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## ABSTRACT

The results of the 1972-1981 National Science Foundation surveys on academic research and development (R\&D) funds, the employment, and utilization of scientists and engineers, and the characteristics of graduate students enrolled in the sciences and engineering (S/E) are presented. Findings include the following: the steady growth to university $S / E$ employment and graduate, $S / E$ enrollment that characterized the 1970 s was maintained into 1980 , but a downturn in Rif expenditures in real doliars is oćcurring in 1981; acadepic R\&D expenditures from all financial sources accounted for aboút one tenth of the national R\&D total; during the 1977-79 period, nonfederally funded R\&D expenditures at universities and colleges grew at an average annual rate nearly twice that of federally financed R\&D expenditures; as in, earlier years, the.life sciences accounted for more than one-half of all academic R\&D expenditures in. 1979; capital expenditures for $S / E$ activities at universities and colleges fell at an average annual rate of three percent, or nearly 10 percent in constant dollars between 1972 and 1979; the 325,000 scientists and engineers employed in higher education institutions in January 1980 represents a three percent per year increase over: the number employed in 1978; ilife, scientists made up the largest singie group of academic. S $\%$ professionals through the 1973-1980 period; 375,000 students were enrolled in courses of study leading to graduate degrees in $S / E$, up two percent per year since fall 1977; and women made up 33 percent of the full-time $S / E$ graduate students enrolled in doctorate-granting institutions in 1980, up from 25 percent in 1975: Questionnaires, statistical tables, and technical notes are appended.. (SW)
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## foreword

*As the Nation enters another decade, its higher education system fåces a new period of challenges. Declining birthrates have led some authorities to predict a period of enrollment retrenchment accompanied by static or deolining numbers of faculty because of the large number of new tenure-track positions filled by young scholars during the expansion period of the sixties. Even as overproduction of new Ph.'D.'s is feared in some fields, other fields' are likely to encounter shortages because new graduates are not attracted into advanced study. At the same time, a new mood of fiscal conservatism appears in legislative bodies at ḅoth the Federal and State levels.

Universities and colleges have traditionally fulfilled two crucial roles within America's scientific and engineering ( $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ ) effort. They are the chief suppliers ${ }^{s}$ of S/E personnel so necessary for the national welfare. They also are the largest performer of basic research which provides the foundation for much of our technology. In other developed countries the expansion of knowledge has primarily been the function of either research institutes or government laboratories; in the United Statess the academic community has been much more heavily involved in. the performance of basic research than either of the other types of organizations.

Decisions of State'and Federal legislators, budget officials in the executive branches of all levels of government, and administrators in un versities and colleges and educational organizationsall depend upon the availability of data on the various characteristics of academic S/E programs. It is the purpose of this report to provide such data. It is the second in a seriets of biennial publications analyzing data collected in the National Science Foundation's (NSF's) surveys of academic R\&D expenditures, the employment and utilization of scientists and engineers, and the characteristics of graduate students enrolled in the sciences and engineering. These reports replace the earlier series of annual publications which presented the results of each of the three surveys separately. The revised format - is intended to facilitate analyses by intégrating data from more than one survey serieqs, as well as providing some comparisons with statistics derived from other sources. Any comments or suggestions for improvements in the data presentation will be welcome.

Charles E. Falk
. Dire̊ctor, Division of Science Resources Studies National Science Foundation Directorate for Scientific, Technological, and International Affairs
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## notes

- The abbreviation " $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ " refers to "science and engineering."
- Unless constant dollars are specified. data for research and development and capital expenditures are shown in current dollars. When constant dollars are discussed. they repręsent an adjustment to the 1972 level and are converted to a fiscal-year basis. The gross national product (GNP) implicit price deflator prepared by the Department of Commerce is used as the basis for the conversion. (See table A-3 for actual valués.)
- Data in part 1 cover fiscal years (FY's). data in part 2 are collected as of January in each year: data in pay 3 are collected as of fall in each year.
- During ke 1978-79 survey cycle, an attempt was made to collect some data items on a short form : malled to doctorate-granting institutions only. FY 1978 expenditures data. January 1979 personnel data, and fall 1978 graduate student data are therefore $\mu$ navailable for, all institutions, although an estimate was made for total FY 1978 expenditures at nondoctorate-granting institutions. In addition. no data are available for those items excluded from the short forms, e.g., capital expendio tures, fulltime-equivalent (FTE) scientists and engineers, and support mechanisms of graduate students. These data gaps are reflected, in the text and in detailed statistical tables.
- Appendix tables àt the end of this report áre designed to provide the detailed data shown in the charts. Tabulations based on NSF survey findings have been compiled from the most recent publications, and data are subject to revision in subsequent years.
-s
- Details shown in appendix tables may not add to totalsbecause of rounding.
- For longer ferm and more detailed analyses. refer to data tabulated and illustrated in theppublications listed on cover 2 of this report.

For information on the availability of data tapes, contact:
J. G. Huckgnpahler

- Division of Science Resources Studies National Science Foundation 1800 G Street N.W.
Room L-602
Washington, D.C. 20550
202-634-4673
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## highlights

- This summary report presęnts data from three surveys conducted annually* by NSF. Expenditures data are collected on a fiscal-year basis and are available for 1972-79 (with preliminary data for 1980); personnel data are available for January 1973 through' January 1980; and data on graduate enrollment are collected as of fall of each year from 1975 through 1979.


## overall trends

- The steady growth to university $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ employment and graduate S/E enrolment, that characterized the seyenties was maintained into 1980, but a downturn in $R \& D$ expenditures in real dollars is occurring in 1981.
- Although only about 1 in 10 institutlons of higher education granted doctorate degrees in S/E fields, this comparatively small group (about 320 institutions) accounted for the majority of all S/E activities. Doc-torate-granting institutions accounted for 98 percent of all ácademic R\&D expenditures in 1980 and received nearly 97 percent of all Federal obligations for S/E activities. These same institutions employed 67 percent of all academic scientists and engineers and enrolled 87 percent of all $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ graduate students.


## r\&d <br> expenditures

- Academic R\&D expenditures from all financial sources accounted for about one-tenth of the national R\&D total. They reached an estimated $\$ 6$ -billion in 1980, up 15 percent from the 1979 amount, equivalent to 6 percent growth in constant-dollar terms. From 1972 to 1980, R\&D funds at universities and colleges grew at an average annual rate of 11 percent, or 3 percent in constant dollars. Estimates for 1981, however, indicate a growth of 6 percent over 1980 , which in real-dollar-terms means a decline of nearly 4 percent.
- During the 1977-79 period, nonfederally funded $R \& D$ expenditures at universities and colleges grew at an average annual rate nearly twice that of federally financed $R \& D$ ex-penditures-7 percent per year compared to 4 percent per year in constant dollars. These growth rates. are considerably higher than the cotmparable rates for the 1972-79 period as a whole ( 4 percent per year and 2 percent pér year, respectively): The most rapid growth between 1977 and 1979 was that of industrially supported R\&D expenditures ( 10 percent per year in
constant dollars); but industrial firms in 1979 still supplied only about 4 percent of all funding for academic R\&D expenditures.
- As in earlier years, the life sciencés accounted for more tharone-half of all academic. R\&D. expenditures in 1979. The environmental sciences, however, grew at the most rapid rate during the 1977-79 period, more than 12 percent per year. The life sciences, engineering, and the mathematical/computer sciences all.grew at rates of between 10 percent and: 11 percent pèr year.
-. Capital expenditures fó $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ activities at universities and colleges fell at an average annual rate of 3 percent, or nearly 10 percent in constant dollars, between 1972 and 1979. In 1980, however, total capita ${ }^{2}$ expenditures rose 13 , percenf( nearly 5 percent in constant dollars). Although the drop in federally financed capital expenditures continued into 1980, funding for capital expenditures from other sources increased by 20 percent.


## academics/e personnel

- The 325,000 scientists and engineers employed in institutions of higher
education in January 1980 represented a 3-percent per year increase over the number employed in 1978. This is almost identical to the average. annual growth rate for the whole 1973-80 period. Full- and part-time employment grew at almost identical rates between 1978 and 1980, in marked contrast to the eaillier years when part-time employment grew three times as fast as full-ime emplayment ( 6 percent compared to 2 percent per year). Virtually all the 1978-80 increáse in S/E employment took place in doctorate-granting institutions; the number of scientists and engineers employeđ̈ in master'sgranting institutions actually declined slightly.
- Life scientists made up the largest single group of academic S/E professionals throughout the 1973-80 pe riod, accounting for about 40 per- cent of all S/E employment in,each year. Between 1978 and 1980 the number of life scientists grew at an average ansual rate of 4 percent, slightly abque the 3-percent average for the 7 -year period as a whole. Mathematical/computer scientists were the fastest-growing group for the entire period, however, increasing by nearly 5 percent per yéar, though between 1978 and 1980 the rate dropped to 4 percent per year. Engineers increased at at 3-percent average annual rate over the 7 -year period, but by more than 4 percent per year between 1978 and 1980. The number of academically employed physical scientists rose at the slowest ess than 2 percent per.year the entire period, and by
only 1 percent per year between 1978 and 1980.
- The $57,1,00$ FTE scientists and engineers engaged in research and development in 1980 represented an average increase of only 1 percent per year over the number in 1978. This rate of growth was considerably lower than the nearly 5 -percent-per-year growth in academic $R \& D$ expenditures during the same period, and when considered in conjunation with the 5 -percent-peryear increase in graduate research assistants, it indicates an increasing tendency @or,universities to rely on support personnel for the conduct. of research. The average annual growth in FTE's in other activities between 1978 and 1980 was 2 percent.


## graduate s/e students

- In fall $1979,375,000$ students were enrolled in courses of study leading to graduate degrees in the sciences and engineering, up 2 percent per year since fall 1977. Preliminary data from the fall 1980 survey indicate another rise of nearly 3 percent between $19 \hat{79}$ and 1980. These increases in S/E enrollment run counter to the trend in nonscience.graduate enrollment, which fell by almost onefourth during the 1975-79 period. The proportion of all graduate students
enrolled in S' ${ }^{\prime}$ E programs at doc-torate-granting institutions rose from 23 percent to 39 percent during those years.
- Growth of graduate student entollment in various fields of science was near the overall 1977-79/average, mathematics/computer sciehces and engineering being slightly above average, while the physical sciences were slightly below.
- Women 'made up 33 percent of the full-time S/E graduate students enrolled in doctorate-granting institutions in 1980, up from 25 percent in 1975. This represents an average. annual growth of 8 percent per year ( 7 percent between 1979 and 1980). The number of women enrolled for graduate study in engineering increased by 17 percent per year during the 1975-80 period, compared with an average anmual growth rate of 6 percent in the social sciences. Between 1979 and 1980, these growth rates were 14 peŕcent and 6 percent, respectively.
- The numbèr of foreign students enrolled in graduate programs grew by 8 percent per year between 1975 and 1980, and by 9 percent between 1979 and 1980. They accounted for an increasing proportion of full-time S.'E graduate enrollment-20 percent in 1980, up from 16 percent in 1975. The largest number of foreigners - were enrolled in engineering, where they comprised 42 percent of the engineering total. Foreigners also accounted for 30 percent of all graduate students enrolled in the math. ematical/computer sciences.


## part 1.

## trends in academic r\&d expenditures

## general characteristics, 1972-81

R\&D expenditures data analyzed in detail in this report are derived from annual NSF surveys of S/E activities at all universities and colleges with S/E graduate programs. The surveys cover all institutions in FY's 1972 through 1977 and 1979 and only doctorate-granting. institutions hr 1978. Estimated data for $\cdot$ 1980 are based on early returns from the subsequent survey cycle, and 1981 estimates have been derived from the annual NSF report analyzing natiönal patterns'of R\&D resources: ${ }^{1}$ Acgording to these estimates, academic institutions' performance of research and develop.ment accounted for about \$0billion; or 10 -percent of total allocations for research and development in the United States in 1980, and the proportion in 1981 is expected to be about the same, or $\$ 6.3$ billion out of $\$ 69.1$ billion (table B-1 and chart 1).
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An examination of the role of academic institutions inthe performánce of all types of research and development, however, tends to obscure the significant involvement of universities and colleges in the performance of basic research. It is estimated that academic institutions' performance accounted for about one-half of every'dollar allucated to basic research in the United States in 1980 (table B-2 and chart 2). University-administered federally funded research and development centers (FFRDC's) accounted for an additional 10 percent of the total.

These amounts understate the total R\&D performance of the academic * sector of the economy, since data collected, in the annual NSF university and college expenditure surveys are limited tu separately budgeted R\&D expenditures. The dccounting procedures adopted by most universities and colleges combine the costs of instruction $\therefore$ and departmental research because of the inherent difficulty in measuring them separately. Amounts spent on departmental' research alone, therefore, cannot be adenified.

Although the growth in academic R\&D expenditures averaged 11 percent per year between 1972 and 1980 , or 3 percent per year in' real dollars, the. rates of increase accelerated in the late seventies andrreacfed 15 percent be, tween 1979 and 1980, or, 6 percent in constant dollars. On the basis of estimates prepared for National Patterns of Science and Technology Resources, an abrupt shift is expected for 1981 , down to 6 percent in current dollars,* equivalent to a decline of almost 4 percent in constant-dollar terms.

Academic expenditures for basic research grew during the 1972-80 period at an average annual rate of 9 percent (or 2 percent in constant dollars), somewhat less than the 11-percent average annual growth in industrial basic research funding and the 10 -percent averdge annual growth for all basic research expenditures in the United States. Preliminary data show a 14 -percent growth in academic expenditures for basie research between 1979 and 1980 , but only a 6-percent growth estimated for 1981. In constant-dollar terms, this translates to alise of 5 .percent followed by, a, 4percent decline.

## detailed characteristics, 1972-79

- During the 7 -y ear period 7972 through 1979 examined in detail in this section of the report, expenditures for basic research by institutions of higher education rose from $\$ 2.0$ billion do $\$ 7.6^{6}$ billion, for an average annual growth of 8 percent. This growth was almost entirely erased by the effects of inflation; in real terms the increase averaged 1 pepcent per year. ${ }^{2}$ University and college expenditures for applied research and development grew during the same period at an averge annual rate of 15 percent ( 7 percent in real dollars), reflecting a shift in emphaṣis toward shorter term objectives during the period of budgetary constraints (table B-3 and chart 3) Since there is an inherent uncertainty of success accompanying any investment in basic research, it is becoming evident that there ism a time of rising fiscal conservatism an increasing reluctance on the part of institutions to concentrate significant funding in what are often viewed as high-risk venturès. The amount allocated to basic research, whigh represented 7 percent of all academic $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ expenditures in 1972 , fell to a low of 68 percent in $19: 6$ and has smbe remained stable at 69 percent

Although the Federal Government remains the largest single source of funding for academic research and devełopment, the 66-percent share of all academic $R \& D$ expenditures funded by the Federal Gqvernment in 1979 marks a steady decline from the $69-$ - percent peak funded from Federal sources in 1973.

During that 7 -year period, the Federal Government increašed its funding for academic research and development by 91 percent. Funding by nonprofit organizations to universities and colleges is estimated to have doubled. Funding from industrial organizations rose by 160 percent, but industry still remained
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the smallest source of academic $R \& D$ fugds throughout the period. never accounting for more than 4 percent of the total.
During the se venties there was a slight change in the distribution of academic R\&D expenditures among fields of science and engineering The life sciences, .whichaccounted for one-half of the 1972 total, increased this relative lead over the remaining fields to 54 percent in I 1979 Engineering and the environmental sciences also grew slightly as proportions of the total, while the physical sciences, social sciences, and psychology accounted for smaller shares in 1979 than in 1972. These changes in funding patterns will be examined in greater detail in the next two subsections.

## the federal role

The Federal Government, the chief supporter of açademic desearch and - development in recent years, began financing academic R\&D activities during the last century with the funding of agricultural research at land-grant
colleges. It was not'until World War It that Federal funds became significant in the support of academic research and development. At that time the im„mediate need for sophisticated weap-- onry quickly raised the War and Navy Departments to leading positions among the Federal supporters of academic research, subsequently, the gradual shift in national priorities from defense to health needs brought the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) into the leading position it maintained throughout the period under consideration.

In annual, NSF surveys of Federal agencies, the latest of which covers FY 1979 obligations, ' HEW has reported about one-half, or more, of all Federal funding for academic research and de-- velopment since 1974. NSF ranked second throughout the 1974-79 period, accounting for between 15 percent and 18 percent of the academic R\&D total, folluwed by the Department of Defense (DOD) which reported between 9 percent and 14 percent of the total. In all, six agencies-these three plus the De-

Fartment of terwiltur mad Energ (DOE) and the NationdTherunatical

 -Tal dhllitr allowatedthaddemm $R \notin D$ activitues (table B-4 and chart 4).'

Federally funded academic R\&D' ex--penditures grew at a slower rate during the 1972-79 period than did nonfederally financed researeh and development in academic institutions (table B-5 and chart 5). In constant dollars, the average annual rate of growth in federally financed research and development over the entire period was only 2 percent.

The growth rate of nonfederally financed açademic $R \& D$ activities varied noticeably from that of Federal funding. Between 1972 and 1973 real growth in nonfederally financed research and development was 3 percent, only onehalf that of Federal funding; during the 19:3-" periud, however, the real grunth rate was 2 percent, and during the $14^{--}-9$ pertond $t$ was mure than 6

Natonal Science Foundation. Federal Support to Universities. Colleges, and Selected Nonprofit Institutons. Fiscul Year 1979. A Report to the President and Congress (NSF 81-308) (Washingion. D C Supt of Documents, US Government Printing Office. 1981).


percent Real-qoilar academic R\&D expenditures de dined in only une y ear (1974) and over the entire period maintained ant average annual grouth rate of 3 percent.
"Institutions' own funds"-a category which includes unrestricted gifts and grants-was the second largest source of R\&D expenditures, ranging between 11 percent and 14 percenj of the total belween 1972 and 1979. State and local governments have supplied about 10 percent of all academic $\cdot$ R\&D funding since 1972. As indicated earlier, industry was the fastest growing source of acàdemic R\&D expenditures, but because of the relatively small amounts involved this did not affect the overall * distribution significantly.

## fields of science/ engineering

All major $\mathrm{S}^{\prime}$ E fields shared in the: 1972-79 growth in academic R\&D expenditures in current dollaŕs; how̄ever, when the effects of inflation were taken into account, the growth was limited to the so-called "hard" sciences-the life sciences, environmental sciences, and ${ }^{*}$
the physical'sciences - and the mathematicalicumputer sigiences and englneering. The most rapid growth occurred in academic funding for the envirọnmental-sciences-up, 12 percent per year in current dollars. The annual. R\& $D$ gron th rates for the mathematical ${ }^{\prime}$ cumputer sciences and the life sciences and engineering were almost identical at 11 percent per year, while the p. hysical sciences showed an 8 -percent-peryear growth in funding. The social sciences and psychology each grew by 5 percient per year (tables B-6 and B-7 and chart 6).

The life sciences retained their lead over the other broad fields and, accounted for 54 percent of the total in 1979. The other fields likewise generally retained their relative rankings throughout the period. Engineeringrand the environmental stiences also increased their sharés of the total slightly, while psybhology and the social sciences ascountedfor simaller proportions in 1979 than in 1972 (chart 7).
The phy sical sciènces ranked first in terms of the proportion of total funding received from Federal sources, and the social sciences last (chrart 8). Tu

some extent, this may result from the far higher equipment costs involved in research in the physical sciences, but it is alsu. a reflection of the relative priurities of the major fünding agencies,

especially mission-oriented agencies such as HEW, DOD, and NASA.

## insțityutioñal control

Although private universities and colleges outnumbered those under public control in 1979-1.702 to 1,488 the latter accounted for 65 percent of. all federally financed R\&D expendi: tures. The dollar gap between public and private institutions in terms of R\&D expenditures has widened during the 7-year period tinder consideration. In 1972 public universities accounted for 62 percent of all academic $R \& D$ expenditures. Since that time the proportion of the total spent by public institutions has hovered around 65 percent. While the R\&D expenditures of publicly controlled institutions increased at an

[^4]average annual rate of 11 percent between 1972 and 1979 ( 4 percent in constant dollars), the comparable rate for 'private institutions was 9 percent, or 1 percent in constant dollars (table $\mathrm{B} \approx 8$ and chart 9 ).

The discrepancy between the relative numbers of public and private institutions and the proportion of total $R \& D$ expenditures accounted for by each group is to a large extent a function of the number of major research institutions within each group. The publicly controlled group included a Kigher number of institutions in the survey of $R \& D$ expenditures than did the group under private control: 22 percent of the public institutions, reported R\&D expenditures, but only 14 percent of the private institutions did so Among.the institutions surveyed, those granting the doctorate -degree accounted for 98 percent of the R\&D expenditures, and 59 percent of these = doctorate-granting institutions were under public control.

Thé Federal Government supported a lower proportion of all $R \& D$ expenditures at publisly controlled universities and colleges thàn at those under private control ( 61 percent compared to 76 per-

distribution of $R \& D$ expenditures by character of Work. Among pyblic institutions, 63 percent of the total was allocated to basic research, while private institutions allocated a much bigher proportion-80 percent (table B-9 and cbart 10).
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## geographic distribution

All geographic divisions of the country participated in the growth in academic R\&D expenditures during the $1972-79$ period, with much higher rates of growth in the "sun belt" States of the South and West than in the more northerly regions. This-sjtuation results largely from recent shifts in population and económic aclivity in general. R\&D expenditares of institutions in the West South Central States increased at an average annual rate of 14 percent while those of instftutions in the East South Céntral Division grew by 12 percent per vear At the nither end of the spectrum the R\&D) expenditures of institutunu in the Viddlle Allantic States grew by less than $y$ percent per year, and the 7-percent annual growth rate of 'institutions in the outlying áreas was barely sufficient to keep pace with inflation (table B-10 and chart 11). The West South Central States also showed the highest growth rate in terms of federally funded $R \& D$ expenditures, 13 percent, and the West, North Central and Middle Atlantic'States the lowest, 8 percent (table B-11).

