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Country overview: The United Kingdom

**Investment Dynamics and Focus**

EIBIS 2021 shows that while fewer UK firms invested in 2020, they have become more optimistic for 2021 as more expect to increase rather than decrease investment. This represents a substantial positive shift from EIBIS 2020.

On average, businesses across the UK spent around three-tenths (28%) of their investment on replacement in, down from 41% in EIBIS 2020. The largest share of investment went into machinery and equipment (35%), followed by software, data, IT and websites (21%).

**COVID-19 Impact**

COVID-19 hit firms in various ways. Two-thirds of firms (66%) report a decline in sales or turnover compared to the beginning of 2020. Almost a quarter of firms (23%) reduced their planned investment. Firms that have experienced a stronger impact from the crisis in terms of a reduction in sales reduced investment most.

Asked about the short-term actions due to COVID-19, digitalisation stood out with two in five (41%) firms reporting that they have taken action or made investments to become more digital since the start of the pandemic.

**Investment Needs and Priorities**

COVID-19 will undeniably have a long-term impact on needs and priorities. Again, digitalisation stands out, with half (50%) of firms expecting COVID-19 to lead to an increased use of digital technologies in the long-term.

In addition, there has been a decline in the share of firms operating at or above full capacity (from 44% to 27%), well below the EU average (49%). However, British firms do not perceive major gaps in their investment activities. In spite of the difficult circumstances, 71% believe their investment over the last three years was about the right amount.

**Innovation Activities**

Half of firms in the UK (50%) developed or introduced new products, processes or services as part of their investment activities, a higher share than the EU average (36%). Around three in ten firms (30%) can be considered as ‘active innovators’ and 4% as developers.

In contrast, half of firms (51%) have implemented at least one of the advanced digital technologies asked about, below the EU average (61%).

**Drivers and Constraints**

Firms became more optimistic about the economic climate (+54% versus -61% in EIBIS 2020), business prospects in their sector (+48% versus -11% in EIBIS 2020) and the availability of internal finance (+33% versus -12% in EIBIS 2020) and external finance (+15% versus -7% in EIBIS 2020), but remain pessimistic about the political and regulatory climate.

The availability of skilled staff and uncertainty about the future remain the two most commonly cited barriers to investment (80% and 72% respectively), although fewer cited uncertainty than in EIBIS 2020 (88%).

**Investment Finance**

Access to finance conditions are benign. Only 7% of firms in the UK can be considered finance constrained, broadly similar to the EU average. Firms that used external finance are on balance satisfied with the finance received, although less so than in the EU. The highest levels of dissatisfaction are with the cost of finance (16%) and the amount (13%).

As a result of COVID-19, one in five firms (20%) have increased their debt position. Eight in ten firms (83%) have received some kind of financial support in response to COVID-19, markedly more than the EU average (56%). Compared to the EU overall, firms in the UK are more likely to have received new subsidised or guaranteed credit (27% versus 17%), deferral of payments (43% versus 16%), and subsidies that do not need to be paid back (71% versus 36%).

**Climate Change and Energy Efficiency**

When asked about climate change, just over four in ten firms (44%) feel their business has been impacted by climate change, below the EU average (58%). Overall firms in the UK are more likely to view the transition to tighter climate regulations and standards as a risk rather than an opportunity (43% versus 26%).

Around one in five firms (22%) have already invested to tackle climate change, below EIBIS 2020 (45%) and the EU average (43%), while half of UK firms (49%) have plans to invest. As well as investing in climate change, half of firms (48%) invested in measures to improve energy efficiency, with an average of 8% of their total investment going towards such measures.

**Firm management, gender balance and employment**

Seven in ten UK firms (70%) report that they strived for gender balance and two-thirds (66%) report to have linked individual performance to pay.
Investment Dynamics and Focus

INVESTMENT DYNAMICS BY INSTITUTIONAL SECTOR

With the COVID-19 crisis abruptly affecting the economy, investment in the UK fell from Q2 2020 onwards, reaching a deep of 10% below the pre-crisis level in Q1 2021. This decline was mainly driven by corporations. The positive policy support from Q4 2020 onwards was not sufficient to trigger a recovery. Nevertheless, private investment started growing again in Q2 2021, with total investment 22% above the level recorded in Q2 2020. However, in Q2 and Q3 2021, total investment still remained 7% below the pre-crisis level.

