CAPACITY

Two in five firms in Slovakia report operating at or above maximum capacity in the last financial year (42%), similar to EIBIS 2017 (39%).

This means Slovakia remains below the EU average of 54%.

The share of firms operating at or above full capacity is consistent across size and sector of firm. The largest increases from EIBIS 2017 in the share of firms that report being at or above full capacity are for firms in the service and manufacturing sectors. On the other hand, the share of firms at or above full capacity in the infrastructure sector decreased from EIBIS 2017.

Full capacity is the maximum capacity attainable under normal conditions e.g. company’s general practices regarding the utilization of machines and equipment, overtime, work shifts, holidays etc.

Q. In the last financial year, was your company operating above or at maximum capacity attainable under normal circumstances?
SHARE OF STATE OF THE ART MACHINERY AND BUILDING STOCK MEETING HIGH ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARDS

The average perceived share of state-of-the-art machinery and equipment in firms is lower than the EU average (34% versus 44%).

On average 41% of firms’ building stock in Slovakia is said to satisfy high energy efficiency standards compared to the EU average of 37%.

The findings are generally in line with those from EIBIS 2017, though firms in the infrastructure sector now report a higher proportion of building stock meeting high efficiency standards (38% compared with 18% in EIBIS 2017).

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

Q. What proportion, if any, of your commercial building stock satisfies high or highest energy efficiency standards?
Q. What proportion, if any, of your machinery and equipment, including ICT, would you say is state-of-the-art?

ENERGY EFFICIENCY INVESTMENT

The share of investment intended primarily to improve energy efficiency stands at 16% in Slovakia, higher than the EU average of 9%.

There is relatively little difference by sector (except for the construction sector). Large firms report a higher share of their investment (19%) as being primarily related to energy efficient improvements (versus a 14% share among SMEs).

Base: All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

Q. What proportion of total investment in the last financial year was primarily for measures to improve energy efficiency in your organisation?
LONG TERM BARRIERS TO INVESTMENT

Around eight in ten firms consider business regulations and availability of skilled staff as obstacles to investment activities (83% and 79% respectively).

Labour market regulation is the next most commonly cited barrier in Slovakia.

Availability of skilled staff is perceived to be an obstacle for 90% of firms in the infrastructure sector compared with 62% of service sector firms.

Availability of finance is more likely to be named as obstacle to investment for Slovakian firms compared to EIBIS 2017. Conversely, uncertainty about the future is now less likely to be cited as a barrier.

---

LONG TERM BARRIERS BY SECTOR AND SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Demand for products/services</th>
<th>Availability of skilled staff</th>
<th>Energy costs</th>
<th>Digital infrastructure</th>
<th>Labour regulations</th>
<th>Business regulations</th>
<th>Transport infrastructure</th>
<th>Availability of finance</th>
<th>Uncertainty about the future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All firms (data not shown for those who said not an obstacle at all/don’t know/refused)

Q. Thinking about your investment activities in Slovakia, to what extent is each of the following an obstacle? Is a major obstacle, a minor obstacle or not an obstacle at all?

Reported shares combine ‘minor’ and ‘major’ obstacles into one category.

---

Base: All firms (data not shown for those who said not an obstacle at all/don’t know/refused)

Q. Thinking about your investment activities in Slovakia, to what extent is each of the following an obstacle? Is a major obstacle, a minor obstacle or not an obstacle at all?
In Slovakia, five per cent of all staff are regarded as not having the right skills to fit their company’s current needs. This is below the EU average of 7%, and this also applies when focusing on staff in higher level and intermediate occupations.

However, the proportion of staff in lower level occupations that are perceived to be without appropriate skills is 9% in Slovakia, fractionally exceeding the EU average of 8%, and significantly larger than for intermediate and higher level occupations in Slovakia.

Ten per cent of staff in lower level occupations in large firms, and among firms in the infrastructure and service sectors, are said not to have the right skills to fit the company’s current needs.

However, perceived levels of skills mis-match among employees in higher- and intermediate-level occupations are consistently low across all firm types.

**PERCEIVED SKILLS MIS-MATCH**

Base: All firms with staff in lower/intermediate/higher level occupations (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

Q. How many of your existing staff would you regard as having the right skills to fit your company’s current needs?

**PERCEIVED SKILLS MIS-MATCH BY SECTOR AND SIZE**

Base: All firms with staff in lower/intermediate/higher level occupations (excluding don’t know/refused responses)

Q. How many of your existing staff would you regard as having the right skills to fit your company’s current needs?
SOURCE OF INVESTMENT FINANCE

Internal funds account for the highest share of investment finance (56%). This is below the EU average and the share reported in Slovakia in EIBIS 2017 (62% and 67% respectively).

