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## Introduction

This report is the second of two publications containing results from the 2000 Survey of Industrial Research and Development. The first publication, an InfoBrief ${ }^{1}$ announcing the availability of survey results, contains analytical information and highlights the increase in industrial research and development (R\&D) funded from companies' own resources and the sales and employment reported by R\&D-performing firms. This report contains, in section A, the full set of statistics produced from the survey including statistics on $R \& D$ funding during the calendar year 2000 and on R\&D personnel in January 2001. Among the tables are several that include statistics on trends in industrial R\&D since 1953, statistics on employment by R\&D-performing firms since 1989, and a table classified by state that contains statistics for selected years since 1981. This report also contains (in the technical notes in section B) information about the new industry coding classification system and expanded company size classifications, both implemented for the 1999 survey, ${ }^{2}$ survey methodology, comparability of the statistics over time, survey definitions, history of the survey, and other information designed to convey to the data user what the survey statistics represent and, in some cases more importantly, what they do not represent. Survey forms, instructions, and other documents are reproduced in section C.

This report provides national estimates of the expenditures on R\&D performed within the United States by industrial firms, whether U.S. or foreign owned. Among the statistics are estimates of total R\&D, the portion of the total financed by the Federal Government, and the portion financed by the companies themselves or by other non-Federal sources such as state and local governments or other industrial firms under contract or subcontract. Total R\&D is also separated into the types of costs (wages, materials and supplies, depreciation, and other costs). Other statistics include R\&D financed by a domestic firm but performed outside the United States, R\&D contracted to organizations outside of the firm, and the funds spent to perform energy-related R\&D. Also, this report provides information on R\&D-performing firms including domestic net sales, number of employees, number of R\&D-performing scientists and engineers,

[^0]geographic location of where the R\&D was performed, and $R \& D$ funds spent per $R \& D$-performing scientist and engineer.

The National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, authorizes and directs the National Science Foundation (NSF) "...to provide a central clearinghouse for the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data on scientific and engineering resources, and to provide a source of information for policy formulation by other agencies of the Federal Government." The Survey of Industrial Research and Development is the vehicle with which NSF carries out the industrial portion of this mandate and NSF's Division of Science Resources Statistics has sponsored and managed a survey of industrial R\&D since 1953. The 1953-56 surveys were conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) in the U.S. Department of Labor. ${ }^{3}$ Since 1957, the Bureau of the Census in the U.S. Department of Commerce has conducted the survey. ${ }^{4}$ Census staff conduct the survey under Title 13 of the United States Code, which prohibits publication or release of data or statistics that may reveal information about individual companies. ${ }^{5}$

The Survey of Industrial Research and Development is an annual sample survey that intends to include or represent all for-profit R\&D-performing companies, either publicly or privately held. Respondents receive detailed definitions to help them determine which expenses to include or exclude from the R\&D data they provide. Nevertheless, the statistics presented in this report are subject to response and concept errors caused by differences in the way respondents interpret the definitions of R\&D activities and by variations in company accounting procedures. The survey's primary focus is on U.S. industry as a performer of, rather than as a source of funds for, R\&D. Thus, data on Federal support of R\&D activities performed by industry are collected, and the resulting statistics appear in several tables while statistics on industrial funding of $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ undertaken at universities and colleges and other nonprofit organizations are not

[^1]collected or included. ${ }^{6}$ The result of collecting and publishing performer-reported statistics is that the federally funded R\&D performance totals presented in this report differ from the totals reported by the Federal agencies that provide the funds and the statistics published in NSF's Federal Funds for Research and Development report series. One reason for these differences is that performers of R\&D often expend Federal funds in a year other than the one in which the Federal Government provides authorization, obligations, or outlays. ${ }^{7}$ During the past several years, the differences have widened between the Federal R\&D funding reported by performers and that reported by funding agencies. These differences are documented and analyzed in the latest editions of NSF's Science \& Engineering Indicators (http:// www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/seind/start.htm) and National Patterns of $R \& D$ Resources (http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/ srs/nprdr/start.htm) report series.

The content of the Survey of Industrial Research and Development has been expanded and refined over the years in response to an increasing need by policymakers for more detailed information on the nation's R\&D effort. For example, questions on energy R\&D were added in the early 1970s, following the oil shortage crisis. On the other hand, collection of certain data items has been eliminated in recent years in an attempt to alleviate some of the burden on respondents. For large firms known to perform R\&D, a detailed survey form (Form RD-1) is used to collect data. To limit the reporting burden on small R\&D performers and on firms included in the sample for the first time, an abbreviated survey form (Form RD-1A), which collects only the most crucial data, is used.

Several changes have been made to the survey since the early 1990s that are of special importance to users of this report. Prior to the 1992 survey, statistics were based on samples selected at irregular intervals (i.e., 1967, 1971, 1976, 1981, and 1987). In intervening years, a subset of the last sample, a panel, was used. For example, original estimates for 1988-91 were based on surveys of approximately 1,700 panel companies that reported R\&D activity in the 1987 survey. Beginning with the 1992

[^2]survey, statistics are based on samples selected annually. Also beginning with the 1992 survey, the sample size was increased from approximately 14,000 to approximately 25,000 firms. Annual sampling and the increase in sample size were instituted for several reasons: (1) to account better for births of R\&D-performing establishments in the survey universe; (2) to survey more fully and accurately $R \& D$ performed by nonmanufacturing firms, especially in the service sector; and (3) to gather more current information about potential R\&D performers.

Prior to the 1994 survey cycle, all companies that spent more than $\$ 1$ million annually on R\&D in the United States or had 1,000 or more employees received a survey form every year. Beginning with the 1994 cycle, the employee cutoff was dropped from the criteria and, beginning with the 1996 cycle, the R\&D level was raised to $\$ 5$ million, where it has remained for subsequent surveys. ${ }^{8}$ For all cycles of the survey, the remaining firms (i.e., those that were not considered "certainties" because of the selection criteria) were subjected to probability sampling and may or may not receive a survey form for a given year. Among the organizations purposely excluded from the survey were trade associations and not-for-profit industrial consortia. Although their primary mission is to serve industry, these associations were excluded because they are nonprofit organizations.

Industry statistics in this report were developed from data collected from individual companies. ${ }^{9}$ Since the survey is company-based rather than establishment-based, all data collected for the various components of each company (plants, divisions, or subdivisions) were tabulated in the company's major industrial classification which was based on payroll. ${ }^{10}$ The resulting industry estimates were estimated by summing the data for companies classified within each major industry classification. National totals were then estimated by summing the industry estimates. Beginning with the 1999 survey, a company's major industrial classification was determined and the resulting

[^3]industry statistics are published using the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS). For prior years, the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system was used. The development and on-going refinement of NAICS has been a joint effort of statistical agencies in Canada, Mexico, and the United States. The system replaced the Standard Industrial Classification (1980) of Canada, the Mexican Classification of Activities and Products (1994), and Standard Industrial Classification (1987) of the United States. ${ }^{11}$ NAICS was designed to provide a production-oriented system under which economic units with similar production processes are classified in the same industry. NAICS was developed with special attention to classifications for new and emerging industries, service industries, and industries that produce advanced technologies. NAICS not only will facilitate comparability of information about the economies of the three North American countries, but potentially will increase comparability with the two-digit level of the United Nations' International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC) system.

Important for the Survey of Industrial Research and Development are several of the new classifications that cover major performers of R\&D in the U.S. Among manufacturers, the computer and electronic products classification (NAICS 334) includes makers of computers and peripherals, semiconductors, and navigational and electromedical instruments. Among nonmanufacturing industries are information (NAICS 51) and professional, scientific, and technical services (NAICS 54). Information includes publishing, both paper and electronic; broadcasting; and telecommunications. Professional, scientific, and technical services includes a variety of industries. Of specific importance for the survey are those that provide engineering and scientific $R \& D$ services.

The change of industry classification system affects most of the statistical tables produced from the survey. Prior to the 1999 report, tables classified by industry contained the current survey's statistics plus statistics for ten previous years. Because of the new classification system, these tables now contain only statistics for the current year (2000) and one prior year (1999). However, to provide a bridge for users who want to make year-toyear comparisons below the aggregate level, in several tables statistics from the 1997 and 1998 cycles of the

[^4]survey, which were previously classified and published using the SIC system, have been reclassified using the new NAICS codes. These reclassified statistics are slotted using their new NAICS classifications alongside the 1999 and 2000 statistics, which were estimated using NAICS from the outset.

Another enhancement that was implemented for the 1999 cycle of the survey was an increase in the number of company size categories used to classify survey statistics. The original 6 categories have been expanded to 10 to emphasize the role of small companies in R\&D performance and to highlight the growth in the amount of $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ performed by smaller companies compared to the amount performed by larger companies. The more detailed business size information also facilitates better international comparisons. Generally, statistics produced by foreign countries that measure their industrial R\&D enterprise are reported with more detailed company size classifications at the lower end of the scale than U.S. industrial R\&D statistics historically have been. ${ }^{12}$ The more detailed classifications of the U.S. statistics will enable direct comparisons with other countries' statistics.

NSF's objective in conducting the survey has always been to provide estimates for the entire population of firms performing R\&D in the United States and to present the estimates in as many meaningful ways as possible. This is especially true for the character of work components of R\&D, basic research, applied research, and development. Since the beginning of the survey, NSF has attempted to estimate each component, relying on traditionally poorly reported data. The methods NSF has used to develop these estimates are discussed in section B. It is important for the user of this report to know that a review has been made of the underlying data used to prepare recent estimates of basic research, applied research, and development and, as a result of the review, the on-going effort to strengthen and maintain the quality of character of work estimates has intensified. Identification of anomalous reporting patterns is underway and research is being pursued to determine appropriate methods of dealing with the anomalies. Publication of character of work distributions of $R \& D$ has been suspended until the research is complete and recommendations have been made.

[^5]Specific questions regarding the survey may be directed to Raymond Wolfe at (703) 292-7789, rwolfe@nsf.gov, or at the following mailing address:

Research and Development Statistics Program
Division of Science Resources Statistics
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 965
Arlington, VA 22230

## Notes to Users of Historical Statistics

Detailed historical statistics for 1953-98 can be obtained from NSF's new Industrial Research and Development Information System (IRIS) at http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/iris/start.htm, an online interface to the Survey of Industrial Research and Development Historical Database (SIRDHD). The SIRDHD is a collection of more than 2,500 statistical tables containing all of the statistics produced and published from the 1953-98 cycles of the annual Survey of Industrial Research and Development.

Statistics for years after 1998, including the latest revised statistics for 1999 and 2000 in this report, are available at http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/indus/start.htm.
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## Table Notes

These notes pertain to the tables in this section and in section $B$, except as noted in footnotes and other explanatory information at the end of specific tables.

## Company Size

Companies were categorized by total number of domestic employees. The following are the size classes used in this report: ${ }^{13}$

- 5 to 24 employees;
- 25 to 49 employees;
- 50 to 99 employees;
- 100 to 249 employees;
- 250 to 499 employees;
- 500 to 999 employees;
- 1,000 to 4,999 employees;
- 5,000 to 9,999 employees;
- 10,000 to 24,999 employees; and
- 25,000 or more employees.

The survey excludes companies with fewer than 5 employees to limit burden on small business enterprises in compliance with the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) guidelines for Federal Government data collection activities.

To reduce the variability in the statistics that can be attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes are assigned to them, the frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector companies with employment of 50 or more and in the nonmanufacturing sector companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values (but with at least 5 employees) were included in the small company partition. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. In the tables, statistics from the small
company partition are shown separately, but are included in "manufacturing," "nonmanufacturing," and "all industries" totals. ${ }^{14}$

## Current and Constant Dollars

Statistics in all tables are reported in current dollars. Constant dollars also are presented in the summary tables (A-1, A-24, A-25, and A-26). Gross domestic product (GDP) implicit price deflators were used to convert current to constant dollars (see The Methodology Underlying the Measurement of $R \& D$ Expenditures: 2000 (Data Update) at http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/srs02902/ start.htm for a detailed discussion of the application of the deflators and a list of values).

## Disclosure and Suppression of Statistics

Title 13 of the United States Code and a pledge of confidentiality to respondents prohibits publication or release of data or statistics that may reveal information about individual companies. Therefore, the data in some table cells have been deleted and replaced with "(D)." This occurs when a small number of companies account for a large percentage of the estimate in a particular data cell. Although publication of certain cells may be withheld, the estimates in the cells are always included in totals. The tables most often affected by cell suppression are those that contain data on Federal support for industrial R\&D performance.

## Geographic Statistics

The statistics in this report cover only those operations located in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Statistics on company-sponsored R\&D performed outside the United States by foreign subsidiaries of U.S. domestic companies are included in tables A-11 and A-12 but excluded from all other tables.

[^6]
## Historical Statistics

Prior to the 1999 report, tables classified by industry contained the current survey's statistics plus statistics for ten previous years. Because of the new classification system (see below), these tables now contain only statistics for the current year (2000) and one prior year (1999). However, to provide a bridge for users who want to make year-to-year comparisons below the aggregate level, in several tables statistics from the 1997 and 1998 cycles of the survey, which were previously classified and published using the SIC system, have been reclassified using the new NAICS codes. These reclassified sta-

## Manufacturing Industries

## Food

Beverage and tobacco products
Textiles, apparel, and leather
Wood products
Paper, printing and support activities
Petroleum and coal products
Chemicals
Basic chemicals
Resin, synthetic rubber, fibers, and filament
Pharmaceuticals and medicines
Other chemicals
Plastics and rubber products
Nonmetallic mineral products
Primary metals
Fabricated metal products
Machinery
Computer and electronic products
Computers and peripheral equipment
Communications equipment
Semiconductor and other electronic components
Navigational, measuring, electromedical, and control instruments
Other computer and electronic products
Electrical equipment, appliances, and components
Transportation equipment
Motor vehicles, trailers, and parts
Aerospace products and parts
Other transportation equipment
Furniture and related products
tistics are slotted using their new NAICS classifications alongside the 1999 and 2000 statistics, which were estimated using NAICS from the outset.

## Industry Classification

One North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) code was assigned to each company. Multiestablishment companies were assigned a single code based on the most dominant aggregated activity for that firm in terms of total payroll. ${ }^{15}$ Statistics for the following industries and industry groupings are published in this report (NAICS codes are given on the right ${ }^{16}$ ):

$$
31+32+33
$$

311
312
$313+314+315+316$
321
$322+323$
324
325
3251
3252
3254
325 minus ( $3251+3252+3254$ )
326
327
331
332
333

## 334

3341
3342
3344

## 3345

334 minus (3341+3342+3344+3345)
335
336
$3361+3362+3363$
3364
336 minus ( $3361+3362+3363+3364$ )
337

[^7]| Miscellaneous manufacturing | 339 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Medical equipment and supplies | 3391 |
| Other miscellaneous manufacturing | 339 minus 3391 |
| Other manufacturing | $(31+32+33)$ minus [(311 through 316)+(321 through |
|  | $327)+(331$ through 337)+339)] |
| NONMANUFACTURRING INDUSTRIES |  |
|  | $21+22+23+42+44+48+49+(51$ through 56$)+61+62+$ |
| Mining, extraction, and support activities | $71+72+81)$ |
| Utilities | 21 |
| Construction | 22 |
| Trade | 23 |
| Transportation and warehousing | $42+44+45$ |
| Mining, extraction, and support activities | $48+49$ |
| Utilities | 21 |
| Construction | 22 |
| Trade | 23 |
| Transportation and warehousing | $42+44+45$ |
| Information | $48+49$ |
| Publishing | 51 |
| Newspaper, periodical, book, and database | 511 |
| Software | 5111 |
| Broadcasting and telecommunications | 5112 |
| Radio and television broadcasting | 513 |
| Telecommunications | 5131 |
| Other broadcasting and telecommunications | 5133 |
| Other information | 513 minus $(5131+5133)$ |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate | 51 minus $(511+513)$ |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services | $52+53$ |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services | 54 |
| Computer systems design and related services | 5413 |
| Scientific R\&D services | 5415 |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services | 5417 |
| Management of companies and enterprises | 54 minus $(5413+5415+5417)$ |
| Health care services | 55 |
| Other nonmanufacturing | $621+622+623$ |
|  | $56+61+624+71+72+81$ |

## Nonresponse and Imputation

For various reasons, some firms did not choose to return the survey form or returned it with one or more blank items. ${ }^{17}$ Missing data for major data items were estimated using mathematical algorithms developed from industry comparisons, data from previous cycles of the survey, and other information. Therefore, the statistics in some table cells may be accompanied by the notation "(S)," which indicates that the imputation rate-the percentage of the statistic not reported by respondents and consequently estimated-exceeds 50 percent for that item. In such cases, the estimate may be statistically unreliable. See table B-5 for imputation rates for specific items.

## Percentages

Percentages were calculated on the basis of thousands of dollars and may differ slightly from those calculated using the rounded figures shown.

## Reporting Unit

The basic reporting unit was the company, firm, or enterprise that included all establishments under common ownership or control. All R\&D expenditures and all information about scientists and engineers of each company were classified into a single NAICS code and size category.

## Rounding

Because of rounding, detail items may not add to totals. Most money amounts are expressed in millions of dollars and are rounded down if less than $\$ 500,000$ or up if $\$ 500,000$ or more. Frequency estimates (e.g., number of companies) are accumulated from decimal weights assigned to company records ${ }^{18}$ and are rounded down if less than 0.5 and rounded up if 0.5 or greater. Most employment counts (e.g., number of scientists and engineers) are expressed in thousands and are rounded down if less than 500 or up if 500 or greater.

## Zeroes

Zeroes are shown in the tables when numerical values are accumulated from the statistical file to estimate a particular cell and the accumulated sum rounds to or equals zero. In the latter case, this accumulated sum is sometimes referred to as a "true zero." In the cases where there were no numerical values to accumulate, the cell is filled with "--" indicating that data were not collected. For example, in Table A-3, the 1999 and 2000 cells for "other manufacturing" contains "--" because data were not collected for 1999 and 2000 but were collected for prior years. ${ }^{19}$

[^8]
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Table A-1. Trends in total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by source of funds, in current and in constant dollars: 1953-2000


See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-1. Trends in total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by source of funds, in current and in constant dollars: 1953-2000

${ }^{1}$ The company-funded R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed within company facilities funded from all sources except the Federal Government. The funds predominantly are the company's own, but also include funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments. Excluded from this table are company-funded R\&D not performed within the company (e.g., R\&D contracted out to other organizations) and company-funded R\&D not performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D not performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).
${ }^{2}$ As a result of a new sample design, statistics for 1988-91 have been revised since originally published. These statistics now better reflect R\&D performance among firms in the nonmanufacturing industries and small firms in all industries.
${ }^{3}$ As a result of the new sample design, statistics for 1991 and later years are not directly comparable with statistics for 1990 and earlier years. For more information, see the technical notes in Section B.
${ }^{4}$ Statistics for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
NOTE: Gross domestic product (GDP) implicit price deflators were used to convert current dollars to constant (1996) dollars.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-2. Summary data for companies performing industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1999-2000
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[^10]Table A-2. Summary data for companies performing industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1999-2000

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ge 3 of 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | Research and development funds |  |  |  |  |  | Domestic net sales |  | R\&D scientists and engineers January ${ }^{1}$ |  | Domestic employment March |  |
|  |  | Total |  | Federal |  | Company |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $1999{ }^{2}$ | 2000 | $1999{ }^{2}$ | 2000 | $1999{ }^{2}$ | 2000 | $1999{ }^{2}$ | 2000 | 2000 | 2001 | $1999{ }^{2}$ | 2000 |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | [In thousands] |  |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: | 52,53 | (D) | 4,025 | (D) | 0 | 1,576 | 4,024 | 336,861 | 335,868 | 16.9 | 20.5 | 834 | 829 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate............... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services. | 54 | 23,640 | 26,036 | 4,837 | 5,104 | 18,803 | 20,932 | 132,199 | 124,342 | 145.1 | 172.5 | 761 | 756 |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services $\qquad$ | 5413 | 4,124 |  | 1,215 | 1,186 | 2,909 | 2,445 | 36,380 | 33,299 |  | 36.8 | 194 | 174 |
| Computer systems design and related services. $\qquad$ | 5415 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { (D) } \\ 11,264 \end{array}$ | 3,632 | (D) | 389 | 4,750 | 6,753 | 38,414 | 42,857 | 46.151.9 | 62.264.3 | 250 | 278 |
| Scientific R\&D services.... | 5417 |  | 14,018 | 3,242 | 3,452 | 8,022 | 10,566 |  | 30,696 |  |  | 144 | 165 |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services. | $\begin{array}{r} 54 \text { (minus 5413, } \\ 5415,5417) \end{array}$ | (D) | 1,245 | (D) | 77 | 3,121 | 1,168 | 32,359 | 17,489 | 7.6 | 9.2 | 173 | 139 |
| Management of companies and enterprises.... | 55 | (D) | 49 | (D) | 0 | 81 | 49 | 1,319 | 1,124 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 7 | 3 |
| Health care services................................ | 621-23 | 660790 | 632929 | 10 | 59 | 650 | 573 | 10,286 | 17,677 | 6.4 | 4.6 | 51 | 156 |
| Other nonmanufacturing ......................... | 56, 61, 624, 71, |  |  | 19 | 18 | 771 | 911 | 73,907 | 70,769 | 9.4 | 6.8 | 839 | 714 |
|  | 72,81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-2. Summary data for companies performing industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1999-2000

| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | Research and development funds |  |  |  |  |  | Domestic net sales |  | R\&D scientists and engineers January |  |  | Domestic employment March |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total |  | Federal |  | Company |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $1999{ }^{2}$ | 2000 | $1999{ }^{2}$ | 2000 | $1999{ }^{2}$ | 2000 | $1999{ }^{2}$ | 2000 | 2000 |  | 2001 | $1999{ }^{2}$ | 2000 |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | [In thousands] |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution by size of company: <br> [Number of employees] | (na)(na)((( | 182,711 | 199,539 | 22,535 | 19,118 | 160,176 | 180,421 | 4,925,124 | 5,249,573 | 1,033.7 | 1,041.0 |  | 18,221 | 17,663 |
| Total... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 to 24. |  | 7,004 | 6,862 | 611 | 922 | 6,393 | 5,940 | 38,554 | 34,562 | 51.2 |  | 53.6 | 206 | 182 |
| 25 to 49. |  | 4,750 | 5,008 | 368 | 222 | 4,382 | 4,786 | 41,243 | 35,717 | 34.8 |  | 32.3 | 242 | 180 |
| 50 to 99. |  | 7,225 | 7,259 | 603 | 514 | 6,623 | 6,745 | 50,899 | 60,164 | 57.7 |  | 35.8 | 353 | 324 |
| 100 to 249 . |  | 7,213 | 9,020 | 674 | 669 | 6,540 | 8,351 | 94,852 | 104,013 | 49.0 |  | 55.6 | 607 | 594 |
| 250 to 499. |  | 7,892 | 7,479 | 485 | 660 | 7,407 | 6,819 | 126,124 | 110,989 | 45.2 |  | 45.7 | 665 | 579 |
| 500 to 999. |  | 7,032 | 9,074 | 591 | 495 | 6,441 | 8,580 | 160,105 | 182,179 | 64.2 |  | 66.7 | 779 | 723 |
| 1,000 to 4,999... |  | 24,840 | 30,636 | 896 | 775 | 23,944 | 29,860 | 764,918 | 844,513 | 154.9 |  | 154.3 | 2,678 | 3,120 |
| 5,000 to 9,999..... |  | 16,376 | 16,768 | 2,194 | 1,625 | 14,182 | 15,143 | 631,873 | 702,858 | 120.4 | (S) | 107.3 | 2,078 | 1,830 |
| 10,000 to 24,999....... |  | 24,922 | 28,653 | 397 | 678 | 24,525 | 27,976 | 891,633 | 890,004 | 115.9 |  | 151.6 | 3,103 | 2,730 |
| 25,000 or more... |  | 75,457 | 78,779 | 15,717 | 12,559 | 59,740 | 66,221 | 2,124,925 | 2,284,573 | 340.4 | (S) | 338.4 | 7,510 | 7,400 |