The graph on the left shows the evolution of total Gross Fixed Capital Formation (in real terms); by institutional sector. The data are transformed into four-quarter sums, deflated using the implicit deflator for total GFCF. The four-quarter sum of total GFCF in 2019 Q4 is normalized to 0. Source: OECD

The graph on the right shows the year-on-year growth of total gross fixed capital formation (in real terms); by institutional sector. The data are deflated using the implicit deflator for total GFCF. Source: OECD

INVESTMENT CYCLE AND EVOLUTION OF INVESTMENT EXPECTATIONS

The share of firms in the UK investing has fallen (77% versus 84% in EIBIS 2020). However, more firms expect to increase rather than decrease investment for 2021, presenting more optimistic views compared to the ones recorded in EIBIS 2020.

Services firms are the least likely to be investing (59%), while manufacturing firms are the most likely (93%).

The forecasted negative change in investment expectations in EIBIS 2020 was more pessimistic than the actual realised change and the outlook for 2021 has returned positive.

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 EIBIS 2021.

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Investment Dynamics and Focus

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

On average, firms across the UK spent 28% of their investment in 2020 on replacing buildings and equipment, well below the 41% recorded in the year before. Investment in capacity expansion shrunk as well (to 16%), while the share of new products and services rose (to 24%). Around a third (32%) was spent for other purposes.

The share of investment spent on capacity expansion and replacement is below the EU average (25% and 50% respectively), the share spent on new products or services and other activities is larger than the EU overall (17% and 8% respectively).

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?

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

INVESTMENT AREAS

Out of the six investment areas considered, the largest share of investment in the UK went into machinery and equipment (35%), below the EU average (48%), followed by software, data, IT and websites (21%, up from 13% in EIBIS 2020) and land, business buildings and infrastructure (15%).

Manufacturing firms allocated the highest share of their investment to machinery and equipment (53%), while services firms and infrastructure firms both allocated around a quarter of their investment to software, data, IT and websites (both 26%).

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?

*Caution very small base size

Base: All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Impact of COVID-19

IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON SALES

COVID-19 hit firms in various ways. When asked about the impact on sales, two-thirds (66%) of firms in the UK report a decline in sales or turnover due to COVID-19 compared to the beginning of 2020. This is higher than the EU average (49%). Around one in five firms report an increase (19%), in line with the EU overall (21%).

The picture is broadly similar among both SMEs and large firms.

Q. What has been the impact so far of the COVID-19 pandemic on your company’s sales or turnover compared to the beginning of 2020?

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

SHORT-TERM ACTIONS AS A RESULT OF COVID-19

Just over half of firms in the UK (54%) have taken action(s) or made investments to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 crisis, broadly in line with EU firms (57%).

Around two in five (41%) UK firms have taken action or made investments to become more digital due to COVID-19, broadly similar to EU firms (46%). Fewer firms have developed new products (27%) or shortened supply chains (12%).

Large firms are the most likely to have taken any short-term action(s) and become more digital (58% and 46% respectively).

Q. As a response to the COVID-19 pandemic, have you taken any actions or made investments to...?

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Impact of COVID-19

IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON INVESTMENT

COVID-19 has had an impact on investment. Almost a quarter of firms in the UK (23%) report having revised plans downwards as a result of COVID-19, while a small proportion (7%) report having revised plans upwards. This is broadly in line with the EU average (26% and 3% respectively), but the overall (net) effect is somewhat less negative.

Firms in the manufacturing and services sectors are the most likely to report a downward revision (27% and 25% respectively).