A State-by-State examination of academic $R \& D$ expenditures points up the concentration of $R \& D$ expenditures more clearly. California led the Nation, as it has through8ut the 1972-79 period, in both total' and federally financed R\&D expenditures, followed by New York, Massachusetts, and Texas (chart 12). It is noteworthy that each of these States, includes at least one locality with a high concentration of leading universities in terms of both staff and facilities. In California, for example, both the San Francisico and Los Angeles Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) have several large universities, as did the SMSA's in the other leading StatesNèw York City, Bosion, and Dallas-Fort Worth.


Chart 12. R\&D expenditures at universities and colleges by State: FY 1979


## capital expenditurès for research, development, and instruction

In addition to the $\$ 5.2$ billion from current operating funds which institutions of higher education allocated to R\&D activities, another $\$ 730$ million went into capital èxpenditures for $S / E$ research, development, and instruc-tion-the smallest amount of any year since 1972. The 1979 total represented only 70 percent of the 1976 peak, for an average annual real-dollar decline of 8 percent.

The Federal Government was the source of 23 percent of the 1979 capital expenditures reported, down fróm 27 percent of the 1973 total (table B-12 and chart 13). During the midsixties, support of academic research facilities and instrumentation grew at an unprecedented pace as a number of agencies implemented or expanded programs for the support of R\&D plant in response to initiatives onthe part of the Administration. During the seventieg, however, investment in R\&D plant declined. sharply. Concern over growing difficulties in maintaining and replacing obsolete $S / E$ equipment and instrumentation resulted from a number of independent and governmental studies. ${ }^{5}$

[^5]

AcademictraD plant support by the Federal Government in 1979 remained at only one-fourth (about one-tenth in real dollars) of its 1965 amount. ${ }^{\text {. }}$
The distribution of capital expenditures by field was not substantially different - from that of current $R \& D$ expenditures. The life sciences again receivèd by far the largest amount, 63 percent of the total. Engineering ranked 'second with 13 percent, followed by the physical sciences with 9 percent (chart 14).

${ }^{\circ}$ National Sçence Foundation. Federal Support to Universities, Colleges, and Selected Nonprofit Institutions. fiscal Year 1979, op cit

## part 2.

## trends in academic s/e employment

## general characteristics; 1973-80

'During the period January 1978 through January 1980, employment of scientists and engineers at universities and colleges rose by an average of 3 percent per year, the same rate of growth as for the entire 1973-80 period. ${ }^{7}$ Fulltime S/E professionals, who represented about four-fifths of all academic S/E employment throughout the 7 -year period, increased their ranks by an annual average of over 2 percènt. Parttime employment grew, however, at more than twice the full-time rate, but its share of total academic S/E employment rose by only 3 percentage points, from 18 percent to 21 percent during this period (table B-14 and chart 15).

[^6]

The 1973-80 overall increase of 23 percent in the number of scientists and engineers employed in academia was reflected in all disciplines, at rates ranging from 45 -percent in the mathematical/computer sciences to 11 percent
in the physical sciences (table B-14 and chart 16). This growth in academic employment occurred despite a net decline of 7 percent in the total number of doctorate S/E degrees awarded annually during the comparable period

(table $\mathrm{B}-15$ ). ${ }^{\text {. }}$ The total number of doctorates a warded in S/E disciplines in the deademic year ending June 1979 exceeded the number awarded in the year ending June $19: 2$ in unly two fields, psychology and the life sciences. The declining number of doctorates granted annually in some fields illustrates the comparative drawing power of industrial and other secturs of employment for bachelor's- and master's-degree holders, especially in the computer and physical sciences and engineering.
Throughout the 1973-80 period, the largest group of academic scientists and engineers has been thuse in the life sciences - about 40 percent of the totalfollowed by the social sciences with about 17 percent. Mathematical/computer scientists, engineers, and physical scientists each comprised about 10 percent of the total. The predominance of the life sciences is consistent with the preponderance of total $R \& D$ expenditures aH/bcated to this area, but this
"Based on National Research Council's Summary Reports, Doctorate Recipients from United States Universitues. annual series. fune 1972 through june 1979. table 1
relationship does not hold in the case of the social sciences: R\&D funding for the social sciences made up only 6 percent of all R\&D expenditures in 1979. In cumparisun with the number of academic persunnel employed in this area, "this level of R\&D funding is traceable primarily to the extremely low equipment costs generally associated with social science research.
The life sciences, in addition to accounting for about two out of every five scientists and engineers employed in universities and colleges, represented over one-third of the net growth in the employment of academic scientists and engineers in the 1973-80 period. Life scientists, mathematical/computer scientists, and social scientists together accounted for nearly three-fourths of the total net growth.

## comparison of academic sector employment patterns with other sectors

Thére has been a discernible trend in the seventies toward a lower rate of growthof employment of scientists and engineers within the academic sector
than within the industrial sector Be tween 1976 and 1978 , the mumber of $S / E$ personnelineducationalanstitutions grew by less than 3 percent compared to 7 percent in industry, and remained stable in the Federal Guvernment and other sectors. In the 1974-76 period. however, employment of scientists and engineers grew by 9 percent in both the educational and Federal Government sectors, 8 percent inf nonprofit organizations, and only 4 percent in the industrial sector"
The sudden relative spurt in industrial S/E employment is partially the result of the postrecession economic recovery that occurred in the midseventies. The slower rate of academic hiring resulted in part from growing financial strains, largely brought on by projections of declines in future enrollment in universities and colleges. These enrollment declines. however, have yet to be significantly felt in S/E fields. In addition, academic employment of recent $S / E$ graduates (those who earned bachelor's and master's degrees between 1976 and, 1979) rose by only about 5 percent, but within the industrial sector $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ employment of recent graduates grew by over 20 percent. ${ }^{\prime \prime}$
Within the S/E disciplines, the NSF ${ }^{\prime}$ study found that employ mept demand in all sectors was greatest forengineers and computer specialists." Recent graduates in these S/E areas have tended to find more attractive employment opportunities within industry than within academic institutions. Of those students who attained bachelor's or master's degrees in 1977 in engineering, nearly five of every eight were employed as engin@rs in all sectors in 1979. Of those whose field of study was the computer sciences, almost two out of three persons who got master's degrees in 1977 and five out of six bachelor's recipients during that year were employed as computer specialists in 1979 (table B-18 and chart 177 . The ability of industrial - engineers and computer scientists to' earn higher salaries than their academic
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1, ininterparta is ohs musk a factur in the surge of industrial empluyment at the expense of academia Of great impurtance, too is that withon the past fru crars industrima hatrexpanded their afforts in the performance of research by investing in more sophisti. cated research facilities and equip: ment during a period when maintenance of existing research plants and the acguisition of more modern equipment At universities was becoming increasingly difficult. Universify researchers háve purchased most of their instrumentation with Federal funds, but the growth of Federal research support has failed to keep up withthe rising costs of the most advanced instrumentation needed. Professiónals in engineering and the computer sciences have tradi-
: Nially been strongly influenced by a research climate that they see as most randuras to opportunaty and inno1.11!.!

[^8]A National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report on academic engineering. found that ". .physical plants in which many departments of engineering are housed are deteriorating. Outdated lathoratories are common, some of which fall far behind thuse in industry, goi, ernment, or even foreign establishmenis. Faculty salaries are hot competitive with those in industry and it is difficult to attract American graduate students.... While all univ́ersity departments are seeking funding support, special conditions influence the economic health of engineering departments. Among these are the comparatively high cost of engineering education and the rapid pace of technology. "".

For all S,'E disciplines combined, the number of FTE R\&D scientists and engineers employed at universities and colleges increased at an average annual rate of 3 percent between 1976 and 1978. compared to the 1974-76 growth rate of 5 percent per year Within the industrial sector. however, FTE scientists and

[^9]engineers hate incredsed their numbers by a, 5 -percent average annual rate during the 1976-88 periud, compared to less than' 1 percent per year fur the previuus two years. Preliminary data for industrial empluyment in 1980 show that FTE's in research and development grew by 6 percent per year since 1978, while empluyment within doademic institutions grew by only 2 percent since $1978{ }^{4 /}$ (table B-19 and chart 18).

## employment status

The number of scientists and engineers employed part time increased at an duerage annual rate of 5 percent between 1973 and 1980, about double the growth rate of full-time S/E persopnel. Both full- and part-time S/E empluyment grew at an average of 3 . percent per year between 1978 and 980 , a significant departure from the earlier 1973-78 period when average growth in part-time employment was nearly triple the rate for full-timers.

[^10]

Between 1973 and 1978, approximately 17,000 additional part-time $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ employees were hired by academic insti-tutions-àn increase of 35 percent. An even higher number of full-timers were added, nearly 26.000 , but their rate of 'growth was significantly lower, up 12 percent between 1973 and 1978. Between 1978 and 1980, however, fewer than 4,000 new part-timers were added to academic payrolls, a 5-percent increase, while nearly 14,000 new full-timers (a 6 -percent increase) were added. This employment trend of academic scientists and engineers was consistent with that shown in a study of all full- and parttime instructional staff in all disciplines reported in all institutions of higher education by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The study reported that the number of full-time staff members ranked as instructors or above rose by 14 percent between 1973 and 1978, while part-timers grew by 46 percent. Between 1978 and 1980, however, projected growth in the number of part-timers and full-timers was estimated at similar overall rates ( 3 percent and 2 percent, respectively). ${ }^{15}$

Full-timestacademic scientists and engineers represented 79 percent of the S/E employment total in 1980, the same proportion as in 1978 but down from 82 percent in 1973 (table B-14 and chart 19). The slight shift from full- to parttime status was felt in every S/E field except the life sciences, where between 1973 and 1980 full-time employment rose at an average annual rate that was three times the growth rate of part-time life scientists.
Over two-fifths of all full-time employees over the 7 -year period were life scientists. Between 1978 and 1980, the number of full-time life scientists grew at a pace that averaged almost 10 times that for part-time life scientists, who comprised one-third of all part-time S/E employment. The life sciences were thepredominant discipline in terms of Federal $\cdot R \& D$ support received, and to a lesser extent, in full-time graduate student enrollment (table B-37). Between 1978 and 1980, all S/E disciplines other

[^11]
than the life sciences, when combined, employed new part-timers by a ratio of 4 to 1 over full-timers (table B-14).
.The number of doctorate-holders employed full time in universities and colleges rose by an average of 4 percent per year between 1973 and 1978, compared to a growth of less than one-half of one percent per year for master's. degree-holders and a decline of 2 percent per year for bachelor's degreeholders (table B-22). In the 1978-80 period, however, the annual growth rate for doctorate-holders slowed to 2 percent while master's-holders also increased 2 percent annually and bachelor's de-gree-holders went up by 10 percent.

## type of activity

The FTE number of R\&D scientists and engineers employed at universities and colleges increased by a total of 22 percent between January 1973 and January 1980, accompanied by an overall growth of 20 percent in the number of FTE's engaged jn other $S / E$ activities
(table B-17)." The rise in R\&D employment is directly linked to a heavy emphasis on $R \& D$ spending at academic institutions, up 21 percent in real dollars between FY 1972 and 1979 (table B-5). The annual growth rate in R\&D FTE's was greater on the averàge, however, between 1973 and 1978 (3 percent) than between 1978 and 1980 (1 percent), attributable, perhaps, to a rapid rise in utilization of graduate research assistants on $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ projects in the later period (table B-32).

A study by the National Commission on Research predicted fewer opportunities for new faculty appointments in research universities in the next two decades because the number of $S / E$ graduate students is expected to decline. Recent baccalaureate recipients are finding that $S / E$ careers in business and industry are becoming more challenging and rewarding while graduate study is becoming more expensive and harder to finance. As a result, the Nation may not have access to enough qualified academic instructors and researchers. The Commission's study stated that "...These prospects seem especially grave in the sciences and engineering where, for other reasons as well; there has been growing apprehension that American science and technology will. not continue to be as forward as they $\lambda$ have been." The study found that while academic research remains substantial ${ }^{\text {. }}$ and of high quality, the continuation of such research is largely dependent on uncertain Federal support because institutions' own funds, endowment income, and State appropriations are sources that are unlikely to be significantly expanded.

The Commission further suggested that "...The ideal combination of instruction and research occurs as a graduate student works closely with an accomplished scientist on a research project of importance. In some fields, however, this ideal is no longer so often achieved. That is because of the increased scale of university research projects and

[^12]her dilut the equmpment nerded fur sume dadanced research is nut atailable in unltratpen the htuh reummended

 the prediction that there will be more and larger FFRDC's and that they will play an increasingly prominent role in the Nation's research effort.' ${ }^{1}$

## type of institution

Doctorate-level institutions employed aboul two-thirds of all academic scien= tists and engineers in 1980. Between 1973 and 1980, nearly three-fourths of the net growth of 60,000 academic sci-
*entists and engineers occurred in doctorate institutions, for a 3-percent average annual rate of growth (table B-16 and chart 20). Although doctorategranting institutions represent quly about one-eighth of the total number of

- the Nation's academic institutions, their continued dominance in attracting scientists and engineers is a result of their ability to draw financial support from a number of sources, especially the Federal Government; State and local governments, and from endowment support. An NSF-sponsored study by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) found that "...the leading 100 research universities showed an average reliance on Federal grants and contracts for 20-35 percent of their funds." ${ }^{18}$ This is a much higher proportion than at other institutions during the period studied (1975-79).
A slightly higher rate of S/E employment growth occurred during the 1973-80 peried at both master's-granting instilutiops and at 2 -year and nonscience-degree-granting institutions (4 percent). Master's-granting institutions accounted for 15 percent of the 7 -year net growth in academic $\mathrm{S} /$ /E employment, reaching a total of 37,400 employees in 1980, a slight decline ( 1,300 persions) from 1978. Bachelor's-granting institutions recorded a decline in hiring (less than 1 percent per year) during the 1973-80 period.

[^13]

Between 1978 and 1980, however, virtually all growth in academic $\mathbf{S} / \mathrm{E}$ employment occurred at doctorategranting institutions, a striking indication of the vitality of these institutions compared to all other institutions in this era of increasingly tight resources in academe.
The ratio of full- to part-time scientists and engineers has changed somewhat between 1973 and 1980, particularly at those institutions that grant master's degrees and at nonscience degree-granting institutions (table B-16 and chart 21). The sharp rise in the proportion of part-time employment in these institutions indiçates a strong trend towards hiring temporary, nonteriure track employees on multiple assignments. In a recent article in Change magazine, it was suggested that "...part-timers provide an attractive option. That they can be obtained at a lower cost than other faculty is fairly apparent. Whether they should be is debatable. It seems likely that some institutions would find it necessary to cut back their course offerings severely, if not close altogether, if denied the use of part-time faculty. By

-saving on fringe benefits and by paying lower salaries, these institutions reduce their instructional costs." ${ }^{20}$ The study added that "...most administrators have been exposed to the dire predictions of the future of academe. Administrators at schools experiencing temporary enrollment surges are loathe to tenure-in faculty since they may find themselves with a surplus when the long-awaited cataclysm arrives."

Between 1978 and 1980, gnly about one-fourth of all nondoctorate-granting institutions showed full-time employment growth but two-fifths.reported parttime employment growith. Over twothirds of aH doctorate-granting institutions in 1978, however, reported growth in full-time S/E employment in 1980 and over three-fifths showed increased part-time employment. In 1980, doc-torate-granting institutions employed 71 percent of all full-time scientists and engineers and 55 percent of all parttimérs (table B-16).

The leading 100 institutions in terms of total S/E employment in 1980 (about 3 percent of all universities and colleges in the country) employed nearly onehalf of all academic scientists and engineers and enrolled a similar proportion of all S/E graduate students. The same institutions accounted for over threefourths of both the FTE personnel in research and development and academic $R \& D$ expenditures.

Public institutions accounted for about, two-thirds, of all employed' ácademic scientists and engineers and S/E graduate students and nearly two-thirds of all acadểmic $R \& D$ expendițures. Between 1973 and 1980 , S/E employment rose at public institutions by an average of 4 'percent per year, compared to a rise of only $i$ percentannually at private institutions. Graduate S/E enrollment, on the other hand, rose at a higher average annual rate.at private institutions than at public institutions between 1974 and 1979-9 percent compared to 6 -percent

## sex of scientists and engineers, 1974-80

In 1980, men outnumbered women in. the academic $S / E$ labor force by four to
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one, accounting for 83 percent of all full-time and 75 percent of all part-time personnel (tables B-21 and B-25 and chart 22 ). Women have gradually increased their share of the total number of fulltime S/E professionals from 15 percent in 1974 when data were first collected by sex to 17 percent in 1980 . This almost imperceptible proportionate rise, however, conceals the rapid rate of increase in the number of women employed in academia relative to men. The number

of woment employed full time as scientists and engineers at universities and colleges during this period grew at an average rate of 6 percent per year compared to 2 percent for men. Data compiled by NCES for the academic year 1979/80 showed that among faculty in all ranks and disciplines, women appeared most often in the lower professional ranks (i.e., lecturer, instructor, assistani professor. $3^{\text {mo }}$ Data collected by NSF for the first time in 1980 show that women accounted for one-fourth of the' scientists and engineers employed part time, compared with only about onesixth of those employed full time.
Universities and colleges employed a more even mix of men and women than exted in the $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ labor force as a whole. The percentage of all academic S/E personnel accounted for by women, 19 percehtin 1980 , was more than twice the proportion of $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ women employed in all sectors of the economy, 9 percent. ${ }^{2}$,
The distribution of women professionals employed in $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ disciplines varied considerably from that of men, both nationally and in the academic "sector. In 1980 , more than one-balf of all women employed full time ${ }^{\text {in }} \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ positions at academic institutions were in the life sciences; the biological and medical sciences combined accounted for 45 percent (chart 23). In contrast, only 3 percent of all women employed full time as scientists and engineers were in the environmental sciences and engi-. neering together, although the number of women in each of these disciplines has doubled since 1974. The distributions by field of both sexest have changeds little, however, over the 6 -year period covered (table B-21).
The growth rate of women exceeded that of men-in every major $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ field during the 6 -year period, $1974-80.4$ Between 1974 and 1980 the number of women employed full time changed most dramatically in engineering, up 13 percent per year, and in the environmental sciences, up 12 percent per'year ftable $\mathrm{B}-21$ and chart 24).
Women made up 30 percent of the psychologists and 23 percent of the life

[^15]$\infty$

scientists employed in academic institutions in 1980, but accounted for much smaller shares of all engineers and -environmental scientists (3 percent and. 8 percent, respectively). Thus, even if universities continue to hire women at present rates felative to men in all S/E disciplines, their proportion to the total would remain small for the forseeable future.

The ability of higher education institutions to sustain the 1974-80 employment growth rate for women in the coming decade by providing new openings may be restricted, however, by decliffing enrollment levels, slower retirements due to the elimination of the mandatory retirement age, the high proportion of "academig faculties with tenure, and uncertainty concerning the level of continued support from Federal and State Governments: One NRC-spónsored study suggested that the turnover in faculty positions in response to falling enrollment, ás forecast for the eighties, may reduce the number of faculty openings by one-half. ${ }^{2}$

Besides the prospect of having fewer positions to offer women in the future, university hiring officials are alréady forced to compete in the job market with industry for S/E-trained candidates in several areas, For example, nearly 1,600 full-time engineering faculty positions were vacant in engineering colleges as of fall 1980.*3 A survey of universities and 4-year colbeges found that nearly 90 percent of engineering schools reported a decrease in their ability ta

[^16]recruit and retain full-tıme faculty. This deurease resulted pirimarily from competition with industry, where higher Salarie's and yther benefits such as mure modern fatilutes and equipment were ciled at the indjor altratiuns of industrial'employnent.

Anecduld infurmatiun cullectyd by NSF from academic officials indicates that this competition is most intensive in- hiring women who are trained as engineers. Presently; women who are employed in higher education receive lower salaries and are less likely to *have tenure than their male counterparts. For the 1979, 80 academic year, VCES rapurtad that fin ult balaries far wamern in all datiplinter and therefer tralage wh temured womenfac ulty laged behind men in all professional ranks. ${ }^{24}$ It.should be noted. however, that since 1975 the proportion of women in all façulty ranks. from lecturer to full professor, has increased steadily. ${ }^{\circ}$ A - 1980 study of women scientists employed in industry and government found that although progress thad been made in equalizing pay, some salary differences between men and women still remained. ${ }^{4}$

## minorities, 1973-79

In the 1979 biennial Survey of Doctorate Recipients conducted by NRC under NSF sponsorship, information on racial background was received from 96 percent of the 332,300 doctoral scientists and engineers reporting in that year; 8 percent of those for whhom racial data were available were reported as nonwhite. ${ }^{27}$ The total number of gcientists and engineers in the Upited States holding doctorate degtees increased at an average annual rate of 6 percent between 1973 and 1979. White doctorateholders accounted for 82 percent of the net increase, and Asians for 13 percent. The number of Asians increased the-

[^17]mast rapidk of ant group nadal 15 percent per yedr uver the b-yedrperiod (table B-27).



