Real. Growth Rate of Academic R\&D Expenditures Slowied to $2 \%$ in $F Y$ 1981. Science Resources. Studies Highlights.
INSTITUTION
REPORT NO.
PUB.DATE
National Sciencie.Foundation, Wasthington, D.C. Di-V. of Science-Resources Studies.
NSF-83-304
21 Mar 83
NOTE
5p.
PUB TYPE

## EDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS


ABSTRACT
This report contains the findings of the National Science Foundation's (NSF's) Survey' of Scientific and Engineering Expengitures at Universities and Colleges; Fy 1981. The survey was maijed to 563 universti'es and colleges, inciuding all institutions that granted a graduate science or engineering ( $S / E$ ) degree, as well as to aqademic institutions with $\$ 50,000$ or mote in separatély budgeted research and defelopment (R\&D) expenditures: Areas considered in the report include sources of R\&D suppart, expenditures related to character of work and $S / E$ fields, largest R\&D performers, and research equipment expenditures. Selected "findings indicate that; separately'budgeted R\&S expenditures totaled $\$ 6: 8$ billion, a 12 percent increase in current dollars over 1980 levels; in the cantext of national research effort, excluding national expenditures for development, academic instititutions performed 27 percent of the U.S. total in 1981, up slightly from their 25/percent share in 1974; Federal agencies continued to sponsor two-thirds ( $\$ 4.5$ billion). of academic R\&D activities;..basic research performance by universities/colleges totaled $\$ 4.6 \mathrm{billion}$, a 3 percent real increase over 1980 levels; and the most rapid current-dollar growth in major S/E disciplines occurred in mathematical/computer sciences, psychology, and the physical sciences. The lifehsciences accounted for more than one-half of total R\&D expenditures. (JṆ)

[^0]
levels. Almosi nu real growih uccurred in spending levels - for applied research and derelopment, which had risen ą an average annual rate of $\%$ percent since 1974 .

- The most tapid current-dollar growth in the major S/E disciplones, occurred in the mathematical/computer sciences, psychologs: and the physical sciences, up 13 percent to 15 percent. The life sciences, up 12 percent. accounted for more * than one-half of total R\&D expenditures.
- Of the total expenditures for separately budgeted R×D achimes. unu ersities and colleges expended approxunatel 5420 million on $S / E$ research equipment. which constutured 6 percent of separately budgeted $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}^{\circ}$ expenditures This amount increasedwabout 15 percent from 1980 to 1981 Engmeering and the physical ant life sciences togetherf accounted for more than 80 percent of total research equipment expenditures.
- In addation to the $\$ 68$ billion spent for research and development by universtues and colleges, $\$ 2.5$ billion was spent by their affilated federally funded research and development centers (FFRDC"s) in 1981, up 11 percent over 1980. just dbote the level of inflation As in previous years. about three-quarters of these funds were concentrated in the phisical sciences and engineering


## Sources of R\&D Support

Federally financed academic R\&D spending. which constituted about two-thirds of total R\&D expenditures. contrinued to clamb in 1981 reaching S 55 billion, an 11-percent current-dollar increase, but inflation cut thiṣ to a 1 -percent rise $1 y$ teal dollars (chart 2). This was markedly lower than the 4 -percent average annual rate of real growth of univerSittes' expenditures of Federal funds for research and development from 1974 toi 1980. The 1980-81 slowdown follows a 1-percent decline in constant dollars in Federal R\&D obli-- gations in 1980 Since Federal academic R\&D obligations declined another 3 percent in real dollars in 1981. instituthons are expected to report'a continuation in this leveling trend in 1982. ${ }^{3}$ A constant-dollar decline in Federal academuc R $\& D$ support of 4 percent is reflected in the Budget tur 198.4 while a $\langle$-percent to 3 -percent increase is expected for 1983.s

Ihe $\$ 2.2$ billuon received by universities from non-Federal surctes for $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ activilues, atcountang for one-third of academic $K \& D$ spending, rose more than 4 percent in real dullars in lyyi All of the rise in non-Federal R\&D support can be altributed to increases in industry and institutional funds, up 10 percent and 8 percent, respectively, in constant dullars thariy). The $\$ 285$ million frum industry, however. atcounted fur unly 4 percent of total academic $R \& D$ spending. showng. little change in relative share since 1974, in sphte of increasing university/andustry collaborative research

[^1]efforts in science_and engineeríng. Institutions' own funds ( $S 9,4$ million) accounted for a 14 -percent share of total expenditures in 1981. State and local government funding ( 8 percent of the total) and all other sources including foundations and voluntary health agencies ( 7 percent of the total) 'showed virtually no real growth in 1981.

> Chat 2. R\&D expanditures.at universitios and colleges by source of funds (Basod on 1972 constant dolars)


## Character of Work

Academic badsic research expenditures rose 14 percent in 1981, or 3 percent in constant dollars, matching the 3 -percent dverage annual growth rate reported since 1974 . Of the $\$ 4.6$ billion expended on basic research, 71 percent was provided by the Federal Government, led by the Department of Health and Human Services (primarily the National Institutes of Healith) and NSF.' Historically, universities and colleges have performed about one-half the Nation's basic research; this proportion remains unchanged in 1981. Basic research accuunted for a 67 -percent share of academic R\&D spending in 1981. down from 71 percent in 1974, indicating a slight shift over time toward applied research and development. Little growth occurred, however, in expenditures for applied research activities in 1981 -less than 1 percent in real termsa considerable decrease from the 7 -percent per year realdollar increase from 1974 to 1980.