${ }^{1}$ Data recorded in January represent employment figures for the previous year.
${ }^{2}$ Some statistics for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
${ }^{3}$ Manufacturing companies with fewer than 50 employees and nonmanufacturing companies with fewer than 15 employees were sampled separately without regard to industry classification to minimize year-to-year variation in survey estimates. However, estimates for companies in these groups are included with their respective NAICS classification for this table. For other tables, they are combined with estimates for companies in "small manufacturing companies" and "small nonmanufacturing companies," respectively.
KEY: (D) = Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
(S) = Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(-)=$ Indicates data not collected.
$(\mathrm{na})=$ Not applicable.
NOTE: Starting with the 1999 survey, estimates are based on the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). In prior years, estimates were based on the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-3. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000

| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | 1997 | 1998 | $1999{ }^{1}$ | 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: | 21-23, 31-33, 42, 44-81 | 157,539 | 169,180 | 182,711 | 199,539 |
| All industries ${ }^{2}$. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing | 31-33 | -- |  | 116,921 | 124,078 |
| Food. | 311 | 1,244 | 1,305 384 | 1,132 | (D) |
| Beverage and tobacco products. | 312 | 447378 | 384399 | (D) | 417 |
| Texilies, apparel, and leather... | 313-16 |  |  |  | (D) |
| Wood products... | 321 | 378 26 | 399 60 | 70 |  |
| Paper, printing and support activities. | 322, 323 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Petroleum and coal products... | 324 | (D) | 1,395 | 615 | (D) |
| Chemicals. | 325 | 16,492 1859 | 18,9693,610 | 20,2462,746 | 20,9182,080 |
| Basic chemicals. | 3251 | 1,859 |  |  |  |
| Resin, synthetic rubber, fibers, and filament... | 3252 |  | 3,610 (D) | 2,746 (D) | $2,852$ |
| Pharmaceuticals and medicines. | 3254 |  | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Other chemicals. | 325 (minus 3251-52, 3254) | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Plastics and rubber products.. | 326 | 1,484 | 1,625558 | 1,785 | (D) 846 |
| Nonmetallic mineral products......... | 327 | 548992 |  |  | 846 |
| Primary metals.. | 331 |  | 558 | 470 | 624 |
| Fabricated metal products..... | 332 | 1,906 | 1,781 | 1,655 | 1,672 |
| Machinery.. | 333 | 5,610 | (D) | 6,057 | 6,580 |
| Computer and electronic products........ | 334 | 33,988(D) | 38,209(D) | 35,932 | 45,097 |
| Computers and peripheral equipment. | 3341 |  |  | (D) | 5,162 |
| Communications equipment........... | 3342 | 2,930 | 8,974 | 6,003 | 11,616 |
| Semiconductor and other electronic components. | 3344 | (D) |  | 10,701 | 12,894 |
| Navigational, measuring, electromedical, and control instruments. $\qquad$ | 3345 | 8,030 | 9,131 |  |  |
| Other computer and electronic products......... | 334 (minus 3341-42, 3344-45) | 543 | 11,232 (D) | 14,337 (D) | 310 |
| Electrical equipment, appliances, and components. | 335 | 2,741 |  |  |  |
| Transportation equipment..... | 336 | 34,422 | 31,359 | 33,965 | 30,085 |
| Motor vehicles, trailers, and parts.... | 3361-63 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D)10,319 |
| Aerospace products and parts......... | 3364 | 17,865 | 16,359 | 14,425 |  |
| Other transportation equipment., | 336 (minus 3361-64) | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Furniture and related products. | 337 | 240 | 211 | 248 | 284 |
| Miscellaneous manufacturing. | 339 | 3,457 | (D) | 3,851 | 4,206 |
| Medical equipment and supplies..... | 3391 | 3,041 | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Other miscellaneous manufacturing. | 339 (minus 3391) | 416 | 525 |  | (D) |
| Other manufacturing ${ }^{3}$. | $31-33$ (minus 311-16, 321-27, | ) 23 | (D) | -- | -- |
|  | 331-37, 339) |  |  |  |  |
| Small manufacturing companies ${ }^{4}$. | Fewer than 50 employees | 2,509 | 2,316 | 3,019 | 2,643 |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-3. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000


[^11]Table A-3. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000

${ }^{1}$ Some statistics for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
${ }^{2}$ The totals for "all industries" prior to 1999 are identical to corresponding totals previously published using the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. Also, pre-1999 detail published using the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) may not add to the totals. See the 'NOTES' below.
${ }^{3}$ Manufacturing companies in the 1997 and 1998 samples that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other manufacturing;" nonmanufacturing companies that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other nonmanufacturing."
${ }^{4}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(--)=$ Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
NOTES: Starting with the 1999 survey, estimates are based on the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). In prior years, estimates were based on the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. For this table, companies in the 1997 and 1998 surveys were assigned NAICS industry codes based on their SIC industry codes. Consequently, the estimates for 1997 and 1998 in this table are not necessarily representative of the NAICS categories of industries in those years. They are included for comparison purposes only.

The R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed within company facilities funded from all sources. The funds are the company's own; funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments; and funds from the Federal Government. Excluded from this table are R\&D not performed within the company (e.g., R\&D contracted out to other organizations) and R\&D not performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D not performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-4. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry, by size of company: 2000
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| Industry | NAICS codes | Total | Size of company [number of employees] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \text { to } \\ 24 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 25 \text { to } \\ 49 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 50 \text { to } \\ 99 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \text { to } \\ 249 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 250 \text { to } \\ 499 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 500 \text { to } \\ 999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 1,000 \text { to } \\ 4,999 \end{array}$ | $5,000 \text { to }$ 9,999 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10,000 \text { to } \\ 24,999 \end{gathered}$ | $25,000$ <br> or more |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transportation equipment. | 336 | 30,085 | 0 | 0 | 44 | (D) | 105 | 215 | 716 | 991 | (D) | 26,912 |
| Motor vehicles, trailers, and parts. | 3361-63 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 11 | 90 | 68 | 84 | (D) | 350 | (D) | (D) |
| Aerospace products and parts...... | 3364 | 10,319 | 0 | 0 | 30 | (D) | 0 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) | 9,481 |
| Other transportation equipment.... | 336 (minus 3361-64) | (D) | 0 | 0 | 3 | (D) | 37 | (D) | 86 | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Furniture and related products.... | 337 | 284 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | (D) | 15 | 39 | 59 | (S) 124 | (D) |
| Miscellaneous manufacturing.. | 339 | 4,206 | 5 | (D) | 111 | 189 | 150 | (D) | (D) | 742 | 0 | (D) |
| Medical equipment and supplies. | 3391 | (D) | 0 | (D) | (D) | 151 | 122 | (D) | (D) | (D) | 0 | (D) |
| Other miscellaneous manufacturing. | 339 (minus 3391) | (D) | 5 | 0 | (D) | 38 | 28 | 41 | (D) | (D) | 0 | 0 |
| Other manufacturing | $\begin{aligned} & 31-33 \text { (minus 311-16, } \\ & 321-27,331-37,339) \end{aligned}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Small manufacturing companies ${ }^{1}$. | Fewer than 50 employees | 2,643 | (D) | (D) | 238 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nonmanufacturing. | 21-23, 42, 44-81 | 75,461 | 5,846 | 3,549 | 5,696 | 6,970 | 4,901 | 4,472 | 15,879 | (D) | (D) | 13,314 |
| Mining, extraction, and support activities. | 21 | 823 | (D) | 0 | (D) | 0 | (D) | 22 | 46 | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Utilities... | 22 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 23 | 23 | 30 | (D) | (D) |
| Construction. | 23 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 7 | 13 | (D) | (D) | 0 |
| Trade. | 42, 44, 45 | 24,959 | 187 | 727 | (D) | 341 | 353 | 1,441 | 5,830 | 1,630 | (D) | (D) |
| Transportation and warehousing. | 48, 49 | (D) | (D) | 0 | 0 | 13 | 44 | 11 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Information. | 51 | 16,830 | 201 | 414 | (D) | 1,203 | 1,019 | 1,089 | (D) | 686 | (D) | (D) |
| Publishing............................... | 511 | 13,004 | 86 | 414 | (D) | 959 | 643 | 1,044 | (D) | (D) | 5,021 | (D) |
| Newspaper, periodical, book, and database. | 5111 | 365 | 3 | 7 | (D) | 0 | 102 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Software. | 5112 | 12,639 | 82 | 407 | (D) | 959 | 541 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) | 0 |
| Broadcasting and telecommunications. | 513 | (S) 1,407 | 0 | 0 | (D) | (D) | 63 | 30 | (D) | 0 | (D) | (D) |
| Radio and television broadcasting. | 5131 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (D) |
| Telecommunications.................. | 5133 | (D) | 0 | 0 | (D) | (D) | 4 | 30 | (D) | 0 | (D) | (D) |
| Other broadcasting and telecommunications. | 513 (minus 5131, 5133) | $59$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other information.......................... | 51 (minus 511, 513) | 2,420 | 115 | 0 | 18 | (D) | 312 | 15 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |

[^13]Table A-4. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry, by size of company: 2000

${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. Note that because companies were assigned to the "small company" partition of the sample based on preliminary information available from the sampling frame and the number of employees may have been revised during statistical processing, some companies' statistics are reported in size categories above the 50 employee threshold for manufacturing companies and the 15 employee threshold for nonmanufacturing companies. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
(S) = Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(-)=$ Indicates data not collected.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-5. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of companies that performed R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, by size of total R\&D program: 2000
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See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-5. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of companies that performed R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, by size of total R\&D program: 2000
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[^15]Table A-5. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of companies that performed R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, by size of total R\&D program: 2000
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${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: (D) = Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(--)=$ Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-6. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of companies in manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by size of company: 2000

| Size of company [Number of employees] | Total | Manufacturing | Nonmanufacturing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Funds for industrial R\&D [In millions of dollars] |  |  |
| Total. | 199,539 | 124,078 | 75,461 |
| 5 to 24................................................................... | 6,862 | 1,016 | 5,846 |
| 25 to 49. | 5,008 | 1,460 | 3,549 |
| 50 to 99. | 7,259 | 1,563 | 5,696 |
| 100 to 249. | 9,020 | 2,050 | 6,970 |
| 250 to 499. | 7,479 | 2,578 | 4,901 |
| 500 to 999. | 9,074 | 4,602 | 4,472 |
| 1,000 to 4,999.. | 30,636 | 14,756 | 15,879 |
| 5,000 to 9,999.. | 16,768 | 12,155 | 4,613 |
| 10,000 to 24,999.. | 28,653 | 18,433 | 10,220 |
| 25,000 or more... | 78,779 | 65,465 | 13,314 |
|  | Number of R\&D-performing companies |  |  |
| Total.. | 35,273 | 17,176 | 18,096 |
| 5 to $24 .$. | 17,062 | 5,991 | 11,071 |
| 25 to 49. | 5,141 | 2,734 | 2,406 |
| 50 to 99. | 4,687 | 2,814 | 1,873 |
| 100 to 249. | 3,880 | 2,577 | 1,303 |
| 250 to 499. | 1,623 | 957 | 667 |
| 500 to 999. | 1,045 | 764 | 280 |
| 1,000 to 4,999. | 1,277 | 967 | 310 |
| 5,000 to 9,999..... | 263 | 193 | 70 |
| 10,000 to 24,999.. | 180 | 107 | 73 |
| 25,000 or more.......................................................... | 115 | 71 | 44 |

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-7. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000

| Industry and size of company |  |  |  |  | Page 1 of 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAICS codes | 1997 | 1998 | $1999{ }^{1}$ |  |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| All industries ${ }^{2}$. | 21-23, 31-33, 42, 44-81 | 133,611 | 145,016 | 160,176 | 180,421 |
| Manufacturing ................................................ | 31-33 | -- | -- | 99,865 | 110,750 |
| Food.. | 311 | 1,244 | 1,305 | 1,132 | 1,145 |
| Beverage and tobacco products. | 312 | 447 | 384 | (D) | 417 |
| Textiles, apparel, and leather.. | 313-16 | 378 | 399 | 334 | 266 |
| Wood products.... | 321 | 26 | 55 | 70 | 105 |
| Paper, printing and support activities. | 322, 323 | 2,252 | 1,660 | 2,474 | 2,700 |
| Petroleum and coal products.. | 324 | 1,349 | 1,390 | (D) | 1,172 |
| Chemicals... | 325 | 16,385 | 18,733 | 20,051 | 20,768 |
| Basic chemicals. | 3251 | 1,840 | 3,467 | 2,648 | 2,050 |
| Resin, synthetic rubber, fibers, and filament......... | 3252 | 1,802 | 1,995 | 2,216 | 2,842 |
| Pharmaceuticals and medicines.. | 3254 | 10,213 | 9,601 | 12,236 | 12,793 |
| Other chemicals.. | 325 (minus 3251-52, 3254) | 2,530 | 3,670 | 2,951 | 3,084 |
| Plastics and rubber products.............................. | 326 | 1,480 | 1,625 | 1,785 | 1,675 |
| Nonmetallic mineral products.. | 327 | 546 | (D) | 595 | 845 |
| Primary metals. | 331 | 754 | 5881,727 | 457 | 598 |
| Fabricated metal products.. | 332 | 1,854 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1,608 \\ & 5,658 \end{aligned}$ | 1,631 |
| Machinery.... | 333 | 5,470 | 5,831 |  | 6,539 |
| Computer and electronic products.. | 334 | 29,697 | 31,873 | 29,939 | 39,553 |
| Computers and peripheral equipment.. | 3341 |  | 8,276 | 4,126 | 5,162 |
| Communications equipment........................ | 3342 | 2,751 | 8,456 | 5,797 | $\begin{aligned} & 11,183 \\ & 12,787 \end{aligned}$ |
| Semiconductor and other electronic components... | 3344 | 14,033 | 9,072 |  |  |
| Navigational, measuring, electromedical, and control instruments |  | 4,659 | 5,483 | 10,624 | 10,114 |
| Other computer and electronic products............... | 334 (minus 3341-42, 3344-45) | 537 | 585 | 760 | 307 |
| Electrical equipment, appliances, and components.... | 335 | 2,580 | 2,139 | 3,820 | 3,390 |
| Transportation equipment.......... | 3366 | 21,713 | 20,677 | 23,928 | 22,917 |
| Motor vehicles, trailers, and parts. |  | 14,340 |  | $5,309$ | 18,306 |
| Aerospace products and parts...... | 3364 | 6,961 | 13,781 6,521 |  | 18,306 3,895 |
| Other transportation equipment. | 336 (minus 3361-64) | 412 | 375 | 632 | 716 |
| Furniture and related products... | 337 | 240 | 211 | 248 | 284 |
| Miscellaneous manufacturing... | 339 | 3,4473,031 | 3,888 | 3,825 | 4,195 |
| Medical equipment and supplies..... | 3391 |  | 3,363 | 3,251 | 3,741 |
| Other miscellaneous manufacturing. | $\begin{array}{r} 339 \text { (minus 3391) } \\ 31-33 \text { minus }(311-16,321-27, \\ 331-37,339) \end{array}$ | (S) $\begin{array}{r}416 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 525 \\ \text { (D) } \end{gathered}$ | 574 | 453 |
| Other manufacturing ${ }^{3}$..................................... | $\begin{array}{r} 31-33 \text { minus }(311-16,321-27, \\ 331-37,339) \end{array}$ | (S) 23 | (D) | -- | -- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small manufacturing companies ${ }^{4}$. | Fewer than 50 employees $\quad 2,357$ 2,188 $\quad 2,950$ |  |  |  | 2,549 |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-7. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000


[^16]Table A-7. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000

${ }^{1}$ Statistics for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
${ }^{2}$ The totals for "all industries" prior to 1999 are identical to corresponding totals previously published using the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. Also, pre-1999 detail published using the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) may not add to the totals. See the 'NOTES' below.
${ }^{3}$ Manufacturing companies in the 1997 and 1998 samples that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other manufacturing;" nonmanufacturing companies that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other nonmanufacturing."
${ }^{4}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: (D) = Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
(S) = Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
(--) = Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
NOTES: Starting with the 1999 survey, estimates are based on the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). In prior years, estimates were based on the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. For this table, companies in the 1997 and 1998 surveys were assigned NAICS industry codes based on their SIC industry codes. Consequently, the estimates for 1997 and 1998 in this table are not necessarily representative of the NAICS categories of industries in those years. They are included for comparison purposes only.

The R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed within company facilities funded from all sources except the Federal Government. The funds predominantly are the company's own, but also include funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments. Excluded from this table are company-funded R\&D not performed within the company (e.g., R\&D contracted out to other organizations) and company-funded R\&D not performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D not performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-8. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry, by size of company: 2000
Page 1 of 3

| Industry | NAICS codes | Total | Size of company [number of employees] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 5 \text { to } \\ 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \text { to } \\ 49 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \text { to } \\ 99 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \text { to } \\ 249 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 250 \text { to } \\ 499 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 500 \text { to } \\ 999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1,000 \text { to } \\ 4,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 5,000 to } \\ 9,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10,000 \text { to } \\ 24,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25,000 \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All industries. | 21-23, 31-33, 42, 44-81 | 180,421 | 5,940 | 4,786 | 6,745 | 8,351 | 6,819 | 8,580 | 29,860 | 15,143 | 27,976 | 66,221 |
| Manufacturing.......................................... | 31-33 | 110,750 | 919 | 1,458 | 1,546 | 1,982 | 2,494 | 4,436 | 14,502 | 11,395 | 17,861 | 54,158 |
| Food. | 311 | 1,145 | 0 | 0 | (D) | 5 | 21 | 45 | 307 | 283 | (D) | 282 |
| Beverage and tobacco products... | 312 | 417 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | (D) | 0 | (D) |
| Textiles, apparel, and leather...................... | 313-16 | 266 | (D) | 0 | 9 | 25 | 13 | 34 | 110 | 12 | 44 | (D) |
| Wood products... | 321 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | (D) | (D) | (D) | 0 |
| Paper, printing and support activities... | 322, 323 | 2,700 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | (D) | 0 | 73 | 115 | (D) | (D) |
| Petroleum and coal products...................... | 324 | 1,172 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (D) | 43 | (D) | (D) | 167 | (D) |
| Chemicals.. | 325 | 20,768 | 0 | (D) | (D) | 177 | 190 | 816 | 2,566 | 3,384 | 7,316 | 6,173 |
| Basic chemicals. | 3251 | 2,050 | 0 | 0 | (D) | (D) | 23 | 580 | 750 | (D) | (D) | 0 |
| Resin, synthetic rubber, fibers, and filament $\qquad$ | 3252 | 2,842 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | (D) | 0 | 317 | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Pharmaceuticals and medicines.. | 3254 | 12,793 | 0 | (D) | 51 | 54 | (D) | 110 | 1,009 | 1,428 | 6,284 | 3,780 |
| Other chemicals. | 325 (minus 3251-52, 3254) | 3,084 | 0 | 0 | 79 | (D) | 82 | 126 | 490 | 1,316 | (D) | (D) |
| Plastics and rubber products. | 326 | 1,675 | 4 | 2 | 69 | 74 | 42 | 282 | 368 | 203 | 218 | 414 |
| Nonmetallic mineral products...................... | 327 | 845 | 0 | 0 | 68 | (D) | 29 | 10 | 137 | 99 | 113 | (D) |
| Primary metals... | 331 | 598 | 0 | 0 | (D) | 0 | 20 | 78 | 114 | (S) 88 | 97 | (D) |
| Fabricated metal products.. | 332 | 1,631 | 9 | 6 | 39 | (D) | 56 | 137 | 241 | 164 | 275 | (D) |
| Machinery.. | 333 | 6,539 | 1 | 41 | 249 | 320 | 340 | 402 | 1,583 | 1,497 | 1,039 | 1,067 |
| Computer and electronic products... | 334 | 39,553 | (D) | 48 | (D) | 752 | 1,458 | 2,095 | 7,016 | 3,896 | 6,431 | 17,360 |
| Computers and peripheral equipment........ | 3341 | 5,162 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 66 | 191 | 400 | 598 | (D) | (D) | 0 |
| Communications equipment................... | 3342 | 11,183 | 0 | 31 | 64 | 134 | 645 | 430 | 988 | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Semiconductor and other electronic components. | 3344 | 12,787 | (D) | (D) | 187 | 96 | 354 | 570 | 3,405 | 841 | 2,501 | (D) |
| Navigational, measuring, electromedical, and control instruments. | 3345 | 10,114 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 437 | 249 | 627 | 1,832 | 733 | (D) | (D) |
| Other computer and electronic products..... | 334 (minus 3341-42, | 307 | 0 | (D) | (D) | 20 | 19 | 68 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Electrical equipment, appliances, and components | 335 | 3,390 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 158 | 29 | 193 | 466 | 117 | 713 | (D) |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.
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See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-8. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry, by size of company: 2000
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| Industry | NAICS codes | Total | Size of company [number of employees] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 5 \text { to } \\ 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \text { to } \\ 49 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \text { to } \\ 99 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \text { to } \\ 249 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 250 \text { to } \\ 499 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 500 \text { to } \\ 999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1,000 \text { to } \\ 4,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 5,000 to } \\ 9,999 \end{gathered}$ | 10,000 to <br> 24,999 | $\begin{aligned} & 25,000 \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate............... | 52, 53 | 4,024 | 24 | 10 | 24 | (D) | (D) | 15 | 2,504 | (S) 354 | 359 | 698 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical |  |  |  |  |  | 4510 | 2710 |  |  |  |  |  |
| services...................................... | 54 | 17,949 | 753 | 2,038 | 2,570 | 4,510 | 2,710 | 1,473 | 2,415 | 912 | (D) | (D) |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services. | 5413 | 2,232 | 26 | 166 | 666 | (D) | 107 | (S) 30 | 839 | (D) | (D) | 0 |
| Computer systems design and related services. $\qquad$ | 5415 | 4,943 | 114 | 481 | 602 | (D) | (D) | (D) | 918 | 187 | 0 | (D) |
| Scientific R\&D services.. | 5417 | 9,715 | 485 | 1,186 | 1,292 | 2,538 | 1,666 | 916 | 624 | (D) | 0 | (D) |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services. | 54 (minus 5413, 5415, | 1,059 | 128 | 206 | 9 | 473 | (D) | (D) | 33 | (D) | (D) | (D) |
|  | 5417) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management of companies and enterprises.... | 55 | 49 | 1 | 13 | 4 | (D) | 0 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Health care services.... | 621-23 | 477 | 58 | 42 | 0 | 119 | 15 | 0 | 217 | (D) | 0 | (D) |
| Other nonmanufacturing ... | 56, 61, 624, 71, 72, 81 | 713 | 62 | 103 | 2 | 0 | 163 | (D) | 128 | 0 | 54 | (S) 182 |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{1}$. | Fewer than 15 employees | 3,783 | (D) | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. Note that because companies were assigned to the "small company" partition of the sample based on preliminary information available from the sampling frame and the number of employees may have been revised during statistical processing, some companies' statistics are reported in size categories above the 50 employee threshold for manufacturing companies and the 15 employee threshold for nonmanufacturing companies. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: (D) = Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(--)=$ Indicates data not collected.
NOTE: The R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed within company facilities funded from all sources except the Federal Government. The funds predominantly are the company's own, but also include funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments. Excluded from this table are company-funded R\&D not performed within the company (e.g., R\&D contracted out to other organizations) and company-funded R\&D not performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D not performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-9. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of companies that performed company and other nonfederally funded R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, by size of nonfederally funded R\&D program: 2000
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Table A-9. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of companies that performed company and other nonfederally funded R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, by size of nonfederally funded R\&D program: 2000
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| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | Total number of companies | Total amount | Size of nonfederally funded R\&D program |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Lessthan$\$ 200,000$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 200,000 \\ \text { to } \\ \$ 999,999 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\$ 1$ million to $\$ 9.9$ million |  | \$ 10 million to $\$ 99.9$ million |  | $\$ 100$ million or more |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { companies } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Amount [In millions of dollars] | Number of companies | Amount [In millions of dollars] | Number of companies | Amount [In millions of dollars] | Number of companies | Amount [In millions of dollars] | Number of companies | Amount [In millions of dollars] |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Navigational, measuring, electromedical, and control instruments. $\qquad$ | 3345 | 387 | 10,114 | 36 | 2 | 95 | 61 | 157 | 508 | 81 | 1,749 | 17 | 7,794 |
| Other computer and electronic products. $\qquad$ | 334 (minus 3341-42, | 43 | 307 | 8 | 1 | 12 | 7 | 17 | 63 | 6 | 237 | 0 | 0 |
| Electrical equipment, appliances, and components | 335 | 443 | 3,390 | 95 | 7 | 196 | 69 | 117 | 373 | 31 | 875 | 4 | 2,067 |
| Transportation equipment...................... | 336 | 556 | 22,917 | 185 | 7 | 159 | 87 | 151 | (D) | 39 | (D) | 22 | 20,950 |
| Motor vehicles, trailers, and parts.......... | 3361-63 | 353 | 18,306 | 151 | 4 | 39 | 22 | 128 | 432 | 26 | 899 | 9 | 16,950 |
| Aerospace products and parts.............. | 3364 | 67 | 3,895 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 22 | 3 | (D) | 6 | (D) | 9 | 3,655 |
| Other transportation equipment... | 336 (minus 3361-64) | 136 | 716 | 33 | 3 | 72 | 44 | 20 | 89 | 7 | 235 | 4 | 346 |
| Furniture and related products.................. | 337 | 214 | 284 | 151 | 10 | 26 | 14 | 29 | 65 | 8 | 194 | 0 | 0 |
| Miscellaneous manufacturing................... | 339 | 528 | 4,195 | 135 | 7 | 223 | 109 | 126 | (D) | 38 | (D) | 7 | 2,915 |
| Medical equipment and supplies........... | 3391 | 249 | 3,741 | 39 | 3 | 86 | 38 | 86 | 288 | 33 | (D) | 6 | (D) |
| Other miscellaneous manufacturing....... | 339 (minus 3391) | 279 | 453 | 96 | 4 | 137 | 71 | 40 | (D) | 5 | 109 | 1 | (D) |
| Other manufacturing ............................ | $\begin{aligned} & 31-33 \text { (minus 311-16, } \\ & 321-27,331-37,339) \end{aligned}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | $-$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Small manufacturing companies ${ }^{1} \ldots . . . . . . . .$. | Fewer than 50 employees | 8,899 | 2,549 | 6,699 | 352 | 1,500 | 597 | 700 | 1,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nonmanufacturing.................................. | 21-23, 42, 44-81 | 17,456 | 69,671 | 7,781 | 386 | 5,260 | 2,500 | 3,443 | 10,907 | 896 | 25,254 | 76 | 30,624 |
| Mining, extraction, and support activities..... | 21 | 128 | 822 | 69 | 3 | 36 | (D) | 14 | 53 | 7 | 212 | 2 | (D) |
| Utilities............................................ | 22 | 99 | 136 | 12 | 1 | 58 | 17 | 26 | 85 | 3 | 34 | 0 | 0 |
| Construction.. | 23 | 78 | 222 | 55 | 1 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 15 | 8 | 201 | 0 | 0 |
| Trade.. | 42, 44, 45 | 2,775 | 24,929 | 1,501 | 107 | 650 | 364 | 365 | 1,133 | 237 | 8,329 | 23 | 14,995 |
| Transportation and warehousing............... | 48, 49 | 172 | 277 | 51 | 0 | 102 | 57 | 15 | 36 | 4 | 184 | 0 | 0 |