 1979 and the same proportion of all doctorate sciendists and engineers. . Universities and colleges accounted for higher proportions of the black and American Indian S/E totals- 57 percent of the black S/E doctorates and 64 percent of the Indians. The proportion of Asians employed in academe was only 45 percent, while the industrial sector employed a much largè proportion of Asians than of any other group40 percent. By contrast, 11 percent of the black S/E doctorates, 19 percent of the American Indians, and 24 percent

* of the whites were employed in indus. trial firms.

Scientisis and engineers of Amerionn Indian $x_{x}$ or Alaskan origin showed the highest average annual growth rate of all S $\times$ E doctorates employed in acadernia between 1973 and 1979-15 percent-but still comprised less than one-half of 1 .percent of all doctoral scientists and engineers employed by universities and colleges. Asians and Pacific Islanders infcreased at the next, highest rate, 11 percent per year, black S/E doctorateholders increased by 7 percent per year, and whites increased by 5 percent per year.

The wide differences in sector of employment among the various racial groups reflects variations in their distribution by field. Asian scientists and engineers, for example, accounted for a lower proportion of academically employed doctorate-hólders than of all doctoratesholders but a higher proportion of those employed in industry. The reason is that more than one-third of the scientists and engineers of Asian background with doctorates were working as engineers, an area in which the industrial sector was the predominant employer. Conversely, among black scientists and engineers, the largest proportions were in the life and social sciences, areas in which the higher education sector was the employer of more than three-fifths of the total doc-torate-holding population. ${ }^{2 s}$

[^18]

The largest proportion of both white and Asian doctoral scientists and engineers employed by universities and colleges was in the life sciences (chart 25). Among blacks, social scientists comprised the largest group. Sdcial scientists were the second largest group among whites, while among Asians, the physical scientists ranked second (table B-28).

In 1978, the latest year for which estimates of unemployment rates of scientists and engineers are available, the rate dectined for each racial group (chart 26). In 1974 unemployment among black scientists and engineers was ơver 8 percent, the titghest of all racial groups (table B-29).

## postdoctorate utilization

Among the 325,000 scientists and engineers employed in universities and colleges in January 1980, 18,600, or approximately 6 percent, were categorized as postdoctorates on the basis of data reported in NSF's Survey of

Graduate Sciente Students and Pustductorates (GSSP). Fall 1979. In that survey. postdoctorates are defined as individuslis with science ur engineering Ph.D.'s. M.D.'s. D.D.S.'s or D.'.'M.'s. or their foreign equivalents.' whó ded ote their full time to research or study in a particular department under temporary appointments (generally for a specific time period) which carry no academic rank. The major purpose of these ap-

- pointments is to provide additional training, although these poṣtdoctorates mady contribute to the academic program through seminars, lectures. or working with graduate students. Appointments in residency training. programs in the - medigal and health professions ăre excluded. unless research training under the supervision of a senior mentor is the primaryturrpose of the appointment.
(The number of postdoctorates employed in unifersities and colleges incredsed at ap average annual rate of unly 2 percent between fall 1974 and fall 1979, compared with an annual rate of 3 percep for the comparable period, January 1975 through January 1980. for all other academic scientists and engineers (table B-30 and chart 27). Between


1974 and 1977. the average annual growth rate for postdoctorates was nearly 6 percent; however, the 18,600 total reported in the fall 1979 survely was 6 percent less than the fall 1977 total. While part of the recent downturn may reflect a real.decline in postdoctoral utilization,
the numbers in earler years may hase been slightly inflated by the inadvertant inclusion by medical sthouls of some medical residents and clinical fellows not involved in research. In the survey questionndire instructions for fall $1979^{\circ}$ thé ${ }^{\text {defefinition was rephrased to specify }}$ Shat such residents or fellows should be excluded.
Since postdoctorates contribute to the R\&D performance at universities and colleges in roles somewhat analogous to those of graduate research assistants, it is of some value to compare the distribution of the two groups. Furthermore, since both groups were financed largely through academic R\&D funding, the distribution of $R \& D$ expenditures is also of interest.
At the total level, there were 2.6 graduate research assistants for each póstdoctorate in fall 1979, up slightly from a ratio of 2.4:1 in 1974. The areas of science and engineering differed significantly with regard to the relative numbers of postdoctorates and graduate research assisfants. In the social sciences. there were over 13 graduate research assistants for avery postdoctorate; the environmental sciences and engineering also showed graduate research assistart,'postdoctorate ratios in excess of 10:1 At the other end of the spectrum, there were almust as many pustductorates as graduate research assistants in the life sciences.
The distribution of postdactorates by area of science/engineering tended to be closer to that of R\&D expenditures than did the distribution of graduate research assistants (chart 28). The life sciences accounted for a majority of both postdoctorates and $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ expenditures, but for only 31 percent of the graduate research assistaints (table B-31). During the 1974-79 period, the number of graduate research assistants at-doc-torate-granting institutions rose 4 percent peryear (table B-32 and chart 29).
The Federal Government provided major support to three of every four postdoctorates in 1979, a sligh rise from the earlier years when the proportion whose major source of support was the Federal Government fluctuated around 70 percent. All of the sharp decline in postdoctorates reported between 1977 and 1979 oćcurred among those whose primary source of support was nonFederal


The 10,300 postdoctorates employed in p<blicly controlled universities and colleges, although representing a slight decline from the 1977 peak, increased as a proportion of the total because of the sizable decline in the number of postdoctorates reported by private institutions ( 5 percent per year). This is consistent ${ }^{*}$ with the declining share of all research and development per-

formed by private institutions, as reported in part 1. Since the decline affected engineering and the physical, environmental, and life sciences in both public and private institutions, it is evident that a real decline occurred, and that not all of the drop can be traced to the inclusion of medical residents, as noted earlier.
Little difference between publič̉ and private institutions in the distribution by field was observed. In botheypes, life scientists comprised about two-thirds of the total, with physieal scientists and engineers making_up most of the remainder (table B-33 and chart 30 )
Women comprised 18 percent of the posidoctorates reported in fall 1979, about one-half the proportion of women among all scientists and engineers in the 1978 S/E labor force. Three-fourths of the women postdoctorates were life scientists, compared with 62 percent of the men. For both sexes, the physical scientists were the second largest group, accounting for 11 percent of the women and 24 percent of the men (table B-34).

Nearly one-third of the postdoctorates employed in American universities and colleges were foreigners, almost the same proportion as in 1977. These foreign postdoctorates differed sharply from their American cólleagues in terms of field distribution. Whereas 72 percent of the American postdoctorates were life scientists, these fields accounted for only 51 percent of fureign post-

ducturates Physical scientists comprised 10 percent of the U.S: citizen posidoclurates hut 33 percent of the foregners. In erginewing the difference was even mure marked Elerent fricent of the furegn porstducturates were engineers, hat engineers made up only 3 pertent of thuse with.U.S. citizenship. In fact, among engineering postdoctorates foreigners outnumbered Americans by more than three to two (table B-33 and chart 31).

Besides the 18,600 posidoctorates for whom data were provided in the grad. uate studept survey, an additional 2,700 scientists were reported in fall 1979, as "other nonfacully doctoral research staff "Life scientists made up the largest contingent, with 56 percent of the total, followed by physical scientists who cimprised it purturn of the tutal Wumen atcuanted fur 23 percent of nonfaculty doctoràl. research personnel. Nearly three-fourths of the women were reported as life scientists, compared with one-half of the men (table B-34).


## trends in graduate s/e enrollments

## general charactistics, 1975-80

Along with the increases in current R\&D expenditures at universities and colleges and academic employment of scientists and engineers, the number of * students enrolled for advanced study in the sciences and engineering grew throughout the late seventies, at an average annual rate of almost 3 percent. Data
: from the fall 1980 survey indicate that this growth rate continued in the 1979/80 period. Fall 1980 graduate S/E enrollment in doctorate-granting institutions was up 4 percent oyer fall 1979, in contrast to a 6-percent decline in enrollment at master's-granting institutions. Full-time enrollment grew at a slightly higher rate between 1979 and 1980 than did part-time enrollment, in contrast to earlier years when the growth rates in part-time enrollment were significantly higher than those in full-time enrollment.
Departmental coverage of the NSF Survey of Graduate Science Students and Postdoctorates, which forms the "basis for this part of the report, has expanded gradually since the inception
of the survey series in 1972. Summary 'data on graduate students enrolled at institutions granting a master's as the highest degree in the sciences and engineering were first collected in 1875 through 1977. These institutions were
wot surveyed in 1978, and detailedinformation on enrollment at master'sgranting institutions comparable to that collected from doctorafe-granting institutions is available only for 197.9. The bulk of this section of the report, therefore, will be concentrated on 1975-79 \&raduate enrollment trends in doctorategranting institutions only. These institutions also accounted for 98 percent of all academic research and development in the United States in 1979, ${ }^{29}$ and for 67 percent of all academically employed scientists and engineers in January 1980, as discussed earlier. ${ }^{30}$

## enrollment and degree patterns, 1975-79

Graduate S/E enrollment at doctoratégranting institutions grew from 295,600in 1975 to 321,800 in 1979, an average annual increase of 2 percent. Mosst of the growth occurred during the latest. ${ }^{-}$ year of the 4 -year period; in the earlier yeans (1975-78) the average growth rate was less than 2 pergent per year. Also, the proportion of all graduate students enrolled in S/E courses rose from 23 percent in 1975 to 30 perceritin 1979 (table B-35 and chart 32).

[^19]

This growth in graduate $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ enrollment occurred in spite of steady declines in overall graduate enrollment; between 1975 and 1979 the total number of students enrolled in postbaccalaureate study fell from $1,267,500$ to $1,074,900$, an average annual decline of 4 percent. ${ }^{31}$ TotalS/Egraduate enrollment increased during the same period by an average of 3 percent per year, to 375,300 . Only about one-half of the universities and colleges in the United States that offered postbaccalaureate studies had programs leading to the $\mathrm{Ph}_{\mathrm{M}} \mathrm{D}$. or other doctorate degrees, and these institutions enrolled about six of every seven graduate students.

The expansion and contraction of total graduate enrollment and the distribution of students among fields, both science and nonscience, are the products of a number of external influences. First, of course, is the total college-age population A number of recent demographic studies have predicted a serious decline in total enrollment in higher education on the basis of the downturn in birthrates which began in the late fifties. ${ }^{72}$

Less than one-half of the population between the ages of 18 and 24 is enrolled. in institutions of higher education at any level" "It may therefore be more appropriate to examine the trend in baccalatureates awarded, since recent graduates constitute the pool from which the vast majority of graduate students is drawn After increasing at an average annual rate of 9 percent during the late sixties and early seventies, the number of bachelor's degrees awarded peaked at 945,800 during the academic year 1973/74. Between 1974 and 1979 the total declined slightly but with no pattern traceable to changes in the birthrate. ${ }^{\text {a4 }}$

[^20]On the contrary, the fluctuations in the period after 1974 seem to be more closely related to the general political and economic situation. For example, we end of the draft and American military involvement in Southeast Asia in 1974 was followed by a 7 -percent average annual decline in total graduate enrollment between 1975 and 1977, compared with a decline of less than 1 percent per year between 1977 and 1979 (table B-35 and chart 33):

Various analysts have cited a number of other possible explanations for this downturn in overall graduate enrollment. The decisions of high school graduates on whether to attend a college or university and the decisions of bachelor's de'gree-holders on whether to begin or continue graduate study are based on, among other criteria, each student's perception of the relative advantages in terms of lifetime income and job satisfaction weighed against the costs. These costs are of two types. Immediate tuition bills and earnings foregone during the period of study. For example, during the 1974-78 period, tuition in private institutions.rose at about 7 percent, the same average an: nual rate as inflation and at only a slightly slower rate in public institutions. ${ }^{1 "}$ During the same period, however, the gap between median annual salaries of college graduates and high school graduates narrowed significantly for both men and women. ${ }^{16}$
The comparatively steady rate of S/E graduate enrollment growth seems to be the product of offsetting forces on three levels: An increase in the number of women enrolled in graduate schools was balanced by a decline in the number of men; an increase in the _ number of minority students was offset by a decline in the number of whites;

[^21]
and an increase in the number of older students was balanced by a decline in the number of 18 - to 24 -year-olds. ${ }^{1}$

General expectations of an oversupply of doctorate-holders in the coming decade in some fields-especially the orts, humanities, and social scienceshas led to a reluctance on the part of many bachelor's degree-holders to pursue advanced training for academic jobs which might not exist wen they complete their education. Given the anticipated cutbacks in academic hiring-a result of the extensive hiring and liberal granting of tenure during the period of rapid expansion during the sixties-this reluctance affected most severely those fields in which academic institutions were the primary employers of doc-torate-holders. In the academic year 1977/78, more than two out of three of thotse receiving doctorates in education, the humanities, and professional fields found employment, in academic institutions, whereas in engineering and the life and physical sciences the ratio was less than one in three. ${ }^{38}$
Graduate S/E enrollment increased much faster between 1975 and 1979 in master's-granting institutions than in dactorate-granting institutions-6 per-

[^22]cent per year compared to 2 percent peryear (table B-36and uhart 34) This grow th rate was diso faster than the -percent derage annualgrow th in the empluyment of scientists and engneers in master's-granting institutions In douturate-granting institutans, however, the reverse was true. While the number of S. E graduate students enrolled rose dt an averagt annual rate at 2 frement. the increase in empliyment of scientists and engineers averaged 4 percent per year, primarily as a result of the employment increases in large research universities.

It uould be reasonable to assume that fluctuations in the production of bachelor's degrees will be reflected in similar fluctuations of master's degrees one or two years later, and of doctorates at -some even later time. No such direct relationship is established because of the multiplicity of other factors affecting shifts in graduate enrollment and de-留er monferend While ther number of Whithelar o degrers anarded in all tields was stable during the 5 -year period 19:4:9, the number of master's degrees au arded increased at an average annual : rate of nearly 2 percent and the number of doctorates awarded declined by almost 1 percent per year. Significant increases at all three levels were reported only in the health fields: Healthrelated baccalaureates awarded grew by 8 percent per year, master's degrees by 10 percent per year, and doctorates at an average annual rate of 4 percent. In $S / E$ fields, tho number of baccalaureates and doctorates awarded declined, at annual rates of 1 percent and nearly 2 percent, respectively (table $B-37$ and chart 35).

In 1975, the largest number of graduate students was enrolled in courses in the social sciences; in 1976 and subsequent years those in the life sciences have comprised the largest group with a $2 \pi$-percent share compared tq 24 percent in the social sciences The sizable growth rate in the life sciences (nearly 5 percent . per year between 1975 and 1979) is traced to the wry rapld growth in health science enrollment. 12 percent peryear At the "ther end of the scale. graduate enrollment in the physical sciences remaned wdually level. increasing at an average rate of only one-half of 1 percent per year.


Chart 35. Number of degrees granted by institutions of higher education by level and field


Master's degrees



SOURCE: National Center for. Education Statistics (HEW)

## full-time graduate s/e enrollment in doctorategranting institutions

Since comparable data on graduate S/E enrollment in master's-granting institutions and on part-time enrollment are not available for all years from the CSSP survey, the remainder of this part of the report focuses on full-time graduate students enrolled in doctorategranting institutions. These students represented about three out of every five S/E graduate students in 1979: the number increased at an average răte of 2 percent per. year between 1975 and 1979. The number enrolled part time increased more rapidly than did the number enrolled full time. Part-time students comprised only one-fourth of the total number enrolled in 1979 , but made up almost one-half of the net increase over the 4 -year period.

- In most fields,"growth rates of fulltime S/E graduate students enrolled in doctorate-granting institutions were slightly higher during the 1975-77 pẹriod than during the 1977-79 period. In the earlier period, the most rapid growth in full-time graduate enrollment occurred in the environmental sciences ( 5 percent per year), followed by the life sciences and psychology ( 4 percent annually). Full-time enrollment in engineering, after a slight decline in the 1975-77 period, grew by 3 percent per year between 1977 and 1979 (table-B-38 and chart 36 ). It should be noted, however, that a substantial proportion of this growth can be attributed to the rapid rise in the number of foreign nationalsmost of them on temporary student visas-enrolled for graduate degrees in engineering at American institutions. (This subject is discussed more fully in a later subsection of this report.)
The number of first-year graduate students enrolled in doctorate-granting institutions continued to declinethough by only 2 percent between 1978 and 1979, compared with an 8-percent drop between 1977 and 1978-and the growth rate accelerated for those beyond ${ }^{*}$ their first year from 5 percent to 7 percent (table B-39). The downtúrn in numbers of first-year graduate $S / E$ students and rise in those beyond their

first year indicate that such negative factors as rising tuition and the anticipation of difficulty in finding S/E employment continued to have an influence.


## sources of support

As a result of tuition increases during the 1975-79 period, students desiring to continue studies beyond the bachelor's degree faced growing difficulties in financing their graduate education. The largest group, those graduate students. receiving primary support from their institutions, accpunteq for about 37 percent of the full-time total throughout the peflod, while those graduate students who were reported as being their own primary source of support declined slightly from 32 percent to 30 percent of the total.

The most rapid growth rate between 1975 and 197.7 occurred in the number of students depending on "other outside support" -4 percent per year. In the 1977-79 period the number of students supported by the Federal Government increased at a rate of slightly over 2 percent per year. The number of students relying primarily on self-support, after remaining virtually level during the 1975-77 period, declined by nearly .1 percent per year during the later period (table B-40 and chart 37 ).

## mechanisms of support

In 1979, about 22 percent of all fulltime graduate students in S/E programs in doctorate-granting institutions were supported through research assistantships, and a like proportion through

teaching assistantships. Fellowships and traineeships together accounted for an additional 17 percent, and the remaining 39 percent were supported under "other" mechanisms (of which 78 percent were those students reported as self-supporting).

The number of S/E graduate students supported under researc̣h assistantships increased at the highest rate of all mechanisms-5 percent per year. In contrast, the number supported under fellowships and traineeships was almost unchanged throughout the 4 -year period under consideration-despite the 11percent average annual decline in the amounts obligated directly by the Federal Government for such support during the 1974-78 period (table B-41). Those relying on other means of support (including self-support) increased by about 1 percent per year in the 1975-77 period and remained level during the 1977-79, period (table B-42 and chart 38).

## women in graduate s/e programs

Whe 1975-79 growth in graduate $S / E$ enrollment is largely a function of the
incredsed participation of women in graduate study. While the number of men enrolled full time in $S$. . graduate courses declined steadily at a rate of 1 percent per year from 1975 to 1979, the number of nomen in such courses increased by 10 percent per year from 1975 to $197 \%$ andpy 6 percent per year from 1977 to 1979.

Although the growth rates for women graduate students were consistently higher than those for men in all $S / E$ areas, in those traditionally considered masculine occupations the difference was especially marked. For example, the number of women enrolled ingrad. uate study in engineering increased at average annual rates of 11 percent in the $1975-77$ period and 20 percent between 1977 and 1979. The environmental sciences also showed sharp increases in the number of women enrolled: 18 percent per year in the earlier period and 13 percent per year in the later period. The number of men enrolled increased in only two areas, engineering and the environmental sciences (table B-43 and chart 39).


Tu sume extent, the rapid increase in the number of women enrolled in S/E graduate student is simply one indication of wumen's increasing participation in higher education at all levels. Thus, 1977 was the first year in which women outnumbered men at the junior college level, ${ }^{19}$ and in 1978 for the fipst time women outnumbered men among all undergraduate students. ${ }^{\text {41 }}$

These enrollment increases vere reflected in the number of degrees awarded to wamen. Psycholbgy led all other fields in the number of doctorate degrees awarded to women (table B-44). Almost one-third of the women who received doctorates during the academic year ending in June 1979 were in psy-chology-a significantly higher proportion than were enrolled ingraduate studies in fall 1979 or than had found employment in the labor force in the previous year as psychologists. In both graduate enrollment and doctorates earned, the proportions of women were almost unchanged from 1977. The life and social sciences together accounted for 70 percent of the women enrolled full time in $S / E$ graduate study at doc-torate-granting institutions, but,only 53 percent of the women awarded doctorates in 1979 and only 43 percent of all women employed in the sciences and engineering. Only 4 percent of the women graduate students or doctorate recipients were in the mathematical/ computer sciences, but 23 percent of the women employed asscientists and engineers were working as mathematicians or computer scientists (table B- 45 and char 40).

The sources of support, for women differed significantly from thase for men in 1979. While 36 percent of the women enrolled full time were self-supporting, only. 28 percent of the men relied primarily on their own funds. In contrast, 38 percent of the men received their major support from institutions, but only

[^23]Chart 39. Full-time graduate science/engineering enrollment in doctorate-granting institutions by field and sex


Chart 40. Women in science/engineering by field


35 percent of the women relied primarily on this source. The Federal Government was the major source of support for 23 percent of the women enrolled full time in graduate $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ programs, almost the same proportion as that of men (table B-46).

## foreign graduate students

frhe proportion of foreign students enrolled full time in $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ graduate.programs at doctorate-granting institutions rose from 16 percent to 20 percert. between 1975 and -1979. Of the et increase in full-time graduate $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ enrollment during the four years, 88 peroent was attributable to the growing number of foreigners enrolled in American institutions. While the number of Americans enrolled asgraduate students increased by only 1 percent per year between 1975 and 1977 and decreased slightly between 1977 and 1979, the number of foreigners grew at an average annual rate of more, than 5 percent between 1975 and 1977 and accelerated to 10 percent ${ }^{\circ}$ per year between 1977 . and 1979.