DIFFERENCES IN IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON INVESTMENT

In the UK, firms whose sales or turnover have been negatively impacted by COVID-19 were most likely to report revising plans downwards compared to firms whose sales or turnover had been stable or buoyant (33% versus 3%).

Firms who experienced a negative sales impact and revised their investment plans downwards, account for about a third in both the UK and the EU, but only about a quarter in the US.
Investment Needs and Priorities

PERCEIVED INVESTMENT GAP

The majority of UK firms do not perceive gaps in their investment activities. In spite of difficult circumstances, seven in ten firms (71%) believe their investment over the last three years was about the right amount, below the EU average (82%), while almost one in ten (8%) report investing too much, higher than the EU overall (2%). One in five firms in the UK (20%) report investing too little.

Manufacturing firms are most likely to say their investment was too little (30%) compared to other sectors.

SHARE OF FIRMS AT OR ABOVE FULL CAPACITY

The share of firms operating at or above full capacity in 2020 has declined (27% versus 44% in EIBIS 2020) and is well below the EU average (49%). Construction firms were more likely to be operating at or above full capacity (72%) compared to firms in other sectors (ranging from 16% to 27%).

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

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

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

Q. In the last financial year, was your company operating above or at maximum capacity attainable?

Base: All firms (data not shown for those operating somewhat or substantially below full capacity)
Investment Needs and Priorities

FUTURE INVESTMENT PRIORITIES (% of firms)

Looking ahead to the next three years, the most commonly cited investment priority among firms is capacity expansion (35%), followed by replacement and the development of new products or services (both 28%). This is in line with the EU overall. Compared to EIBIS 2020, the share of firms with no investment planned has fallen (from 19% to 9%).

Construction firms are most likely to prioritise capacity expansion (61%) and least likely to prioritise new products or services (6%).

When looking at size, SMEs are more likely than large firms to have no investment planned (17% versus 3%).

COVID-19 LONG-TERM IMPACT

The share of firms in the UK expecting COVID-19 to have a long-term impact on needs and priorities remained broadly stable. However, most still expect an impact (75%), in line with the EU average (72%).

Digitalisation stands out, with half of firms (50%) expecting COVID-19 to lead to an increased use of digital technologies, in line with the EU overall (55%).

Firms in the UK have become less pessimistic with a fall in the share of firms expecting a permanent reduction in employment since EIBIS 2020 (falling from 47% to 29%) but firms in the UK are still more likely to expect a permanent reduction in employment compared to the EU (13%).

Firms in the UK are also now less likely to expect a long-term impact on their supply chain than in EIBIS 2020 (falling from 46% to 30%), as well as on their service or product portfolio (falling from 48% to 23%).

Q. Do you expect the COVID-19 outbreak to have a long-term impact on any of the following?

Base: All firms
Innovation Activities

INNOVATION ACTIVITY

Half of firms (50%) developed or introduced new products, processes or services as part of their investment activities in 2020 (higher than the EU average of 36%), with 6% having undertaken innovation that new to the country or the global market.

Manufacturing firms and large firms were most likely to innovate (68% and 58% respectively) while construction firms were least likely to innovate (28%).

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?

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

INNOVATION PROFILE

When firms’ innovation and research and development behaviour is profiled more widely, 30% of firms in the UK can be classified as ‘active innovators’ (higher than the EU average of 18%) and a further 4% of firms as ‘developers’.

Compared to EIBIS 2020, there are more innovators and fewer adopters.

The ‘No innovation and no R&D’ group comprises firms that did not introduce any new products, processes or services but without undertaking any of their own research and development effort. ‘Developers’ are firms that did not introduce new products, processes or services but allocated a significant part of their investment activities to research and development. ‘Incremental’ and ‘Leading innovators’ have introduced new products, processes and services and also invested in research and development activities. The two profiles differ in terms of the novelty of the new products, processes or services. For incremental innovators these are ‘new to the firm’; for leading innovators these are new to the country/world.

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?
Q. In the last financial year, how much did your business invest in Research and Development (including the acquisition of intellectual property) with the intention of maintaining or increasing your company’s future earnings?

