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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
Sanne Zwart, 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.
The United Kingdom

This country overview presents selected findings based on telephone interviews with 602 firms in The United Kingdom in 2018 (carried out between April and July).

Key results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macroeconomic context:</th>
<th>Aggregate Investment is well above pre-crisis levels across all institutional sectors and asset classes. Brexit and the related uncertainty keep weighing on growth, however.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment outlook:</td>
<td>More firms are expecting to increase rather than reduce investment in the coming year. However, for SMEs and firms in the service sector the opposite holds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment activity:</td>
<td>87% of firms invested in the last financial year, in line with the previous wave, EIBIS 2017, (86%) and the EU average (also 87%). Investment intensity (EUR per employee) was marginally below the EU average. The share of investment that firms allocated to ‘intangible’ assets in the last financial year was in line with the EU average; the same goes for firms’ propensity to innovate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived investment gap:</td>
<td>19% of firms report investing too little over the last three years, an increase on EIBIS 2017 (12%) and above the EU average (16%). The average perceived share of state-of-the-art machinery and equipment in firms (30%) and the average share of building stock said to meet high energy efficiency standards (28%) are both below the EU averages (44% and 37% respectively).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment barriers:</td>
<td>Availability of skilled staff and uncertainty about the future are the primary obstacles for firms in the UK, as well as the EU as a whole. Large firms and those in the manufacturing sector in the UK are even more likely to perceive uncertainty about the future as a barrier to investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External finance:</td>
<td>Three per cent of firms are finance constrained, below the EU average (5%). Firms are largely satisfied with their external finance; dissatisfaction is highest with the cost of finance (5%) and collateral required (4%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm performance:</td>
<td>Productivity of firms in the UK is broadly in line with the EU benchmark. Large firms account for the greatest share of value-added (58%), above the EU average (50%).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INVESTMENT DYNAMICS

INVESTMENT ACTIVITY IN LAST FINANCIAL YEAR

Almost nine in ten firms in the UK invested in the last financial year (87%), in line with EIBIS 2017 (86%) and the EU average (also 87%).

Firms in the manufacturing and construction sectors (92% and 91%) were more likely to invest than those in the services sector (82%).

SMEs were less likely to invest than larger firms (83% versus 90%).

Investment intensity (EUR per employee) decreased and is now 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

The UK remains in the ‘high investment expanding’ quadrant on the investment cycle.

Relatively high shares of large firms invested in the last financial year and plan to expand investment in the current financial year.

Firms in the service sector and SMEs fall into the ‘low investment contracting’ quadrant.
INVESTMENT DYNAMICS

EVOLUTION OF INVESTMENT EXPECTATIONS

More firms in the UK increased rather than reduced their investment activities in 2017, with the net balance exceeding expectations. For 2018, this positive trend is expected to continue though to a lesser extent. The infrastructure sector and large firms are most likely on balance to expect more investment, but more service firms and SMEs anticipate reducing investment than increasing it.

Looking ahead to the next three years, investment in capacity expansion for existing products and services is most commonly cited as a priority (30%), followed by investment in new products and services (28%).

In the manufacturing sector, investment in new products and services remains more dominant and is the priority for 42% of firms.

Firms in the infrastructure sector are more likely to prioritise investing in replacement (37%), relative to other sectors.

Realised change (€) Expected change (€)

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 expected to invest more minus those who expected to invest less.

* Icon for Construction firms is obscured by the icon for Manufacturing firms – both sectors have a net balance of +3.7%.

FUTURE INVESTMENT PRIORITIES (% of firms)

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Q: Looking ahead to the next 3 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

Of the six investment areas asked about, the highest share of investment in the UK is in machinery and equipment (41%). This is followed by land, business buildings and infrastructure (20%), with the service sector having the highest share of investment in this area (31% versus 9-20% in the other sectors).

The manufacturing sector has the highest share of investment in machinery and equipment (50%), and in R&D (19%).

Large firms have a higher share of investment in land, business buildings and infrastructure (24%, versus 14% among SMEs).

SMEs report a higher share of investment in software, data and IT (17% versus 10% in large firms), and training of employees (15% versus 6%).

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?

The largest share of investment in the UK is driven by the need to replace existing buildings, machinery, equipment and IT (43%), slightly below the EU average (47%) and EIBIS 2017 (46%).

This is followed by capacity expansion for existing products and services (34% share in the UK compared with 31% both across the EU and in the UK in EIBIS 2017).

The highest share of investment in replacement is in the construction and infrastructure sectors (both 51%).

Large firms invested a higher share in capacity expansion than SMEs (40% versus 24%).

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, 37% developed or introduced new products, processes or services as part of their investment activities, slightly above the EU average of 34%.

Firms in the manufacturing sector exhibited the highest levels of innovation, introducing products, processes or services new to the firm (30%) or new to the country/world (18%).