[^17]Table A-9. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of companies that performed company and other nonfederally funded R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, by size of nonfederally funded R\&D program: 2000
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| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes |  | Total number of companies | Total amount | Size of nonfederally funded R\&D program |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Lessthan$\$ 200,000$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 200,000 \\ \text { to } \\ \$ 999,999 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\$ 1$ million to $\$ 9.9$ million |  | $\$ 10$ million <br> to <br> $\$ 99.9$ million |  | $\$ 100$ million <br> or <br> more |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Number of companies | Amount [In millions of dollars] | Number <br> of companies | Amount [In millions of dollars] | Number <br> of companies | Amount [In millions of dollars] | Number <br> of companies | Amount [In millions of dollars] | Number of companies | Amount [In millions of dollars] |
| Distribution by size of company: [Number of employees] | (na) |  | 34,373 | 180,421 | 17,586 | 962 | 9,037 | 4,176 | 6,002 | 18,546 | 1,528 | 42,718 | 221 | 114,019 |
| Total.. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 to 24. |  | (na) | 16,473 | 5,940 | 10,975 | 507 | 4,019 | 1,852 | 1,476 | 3,530 | 3 | (S) 51 | 0 | 0 |
| 25 to 49. |  | (na) | 5,019 | 4,786 | 2,197 | 150 | 1,647 | 815 | 1,091 | 2,769 | 84 | 1,053 | 0 | 0 |
| 50 to 99. |  | (na) | 4,545 | 6,745 | 2,073 | 125 | 1,347 | 568 | 971 | 2,992 | 154 | 3,061 | 0 | 0 |
| 100 to 249. |  | (na) | 3,862 | 8,351 | 1,574 | 103 | 1,124 | 450 | 944 | 3,405 | 221 | 4,393 | 0 | 0 |
| 250 to 499. |  | (na) | 1,604 | 6,819 | 467 | (D) | 469 | 258 | 481 | 1,863 | 186 | 4,351 | 2 | (D) |
| 500 to 999.. |  | (na) | 1,038 | 8,580 | 122 | 16 | 276 | 147 | 399 | 1,272 | 236 | 6,244 | 5 | 901 |
| 1,000 to 4,999.. |  | (na) | 1,275 | 29,860 | 153 | 18 | 118 | 65 | 524 | 2,146 | 419 | 15,610 | 61 | 12,021 |
| 5,000 to 9,999... |  | (na) | 263 | 15,143 | 21 | 2 | 20 | 12 | 65 | 322 | 113 | 3,671 | 44 | 11,135 |
| 10,000 to 24,999.... |  | (na) | 179 | 27,976 | 4 | (D) | 15 | (D) | 38 | 159 | 72 | 2,449 | 50 | (D) |
| 25,000 or more... |  | (na) | 115 | 66,221 | 1 | (D) | 1 | (D) | 13 | 88 | 41 | 1,834 | 59 | 64,297 |

${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
(--) = Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
NOTE: The R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed within company facilities funded from all sources except the Federal Government. The funds predominantly are the company's own, but also include funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments. Excluded from this table are company-funded R\&D not performed within the company (e.g., R\&D contracted out to other organizations) and company-funded R\&D not performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D not performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-10. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. contracted to outside organizations and number of R\&D-performing companies that contracted out performance of company-funded R\&D, by industry and size of company: 1997-2000
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| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | 1997 |  | 1998 |  | $1999{ }^{1}$ |  | 2000 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number of companies | Amount [In millions of dollars] | Number of companies | Amount [In millions of dollars] | Number of companies | Amount [In millions of dollars] | Number of companies | $\begin{gathered} \text { Amount } \\ \text { [ln millions of dollars] } \end{gathered}$ |
| Distribution by size of company: [Number of employees] | ( na( n )(na)(na)(na)(na)(na)(na)(na)(na(na) | $\begin{array}{r}3,34 \\ 93 \\ 58 \\ 40 \\ 49 \\ 31 \\ 15 \\ 22 \\ 11 \\ 4 \\ 7 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total... |  |  | 6,000 | 3,053 | 6,710 | 4,243 | 9,240 | 3,832 | 14,785 |
| 5 to $24 .$. |  |  | 70 | 673 | 40 | 1,938 | 1,214 | 1,469 | 494 |
| 25 to 49. |  |  | 175 | 707 | 305 | 760 | 233 | 803 | 705 |
| 50 to 99. |  |  | 201 | 426 | 201 | 543 | 319 | 530 | 433 |
| 100 to 249 . |  |  | 230 | 553 | 184 | 423 | 292 | 259 | 295 |
| 250 to 499. |  |  | 123 | 198 | 275 | 196 | 148 | 229 | 237 |
| 500 to 999....... |  |  | 220 | 169 | 138 | 85 | 94 | 186 | 111 |
| 1,000 to 4,999................................ |  |  | 984 | 191 | 1,214 | 167 | 1,168 | 223 | 6,347 |
| 5,000 to 9,999..... |  |  | 992 | 65 | 589 | 61 | 1,087 | 64 | 986 |
| 10,000 to 24,999.......................... |  |  | 1,031 | 44 | 1,318 | 38 | 1,557 | 37 | 2,535 |
| 25,000 or more...... |  |  | 1,974 | 27 | 2,446 | 33 | 3,128 | 32 | 2,642 |

${ }^{1}$ Some statistics for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
${ }^{2}$ The totals for "all industries" prior to 1999 are identical to corresponding totals previously published using the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. Also, pre-1999 detail published using the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) may not add to the totals. See the 'NOTES' below.
${ }^{3}$ Manufacturing companies in the 1997 and 1998 samples that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other manufacturing;" nonmanufacturing companies that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other nonmanufacturing."
${ }^{4}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.
KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
(S) = Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(-)=$ Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
NOTES: Starting with the 1999 survey, estimates are based on the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). In prior years, estimates were based on the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. For this table, companies in the 1997 and 1998 surveys were assigned NAICS industry codes based on their SIC industry codes. Consequently, the estimates for 1997 and 1998 in this table are not necessarily representative of the NAICS categories of industries in those years. They are included for comparison purposes only.

The R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed outside company facilities funded from all sources except the Federal Government. The funds predominantly are the company's own, but also include funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments. Excluded from this table is company-funded R\&D not performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D not performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-11. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance outside of the U.S. and number of companies with subsidiaries that performed industrial R\&D both within and outside of the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000
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See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-11. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance outside of the U.S. and number of companies with subsidiaries that performed industrial R\&D both within and outside of the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000
${ }^{1}$ Some statistics for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
${ }^{2}$ The totals for "all industries" prior to 1999 are identical to corresponding totals previously published using the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. Also, pre-1999 detail published using the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) may not add to the totals. See the 'NOTES' below.
${ }^{3}$ Manufacturing companies in the 1997 and 1998 samples that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other manufacturing;" nonmanufacturing companies that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other nonmanufacturing."
${ }^{4}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: (D) = Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(\mathrm{S})=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(-)=$ Indicates data not collected.
$(\mathrm{na})=$ Not applicable.
NOTES: Starting with the 1999 survey, estimates are based on the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). In prior years, estimates were based on the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. For this table, companies in the 1997 and 1998 surveys were assigned NAICS industry codes based on their SIC industry codes. Consequently, the estimates for 1997 and 1998 in this table are not necessarily representative of the NAICS categories of industries in those years. They are included for comparison purposes only.

The R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed outside the U.S. by a company's foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations funded from all sources except the Federal Government. The funds predominantly are the company's own, but also include funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments. Excluded from this table is company-funded R\&D performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-12. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance outside of the U.S. and number of companies with subsidiaries that performed industrial R\&D both within and outside of the U.S., by location of R\&D performance (country): 2000

| Location of R\&D performance (country) | Number of companies ${ }^{1}$ | Total [ln millions of dollars] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distribution by country: |  |  |
| Total. | 1,718 | 17,462 |
| Canada.. | 127 | 1,362 |
| Germany.... | 124 | 1,846 |
| France.. | 106 | 950 |
| Japan... | 80 | 1,053 |
| United Kingdom.. | 203 | 1,395 |
| Puerto Rico...... | 19 | 194 |
| Other countries... | 238 | 2,840 |
| Undistributed ${ }^{2}$. | 1,422 | 7,820 |

${ }^{1}$ Detail does not add to total because categories are not mutually exclusive.
${ }^{2}$ Includes data reported on Form RD-1 that were not allocated to a specific country, and total foreign R\&D reported on Form RD-1A. Form RD-1A does not collect data by country.

NOTES: Data are reported in current U.S. dollars.
The R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed outside the U.S. by a company's foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations funded from all sources except the Federal Government. The funds predominantly are the company's own, but also include funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments Excluded from this table is company-funded R\&D performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-13. Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000
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See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-13. Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000

${ }^{1}$ Some statistics for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
${ }^{2}$ The totals for "all industries" prior to 1999 are identical to corresponding totals previously published using the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. Also, pre-1999 detail published using the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) may not add to the totals. See the 'NOTES' below.
${ }^{3}$ Manufacturing companies in the 1997 and 1998 samples that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other manufacturing;" nonmanufacturing companies that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other nonmanufacturing."
${ }^{4}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(--)=$ Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
NOTES: Starting with the 1999 survey, estimates are based on the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). In prior years, estimates were based on the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. For this table, companies in the 1997 and 1998 surveys were assigned NAICS industry codes based on their SIC industry codes. Consequently, the estimates for 1997 and 1998 in this table are not necessarily representative of the NAICS categories of industries in those years. They are included for comparison purposes only.

The R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed within company facilities funded by the Federal Government. Excluded from this table are R\&D not performed within the company (e.g., R\&D contracted out to other organizations) and R\&D not performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D not performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-14. Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry, by size of company: 2000
Page 1 of 3


See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.
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| Industry | NAICS codes | Size of company [number of employees] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 5 \text { to } \\ 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \text { to } \\ 49 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \text { to } \\ 99 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \text { to } \\ 249 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 250 \text { to } \\ 499 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 500 \text { to } \\ 999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 1,000 to } \\ 4,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5,000 \text { to } \\ 9,999 \end{gathered}$ | 10,000 to <br> 24,999 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 25,000 \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate...... | 52,53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services. | 54 | 4,628 | 316 | 199 | 435 | 583 | 504 | 322 | (S) 481 | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services. | 5413 | 1,149 | 113 | 72 | 92 | (D) | 245 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) | 0 |
| Computer systems design and related services $\qquad$ | 5415 | 226 | 11 | (D) | 102 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) | 0 | 0 | (D) |
| Scientific R\&D services........... | 5417 | 3,177 | 141 | 116 | 241 | 455 | 197 | 174 | 143 | (D) | 0 | (D) |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services. | 54 (minus 5413, 5415, | 77 | 50 | (D) | 0 | 0 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management of companies and enterprises.. | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Health care services... | 621-23 | 59 | (D) | (D) | 12 | 0 | (D) | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other nonmanufacturing | 56, 61, 624, 71, 72, 81 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | (D) | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{1}$.. | Fewer than 15 employees | 494 | (D) | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. Note that because companies were assigned to the "small company" partition of the sample based on preliminary information available from the sampling frame and the number of employees may have been revised during statistical processing, some companies' statistics are reported in size categories above the 50 employee threshold for manufacturing companies and the 15 employee threshold for nonmanufacturing companies. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: $\quad \begin{aligned}(D) & =\text { Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies. } \\ (\mathrm{S}) & =\text { Indicates imputation of more than } 50 \text { percent. } \\ (--) & =\text { Indicates data not collected. }\end{aligned}$
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000
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See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.
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${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B .

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
(S) = Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(-)=$ Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.

[^28]Table A-16. Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by selected Federal agency and selected industry: 1997-2000


[^29]
## Table A-16. Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by selected Federal agency and selected industry:

 1997-2000Page 2 of 2
${ }^{1}$ Some statistics for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
${ }^{2}$ The totals for "all agencies" prior to 1999 are identical to the corresponding totals previously published using the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. Detail published using the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) may not add to the totals. See the 'NOTES' below.
${ }^{3}$ Estimates for all manufacturing companies with at least 5 but with fewer than 50 employees and nonmanufacturing companies with at least 5 but with fewer than 15 employees are combined with those for companies in 'Other industries' without regard to industry classification.

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
(S) = Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(--)=$ All NAICS codes other than those specified.
NOTES: Starting with the 1999 survey, estimates are based on the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). In prior years, estimates were based on the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. For this table, companies in the 1997 and 1998 surveys were assigned NAICS industry codes based on their SIC industry codes. Consequently, the estimates for 1997 and 1998 in this table are not necessarily representative of the NAICS categories of industries in those years. They are included for comparison purposes only.

Data for DoD, NASA, and DOE do not sum to the totals because the data reported by other Federal agencies are included in the totals but not shown separately. In addition, Federal R\&D data collected on the Form RD-1A are not allocated by agency type.

During data collection, if exact figures were not available, respondents were asked to estimate or apportion R\&D costs according to the number of scientists and engineers working on Federal projects and/or the costs of Federal programs. Consequently, statistics in this table may be based on such estimates.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-17. Domestic net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry, by size of company: 2000
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Table A-17. Domestic net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry, by size of company: 2000
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| Industry | NAICS codes | Total | Size of company [number of employees] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 5 \text { to } \\ 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \text { to } \\ 49 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \text { to } \\ 99 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \text { to } \\ 249 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 250 \text { to } \\ 499 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 500 \text { to } \\ 999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1,000 \text { to } \\ 4,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5,000 \text { to } \\ 9,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10,000 \text { to } \\ 24,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 25,000 \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transportation equipment.......................... | 336 | 749,851 | 0 | 0 | 1,876 | 2,872 | 4,416 | 7,357 | 46,059 | 69,590 | 25,247 | 592,433 |
| Motor vehicles, trailers, and parts............. | 3361-63 | 567,523 | 0 | 0 | 1,008 | 1,593 | 3,432 | 5,646 | 38,932 | 58,193 | 13,679 | 445,039 |
| Aerospace products and parts.................. | 3364 | 141,548 | 0 | 0 | 448 | (D) | 0 | (D) | 1,220 | 7,063 | (D) | 127,848 |
| Other transportation equipment............... | 336 (minus 3361-64) | 40,780 | 0 | 0 | 420 | (D) | 984 | (D) | 5,906 | 4,334 | (D) | 19,546 |
| Furniture and related products..................... | 337 | 36,544 | 0 | 0 | (D) | 2,415 | 1,548 | 1,756 | 6,042 | 7,836 | 11,163 | (D) |
| Miscellaneous manufacturing.. | 339 | 48,371 | 189 | (D) | 2,466 | 4,800 | 3,989 | 4,658 | 18,526 | 11,840 | 0 | (D) |
| Medical equipment and supplies............... | 3391 | 28,588 | 0 | (D) | 439 | 2,300 | 2,142 | 1,837 | 11,238 | (D) | 0 | (D) |
| Other miscellaneous manufacturing.......... | 339 (minus 3391) | 19,783 | 189 | (D) | 2,028 | 2,500 | 1,847 | 2,821 | 7,289 | (D) | 0 | 0 |
| Other manufacturing ............................... | $\begin{aligned} & 31-33(\text { minus } 311-16, \\ & 321-27,331-37,339) \end{aligned}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | -- | -- |
| Small manufacturing companies ${ }^{1} \ldots \ldots . . . . . . . . . . .$. | Fewer than 50 employees | 65,681 | 15,886 | 14,252 | (D) | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nonmanufacturing...................................... | 21-23, 42, 44-81 | 1,844,364 | 16,831 | 16,168 | 26,449 | 40,021 | 44,575 | 59,462 | 342,727 | 231,845 | 317,603 | 748,682 |
| Mining, extraction, and support activities.. | 21 | 82,963 | (D) | 0 | 1,018 | 0 | 737 | 8,141 | 6,065 | (D) | 17,404 | (D) |
| Utilities. | 22 | 232,802 | 0 | 0 | (D) | 0 | 8,937 | 5,415 | 32,248 | 59,322 | 116,814 | (D) |
| Construction... | 23 | 11,934 | 0 | 0 | 693 | 282 | (D) | 1,215 | 5,448 | (D) | (D) | 0 |
| Trade.. | 42, 44, 45 | 466,903 | 3,001 | 9,486 | 14,383 | 7,569 | 7,145 | 24,399 | 182,985 | 72,255 | 67,683 | 77,998 |
| Transportation and warehousing.. | 48, 49 | 89,405 | (D) | 110 | 0 | 9,654 | 4,122 | 937 | 10,089 | (D) | (D) | 58,847 |
| Information.... | 51 | 406,919 | 724 | 1,473 | 1,092 | 7,412 | 8,138 | 6,440 | 23,093 | 6,957 | 55,389 | 296,201 |
| Publishing... | 511 | 79,544 | 516 | 1,473 | 962 | 6,616 | 4,069 | 4,817 | 19,220 | (D) | 28,482 | (D) |
| Newspaper, periodical, book, and database. $\qquad$ | 5111 | 18,015 | (S) 3 | 110 | (D) | 0 | 1,153 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Software...................................... | 5112 | 61,530 | 512 | 1,363 | (D) | 6,616 | 2,916 | (D) | (D) | 4,036 | (D) | 0 |
| Broadcasting and telecommunications........ | 513 | 279,983 | 0 | 0 | (D) | (D) | 120 | 626 | (D) | 0 | (D) | 276,422 |
| Radio and television broadcasting......... | 5131 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (D) |
| Telecommunications........................ | 5133 | 272,351 | 0 | 0 | (D) | (D) | 61 | 626 | (D) | 0 | (D) | (D) |
| Other broadcasting and telecommunications. | 513 (minus 5131, 5133) | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other information............................... | 51 (minus 511, 513) | 47,392 | 208 | 0 | (D) | (D) | 3,949 | 996 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |

[^30]Table A-17. Domestic net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry, by size of company: 2000
Page 3 of 3

${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. Note that because companies were assigned to the "small company" partition of the sample based on preliminary information available from the sampling frame and the number of employees may have been revised during statistical processing, some companies' statistics are reported in size categories above the 50 employee threshold for manufacturing companies and the 15 employee threshold for nonmaufacutring companies. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: (D) = Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
(S) = Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(--)=$ Indicates data not collected.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-18. Concentration of total, Federal, and company and other industrial R\&D funds and net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., ranked by size of R\&D program: 1989-2000

| Companies ranked by size of R\&D program | $1989{ }^{1}$ | $1990{ }^{1}$ | $1991{ }^{1,2}$ | $1992{ }^{2}$ | $1993{ }^{2}$ | $1994{ }^{2}$ | $1995{ }^{2}$ | $1996{ }^{2}$ | $1997{ }^{2}$ | $1998{ }^{2}$ | $1999{ }^{2,3}$ | $2000{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent of total (company, Federal, and other) R\&D funds |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First 4 (1-4). | $\begin{array}{r} 19 \\ 13 \\ 16 \\ 12 \\ 15 \\ 8 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18 \\ 13 \\ 15 \\ 12 \\ 16 \\ 9 \\ 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 16 \\ 8 \\ 12 \\ 11 \\ 15 \\ 12 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 158131115126 | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 7 \\ 13 \\ 12 \\ 16 \\ 8 \\ 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 8 \\ 14 \\ 13 \\ 15 \\ 9 \\ 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ 8 \\ 13 \\ 12 \\ 14 \\ 8 \\ 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 8 \\ 13 \\ 12 \\ 14 \\ 9 \\ 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline 14 \\ 8 \\ 13 \\ 11 \\ 14 \\ 9 \\ 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 8 \\ 13 \\ 11 \\ 13 \\ 9 \\ 8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 11813111397 |  |
| Next 4 (5-8)............... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 12 (9-20).......... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 20 (21-40)........ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 60 (41-100)......... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 100 (101-200)..... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 200 (201-400)..... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of Federal R\&D funds |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First 4 (1-4)... | $\begin{array}{r} 36 \\ 15 \\ 30 \\ 11 \\ 6 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 38 \\ 16 \\ 26 \\ 12 \\ 6 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline 14 \\ 21 \\ 21 \\ 15 \\ 13 \\ 3 \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 111827131142 | $\begin{array}{r} 23 \\ 17 \\ 32 \\ 16 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26 \\ 19 \\ 32 \\ 13 \\ 7 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 35 \\ 19 \\ 27 \\ 8 \\ 5 \\ 3 \\ 3 \end{array}$ | 3720237544 | $\begin{array}{r} 40 \\ 23 \\ 18 \\ 7 \\ 5 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 46 \\ 17 \\ 14 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 5 \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4714158745 | (S) |
| Next 4 (5-8).............. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 12 (9-20)...... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 20 (21-40)....... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 60 (41-100)...... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 100 (101-200)..... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 200 (201-400)..... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of company and other (except Federal) R\&D funds |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First 4 (1-4).. | $\begin{array}{r} 22 \\ 7 \\ 13 \\ 12 \\ 16 \\ 10 \\ 8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 217121317108 | 177101016157 | 178121117147 | 17712111498 | 16712111498 | 16711111498 | 157111014108 | 137111113109 | 127121013108 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 11 \\ 8 \\ 12 \\ 10 \\ 13 \\ 9 \\ 8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 10 <br> 7 <br> 12 <br> 10 <br> 13 <br> 9 <br> 11 |
| Next 4 (5-8)............... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 12 (9-20)............ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 20 (21-40)...... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 60 (41-100)...... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 100 (101-200)..... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Next 200 (201-400)..... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of net sales |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First 4 (1-4)............... | 655512811 | 845512912 | 734412911 | 834412911 | 834411810 | 25510810 | 2649810 | 636481111 | 6 | 5 | (S) $\begin{array}{r}5 \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ 4 \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ 12\end{array}$ | 3 |
| Next 4 (5-8)............... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 3 |  | (D) |
| Next 12 (9-20)............ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 5 |  | 8 |
| Next 20 (21-40)......... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 5 |  | 4 |
| Next 60 (41-100)....... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 8 |  | 11 |
| Next 100 (101-200)..... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 8 |  | 9 |
| Next 200 (201-400)..... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 | 11 |  | 12 |

${ }^{1}$ As a result of a new sample design, statistics for 1989-91 have been revised since originally published. These statistics now better reflect R\&D performance among firms in the nonmanufacturing industries and small firms in all industries. For more information, see the technical notes in Section
${ }^{2}$ As a result of the new sample design, statistics for 1991 and later years are not directly comparable with statistics for 1990 and earlier years. For more information, see the technical notes in Section B.
${ }^{3}$ Some percentages for 1999 have been revised since originally published
KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
NOTE: Companies were ranked individually for each year; therefore, particular companies comprising the size groups may have changed from year to year.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-19. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000