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

IMPLEMENTATION OF ADVANCED DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

Half of the firms (51%) have implemented at least one of the advanced digital technologies they were asked about, below the EU average (61%), with one in five (19%) implementing a single technology, down from 31% in EIBIS 2020.

Manufacturing firms are most likely to have implemented advanced digital technologies (62%), while services firms and SMEs are least likely to have done so (39% and 41% respectively).

Q: Can you tell me for each of the following digital technologies if you have heard about them, not heard about them, implemented them in parts of your business, or whether your entire business is organised around them?

Reported shares combine implemented the technology ‘in parts of business’ and ‘entire business organised around it’

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

ADVANCED DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

Q: Can you tell me for each of the following digital technologies if you have heard about them, not heard about them, implemented them in parts of your business, or whether your entire business is organised around them?

Reported shares combine implemented the technology ‘in parts of business’ and ‘entire business organised around it’

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses);
Sample size UK: Manufacturing (180); Construction (130); Services (164); Infrastructure (120)

* Sector: 1 = Asked of Manufacturing firms, 2 = Asked of Services firms, 3 = Asked of Construction firms, 4 = Asked of infrastructure firms

Not every digital technology was asked of each sector
Drivers And Constraints

**SHORT TERM FIRM OUTLOOK**

Firms remain on balance pessimistic about the political and regulatory climate. Nevertheless, expectations for the overall economic climate have turned positive (rising from -61% to 54%) as well as business prospects in the sector (rising from -11% to 48%), and the availability of internal finance (rising from -12% to 33%) and external finance (rising from -7% to 15%). The short term outlook in the UK is significantly more optimistic than the EU as a whole regarding the economic climate, business prospects in the sector and the availability of internal finance.

Q. Do you think that each of the following will improve, stay the same, or get worse over the next twelve months?

Base: All firms

**SHORT TERM FIRM OUTLOOK BY SECTOR AND SIZE (NET BALANCE %)**

Firms are consistently more positive than negative about the economic climate, business prospects and the availability of internal finance.

Constructions firms are the most optimistic about business prospects (72%) and the most pessimistic about the political and regulatory climate (-37%), while services firms are optimistic overall across all five measures.

Overall, optimism is highest among large firms compared to SMEs, except regarding the political and regulatory climate.

Please note: green figures are positive, red figures are negative

Q. Do you think that each of the following will improve, stay the same, or get worse over the next twelve months?

Base: All firms
Drivers And Constraints

LONG TERM BARRIERS TO INVESTMENT

The availability of skilled staff and uncertainty about the future remain the two most frequently mentioned barriers to investment (80% and 72% respectively). Nevertheless, uncertainty about the future is less likely to be cited than in EIBIS 2020 (falling from 88% to 72%).

The perception of long term barriers to investment among UK firms is broadly similar to the EU overall. Construction firms are most likely to cite the availability of skilled staff and uncertainty about the future as barriers (91% and 79% respectively).

LONG TERM BARRIERS BY SECTOR AND SIZE

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

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

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

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

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

SOURCE OF INVESTMENT FINANCE

Firms in the UK continued to fund three-quarters (74%) of their investment in 2020 through internal financing, more than in the EU (63%). Infrastructure firms report the largest share of investment funded through internal finance (80%), while construction firms had the lowest share (66%), although this is partly due to the high share of intra-group financing (11%).

In the UK, bank loans continued to make up the highest share of external finance (40%). This is higher than what was reported in EIBIS 2020 (27%) but lower than the EU average (56%). Leasing or hire purchase accounts for the second highest share of external finance (37%), which is above the current EU average (20%).

The pattern of external finance used varies by sector and size of firm.

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

Base: All firms who invested 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?

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

In the UK, bank loans continued to make up the highest share of external finance (40%). This is higher than what was reported in EIBIS 2020 (27%) but lower than the EU average (56%). Leasing or hire purchase accounts for the second highest share of external finance (37%), which is above the current EU average (20%). The pattern of external finance used varies by sector and size of firm.