The number of foreign students rose in almost every $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ area at a faster rate between 1977 and 1979 than between 1975 and 1977 ( (table B-47 and chart 41). American citizens enrolled in graduate study showed significant increases between 1975 and 1977 in only three àreas of science and engineering: The environmental sciences ${ }^{\prime}(5$ percént per year) and the life sciences and psychology (4 percent per year each), along with sharp declines in engineering and the mathematical/computer, sciences (4 percent and 3 percent pet year, respectively). Between 1977 and 1979, however, declining enrollment of U.S. citizens was reported in five of the broad areas of science and engineering, with only the life and environmental sciences showing slight increases.
The increase in foreign $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ graduate enrollment is consistent with the growth in the number of ndaresident aliens enrolled (n all fields and at all levels of -hígher education reporked by NCES of The Department of Education (in earlier years, the Office of Education within HEW). From 1976 to 1978, the most recent period for which detailed NCES data

are available, total graduate and undergraduate foreign enrollment increased at an average annual rate of 7 percent. Ingeneral, the proportion of foreigners was higher at the graduatedevel than at the undergraduate level and higher also in the sciences and engineering than in the arts and humanities. ${ }^{44}$.
The largest proportion of foreigners enrolled in graduate $S / E$ programs was reported in engine fing- 41 percent of all engineeringgraduate students in 1979 , compared with 32 percent in 1975 . The mathematical/computer sciences also showed a foreign student percentage significantly above the avérage, with 30 percent, up from 20 percent four years earlier (chart 42).
The continuing rapid growth in the number of foreign students enrolled in S/E graduate courses in American institutions has presented problems both

[^24]
for the students themselves and for their host institutions, especially in the case of those from the developing nations. $A$ 1979report by the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) - describes some of these problems. Although he study pertains to students in all fields and at all level's, it is equally applicable to S/E graduate students. On the part of the students, lack of sophisticated or even adquate equipment in their home countries combined with resistance to imported technology on the part of their colleagues who have not had American training makes their adjustment to conditions in their home countries more difficult. The institutions are faced with the problem of trying to adapt programs and courses originally designed for American students to it the special needs of those from abroad. ${ }^{42}$

A recent NSF report, Foreign Participation in U.S. Science and Engineering Higher Education and Labor Markets, gives some indication of the significance of the growing numbers of foreigners enrolled in American universities and colleges for advanced study in the sciences and engineering. In 1979, one of eyery five $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ graduate students and doçtorate recipients was a foreign citizen; in engineering the proportion was one out of two doctorate recipients. If the trend continues and those students on temporary visas acquire permanent status, the effect on the engineering labor force could mean that by 1990 one out of three engineers working in the United States would be a foreign national, compared to about one outof eight in 1979. ${ }^{33}$

[^25]
## part-time graduate s/e enrollment at doctorategranting institutions

In addition to the $224,100 \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{E}$ graduate students enrolled full time at doctorategranting institutions, 97,700 were reported as enrolled part time-up nearly 4 percent per year since 1975. These students reprèsented 30 percent of all S/E graduate students enrolled in doc-torate-granting institutions in 1979, up only slightly from the 29 percent who were reponted as part time in 1975 and considerably less than their 59-percent share of all graduate students in all fields in 1979 (table B-48 and chart 43).
The 4-percent average annual.growth rate in part-time graduate enrollment in the sciences and pngineering in the 1975-79 period was twice the 2 -percent average annual increase in full-time S/E graduate enrollment. Between 1975 and 1979, part-time graduate enrollment in all fields fell at án average annual rate of 6 percent, compared with a 1-percent per year decline in full-time enrollment (table B-49 and chart 44).44
The distribution by field of part-time graduate students differed sharply from that of full-time students. Part-time graduate students enrolled in engineering made up the largest single group with 30 percent of the total, followed by the social sciences with 27 percent: By contrast, 30 percent of the full-time enrollment was in the life sciences,"but only 21 percent of the patt-timers. Those - in the physical sciences made up 10 percent of the full-timers compared to only 3 percent of the part-timers.
"Andrew j Pepin, Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1979 (NCES 80-349) (Washington, D.C. Supt. of Documents. US Government Printing Office, 1980). p. 4.


## Chart $4 \%$ Graduate enroliment by field and status.

## Chart 45. Part-time graduate science/engineéring enroliment in doctorate-granting institutions by field and sex: fall 1979

The rafo of women to men among part-ime S/E graduate students waş nearli the same as among full-time students about one to two Men differed sharply from women in terms of feld of concentration. however. Among men the largest number was in engineeríng courses ( 42 percent while more women were enrolled in the life sciences (38 percent) than in any other field. The social sciences ranked second among both sexes, with 24 percent of the men and 33 percent of the women enrolled in this area ftable B-50 and chart 45). Because of the lack of trend data on part-time S/E graduate students by sex, it is not yet possible to determine whether the distributions of men and women by field are becoming more or less similar over time. Given the distribution of employment opportunities among fields, however, it is likely that fewer students of both sexes will make the social sciences theiffield of specialization, while enrollment of both men and women in such fields as. engineering and the mathematical/computer sciences will increase. Since ample employment opportunities in industry are avalable in these latter two fields, this is apt to be reven mpre true fur part-ume students than for full-time
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## appendixes

$\cdots$

## survey of scientific and engineering expenditures at universities and colleges, fy 1979

On January 24, 1980, survey questionnaires were mailed to 567 universities and colleges offerlng a doctorate or master's degree in the sciences and engineering, and to all other institutions with $\$ 50,000$ or more in separately budgeted R\&D expenditures. In addition, 19 FFRDC's were surveyed separately. The institutions surveyed are estimated to account for over 99 percent of all academic R'\&D expenditures. The criteria for establishing the survey universe is essentially the same as in FY 1977.
The FY 1979 survey was conducted on' a "full-scale" or long-form basis and followed essentially the same format used in FY 1977. In the continuing effort to provide statistical information of importance to Federal and academic planners, NSF modified portions of the 1979 questionnaire. The instruction and departmental research item was deleted and replaced with a new optional item on separately budgeted current fund expenditures for $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E}$ equipment used in research projects. It was identified
as "optional" in order to provide a year's leadtime to respondents to prepare for any significant change or addition to the survey form. Accurate data on research equipment are not readily available in most institutions' central recordkeeping systems and many schools could not repond readily to this item in FY 1979: During the survey cycle, respondents indicated these data would be available in the future, since many institutions are revising their recordkeeping procedures in compliance with the new Federal reporting requirements to provide more detailed inventory records on scientific apparatus.
In an effort to decrease the respondent reporting burden, NSF conducted an abbreviated or short-form survey during FY 1978, mailed to doctorate-granting institutions only. Respondents subsequently have indicated, however, that since the record systems and computer programs, used to respond to NSF surveys had already been developed to ${ }^{+}$ supply all the data needed on a long form, no real reduction in the burden was achieved by alternating with a short form. Therefore, NSF decided to resume ise of the standardized annual form for the entire universe and plans to maintain consistency to the extent possible.
At closeout of the survey in late July 1980, 510 institutions, or 90 percent of the universe, had responded, including. 99 of the top 100 institutions. Table A-1
shows a distribution of the institutional response rates by highest degree granted. The final data tabulations are available in Acpademic Science: RधD Funds, Fiscal Year 1979 (Detailed Statistical Tables) (NSF, 81-301).

1
Table A-1. Response rates to survey of academic R\&D expenditures by highest degree granted: FY 1979

| Highest degree granted | Number surveyed | Number -of respondents | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { total } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 567 | 510 | 89.9 |
| Doctorate | 320 | 301 | 94.1 |
| Master's..... | 179 | 152 | 84.9 |
| Bachelor's and no science degree ... | 68 | 57 | 83.8 |

Source' Nationa!Science Foundation

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { imputation for } \\
\text { nonresponse }
\end{gathered}
$$

Approximately 10 percent of the survey universe had not responded at the survey closeout in July 1980. The computer program developed to estimate data for these noñrespondent institutions iss referred to as "imputation" and
is based on key data elements reported in the institutions' prior years' response, when available. Each phase of the FY 1979 imputation process used detailed summary data according to the respondent institutions' characteristics (highest degree granted and type of control) to determine inflation or deflation factors. These factors were applied to respondents' previous years data; however, because pnly doctorate-granting institutions were surveyed in FY 1978, data for all other nonrespondent schools were estimated based on inflation or deflation factors applied to their FY 1977. responses.
Table A-2 shows total and estimated or imputed separately budgeted R\&D expenditures and the percentage of total which was estimated.
In the absence of a reliable R\&D cost index, constant-dollar figures are derived by using the GNP implicit price deflators calculated by the Depaftment of Commerce, as modified by NSF to reflect a fiscal year basis. Table A-3 shows the factors used in calculating constant 1972 dollars for all years from 1972 through 1982.

## response analysis and data quality

NSF's effort to reduce the institutional reporting burden of surveys by changing to a biennial cycle utilizing an abbreviated form in alternate years failed to give any significant relief. Large institutions that responded to both the long form and short form reported that little if any reduction was achieved in the reporting burden since most of these schools had incorporated into their systems the requirements for completing the long form. Notable response problems, however, arose for the smaller nondoctorate schools, resulting in an overall lowering of the response rate and a slowdown in the timeliness of responses. For example, during the short-form cycle, 1978, when only doc-torate-granting institutions were surveyed \& response rate of 96 percent was attained, generally the same as in, previous long-form years. During 1979, howéver, when the full universe was surveyed, the response rate dropped to $9 \rho$ percent, primarily as a resuilt of the

Table A-2. Imputation rates to survey of academic R\&D expenditures by highest dégree.granted: FY 1979
[Dollars in millions]

| Highest degree granted | Separately budgeted R\&D expenditures | Amount imputed and/or estimated | Percent of total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | \$5,183 | \$202 | 3.9 |
| Doctorate | 5,093 | 183 | 3.6 |
| Master's . | 69 | 13 | 18.8 |
| Bachelor's and no. science degree . | 21 | 6 | 28.6 |

Source National Sclence Foundation

Table A-3, Gross national product (GNP) implicit price deflators used in the calculation of constant 1972 $\because$. . dollars in.this report

| - + C Year | Factor: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1972 | 1.000 |
| 1973 | 1.044 |
| 1974 .. . | 1.119 . |
| 1975 | 1.231 |
| 1976 | 1.317 |
| 1977 | 1.406 |
| 1978 | 1.500 |
| 1979 | 1.628 |
| 1980 | 1.767 |
| 1981 | 1.944 |
| 1982 | 2.113 |

Source Department of Commerce, adjusted to a fiscal-year basis by the National Science Foundation
declining response rates of nondoctorate schools. NSF learned that the reason for this reduction was that most of the institutions which were not surveyed in 1978 had reallocated their personnel and the time to complete the survey forms. When requested in 1979 to fill out the questionnaire, these resources were often no longer available. Respondents from both doctorate-granting and nondoctorate-granting schools indicated their preference for a standdard, consistent format each year. Therefore, NSF will no longer use a short-form questionnaire with an abbreviated universe; the survey effort has returned in 1980 to the former full-scale data collection procedure used through 1977.
Additional questions regarding the findings from the Survey of Scientific
and Engineering Expenditures at Universities and Colleges should be addressed to James B. Hoehn or M. Marge Machen, Universities and Nonprofit Institutions Studies Group, Division of Science Resources Studies, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550 (202-634-4673). Data tapes for $F Y$ 1979 and prior years may be purchased from:

Moshman Associates, Inc.
6400 Goldsboro Road

- Washington, D.C. 20034.
(301) 220-3000


## survey of scientific and engineering personnel at universities and colleges, january 1980

Survey questionnaires were mailed in mid-February 1980 to more thanf 2,200 institutions of higher education and 19 university-administered FFRDC's. The survey universe included all institutions of higher education, including 2 -year institutions, that were identified by NSF as̀ offering degree-credit courses in either the sciences or engineering.
At the survey closeout date in midSeptember 1980, the survey population included 2,247 universities and colleges and 19 university-associated FFRDC's. This adjustment reflected curricúlum modifications, i.e., addition or termination of S/E programs, as well as changes in the institutional population. Of this total, 1,364 or 61 percent responded, compared with 79-percent response rate for the previous full-scale survey in January 1978. General expressions of concern about "paperswork burden" related to the change froma short to a long form and increased workloads of academic support staff appear to have ntributed to the decline in the response rate.
Specific changes to the survey form were made in January 1980: (1.) Highest earned degreets of professional S/E staff were requested by employment status rather than by function in which primarily employed; (2) a question relating
to part-time employment of men and women by field was added; (3) the item on technicians was deleted; and (4) FTE's became the only measure of separately budgeted R\&D involvement. Even though the FTE concept provided a more sensitive measure of academic R\&D involvement, many institutions have indicated that their records do not readily yield data in this format.

The majority of nonrespondents in 1980 were small institutions: Of the 326 Ph. D.-granting institutions, only 56 were nonrespondents.-Résponse rates are shown in table A-4.

Table A-4. Response rates to survey of scientific and engineering personnel by highest degree granted: January 1980

| Highest. <br> degree <br> granted | Number <br> surveyed | Number <br> of re- <br> spondents | Percent <br> of <br> total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total ..... | 2,247 | 1,364 | 60.7. |
|  | 326 | 270 | 82.8 |
| Master's .... | 320 | 282 | 88.1 |
| Bachelor's <br> and no <br> science <br> degree .... | 1,601 | 812 | 50.7 |

Source National Science Foundation

## estimates for nonresponse

In order to develop national totals of academic employment of scientists and engineers, estimates were made by NSF for institutions that failed to respoped by the close of the survey in mid-September 1980. These. "imputations" for nonrespondents were based upon key item totals reported or estimated in the. 1978 full-scale survey cycle. Totals for these înstitutions were inflated or deflated according to overall rates of changes reported by institutions at the same degree level and type of control (public or private). Detailed impùtations were then made on the basis of the distribution computed for similar in, stitutions, a method that has been used in the survey since 1977.

The combined imputed and estimated amounts totaled 69,600, or 21 percent of the total academic S/E force (table A-5). . The largest imputation rates occurred for data collected on the number of FTE scientists and engineers involved

Table A-5. Estimated and/or imputed amounts for scientists and engineers employed at universities and colleges: January 1980

| Oficiplines | Total | Full time | Part time | Totál <br> FTE's' | FTE's devoted to separately buctgeted R\&D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scientists and engineers, total .. | 69.646 | 61.653 | 19.661 | 76.287.7 | 13,981.3 |
|  | 5.919 | 4,233 | 1.673 | .6.405.1 | 1,541.2 |
| Aeronautical \& astronautical engineers $\qquad$ | - ${ }^{-133}$ | 191 | 42 | 250.2 | 169.4 |
| Chemical engineers | 283 | 218 | - 65 | 365.4 | - 124.8 |
| Civilengineerś. | 1.031 | 716 | 315 | 1.022 .3 | 142.2 |
| Electrical engineers | 1,728 | 1,223 | -505 | 1,672.0 | 429.4 |
| Mechanical engineers | 1.288 | $934{ }^{\circ}$ | 348 | 1,266.7 | 193.0 |
| Other engineers | 1,622 | 1,154 | 461 | 1.733 .5 | - 482.4 |
| Physical scientists, total <br> Chemists | 8,104 | 6,442 | 1,662 | 8.488 .3 | 1.720.2 |
|  | 4,475 | 3,473 | -. 1,008 | 4,638.3 | 739.7 . |
| Physicists | 2.918 | 2,408 | 511 | 3,123.4 | 751.3 |
| Astronomers | 51 | 44 | 7 | 92.0 | 41.1 |
| Other physical scientists | 510 | 379 | 133 | 472.6 | - 161.1 |
| Environmental scientists, total ....... | 1,809 | 1,240 | ; 369 | 1,833.3 | 514.7 |
| Earth scientists | 1,282 | 1,006 | 284 | 1,346.9 | 234.5 |
| Atmospheric sclentists | 112 | 79 | 33 | 96.9 | - 45.3 |
| Oceanographers | 181 | 137 | 44 | 337.3 | 202.1 |
| Other environmental scientists | 19 | 11 | 8 | 37.2 | 32.2 |
| Mathematical scientists, total <br> Mathematicians $\qquad$ <br> Computer scientists $\qquad$ <br> Life scientists, total $\qquad$ | 9.740 | 6.447 | 3.285 | 9,223.4 | 622.8 |
|  | 7.735 | 5.203 | 2.526 | 7.275.7 | 397.7 |
|  | 2.002 | 1.192 | 808 | 1.869.7 | 225.1 |
|  | 23.163 | 18.014 | 5.149 | 25,197.8 | 7.937.6 |
| Agriculturalscientists | 1.456 | 7.179 | 27. | 1.803 .7 | 540.4 |
| Biological scientists | 9.590 | 7.769 | .1.835 | -10,324.4 | 3.068 .1 |
| Medical scientists | 10,920 | 8.202 | 2,704. | 11.911 .5 | 4.162.1 |
| Other life scientists <br> Psychologists, total | 494 | 430 | 64 | 626.3 | 162.0 |
|  | 7.060. | 4.582 | 2.501 | 6,517.1 | 442.9 |
| Social scientists, total | -14.520 | 9,862 | 4.650 | 13;882.0 | 94ß.6 |
| Economists. | 3,711 | 2,326 | 1,384 | 3,544.1 | 297.3 |
| Sociologists | 4,246 | 2,813 | 1,429 | 3,982.9 | - 224.9 |
| Political scientists | 3,221 | 2,357 | 861 | 3,188.6 | 166.2 |
| Other social scientists . . . . . . . . . . | 3,315 | 2,317 | 998 | 3,049,4 | 258.2 |

-Full-time-equivalents
5
SOURCE National Science Foundation
in separately budgeted $R \& D$ activities, Imputations and estimations accounted for 25 percent of the R\&D-engaged FTE total. During the last four survey cycles, steady improvement has occurred in the reporting of research involvement of S/E professionals, as universities' record systems have evolved to provide these data by field.

Beginning with the January 1979 sur-- vey, a 2 -year cycle alternating short and long forms was initiated. Item's on sex
and degree level were deleted in the short-form years. The long-form/shortform cyele failed to lower the overall reporting burden of institutions, and in fact caused a disfuption at many small institutions, resulting in an overall lowering of the response rate and a slawdown in the submission of responses. For example, the response rate during the January 1978 short-form survey cycle, which was mailed to 320 doctorate-granting institutions only, was
' 83 percent, about the same rate as reported. in the prior long-form year. During the 1980 long-form survey cycle, however, the response rate dropped to 61 percent. This decline was primarily a result of a dropoff in responses from nondoctorate-granting institutions which had not been surveyed during the preceding short-form year. In tracing the reasons behind this decline, NSF staff learned that during the January 1979 survey, most of these institutions had reallocated their personnel, and in many of these institutions, staff resources we re no longer available when the January 1980 questionnaire arrived on campus.
Respondents at doctorate-granting institutions, which were surveyed in both the long-form and short-form years, indicated that no real reduction had occurred in their reporting burden, and although no significant decline in response rate occurred among doctorategranting institutions, these schools generally indicated their preference for a mare consistent survey format each year. NSF will hherefore no longer use a shortform questionnaire with an abbreviated universe for the S/E personnel survey; the survey effort will return in January 1981 to the former full-scale, long-form data collection effort used through 1978.
Requests for additional information concerning the personnel survey findings should be addressed to Mr. James Hoehn or Mrs. Esther Gisț, Universities and Nonprofit Institutions Studies Group, Division of Science Resources Studies, National Science Foundation, Washington,' D.C. 20550 (202-634-4673). Data tap for January 1980 and prior years may be purchased from:

[^26]
## survey of graduate science students and postdoctorals, fall 1979

- Questionnaires for the fall 1979 survèy were mailed to 437 reporting units, at 322 doctorate-granting institutions
and to 315 master"şgranting institutions by January 4, 1980. Thé closeout dita for survey response was-July 9, 1980, by which time all but 14 institutions- 6 doctorate-granting institutions and 8 master s-granting-had submitted responses.


## imputation for nonresponse

In order to arrive at universe totals, data were estimated for institutions or departments which failed to return questionnaires. Item totals for which the institutions were umable to provide data were esstimated on the basis of the institution's response in the previous survey, inflated or deflated by a factor derived from those departments of the same degree. leviel and type of control responäăng to both surveyṣ. Detailed data within the iterf were then imputed on the basis of that department's previous tesponse. The response rates at the institutional and department level are shown in table A-6.
The responding departments accounted for almost all the graduate students añ postdoctorates included in the report; estimates made up only 3 percent of the total. Table A-z shows the proportion of the total shown in this publication which was imputed, by level of institution (either dactorateor master's-granting), for S/E graduate students and for postdoctorates.

## expansion of the survey system

'One factor contributing significantly to the difficulty of comparing current data with prior years' data lies in the gradual growth of the universe of the survey system. The present Survey of

Graduate Science Students and Postdoctorates is an outgrowth of the departmental application forms which were filled out as part of NSF's Graduate Traineeship Program between 1967 and 1971. Completion of these Departmental Data Sheets was required of departments participating in the program. In 1972, the survey coverage was expanded to include all S/E departments in all doctorate-granting institutions, and in 1975 an abbreviated questionnaire was designed to gather data on S/E departments in master's-granting institutions as well. In 1978, the short form was sent to doctorate-granting institutions only; in 1979, the short form was discontinued and for the first time the same data were cqllected for all graduate S/E departments, whether in doctorate- or master's-granting institutions. The surz vey therefore provides only partial data on master's-granting institutions for 1975 through 1977 and complete data tocompare with doctorate-granting institutions beginning in 1979.