[^31]Table A-19. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000

| Page 2 of 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | 1997 | 1998 | $1999{ }^{1}$ | 2000 |
|  |  |  | [Perc |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nonmanufacturing | 21-23, 42, 44-81 | -- | -- | 3.7 | 4.1 |
| Mining, extraction, and support activities. | 21 | (D) | (D) | (D) | 1.0 |
| Utilities. | 22 | (D) | (D) | 0.1 | (D) |
| Construction.. | 23 | 1.7 | (D) | 3.1 | (D) |
| Trade. | 42, 44, 45 | (D) | 4.9 | 5.5 | 5.3 |
| Transportation and warehousing.. | 48,49 | (D) | 0.3 | 0.5 | (D) |
| Information.. | 51 | 2.8 | 4.6 | 3.6 | 4.1 |
| Publishing. | 511 | 11.6 | 13.3 | 13.4 | 16.3 |
| Newspaper, periodical, book, and database..... | 5111 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Software.. | 5112 | 19.3 | 20.0 | 16.8 | 20.5 |
| Broadcasting and telecommunications... | 513 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (S) 0.5 |
| Radio and television broadcasting..... | 5131 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Telecommunications.. | 5133 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Other broadcasting and telecommunications.... | 513 (minus 5131, 5133) | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Other information... | 51 (minus 511, 513) | (D) | (D) | (D) | 5.1 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate... | 52,53 | (D) | (D) | (D) | 1.2 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services......... | 54 | 14.4 | 15.5 | 15.3 | 18.7 |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services....... | 5413 | 6.4 | 9.5 | 10.1 | 10.8 |
| Computer systems design and related services......... | 5415 | (D) | (D) | (D) | 12.3 |
| Scientific R\&D services...................................... | 5417 | 57.6 | 57.2 | 45.3 | 42.9 |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services... | 54 (minus 5413, 5415, 5417) | (D) | (D) | (D) | 6.6 |
| Management of companies and enterprises... | 55 | (D) | 28.5 | (D) | 4.4 |
| Health care services.............. | 621-23 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 6.5 | 3.2 |
| Other nonmanufacturing ${ }^{3}$.. | 56, 61, 624, 71, 72, 81 | 0.8 | 2.2 | (D) | 1.0 |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{4}$. | Fewer than 15 employees | (D) | 19.8 | 15.1 | 46.1 |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-19. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000

|  |  |  |  |  | Page 3 of 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | 1997 | 1998 | $1999{ }^{1}$ | 2000 |
|  |  |  | [Perc |  |  |
| Distribution by size of company [Number of employees] |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | (na) | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.8 |
| 5 to 24. | (na) | 11.1 | 9.8 | 18.2 | 19.9 |
| 25 to 49. | (na) | 8.4 | 9.1 | 11.5 | 14.0 |
| 50 to 99. | (na) | 8.7 | 8.9 | 14.2 | 12.1 |
| 100 to 249. | (na) | 5.4 | 9.2 | 7.6 | 8.7 |
| 250 to 499. | (na) | 4.6 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 6.7 |
| 500 to 999... | (na) | 3.0 | 3.2 | 4.4 | 5.0 |
| 1,000 to 4,999.. | (na) | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.6 |
| 5,000 to 9,999... | (na) | 2.5 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 2.4 |
| 10,000 to 24,999.. | (na) | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.2 |
| 25,000 or more.... | (na) | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 3.4 |

${ }^{1}$ Some percentages for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
${ }^{2}$ The totals for "all industries" prior to 1999 are identical to corresponding totals previously published using the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. Also, pre-1999 detail published using the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) may not add to the totals. See the 'NOTE' below.
${ }^{3}$ Manufacturing companies in the 1997 and 1998 samples that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other manufacturing;" nonmanufacturing companies that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other nonmanufacturing."
${ }^{4}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
(--) = Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
NOTE: Starting with the 1999 survey, estimates are based on the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). In prior years, estimates were based on the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. For this table, companies in the 1997 and 1998 surveys were assigned NAICS industry codes based on their SIC industry codes. Consequently, the estimates for 1997 and 1998 in this table are not necessarily representative of the NAICS categories of industries in those years. They are included for comparison purposes only.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-20. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000


[^32]Table A-20. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000

| Industry and size of company |  |  |  |  | Page 2 of 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAICS codes | 1997 | 1998 | $1999{ }^{1}$ | 2000 |
|  |  | [Percent] |  |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nonmanufacturing | 21-23, 42, 44-81 | -- | -- | 3.4 | 3.8 |
| Mining, extraction, and support activities.... | 21 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 1.0 |
| Utilities.. | 22 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Construction. | 23 | 1.7 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 1.9 |
| Trade. | 42, 44, 45 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 5.5 | 5.3 |
| Transportation and warehousing.. | 48, 49 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Information... | 51 | 2.7 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 4.0 |
| Publishing.. | 511 | 11.6 | 13.2 | 13.4 | 16.3 |
| Newspaper, periodical, book, and database......... | 5111 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Software.. | 5112 | 19.2 | 19.8 | 16.7 | 20.4 |
| Broadcasting and telecommunications... | 513 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Radio and television broadcasting. | 5131 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Telecommunications... | 5133 | (D) | 0.9 | (D) | (D) |
| Other broadcasting and telecommunications... | 513 (minus 5131, 5133) | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Other information.. | 51 (minus 511, 513) | 2.0 | 8.0 | 8.6 | 4.9 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate. | 52, 53 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.2 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services.... | 54 | 10.4 | 11.0 | 11.6 | 14.9 |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services....... | 5413 | 3.3 | 4.2 | 6.8 | 7.1 |
| Computer systems design and related services......... | 5415 | 10.4 | 9.5 | 11.0 | 11.8 |
| Scientific R\&D services.. | 5417 | 38.5 | 40.7 | 32.1 | 32.3 |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services.. | 54 (minus 5413, 5415, 5417) | (S) 3.7 | 2.9 | 1.9 | 6.1 |
| Management of companies and enterprises.. | 55 | 7.9 | 28.5 | 5.7 | 4.4 |
| Health care services.............................. | 621-23 | 5.2 | 4.5 | 6.4 | 2.8 |
| Other nonmanufacturing ${ }^{3}$. | $56,61,624,71,72,81$ | 0.8 | 2.2 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{4}$. | Fewer than 15 employees | 10.6 | 16.2 | 14.4 | 40.8 |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-20. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000

${ }^{1}$ Percentages for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
${ }^{2}$ The totals for "all industries" prior to 1999 are identical to corresponding totals previously published using the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. Also, pre-1999 detail published using the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) may not add to the totals. See the 'NOTES' below.
${ }^{3}$ Manufacturing companies in the 1997 and 1998 samples that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other manufacturing;" nonmanufacturing companies that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other nonmanufacturing."
${ }^{4}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
(S) = Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
(--) = Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
NOTES: Starting with the 1999 survey, estimates are based on the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). In prior years, estimates were based on the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. For this table, companies in the 1997 and 1998 surveys were assigned NAICS industry codes based on their SIC industry codes. Consequently, the estimates for 1997 and 1998 in this table are not necessarily representative of the NAICS categories of industries in those years. They are included for comparison purposes only.

The R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed within company facilities funded from all sources except the Federal Government. The funds predominantly are the company's own, but also include funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments. Excluded from this table are company-funded R\&D not performed within the company (e.g., R\&D contracted out to other organizations) and company-funded R\&D not performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D not performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-21. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, ranked by size of R\&D program: 2000

Page 1 of 4

| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | Total (Federal plus company and other) R\&D funds |  |  | Total (Federal plus company and other) R\&D funds as a percent of net sales |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | First 4 companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 companies | First 4 companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 <br> companies |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  | [Percent] |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: | 21-23, 31-33, 42, 44-81 | 19,061 | 14,461 | 26,244 | 11.1 | 7.6 | 6.1 |
| All industries.. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing. | 31-33 | 19,061 | 12,397 | 22,108 | 11.1 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| Food. | 311 | 345 | 177 | 251 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Beverage and tobacco products... | 312 | 408 | 6 | 0 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Textiles, apparel, and leather.. | 313-16 | 71 | 48 | 59 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.1 |
| Wood products..... | 321 | 89 | 6 | 4 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Paper, printing and support activities.. | 322, 323 | 2,251 | 208 | 181 | 3.7 | 0.9 | 0.4 |
| Petroleum and coal products.. | 324 | 1,018 | 99 | 9 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Chemicals.. | 325 | 6,213 | 4,282 | 5,208 | 10.8 | 11.7 | 6.4 |
| Basic chemicals.. | 3251 | 504 | 270 | 502 | 3.0 | 4.6 | 2.3 |
| Resin, synthetic rubber, fibers, and filament... | 3252 | 2,462 | 277 | 108 | 6.7 | 4.0 | 1.9 |
| Pharmaceuticals and medicines......................... | 3254 | 5,866 | 3,809 | 2,456 | 11.6 | 9.2 | 8.8 |
| Other chemicals............................................ | 325 (minus 3251-52, 3254) | 2,052 | 322 | 355 | 6.6 | 2.4 | 3.0 |
| Plastics and rubber products.. | 326 | 609 | 210 | 260 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 2.2 |
| Nonmetallic mineral products.. | 327 | 512 | 96 | 108 | 3.4 | 1.4 | 1.3 |
| Primary metals... | 331 | 298 | 82 | 103 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Fabricated metal products.................................... | 332 | 723 | 181 | 233 | 3.3 | 2.4 | 1.0 |
| Machinery.... | 333 | 1,995 | 741 | 1,183 | 6.6 | 4.9 | 4.7 |
| Computer and electronic products........................... | 334 | 16,124 | 7,039 | 6,708 | 15.1 | 10.7 | 6.9 |
| Computers and peripheral equipment.................... | 3341 | 3,143 | 945 | 508 | 9.1 | 15.7 | 3.6 |
| Communications equipment.. | 3342 | 8,614 | 873 | 848 | 12.0 | 8.5 | 7.0 |
| Semiconductor and other electronic components........ | 3344 | (S) 7,151 | 1,487 | 2,069 | 11.1 | 4.7 | 11.5 |
| Navigational, measuring, electromedical, and control instruments. | 3345 | 9,134 | 1,731 | 1,881 | 13.5 | 15.3 | 12.0 |
| Other computer and electronic products................. | 334 (minus 3341-42, 3344-45) | 210 | 41 | 45 | 7.9 | 6.2 | 1.9 |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-21. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, ranked by size of R\&D program: 2000
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[^33]Table A-21. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, ranked by size of R\&D program: 2000
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| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | Total (Federal plus company and other) R\&D funds |  |  | Total (Federal plus company and other) R\&D funds as a percent of net sales |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | First 4 companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 companies | First 4 companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 companies |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  | [Percent] |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: | 513 (minus 5131, 5133) |  |  | 101 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 10.2 |
| Broadcasting and telecommunications.. |  | (S) 1,083 | 187 |  |  |  |  |
| Radio and television broadcasting. |  | (D) |  | 0 | 3.3 | 0.2 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Telecommunications. |  | (S) 909 | 137 | 45 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 4.9 |
| Other broadcasting and telecommunications.... |  | 31 | 0 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other information... | 51 (minus 511, 513) | 1,364 | 228 | 219 | 3.9 | 8.1 | 4.7 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate. | 52, 53 | (S) $\quad \begin{array}{r}975 \\ 3,175\end{array}$ | 447 | 329 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 0.7 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services.............. | 54 |  | 983 | 1,637 | 27.4 | 47.4 | 17.2 |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services........ | 5413 | 994395 |  | 407 | 18.1 | 29.2 | 9.8 |
| Computer systems design and related services.......... | 5415 |  |  | 525 | 13.326.2 | 27.5 | 5.7 57.8 |
| Scientific R\&D services... | 5417 |  |  |  |  | 36.3 | 57.8 |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services.... | 54 (minus 5413, 5415, 5417) | (S) 210 | 57 | 45 | 14.9 | 0.8 | 1.3 |
| Management of companies and enterprises................ | 55 | 37 | 2 | 0 | 28.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Health care services... | 621-23 | 46 | 22 | 22 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 0.7 |
| Other nonmanufacturing. | $56,61,624,71,72,81$ | 272 | 106 | 120 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 0.4 |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{1}$. | Fewer than 15 employees | 67 | 12 | 7 | 16.3 | 489.6 | 42.0 |

[^34]Table A-21. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, ranked by size of R\&D program: 2000

Page 4 of 4

${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{S})=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(--)=$ Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
NOTE: Rankings were based on total (company, Federal, and other) R\&D funds.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-22. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, ranked by size of nonfederally funded R\&D program: 2000

| Industry and size of company |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 1 of 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAICS codes | Company and other non-Federal R\&D funds |  |  | Company and other non-Federal R\&D funds as a percent of net sales |  |  |
|  |  | First 4 companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 companies | First 4 companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 companies |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  | [Percent] |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: | 21-23, 31-33, 42, 44-81 |  | 13,356 | 22,189 | 9.5 | 7.3 | 5.2 |
| All industries.. |  | $\begin{aligned} & 18,551 \\ & 18,453 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing. | 31-33 |  | $10,197$ | 18,636 | 6.3 | 4.8 | 7.0 |
| Food.. | 311 | $\begin{aligned} & 345 \\ & 408 \end{aligned}$ | 177 | 250 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Beverage and tobacco products.... | 312 |  | 648 | 0 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Textiles, apparel, and leather. | 313-16 | 408 71 |  | 59 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.1 |
| Wood products..... | 321 | 89 | 6 | 4 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Paper, printing and support activities.. | 322, 323 | 2,229 |  | 181 | 3.6 | 0.9 | 0.4 |
| Petroleum and coal products.. | 324 | 1,014 | 99 | 9 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Chemicals.. | 325 | 6,211 | 4,210 | 5,177 | 10.8 | 10.3 | 6.8 |
| Basic chemicals... | 3251 | 490 267 |  | 497 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 2.2 |
| Resin, synthetic rubber, fibers, and filament.... | 3252 | 2,454 | 2743,809 | 108 | 6.7 | 3.9 | 1.9 |
| Pharmaceuticals and medicines.. | 3254 |  |  | 2,454 | 11.66.3 | 9.2 | 8.8 |
| Other chemicals... | 325 (minus 3251-52, 3254) | 5,866 1,955 | $322$ | 355 |  | 2.4 | 3.0 |
| Plastics and rubber products. | 326 | 609 | 210 | 260 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 2.2 |
| Nonmetallic mineral products.. | 327 | 512 | 96 | 108 | 3.4 | 1.4 | 1.3 |
| Primary metals.... | 331 | 274723 | 82 | 103 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Fabricated metal products.. | 332 |  | 165735 | 214 | 3.36.5 | 2.14.8 | 0.9 |
| Machinery................ | 333 | 1,970 |  | 1,179 |  |  | 4.7 |
| Computer and electronic products............... | 334 | 14,290 | 4,985 | 6,016 | 11.7 | 12.7 | 5.6 |
| Computers and peripheral equipment.. | 3341 | 3,143 | 945 683 | 508 | 9.1 | 15.7 | 3.6 |
| Communications equipment....................... | 3342 | 8,487 | [683 | 797 | 11.911.1 | $6.3$ | 6.4 |
| Semiconductor and other electronic components. | 3344 | (S) 7,151 |  | 2,069 |  | 4.7 | 11.5 |
| Navigational, measuring, electromedical, and control instruments. | 3345 | 4,879 | $1,466$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,625 \end{aligned}$ | 7.2 | 12.0 | 10.7 |
| Other computer and electronic products.. | 334 (minus 3341-42, 3344-45) | 209 | 41 | 45 | 7.9 | 6.2 | 1.9 |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-22. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, ranked by size of nonfederally funded R\&D program: 2000


See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-22. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, ranked by size of nonfederally funded R\&D program: 2000

| Industry and size of company |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 3 of 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAICS codes | Company and other non-Federal R\&D funds |  |  | Company and other non-Federal R\&D funds as a percent of net sales |  |  |
|  |  | First 4 companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 <br> companies | First 4 companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 companies |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  | [Percent] |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadcasting and telecommunications... | 513 | 784 | 136 | 70 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.0 |
| Radio and television broadcasting... | 5131 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Telecommunications... | 5133 | 784 | 123 | 24 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.8 |
| Other broadcasting and telecommunications.......... | 513 (minus 5131, 5133) | 31 | 0 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other information........................................... | 51 (minus 511, 513) | 1,344 | 228 | 212 | 3.8 | 8.1 | 4.6 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate......................... | 52, 53 | 975 | 447 | 329 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 0.7 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services............... | 54 | 1,413 | 832 | 1,458 | 12.4 | 44.1 | 19.5 |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services.......... | 5413 | 662 | 306 | 199 | 19.0 | 9.0 | 4.6 |
| Computer systems design and related services.......... | 5415 | 395 | 288 | 500 | 13.3 | 27.5 | 5.5 |
| Scientific R\&D services................................... | 5417 | 1,413 | 755 | 1,075 | 12.4 | 36.7 | 53.6 |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services.... | 54 (minus 5413, 5415, 5417) | 188 | 55 | 44 | 13.5 | 0.8 | 1.2 |
| Management of companies and enterprises.................. | 55 | 37 | 2 | 0 | 28.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| Health care services.... | 621-23 | 44 | 22 | 2 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| Other nonmanufacturing . | 56, 61, 624, 71, 72, 81 | 272 | 106 | 106 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 0.4 |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{1}$......................... | Fewer than 15 employees | 67 | 12 | 6 | 16.3 | 535.0 | 33.2 |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-22. Company and other non-Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, ranked by size of nonfederally funded R\&D program: 2000

| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | Company and other non-Federal R\&D funds |  |  | Company and other non-Federal R\&D funds as a percent of net sales |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | First 4 companies companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 companies | First 4 companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 companies |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  | [Percent] |  |  |
| Distribution by size of company: [Number of employees] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | (na) | 18,551 | 13,356 | 22,189 | 9.5 | 7.3 | 5.2 |
| 5 to 24.. | (na) | (S) 61 | 31 | 53 | 41.3 | 160.6 | 154.3 |
| 25 to 49. | (na) | 118 | 60 | 119 | 74.4 | 161.4 | 137.3 |
| 50 to 99.. | (na) | 174 | 114 | 223 | 85.7 | 232.0 | 141.8 |
| 100 to 249.. | (na) | 282 | 200 | 449 | 15.2 | 39.4 | 90.5 |
| 250 to 499. | (na) | 491 | 346 | 742 | 133.6 | 32.3 | 34.3 |
| 500 to 999. | (na) | 781 | 378 | 844 | 48.6 | 20.5 | 17.7 |
| 1,000 to 4,999.. | (na) | 1,780 | 1,355 | 3,123 | 26.9 | 13.6 | 23.9 |
| 5,000 to 9,999... | (na) | 2,922 | 1,862 | 3,404 | 13.7 | 12.7 | 7.7 |
| 10,000 to 24,999... | (na) | 8,500 | 4,301 | 7,230 | 25.7 | 16.9 | 6.9 |
| 25,000 or more.................................... | (na) | 18,551 | 12,494 | 18,978 | 9.5 | 6.3 | 4.5 |

${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
(-) = Indicates data not collected.
(na) = Not applicable.
NOTES: The R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed within company facilities funded from all sources except the Federal Government. The funds predominantly are the company's own, but also include funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments. Excluded from this table are company-funded R\&D not performed within the company (e.g., R\&D contracted out to other organizations) and company-funded R\&D not performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D not performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).

Rankings were based on company and other R\&D funds.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-23. Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, ranked by size of federally funded R\&D program: 2000

| Industry and size of company |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 1 of 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAICS codes | Federal R\&D funds |  |  | Federal R\&D funds as a percent of net sales |  |  |
|  |  | First 4 companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 companies | First 4 companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 companies |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  | [Percent] |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All industries. | 21-23, 31-33, 42, 44-81 | 8,283 | (S) 3,121 | 2,823 | 14.6 | 3.7 | 1.0 |
| Manufacturing. | 31-33 | (D) | (D) | (D) | 14.6 | 2.4 | 0.7 |
| Food.. | 311 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Beverage and tobacco products... | 312 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Textiles, apparel, and leather... | 313-16 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Wood products................ | 321 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Paper, printing and support activities. | 322, 323 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Petroleum and coal products.. | 324 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Chemicals.. | 325 | 121 | 14 | 9 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Basic chemicals... | 3251 | 26 | (S) 5 | 0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Resin, synthetic rubber, fibers, and filament... | 3252 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pharmaceuticals and medicines... | 3254 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other chemicals.............. | 325 (minus 3251-52, 3254) | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Plastics and rubber products..... | 326 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Nonmetallic mineral products.. | 327 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Primary metals.. | 331 | (S) 26 | (D) | 0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Fabricated metal products.. | 332 | 40 | 1 | 0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Machinery... | 333 | 34 | 4 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Computer and electronic products......... | 334 | 4,847 | 339 | 273 | 13.0 | 1.2 | 9.4 |
| Computers and peripheral equipment.. | 3341 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Communications equipment........................ | 3342 | 409 | (S) 23 | 0 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Semiconductor and other electronic components... | 3344 | 99 | 9 | 0 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Navigational, measuring, electromedical, and control instruments. | 3345 | 4,754 | 163 | 28 | 12.0 | 23.7 | 0.5 |
| Other computer and electronic products............ | 334 (minus 3341-42, 3344-45) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-23. Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, ranked by size of federally funded R\&D program: 2000


See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-23. Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, ranked by size of federally funded R\&D program: 2000

| Industry and size of company |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 3 of 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAICS codes | Federal R\&D funds |  |  | Federal R\&D funds as a percent of net sales |  |  |
|  |  | First 4 companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 companies | First 4 companies | Next 4 companies | Next 12 companies |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  | [Percent] |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadcasting and telecommunications.................... | 513 | (S) 381 | (D) | 0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Radio and television broadcasting... | 5131 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Telecommunications.. | 5133 | (S) 160 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other broadcasting and telecommunications.......... | 513 (minus 5131, 5133) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other information.... | 51 (minus 511, 513) | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate........................... | 52,53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services............... | 54 | (S) 2,128 | 275 | 428 | 24.0 | 10.2 | 43.6 |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services.......... | 5413 | (S) 538 | 137 | (S) 188 | 17.1 | 55.0 | 21.2 |
| Computer systems design and related services........... | 5415 | 99 | 28 | 29 | 36.2 | 45.2 | 0.5 |
| Scientific R\&D services..................................... | 5417 | 1,865 | 144 | 291 | 22.1 | 36.2 | 36.5 |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services.... | 54 (minus 5413, 5415, 5417) | 28 | 0 | 0 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Management of companies and enterprises.................. | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Health care services........................................... | 621-23 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other nonmanufacturing ...................................... | 56, 61, 624, 71, 72, 81 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{1}$......................... | Fewer than 15 employees | 2 | 0 | 0 | 56.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 |

[^35]Table A-23. Federal funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. as a percent of net sales of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, ranked by size of federally funded R\&D program: 2000


[^36]KEY: (D) = Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(--)=$ Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
NOTE: Rankings were based on Federal R\&D funds.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-24. Total, Federal, company and other funds for industrial energy R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of companies that performed energy R\&D in the U.S., by selected industry and size of company: 2000 and projected 2001


KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(--)=$ All NAICS codes other than those specified.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
NOTES: Energy R\&D data are collected only on Form RD-1, the questionnaire sent to larger R\&D-performing companies. Consequently, the universe of companies that performs energy R\&D may not be represented by the statistics in this table.
The company R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed within company facilities funded from all sources except the Federal Government. The funds predominantly are the company's own, but also include funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments. Excluded from this table are company-funded R\&D not performed within the company (e.g., R\&D contracted out to other organizations) and company-funded R\&D not performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D not performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-25. Total, Federal, company and other funds for industrial energy R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of companies that performed energy R\&D in the U.S., by primary energy source: 2000 and projected 2001