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

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

*Loans from family, friends or business partners
Investment Finance

ACTIONS TAKEN AS A RESULT OF COVID-19

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, one in five firms (20%) have increased their debt position, 5% have raised new equity through their current owners and 1% have raised new equity through a new source. This is in line with the EU average. The share of SMEs raising new equity was higher than that of large firms.

SHARE OF FIRMS RECEIVING FINANCIAL SUPPORT IN RESPONSE TO COVID-19

More than eight in ten firms in the UK (83%) have received some kind of financial support in response to COVID-19, markedly more than the EU average (56%).

Firms in the UK are more likely than EU firms to have received new subsidised or guaranteed credit (27% versus 17%), deferral of payments (43% versus 16%) and subsidies or other support that do not need to be paid back (71% versus 36%).
Access To Finance

DISSATISFACTION WITH EXTERNAL FINANCE RECEIVED

Firms who used external finance in 2020 report that they are, on balance, satisfied with the amount, cost, maturity, collateral and the type of external finance received. However, except for external finance received, firms in the UK are more dissatisfied than those in the EU.

The highest levels of dissatisfaction recorded among firms in the UK are with the cost of finance (16%). This is followed by the amount of finance (13%), collateral requirements (11%), maturity (10%) and type of external finance received (2%).

Q. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with …?

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

DISSATISFACTION BY SECTOR AND SIZE (%)

Overall dissatisfaction levels are low, except among firms in the services sector, who report the highest levels of dissatisfaction with the amount, cost, maturity and collateral requirements. Construction firms also report relatively high dissatisfaction levels for the amount and cost of finance.

Q. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with …?

*Caution very small base size

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

SHARE OF FINANCE CONSTRAINED FIRMS

On average, 7% of all firms in the UK can be considered finance constrained, somewhat higher than the EU average (5%).

Firms in the services and construction sectors are the most likely to be considered finance constrained (13% and 11% respectively).

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).

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

FINANCING CONSTRAINTS OVER TIME

The share of finance constrained firms has increased somewhat since EIBIS 2020, and is now slightly higher than in previous years. This is different from the EU, where the share of finance constrained firms is lower than in previous years.

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses)
Climate Change and Energy Efficiency

IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE – PHYSICAL RISK

More than four in ten firms (44%) feel their business is being impacted by climate change and the related changes in weather patterns. This is lower than the EU average (58%) and what was reported in EIBIS 2020 (56%).

Construction firms are most likely to report being impacted by climate change (57%), including around a half (53%) reporting a minor impact.

SMEs are most likely than large firms to report a major impact (9% versus 2%).

Q. Thinking about climate change and the related changes in weather patterns, would you say these weather events currently have a major impact, a minor impact or no impact at all on your business?

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

IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE – RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE TRANSITION TO A NET ZERO EMISSION ECONOMY OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS

Just over four in ten firms (43%) believe the transition to stricter climate standards and regulations over the next five years will be a risk to the company, higher than the EU average (31%). Around a quarter (26%) believe it will be an opportunity, which is in line with the EU.

Services firms and large firms are most likely to believe the transition will be a risk to the company (63% and 48% respectively), while construction firms are most likely to believe it will be an opportunity (55%).

Q. Thinking about your company, what impact do you expect this transition to stricter climate standards and regulations will have on your company over the next five years?

Base: All firms (excluding don’t know / refused responses)
Climate Change and Energy Efficiency

INVESTMENT PLANS TO TACKLE CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACT

On average, 22% of UK firms have already invested in plans to tackle the impact of climate change, well below the share reported in EIBIS 2020 (45%) and the EU average (43%). Around half (49%) plan to invest, in line with EIBIS 2020 (53%) and the EU overall (47%).

Manufacturing firms and large firms are the most likely to have already invested (30% and 26% respectively), while construction firms and large firms are the most likely to be planning to invest (65% and 57% respectively).