SMEs were less likely than large firms to have innovated (30% versus 42%).

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 UK firms that invested in the last financial year, 7% had invested in another country, a fall vis-à-vis EIBIS 2017 and now well below the EU average (both 12%).

Although the manufacturing sector and large firms have seen the largest drops in investment abroad (from 23% to 11% for manufacturing, and 18% to 8% for large firms), they are still more likely than other types of firm to have invested in another country.

Only 5% of SMEs have invested in another country, although this share was higher than in EIBIS 2017. More construction firms also report investing abroad (now 9%).

Base: All firms who invested in the last financial year

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

PERCEIVED INVESTMENT GAP

More firms report investing too little in the last three years (19%, versus 12% in EIBIS 2017), which places the UK above the EU average (16%) on this measure. Very few firms report investing too much (2%).

Under-investment is perceived to be highest in the manufacturing and service sectors (both 23%), as well as among larger firms (20%). Conversely, firms in the construction and infrastructure sectors are most likely to believe they have invested the right amount (both 82%), with 79% of SMEs also saying this compared to a UK average of 75%.

Base: All firms (excluding ‘Company didn’t exist three years ago’ responses)

Q. Looking back at your investment over the last 3 years, was it too much, too little, or about the right amount?

SHARE OF FIRMS AT OR ABOVE FULL CAPACITY

Half of firms in the UK report operating at or above maximum capacity in the last financial year (49%), slightly below EIBIS 2017 (51%) and the EU average (53%).

Firms in the infrastructure and construction sectors are more likely to report operating at or above full capacity (65% and 58% respectively), with firms in the manufacturing sector least likely to report this (33%).

SMEs are more likely than large firms to state that they are operating at or above maximum capacity (55% versus 45%).

Base: All firms

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?
ENERGY EFFICIENCY INVESTMENT

The share of investment primarily intended to improve energy efficiency stands at 8% in the UK, similar to the EU average (9%). Among UK firms, this is the highest in the service sector (10%) and lowest in the construction sector (5%).

There is no difference by size of firm.

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?
DRIVERS AND CONSTRAINTS

LONG TERM BARRIERS TO INVESTMENT

Around three-quarters of firms consider the availability of skilled staff and uncertainty about the future as obstacles to investment activities (75% and 73% respectively). Labour market and business regulations and high energy costs are also noteworthy as barriers for UK firms.

Access to digital infrastructure and availability of finance are both less likely to be perceived as obstacles in the UK (both 38%) than across the EU overall.

Large firms and those in the manufacturing sector are even more likely to perceive uncertainty about the future as a barrier to investment.

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 The United Kingdom, 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

LONG TERM BARRIERS BY SECTOR AND SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Demand for products &amp; 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>61%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>76%</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 The United Kingdom, to what extent is each of the following an obstacle? Is a major obstacle, a minor obstacle or not an obstacle at all?
Drivers and Constraints

Perceived Skills Mis-Match

Firms across the UK think that on average 8% of their existing staff do not have the right skills to fit the company’s current needs. This is in line with the EU average (7%).

Within the UK, the proportion of staff without appropriate skills is broadly consistent across different levels of occupation.

Share of staff without right skills

![Graph showing share of staff without right skills by level and country]

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

Service sector firms are more likely to perceive a greater share of employees without the right skills, particularly at the intermediate level (12%). This is also the case for large firms compared with SMEs.

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?
Internal funds account for the highest share of investment finance (74%). This is above the EU average (62%), and slightly higher than the share reported in the UK in EIBIS 2017 (69%).

Construction firms rely on internal finance to the greatest extent (80%). Infrastructure firms source a higher proportion of their finance externally (31%) than the other sectors.

Bank loans account for the highest share of external finance (38%), followed by leasing (31%). This pattern is broadly similar to EIBIS 2017, but different from the EU overall where bank loans account for a higher share.

The share of external finance from factoring varies from 3% in construction to 22% in the manufacturing sector.
SHARE OF FIRMS HAPPY TO RELY EXCLUSIVELY ON INTERNAL SOURCES TO FINANCE INVESTMENT

One-quarter (26%) of all firms in the UK report the main reason for not applying for external finance was because they were content to use internal finance or did not have a need for it. This is above the EU average (16%).

SMEs (33%) were far more likely to be happy relying on internal finance than large firms (21%).

Firms in the service sector (33%) were also more content to rely exclusively on internal funds.

SHARE OF PROFITABLE FIRMS

Around three in ten firms in the UK report being highly profitable (29%, compared to 32% reported in EIBIS 2017), which continues to be above the EU average (20%).

SMEs have a marginally higher share of highly profitable firms (31% compared with 28% of large firms). There are no differences by sector.

More generally, 80% of UK firms claim to have made a profit in the last financial year, similar to the EU average of 82%.