${ }^{1}$ Detail does not add to total because categories are not mutually exclusive.
KEY: (D) = Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
NOTES: Energy R\&D data are collected only on Form RD-1, the questionnaire sent to larger R\&D-performing companies.
Consequently, the universe of companies that performs energy R\&D may not be represented by the statistics in this table.
The company R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed within company facilities funded from all sources except the Federal Government. The funds predominantly are the company's own, but also include funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments. Excluded from this table are company-funded R\&D not performed within the company (e.g., R\&D contracted out to other organizations) and company-funded R\&D not performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D not performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-26. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by state in selected years: 1981-2000

| State | 1981 | 1983 | 1985 | 1987 | $1989{ }^{1}$ | $1991{ }^{1,2}$ | $1993{ }^{2}$ | $1995{ }^{2}$ | $1997{ }^{2}$ | $1998{ }^{2}$ | $1999{ }^{2,3}$ |  | $2000{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| United States, total.. | 51,810 | 65,268 | 84,239 | 92,155 | 102,055 | 116,952 | 117,400 | 132,103 | 157,539 | 169,180 | 182,711 |  | 199,539 |
| Alabama.. | 100 | 187 | (S) | 1,523 | 430 | 596 | (S) 557 | 686 | (S) 589 | 707 | 556 |  | 607 |
| Alaska.. | (T) | (T) | (D) | 10 | 9 | 21 | 14 | 30 | (S) 24 | 189 | (D) | (S) | 9 |
| Arizona.. | 758 | (T) | 1,079 | 809 | 921 | 1,080 | 1,039 | (S) 1,356 | 1,854 | 1,727 | 4,434 |  | 2,445 |
| Arkansas.. | 52 | (T) | (D) | 129 | 51 | (S) | 179 | 181 | 118 | 118 | 216 |  | 273 |
| California... | 7,626 | (T) | (S) | 18,636 | 23,781 | (S) | 21,975 | 28,710 | 34,011 | 35,568 | 39,047 |  | 45,769 |
| Colorado...... | 529 | 741 | 988 | 1,207 | 1,167 | (S) | 1,966 | 1,865 | 2,248 | 3,565 | 3,136 |  | 3,140 |
| Connecticut.... | 1,514 | 1,682 | 2,129 | 2,121 | 2,421 | 1,756 | 2,228 | 3,906 | 3,014 | 3,113 | (S) 3,984 | (S) | 4,371 |
| Delaware. | (T) | (T) | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) | (S) 913 | (S) 1,077 | (S) 1,009 | 2,476 | (S) 1,261 | (S) | 1,444 |
| District of Columbia. | (T) | (T) | (D) | (D) | (D) | 46 | (S) 515 | (S) 672 | (D) | (S) 503 | 171 |  | 112 |
| Florida.. | 1,449 | (T) | 1,973 | 2,041 | 2,352 | (S) | 2,386 | 4,101 | 3,442 | 3,300 | (S) 2,697 |  | 3,212 |
| Georgia.. | 220 | 348 | (D) | 958 | 722 | 993 | 792 | 1,175 | 1,273 | 1,444 | 1,827 |  | 1,579 |
| Hawaii... | (T) | (T) | 13 | 70 | 9 | 13 | 255 | 14 | 87 | (S) 17 | 27 |  | 154 |
| Idaho... | (T) | (T) | 451 | 467 | (D) | (S) | 686 | 827 | (S) 1,181 | (S) 1,028 | 1,210 |  | 1,338 |
| Illinois. | 2,077 | 2,291 | (D) | 4,099 | 4,068 | 5,750 | 5,023 | (S) 5,776 | 6,248 | 6,892 | 7,603 |  | 10,661 |
| Indiana. | 1,054 | (T) | (D) | 1,860 | 1,823 | 2,274 | 2,141 | (S) 2,721 | 2,677 | (S) 2,622 | (S) 2,246 | (S) | 2,668 |
| lowa.. | 393 | 287 | (D) | 328 | 365 | 527 | 505 | 998 | 578 | 634 | 559 |  | 538 |
| Kansas... | 211 | 293 | (D) | 1,128 | 406 | (S) | (S) 280 | 569 | (S) 1,136 | (S) 1,279 | (S) 1,284 | (S) | 1,140 |
| Kentucky...... | 170 | 191 | (D) | 238 | 227 | 176 | 282 | 452 | 359 | 427 | 684 |  | 582 |
| Louisiana.... | 158 | 257 | (D) | 128 | 169 | (S) | 106 | 61 | 172 | 102 | 187 |  | 126 |
| Maine... | (T) | (T) | (D) | 39 | 33 | (S) | (D) | 286 | 83 | 82 | 140 |  | 201 |
| Maryland.... | (T) | (T) | 1,548 | 1,292 | 1,093 | 1,376 | 1,296 | 1,075 | 1,425 | 1,744 | 1,700 |  | 2,032 |
| Massachusetts. | 1,907 | 2,466 | 4,495 | 5,255 | 5,851 | (S) | 5,960 | 7,416 | 8,300 | 10,604 | 9,314 |  | 9,863 |
| Michigan.... | 4,272 | 5,716 | 6,436 | 7,095 | 8,506 | 9,283 | 18,845 | 12,388 | 13,009 | 12,648 | 17,714 | (S) | 17,640 |
| Minnesota... | 1,180 | 1,814 | (D) | 2,145 | 2,075 | 2,070 | 2,341 | (S) 2,636 | 3,116 | 3,321 | 3,379 | (S) | 3,722 |
| Mississippi... | (T) | (T) | 62 | 42 | 56 | (S) | 51 | 66 | 73 | 73 | 114 |  | 101 |
| Missouri... | 1,137 | (T) | (D) | 1,823 | 2,391 | (S) | (S) 1,339 | (S) 2,028 | (S) 1,290 | (S) 1,313 | (S) 1,387 |  | 1,893 |
| Montana..... | (T) | (T) | (D) | 7 | (D) | (S) | (D) | 17 | 92 | 82 | 33 | (S) | 28 |
| Nebraska.. | 28 | 26 | (D) | 59 | 64 | 67 | 93 | 150 | 71 | 93 | 178 |  | 2,253 |
| Nevada... | (T) | (T) | (S) | 55 | 29 | 95 | 65 | 322 | 380 | 434 | 337 |  | 248 |
| New Hampshire... | (T) | (T) | (D) | 90 | (D) | (D) | 247 | 472 | 652 | 1,187 | 1,099 |  | 586 |

See explanatory information at end of table.

Table A-26. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by state in selected years: 1981-2000

${ }^{1}$ As a result of a new sample design, statistics for 1989-91 have been revised since originally published. These statistics now better reflect R\&D performance among firms in the nonmanufacturing industries and small firms in all industries. For more information, see the technical notes in Section B.
${ }^{2}$ As a result of the new sample design, statistics for 1991 and later years are not directly comparable with statistics for 1990 and earlier years.
${ }^{3}$ Some statistics for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing information about individual companies
(S) = Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent. For years prior to 1993, data have been withheld.
$(\mathrm{T})=$ Data are not separately available but included in total.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-27. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of companies that performed R\&D in the U.S., by state and source of funds: 2000

Page 1 of 2


[^37]Table A-27. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of companies that performed R\&D in the U.S., by state and source of funds: 2000

Page 2 of 2

| State | Number of companies ${ }^{1}$ |  | Total |  | Federal | Company |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  |  |  |
| South Carolina.... | 103 |  | 781 |  | (D) | (D) |
| South Dakota... | 64 |  | 44 |  | 16 | 28 |
| Tennessee. | 350 | (S) | 1,215 |  | (D) | (D) |
| Texas... | 2,062 |  | 8,961 |  | 230 | 8,731 |
| Utah.. | 200 |  | 979 |  | (D) | (D) |
| Vermont... | 216 |  | 396 |  | (D) | (D) |
| Virginia.. | 1,100 |  | 2,718 |  | 800 | 1,918 |
| Washington... | 953 | (S) | 9,265 |  | (D) | (D) |
| West Virginia.. | 20 |  | 235 |  | (D) | (D) |
| Wisconsin.... | 908 |  | 1,981 | (S) | 18 | 1,963 |
| Wyoming.................. | 5 |  | 7 |  | 0 | 7 |
| Undistributed funds ${ }^{2}$. | 225 | (S) | 9,831 | (S) | 999 | 8,832 |

${ }^{1}$ Detail does not add to total because categories are not mutually exclusive.
${ }^{2}$ Includes data reported on Form RD-1 that were not allocated to a specific state.
KEY: (D) = Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
(S) = Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.

NOTE: The company R\&D in this table is the industrial R\&D performed within company facilities funded from all sources except the Federal Government. The funds predominantly are the company's own, but also include funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments. Excluded from this table are company-funded R\&D not performed within the company (e.g., R\&D contracted out to other organizations) and company-funded R\&D not performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D not performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-28. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of R\&D-performing companies in the U.S., by industry and size of company, for the U.S. and top 10 R\&D-performing states: 2000


See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table

Table A-28. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of R\&D-performing companies in the U.S., by industry and size of company, for the U.S. and top 10 R\&D-performing states: 2000


See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-28. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of R\&D-performing companies in the U.S., by industry and size of company, for the U.S. and top 10 R\&D-performing states: 2000


See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-28. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S. and number of R\&D-performing companies in the U.S., by industry and size of company, for the U.S. and top 10 R\&D-performing states: 2000

${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals
For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.
KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
(--) = Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-29. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry and size of company, by type of cost: 2000


See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-29. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry and size of company, by type of cost: 2000


[^38]Table A-29. Total (Federal plus company and other) funds for industrial R\&D performance in the U.S., by industry and size of company, by type of cost: 2000

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 of 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | Total R\&D costs |  |  |  |  | R\&D depreciation |  | costs |
|  |  | [In millions of dollars] |  |  |  | [Perc |  |  |  |
| Distribution by size of company: [Number of employees] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | (na) | 199,539 | (S) | 42.2 | (S) | 14.1 | 2.0 | (S) | 41.7 |
| 5 to $24 .$. | (na) | 6,862 | (S) |  | (S) | 6.7 | (D) |  | (D) |
| 25 to 49. | (na) | 5,008 | (S) | 44.4 | (S) | 11.1 | 1.9 |  | 42.6 |
| 50 to 99. | (na) | 7,259 |  | 41.0 |  | 13.7 | 3.3 |  | 42.1 |
| 100 to 249 . | (na) | 9,020 | (S) | 45.1 |  | 13.1 | 3.6 |  | 38.2 |
| 250 to 499. | (na) | 7,479 |  | 47.7 | (S) | 11.8 | 3.0 |  | 37.5 |
| 500 to 999 | (na) | 9,074 |  | 49.8 |  | 12.8 | 3.2 |  | 34.2 |
| 1,000 to 4,999... | (na) | 30,636 |  | 49.3 |  | 10.5 | 3.5 |  | 36.7 |
| 5,000 to 9,999.... | (na) | 16,768 |  | 45.9 |  | 15.4 | 1.7 | (S) | 37.0 |
| 10,000 to 24,999. | (na) | 28,653 | (S) | 40.9 | (S) | 10.6 | 1.6 | (S) | 46.9 |
| 25,000 or more. | (na) | 78,779 | (S) | 38.9 | (S) | 16.3 | 1.4 | (S) | 43.3 |

${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: (D) = Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(-)=$ Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-30. Domestic employment of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry, by size of company: 2000
Page 1 of 3


[^39]Table A-30. Domestic employment of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry, by size of company: 2000
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See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-30. Domestic employment of companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry, by size of company: 2000
Page 3 of 3

| Industry | NAICS codes | Total | Size of company [number of employees] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \text { to } \\ 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \text { to } \\ 49 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \text { to } \\ 99 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \text { to } \\ 249 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 250 \text { to } \\ 499 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 500 \text { to } \\ 999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 1,000 to } \\ 4,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5,000 \text { to } \\ 9,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10,000 \text { to } \\ 24,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25,000 \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | [In thousands] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: | 51 (minus 511, 513) | 193 | 1 | 0 | 1 | (D) | 26 | 5 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Other information............................... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate............... | 52,53 | 829 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 9 | (D) | 3 | 108 | (D) | 75 | 588 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services. | 54 | 724 | 17 | 36 | 50 | 85 | 59 | 51 | 158 | 102 | 64 | 103 |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services $\qquad$ | 5413 | 164 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 45 | 24 | 51 | 0 |
| Computer systems design and related services $\qquad$ | 5415 | 267 | 3 | 18 | 25 | 30 | (D) | 18 | 77 | 27 | (D) | (D) |
| Scientific R\&D services..... | 54 (minus 5413, 5415, | 155 | 5 | 8 | 14 | 30 | (D) | 11 | 15 | 19 | 0 | (D) |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services. |  | 138 | 5 |  |  | 18 | (D) | 14 |  | 32 |  | (D) |
|  | 5417) |  |  | 3 | 3 | 18 | (D) | 14 | 20 |  | (D) |  |
| Management of companies and enterprises..... | 55 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | (D) | 0 | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Health care services....................... | 621-23 | 147 | (D) | (D) | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 66 | (D) | 0 | (D) |
| Other nonmanufacturing ........................... | 56, 61, 624, 71, 72, 81 | 706 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 18 | 66 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 210 | 372 |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{1}$............ | Fewer than 15 employees | $68$ | (D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. Note that because companies were assigned to the "small company" partition of the sample based on preliminary information available from the sampling frame and the number of employees may have been revised during statistical processing, some companies' statistics are reported in size categories above the 50 employee threshold for manufacturing companies and the 15 employee threshold for nonmanufacturing companies. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: $\quad \begin{aligned} & (\mathrm{D}) \\ & =\text { Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies. } \\ (\mathrm{S}) & =\text { Indicates imputation of more than } 50 \text { percent. } \\ (--) & =\text { Indicates data not collected. }\end{aligned}$
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-31. R\&D funds per employee spent by companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by size of company: 1997-2000


[^40]NOTE: Averages were derived by dividing total and company R\&D funds spent during a calendar year by total employment in March of that year.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-32. Distribution of total employment in companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., ranked by size of R\&D program: 1989-2000

| Companies ranked by size of R\&D program | $1989{ }^{1}$ | $1990{ }^{1}$ | $1991{ }^{1,2}$ | $1992{ }^{2}$ | $1993{ }^{2}$ | $1994{ }^{2}$ | $1995{ }^{2}$ | $1996{ }^{2}$ | $1997{ }^{2}$ | $1998{ }^{2}$ | $1999^{2,3}$ | $2000{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | [Percent] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 100 | 1007355981152 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| First 4 (1-4).... |  |  | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| Next 4 (5-8)......... |  |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Next 12 (9-20)...... |  |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Next 20 (21-40)....... |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Next 60 (41-100)........ |  |  | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 8 |
| Next 100 (101-200).... |  |  | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 7 |
| Next 200 (201-400).... |  |  | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 17 | 11 | 14 | 13 |
| All others...... |  |  | 52 | 47 | 55 | 59 | 61 | 59 | 34 | 60 | 58 | 57 |

${ }^{1}$ As a result of a new sample design, statistics for 1989-91 have been revised since originally published. These statistics now better reflect R\&D performance among firms in the nonmanufacturing industries and small firms in all industries. For more information, see the technical notes in Section B.
${ }^{2}$ As a result of the new sample design, statistics for 1991 and later years are not directly comparable with statistics for 1990 and earlier years For more information, see the technical notes in Section B.
${ }^{3}$ Percentages for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-33. Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) R\&D scientists and engineers in companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, by source of R\&D funds: January 2001


See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-33. Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) R\&D scientists and engineers in companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, by source of R\&D funds: January 2001

| Industry and size of company |  | Page 2 of 3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAICS codes | Total | Federal | Company |
|  |  |  | [In thousands] |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |
| Nonmanufacturing. | 21-23, 42, 44-81 | 432.5 | (S) 34.0 | 398.5 |
| Mining, extraction, and support activities..................... | 21 | 5.2 | (D) | (D) |
| Utilities. | 22 | 0.6 | (D) | (D) |
| Construction. | 23 | 0.5 | (D) | (D) |
| Trade. | 42, 44, 45 | 99.1 | (D) | (D) |
| Transportation and warehousing... | 48, 49 | 1.9 | (D) | (D) |
| Information. | 51 | 117.2 | (D) | (D) |
| Publishing... | 511 | 86.8 | (D) | (D) |
| Newspaper, periodical, book, and database...... | 5111 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 3.6 |
| Software.............................................. | 5112 | 83.2 | (D) | (D) |
| Broadcasting and telecommunications.................... | 513 | 12.0 | (D) | (D) |
| Radio and television broadcasting. | 5131 | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Telecommunications... | 5133 | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Other broadcasting and telecommunications.......... | 513 (minus 5131, 5133) | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Other information.. | 51 (minus 511, 513) | 18.4 | (D) | (D) |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate............. | 52, 53 | 20.5 | 0.0 | (S) 20.5 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services........ | 54 | 145.6 | (S) $\quad 19.1$ | (S) 126.5 |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services....... | 5413 | (S) 34.0 | (D) | (D) |
| Computer systems design and related services........ | 5415 | 46.4 | 0.7 | (S) 45.7 |
| Scientific R\&D services... | 5417 | 56.8 | (S) $\quad 12.4$ | 44.4 |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services... | 54 (minus 5413, 5415, 5417) | 8.4 | (D) | (D) |
| Management of companies and enterprises................. | 55 | 0.3 | (D) | (D) |
| Health care services... | 621-23 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| Other nonmanufacturing | 56, 61, 624, 71, 72, 81 | 5.8 | (D) | (D) |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{1}$. | Fewer than 15 employees | 32.8 | (D) | (D) |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-33. Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) R\&D scientists and engineers in companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company, by source of R\&D funds: January 2001


${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(-)=$ Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
NOTE: The company R\&D in this table is the industrial $R \& D$ performed within company facilities funded from all sources except the Federal Government. The funds predominantly are the company's own, but also include funds from outside organizations such as other companies, research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and State governments. Excluded from this table are company-funded R\&D not performed within the company (e.g., R\&D contracted out to other organizations) and company-funded R\&D not performed in the U.S. (e.g., R\&D not performed on U.S. soil by foreign subsidiaries or other foreign organizations).

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-34. R\&D funds per full-time equivalent (FTE) R\&D scientist or engineer spent by companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry,

## by size of company: 2000



[^41]Table A-34. R\&D funds per full-time equivalent (FTE) R\&D scientist or engineer spent by companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry,

## by size of company: 2000



See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-34. R\&D funds per full-time equivalent (FTE) R\&D scientist or engineer spent by companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry,

## by size of company: 2000



[^42]Table A-34. R\&D funds per full-time equivalent (FTE) R\&D scientist or engineer spent by companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry,

## by size of company: 2000

Page 4 of 4

| Industry | NAICS code(s) | Total | Size of company [number of employees] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 5 \text { to } \\ 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \text { to } \\ 49 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \text { to } \\ 99 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \text { to } \\ 249 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 250 \text { to } \\ 499 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 500 \text { to } \\ 999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1,000 \text { to } \\ 4,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 5,000 to } \\ 9,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10,000 \text { to } \\ 24,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25,000 \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | [Dollars] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Computer systems design and related services. | 5415 | 124,254 | 64,061 | 127,125 | 104,338 | 149,100 | 171,218 | 128,949 | 134,555 | (S) 44,882 | 0 | (D) |
| Scientific R\&D services.. | 5417 | 246,174 | 242,879 | 244,104 | 203,499 | 289,857 | 271,989 | 188,935 | 210,645 | (D) | 0 | (D) |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services. | $\begin{array}{r} 54 \text { (minus } 5413, \\ 5415,5417) \end{array}$ | 149,203 | 155,796 | $190,438$ | 7,801 | (S) 393,838 | (D) | (D) | $104,801$ | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Management of companies and enterprises. $\qquad$ | 55 | 132,984 | 227,714 | (S) 73,864 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) | 0 | $0$ | 0 | 0 |
| Health care services.... | 621-23 | 156,338 | 114,160 | (S) 79,416 | (S) 364,523 | 283,783 | 179,418 | 0 | 565,606 | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Other nonmanufacturing ........ | 56, 61, 624, 71, 72, 81 | 125,219 | 195,491 | (S) 243,615 | 6,518 | 594 | 212,912 | (D) | 56,056 | 0 | (S) 95,433 | (D) |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{1}$ | Fewer than 15 employees | 122,152 | 135,021 | $0$ | $0$ | $0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0$ | $0$ | 0 |

${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. Note that because companies were assigned to the "small company" partition of the sample based on preliminary information available from the sampling frame and the number of employees may have been revised during statistical processing, some companies' statistics are reported in size categories above the 50 employee threshold for manufacturing companies and the 15 employee threshold for nonmanufacturing companies. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: (D) = Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(--)=$ Indicates data not collected.
NOTE: The number of full-time-equivalent R\&D scientists and engineers used to estimate the cost per R\&D scientist or engineer is the arithmetic mean of the numbers of R\&D scientists and engineers reported for January in two consecutive years. This number is then divided into the total R\&D expenditures of the earlier year, and the ratio is attributed to the earlier year.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-35. R\&D funds per full-time equivalent (FTE) R\&D scientist or engineer spent by companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., ranked by size of R\&D program: 1989-2000

| Companies ranked by size of R\&D program | $1989{ }^{1}$ | $1990{ }^{1}$ | $1991{ }^{\text {1,2 }}$ | $1992{ }^{2}$ | $1993{ }^{2}$ | $1994{ }^{2}$ | $1995{ }^{2}$ | $1996{ }^{2}$ | $1997{ }^{2}$ | $1998{ }^{2}$ | $1999{ }^{2,3}$ | $200{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | [Dollars] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First 4. | 218,100 | 219,600 | 213,200 | 202,492 | 252,629 | 218,906 | 234,791 | 231,784 | (S) 229,602 | 242,408 | (S) 289,072 | (S) 283,219 |
| Next 4. | 225,800 | 249,000 | 223,700 | 238,950 | 199,559 | (S) 245,626 | (S) 188,928 | (S) 185,032 | 180,389 | 193,597 | 192,657 | 199,586 |
| Next 12. | 148,700 | 129,100 | 159,900 | 170,276 | 199,118 | 188,437 | 190,548 | 202,670 | (S) 238,022 | 239,162 | (S) 266,117 | (S) 265,044 |
| Next 20.. | 132,500 | 145,800 |  |  | (S) | 182,699 | 204,159 | 210,552 | 213,496 | 196,276 | (S) 208,682 | (S) 251,340 |
| Next 60. | 145,400 | 164,200 | 170,500 | 181,760 | 193,925 | 181,163 | 196,023 | 202,405 | 206,350 | 208,144 | 203,559 | 224,965 |
| Next 100.. | 141,900 | 137,000 | 169,000 | 173,101 | 138,227 | 174,524 | 162,707 | 160,560 | 155,255 | 162,965 | 162,654 | 176,239 |
| Next 200.. | 106,100 | 120,200 | 121,000 | 126,545 | 140,292 | 156,025 | 152,977 | 151,812 | 157,347 | 154,395 | 161,664 | 238,522 |
| Average of above 400 R\&D performing companies....... | 161,500 | 161,200 | 169,000 | 158,098 | 154,814 | 174,536 | 167,339 | 168,362 | 171,495 | 173,585 | 179,880 | 232,405 |

${ }^{1}$ As a result of a new sample design, statistics for 1989-91 have been revised since originally published. These statistics now better reflect R\&D performance among firms in the nonmanufacturing industries and small firms in all industries. For more information, see the technical notes in Section B.
${ }^{2}$ As a result of the new sample design, statistics for 1991 and later years are not directly comparable with statistics for 1990 and earlier years. For more information, see the technical notes in Section B .
${ }^{3}$ Statistics for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
KEY: $\quad(S)=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent. Prior to 1994, data have been withheld.
NOTE: The number of full-time-equivalent $R \& D$ scientists and engineers used to estimate the cost per $R \& D$ scientist or engineer is the arithmetic mean of the numbers of $R \& D$ scientists and engineers reported for January in two consecutive years. This number is then divided into the total $R \& D$ expenditures of the earlier year, and the ratio is attributed to the earlier year.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

Table A-36. Full-time equivalent (FTE) R\&D scientists and engineers per 1,000 employees in companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000


See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table A-36. Full-time equivalent (FTE) R\&D scientists and engineers per 1,000 employees in companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000


[^43]Table A-36. Full-time equivalent (FTE) R\&D scientists and engineers per 1,000 employees in companies that performed industrial R\&D in the U.S., by industry and size of company: 1997-2000

${ }^{1}$ Some statistics for 1999 have been revised since originally published.
${ }^{2}$ The totals for "all industries" prior to 1999 are identical to corresponding totals previously published using the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. Also, pre-1999 detail published using the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) may not add to the totals. See the 'NOTE' below.
${ }^{3}$ Manufacturing companies in the 1997 and 1998 samples that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other manufacturing;" nonmanufacturing companies that could not be classified with a NAICS code are included in "other nonmanufacturing."
${ }^{4}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

KEY: (D) = Data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
(S) = Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
(--) = Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
NOTES: Starting with the 1999 survey, estimates are based on the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). In prior years, estimates were based on the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. For this table, companies in the 1997 and 1998 surveys were assigned NAICS industry codes based on their SIC industry codes. Consequently, the estimates for 1997 and 1998 in this table are not necessarily representative of the NAICS categories of industries in those years. They are included for comparison purposes only.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000
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## Survey Methodology

Much of the information for this section was provided by the Manufacturing and Construction Division of the U.S. Bureau of the Census, which collected and compiled the survey data for NSF. ${ }^{20}$

## Reporting Unit

The reporting unit for the Survey of Industrial Research and Development is the company, ${ }^{21}$ defined as a business organization of one or more establishments under common ownership or control. The survey includes two groups of enterprises: (1) companies known to conduct $R \& D$, and (2) a sample representation of companies for which information on the extent of R\&D activity is uncertain.

## Frame Creation

The Standard Statistical Establishment List (SSEL), a Bureau of the Census compilation that contains information on more than 3 million establishments with paid employees, was the target population from which the frame used to select the 2000 survey sample was created (see table B-1 for population and sample sizes). For companies with more than one establishment, data were summed to the company level and the resulting company record was used to select the sample and to process and tabulate the survey data.