SHARE OF FIRMS INVESTING IN MEASURES TO IMPROVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND SHARE OF TOTAL INVESTMENT

Half of firms (48%) invested in measures to improve energy efficiency, with an average of 8% of their total investment in 2020 going towards such measures. The share of firms investing is higher than the EU average (37%).

Large firms were most likely to be investing in measures to improve energy efficiency (63%), while SMEs were least likely (30%).

Comparing sectors, construction firms were most likely to be investing in such measures (55%) and also allocated the highest share of their total investment in 2020 (10%).
Firm management, climate targets, gender balance and employment

FIRM MANAGEMENT, CLIMATE TARGETS AND GENDER BALANCE

In 2020, seven in ten UK firms (70%) strived for gender balance and two-thirds (66%) linked individual performance to pay, while just under half (46%) used a strategic monitoring system and four in ten (40%) monitored carbon and energy targets. This is broadly in line with the EU overall.

Comparing sectors, manufacturing firms were most likely to use a strategic monitoring system (63%), link individual performance to pay (74%) and strive for gender balance (75%), while construction firms were most likely to monitor carbon and energy targets (68%).

When looking at size, large firms consistently have the highest share across all four measures.

CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT DURING COVID-19

Overall, firms in the UK experienced a small decline in employment (-4%) during the COVID-19 pandemic. This is slightly higher than in the EU where no change was observed.

The decline in employment was greatest among SMEs (-8%).
EIB Investment Survey 2021
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EIBIS 2021 – 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 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>US</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>Constr vs Manuf</th>
<th>SME vs Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11920</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(130)</td>
<td>(164)</td>
<td>(120)</td>
<td>(574)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(11920 vs 605)</td>
<td>(130 vs 180)</td>
<td>(574 vs 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% or 90%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% or 70%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>24.2%</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.

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.

Note: the EIBIS 2021 country overview refers interchangeably to ‘the past/last financial year’ or to ‘2020’. Both refer to results collected in EIBIS 2021, where the question is referring to the past financial year, with the majority of the financial year in 2020 in case the financial year is not overlapping with the calendar year 2020.
The country overview presents selected findings based on telephone interviews with 605 firms in The United Kingdom (carried out between March and July 2021).

### BASE SIZES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All firms, p. 2, p. 6, p. 7, p. 10, p. 11</td>
<td>11920/11971</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>605/601/606</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding 'Company didn’t exist three years ago' responses), p. 6</td>
<td>11910/11949</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>603/597/592</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 2</td>
<td>11620/11634</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>571/568/567</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 4 (top)</td>
<td>11860/NA</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>600/596/592</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 4 (bottom)</td>
<td>11891/NA</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>603/599/595</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 5 (top)</td>
<td>11814/11971</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>586/601/597</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 5 (bottom)</td>
<td>11865/NA</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>587/584/580</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 7 (top)</td>
<td>11648/11720</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>581/586/582</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 7 (bottom)</td>
<td>8780/9039</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>423/454/452</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 9</td>
<td>11891/11938</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>605/597/593</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 10, 12</td>
<td>11882/NA</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>594/590/587</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 11</td>
<td>11857/NA</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>595/592/588</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding 'Company didn’t exist three years ago' responses), p. 11</td>
<td>11518/11477</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>556/546/543</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 15</td>
<td>11849/11898</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>599/597/594</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 16 (top)</td>
<td>11384/NA</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>579/576/573</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 16 (bottom)</td>
<td>11659/11739</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>593/581/579</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 17</td>
<td>11616/NA</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>570/568/565</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 18 (top)</td>
<td>11664/11402</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>589/585/582</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 3 (top)</td>
<td>9670/10138</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>467/496/493</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 3 (bottom)</td>
<td>9523/9874</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>489/527/524</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 12</td>
<td>8675/9255</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>417/441/438</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who have invested in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 17</td>
<td>11920/11971</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>605/601/600</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>31</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>4003/4354</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>160/187/184</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms who used external finance in the last financial year (excluding don’t know/refused responses), p. 14</td>
<td>3964/4310</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>168/181/178</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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