Slovakia is close to the EU average in terms of firms’ share of external finance (37% versus 35%). However, intra-group finance comprises 7% of finance in Slovakia, compared with 3% at EU level. Intra-group finance is more likely to be used by manufacturing and large firms in Slovakia.

Service sector firms report a higher share of internal finance (67%) than firms in other sectors (where it varies from 50%-57%). Firms in the infrastructure sector source a higher than average proportion of their finance externally (45%, versus the 37% average for all firms in Slovakia).

(Source: All firms who invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses))

Q. What proportion of your investment was financed by each of the following?

TYPE OF EXTERNAL FINANCE USED FOR INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES

Bank loans continue to make up the highest share of external finance (63%). Bank finance overall accounts for 72% of finance, versus 65% in EIBIS 2017 and the EU average of 64%.

The share of bank finance is highest in the service sector (84%) and lowest in the infrastructure sector (62%).

At 18%, the share of leasing/hire purchase is similar to the share reported in EIBIS 2017 (when it was 19%), and this is again most prominent in the infrastructure sector (where leasing accounts for 29% of external finance).

(Source: All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses))

Q. Approximately what proportion of your external finance does each of the following represent?

*Loans from family, friends or business partners
SHARE OF PROFITABLE FIRMS

More than eight in ten firms in Slovakia state they generated a profit (82%), which represents an increase vis-à-vis EIBIS 2017 (from 72%) and in line with the current EU average (also 82%).

Large firms are more likely to be profitable in general than SMEs (86% versus 77%), while the service sector has the lowest level of highly profitable firms (13%, versus 19% overall in Slovakia, which in turn is similar to the 20% share of highly profitable firms recorded across the EU).

Three per cent of all firms in Slovakia report the main reason for not applying for external finance was because they were happy to use internal funds or did not have a need for it. This remains below the EU average (16%).

The findings suggest fewer firms in Slovakia are happy to exclusively use internal funds than in EIBIS 2017, predominantly among large firms and firms in the infrastructure sector.

SMEs (5%) are more likely to be happy relying on internal finance than large firms (1%).

Base: All firms
Q: What was your main reason for not applying for external finance for your investment activities? Was happy to use internal finance/didn’t need the finance

SHARE OF PROFITABLE FIRMS
DISSATISFACTION WITH EXTERNAL FINANCE RECEIVED

While the majority of firms using external finance are satisfied with the amount, cost, maturity, collateral and type of finance received, levels of dissatisfaction tend to be higher in Slovakia than the EU average. This was also generally the case in EIBIS 2017, though the gap has increased.

The highest proportions of dissatisfaction in Slovakia are with the cost of finance (16%) and the collateral required (13%), which are well above the EU averages (6% on both measures).

Diagrams and tables are used to illustrate the satisfaction levels across different sectors and firm sizes. For instance, SMEs are more likely than large firms to be dissatisfied with the amount of finance obtained (11% versus 3%).

More than one in five service sector firms (22%) are dissatisfied with the cost of finance. For manufacturing and construction firms, dissatisfaction is highest with collateral requirements.

Base: All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Q. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with ....?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount obtained</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Length of time</th>
<th>Collateral</th>
<th>Type of finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Q. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with ....?
Six per cent of all firms can be considered finance constrained, the same share as in EIBIS 2017 and still similar to the EU average (5%). SMEs are more likely to be finance constrained than large firms (11% compared with 2%).

Finance constrained firms include: those dissatisfied with the amount of finance obtained (received less), firms that sought external finance but did not receive it (rejected) and those who did not seek external finance because they thought borrowing costs would be too high (too expensive) or they would be turned down (discouraged)

*Caution very small base size less than 30

Firms in Slovakia are similarly likely to be finance constrained and less likely to rely exclusively on internal funds than the EU benchmarks.

Within Slovakia, there is generally more difference by firm size than sector. Large firms are less likely to be finance constrained and somewhat less likely to be happy to rely only on internal funds compared to SMEs.
Large firms in Slovakia account for the greatest share of value-added (56%). This is above the EU average (50%).

Manufacturing firms in Slovakia contribute nearly half of value-added (47%). This is well above the 36% EU average.

Firms say over half of their staff (58%) are employed in lower level occupations. The remainder is made up of 32% of staff in intermediate level occupations and 10% of staff in higher level occupations.