After data were summed to the company level, each company then was assigned a single North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) ${ }^{22}$ code based on payroll. The method used followed the hierarchical structure of the NAICS. The company was first assigned to the economic sector, defined by a 2 -digit NAICS code representing manufacturing, mining, trade, etc., that accounted for the highest percentage of its aggregated

[^44]payroll. Then the company was assigned to a subsector, defined by a 3-digit NAICS code, that accounted for the highest percentage of its payroll within the economic sector. Finally, the company was assigned a 4-digit NAICS code within the subsector, again based on the highest percentage of its aggregated payroll. Assignment below the 4-digit level was not done because of the concentration of R\&D in relatively few industries and disclosure concerns. ${ }^{23}$

The frame from which the survey sample was drawn included all for-profit companies classified in nonfarm industries. For surveys prior to 1992 , the frame was limited to companies above certain size criteria based on number of employees. ${ }^{24}$ These criteria varied by industry. Some industries were excluded from the frame because it was believed that they contributed little or no R\&D activity to the final survey estimates. For the 1992 sample, new industries were added to the frame, ${ }^{25}$ and the size criteria were lowered considerably and applied uniformly to firms in all industries. As a result, nearly 2 million enterprises with 5 or more employees were given a chance of selection for subsequent samples, including the 2000 sample. For comparison, the frame for the 1987 sample included 154,000 companies of specified sizes and industries.

## Defining Sampling Strata

A fundamental change initiated in 1995 and repeated for subsequent samples was the redefinition of the sampling strata. For the survey years 1992-94, 165 sampling strata were established, each stratum corresponding to one or more 3-digit-level SIC codes. The objective was to select sufficient representation of industries to determine whether alternative or expanded publication levels were warranted. For the 1995-98 surveys, the sampling strata corresponded to publication level industry aggregations. For each year, 40 publication levels were defined. These corresponded to the original 25 groupings of manufacturing industries used as sampling strata before 1992 and an additional 15 groupings of nonmanufacturing industries. For the 1999 and 2000 surveys, with the conversion to NAICS, 29 manufacturing and

[^45]Table B-1. Survey of Industrial Research and Development—number of companies in the target population and selected for the sample, by industry and size of company: 2000
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| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | Companies in target population | Companies selected for the sample |  |  | Companies with reported or imputed R\&D expenditures ${ }^{3}$ |  | Companies that reported no R\&D expenditures ${ }^{4}$ | Other companies ${ }^{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Noncertainties ${ }^{1}$ | Certainties ${ }^{2}$ | Greater than or equal to $\$ 5$ million | Less than $\$ 5$ million |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All industries.. | 21-23, 31-33, 42, 44-81 | 1,912,456 | 25,002 | 21,975 | 3,027 | 1,888 | 1,695 | 17,741 | 3,678 |
| Manufacturing. | 31-33 | 177,312 | 4,825 | 3,395 | 1,430 | 970 | 1,010 | 2,173 | 673 |
| Food. | 311 | 2,502 | 131 | 76 | 55 | 34 | 42 | 42 | 13 |
| Beverage and tobacco products... | 312 | 278 | 11 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| Textiles, apparel, and leather........ | 313-16 | 3,105 | 244 | 187 | 57 | 11 | 66 | 115 | 52 |
| Wood products..... | 321 | 1,763 | 111 | 79 | 32 | 3 | 20 | 72 | 16 |
| Paper, printing and support activities... | 322, 323 | 3,455 | 106 | 76 | 30 | 27 | 10 | 58 | 11 |
| Petroleum and coal products............ | 324 | 147 | 16 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| Chemicals.............. | 325 | 1,380 | 218 | 76 | 142 | 139 | 40 | 16 | 23 |
| Basic chemicals........................ | 3251 | 221 | 62 | 15 | 47 | 46 | 12 | 2 | 2 |
| Resin, synthetic rubber, fibers, and filament. | 3252 | 102 | 16 | 2 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Pharmaceuticals and medicines.. | 3254 | 294 | 51 | 8 | 43 | 41 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Other chemicals.. | 325 (minus 3251-52, 3254) | 763 | 89 | 51 | 38 | 38 | 23 | 12 | 16 |
| Plastics and rubber products.. | 326 | 2,773 | 328 | 223 | 105 | 47 | 118 | 103 | 60 |
| Nonmetallic mineral products. | 327 | 1,263 | 131 | 89 | 42 | 17 | 37 | 61 | 16 |
| Primary metals... | 331 | 1,088 | 104 | 61 | 43 | 21 | 36 | 36 | 11 |
| Fabricated metal products... | 332 | 5,627 | 337 | 249 | 88 | 37 | 128 | 137 | 35 |
| Machinery. | 333 | 3,561 | 262 | 147 | 115 | 114 | 63 | 56 | 29 |
| Computer and electronic products.............. | 334 | 2,613 | 530 | 183 | 347 | 300 | 85 | 84 | 61 |
| Computers and peripheral equipment...... | 3341 | 230 | 70 | 33 | 37 | 43 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Communications equipment................. | 3342 | 411 | 79 | 21 | 58 | 60 | 7 | 5 | 7 |
| Semiconductor and other electronic components. | 3344 | 1,126 | 114 | 24 | 90 | 85 | 12 | 9 | 8 |
| Navigational, measuring, electromedical, and control instruments. | 3345 | 691 | 160 | 64 | 96 | 100 | 33 | 13 | 14 |

[^46]Table B-1. Survey of Industrial Research and Development—number of companies in the target population and selected for the sample, by industry and size of company: 2000

| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | Companies in target population | Companies selected for the sample |  |  | Companies with reported or imputed R\&D expenditures ${ }^{3}$ |  | Companies that reported no R\&D expenditures ${ }^{4}$ | Other companies ${ }^{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Noncertainties ${ }^{1}$ | Certainties ${ }^{2}$ | Greater than or equal to \$5 million | Less than $\$ 5$ million |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other computer and electronic products..... | $\begin{array}{r} 334 \text { (minus 3341-42, } \\ 3344-45) \end{array}$ | 155 | 107 | 41 | 66 | 12 | 24 | 48 | 23 |
| Electrical equipment, appliances, and components. | 335 | 984 | 110 | 58 | 52 | 51 | 29 | 18 | 12 |
| Transportation equipment. | 336 | 2,026 | 219 | 125 | 94 | 85 | 52 | 61 | 21 |
| Motor vehicles, trailers, and parts.. | 3361-63 | 1,387 | 137 | 82 | 55 | 50 | 36 | 38 | 13 |
| Aerospace products and parts... | 3364 | 262 | 24 | 5 | 19 | 19 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Other transportation equipment.... | 336 (minus 3361-64) | 377 | 58 | 38 | 20 | 16 | 15 | 19 | 8 |
| Furniture and related products... | 337 | 1,582 | 180 | 118 | 62 | 10 | 60 | 98 | 12 |
| Miscellaneous manufacturing..... | 339 | 1,982 | 343 | 216 | 127 | 61 | 128 | 103 | 51 |
| Medical equipment and supplies..... | 3391 | 591 | 151 | 93 | 58 | 46 | 55 | 28 | 22 |
| Other miscellaneous manufacturing......... | 339 (minus 3391) | 1,391 | 192 | 123 | 69 | 15 | 73 | 75 | 29 |
| Other manufacturing.............................. | 31-33 (minus 311-16, | 98 | 30 | 7 | 23 | -- | -- | 11 | -- |
| Small manufacturing companies ${ }^{6}$............... | Fewer than 50 employees | 141,085 | 1,414 | 1,411 | 3 | 1 | 90 | 1,094 | 229 |
| Nonmanufacturing.................................... | 21-23, 42, 44-81 | 1,726,417 | 20,088 | 18,492 | 1,596 | 918 | 685 | 15,568 | 2,916 |
| Mining, extraction, and support activities........ | 21 | 2,922 | 186 | 124 | 62 | 14 | 20 | 128 | 24 |
| Utilities....... | 22 | 554 | 66 | 30 | 36 | 9 | 26 | 23 | 8 |
| Construction.. | 23 | 78,882 | 2,056 | 1,895 | 161 | 6 | 15 | 1,777 | 258 |
| Trade.. | 42, 44, 45 | 146,524 | 3,041 | 2,946 | 95 | 94 | 54 | 2,515 | 378 |
| Transportation and warehousing................ | 48,49 | 21,842 | 552 | 506 | 46 | 5 | 14 | 447 | 86 |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table B-1. Survey of Industrial Research and Development—number of companies in the target population and selected for the sample, by industry and size of company: 2000

| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes |  | Companies selected for the sample |  |  | Companies with reported or imputed R\&D expenditures ${ }^{3}$ |  | Companies that reported no R\&D expenditures ${ }^{4}$ | Other companies ${ }^{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Noncertainties ${ }^{1}$ | Certainties ${ }^{2}$ | Greater than or equal to $\$ 5$ million | Less than <br> $\$ 5$ million |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Information.. | 51 | 12,381 | 746 | 495 | 251 | 192 | 66 | 360 | 128 |
| Publishing.. | 511 | 5,219 | 450 | 264 | 186 | 156 | 50 | 179 | 65 |
| Newspaper, periodical, book, and database. | 5111 | 3,228 | 177 | 147 | 30 | 5 | 8 | 145 | 19 |
| Software. | 5112 | 1,991 | 273 | 117 | 156 | 151 | 42 | 34 | 46 |
| Broadcasting and telecommunications..... | 513 | 3,516 | 130 | 98 | 32 | 12 | 3 | 88 | 27 |
| Radio and television broadcasting....... | 5131 | 1,628 | 34 | 33 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 4 |
| Telecommunications.... | 5133 | 1,577 | 73 | 51 | 22 | 10 | 3 | 43 | 17 |
| Other broadcasting and telecommunications....... | 513 (minus 5131, 5133) | 311 | 23 | 14 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 6 |
| Other information.......... | 51 (minus 511, 513) | 3,646 | 166 | 133 | 33 | 24 | 13 | 93 | 36 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate. | 52,53 | 38,687 | 872 | 819 | 53 | 33 | 15 | 727 | 97 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services. $\qquad$ | 54 | 52,950 | 3,072 | 2,330 | 742 | 534 | 376 | 1,730 | 432 |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services. | 5413 | 11,764 | 926 | 737 | 189 | 69 | 90 | 663 | 104 |
| Computer systems design and related services. | 5415 | 7,231 | 846 | 608 | 238 | 167 | 164 | 328 | 187 |
| Scientific R\&D services.. | 5417 | 1,472 | 476 | 213 | 263 | 287 | 97 | 45 | 47 |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services. | 54 (minus 5413, 5415, 5417) | 32,483 | 824 | 772 | 52 | 11 | 25 | 694 | 94 |
| Management of companies and enterprises.. | 55 | 657 | 167 | 116 | 51 | 2 | 11 | 122 | 32 |
| Health care services.......................... | 621-23 | 44,579 | 1,026 | 972 | 54 | 7 | 25 | 877 | 117 |
| Other nonmanufacturing . | 56, 61, 624, 71, 72, 81 | 195,628 | 2,724 | 2,684 | 40 | 17 | 23 | 2,182 | 502 |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{6}$........... | Fewer than 15 employees | 1,130,811 | 5,580 | 5,575 | 5 | 5 | 40 | 4,682 | 853 |
| Unclassified ${ }^{7}$. |  | 8,727 | 89 | 88 | 1 | -- | - | $-$ | -- |

[^47]Table B-1. Survey of Industrial Research and Development—number of companies in the target population and selected for the sample, by industry and size of company: 2000
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| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | Companies in target population | Companies selected for the sample |  |  | Companies with reported or imputed R\&D expenditures ${ }^{3}$ |  | Companies that reported no R\&D expenditures ${ }^{4}$ | Other companies ${ }^{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Noncertainties ${ }^{1}$ | Certainties ${ }^{2}$ | Greater than or equal to $\$ 5$ million | Less than \$5 million |  |  |
| Distribution by size of company: <br> [Number of employees] | (na)(na)(na)(na)(na)(na)(na)(na)(na)(na)(na) | 1,912,456 | 25,002 | 21,975 | 3,027 | 1,888 | 1,695 | 17,741 | 3,678 |
| Total.. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 to 24. |  | 1,507,221 | 11,547 | 11,522 | 25 | 13 | 220 | -- | -- |
| 25 to 49. |  | 220,303 | 3,992 | 3,927 | 65 | 46 | 168 | -- | -- |
| 50 to 99. |  | 103,055 | 2,683 | 2,500 | 183 | 134 | 224 | -- | -- |
| 100 to 249. |  | 53,624 | 2,272 | 1,923 | 349 | 281 | 285 | -- | -- |
| 250 to 499. |  | 14,620 | 1,251 | 874 | 377 | 240 | 227 | -- | -- |
| 500 to 999. |  | 6,659 | 986 | 582 | 404 | 222 | 219 | -- | -- |
| 1,000 to 4,999. |  | 5,374 | 1,439 | 502 | 937 | 525 | 275 | -- | -- |
| 5,000 to 9,999... |  | 752 | 356 | 58 | 298 | 189 | 44 | -- | -- |
| 10,000 to 24,999.. |  | 555 | 296 | 49 | 247 | 130 | 27 | -- | -- |
| 25,000 or more.. |  | 293 | 180 | 38 | 142 | 108 | 6 | $-$ | -- |

${ }^{1}$ Noncertainties are companies whose probability of selection is less than one. For more information, see "identifying certainty companies" in the technical notes in this section.
${ }^{2}$ Certainties are companies whose probability of selection is one. This includes companies whose 1999 R\&D expenditures were equal to or greater than $\$ 5$ million as well as others included in the sample for analytical purposes ("analytical certainties"). For more information, see "identifying certainty companies" in the technical notes in this section.
${ }^{3}$ For information about imputed R\&D, see "Probability Proportionate to Size" in the technical notes in this section.
${ }^{4}$ Includes companies that responded to the survey but did not indicate any information about R\&D performance.
${ }^{5}$ Includes companies that that did not respond to the survey or reported that they were out-of-scope, out-of-business, or had merged with another company (which may or may not have been selected for the survey, and/or may not be in the same industry).
${ }^{6}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely atributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in this section.
${ }^{7}$ Companies that were missing or had an incomplete North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) code at the time of sampling were assigned to an "unclassified" industry category temporarily. If an "unclassified" company reported R\&D expenditures, its primary industrial activity was investigated and a NAICS code was assigned during statistical processing.

## Table B-1. Survey of Industrial Research and Development—number of companies in the target population and selected for the sample, by industry and size of company: $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$

NOTES: The last four columns in this table account for all of the categories of companies selected for the sample. Companies that responded to the survey are distributed among three categories, those that reported or had imputed $R \& D$ greater than or equal to $\$ 5$ million, those that reported or had imputed R\&D less than $\$ 5$ million, and those that had no reported or imputed R\&D. Companies that did not respond to the survey, were found to be out-of-scope, out-of-business, or had merged with another company, are included in the last column. Consequently, the sum of the counts in the last four columns equals the counts for total number of "companies selected for the sample."

The total number of "companies selected for the sample" is larger than the "number of companies that received a questionnaire" in Table B-4 because some companies selected for the survey went out of business or were merged with other companies during the time between sample selection and survey mail-out, that is, the sample frame was updated before actual mail-out took place. For more information, see "frame creation" in the technical notes in this section.

KEY: $\quad(-)=$ Indicates data not collected.
(na) = Not applicable.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

20 nonmanufacturing strata were defined corresponding to the 4-digit industries and groups of industries for which statistics were developed and published.

## Identifying Certainty Companies

Since industrial R\&D is performed by relatively few companies and the national estimate is dependent primarily on large R\&D performers concentrated in a small number of industries, it is important to capture and retain large performers for the sample. For this reason some companies are selected with certainty. Since 1996 the criteria for such selection has been total R\&D expenditures of $\$ 5$ million or more based on data gathered from the prior year's survey (arbitrary certainty) or on predetermined sampling error constraints relating to individual industry estimates (analytical certainty). ${ }^{26}$

## Frame Partitioning

Partitioning of the frame for noncertainty companies into large and small companies was first introduced in 1994 because of concern arising from a study of 1992 survey results which showed that a disproportionate number of small companies was being selected for the sample, and often assigned very large weights. These small companies seldom reported $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ activity. This disproportion was a result of the minimum probability rule (see "Sample Size" below) used as part of the independent probability proportionate to size (pps) sampling procedure employed exclusively prior to 1994 ( pps is discussed in detail later under "Sample Selection"). This rule increased the probabilities of selection for several hundred thousand smaller companies. For the 1994 and subsequent surveys, simple random sampling (srs) was applied to the small company partition causing the smaller companies to be sampled

[^48]more efficiently than with independent pps sampling since there was little variability in their size (srs also is discussed in detail later under "Sample Selection"). The large company partition continued to be sampled using independent pps sampling.

For the 1994 and 1995 surveys, total company payroll was the basis for partitioning the noncertainty frame. For each industry grouping, the largest companies representing the top 90 percent of the total payroll for the industry grouping were included in the pps frame. The balance, the smaller companies comprising the remaining 10 percent of payroll for the industry grouping, were included in the srs frame.

Beginning with the 1996 survey, total company employment became the basis for partitioning the frame. The total company employment levels defining the partitions were based on the relative contribution to total R\&D expenditures of companies in different employment size groups in both the manufacturing and nonmanufacturing sectors. In the manufacturing sector, all companies with total employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, all companies with total employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values were included in the small company partition. In the 2000 survey, the large company partition contained almost 632,000 companies and the small company partition contained approximately 1.3 million companies. ${ }^{27}$

## Identifying "Zero" Industries

One final modification in the frame development for 1996, which was repeated for the 1997 and 1998 surveys, was the designation of "zero" industries in the large company partition. Zero industries were those three-digit SIC industries having no R\&D expenditures reported in survey years 1992-94-the years when estimates by three-digit SIC industry were formed. These industries remained within the scope of the survey, but only a limited sample was drawn from them because it was unlikely that these industries conducted R\&D. Simple random sampling was used to control the number of companies selected from these industries. For the 1999 and 2000 surveys, no zero industries were defined because of the

[^49]conversion to NAICS. For the next several cycles of the survey, NAICS industries will be evaluated to ascertain if any of them should be designated "zero" industries.

## Sample Selection

Beginning with the 1996 cycle of the survey and repeated for subsequent surveys, a significant revision in the procedure for selecting samples from the partitions led to a change in the development and presentation of estimates. For the 1995 survey, the sample of companies from the large company partition was selected using probability proportionate to size sampling (discussed in detail below) in each of the 40 strata (discussed previously under "Defining Sampling Strata"). Likewise, the simple random sampling of the small company partition was done for each of the 40 strata. However, beginning in 1996, the number of strata established for the small company partition was reduced to two. One stratum consisted of small companies classified in manufacturing industries and the second stratum consisted of small companies classified in nonmanufacturing industries. Simple random sampling continued as the selection method for these two strata.

The purpose of selecting the small company panel from these two strata was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes occurred. As a consequence of this change, estimates for industry groups within manufacturing and nonmanufacturing were not possible from these two strata as noted on affected tables. The statistics for the detailed industry groups were based only on the sample from the large company partition. Estimates from the small company partition were included in statistics for total manufacturing, total non-manufacturing, and all industries. For completeness, in the affected tables for 1996-98 the estimates also were added to the categories "other manufacturing" and "other nonmanufacturing." For 1999 and 2000, the estimates were published separately in the "small manufacturing companies" and "small nonmanufacturing companies" categories.

## Probability Proportionate to Size

Imputing R\&D. Except for the companies that were in a previous survey or for which there is information from external sources, it is impossible to know the R\&D expenditures for every firm in the universe because $R \& D$
information is not available from the Standard Statistical Establishment List (SSEL). Consequently, the probability of selection for most companies is based on estimated R\&D expenditures. Since total payroll is known for each company in the universe (payroll information is available from the SSEL), it is possible to estimate R\&D from payroll using relationships derived from previous survey data. Imputation factors relating these two variables are derived for each industry grouping. To impute R\&D for a given company, the imputation factors are applied to the company payroll in each industry grouping. A final measure is obtained by adding the industry grouping components. The effect, in general, is to give firms with large payrolls higher probabilities of selection in agreement with the assumption that larger companies are more likely to perform R\&D. Estimated R\&D values are computed for companies in the small company partition as well. The aggregate of reported and estimated R\&D from each company in both the large and small company partitions represent a total universe measure of the previous year's R\&D expenditures. However, assigning R\&D to every company results in an overstatement of this measure. To adjust for the overstatement, the universe measure is scaled down using factors developed from the relationship between the frame measure of the prior year's R\&D and the final prior-year survey estimates. These factors, computed at levels corresponding to published industry levels, are used to adjust the originally imputed R\&D values so that the new frame total for $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ at these levels approximates the prior year's published values. This adjustment provides for better allocation of the sample among these levels.

For 2000, the distribution of companies by payroll and estimated R\&D in the large company partition was skewed as in earlier frames (i.e., the correlation of payroll and estimated $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ was high because estimated R\&D had been calculated based on payroll). Because of this skewness, pps sampling remained the appropriate selection technique for this group. ${ }^{28}$ That is, large companies had higher probabilities of selection than did small companies. However, a different approach to pps sampling was introduced beginning with the 1998 survey. Historically, pps sampling had been accomplished using an independent sampling methodology, i.e., the selection (or nonselection) of a given company was independent of the sampling result (select or nonselect) of any other

[^50]company. This implied that over repeated samplings in a given stratum, different size samples would result. This added more variability to the sample estimates. For 1998, a fixed sample size pps method was introduced. This method ensured that the sample size desired for a given stratum was achieved, thus eliminating error because of sample size variation from the sample estimates. For a given sample size, the fixed sample size method produces more precise estimates on average than the independent method. The fixed sample size methodology was repeated for the 1999 and 2000 surveys.

## Simple Random Sampling

As described earlier, only two major strata were defined for samples in the small company partition, manufacturing and nonmanufacturing. The use of srs implied that each company within a stratum had an equal probability of selection with the exception of the pre-assigned arbitrary and analytical certainties (discussed previously). The total sample allocated to the small company partition was dependent upon the total sample specified for the survey and upon the total sample necessary to satisfy criteria established for the large partition. Once determined, the allocation of this total by stratum was made proportionate to the stratum's payroll contribution to the entire partition. For 2000, there was also a third srs stratum that contained 8,727 company records where the NAICS code was unknown at the time the sample was selected. ${ }^{29}$

## Sample Stratification and Relative Standard Error Constraints

The particular sample selected was one of a large number of samples of the same type and size that by chance might have been selected. Statistics resulting from the different samples would differ somewhat from each other. These differences are represented by estimates of sampling error or variance. The smaller the sampling error, the more precise the statistic.

Controlling Sampling Error. Historically, it has been difficult to achieve control over the sampling error of survey estimates. Efforts were confined to controlling the amount of error due to sample size variation, but this

[^51]was only one component of the overall sampling error. The other component depended on the correlation between the data from the sampling frame used to assign probabilities (namely $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ values either imputed or reported in the previous survey) and the actual current year reported data. The nature of $R \& D$ is such that these correlations could not be predicted with any reliability. Consequently, precise controls on overall sampling error were difficult to achieve.

For recent surveys, primary concern was placed on controlling error for the large company partition since nearly all of the R\&D activity was identified from that portion of the sample. Since 1998, with the introduction of the fixed sample size sampling procedure, the component of sampling error due to sample size variation was eliminated. However, the amount of error attributable to the remaining component of the sample remained. Since there was still no way to predict how well the data from the sampling frame would correlate with actual survey data, the approach taken to allocate the sample across the various strata was to assign probabilities in the same manner as in the past when independent sampling was used. The probabilities resulting from this allocation technique determined the sample sizes to be selected from each stratum subject to the overall sample size constraint dictated by the survey budget. Although the actual survey sampling errors could not be predicted, the parameters used to assign probabilities, and the use of the minimum probability rule resulted in a desirable number of companies being sampled from the large company partition (see "Sample Size" below).

## Sampling Strata and Standard Error Estimates.

 A limitation of the sample allocation process for the large company partition should be noted. The constraints used to control the sample size in each stratum were based on a universe total that, in large part, was improvised. That is, as previously noted, an R\&D value was assigned to every company in the frame, even though most of these companies actually may not have had $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ expenditures. The value assigned was imputed for the majority of companies in the frame and, as a consequence, the estimated universe total and the distribution of individual company values, even after scaling, did not necessarily reflect the true distribution. Assignment of sampling probability was nevertheless based on this distribution. The presumption was that actual variation in the sample design would be less than that estimated, because many of the sampled companies have true R\&D values of zero, not the widely varying values that were imputed using total payroll as apredictor of R\&D. Previous sample selections indicate that in general this presumption held, but exceptions have occurred when companies with large sampling weights have reported large amounts of R\&D spending. See table B-2 for a list by industry of the relative standard error estimates for selected items and table B-3 for a list of the relative standard error estimates of total R\&D by state. ${ }^{30}$

Nonsampling Error. In addition to sampling error, estimates are subject to nonsampling error. Errors are grouped in five categories: specification, coverage, response, nonresponse, and processing. For detailed discussions on the sources, control, and measurement of each of these types of error, see U.S. Bureau of the Census (1994b and 1994f).