[^2]
## Fields of Science and Engincering'

R\&D spending in all major $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$. fields either exceeded of equaled the 10-percent inflation rate in effect from 1980 to 1981 (chart 3). The largest 1980-81 growth rates were repo (ted for mathematical/computer sciences and psychology. upts percent and 14 percent, respectively. mainly attributable to ircreases in Federal funding which accounted for more than ;0 percent of total expenditures in these fields. The growth in 1981 expenditures for research and development in the physical and life sciences, up 12 percent to 13 percent. although below that of mathematical/computer sciences and psychology. accounted for nearly two-thirds of the total 1981 dollar, increase reported for all fields combined. Growth

[^3]Chart 3. R\&D expenditures at unlversitles and collages by flalda': FY 1980-81

in engineering and social and environmental sciences kept pace with inflation but fell-slightly below the growth rate for all disciplines combined.

## Largest R\&D Perfórmérs

The 100 largestacademic R\&D performers expended $\$ 56$ billion in 1981. or 83 percent of the R\&D total and 84 percent of federally financed expenditures. about the same shares reported for the past decade. Twelve of the leading $20 \mathrm{~K} \& \mathrm{D}$-performing institutions reported expenditures exceeding S100 million in 1981 (table 1): 13 of the 20 reported real growth in R\&D spending.

Table 1. Twenty institutions reporting the largest R\&D expenditures in the sciences and engineering: FY 1981'
[Dollars in millions]

| Institution | Total |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} F Y \\ \text { F981 } \end{gathered}$ | Percent change, FY. 1980-81 | $\begin{gathered} \\ \text { FY } \\ 1981 \end{gathered}$ | Percent change, FY 1980-81 |
| Total. all institutions | \$6,793 | 12 | \$4,549 | 11 |
| Total, leading 20 institutions | 2,415 | 12 | 1.810 | 10 |
| 1 Johns Hopkins Uniy ${ }^{2}$... | 270 | 7 | ( 257 | 7 |
| 2. MIT ... .... ..... .... | 184 | 13 | 152 | 10 |
| 3. Univ. of WisconsinMadison | 148 | 7 | 96 | 8 |
| 4. Univ. of Calif.San Diego | 138 | 10 | 119 | 7 |
| 5 Univ. of Michigan ..... . . | 133 | 20 | 84 | 12 |
| 6. Univ. of Minnesota . . . . . | 133 | 12 | 78 | 14 |
| 7. Stanford Univ. . . | 130 | 15 | 117 | 14 |
| 8. Univ. of Washington ...: | 125 | 12 | 104 | 12 |
| 9. Cornell Univ. . . . . . . . . | 123 | 15 | 82 | 16 |
| 10 Harvard Univ. . . . . | 3112 | 11 | 85 | 11 |
| 11. Univ. of Pennsylvania ... | 104 | 11 | 80 | 14 |
| 12. Columbia Univ.... | 101 | -1 | 85 | 2 |
| 13. Univ. of Calif.-Berkeley .. | 99 | 9 | 66 | 3 |
| 14. Jniv. of Calif.- | 97 | - ${ }^{\circ}$ | 74 | 5 |
| 15. . niv. of Illinois-Urbana . . | 93 | 12. | 57 | 8 |
| 16. Univ. of Calif.- |  | - |  |  |
| San Francisco . . . . . . . | 89 | 21 | 73 | 19 |
| 17 Yale Unıv. | 84 | 18 | 74 | 16 |
| 18. Texas A\&M Univ. | 84 | 18 | 38 | 21 |
| 19. Univ. of Calif.-Davis | 84 | 23 | - 39 | 12 |
| 20. Univ. of Texas at Austin | 82 | 5 | 49 | 2 |
| Total, all other institutions. | \$4.378 | 13 | \$2.739 | 12 |
| Wha do nol inchude K\&LI performed research and development centers <br> - Includes Apphed Phvescs laborator 'hasumalle | dby univers <br> ry | $y$-adminisi | ed federa | funded |
| solfitar. Nomonal Srience Foundmation |  |  | 4 |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |

## Research Equipment Expenditures

Separately budgeted R\&D expenditures by universities for S/E/reseatch oumimment were up an estimated 15 percent in 1981 to approximately $\mathbf{\$ 4 2 0}$ million, constituting a 6-perdent share of total academic R\&D spending-the same share reported in 1980.' Of this total, almost two-thirds were federally funded equipment expenditures. As with R\&D performance; research equipment expenditures were highly concentrated, with 20 institutions accounting for more than ong-third of the total in 1981: expenditures for engineering equipment alone were even more concentrated with oneHalf of all funds coming from 20 institutions. Thirteep of the peading 20 universities were also among the top 20 R\&D performers listed in table $\lambda$. Nearly one-half of all academic research equipment expenditures in 1981 went for the life sciences (chart 4).


The report Academic. Science: R\&D Funds, Fiscal-Year 1981 (Detalled Statistical Tables) (NSF 83-308) (in press) can be obtaned from the Division of Science Resources Studies. National Science Foundatión, Washington, D.C. 20550. for more information of the availability of data tapes. call (20:) 634-4673
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Chart 4. Distrtbutten of soparataly budgotad R\&D expondturus for reseorch equipment by field: FY 1981

Total: 5420 multon
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