Productivity of firms in Slovakia remains below the EU average, with productivity relatively high in the service sector and lowest among construction sector firms relative to EU benchmarks.
MACROECONOMIC INVESTMENT CONTEXT

Investment Dynamics over time

- Aggregate investment in Slovakia has surpassed its pre-crisis level and stands slightly above its longer-term trend.
- While government investment has consistently been above pre-crisis levels in recent years, corporate investment has only just reached its pre-crisis level.
- Investment in machinery and equipment has been the main driver of investment in recent years, followed by investment in dwellings, while infrastructure investment is still significantly lagging.

The graph shows the evolution of total Gross Fixed Capital Formation (in real terms); against the series ‘pre-crisis trend. The data has been indexed to equal 100 in 2008. Source: Eurostat.

Investment Dynamics by Institutional Sector

Investment Dynamics by Asset Class

The graph shows the evolution of total Gross Fixed Capital Formation (in real terms); by institutional sector. The data has been indexed to equal 100 in 2008. Source: Eurostat.

The graph shows the evolution of total Gross Fixed Capital Formation (in real terms); by asset class. The data has been indexed to equal 100 in 2008. IPP stands for Intellectual Property Product. Source: Eurostat.
EIB 2018 – COUNTRY TECHNICAL DETAILS

SAMPLING TOLERANCES APPLICABLE TO PERCENTAGES AT OR NEAR THESE LEVELS
The final data are based on a sample, rather than the entire population of firms in Slovakia, so the percentage results are subject to sampling tolerances. These vary with the size of the sample and the percentage figure concerned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling Tolerance</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Slovakia</th>
<th>EU vs Slovakia</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>SME vs Large</th>
<th>EU vs Slovakia</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>SME vs Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10% or 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% or 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLOSSARY

**Investment**
A firm is considered to have invested if it spent more than EUR 500 per employee on investment activities with the intention of maintaining or increasing the company’s future earnings.

**Investment cycle**
Based on the expected investment in current financial year compared to last one, and the proportion of firms with a share of investment greater than EUR 500 per employee.

**Productivity**
Total factor productivity is a measure of how efficiently a firm is converting inputs (capital and labor) into output (value-added). It is estimated by means of an industry-by-industry regression analysis (with country dummies).

**Manufacturing sector**
Based on the NACE classification of economic activities, firms in group C (manufacturing).

**Construction sector**
Based on the NACE classification of economic activities, firms in group F (construction).

**Services sector**
Based on the NACE classification of economic activities, firms in group G (wholesale and retail trade) and group I (accommodation and food services activities).

**Infrastructure sector**
Based on the NACE classification of economic activities, firms in groups D and E (utilities), group H (transportation and storage) and group J (information and communication).

**SME**
Firms with between 5 and 249 employees.

**Large firms**
Firms with at least 250 employees.
## EIB 2018 – COUNTRY TECHNICAL DETAILS

### BASE SIZES (*Charts with more than one base; due to limited space, only the lowest base is shown*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base definition and page reference</th>
<th>EU 2017/2018</th>
<th>SK 2017/2018</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>SME</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All firms, p. 2, 3, 6, 9, 11, 13, 14</td>
<td>12338/12355</td>
<td>286/400</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 2</td>
<td>11839/11790</td>
<td>280/384</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 3</td>
<td>12020/12095</td>
<td>282/381</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 4</td>
<td>10321/10126</td>
<td>262/327</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 5</td>
<td>12073/12080</td>
<td>271/382</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who invested in the last financial year, p. 5</td>
<td>10889/10873</td>
<td>266/368</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding ‘company didn’t exist three years ago’ responses), p. 6</td>
<td>12306/12335</td>
<td>286/400</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 7*</td>
<td>11265/11358</td>
<td>269/383</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 7</td>
<td>NA/10004</td>
<td>NA/330</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (data not shown for those who said not an obstacle at all/don’t know/refused), p. 8</td>
<td>12338/12355</td>
<td>286/400</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms with staff in higher / intermediate lower level occupations (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 9*</td>
<td>NA/8354</td>
<td>NA/333</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 10</td>
<td>9131/9030</td>
<td>235/330</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 10</td>
<td>4206/4323</td>
<td>119/271</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 11</td>
<td>10778/10865</td>
<td>267/386</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 12</td>
<td>4212/4339</td>
<td>119/274</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 14</td>
<td>NA/11466</td>
<td>NA/379</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>