## response analysis and dạta quality

To determine the accuracy of the reporting in thefsurvey series, two stuđies have been conducted in recēnt years. The first of these, in 1974, consisted of a series of personal visits and structured interviews at $120 \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{E}$ departments in 30 institutions;' the second, in 1978, consisted of campus interviews at 45 major research universities. Bothof these studies indicated that records -needed for institutional respónses to

[^27]Table A-6. Institutional and departmental respodnse rates to the survey of graduate science students and posidoctorates by highest degree granted: Fall 1979

'Table A-7. Proportions.of totals imputed, by highest degree granted and enroliment status: 1979

the GSSP survey are much more decentralized than those of the expenditures or personnel surveys. Questionnaires are filled out primarily at the department level, where data on sources of support of graduate students and posddoctorates are most likely to be -available. The level of accuracy, however, may yary considerably from department to department, even within a given institution.
Since 1978, institutional personnel have increasingly been brought into the data editing phase of all three academic. science surveys as well as the Survey of Federal Support to Universities com-puter-generated "Institutional Profiles." The respondents are given the opportunity to make modifications or corrections not only to the current year's data but also to the data shown for earlier
years in the survey series. The trend data shown in the current report, therefore, supersede totals published in previous reports.
Requests for additional information concerning the Survey of Graduate . Science Students and Poştdoctorates should be addressed to Mr. J. G. Huckenpahler, Universities and Nonprofit Institutions Studies Group, Division of Science Resources Studies, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550 (202-634-4673). Data types for fall 1979 and earlier years máy be purchased from:

## NSF Surveys

Abt Associates, Ino.
${ }^{55}$ Wheeler Street $f$
umbridge, Massachusetts 02138
(617) 492-7100

## the data user guide

In order to inform potential users of the types of institutional data available through the multi-survey data base, Moshman Associates, Inc., has. developed and periodically updates a " "Data User Guide." Copies of the latest adition, dated January 1980, and the January 1981 Addendum may be obtained free of charge by writing to:

Universities and Nonprofit , Institutions Studies Group
National Science Foundation
Room L-602
1800 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C 20550
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TABLE B'-1. - MATIONAL RED EXPENIDITURES oy SEGTOR: *
(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)


1/ FEDERALLY FUWDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.
S' ESTIMATE BASED OH DATA COLLECTED FOR DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS ONLY.

TABLE B-2. - MATIOMAL BASIC RESEARCH EXPENDITURES BY PERFORMER:
(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

|  | YEAR, , | , total | FEDERAL GOVERMMENT | INDUSTRY | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { UNIVERSITIES } \\ \text { COLLEGDES } /= \end{array}\right.$ | ALL OTHER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1972 |  | \$3,788 | \$584 |  |  |  |
| 1973 |  | 3,924 | 586 | 631 | 2,053 | \$554 |
| 1974 |  | 4,207 | 664 | 699 | 2,154 | 690 |
| 1975 1976 | … . . . . . . . | 4,575 | 701 736 | 730 | 2,410 | 734 |
| 1976 |  | 4,928 | 738 867 | 811 | 2,548 | 823 |
| 1978 |  | 6,318 | ' 973 | 1,028 | 3,165 2/1 | 1,152 |
| 1979 1980 | [Pri̇i iniol ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | - 7, 164. | - 1.026 | 1, 188 | 3,552 | 1,398 |
| 1981 | (ERS.) ${ }_{\text {(RELIM. }}$ | 8,772 | -1,097 | 1,350 | 4,065 | 1,620 |



TABLE B-3. CMAD EXPENDITURES AT UWIVERSITIES AMD COLLEEES
(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

| $\square$ | BASIC RESEARCH ${ }_{3}$ |  | APPLIED RESEARCH ANDDEVELOPMENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CUTR | CONSTART |  | COMSTAMT |
| 1972 | \$2,022 | \$2,022 | \$608 | \$608 |
| 1973 | 2,053 | 1,967 | 831 | + 796 |
| 1974 ..1.... | 2,154 | 1,925 | 869 | 777 |
| 1975 ........ | 2,410 2,548 | 1,958 | 999 1.180 | 812 |
| 1977 ........ | 2,548 $+2,795$ | 1,935 | 1,180 | 896 902 |
| 1978 1979 | - ${ }^{2,165}$ | ( $\begin{array}{r}1,988 \\ \hdashline \quad 2,110\end{array}$ | 1,268 | 902 966 |
| 1979. | 3,552 | - 2,182 | 1,631 | 1,002 |

1' BASED ON GMP IMPLICIT PRICE DEFLATOR IN 1972 DOLLARS
2/ ESTIMATE BASED ON DATA COLLECTED FROH, DOCTORATE-GRAHTIMG, IMSTITUTIONS OHLY.
SOURCE: HATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

TABLE B-4. - FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS TO UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BY AGENCY AMO GROAD SCIENCE/ENGINEERING FIELD: FY 1979
(DOLLARS In thousamos)


SOURCE: MATIOHAL SCIENCE. FOUNDATION

TABLE B-5. - RED EXPENDITURES AT UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES
(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

| FISCAL YEAR | TOTAL |  | FEDERAL |  | NON-FEDERAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CURRENT. | CONSTANT 1/1 | CURRENT | CONSTANT $1 /$ | CURRENT | CONSTANT 1/ |
| 1972 | \$2,630 | \$2,630 | , \$1,795 | \$1,795 | \$835 | \$835 |
| 1973. | 2,884 | 2,762 | 1,985 | 1,901 | 899 | 861 |
| $1974 . .$. | 3,023 | 2,702 | 2,032 | 1,816 | 991 | 886 |
| 1975 ... | 3,409 | - 2,769 | 2,288 | 1,8188 | 1,121 | 911 |
| 1976 ........ | 3,727. | - 2,830 | 2,512 | 1,907 | 1,215 | 923 |
| 1977 1978 2\%....... | 4,063 | 2,890 3,076 | 2,729 | 1,941 | 1,334 1,557 | 949 1,038 |
| 1979 ........ | 5,614 | 3,184 | 3,057 3,432 | - 2,038 | . 1,557 | 1,038 1,076 |

1/ BASED ON GNP IMPLICIT PRICE DEELATOR IN 1972 DOLLARS.
SOURCE: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FROH DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIIONS ONLY.
table b-G. - rad expenditures at universities and colleges by source of fünd, character of mork, AND SCIENCE/ENGINEERING FIELD: FISCAL YEARS 1972-79
(DOLLARS in thousands)


1/ ESTIMATE BASED ON DANA COLLECTED FROH DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS ONLY.

tABLE B-7. - FEDERALLY FIMAMCED RLD EXPEMDITURES AT WIVERSITIES AMD COLLEGES BY CHARACT色 OF WORK
(DOLLARS IN THOUSAMDS)


TABLE B-8 BMSTROD EXPEMOITURES AT WUIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES
(DOCLARS IN MILLIONS)


TABLE B-9. - RRD EXPENDITURES AT UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES BY SOURCE OF
FUNDS, CHARACTER OF HORK, AND INSTITUTIONAL CONROL: FISCAL YEAR 1979 . (DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

(dOLLARS In THOUSAMOS)


TV IM 1978 DATA MERE COLLECTED OMLY FRON DOCTORATE-GRANTIMG INSTITUTIONS.

TABLE B-11. - FEDERALLY FIMAYCED RAD EXPENDITURES AT UWIYERSITIES AND COLLEGES $\therefore$ (DOLEARS In thoósamds)

 SOURCE: NATIONAL ŞCIENCE FOUNDATION

| FIELD - | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1979 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL SOURCES, TOTAL <br> EMGIHEERING <br> PHVSICAL SCIĖNCOES <br> ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCĖS <br> MATHEMATICAL / COHPUTER SCOĖĖĊĖS <br> LIFE SEIENCES <br> PSYCHOLOGY <br> SOCIAL SCIENCEOS <br> OTHER SCIENCES, $\mathbf{H}$.E...... | ¢912-487 | 8835,362! | \$841.560 |  | 1,042.370 | \$959,491 | \$722.904 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 137,351 | 55,800 106,210 | 91,701 | 118,299 80,282 | 81,661 | 87,715 | 95,399 |
|  | 27:1871 | 106,739 | 24,5881 | 35,278 | 73, 4 461 | 65,154 28,052 | 64,551 25,293 |
|  | 517,712 | 408,016 | 23,670 | 15,042 668,715 | 24,677 |  | 27,465 |
|  | 19,007 | 439,5841 | 49, ${ }^{\text {1511 }}$ | 668,715 | 706,8481 |  | 7,877 |
|  | 59,993 | 61,215 | 59,329 | 69,659 | 44,0201 | 31,738 | 20,932 |
|  | 41,366 | 37,593 | 38,215 | 37,602 | 53,334; | 66,5991 | 31,984 |
| FEDERAL SOURCES, TOTAL | 236.836 | 224.651 | 225.681! | 270,082 | 206, 710 , | 195,462 | 167.975 |
| Engineering <br> PHKSUCAL SCIĖMCES <br> ENVIROMHENTAL SCIENCEOS <br> MATHEMATICAL/COHPUTER SCIE EOCOE S <br> LIFE SCIENCES <br> PSYCHOLOGY <br> SOCIAL SCIEMCES <br> OTHER SCI ENCES, $\dot{H}, \dot{E} . \dot{C}$. | 21,082 | 13,547 | 42,702 |  | 20,200 |  |  |
|  | 27,892 | 24,496 | 20,721 | 18,862 | 19,174 | 21,89 |  |
|  | 8,4861 |  | 7,0841 | 5,960 | 6,312 | 9,273 | 8,970 |
|  | 473 | 161,907 |  |  | 2,0 |  | 3,049 |
|  | 3,663 |  | 2,536 | 2,24 | 53,531 | 137 | 2,567 |
|  | 10,939 | 5,3691 | 2,5361 | 2,245 | 1,9671 |  | 1,767 |
|  | 8,1051 | 5,230 | 4,139\| | 4,1991 | 1,672 | 2,341 | 2,069 |
| OTHER SOURCES, TOTAL | 675.651 ! | 611.2 | 615,872 | 746.320 | 835.660 | 764.02 | 561.922 |
| EMGINEERING environag ital sciencees <br> MATHELATICAL/COMPUTER SCOĖEOCȮS <br> LIFE SCIENCES <br> PSYCHOLOGY <br> SOCIAL SCIENCES <br> OTHER SCIENCES: $\mathrm{N} . E$ E. C . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 63,8681 109,439 | 81, 2141 | 72,7471 | 54,200 61,420 | 61,461 | 70,496 | 73,339 |
|  | 18,701 | 20,778, | 17,504, | 29,3181 | 42,843, | 18,779 | 16,323 |
|  | 365,6131 | 326,994, | 355, 313 | 499,257 | 553,629 | 23,244 505,039 | 24,416 363,910 |
|  | 15,344 49,054 | 326,798 $34 ; 465$ 55,846 | 12,9751 | 49,2801 | 553,3171 | 505,039 10,301 | 363,910 6,036 |
|  | 49,0541 | 55,846 | 54,862 | 46,904 | 42,214; |  | 18,863 |
|  |  |  | 3, 076 |  | 51,662 | 63,25 | 26,930 |

J' DATA MERE MOT COLLECTED IN 1978.
SOURE: MATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATIOK
table's b-13. - total and feperally financed capital expendijines for scientific and engineering activities at UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES BY CONTROL: FISCAL YEARS $1972-77$ AND $1979 \downarrow$
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

| CONTROL | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1979 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \all sources, total | \$912.487 | \$835,862 | \$841.560 | 51.016.402 | \$1.042.370 | \$959.491 | \$729.904 |
| PUBLIC <br> PRIVATE | 664,684 | 610,331 225,531 | 641,971 | 775,709 240,693 | 751,965 290,405 | $\begin{array}{r} 686,664 \\ 272,827 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 495,175 \\ 234,729 \end{array}$ |
| FEDERAL SOURCES, TOTAL | 236.836 | 224.651 | 225.681? | 270.082 | 206.710 | 195,462 | $167.975$ |
| PUBLIC PRIVATE | 160,808 | 157,610 | 173,713 51,968 | 198,404 71,678 | 126,537 | 118,962 | 96,837 |
| OTHER SOURCES, TOTAL | 675.651 | 611.211 | 615.879 | 746,320 | 835.660 ! | 764.029! | 561.929 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PUBLIC } \\ & \text { PRIVATE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 503,876 \\ & 171,775 \end{aligned}$ | 452,721 | $\begin{aligned} & 468,258 \\ & 147,621 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 577,305 \\ & 169,015 \end{aligned}$ | 625,428 210,232 | $\begin{aligned} & 567,702 \\ & 196,327 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 398,338 \\ & 163,591 \end{aligned}$ |

table, b-14. - scientists and ewgimers employed at uwiversities ano coll leges by science/engimeerimg

 -
table b-15. - doctorate recipients in sciemce amo emgineerimg by field: sume 1972-79

| FIELD | 1972 | 1973 | . 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | $\mathrm{C}^{1977}{ }^{\circ}$ | 1978 | 1979 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL | 19.556 | 12,555 ${ }^{\prime}$ | 12.086 | 19,048 | 18.790 | 18.281 | 17.956 | 18.242 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ENGINEERS | 3,475 | 3,338 | 3,144 | 2,959 | 2,791 | 12,641 | 2,423 | 2,494 |
| PHYSICAL SCIENTISTS | 3,646 | 3,439 | 3,126 | 3,055 | 2,858. | 2,719 | 1* 2,611 | 2,675 |
| ENVIROMMENTAL SCIENTISTS | - 650 | 662 | 674 | 695 | 714 | 691 | )623. | 646 |
| MATHEMATICAL AMD COMPUTER SCIENTISTS | 1,281 | 1,222 | 1,196 | 1,149 | 1,003 | 95 | 959 | $\stackrel{877}{ }$ |
| LIFE SCIENTISTS | 4,914 | 4,983 | 4,790 | 4,884 | 4,841 | 4,767 | 1.4,887 | 5,076 |
| PSYCHOLOGISTS | 2,262 | 2,444 | 2,587 | 2,749 | 2,878 | 2,960 | - 3,049 | 3,081 |
| SOCIAL SCIENTISTS | 3,328 | 3:467 | 3,569 | 3,558 | 3,705. | 3,544 | 3,404 | 3,298 |

SOURCE: HATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, SUMARY RERORT, DOCTORATE RECIPEETS EROÚU UMITED STATES UHIYERSILIES, JUNE 1972 THROUCA JUNE 1979, SURVEY OF EARNED DOCTORAIES.
$\bullet$


table b-17. - full-time equivalent (fie) scientists and engineers employed at universities and colleges by type

| TYPE OF ACTIVITY. | 2973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1980 | $\begin{gathered} \text { PERCENT CHANGE } \\ 1973-80 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| total fre's | 235.050 | 238,055 | 244,381 | 252.555 | 258.966 | 271.560 | 282,173 | 20.0 |
|  | 186,896 | 47,952 190,103 |  | 52,916 49,639 | 54,408 204,558 | 215,919 215,641 | 225,116 | 21.8 19.6 |

SOURCE: MATIOMAL SCIEHCE FOUNEATIONLY FROH DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS.

TABLE B-18. - BACHELOR'S'- AMD MASTER'S-DEGREE RECIPIENTS COHPARED TO EMPLOYHENT BY SCIENCE/ENGINEERING FIELD: 1977 AND 1979

|  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FIELD OF-SCIENCE/ENGINEERINǴ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BACHELOR'S } \\ \text { DEGREE } \\ \text { RECIPIENTS } \\ 1977 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBER } \\ & \text { EMPLOYED } \\ & \text { IN FIED, } \\ & 1979 \end{aligned}$ | PERCENT EMPLOYED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HASTER'S } \\ & \text { DEGREE } \\ & \text { RECIPIENTS } \\ & 1987 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBER } \\ & \text { EMPLOYED- } \\ & \text { IN FIELD, } \\ & 1979 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERCENT } \\ & \text { EHPLOYED } \end{aligned}$ |
| TOTAL, ALL FIELDS* | 222.200 | 84.000 | 37.8 | 45,300. | 27.700 | 61.1 |
| ENGINEERING . ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 45,800 |  |  |  |  | 86.6 |
|  | 45,800 8,400 | 39,500. | 86.2 | 14,900 2,300 | 12;900 | 86.6 56.5 |
| ENVIROHHENTAL SCIENCES HATHEHATICAL/COHPUTER SĊĖĖĖĖ- | 7,800 18,100 | 2, 10 100 | 35.9 | 2,100 | 1,100 | 66.5 52.4 |
| COMPUTER SCIENCES . . . . . . . . | 18,800 | 10,800 | 89.7 | 5,600 | 3,200 | 57.1 |
| MATHEMATICS . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 12,300 ' | 5,900 | 84.5 | 2,600 | 1,700 | 65.4 |
| LIFE SCIENCES ................. | 52,300 | 18,200 | 34.8 | 8,100 | 1,500 | 50.0 50.6 |
| SOCIAL SCIENCEXS ${ }^{\text {a }}$. | 36,300 53,500 | 4,000 5,000 | 11.9 9.3 | 6,400 5,900 | 3,300 | 51.6 |
| S SIENCES | 53,500 | 5,000 | 9.3 | 5,900 | 1,800 | 30.5 |

SOURCE: NATIONAL SEIENCE FOUNDATION $f_{i}$
table b-19. - full-time equivaleri (fTE) scientisis am emgineers emgaged in research amd development at UWIVERSIties ako colleges ano in industry: 1974-1980


3' IN 1979, DATA HERE COLLECTED ONLY FROH DOCTORATE-GRA SOURCE: WATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

TABLE B-20. - FULL-TIME SCIEMISTS AMOVEWGIMEERS EMPLOYED AT UWIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES


DATA MOO AVAILABLE PRIOR TO 1980 .
DATA MOT AVALABLE PRIOR TO 1976 .



TABLE B-21. - FULL-TIME SCIENISTS AND ENGINEERS EMPLOYED AT UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES


1/' DATA MERE NOT COLLECTED IN 1973 AND 1979. 3/ DATA NOT AVAILABLE PRIgR TO 1980.

TABLE 8-22. FY FOL-TIME SCLENTISTS AMD EMGIMEERS EMPLOYED AT UWIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES - BY CONTROL AND LEVEL OF ATTAINHENT: JANUARY 1975-78AMD 1980 1/

| COHTROL AMD <br> LeVEL OF ATtAINHENT | 1975. | 1976 | 2977 | 1978 | 1980 | AVERAGE 1 AVEUAL PERCENT CHANGE $1978-80$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL INSTITUTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| toral | 223,336 | 229.823 | 236.192 | 242.063 | 1255.659 | 2.8\% |
| PH.D. OR SC.D. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ED. D. 1/: | 122,760 | 126,478 | 131,056 | 135,601 3,332 | 140,477 3,242 | 1.8 |
|  | 29,148 | 30, 399 | 30,834 | 31, 332. | 3,242 | -1.4 |
| MASTER'S': | 54,719 16,709 | 53,717 16,153 | 54,076 | 54,531 | 56,811 | 6.6 2.1 |
|  | 16,709 | 16,153 | 16,653 | 16,966 | 20,521 | 10.0 |
| PUALIC INSTITUTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MTOTAL | +156.819 | 161.755 | 166,424 | 169.289 | . 177.24 | 2.5 |
| PH.D. OR SC.D. | 84,539 | 87,395 |  |  |  |  |
| ED.D. $1 /{ }^{\text {d }}$ |  | 2,690 | 2,908 | 23,739 | 36,266 | 1.7 |
| MiSter is | 15,525 | 16,248 | 16,32 | 16,425 | 17,409 | 3.0 |
| BACHELOR'S.' | 43,351 | 42,785 | 43,388 13,150 | 43,816 | 45,694 | 2.1 |
| _PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 66.517 | 68.068 | 69.768 | 72.774 | 77.712 | 3.3 |
| PH.D. OR SC.D. | 38,221 | 39,083 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 39. 686 |  |  | 44,211 | 2.0 -2.9 |
| Misíer D.S. ETO | 13,623 11,368 | 13,851 10,932 | 14,272 | +15,200 | 17,199 | 6.3 |
| BACHELOR'S | 11,368 | 10,932 3,516 | 10,688 3,503 | 10,715 3,796 | 11,117 | 1.9 10.4 |


SOURCE: MATIONAL SCIEMCE FOUHDATIOM

TABLE B-23. - U.S. SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS BY. SEX:

| SEX | - 1974 | 1976 | 1978 | PERCENT Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 1974-76 | 1976-78 |
| TOTAL AAL U.S. SCIENTISTS AND ${ }_{x}$ ENGTHEERS | 2.481.800 | 2.705 .800 | 2,741,400 | 2.0 | 1.3 |
| MEN MOWEN ................................ | $2,265,000$ 216,800 | 2,455,800 | $2,475,300$ 266,100 | '8.4 | 6.8 |
| FULL-TIME SCIENTISTS AMD UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES .. | 218.407 | 229.767 | 242.063 | 5.2 | 5.4 |
| MEN HOHEN .................................... | $\begin{array}{r} 186,283 \\ 32,124 \end{array}$ | 194,273 35,484 | $\begin{array}{r} 203,136 \\ 38,927 \end{array}$ | 4.3 10.5 | 4.6 |

SOURCE: NATIOMAL SCİENCE FOUNDATION.