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

Q: Taking into account all sources of income in the last financial year, did your company generate a profit or loss before tax, or did you break even? Highly profitable is defined as profits/turnover of 10% or more
Firms that used external finance are on balance satisfied with the amount, cost, maturity, collateral and type of finance received.

The highest proportion of dissatisfaction in the UK, as well as across the EU, is with the cost of finance (5% in the UK) and the collateral requirements (4%).

No large firms sampled were dissatisfied with any of the aspects asked about. Around one in ten SMEs were dissatisfied with the cost of finance and collateral required (12% and 9% respectively).

Service sector firms recorded higher levels of dissatisfaction than other sectors, but still the majority were positive on balance.

---

**DISSATISFACTION WITH EXTERNAL FINANCE RECEIVED**

**DISSATISFACTION BY SECTOR AND SIZE**

---

* Caution very small base size less than 30

---
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SHARE OF FINANCE CONSTRAINED FIRMS

Three per cent of all firms can be considered finance constrained, below the EU average (5%). SMEs are more likely to be finance constrained than large firms (6% compared with 1%).

UK firms are less likely to be finance constrained and more likely to be happy to rely exclusively on internal funds than the EU benchmarks.

Within the UK, there are some differences by size and sector. Firms in the manufacturing sector are less likely to be finance constrained and more likely to be content with using internal sources of funding compared to those in the infrastructure sector.

SMEs are more likely to be happy to rely exclusively on internal funds than large firms.

**FINANCING CROSS**

UK firms are less likely to be finance constrained and more likely to be happy to rely exclusively on internal funds than the EU benchmarks.

Within the UK, there are some differences by size and sector. Firms in the manufacturing sector are less likely to be finance constrained and more likely to be content with using internal sources of funding compared to those in the infrastructure sector.

SMEs are more likely to be happy to rely exclusively on internal funds than large firms.

**SHARE OF FINANCE CONSTRAINED FIRMS**

Financial 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).

Base: All firms

Data derived from the financial constraint indicator and firms indicating main reason for not applying for external finance was ‘happy to use internal finance/didn’t need finance’

The x- and y-axes lines cross on the EU average for 2016

*Financing constraints for 2016 among non-investing firms estimated*
PROFILE OF FIRMS

CONTRIBUTION TO VALUE ADDED

Large firms in the UK account for the greatest share of value-added (58%). This is above the EU average (50%).

Infrastructure and service sector firms in the UK each contribute one-third of the share to value-added. This differs to the EU, where manufacturing accounts for the highest share (36%).

Across the UK, 50% of the total workforce is comprised of staff in lower level occupations. The remainder is made up of 31% of staff in intermediate level occupations and 19% of staff in higher level occupations.

Productivity of firms in the UK is broadly in line with the EU benchmark.

DISTRIBUTION OF STAFF BY OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Q. Approximately how many of your staff across all locations are employed in... occupations?

DISTRIBUTION OF FIRMS BY PRODUCTIVITY CLASS

Share of firms by productivity class (Total Factor Productivity). Productivity classes are defined on the basis of the entire EU sample.
MACROECONOMIC INVESTMENT CONTEXT

Investment Dynamics over time

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

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. Differences with the aggregate trend are due to measurement. Source: Eurostat.

Investment Dynamics by Asset Class

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.

The investment gap vis-à-vis the long-term (pre-crisis) trend has been stable recently.
Nevertheless, real investment is now above 2008 levels for all institutional sectors and asset classes.
The final data are based on a sample, rather than the entire population of firms in The United Kingdom, 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>EU</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>SME</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>EU vs UK</th>
<th>Manufacturing vs Construction</th>
<th>SME vs Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12355)</td>
<td>(602)</td>
<td>(162)</td>
<td>(137)</td>
<td>(152)</td>
<td>(140)</td>
<td>(478)</td>
<td>(124)</td>
<td>(12355 vs 602)</td>
<td>(162 vs 137)</td>
<td>(478 vs 124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% or 90%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% or 70%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>9.2%</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>UK 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>600/602</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 2</td>
<td>11839/11790</td>
<td>542/546</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 3</td>
<td>12020/12095</td>
<td>583/583</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>123</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>471/498</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 5</td>
<td>12073/12080</td>
<td>582/579</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who invested in the last financial year, p. 5</td>
<td>10889/10873</td>
<td>506/516</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding ‘company didn’t exist three years ago’ responses), p. 6</td>
<td>12306/12335</td>
<td>600/602</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 7</td>
<td>11265/11358</td>
<td>544/536</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>109</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/488</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>96</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>600/602</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>124</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/429</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>94</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>402/383</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>53</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>160/125</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 11</td>
<td>10778/10865</td>
<td>486/494</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>108</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>161/127</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 14</td>
<td>NA/11466</td>
<td>NA/564</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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