## SAmple Size

The parameters set to control sampling error discussed above resulted in a sample size of 17,917 companies from the large company partition. For the small company partition, two strata (manufacturing and nonmanufacturing) were identified. Also included was a separate stratum of small companies that could not be classified into a NAICS industry because of incomplete industry identification in the SSEL. In 2000, as in the 1994 through 1999 surveys, a small number of companies was selected from this group in the hope that an accurate industry identification could be obtained at a later point (as discussed above). Ultimately, a final sample of 7,083 companies was selected from the small company and unclassified partitions. Companies in the small manufacturing and unclassified partitions received weights slightly less than $100^{31}$ and their sample size accounted for one one-hundredth of the population in each partition. The sample size of the "small nonmanufacturing companies" category was the difference between the desired total sample size of 25,000 and the sum of the large manufacturing, small manufacturing, large nonmanufacturing, and unclassified partitions. This total included an adjustment to the sample size based on a minimum probability rule and changes in

[^52]the operational status of some companies. With the use of fixed sample size pps sampling for the large company partition and simple random sampling for the small company partition (and with no zero-industry stratum for 2000), the target sample size was met.

Minimum Probability Rule. A minimum probability rule was imposed for both partitions. As noted earlier, for the large partition, probabilities of selection proportionate to size were assigned to each company, where size was the reported or imputed $R \& D$ value assigned to each company. Selected companies received a sample weight which was the inverse of their probability. Selected companies that ultimately report $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ expenditures vastly larger than their assigned values can have adverse effects on the statistics, which were based on the weighted value of survey responses. To lessen the effects on the final statistics, the maximum weight of a company was controlled by specifying a minimum probability that could be assigned to the company. If the probability, based on company size, was less than the minimum probability, then it was reset to this minimum value. The consequence of raising these original probabilities to the minimum probability was to raise the sample size. Similarly, a maximum weight for each stratum was established for the simple random sampling of the small company partition. If the sample size initially allocated to a stratum resulted in a stratum weight above this maximum value, then the sample size was increased until the maximum weight was achieved.

Changes in Operational Status. Between the time that the frame was created and the survey was prepared for mailing, the operational status of some companies changed. That is, they were merged with or acquired by another company, or they were no longer in business. Before preparing the survey for mailing, the operational status was updated to identify these changes. As a result, the number of companies mailed a survey form was somewhat smaller than the number of companies initially selected for the survey.

## Weighting and Maximum Weights

Weights were applied to each company record to produce national estimates. Within the pps partitions of the sample, company records classified in the "other nonmanufacturing companies" category were given weights up to a maximum of 75 ; company records classified in the remaining NAICS categories were given maximum weights of 50 . Within the srs partitions, company records classified in the "small nonmanufacturing
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Table B-2. Survey of Industrial Research and Development-relative standard error for survey estimates, by industry and size of company: $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$

| Industry and size of company | NAICS codes | Number of R\&D-performing companies ${ }^{1}$ | Domestic net sales of R\&D performers | Domestic employment of R\&D performers | Number of <br> FTE <br> scientists <br> and engineers | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { R\&D } \end{aligned}$ | Company and other funds for R\&D | Companyfinanced R\&D performed outside of U.S. | Companyfinanced R\&D contracted to outside organizations | Federal funds for R\&D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | [Percent] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other computer and electronic products. $\qquad$ | 334 (minus 3341-42, 3344-45) | 36 | 7.7 | 4.9 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.6 | (D) | 5.6 | 57.6 |
| Electrical equipment, appliances, and components. | 335 | 80 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 3.5 | (D) | 3.9 | 0.4 | 3.0 | (D) |
| Transportation equipment.. | 336 | 137 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Motor vehicles, trailers, and parts $\qquad$ | $3361-63$ | 86 | 1.1 | 4.2 | 1.2 | (D) | 0.7 | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Aerospace products and parts....... | 3364 | 20 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.6 | (D) | (D) | 0.0 |
| Other transportation equipment..... | $\begin{array}{r} 336 \text { (minus } \\ 3361-64) \end{array}$ | 31 | 3.1 | 3.1 | (S) $\quad 3.3$ | (D) | 4.9 | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Furniture and related products........... | 337 | 70 | 54.8 | 5.5 | (S) 6.3 | 4.2 | 4.2 | (D) | (D) | 0.0 |
| Miscellaneous manufacturing............ | 339 | 189 | 4.9 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 18.1 | 6.8 |
| Medical equipment and supplies... | 3391 | 101 | 5.9 | 3.2 | 4.2 | (D) | 1.8 | (D) | 17.2 | (D) |
| Other miscellaneous manufacturing | 339 (minus | 88 | 8.3 | 6.8 | 8.5 | (D) | 5.2 | (D) | 58.8 | (D) |
|  | 3391) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other manufacturing .................... | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} 31-33 \text { (minus } \\ 311-16,321-27, \\ 331-37,339) \end{array}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | -- | -- | -- |
| Small manufacturing companies ${ }^{2}$. | Fewer than 50 employees | 91 | 43.9 | 60.1 | 18.2 | 28.3 | 29.2 | 0.0 | 49.5 | 76.8 |
| Nonmanufacturing............................ | 21-23, 42, 44-81 | 1,603 | 7.5 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 6.5 | 7.0 | 10.5 | 48.7 | 6.0 |
| Mining, extraction, and support activities. $\qquad$ | 21 | 34 | 3.8 | 2.9 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | (D) | 57.0 |
| Utilities.................................... | 22 | 35 | 10.6 | 13.6 | 10.8 | (D) | 17.8 | 0.0 | 44.5 | (D) |
| Construction............................. | 23 | 21 | 6.3 | 6.8 | 2.1 | (D) | 51.7 | (D) | (D) | (D) |
| Trade..................................... | 42, 44, 45 | 148 | 28.6 | 13.1 | 6.8 | 16.0 | 16.1 | 13.4 | 72.1 | 57.0 |
| Transportation and warehousing........ | 48, 49 | 19 | 12.8 | 3.0 | 44.1 | (D) | 16.7 | 0.0 | 55.5 | (D) |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.
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${ }^{1}$ The counts of R\&D-performing companies in this table are equal to the sum of the counts of companies with reported or imputed R\&D expenditures of "greater than or equal to $\$ 5$ million" plus companies with reported or imputed R\&D expenditures of "less than $\$ 5$ million" in Table B-1. The relative standard error (RSE) estimates are based on reported and imputed data.
${ }^{2}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in this section.
KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ RSE is not calculated for a cell from which data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies
$(S)=$ RSE shown is calculated for a cell with imputation of more than 50 percent.
$(--)=$ Indicates data not collected.
(na) = Not applicable.
NOTE: A description of the standard error of estimate is given in this section under "Sampling Stratification and Relative Standard Error Constraints." The percentage (or relative) standard errors in this table may be converted to standard errors of estimate by multiplying the percentages shown by the associated estimates. For example, the relative standard error of estimate for company-funded R\&D performance by the wood products industry (NAICS 321) is shown as 3.6 percent, and the associated company-funded R\&D estimate for this industry is shown as $\$ 105$ million in Table A-7. The standard error of estimate is 0.036 times 105 million or 3.8 million.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development 2000
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| State |  | Total R\&D | Relative standard errors | Percent of estimate from certainties |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ohio.. |  | 5,962 | 7.0 | 79.3 |
| Oklahoma.. |  | 333 | 12.3 | 70.0 |
| Oregon.. |  | 1,651 | 9.0 | 63.0 |
| Pennsylvania.... |  | 7,873 | 3.1 | 87.9 |
| Rhode Island.. | (S) | 1,090 | 1.3 | 97.1 |
| South Carolina.................................. |  | 781 | 0.8 | 97.8 |
| South Dakota.. |  | 44 | 47.6 | 28.5 |
| Tennessee.. | (S) | 1,215 | 2.2 | 94.9 |
| Texas..... |  | 8,961 | 3.4 | 86.0 |
| Utah.. |  | 979 | 7.5 | 80.2 |
| Vermont... |  | 396 | 9.2 | 84.6 |
| Virginia....... |  | 2,718 | 12.3 | 62.3 |
| Washington... | (S) | 9,265 | 12.9 | 79.3 |
| West Virginia... |  | 235 | 0.6 | 99.1 |
| Wisconsin.. |  | 1,981 | 2.5 | 88.7 |
| Wyoming.......................................... |  | 7 | NA | 100.0 |
| Undistributed funds................................. | (S) | 11,994 | 16.9 | 80.9 |

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{S})=$ Indicates imputation of more than 50 percent.
NA = Not applicable
NOTE: A description of the standard error of estimate is given in this section under "Sampling Strata and Standard Error Estimates." The percentage (or relative) standard errors in this table may be converted to standard errors of estimate by multiplying the percentages shown by the associated estimates. For example, the relative error of estimate for United States, total is shown as 2.5 percent, and the associated R\&D estimate is shown as $\$ 199.5$ million. The standard error of estimate is 0.025 times 199.5 million or 5 million.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000
companies" category were given weights up to a maximum of 250 ; company records classified in the remaining NAICS categories were given maximum weights of 100.

## Survey Forms

Two forms are used each year to collect data for the survey. Known large $R \& D$ performers are sent a detailed survey form, Form RD-1. ${ }^{32}$ The Form RD-1 requests data on sales or receipts, total employment, employment of scientists and engineers, expenditures for R\&D performed within the company with Federal funds and with company and other funds, character of work (basic research, applied research, and development), company-sponsored R\&D expenditures in foreign countries, $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ performed under contract by others, federally funded R\&D by contracting agency, R\&D costs by type of expense, domestic R\&D expenditures by state, energy-related R\&D and foreign R\&D by country. Because companies receiving the Form RD-1 have participated in previous surveys, computer-imprinted data reported by the company for the previous year are supplied for reference. Companies are encouraged to revise or update this imprinted data if they have more current information, however prior-year statistics that previously have been published are revised only if large disparities are reported. ${ }^{33}$

Small R\&D performers and firms included in the sample for the first time are sent Form RD-1A. This form collects the same information as Form RD-1 except for five items: Federal R\&D support to the firm by contracting agency, $R \& D$ costs by type of expense, domestic R\&D expenditures by state, energy-related R\&D, and foreign R\&D by country. It also includes a screening item that allows respondents to indicate that they do not perform R\&D. No prior-year information is made available since the majority of the companies that receive the Form RD-1A have not been surveyed in the previous year.

## Recent Survey Form Content Changes

Beginning with the 1997 survey, data on federally funded R\&D performed under contract to others (or "contracted-out") were collected to better measure the

[^55]amount of R\&D performed both within and between companies. For earlier years, data were collected only on nonfederally funded contracted-out R\&D. ${ }^{34}$

A new item, R\&D depreciation costs, was added to the 1998 Form RD-1. In prior years R\&D depreciation was included in the "other costs" category of R\&D expenditures. Also beginning with the 1998 survey, items used to collect detailed information on the allocation of R\&D expenditures by field of science and engineering and by product class, and R\&D expenditures for pollution abatement were eliminated. Further, the amount of detail requested for energy-related R\&D was reduced. Item nonresponse on each of these items was unacceptably high relative to their response burden.

To control burden and continuity during the transition to NAICS, the 1999 and 2000 survey forms remained as they were for 1998.

## Number of Survey Forms Sent

Form RD-1 was mailed to companies that reported R\&D expenditures of $\$ 5$ million dollars or more in the 1999 survey. Approximately 1,700 companies received Form RD-1 and approximately 23,100 received Form RD-1A. Both survey forms and the instructions provided to respondents are reproduced in section C, Survey Documents.

## Survey Nonresponse

For various reasons, some firms did not choose to return the survey form or returned it with one or more blank items. ${ }^{35}$ For some firms, internal accounting systems and procedures may not have allowed

[^56]quantification of specific expenditures. Others may have refused to answer any voluntary questions as a matter of company policy. ${ }^{36}$

## Follow-up for Unit Nonresponse

The 2000 survey forms were mailed in March 2001. Recipients of Form RD-1A were asked to respond within 30 days, while Form RD-1 recipients were given 60 days. A follow-up form and letter were mailed to RD-1A recipients every thirty days if their completed survey form had not been received; a total of five follow-up mailings were conducted for delinquent RD-1A recipients.

A letter was mailed to Form RD-1 recipients thirty days after the initial mailing, reminding them that their completed survey forms were due within the next 30 days. A second form and reminder letter were mailed to Form RD-1 respondents after 60 days. Two additional follow-up mailings were sent to delinquent Form RD-1 recipients.

In addition to the mailings, telephone follow-up was used to encourage response from those firms ranked among the 300 largest R\&D performers, based on total R\&D expenditures reported in the previous survey. Table B-4 shows the number of companies in each industry or industry group that received a survey form and the percentage that responded to the survey.

If all attempts to get a response failed and no current-year information was reported, data for domestic sales, total employment, total R\&D, and the number of R\&D scientists and engineers were imputed as described in the next section.

## Imputation for Unit and Item

## Nonresponse

When respondents did not provide the requested information, estimates for the missing data were made using various methods. Specific rules governed imputation for missing data depending on the item being imputed. For some items (domestic sales, total employment, total R\&D, and number of research scientists and engineers) missing current year data are always imputed.

[^57]Rates of change are applied to prior year data regardless of whether prior year data were reported or imputed. For other items (e.g., basic research, subcontracted R\&D, and foreign $\mathrm{R} \mathrm{\& D}$ ) missing current year data are imputed only if the company reported the item in either of the prior two years. A third type of imputation occurs when detail does not sum to the total (e.g., Federal R\&D by agency). In this case if prior year detail is not imputed, then current year data are distributed based on the previous distribution pattern of the reporting unit. Otherwise, an industry average distribution is applied to the total to derive a value for each detail item. Rates of change are calculated by item within each NAICS category or industry. The calculations are based on weighted data for all companies that reported both variables. In the case of inter-item ratios (e.g., R\&D to sales), calculations are based on data for all companies that reported both items in the current reporting period. For current-to-prior-year ratios (e.g., employment), calculations are based on data for all companies that reported that item in both years. ${ }^{37}$

Outside sources of information are also used for imputing missing data. During the edit review process, analysts compare data reported to the Survey of Industrial Research and Development by publicly-owned companies with the company's report to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Data items matched include domestic sales, domestic employment, total or company-funded R\&D, and in some cases, federally funded R\&D. This comparison provides analysts a means to 1) potentially resolve inconsistencies between current and prior year data on the R\&D survey, 2) impute missing data for specific items, and 3) ensure that companies are reporting comparable values in both reports. A second source for verifying or obtaining domestic employment and domestic sales data is the U.S. Census Bureau's Business Register. Data for these items are collected on economic census and annual survey forms. Table B-5 contains imputation rates for the principal survey items.

## Response Rates and Mandatory/ Voluntary Reporting

Current survey reporting requirements divide survey items into two groups: mandatory and voluntary. Response to four data items was mandatory; response to the remaining items was voluntary. The mandatory items were total R\&D expenditures, Federal R\&D funds,

[^58]Table B-4. Survey of Industrial Research and Development-unit response rates-number and percentage of companies that responded to the survey and percentage of companies that performed R\&D, by industry and type of survey form: 2000

| Industry and form received | NAICS codes | Number of companies that received a questionnaire ${ }^{1}$ | Number of companies that responded to the survey | Percentage of companies that responded to the survey | Percentage of responding companies that reported R\&D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All industries.. | 21-23, 31-33, 42, 44-81 | 24,844 | 21,066 | 84.8 | 15.6 |
| Manufacturing. | 31-33 | 4,808 | 4,012 | 83.4 | 45.8 |
| Food.. | 311 | 131 | 113 | 86.3 | 62.0 |
| Beverage and tobacco products... | 312 | 11 | 11 | 100.0 | 54.6 |
| Textiles, apparel, and leather.. | 313-16 | 244 | 192 | 78.7 | 40.1 |
| Wood products.. | 321 | 111 | 94 | 85.5 | 25.5 |
| Paper, printing and support activities.. | 322, 323 | 106 | 91 | 85.9 | 36.3 |
| Petroleum and coal products... | 324 | 16 | 15 | 93.8 | 86.7 |
| Chemicals.. | 325 | 218 | 178 | 81.3 | 91.0 |
| Basic chemicals.. | 3251 | 62 | 55 | 88.7 | 94.6 |
| Resin, synthetic rubber, fibers, and filament..... | 3252 | 16 | 16 | 100.0 | 93.8 |
| Pharmaceuticals and medicines.. | 3254 | 51 | 40 | 76.9 | 100.0 |
| Other chemicals. | 325 (minus 3251-52, 3254) | 89 | 67 | 75.3 | 82.1 |
| Plastics and rubber products. | 326 | 325 | 262 | 80.6 | 60.7 |
| Nonmetallic mineral products........ | 327 | 131 | 114 | 87.0 | 47.4 |
| Primary metals... | 331 | 104 | 89 | 85.6 | 59.6 |
| Fabricated metal products.. | 332 | 337 | 297 | 88.1 | 53.9 |
| Machinery.... | 333 | 260 | 218 | 83.9 | 74.3 |
| Computer and electronic products.. | 334 | 529 | 414 | 78.3 | 79.5 |
| Computers and peripheral equipment... | 3341 | 70 | 55 | 77.5 | 81.8 |
| Communications equipment. | 3342 | 79 | 54 | 69.2 | 88.9 |
| Semiconductor and other electronic components. | 3344 | 114 | 91 | 79.8 | 89.0 |
| Navigational, measuring, electromedical, and control instruments. | 3345 | 159 | 131 | 82.4 | 90.8 |
| Other computer and electronic products.......... | 334 (minus 3341-42, 3344-45) | 107 | 83 | 77.6 | 43.4 |
| Electrical equipment, appliances, and components... | 335 | 110 | 89 | 80.9 | 76.4 |
| Transportation equipment......................... | 336 | 217 | 188 | 86.6 | 69.2 |
| Motor vehicles, trailers, and parts.................. | 3361-63 | 137 | 119 | 86.9 | 68.9 |
| Aerospace products and parts...... | 3364 | 24 | 20 | 83.3 | 90.0 |
| Other transportation equipment.. | 336 (minus 3361-64) | 56 | 49 | 87.5 | 61.2 |
| Furniture and related products. | 337 | 180 | 168 | 88.4 | 41.1 |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

Table B-4. Survey of Industrial Research and Development-unit response rates-number and percentage of companies that responded to the survey and percentage of companies that performed R\&D, by industry and type of survey form: 2000

| Industry and form received | NAICS codes | Number of companies that received a questionnaire ${ }^{1}$ | Number of companies that responded to the survey | Percentage of companies that responded to the survey | Percentage of responding companies that reported R\&D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Miscellaneous manufacturing.. | 339 | 338 | 281 | 83.1 | 63.0 |
| Medical equipment and supplies. | 3391 | 147 | 121 | 82.3 | 76.9 |
| Other miscellaneous manufacturing. | 339 (minus 3391) | 191 | 160 | 83.8 | 52.5 |
| Other manufacturing | $31-33$ (minus 311-16, 321-27, $331-37,339)$ | 28 | 11 | 61.1 | 0.0 |
| Small manufacturing companies ${ }^{2}$. | Fewer than 50 employees | 1,412 | 1,187 | 84.1 | 7.7 |
| Nonmanufacturing. | 21-23, 42, 44-81 | 20,036 | 17,054 | 85.1 | 8.5 |
| Mining, extraction, and support activities.. | 21 | 186 | 161 | 86.6 | 21.1 |
| Utilities. | 22 | 65 | 58 | 89.2 | 60.3 |
| Construction.. | 23 | 2,055 | 1,798 | 87.5 | 1.2 |
| Trade.. | 42, 44, 45 | 3,040 | 2,653 | 87.3 | 4.9 |
| Transportation and warehousing.. | 48, 49 | 550 | 468 | 85.1 | 3.9 |
| Information. | 51 | 745 | 590 | 79.2 | 38.0 |
| Publishing.... | 511 | 450 | 360 | 80.0 | 49.2 |
| Newspaper, periodical, book, and database.. | 5111 | 177 | 158 | 89.3 | 7.6 |
| Software............................................... | 5112 | 273 | 202 | 74.0 | 81.7 |
| Broadcasting and telecommunications. | 513 | 129 | 102 | 79.1 | 12.8 |
| Radio and television broadcasting................. | 5131 | 34 | 30 | 88.2 | 3.3 |
| Telecommunications... | 5133 | 72 | 55 | 76.4 | 20.0 |
| Other broadcasting and telecommunications..... | 513 (minus 5131, 5133) | 23 | 17 | 73.9 | 5.9 |
| Other information.. | 51 (minus 511, 513) | 166 | 128 | 77.1 | 26.6 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate.. | 52, 53 | 870 | 765 | 87.9 | 4.8 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services............ | 54 | 3,055 | 2,559 | 83.8 | 32.0 |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services......... | 5413 | 920 | 805 | 87.5 | 17.3 |
| Computer systems design and related services........ | 5415 | 837 | 633 | 75.6 | 47.7 |
| Scientific R\&D services.................................. | 5417 | 475 | 393 | 82.7 | 87.5 |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services... | 54 (minus 5413, 5415, 5417) | 823 | 728 | 88.5 | 4.8 |
| Management of companies and enterprises... | 55 | 160 | 136 | 85.0 | 10.3 |
| Health care services... | 621-23 | 1,024 | 911 | 89.0 | 3.5 |
| Other nonmanufacturing ......................... | 56, 61, 624, 71, 72, 81 | 2,707 | 2,222 | 82.1 | 1.6 |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{2}$. | Fewer than 15 employees | 5,579 | 4,733 | 84.8 | 0.9 |
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| Industry and form received | NAICS codes | Number of companies that received a questionnaire | Number of companies that responded to the survey | Percentage of companies that responded to the survey | Percentage of responding companies that reported R\&D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Miscellaneous manufacturing.. | 339 | 52 | 41 | 78.9 | 100.0 |
| Medical equipment and supplies.. | 3391 | 38 | 30 | 79.0 | 100.0 |
| Other miscellaneous manufacturing....... | 339 (minus 3391) | 14 | 11 | 78.6 | 100.0 |
| Other manufacturing . | 31-33 (minus 311-16, 321-27, | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | 331-37, 339) |  |  |  |  |
| Small manufacturing companies ${ }^{2}$. | Fewer than 50 employees | 2 | 1 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
| Nonmanufacturing.... | 21-23, 42, 44-81 | 793 | 625 | 78.8 | 95.8 |
| Mining, extraction, and support activities.. | 21 | 14 | 13 | 92.9 | 100.0 |
| Utilities.. | 22 | 10 | 9 | 90.0 | 100.0 |
| Construction. | 23 | 5 | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Trade.. | 42, 44, 45 | 95 | 73 | 76.8 | 94.5 |
| Transportation and warehousing.. | 48, 49 | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 75.0 |
| Information.. | 51 | 181 | 143 | 79.0 | 95.1 |
| Publishing.. | 511 | 148 | 116 | 78.4 | 98.3 |
| Newspaper, periodical, book, and database....... | 5111 | 5 | 4 | 80.0 | 100.0 |
| Software.............................................. | 5112 | 143 | 112 | 78.3 | 98.2 |
| Broadcasting and telecommunications....... | 513 | 14 | 12 | 85.7 | 75.0 |
| Radio and television broadcasting..... | 5131 | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Telecommunications................. | 5133 | 12 | 10 | 83.3 | 80.0 |
| Other broadcasting and telecommunications... | 513 (minus 5131, 5133) | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Other information.. | 51 (minus 511, 513) | 19 | 15 | 79.0 | 86.7 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate.. | 52, 53 | 34 | 24 | 70.6 | 91.7 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services............ | 54 | 422 | 333 | 78.9 | 97.3 |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services........ | 5413 | 64 | 46 | 71.9 | 95.7 |
| Computer systems design and related services....... | 5415 | 107 | 77 | 72.0 | 97.4 |
| Scientific R\&D services................................... | 5417 | 241 | 202 | 83.8 | 97.5 |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services.. | 54 (minus 5413, 5415, 5417) | 10 | 8 | 80.0 | 100.0 |
| Management of companies and enterprises............... | 55 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Health care services....... | 621-23 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Other nonmanufacturing . | $56,61,624,71,72,81$ | 18 | 13 | 72.2 | 84.6 |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{2}$. | Fewer than 15 employees | 5 | 3 | 60.0 | 66.7 |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.
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| Industry and form received | NAICS codes | Number of companies that received a questionnaire ${ }^{1}$ | Number of companies that responded to the survey | Percentage of companies that responded to the survey | Percentage of responding companies that reported R\&D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COMPANIES THAT RECEIVED FORM RD-1A |  |  |  |  |  |
| All industries.. | 21-23, 31-33, 42, 44-81 | 23,117 | 19,665 | 85.1 | 9.8 |
| Manufacturing. | 31-33 | 3,874 | 3,236 | 83.5 | 33.3 |
| Food.. | 311 | 95 | 84 | 88.4 | 50.0 |
| Beverage and tobacco products. | 312 | 7 | 7 | 100.0 | 28.6 |
| Textiles, apparel, and leather.. | 313-16 | 231 | 179 | 77.5 | 36.3 |
| Wood products... | 321 | 106 | 92 | 86.8 | 22.8 |
| Paper, printing and support activities.. | 322, 323 | 76 | 65 | 85.5 | 12.3 |
| Petroleum and coal products. | 324 | 8 | 7 | 87.5 | 71.4 |
| Chemicals. | 325 | 77 | 55 | 71.4 | 72.7 |
| Basic chemicals.. | 3251 | 16 | 14 | 87.5 | 85.7 |
| Resin, synthetic rubber, fibers, and filament.... | 3252 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 50.0 |
| Pharmaceuticals and medicines.. | 3254 | 8 | 4 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
| Other chemicals.. | 325 (minus 3251-52, 3254) | 51 | 35 | 68.6 | 65.7 |
| Plastics and rubber products.. | 326 | 279 | 222 | 79.6 | 54.1 |
| Nonmetallic mineral products..... | 327 | 120 | 104 | 86.7 | 42.3 |
| Primary metals.. | 331 | 83 | 72 | 86.8 | 51.4 |
| Fabricated metal products.. | 332 | 303 | 268 | 88.5 | 48.9 |
| Machinery.... | 333 | 148 | 122 | 82.4 | 55.7 |
| Computer and electronic products.. | 334 | 246 | 191 | 77.6 | 57.6 |
| Computers and peripheral equipment. | 3341 | 35 | 26 | 74.3 | 65.4 |
| Communications equipment. | 3342 | 20 | 15 | 75.0 | 66.7 |
| Semiconductor and other electronic components.. | 3344 | 24 | 19 | 79.2 | 57.9 |
| Navigational, measuring, electromedical, and control instruments. | 3345 | 68 | 55 | 80.9 | 78.2 |
| Other computer and electronic products.. | 334 (minus 3341-42, 3344-45) | 99 | 76 | 76.8 | 38.2 |
| Electrical equipment, appliances, and components. | 335 | 59 | 49 | 83.1 | 59.2 |
| Transportation equipment............................. | 336 | 141 | 122 | 86.5 | 53.3 |
| Motor vehicles, trailers, and parts... | 3361-63 | 96 | 84 | 87.5 | 56.0 |
| Aerospace products and parts.. | 3364 | 5 | 4 | 80.0 | 50.0 |
| Other transportation equipment. | 336 (minus 3361-64) | 40 | 34 | 85.0 | 47.1 |
| Furniture and related products. | 337 | 181 | 160 | 88.4 | 39.4 |
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| Industry and form received | NAICS codes | Number of companies that received a questionnaire ${ }^{1}$ | Number of companies that responded to the survey | Percentage of companies that responded to the survey | Percentage of responding companies that reported R\&D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Miscellaneous manufacturing.. | 339 | 286 | 240 | 83.9 | 56.7 |
| Medical equipment and supplies. | 3391 | 109 | 91 | 83.5 | 69.2 |
| Other miscellaneous manufacturing. | 339 (minus 3391) | 177 | 149 | 84.2 | 49.0 |
| Other manufacturing . | 31-33 (minus 311-16, 321-27, | 18 | 11 | 61 | 0 |
| Small manufacturing companies ${ }^{2}$. | Fewer than 50 employees | 1,410 | 1,186 | 84.1 | 7.7 |
| Nonmanufacturing. | 21-23, 42, 44-81 | 19,243 | 16,429 | 85.4 | 5.1 |
| Mining, extraction, and support activities. | 21 | 172 | 148 | 86.1 | 14.2 |
| Utilities.. | 22 | 55 | 49 | 89.1 | 53.1 |
| Construction. | 23 | 2,050 | 1,793 | 87.5 | 1.0 |
| Trade. | 42, 44, 45 | 2,945 | 2,580 | 87.6 | 2.4 |
| Transportation and warehousing... | 48, 49 | 546 | 464 | 85.0 | 3.2 |
| Information... | 51 | 564 | 447 | 79.3 | 19.7 |
| Publishing.... | 511 | 302 | 244 | 80.8 | 25.8 |
| Newspaper, periodical, book, and database...... | 5111 | 172 | 154 | 89.5 | 5.2 |
| Software.......................................... | 5112 | 130 | 90 | 69.2 | 61.1 |
| Broadcasting and telecommunications.......... | 513 | 115 | 90 | 78.3 | 4.4 |
| Radio and television broadcasting.. | 5131 | 33 | 29 | 87.9 | 0.0 |
| Telecommunications...... | 5133 | 60 | 45 | 75.0 | 6.7 |
| Other broadcasting and telecommunications..... | 513 (minus 5131, 5133) | 22 | 16 | 72.7 | 6.3 |
| Other information.. | 51 (minus 511, 513) | 147 | 113 | 76.9 | 18.6 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate.. | 52, 53 | 836 | 741 | 88.6 | 2.0 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services........... | 54 | 2,633 | 2,226 | 84.5 | 22.3 |
| Architectural, engineering, and related services...... | 5413 | 856 | 759 | 88.7 | 12.5 |
| Computer systems design and related services........ | 5415 | 730 | 556 | 76.2 | 40.8 |
| Scientific R\&D services................................... | 5417 | 234 | 191 | 81.6 | 77.0 |
| Other professional, scientific, and technical services.. | 54 (minus 5413, 5415, 5417) | 813 | 720 | 88.6 | 3.8 |
| Management of companies and enterprises............... | 55 | 158 | 134 | 84.8 | 9.0 |
| Health care services............................. | 621-23 | 1,021 | 908 | 88.9 | 3.2 |
| Other nonmanufacturing ................................ | 56, 61, 624, 71, 72, 81 | 2,689 | 2,209 | 82.2 | 1.1 |
| Small nonmanufacturing companies ${ }^{2}$. | Fewer than 15 employees | 5,574 | 4,730 | 84.9 | 0.9 |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