TABLE B-24. - FULL-TIME SCIENTISTS AMO EMGINEERS EMPLOYED AT UNIVERSITIES AMD COLIEGES

| TYPE OF INSTITUTION AND CONTROL | total | Hen |  | HOMEN |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NUHEER | P.ERCENT OF TOTAL | NUHBER | $\underset{\substack{\text { PERCENT } \\ \text { TOTAL }}}{\text { OF }}$ |
|  | 255,659 177 77,947 | 211,299 147,392 63,907 | $82.6 \%$ 82.8 82.2 | 44,360 30 13,555 | $17.4 \%$ 17.2 17.8 |
| InSTITUTIONS GRANTING: | - |  |  |  |  |
| doctorate in ste <br> PRIVATE | 180,433 123 $56 ; 458$ 56 | 150,246 103,374 46,872 | 83.3 83.4 83.0 | 30,187 20,584 9,963 | 16.7 . 16.6 17.0 |
|  | 27,953 22,988 2, 871 | 23,467 18,671 4,796 | 84.0 84.6 81.7 | 4,486 3,411 1,075 | $16: 0$ 95.4 18.3 |
|  | 20,788 6,979 13,709 | 19,030 5 $11 ; 929$ | 81.9 85.0 80.4 | 3,758 1,050 $\mathbf{2}, 708$ | 18.1 15.0 19.6 |
|  | 702 455 247 |  | 90.3 92.7 85.8 | 68 33 35 | 9.7 7.3 14.2 |
| 2-YEAR İNSTITUTIONS <br> UBLIC <br> PRIVATE | 25,783 24,473 $\times 1,310$ | 19,922 18,996 .926 | 77.3 77.6 70.7 | 5,861 5,477 384 | 22.7 22.7 29.3 |

SOURCE: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

TABLE B-25. - PART-TIME SCIERTISTS AND ENGINEERS EMPLOYED AT UHIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES* BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION, CONTROL, AND SEX: JANUARY 1980


SOURCE: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

TABLE 8-26. - UNEMPLOMHENT RATE OF U.S SCIEMTISTS, AMD ENGINEERS DY SEX: 1974, 1976. גMD 1978

| YEAR AND SEX |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EHPLOYED } \\ & \text { SCIENTISTS } \\ & \text { ENGINEERS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LWEMPLOYED, } \\ & \text { SEEKIMG } \\ & \text { EMPLOYMENT } \end{aligned}$ | UNEMPLOYMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1974, Total | 2.288 .000 | 2.248.200 | 39.800 | 1.7 |
| MEANEN | $2,104,700$ 183,300 | $2,072,100$ 176,100 | $32,600^{\circ}$ 7,200 | 1.5 3.9 |
| 1976, TOTAL | 21451,700 | 2.337 .200 | 74.600 | 3.0 |
| - MEN HCN | $\begin{array}{r}2,240,000 \\ \hline \quad 211,700\end{array}$ | 2,179,900 | 60,100 14,500 | 2.7 6.8 |
| 1978, TOTAL | 2,507,600 | 2.473 .200 | 34.400 | 1.4 |
| MEM | $2,270,400$ 237,200 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,241,700 \\ 231,500 \end{array}$ | 28,700 5,700 | 1.3/ |

SOURCE: MATIONAL SĊIEMCE FOUNDATION

TABLE B-27. - DOCTORAL SCI ENTISTS AMD ENGINEERS
IN THE UNITED STATES BY RACE: 1973 AND 1979


TABLE B-28, - DOCTORAL SCIENTISTS AMD ENGIMEERS EMPLOYED IN ACADEMIC IMSTITUTIONS 8Y SCIENCE/ENGINEERING FIELD AND RACE: 1973 AND 1979.

| 1 | 1973 |  |  |  | 1979 |  |  |  | PERCENT CHANGE, 1973-79 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FIELO | UnITE | 8LACX |  | ASIAM / pacific ISLAMDER | HITIE | BLACK | AMERICAN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ASIAM }{ }^{\prime} \\ & \text { PACIF IC } \\ & \text { ISLAMDER } \end{aligned}$ | MHITE | 8LACX | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AMERICAM } \\ & \text { IMDIAM } \\ & \text { i. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ASIAM } \\ & \text { PACIFIC } \\ & \text { ISLAMDER } \end{aligned}$ |
| TOTAL | 115.922 | 1.381 | -2741 | 5.155 | 152.302 | 2.118 | 618 | 2.826 | 31.4 | 53.6 | 125.5 | 90.6 |
| EMGIMEERS <br> PHSICAL sci <br> EMVIRONGENTAL SCIENTISTS <br> mathematical amo | 11,467 19,283 4,830 | 66 279 6 | 26 34 13 | 1,001 1,093 120 | 14,686 23,724 5,750 | $\begin{array}{r}89 \\ 235 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 15 120 12 11 | 1,642 | 28.1 23.0 19.0 | 34.8 -13.3 -33.3 | -42.3 252.9 -15.4 | 64.0 64.6 59.2 |
| COHPUTER SCIENTISTS <br> LIFE SCIENTISTS pSYCHOLOGISTS <br> SOCJAL SCIEMTIŚtis | 10,575 35,658 13,263 20 | 115 455 171 297 | $\begin{array}{r}10 \\ -\quad 74 \\ \hline 3\end{array}$ | 494 1,541 115 | 12,936 46,199 16,981 | 133 646 331 | 52. 168 136 | $\begin{array}{r}941 \\ 3,334 \\ \hline 229\end{array}$ | 22.3 29.6 28.0 | 15.7 42.0 93.6 | 420.0 127.0 216.3 | 99.2 90.5 116.4 99.1 |
| SOCIAL SCIENTISTS ...... | 20,846 | 297 | 74 | 791 | 32,033 | $\begin{array}{r}681 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 116 | 1,699 | 28.0 53.7 | 93.6 129.0 | 216.3 56.8 | 99.1 113.7 |

SOURCE: MATIONAL SCIENCE FOU'̛́DATION, SURVEY OF DOCTORATE RECIPIENTS

TABLE B-29- - UWEAPLOHMENT RATE OF U.SASCIEMTISTS AND EMGINEERS BY-RACE: 1974, 1976, AND 1978

| year and race | LABOR FORCE | EMPLOYED SCIENTISTS emgine ers | UNEMPLOYED, SEEKING, EMPLOYENT | UNEMPLOYHENT RATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1974, total | 2.288,000 | 2.248,200 | 39.800 | 1.7 |
| HHITE | 2,188,500 | 2,152,900 | 35,600 |  |
| SLACK ASIAN | 35,500 <br> 41,200 <br> 12200 | 3, 32, 500 | 3,000 | 8.5 |
| OTHER | - $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42,'800 }\end{aligned}$ | 40,500 22,500 | 700 | 1.7 1.3 |
| 1976, total | 2.451.700 | 2,377,200 | 74.600 | 3.0 |
| HITE | 2,348,200 | 2,278,800 | 69,400 | 3.0 |
| BiAACK | 36,2000 42,600 | 2,273,000 | 3,400 1,200 | 3.0 8.3 2.8 |
| OTHER $\ldots$ :...........: | 42,600 24,800 | - $\begin{array}{r}\text { 41,800 }\end{array}$ | 1,200 | 2.8 |
| 1978, TOTAL | 2.507 .600 | 2,473.200 | 34,400 | 1.4 |
|  | 2,393,600 | 2,360,900 |  |  |
| BiACK | 行 $\begin{aligned} & 39,600 \\ & 59\end{aligned}$ | 2,36,900 |  | 1.5 |
| ASTAH | 51,300 | 50,500 | 800 400 | 1.6 |

SOURCE: HATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNOATION
TABLE B-30. - SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS EMPLOYED AT UNIYERSITIES AND COLLEGES

| TYPE OF ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT, | 1975 | 1976 | '9977 | 1978 | 19800 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| total | 278,919 | 288,221 | 297.768 | 307.642 | 324.843 |
| POSTDOCTORATES 2/ | 16,660 | 17,034 | 18,653 | 19,753 | 18,589 |
| - ALL OTHER ACADEMIC SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS | 262,259 | 271,187 | 279,115 | 287,889 | 306,254 |

1/ DATA ON POSTDOCTORATES MERE NOT COLLECTED IN FALL 1978.
3' AT DOCTORATE-GRANIME INSTITUTIONS OWLY; DATA, ARE FOR FALL SEMESTER OF PRECEDING YEAR.
SOURCE: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUKDATION

TABLE B-31, -- POSTDOCTORATES, GRADUATE RESEARCH ASSISTANTS AND RRD EXPEMDITURES (DOLLARS IN HILLIONS)

| FIELD | POSTDOCTORATES |  | GRADUATE RESEARCH ASSISTANTS |  | RZD EXPEMDITURES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NEMBER | PERCEMT DISIR8UTION | NUMBER | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERCENT } \\ & \text { DISIRI- } \\ & \text { BUTION } \end{aligned}$ | AMOUNT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERCENT } \\ & \text { DISTRI- } \\ & \text { BUTION } \end{aligned}$ |
| TOTAL | 18.589 | 100.0 | 48.497 | 100.0 | 55.093 | 100.0 ${ }^{+}$ |
|  | 1,073 4,028 | 5.8 -21.7 | 12,684 | 26.2 16.0 | 708 543 | 13.9 |
| ENYIRONHENTAL SCIEMCE ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | -329'1 | 21.7 $=\quad 1.8$ | 3,452 | 16.0 7.1 | 543 420 | 10.7 8.2 |
| MATHEMATICAL AND COMPUT | 203 | 1.1 |  | 3.4 |  | 2.8 |
| LIFE SCIENCES PSYCHOL OGY | 12,089 | 65.0 | - 15,129 | 31.2 | 2,785 | 54.7 |
| PSYCHOLOG <br> SOCIAL SCIENCES ..... | 456 | 2.5 | 2,333 | 11.8 | + 938 | 1.8 5.5 |
| OTHER SCIENCES, W.E.E.C. | 411 | 2.2 | 5,533 | 11.4 | 278 125 | 5.5 2.5 |

source: hational science foundation

TABLE B-32. - POSTDOCTORATES GRADUATE RESEARCH ASSISTANTS AND RED EXPENDITURES IN DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS BY SOURCE OF SUPPORt: FALL 1974-77 AND 1979 $\rightarrow$ (DOLLARS IN HILLIONS)


2/ DATA NERE MOT COLLECTED IN FALL 1978
SOURCE: WATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATIONATOR EXPRESSED IN 1972 dOLLARS.
GON

INSTITUTIONAL COMTROL, AND CITIZENSHIP: FAL SCIENCE/ENGINEERIMG FIELD, INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, AND CITIZENSHIP: FALL 1979

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{FIELO*} \& \multirow{3}{*}{NUMBER} \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} \& \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{CONTROL} \& \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{CITIZENSHIP} \\
\hline \& \& \& \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{PUBLIC} \& \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{PRIVATE} \& \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FOREIGM} \& \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{U.S.} \\
\hline \& \& \& MUMBER \& \begin{tabular}{l}
PERGENT \\
DISTRI- \\
BUTION
\end{tabular} \& number \& \begin{tabular}{l}
PERCENT \\
DISIRI- \\
BUTION
\end{tabular} \& NUMBER \& PERCENT
DISRI-
BUTION \& NUMBER \& \begin{tabular}{l}
PERCENT
DISTRI- \\
BUTION
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \multicolumn{11}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{7}{*}{ENGINEERING PHYSICAL SCI ĖNĊĖS ENYIRONMENTAL SCIENĊĖS hathematical and computer SCIENCES LIFE SCIENCES PSYCHOLOGY SOCIAL SCIENĊĖŚS} \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
\& 1,073 \\
\& 4,028 \\
\& 329
\end{aligned}
\]} \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
5.8 \\
21.7 \\
01.8
\end{array}
\]} \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline \& \& \& \multirow[t]{5}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
546 \\
2,405 \\
205 \\
95 \\
6,575 \\
208 \\
234
\end{array}
\]} \& \multirow[t]{5}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
5.3 \\
23.4 \\
2.0 \\
0.9 \\
64.0 \\
2.0 \\
2.3
\end{array}
\]} \& \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
527 \\
1,623 \\
124 \\
108 \\
5,514 \\
248 \\
177
\end{array}
\]} \& \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
6.3 \\
19.5 \\
1.5 \\
1.3 \\
66.3 \\
3.0 \\
2.1
\end{array}
\]} \& \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
663 \\
1,992 \\
112 \\
9,94 \\
3,079 \\
34 \\
101
\end{array}
\]} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
10.9 \\
32.8 \\
1.8
\end{array}
\]} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{r} 
r \\
\hline 1210 \\
2,036 \\
217
\end{tabular}} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
3.3 \\
16.3 \\
1.7
\end{array}
\]} \\
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline \& 12,089 4 \& 65.0
2.5 \& \& \& \& \& \& 50.7 \& 109
9,010 \& 0.9
72.0 \\
\hline \& \(\begin{array}{r}456 \\ \hline \quad 411\end{array}\) \& \(\begin{array}{r}2.5 \\ \hline 2.2\end{array}\) \& \& \& \& \& \& -0.6

1.7 \& 9
422
310 \& $\begin{array}{r}12.04 \\ 3.4 \\ \hline\end{array}$ <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& 310 \& 2.5 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

TABLE B-34J- POSTDOCTORATES AND OTHER "NONFACULTY DOCTORAL RESEARCH STAFF
IN ALL GRADUATE INSTITUTIONS EY SCIENCE/ENGINEERING FIELD AMD SEX: FALL 1979

| FIELD | POSTDOCTORATES |  |  | OTHER NON-FACULTY DOCTORAL RESEARCH STAFF |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | MEN | HOHEN | TOTAL | HEN | HOMEN |
| TOTAL | 18.639 | 15.250 | - 3.389 | 2.697 | 2.080 | 617 |
| ÉNGIMEERING |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |
| PHYSICAL SCIENCES <br>  | $\begin{array}{r}1,059 \\ \hline 329\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 3,623 } \\ \hline 293\end{array}$ | 386 | 265 469 | 253 | 12 |
| ENYIRONMENTAL SCIENCES ${ }^{\text {MATHEMAT ICAL/COHPUTER SCIĖMCĖS }}$ | 329 .203 | 293 181 | 36 22 | 105 108 | 418 .97 | 7 7 |
| LIFE SCIENCES PSYCHOLOGY | 12, 105 | 9, 513 | 2,592 | 1,108 | $\begin{array}{r}1,074 \\ \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 452 |
| SOCIAL SCIENĊĖS | 456 | 298. 268. | 158 146 | 63 181 | 130 134 | 33 47 |

SOURCE: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ${ }^{\text {. }}$


1/ AT ALL GRADUATE INSTITUTIONS AS REPORTED BY MATIDML CEETER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS, DEPARTHENT

SOURCR: HATIONAL SCIEME FONS AND POSTDOCTORATES, AMHUAL SERIES,
SOURCE: WATIONAL SCIENCE FOUMDATION

TABLE 8-36. - SCIENCE/EMGINEERIMG GRADUATE STUDENTS AND SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS BY TYPE OF GRADUATE INSTITUTION: 1974-80


1

TABLE 8-37. - NuMBER OF DEGREES GRANTED B'Y INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION BY LEVEL AND FIELD: 1974-79

|  | academic year |  |  |  | - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1973-74 | 1974-75 | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 |
| BACHELOR'S AMD FIRST <br> PROFESSIONAL DEGREES, TOTAL | 1.008.654 | 987,922 | 997.504 | 993.008 | 997.165 | 1.000.562 |
| SCIEMCE AMD EMGIMEERING HEALTH FIELDS ALL OTHER FIELOS | $\begin{array}{r} 305,062 \\ 61,025 \\ 642,567 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2 9 4}, 920 \\ & 70,058 \\ & \mathbf{6 2 2}, 944 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 292,174 \\ & 79,126 \\ & 626,204 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 288,543 \\ 82,378 \\ \mathbf{6 2 2}, 087 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 288,167 \\ 86,012 \\ 622,986 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 288,625 \\ 899,951 \\ 621,986 \end{array}$ |
| MASTER'S DEGREES, TOTAL | 278.259 | 293.651 | 313.00\% | 318.241 | 312.816 | 302.075 ? |
| SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING <br> HEALTH FIELDS <br> ALL DTHER FIELDS .......... | $\begin{array}{r} 54,175 \\ 99,741 \\ 216,363 \end{array}$ | 53,852 10,862 228,957 | $\begin{array}{r} 54,747 \\ 12,696 \\ 245,558 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 56,731 \\ 13,092 \\ 248,418 \end{array}$ | 56,237 14,483 242,096 | $\begin{array}{r} 54,456 \\ 15,637 \\ 231,982 \end{array}$ |
| doctor's degrees, total | 33.826 | 34.086 | 34.076 | 33,244 | 32.156 | 32.756 |
| SCIEMCE AMD ENGIMEERIMG HEALTH FIELDS ALL OTHER FIELDS | $\begin{aligned} & 17,865 \\ & 15,588 \end{aligned}$ | 17,784 15,618 | $\begin{aligned} & 17,288 \\ & 577 \\ & 16,212 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,937 \\ & 15,738 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,196 \\ & 15,354 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 ; 363 \\ & 15,675 \end{aligned}$ |

[^28]TABLE B-38. GRADUATE STUDENTS IN DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS
BY STATUS AND SCI ENCE/ENGINEERING FIELD: FALL 1974-79


SOURCE: NATIOWAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

TABLE B-39. - FULL-TIME SCIEṄCE/ENGINEERING, GRADUATE STUOENTS IN DOCTORRTE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS EY LEVEL OF STIUYY: FALL $1974-79$

|  | YEAR | $\cdots,{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | TOTAL | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FIRST } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | FIRST YEAR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1974 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 |  |  | 195,906 210,822 | 73,745 79,459 | 122,161 |
| 1976 |  |  | 214,729 218,445 | 78,458 | 136,271 137,732 |
| 1978 1979. |  |  | 218,445 | 80,713 74,456 | 137,732 |
| 1979: |  |  | 224,057 | 73,263 | 150,794 |

SOURCE: WATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

TABLE B-40. - FULL-TIME SCIENCE/ENGINEERING GRADUATE STUDENTS IN DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS BY SOURCE OF MAJOR SUPPORT: FALL 1974-79


1'O INCLUOES SUPPORT FROH STATE AMR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.
SOURCE: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATIO
$\$$
(DOLLARS IN THOUSAMDS)

| - FIELD | 1973 | $\dot{1974}$ | $1975$ | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL | 5287.210 | S 326.600 | \$ 201.273! | s 174,871 | S 184.671 | S 205.865 | S 204.805 |
| ENGINEERIMG ..... | 12,631 | 10,3611 | 10,821 | - 8,200 | 10,015 | 12,626 | 13,682 |
| PHYSICAL SCIENCES | - 3,9011 | -4,051 | 3,238 | 3,0491 | 3,675 | 1,441 | 5,473 |
| ENYIROWHENTAL SCIENCES : | 4,1241 | 4,927 | - 3,2851 | 1,629 | 764 | 663 | 1,507 |
| MATHEMATICAL/COHPUTER SCIENCES | 3,1891 | 3,975 | 2,3891 | 1,956 | 2,875 | 558 | 1,558 |
| LIFE SCIENCES | 179,222 | 225,575 | 135,600 | 105,631 | 118,799 | 130,840 | 136,009 |
| PSYĊHOLOGY | 20,513 | 27,209 \| | 12,819 | 9,541 | 27,274 | 16,937 | 15,296 |
| SOCIAL SCIENCES | 43,515 | 40,741 | 30,2431 | 39,7431 | 21,755 | 20,311 | 18,198 |
| OTHER SCIEMCES, N.E.C. | 20,125 | 9.761 | 2,878 | 5,222 | 20,514 | 22,489 | 13,082 |

- SOURCE: MATIONAL SCIENCE FOUWDATION

TABLE B-42. - FULL-TIME SCIENCE/ENGINEERING GRADUATE STUDENTS IM DOOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS


Y'OURCE: NERE NOT COLLECTED IN FALL 1978.
SOURAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION


TABLE B-43. F FULL-TIME GRADUATE STLOENTS IN DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS


[^29]TABLE B-44. - SCIENCE/ENGINEERING, DOCTOẢATE RECIPI ENTS BY SEX AMO SCIEMCE/ENGINEERING.FIELD: JUNE 1974-79


SOURCE: MATIOMAL RESEARCH COUMCIL, SURVEY OF EARNED DOCTORATES


TABLE B-45. - HOMEN IN SCIENCE AND EMGINEERING BY FIELD: 1978 AND 1979


SOURCE: DOCTORATE-GRANTING IMSTITUTIONS OHLY.
SOURCE: MATIONAL SCIENCE FOUMDATION AND MATIOMAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, SURVEY OF DOCTORATE RECIPIEMTS.

TABLE I-46. - FULL-TIME GRADUATE STUDEMTS IM DOCTORATE-GRAMTIMG IMSTITUTIONS BY SEX, SOURCE OF MANOR SUPPORT,


SOURCE: MATIONAL SCIEMCE FOMNDATION:

TABLE B-67. - FY FUL-TIME SCIEMCE/EMGIMEERIMG GRIDUATE STUDENTS IM DOCTORATE-GRANTIMG IMSTITUTIOWS


table b-48. -- total emrollhent by insiliutions of higher education

| Status | $\text { FALL } 1979$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | mumber | PERCENT DISTRIGUTION |
| total enrollment, all fieldos | 11.707 .126 | a 100.0 |
| PuRL Time | 6,901,426 | 59.0 41.0 |
| griduate enrollhent, all fields | 18074.922 | 100.0 |
| FULL TIME PART TITE $\ldots$.................. | 436,458 636,464 | 40.6 59.4 |
| GRADUATE EMROLLMENT, SCIEMCE/ ENGINEERING FIELÓS ¿ 1 ....... | 321,770 | 100.0 |
| full time | $\begin{array}{r} 224,057 \\ 97,713 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 69.6 \\ & 30.4 \end{aligned}$ |

SOURCE: DOCTORATE-GRANTIMG IMSTITUTIOMS OMLY
MATIOMAL CEMTER FOR EDUCAIION STATIStics; demarthent of education, and
MATIONAL SCIEMCE FOUNDATION


1/ DATA HERE MOT COLLECTED IN FALI 1978.
SOURCE: MAIIOHAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, AMD


SOURCE: MATIOWAL SCIENCE FOUMDATION

# reproduction of survey instruments 

Scientific and Engineering Expenditures at Ưniversities and Colleges, page
FY'1979 and Instructions64
Scientific and Engineering Personnel Employed at Üniversitiés and Colleges, January 1979 andlastructions

$\qquad$ ..... 69
Graduate Science Student Support and Postdoctorates,Fall 1979, and InstructionsA.80

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION <br> Washington, D.C. 20550

## SURVEY OF SCIENTIFIC AND ENGINEERING EXPENDITURES AT UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES, FY 1979

(Current and Capital Expenditures for Research', Development, and Instruction in the Sciences and Engineering)

Organizations are requested to complete and return thi form to: ${ }^{\text {- }}$

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION 1800 G Street, N.W.
Washington', D.C. 20550
Attn: UNISG
This form should be returned by February 1, 1980. Your cooperation in returning the survey questionnaire promptly is very important.

Financial data are requested for your institution's 1979 fiscal year.

This information is solicited under the authority of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. All information you provide will be used for statistical purposes only. Your response is entírely voluntary and your faiture to provide somie or all of the information will in no way adversely affect your institution:

All financial data requested on this form should be reported in thousands of dollars; for example, an expenditure of $\$ 25,342$ should be rounded to the nearest thousand dollars and reported as $\mathbf{\$ 2 5}$. '

Where exact data are not available, estimates are acceptable. Your estimates will be better than ours:

.

Include data for branches and all organizational units of your institution, such as medical schools and agricultural experiment stations. Also include hospitals or clinics owned. operated, or controlied by universities, and intégrated operatıonally with the clinical programs of your medıcal schools. Exclude data for federally funded 'research and development centers (FFRDC's). A separate questionnaire is included in this package if your institution administers an FFRDC. If you have any questions please contact Jim Hoathn (202-634-4674).
Please enter the beginning and ending dates of your institution's fiscal year for which you are reporting oh this form:

Please note in space below:
(1) Ahy suggestions to improve the design of the survey questionnaire, (2) any suggestions to improve the instructions, or (3) any comments on significant change in R\&D in your institution,
(Attach additional sheets, if necossary.)
 $\nu$

# ITEM. 1. CURRENT EXPENDITURES FOR SEPARATELY BUDGETED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (R\&D) IN THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING, BY SOURCE OF FUNDS AND BASIC RESEARCH, FY 1979 (Include indirect costs) 

4. 

## ITEMS 1. \& 2. INSTRUCTIONS

. Separately budgefed resegrch and development (R\&D) includes all funds expended for activities specifically organized to produce research outcomes and commisgoned by an agency either external to the institution or separately budgeted by an organizational unit within the institution Include equipment purchased under research project awards as part of "current funds." Research funds subcontracted to outside organizations should also be included Exclude training grants, public service grants, demonstration projects, etc.

Under a Federal Government. Report grants and contracts for R\&D by all agencies of the Federal Government including indirect costs from these sources.

Under b State and local governments. Include funds for R\&D from State, county, municipal, or other local governments and their agencies Include here State funds which support R\&D at agricultural experiment stations.

Under c Industry. Include all grants and contracts for R\&D from profitmaking organizations, whether engaged in production, distribution, research, service, or other activities. Do not include grants and contracts from nonprofit foundations financed by industrh which should be reported under All other sources.

Under d - Institutional funds. Report funds which your institution spent for R\&D p大tivities including indirect costs from the following sources (1) General-purpose State or local government appropriations, (2) generai-purpose grants from industry, foundations, or other outside sources, (3) tuition and fees, (4) endowment income In addition, estimate yofir institution's contribution to unreimbursed indirect costs incurred in association winh-R\&D projects finançed by outside organizations, and mandatory cost sharing on Federal and other grants. To estimate unreimbursed indirect costs, many institutions use a yniversity-wide-negotiated indirect goskrate inultiplied by the base le.g., diredt salaries and wages, etc.) minus actual indirect cost recoveres. If yout institution now separate/y budgets what was previously classified as departmental research, these data should be ancluded in line d.

Under e All other sources. Include foundations and voluntary health agencies grants for R"\& , as well as of other sources not eisewhere classified. Funds from foundations which are affiliated with or grant solely to your institution should be yeluded under d. Institutional funds Funds for R\&D received from a health agency that is a unit of a State or local government should be reported under State and local - governments. Also include gifts from individuals that are restricted by the donor to research'.

Please exclude from your response any R\&D expenditures in the fields of education, law, humanitles, music, the arts, physical education, liberary science, and all other nonscience fields.


| ITEM 2. TOTAL AND FEDERALLY FINANCED EXPENDITURES FOR SEPARATELY BUDGETED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, BY FIELD OF SCIENCE, FY 1979 (Include indirect costs and equipment). |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Field of xcience | Illustrative disciplines |  | (Dollars in thousands) |  |
|  |  |  | (1) Total | (2) Federal |
| a. ENGINEERING . (TOTAL) | Aeronautical, agricultural, chemical, civil, electrical, industrial, mechanical, metaliurgical, mining, nuclear, petroleum, bio- and biomedical, energy, textile, archifecture | 7410 | $\$$ | $\$$ |
| b. PHYSICAL SCIENCES (TOTAL) |  | 1420 |  |  |
| (1) Astronomy | Astrophysics, optical and radio, x-ray, gamma-ray, neutrino | 1421 | - |  |
| (2) Chemistry | Inorgaņic,' organo-metallic, prganic, physical, analytical, pharma-, ceutical, polymer science (exciode biochemistry) | 1422 | - | - |
| (3) Physics | Acoustics, atomic and molecular, condensed matter, elementary particles, nuclear structure, opyics, plasma | 1423 |  | . |
| (4) Other | Used for multidisciplinary projects within physical sciences and for disciplinès not requested separately | 1424 |  | - |
| c. ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES (TOTAL) | ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCES: Aeronomy, solar weather modification, meteorology, extra-terrestrial atmospheres GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES: Engineering geophysics, geológy, geodesy, geomagnetism, hydrology, geochemistry, paleomagnetism, paleontology, physical geography, cartogräphy, seismology, sqi! sciences OCEANOGRAPHY: Chemical, geological, physical, marine geophysics, marine biology, biological oceanography | 1430 | $\because$ |  |
| d. MATHEMATICAL AND COMPUTER SCIENCES (TOTAL) |  | 1440 |  | - |
| (1) Mathematics | Algebra, analysis, applied mathematics, foundations and logic, . geometry, numerical analysis, statistics, topology | 1441 |  | - |
| (2) Computer sciences | Design, development, and application of computer capabilities to data storage and manipulation; information science | 1442 |  | $\cdots$ |
| e. LIFE SCIENCES (TOTAL) |  | 1450 |  |  |
| (1) Biological sciencés | Anatomy, biochemistry, biophysics, biogeography, ecology, embryology, entomology, genetics, immunology, microbiology, nutrition, parasitology, pathology, phármacology, physical anthropology, physiology, botany, zoology | 1451 | $\cdots \cdot$ | $\cdots$ |
| (2) Agricultural | Agricultural chemistry, agronomy, animal science, conservation, dairy science, plant science, range science, wildlife | 1452 | $\cdots \quad$. | - |
| (3) Medical | Anesthesioldfy, cardiology, endocrinology, gastroenter ology, hematology, neurology, obstetrics, opthalmology, preventive . medicine and community health, psychiatry, radiology, surgery, veterinary medicine, dentistry, pharmacy - | 1453 | . | $\bigcirc$ |
| (4) Other | Used for multidisciplinary projects within life sciences | 1454 | 4 | . |
| f. PSYCHOLOGY (TOTAL) | Animal behavior, clinical, educational, experimental, human development and personality, social | 1460 | . | , |
| g. SOCIAL SCIENCES (TOTAL) |  | 1470 |  |  |
| (1) Economics | Econometrics, international, industrial, labor, agricultural, public finance and fiscal policy | 1471 | , | $\cdots$ |
| (2) Political 3cience | Régional studies, comparative government, international relations, legal systems, political theory, public administration | 1472 | - . . . |  |
| (3) Sociology $\quad \because$ | Comparative and historical, complex organizations, culture and social structure, demography, group interactions, socia! problems and welfare, theory | 1473 | . ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |
| (4) Other | History of science, cultural anthropology, linguistics, socioeconomic geography | 1474 | , |  |
| h. OTHER SCIENCES, n.e.c. (TOTAL)* | To be used when the multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary aspects make the classification under one primary field impossible | 1480 | $\cdots \times$ |  |
| i. TOTAL (SUM of a through h) Check to insure that column totals are identical with data reported in item 1. |  | 1400 | , | , |

-PLEASE EXCLUDE FROM YOUR RESPONSE ANY R\&D EXPENDITURES IN THE FIELDS OF EDUCA MUSIC, THE ARTS, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, LIBRARY SCIENCE, AND ALL OTHER NONSCIENCE FIELDS.

## ITEM 3. CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FOR SCIENTIFIC ANḊ ENGINEERING FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND INSTRUCTION, BÝ FIELD OF SCIENCE AND SOURCE'ÖF'FUNDS, FY 1979

## ITEM 3. INSTRUCTIONS

## -•

Report funds for facilities which were in process or completed during FY 1979. Expenditures for administration buildings, steach plants, residence halls, and other such facilities should be excluded ulêss utilized principally for research, development, or instruction in engineering or in the sciences Land costs should be excluded Exclude small equipment items in your current fund account costing approximately $\$ 300$ or less per unit or as recommended by the Joint Accounting Group (JAG) or as determined by your institutional policy, these are to be reported under items 1 and 2.

Facilitıes and equipment expenditures include the following (a) Fixed equipment such as built-in equipment and furnishings, (b) movable scientific equipment such as oscilloscopes and pulseheight analyzers, (c) movable furnishings such as desk, (d) architect's fees, site work, extension of utilities, and the building costs of service functions such as integral cafeterias and bookstores of a facility, (e) facilities constructed to house separate components such as medical schools' and teaching hospitals; and ( $f$ ) special separate facilities used to house fientific apparatus such as accelerators, oceanographic vessels, and computers.


## ITEM 4. TOTAL AND FEDERALLY FINANCED CURRENT FUND EXPENDITURES FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH EQUIPMENT, BY FIELD OF SCIENCE: FY 1979

## ITEM 4. INSTRUCTIONS

Please report below FY 1979 expenditures for scientific research equipment purchased from current funds only. If actual expenditure data are not readily available, please provide estımates. Equipment is defined.to include articles of nonexpendable tangible personal property having a useful life of more than ohe year and an acquisition cost of $\$ 300$ or more per unit. Institutions may use their own definition provided that it at least includes all equipment defined here.
O

NOTE. These research equipment data should also be included with the separately budgeted R\&D expenditures reported in items 1 and 2.
For column (1) report current funds expenditures from all sources. Federal Government, State, county, municipal, or other governments and their agencies (including State funds supporting research and development at agricultural experiment stations), industry, private foundations and voluntary health agencies, individuals and associations; and institutional funds.

For column (2) Federal Government sources include funds from grants and contracts for research and development by all agencies of the Federal Government.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION<br>Washington, D.C. 20550

# SURVEY OF SCIENTIFIC AND ENGINEERING PERSONNEL EMPLOYED AT UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES, JANUARY 1979 

This survey is directed toward doctorategranting institutions and their affiliates only. All other institutions will be surveyed in 1980. Organizations are requested to complete and return this form to:

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

1800 G Street, N.W. Room L-602
Washington; D.C. 20550 Att: UNISG


Name and address of institution:
(Please correct if name or address has changed)

If your institution does not grant a doctorate degree in the sciences or engineering, please indicate this in the REMARKS of the questionnaire and return it to the address above.

This form represents a reduction in the number of items requested in January 1978 and will be sent on a biennial cycle to doctorate-granting institutions only.

This survey requests scientific and engineering employment data according to institutional recordkeep- ing conventions: The completed 1979 questionnaire should be returned by April 20, 1979. Your prompt cooperation will be appreciated. If you determine, however, that you cannot respond by April. 20, notify NSF and request an extension of time.

Please read the enclosed instructions before completing this form. If you have any questions, contact Mr. James Hoehn or Ms. Esther Gist (202-6344673). Please complete all columns; estimates by academic officials will be better than NSF estimates.

All entries should be in whes numbers; please do not enter decimals or fractions, except in column 6 where one decimal place is optionsl.

## SURVEY POPULATION

Include data for all organizational units öf your institution that employ scientists and engineers, such as medical schools, or agricultural experiment stations, nonacademic departments and institutes. (include regional campuses and branches). Also include any hospital or clinic owned, operated; or controlled by your university and integrated operationally with the clinical programs of your medical school.

If your institution has a branch campus, a listing is enclosed showing those branches considered by NSF to be part of your institution. If any data for any of these campuses are not included in your final report, please indicate this when submitting your questionnaire.

Exclude data for any federally funded research and development center (FFRDC) administered by your institution; these are to report separately. See listing of FFRDC's administeréd by-academic institutions.


## CHECK LIST

( ) 1. Are all entries rounded to whole numbers? Please do not enter fractions or decimals, except in column 6 where one decimal place is optional.
( ) 2. Do the data add to subtotals?
( ) 3, Are all columns completed? YQUR astimates will be better than OURS. An explanation of estimates may be noted on a separate sheet or in the REMARKS.
( ) 4. Are all branches and components such as medical school, computer center, and as ricultural experiment station included?
( ) 5. Have you included all postdoctorals?
( ) 6. Have you excluded graduate students?

## CONFIDENTIALITY

The, National Science Foundation recognizes that its ability to gather much of the enclosed information would be severely impaired if it could not be held in confidence. Please indicate below the number of any items which would not be supplied but for assurance that the source will be held in confidence. The Foundation will hold in confidence such information to the extent permitted.by law.


What month did the data come from that were used to complete this survey?

Are there any significant changes in data reported in previous surveys?
Please compare your January 1979 personnel data with your survey response for January 1978, particularly for the totals. Please explain below or on a separate sheet any significant changes; and, where possible, indicate any required adjustments in data reported in previous surveys.

Total full time scientists \& engineers

Line 2700, col 2 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tótal part-time scientists \& engineers | Line 2700, col 3. |

Line 2700, col 4

## REMARKS

What methods and source records were used for estimating R\&D effort?

Please indicate problem's encountered in estimating R'丷ㄹD-related activity.


PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT
NAME OF PERSON SUBMITTING THIS FORM


NATIONAL SCIENĊE FOUNDATION<br>WASHINGTON, D.C. 20550

# SURVEY OF SCIENTIFIC AND ENGINEERING PERSONNEL EMPLOYED AT UNFVERSITIIES AND COLLEGES . JANUARY 1979 

## INSTRUCTIONS ȦND DEFINITIONS

## Introduction

The National Science Foundation requests your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire covering the personnel characteristics of your institution as they relate to the sciences and engineering. This form requests employment data in 1979 according to institutional recordkeeping conventions. The questionnaire should be completed and returned to NSF by April 20,1979 . If you determine, however, that you will not be able to respond by that date, please notify NSF and request an extension of time.

Where data reported in the current survey differ significantly from those reported' in the previous. survey, please indicate the reasons for the difference, such as "opening of new medical school," etc., at the end of the questionnaire in the "Remarks" section, or on a separate sheet of paper.

The survey procedures are outlined in flow chart format. (See pp 5-8.)
If you have any questions regarding information requested on this form, write or telephone Mr. James Hoehp or Ms. Esther Gist at the Universities and Nonprofit Institutions Studies Group, Division of Science Resources Studies, 'National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, N.W., Roonfl-602, Washington, D.C. ' 20550 (Telephone: 202/634-4673). Additional forms, as well as copies of previous responses, may be ${ }^{*}$ obtained by writing to the above address.

## Survey.Instructions

## 1. Survey Population

This survey, conducted biennialty, covers•professional employment at all academic institutions granting a doctoral degree (i.e., Ph.D., M.D., D.D.S., etc.) in ány of the sciences or engineering (S/E) disciplines. The institutional response to this - survey should reflect personnel activity in all branches
and other units of the parent institution, including regional campuses, medical schools, or an agricultural experiment station.

If your institution has one or more branch campuses, a listing is enclosed showing those branches considered by NSF to be part of your institution for survey purposes. If any data for any-of these campuses are not included in your response to NSF, please indicate this under "Remarks" when submitting your questionnaire.

$$
{ }^{2}-
$$

Federally funded kesearch and development centers (FFRDC's) are to report their data separately from the administering university; see the listing of $\mathrm{FF}_{\text {R }} \mathrm{RDC}$ 's administered by academic institutions ( $p 4$ ).

## 2. Survey Time Period

The January date eferenced in this questionnaire is the point-of time when this survey is conducted rather than the actual reporting date of data compiled for NSF. For institutions reporting on the basis of central record systems, data should reflect the date when your files are "frozen"' for annual personnel reports. Many institutions, especially those with State affiliation, use their central records compiled in the preceding fall of each year to report to NSF. Please indicate the reporting date of data for your institution in the space provided, n the back of the questionnaire.

## 3. Profetional Employment.

The termy "professional," for purposes of this survey, refers to all persoṇ paid a salary or stipend by the responding institution who work at a level at which the knowledge acquired by academic training equal to a bàchelor's degree in science or engineering is éssential in the performanee of duties. Many institutions, with central reporting systems use headcounts of exempt employees, i.e., those employees who are in the exempt category of the Fair Labor Standards Act -
as amended. Exempt employees are nof eligiblé for overtime payment. Others use EEO6 concepts.
Include: S/E personnel with faculty status, , bostdoctorals,' and other pros sssional employees such as systems analysts in computer centers.

Exclude: (1) Personnel on sabbatical or-other leave status; (2) personnel employed in branches of your institution located in foreign countries; (3) ưnpaid yoluntary staff; (4) person "unpaid,' by the uniyersity but paid, by the medical school; (5) student health service personiel; (6),those agricultural extension personnel primarily involved in home economics and 4-H youth programs; (7) administrative offieers above the level of department chairpersons with titles such as. president, academic dean, dean of faculty, provost, chancellor, etc., even though they may devote part of their time to teaching and\%or research; (8) ali graduate students.

## 4. Assignment of Scientists and Engineers (S/E) to NSF Disciplines

Determination of whether professional employees. should be reported in the NSF personnel survey as "s'cientists and engineers" and their associated disciplines is done by most respóndents onthe basis of departmental structures. After parficular departments are selected for finclusion in the NSF personnel survey, respondents úsually classify headcounts of all professional employees into varioy S/E disciplines according to their primary or pome department of assignment. Where individual assignments are splitin-. to two departments on a 50 -percent basigy classification into. a single NSF discipline should be made according to institutional conventions.
See classification of disciplines of employment in the sciences and engineering for the broad and detailed $S / E_{1}$ disciplines of eniplo ${ }^{2}$ yment corresponding to those shown on the questionnaire, with illustrative categories of each discipline (p 4). This Atsciplineoriented taxonomy is used by institutions that compile. their own departmental groupings for this NSF survey. As a separä̈é enclosure in this survey package, you will also find a computer-generated List of Graduate Programs. ${ }^{2}$ This listing is intended to serve as an additional guideline to asssist you in determining how to classify your professional personnel as "scien-:
\% 'Somefnstitutions without comprehensive central records on the numbers of postdoctorals base their response to this survey on data gathered in the office of the graduate dean as part of NSF's Survey of Graduate Science Sfudent Support and Postdoctorals.
 ed from the NSF Survey of Graduate Science Student Support, Fiful 1978.
tists and engineers" into various disciplines. While most respondents report S/E headcounts based on departmdntat structurest NSF recognizes that because of the multidisciplinary nature of many academic activities, degree specialties and departmental assignments may differ (i.e., a Ph.D. in mechanical engineering may be assigned to the department of orthopedics). To promote ease of reporting and consistency of data among institutions, it is suggested that, where these differences are not significant, all professionals in a department be assigned to a single discipline. In other instances, where sizable differences occur, institutional respondents may choose to report professionals employed in a single department into two dy more disciplines for the NSF personnel -report. For example, an institution may have a -single department of electrical engineering and com: puter science and report individuals into two separate disciplines on the NSF personnel survey according to their degree specialitiès.
It is important that respondents inclugde in the survey scientists and engineers who are appointed to organizational units that are not part of any academic department. For example, scientists and engineers employed at a computer center that is no affiliated with a particular acadenic department should be included in the survey. The most prevalent reporting practice for these nonacademic units is to assign groups of individuals to NSF disciplines according to their degree specialties, espefáally when multidisciplinary activities are prominent.

## 5. Medical and Clinical Disciplines

For purposes of this survey, all M.D.'s, D.D.D.S.'s, - etc., with faculty or acaderiic appointments are to be reported, including postdoctorates. NSF conisiders fáculty status given to physicians, dentists, public health speccialists, pharmacists etc., to be an indicator of significant inyolvement if teaching, clinical investigation;*or other R\&D adfivitios.
Exclude. (1) All medical pfactitioners, sugh as nurse antesthetists, occupational, theräpists, physical therapists, interns; (2) nurses with or without faculty oräcademic appointments who argpriffarily involved in direct patient care; (3) scientiets whose primary employment is at independent hpspitáls even though they may perform seme teảching or research functions for your institution through cooperatî́e agreements; (4) unpaid voluntary staff at medital or dental schools; and, (5) monedical residents unless research training under the supervisign of a senior mentor is the ' primép purpose of the appoîntment.

## 6. Headcounts of Full-time Scientists and Engineers

Full-time employees are those individuals available for full-time assignments at the date used for reporting in this survey, or those who are designated as "full time" ih an official contract, appointment, or agreement. Determination of "full-time" designation shotuld be based on institutional recordkeeping conventions and standards. Avoid double counting; if, for example, individuals are fullstime employes but their assignments invelve more than one department (or campus), they should be counted as one full-time employee acçording to their primary or home department of ofsignment (or campus):
( 7. Full-Time-Equivalent (FTE)
The FTE reporting concept should reflect the actual utilization of $S / E$ professionals in various disciplines and their involvement in separately buageted R\&D activities. While headcounts are usually reported on the basis of primary department of assignment, FTE reporting in various NSF disciplines should reflect. multiple appointments. For example, an individưal with a 60 -percent appointment in electrical engineering and a 40 -percent appointment in computer science would be reported in FTE's in two NSF disciplines according to the $60-40$-percent split in departmental assignments. Accordingly, the FTE concept converts the number of persons with part-time or split appointments among various disciplines or activities to an equivalent namber of full-time persons, in accordance with institutionally agreed upon conventionsu:
The procedures used to compile FTE data vary from institution to institution, depending largely on the recor's available. Generally, there are two categories of records available to institutions büdgeting information describing the allocation of personnel resources and/or data reflecting actual rather than planned utilization o ${ }^{\frac{8}{t}}$ the'resources.

In converting S/E headcounts into FTE's; the - following method is suggested:

Categorizè headcodints of all exempt employees' in S/E departments, ?medical. schools, agricultural experiment stations, research inistitutes, and other institutional organizational units into one of the NSF disciplines according. to primary assignment;
b. Within each ${ }^{\circ}$ discipline, differentiate employees as being either full time or part time (according to institutional practices);
c. Calculate the full-timerenalents of full-time S/E personnel. Use budgefary or resource utilization records to report $S / E$ employees with split appointments between departmefts and/or institutional units, and distribute these data ac- . cording to appropriate NSF disciplines;
d. Calculate the full-time-equivalents of part-time S7E personnel and merge them into appropriate NSF disciplines.

## 8. Research and Development (R\&D)

R\& $\dot{D}$ açtivities are systematic, intensive studies directed toward fuller knowledge of the subject studied. For purposes of this survey, report only the full-time-equivalent involvement of persons engaged in separately budgeted research and development. Separately budgeted research and development includes all activities specifically organized to produce research outcomes and commissioned by an agency either external to the institution or separately budgeted by an organizational unit within the institution.

Exclude: Time spent bly professional employees on training grants, public service grants, demonstration projects, etc.

Estimating the division of time allocated or spent by individuals in separately budgeted R\&D programs is difficult for maṇy institutions. Again, procedures uśed to supply these datarary among institutions and the extent ${ }^{3}$ to which central feporting is feasible depends, by and large, on the degree to which budget/personnel/financial records -are mechanized and linked. Among the procedures used by various institutions are the following:
' a. Using sóme gene ally héld criteria at the institutional or departmental levels (i.e., three-fourths for instruction, one-fourth for research);
by Estimating separately budgeted R\&D invòlvetrènt or assignment obtained from payroll records, personnel recoìds, or from employee contracts '(i.e., salaries paid from separately budgeted R\&D funds may be compared with total academic salaries of individuals); ${ }^{*}$ 。
c. Asking research administrators, department chairpersons, or heads of other organizational units to furnish'estimates of separately budgeted
-s R\&D involvement.
d. Using faculty activity analyses in institutions. where these are regularly conducted.

## Federally Funded Research and Development * Centers (FFRDC's)

For purposes of this survey, FFRDC's are defined - as R\&D organizations exclusively or substantially financed by the Government and administered on a contractual basis by educational institutions or other organizations. The following is a current list of FFR ${ }_{2} \mathrm{C}$ C's administered byuniversities and colleges:

Ames Laboratory
Argonne National Laboratory
Brookhaven National Laboratory
Center for Nakal Analyses
Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory

- E. O. Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
${ }^{`}$ E. O. Lawrence Livermore Laboratory
Fermi National Accelerator Laboratøry
Jet Propulsion Laboratory
Kitt.Peak National Observatory Lincoln Laboratory Los Alamos Scientific Laboratiyy National Astroperay and Ionosphete Center National Center for Atmospheric Research National Rad o Astronomy Observatory Oak Rid dit trsoçiated Universities Plasma Physics Laboratory Space Radiation Effects Laboratōry Stanford Linear Accelerator Center

Classification of Disciplines of Emptoyment in the Sciences and Engineèring

## ENGINEERING

Aeronautical \& Astronomical: aerodynamics, aerospace, space technology.
Chemical: ceramic, petroleum, petroleum refining process.
Çivil: architectural, hydraulic, hydrologıc, marine, sanıtary and environmental, structural, transportation.
Electrical: communication, electronic, power.
Mechanical: engineering mechanics.
Other Engineering: agricultural, industrial and management, metallurgical and materials, mining, nuclear, ocean engineering systems, textile, welding.

## PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Chemistry: analytical, inorganic, organo-metallic, organic, pharmaceutical, physical, polymer science (exclude biochemistry).
Physics: acoustics, atomic and molecular, condensed matter, elementary partucles, nuclear structure, optics, plasma.
Astronomy: laboratory astrophysics, optical astronomy, radıo astronomy, theoretical dstrophysics, X-ray, gamma-ray, neutrino astronomy.
Other Physical Sciences: used for multidisciplinary fields within physical sciences.

## ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

## (TERRESTRIAL AND EXTRATERRESTRIAL)

Earth Sciences: engineering geophysics, general geology, geodesy
and gravity, ggomagnetism, hydrology, inorganic geochemistry - isotopic geonemittry, organic geochemistry, lab gẹphysics, palcomagnetism, paleontology, physical geography and car: tography, seismology.
Almospheric Sciences: aeronomy, solar, weather,modification, extraterrestrial atmospheres, meteorology.
Oceanography: bological oceanography, chemical oceanography, geological oceanography, physical oceanography, marine geophysics.
Othe Environmental Sciences: used for multidisciplinary fields within environmental sciences.

## MATHEMATICAL AND COMPUTER SCIENCES

Mathematics: algebra, analysis, applied mathematics, foundations and logic, geometry, numerical ańalysis, statistics, topology.
Computer Sciences: computer programming,' computer and information sciences (general); design, development, and application of computer capabilities to data storage and manipulation; informatioh sciences and systems; systems analysis.

## LIFE SCIENCES

Agricultural Sciences: agronomy, anjimal science, dairy science, food science and technology', forestry, horticulture, poultry sclence.
Biological Sciences: anatomy, bacteriology, biochemistry, biogeography, biophysics, ecology, embryology, entomology, evolutionary biology, genetics, immunology, microbiology, nutrition and metabolism, parasitology, pathology, pharmacology, physical anthropology, physiology, plant sciences, radiobiology, systematics, zoology.
Medical Sciences: ${ }^{\text {internal medicine, neurology, ophthalmology, }}$ preventive mepficine and public health, psychiatry, radiology, surgery, veterinary medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, podiatry, anesthesiology, chemotherapy, dermatology, geriatrics, nuclear medicine, obstetrics, gynecology, oncology, pediatrics, physical medicine and rehabilitation.
Other Life Sciences: all other health-related disciplines* ${ }^{4}$.
PSYCHOLOGY: animal behavior; clinical psychology; comparative psychology, counseling and guidance; development and personality; educational, persqnnel, vocational psychology and testing; experimental psychology; ethology; industrial and engineering psychology; social psychology.

## SOCLAAL S. SICIENCES

Economics: agricultural economics; econometrics and economics statistics; history of economic thought; international economics; industriai, labor and agricultural economics; macroeconomics; microeconomics; public finance and fiscal policy; theory; economicsystems and development.
Soclology: comparative and historical, complex orgánizations, culture and social structure, demography, group interactions, socíal problems and social welfare, sociological theory.
Political Science: area or regional studies; comparative government; history of political ideas; international relations and law; national, political and legal systems; political theory; public administration.
Other Social Sciences: cultufal anthropology, criminology, history of science, linguistics, socioéconomic geography, urban studiés.
'Personnel employed as computer programmers should not be reporifd a
professionals.
-Exd
-Exclude personnel primanly involved in direct patient care.

## . Flow Charts

Institutions who automate NSF survey data or plan to - or even engage in manuál data processing - may -be assisted by these charts.



STEP 3:
Collect information on any remaining affiliated entities not covered by files already processed. Such entities might include a regional campus, an agricultural experimint station, a research institute (except for FFRDC's), à computer center, etc. Also check for postdoctorates not inclouded in central files (see footnote to secton 4 in Instructions).

See section 1 in Instructions.

Select personnel exempt from Fair Labor Standards Act. (See section 3 in Instructions.)

See discussions in sections 3 and 4 in instructions.
(Note exclusions listed in section 3 in Instruc. tons (egg., exclude personnel away on sabbatical and voluntary staff).

$$
\because-1 \because
$$

$$
\dot{x}
$$




NOTE: IF YOUR DEPARTMENT DOES NOT ENROL GRADUATE STUDENTS, PLEASE MOVE TO ITEM 8 BELOW.


| FOREIGN STUDENTS | Of the full time gratuate stuctents on line (6), column (J), how many are <br> FOREIGN students? |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



| 6. NUMBER OF PART.TIME GRADUATE STUDENTS* |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| PART.TIME TOTAL | (1) ${ }^{\circ}$ |
| Of the part-itime total on line (1), how many are WOMEN? | (2) |
| Of the part time total on line (1), how many. are FIRSY YEAR? | (3) |

## Chack List



| 8. Number ol POSTDOCTORALS and NON-F.ACULTY DOCTORAL RESEARCH STAFF |  | POSTDOCTORALS |  |  |  |  |  | OTHER NON. FACULTY DOCTORAL RESEARCH - STAFF (G) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SQURCE OF SUPPORT |  |  |  | TOTAL for all sources A thru D (E) | Of the total in E. how many are POREIGN? <br> (F) |  |
|  |  | Federal ${ }^{\circ}$ |  |  | Non. Federal <br> (D) |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fellowatios } \\ & \qquad \text { (A) } \end{aligned}$ | Trainceships <br> (B) |  |  |  |  |  |
| -TOTAL | (1) |  |  |  | . |  |  | - (G) |
| Of the total on line (1). how many are WOMEN? | (2) |  |  | - |  |  |  | * |

Please provide eny comments which might explain variances from prior yeur's data:

Item 5:
-


87 NOTE: This information is solicited under the suthority of the Nationst Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. Al information you provide will be used for statisticsl purposes
only. Your response is entirely voluntary and your fallure to provide some or all of the information will in no way

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR SURVEY OF GRADUATE SCIENCE STUDENTS AND POSTDOCTORALS, FALL 1979

## 1

## General Definitions

A groduot: student is defined as a student enrolled for credil in an advancell-degree program leading to erther a m.ister 9 or Ph.D. degree in fall 1979. M.D., I) V.M.. or D.D.S Landidates. interns. and residents should not her reported unless they are concurrently worhing for " master's or Ph D. in a science or engineering fueld or are enrolled in a joial M.D/Ph D program. Indulduals who already hold an MD, DVM, or DIDS . master's or Ph D degree but who are working. on onother master's or Ph 1$)$ degree are to be counted as graduate students, elfher full or partime. Do not report such individuals as postdoctorals in item 8

Graduate students performing thesis or dissertation research wway from the campuis at Government and contractor-owned fatalities in the United States are to be inchuded as long as they are enrolled for credit in an advanted-deyree program Students enrolled at a branch or extenston cenier in afforeigń country are to be: exchulfol.
A griadmite student. whether full- or part-impe, should be: reported in only one department. If any students are in interdisciphinary programs. please be sure that they are counted only once by their "home" department If a graduale studentis enrolled in an ister-institutional program. please report the student only if the degree will bre kranted by your instifution. Please report in terms of headcounis. not in ful|-hime-equivalent (FTE) lerms

## Item Instructions and Definitions

Highest degroe offered, item 4 . Check the item which refersso the highest degree program offered by this scaencor department in fall 1979 If your department d, ex not offirf a xraduate degree, but is a depariment afchincal medicine with or without posidocturals. check (3)
Full-time graduate students, item or A full-tıme grad-- uate student is clefined as a student enrolled for credit
in, an advanced-degree program (not a regular stalf member or a postdoctoral) who is engaged full time in Iraining activities in his/her field of stience. these acpivilies may embrade any appropriate combination of sludy, teaching, and research, depending on your institution's own policy. It your department has no fulltime gafduate students, write "None" in item 5 and move to lem 6 .
Mechanisms of support, item 5, hines 1-5: Reporl each full-ume graduate student according to the type of mopor support received in the fall of 1979. Students who receive fellowships.or troinceships should be reported on lines 1 and 2 , respectively. if ether of these mechanisms constlate the major source of his/her suppurt the Fedral Interagency Commiltee on Education (FICE) differentiates between the two fellowship ond trumep. ship stipends as follows: (1) A fellowship is an award made directly to or on behalf of a student selected in a ñational competition, to enable him to pursue postbaccalaureate traming. and (2) a trameeship ts an educational award to a student selected by his universily Except for the student select on process. The terms and conditions of the two types of awards are generally identical A sludent receivifig primary supporl frum dn assistantship should be classilied as a research assistant on line 3 or as a teaching assistant on line 4 , depending on how he/shespends the majority of his/her time.e g. a graduate assistant devoting most of his/her time to teaching should be classified as a graduate teaching assistant All other full-time graduate students should be reported on line 5.
Studenis receiving financlal assistance, item.5. columns (A) thru (II). Report the number of fulltume graduate students in the appropriate column according to the source of the largest portion of their support. In determining the source of major support. consider only tuntion . and othen academic expenses. If a graduate student. receives strpend support from more than one soarce, choose the major category of support.

Federal sources, columns ( A ) thru ( E ): Report the number of full-time graduate students in the appropriate columu where they receive the largest portion of their suppurt F'uN-time graduale students receiving the larg. est puituon of their support. from Federal Governmed louns, hivuld be reported as self-supported, column (I)
Department of Defense (DOD), column (A). Report full:the graduate students receiving support from the Depuitment of the Army. Navy, or Air Furce, Students ret cumb their mufor support frum the V'elerans AdmumisIrallun under the G I. Bill should be reported under culumin (E). "Other Federal Sources," If this form of support does not constutute his/her nopor source, the stathent should be countequin the appropriate column represenling that source.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), columns ( $B$ ) and ( $C$ ): Report full-time graduate students recerving supporif from the inslitutes or divisions of the
National Institute of Health (NIH) under the column - ili. supporl from all other components of HEW should be reported under column ( $C$ ). as indicated below:
National nstitutes of Health (report in column B):
DizisiorleftusearchResources
Fogarty International Center
National Cancer Instulute
National Eye Instilute
National Heacl. Lung, and Blood Institute
National Institùte on Aging

- National Institute of Allergy and Infectoous Diseases

National Institute of Arthrifisa Metabolism. and Digestive Diseases
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
National Instriute of Dental Research
National Ingithute of Environmental Health Sciences
National Institute of General Medical Sciences
Natiönal Institute of Neurological and Communicative
Disorders and Stroke

## Other HEW (reporl in columma.f:

Alcohol. Drug Abuse, and Mehral Health Adminis. . tration (including National Inslitute of Mental Health)
Center for Disease Control
Food and Drug Administration
Heillth Resources Adminisistation
Health Services Administration
National Institute of Education
Office of Education
Sucial and Rehabuhtation Service
Non.Federal sources, columns (F) hru $(\mathrm{H})$
Instilutional supporfif column (F): Reports full-time graduale students receiving supporl from your own instifution and State and local governments. Funds given to a university by the Federal Government, such as Iraining grant funds. should be reported under the apprnpriate Federal agency and NOT. reporied as institutunal support.
Fgyeign sources, column ( $\mathbf{G}$ ): Include sapport from any non-IJ.S. source
Other U.S. sources, column (H) Include suppore from nonprofit instlutions, private industry, and all other U.S. sources.
Sehf-supported students, column (1): Include fulllime graduate students whose major source of support is derived from loans from any source and frpm per. sonal or family financial contributions. Full-time gradunte students receiviny the targest portion of their, sup. porl from Federal loans should be reported here.
Women, line 7: Report all women sludents by their source of majtr support. Please note that in each column. data on line 7 should not exceed the iotal on line 6 .
Foreign students, line 8: A foreign full-lime graduate student is defined as an individual who has not attained U.S. cilizenship. Do not include native residents of a US. possession. such as American Samon. Applicants for U.S. citizenship are to be considered as foreign until the date their citizenship becomes effective.)
First-year students, line 9: A.first-year graduate student is defined as one who will have compleled less than a full year of graduate sludy as of the beginning of tha fall term in 1979 in the progrom in which he/she

1
is enfolled for a degree. All other graduate students should be considered heyond thess first year
Part-Hime graduate students, item 6: A part-timegrad. uate stuḍent is defined as a student who is enrolled in an advanced-degree program who is NOT pursuing graduatê work full time as defined in item 5 . Report the total number of part-ime graduate students on line $\mathbb{1}$; if a depariment has no par-time graduate students. enter "None". and movef 10 item 7.
Raclal//elhnic background. ilem 7 (Optional $\cap$ 1979): This item has been designated as, uptional for the fall 1979 survey year, in order to determine the avallability of racial/elhnic data at the depar!ment level. We would appreciate your full cooperation in completung tem 7 this year: however, if data are unavailable. please note this in the "Comments" section at the bottom of the form Racial/ethnic designations as used in this survey do not denote scientific definitions.of anthropological drigins: a graduate student may thus be included in the group to which, he/she :appears to belong, identufies wilh. or is regarded in the community as belonging However. po person should be counted in more than one racial/éthnic group. The following racial/ethnic designations are those defined hy the Office of Civil Rights:

## U.S. CITIZFNS:

Biack. non-Hispons, column (A): Report persons having origins in any of the black racial groups (except those of Hispanic origin).
Americun Indıan or Alaskan Native, column (B):
Regport persons having origins. in any of the original peoples of North America.
Asion or Pocific Isiander. column (C): Report persons having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East. Southeast Asia, or the Pacific Islands. These areas include China. Japan, Korega. the Philippine Islands, and Samoa.
Hispanic, column (D): Report persoons of Mexican. Puerto Rican, Cubag. Central or South American. or other Spanish cullure or origin, regurdless of race.
$\therefore \quad$ White, non-Hispanic, column (E): Report per sons having origins in any of the original peoples

$$
\%
$$

of Europe. North Africa, the Mididle East or the Indian subcontinent, excep:t those of Hispanic origin

- :

In column (F) reporit the' number of foreign students as defined ${ }^{4}$ earlier.
On line I repord the totalthumber of full-urge praduaite students under the appropriate racial/ethmic category. Item 7. line 1. column (G) shopuld equal the full-lime. total reported in item 5 . line 6 . column (I). Similarly: the total number of part-ime graduate sludents should be reported on liñee 2.Iteın 7. line'2. colymn [G]. should equal the part-tyme fotal feported if item ${ }^{6}$. line 1.

Postdoctorals and nonfaculty dotoral research staff, ilem 8 . Under this category. 'ibelude andividuals with science or engineering Ph.D.'s. M.D.'s, D D.S.'s. or DVM s dincluding foremen degrees that are equivalent to U. $\dot{S}$; doctorates) whatevote full time to research activities or? study in the depariment under lemporary appointmegls carrying no academic rank. Such appointments are jenerally for a specific time permi. They may contripute to the ácalemic program through seminars, lect ufes, or working with graduate studeqnis. Theth postdoctofal aclivities provide addilional training for Hiem. Exclude appoinıments in residency training programs in medical and health prokessions. unless research training under the supervision of a senior mentor is the primary purpose of the appointment. On line 1 . under colimns $(A)$ and (B), enter the number of fellows aņd trainees receiving support under Federal fellowships and/or training grants. Under column (C) enter the number of postdoctorals who are receiving. federally supported research grants. Those remaining postdgctoral appointees receving non-Government support should be entered under column' (D). Of the totul in column ( $E$ ). enter the column ( $F$ ) the. number of postdoctorals with foreign citizenship. Under other nonfuculty docioral reseurch stuff. column ( $G_{i}$ ). repart all dactoral scientists and endineers who are principally involyed in research activities hut who are considered neither postdocloral appointees nor memhers of the regular faculy. On line 2, report the number of women in each category; please note that in each column, data on iine 2 should not exceed the total on line 1 .

# 2 <br> other science, resources publications 
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