## Table B-4. Survey of Industrial Research and Development—unit response rates-number and percentage of companies that responded to the survey and percentage of companies that performed R\&D, by industry and type of survey form: 2000

${ }^{1}$ The "number of companies that received a questionnaire" is less than the number of "companies selected for the sample" in Table B-1 because some companies selected for the survey went out of business or were merged with other companies during the time between sample selection and survey mailout, that is, the sample frame was updated before actual mail-out took place. For more information, see "sample size" in the technical notes in this section.
${ }^{2}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in this section.

KEY: (--) = Indicates data not collected.
NOTES: The calculation of the "percentage of companies that responded to the survey" was based on all companies that responded to the survey including those that reported they were out-of-scope, out-of-business, or had merged with another company. It excludes companies for which total R\&D expenditure data were imputed. Mathematically, the percentage was calculated by dividing the number of companies that received a questionnaire (indicated in the previous column) into the number of companies that returned a response or questionnaire regardless of the data or informaion supplied in the response or on the questionnaire.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000
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See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.
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| Industry and size of company |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 4 of 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAICS codes | R\&D by type of cost |  |  |  | Company R\&D |  | Energy R\&D |
|  |  | Wages | Materials | Depreciation | Other costs | Contracted out R\&D | Foreign R\&D |  |
|  |  | [Percent] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution by industry: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All industries.. | 21-23, 31-33, 42, 44-81 | 54.7 | 56.5 | 11.5 | 58.5 | 6.9 | 3.2 | 45.8 |
| Manufacturing................................................... | 31-33 | 57.5 | 55.6 | 15.9 | 60.8 | 12.3 | 2.9 | (D) |
| Food. | 311 | 62.3 | 62.4 | 2.2 | 49.9 | 0.0 | 59.0 | 0.0 |
| Beverage and tobacco products........................... | 312 | (D) | (D) | (D) | 13.1 | (D) | (D) | 0.0 |
| Textiles, apparel, and leather.............................. | 313-16 | 15.7 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 24.5 | 0.0 | (D) | 0.0 |
| Wood products.... | 321 | 79.1 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Paper, printing and support activities.. | 322, 323 | 60.2 | 67.6 | 0.0 | 40.2 | (D) | (D) | 0.0 |
| Petroleum and coal products... | 324 | 75.6 | 60.3 | 0.0 | 58.9 | (D) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Chemicals................................................... | 325 | 35.4 | 30.4 | 6.7 | 48.8 | 13.6 | 2.0 | (D) |
| Basic chemicals.................................... | 3251 | 53.0 | 49.7 | 41.7 | 51.9 | (D) | 15.2 | 0.0 |
| Resin, synthetic rubber, fibers, and filament.......... | 3252 | 24.2 | (D) | (D) | 21.3 | (D) | (D) | 0.0 |
| Pharmaceuticals and medicines....................... | 3254 | 12.8 | 9.9 | 0.5 | 47.1 | 14.2 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Other chemicals. | 325 (minus 3251-52, 3254) | 80.2 | 81.8 | 59.3 | 80.9 | 1.4 | (D) | 0.0 |
| Plastics and rubber products............................... | 326 | 65.5 | 43.2 | 2.7 | 68.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Nonmetallic mineral products.............................. | 327 | 29.2 | 12.9 | (D) | (D) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Primary metals.............................................. | 331 | 31.6 | 63.1 | 64.5 | 70.8 | 26.7 | (D) | 0.0 |
| Fabricated metal products.................................. | 332 | 73.0 | 73.8 | 21.5 | 78.3 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 |
| Machinery... | 333 | 36.0 | 35.2 | 8.4 | 34.8 | 0.0 | 9.6 | (D) |
| Computer and electronic products........................ | 334 | 71.3 | 74.9 | 16.1 | 67.3 | 22.5 | 4.4 | (D) |
| Computers and peripheral equipment................ | 3341 | 55.0 | 57.9 | 10.3 | 23.6 | 5.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 |
| Communications equipment........................... | 3342 | 92.8 | 94.1 | 15.0 | 89.5 | (D) | (D) | 0.0 |
| Semiconductor and other electronic components... | 3344 | 62.8 | 51.8 | 18.1 | 75.2 | (D) | 4.0 | 0.0 |
| Navigational, measuring, electromedical, and control instruments. $\qquad$ | 3345 | 45.8 | 58.1 | 13.0 | 70.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Other computer and electronic products.............. | 334 (minus 3341-42, 3344-45) | 8.7 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 28.2 | 0.0 | (D) | 0.0 |
| Electrical equipment, appliances, and components..... | 335 | 20.7 | 14.5 | 16.7 | 22.9 | 0.0 | 3.6 | (D) |
| Transportation equipment.................................. | 336 | 61.7 | 55.4 | 31.6 | 79.0 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 28.1 |
| Motor vehicles, trailers, and parts...................... | 3361-63 | 61.0 | 53.7 | 37.6 | 65.6 | (D) | (D) | 0.0 |
| Aerospace products and parts......................... | 3364 | 60.1 | 58.0 | (D) | (D) | (D) | (D) | 0.0 |
| Other transportation equipment....................... | 336 (minus 3361-64) | 79.6 | 76.3 | 72.3 | 89.0 | (D) | (D) | 0.0 |

See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.
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[^65] employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in this section.

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{D})=$ Imputation rate is not calculated for a cell from which data have been withheld to avoid disclosing operations of individual companies.
$(--)=$ Indicates data not collected.
$(n a)=$ Not applicable.
NOTES: The figures in this table represent the percentage of the value in a given table cell in the Section A tables that has been imputed. In those tables, cells for which more than 50 percent of the value is imputed are flagged with an "(S)."
Cells in this table that contain " 0.0 " indicate that no imputation was performed or, if performed, imputation accounted for less than 0.1 percent of the estimate for the indicated item.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000
net sales, and total employment. During the 1990 survey cycle, NSF conducted a test of the effect of reporting on a completely voluntary basis to determine if combining both mandatory and voluntary items on one survey form influences response rates. For this test, the 1990 sample was divided into two panels of approximately equal size. One panel, the mandatory panel, was asked to report as usual on four mandatory items with the remainder voluntary; and the other panel was asked to report all items on a completely voluntary basis. The result of the test was a decrease in the overall survey response rate to 80 percent from levels of 88 percent in 1989 and 89 percent in 1988. The response rates for the mandatory and voluntary panels were 89 percent and 69 percent, respectively. Detailed results of the test were published in Research and Development in Industry: 1990. For firms that reported R\&D expenditures in 2000, table B-6 shows the percentage that also reported data for other selected items.

## Character of Work Estimates

Response to questions about character of work (basic research, applied research, and development) declined in the mid-1980s, and, as a result, imputation rates increased. The general imputation procedure described above became increasingly dependent upon information imputed in prior years, thereby distancing current year estimates from any reported information. Because of the increasing dependence on imputed data, NSF chose not to publish character of work estimates in 1986. The imputation procedure used to develop these estimates was revised in 1987 for use with later data and differs from the general imputation approach. The new method calculated the character of work distribution for a nonresponding firm only if that firm reported a distribution within a 5 -year period, extending from 2 years before to 2 years after the year requiring imputation. Imputation for a given year was initially performed in the year the data were collected and was based on a character of work distribution reported in either of the 2 previous years, if any. It was again performed using new data collected in the next 2 years. If reported data followed no previously imputed or reported data, previous period estimates were inserted based on the currently reported information. Similarly, if reported data did not follow 2 years of imputed data, the 2 years of previously imputed data were removed. Thus, character of work estimates were revised as newly reported information became available and were not final for 2 years following their initial publication.

Beginning with 1995 , previously estimated values were not removed for firms that did not report in the third year, nor were estimates made for the 2 previous years for firms reporting after 2 years of nonresponse. This process was changed because, in the prior period, revisions were minimal. Estimates continued to be made for 2 consecutive years of nonresponse and discontinued if the firm did not report character of work in the third year. If no reported data were available for a firm, character of work estimates were not imputed. As a consequence, only a portion of the total estimated $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ expenditures were distributed at the firm level. Those expenditures not meeting the requirements of the new imputation methodology were placed in a "not distributed" category.

NSF's objective in conducting the survey has always been to provide estimates for the entire population of firms performing R\&D in the United States. However, the revised imputation procedure would no longer produce such estimates because of the "not distributed" component. A baseline estimation method thus was developed to allocate the "not distributed" amounts among the character of work components. In the baseline estimation method, the "not distributed" expenditures were allocated by industry group to basic research, applied research, and development categories using the percentage splits in the distributed category for that industry. The allocation was done at the lowest level of published industry detail only; higher levels were derived by aggregation, just as national totals were derived by aggregation of individual industry estimates, and result in higher performance shares for basic and applied research and lower estimates for development's share than would have been calculated using the previous method.

Using data collected during the 1999 and 2000 cycles of the survey, reporting anomalies for the character of work survey items, especially for basic research, were investigated. It was discovered that a significant number of large companies known to develop and manufacture products reported all of their R\&D as basic research. This phenomenon is not logical and prompted a renewed effort to strengthen character of work estimates produced from the survey. Further identification of anomalous reporting patterns is underway and research is being pursued to determine appropriate methods of dealing with the anomalies. Publication of character of work distributions of R\&D has been suspended until the research is complete and recommendations have been made,

Table B-6. Survey of Industrial Research and Development-percentage of R\&D-performing companies that reported non-zero data for major survey items: 2000

| Survey Item | Form RD-1 ${ }^{1,2}$ | Form RD-1A ${ }^{1,2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sales ${ }^{3}$. | 97.4 | 96.9 |
| Total employment ${ }^{3}$. | 98.3 | 99.2 |
| Scientist and engineers... | 75.9 | 86.0 |
| Federal R\&D ${ }^{3,4}$. | 99.9 | 99.8 |
| Department of Defense............................................... | 5.5 | (NA) |
| NASA. | 2.6 | (NA) |
| Department of Energy... | 1.9 | (NA) |
| Other Federal agencies... | 6.2 | (NA) |
| Company R\&D ${ }^{4}$.............................................................. | 99.9 | 99.8 |
| Contracted out R\&D.. | 17.3 | 14.1 |
| Foreign R\&D..... | 30.6 | 7.3 |
| Total R\&D ${ }^{3}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Wages and salaries...................................................... | 66.1 | (NA) |
| Materials and supplies.................................................... | 59.3 | (NA) |
| R\&D depreciation................ | 41.8 | (NA) |
| Other costs by type of expense......................................... | 60.2 | (NA) |
| Energy R\&D ........................................................................ | 3.1 | (NA) |

${ }^{1}$ Percentages are based on reported data for companies that reported total R\&D expenditures. Imputed data are not included. Companies that reported they were out-of-scope, out-of-business, merged with another company, or had no R\&D expenditures for 2000 were excluded from the calculations.
${ }^{2}$ For descriptions of the survey forms, see technical notes in this section.
${ }^{3}$ Response to four data items on the questionnaires, sales, total employment, Federal R\&D, and total R\&D, was mandatory. Response to all other items was voluntary.
${ }^{4}$ Item response for "Federal R\&D" and for "Company R\&D" are considered together; companies that reported "Total R\&D" and either of these expenditures implicitly reported both company and Federal R\&D, since these two items sum to total R\&D.

KEY: $\quad(\mathrm{NA})=$ Not available.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000
consequently tables containing basic research, applied research, and development estimates do not appear in this report.

## State Estimates

Form RD-1 requests a distribution of the total cost of R\&D among the state(s) where the R\&D was performed. Prior to the 1999 survey, an independent source, the Directory of American Research and Development, published by the Data Base Publishing Group of the R. R. Bowker Company was used in conjunction with previous survey results to estimate R\&D expenditures by state for companies that did not provide this information. The information on scientists and engineers published in the directory was used as a proxy indicator of
the proportion of R\&D expenditures within each state. R\&D expenditures by state were estimated by applying the distribution of scientists and engineers by state from the directory to total R\&D expenditures for these companies. These estimates were included with reported survey data to arrive at published estimates of R\&D expenditures for each state.

The practice of using outside information to formulate or adjust estimates of R\&D expenditures for each state has been discontinued because a suitable source for supporting information is no longer available. ${ }^{38}$ State estimates resulting from the 1999 and 2000 surveys are based solely on respondent reports and information internal to the survey.
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## Comparability of Statistics

This section summarizes survey improvements, enhancements, and changes in procedures and practices that may have affected the comparability of statistics produced from the Survey of Industrial Research and Development over time and with other statistical series. ${ }^{39}$

## Industry Classification System

Beginning with the 1999 cycle of the survey, industry statistics are published using the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS). The ongoing development of NAICS has been a joint effort of statistical agencies in Canada, Mexico, and the United States. The system replaced the Standard Industrial Classification (1980) of Canada, the Mexican Classification of Activities and Products (1994), and Standard Industrial Classification (SIC, 1987) of the United States. ${ }^{40}$ NAICS was designed to provide a production-oriented system under which economic units with similar production processes are classified in the same industry. NAICS was developed with special attention to classifications for new and emerging industries, service industries, and industries that produce advanced technologies. NAICS not only eases comparability of information about the economies of the three North American countries, but it also increases comparability with the two-digit level of the United Nations' International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC) system. Important for the Survey of Industrial Research and Development is the creation of several new classifications that cover major performers of R\&D in the U.S. Among manufacturers, the computer and electronic products classification (NAICS 334) includes makers of computers and peripherals, semiconductors, and navigational and electromedical instruments. Among nonmanufacturing industries are information (NAICS 51) and professional, scientific, and technical services (NAICS 54). Information includes publishing, both paper and electronic, broadcasting, and telecommunications. Professional, scientific, and technical services includes a variety of industries. Of specific importance for the survey are engineering and scientific R\&D service industries.

[^67]Effects of NAICS on Survey Statistics. The change of industry classification system affects most of the detailed statistical tables produced from the survey. In this report, some tables which contain industry statistics from the 1997 and 1998 cycles of the survey, previously classified using the SIC system, have been reclassified using the new NAICS codes. This has been done to provide a bridge for users who want to make year-to-year comparisons below the aggregate level.

## Company Size Classifications

Beginning with the 1999 cycle of the survey, the number of company size categories used to classify survey statistics was increased. The original 6 categories were expanded to 10 to emphasize the role of small companies in R\&D performance. During 1998, companies with fewer than 500 employees spent $\$ 30.2$ billion on industrial R\&D performed in the United States. During 1999, they spent $\$ 34.1$ billion. ${ }^{41}$ Because of the addition of the new size classifications, we can say that of the $\$ 34.1$ billion, 21 percent ( $\$ 7.0$ billion) was spent by the smallest companies (those with at least 5 but fewer than 25 employees). Further, again because of the new size classifications, the 1999 statistics show that there was more growth in the amount of $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ performed by smaller companies than in the amount performed by larger companies. The more detailed business size information also facilitates better international comparisons. Generally, statistics produced by foreign countries that measure their industrial R\&D enterprise are reported with more detailed company size classifications at the lower end of the scale than U.S. industrial R\&D statistics traditionally have been. ${ }^{42}$ The new classifications of the U.S. statistics enable more direct comparisons with other countries' statistics.

## Revisions to Historical and Immediate Prior Year Statistics

Revisions to historical statistics usually have been made because of changes in the industry classification of companies caused by changes in payroll composition

[^68]detected when a new sample was drawn. Various methodologies have been adopted over the years to revise, or backcast, the data when revisions to historical statistics have become necessary. Documented revisions to the historical statistics from post-1967 surveys through 1992 are summarized in NSF (1994) and in annual reports for subsequent surveys. Detailed descriptions of the specific revisions made to the statistics from pre-1967 surveys are scarce, but U.S. Bureau of the Census (1995) summarizes some of the major revisions.

Changes to reported data can come from three sources: respondents, analysts involved in survey and statistical processing, and the industry reclassification process. Prior to 1995, routine revisions were made to prior year statistics based on information from all three sources. Consequently, results from the current year survey were used not only to develop current year statistics, but also to revise immediate prior year statistics. Beginning with the 1995 survey, this practice was discontinued. The reasons for discontinuation of this practice were annual sampling, continual strengthening of sampling methodology, and improvements in data verification, processing, and nonresponse follow-up. Moreover, it was not clear that respondents or those who processed the survey results had any better information a year after the data were first reported. Thus, it was determined that routinely revising published survey statistics increased the potential for error and often confused users of the statistics. Revisions are now made to historical and immediate prior year statistics only if substantive errors are discovered.

For 1999, an error in the sample frame caused one very large company (based on payroll) to be selected for the sample and its statistical record to be assigned a large weight (see "Frame Creation" and "Weighting and Maximum Weights" above). Because the company's record had received a large weight during 1999 sampling, the company was selected with certainty for the 2000 sample and assigned a weight of one (see "Identifying Certainty Companies" above). This sampling artifact caused an abnormally large decrease in the company's data, especially for sales and employment, ${ }^{43}$ when comparing the 2000 statistics with the statistics originally published for 1999. The weight in the company's record in the 1999 statistical file was corrected and revised 1999 statistics are included in the tables in this report.

[^69]
## Year-to-Year Changes

Comparability from year to year may be affected by new sample design, annual sample selection, and industry shifts.

## Sample Design

By far the most profound influence on statistics from recent surveys occurred when the new sample design for the 1992 survey was introduced. Revisions to the 1991 statistics were dramatic (see Research and Development in Industry: 1992 for a detailed discussion). While the allocation of the sample was changed somewhat, the sample designs used for subsequent surveys were comparable to the 1992 sample design in terms of size and coverage.

## Annual Sample Selection

With the introduction of annual sampling in 1992, more year-to-year change has resulted than when survey panels were used. There are two reasons why this was so. First, changes in classification of companies not surveyed are not reflected in the year-to-year movement. Prior to annual sampling, a wedging operation-which was performed when a new sample was selected-was a means of adjusting the data series to account for the changes in classification that occurred in the frame (see the discussion on wedging later under "Time Series Analyses"). Second, yearly correlation of $R \& D$ data is lost when independent samples are drawn each year.

## Industry Shifts

The industry classification of companies is redefined each year with the creation of the sampling frame. By redefining the frame, the sample reflects current distributions of companies by size and industry. A company may move from one industry to another because of either changes in its payroll composition, which is used to determine the industry classification code (see previous discussion under "Frame Creation"); changes in the industry classification system itself; or changes in the way the industry classification code was assigned or revised during survey processing.

A company's payroll composition can change because of the growth or decline of product or service lines, the merger of two or more companies, the acquisition of one company by another, divestitures, or the formation of conglomerates. Although an unlikely occurrence, a company's industry designation could be reclassified
yearly with the introduction of annual sampling. The result is that a downward movement in R\&D expenditures in one industry is balanced by an upward movement in another industry from one year to the next.

From time to time, the industry coding system used by Federal agencies that publish industry statistics is changed or revised to reflect the changing composition of U.S. and North American industry. For statistics developed for 1988-91 from the 1988-91 surveys, companies retained the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes assigned for the 1987 sample. These classifications were based on the 1977 SIC system. Since the last major revision of the SIC system was in 1987, this revision was used to classify companies in the 1992-98 surveys. As discussed above, the industrial classification system has been completely changed and, beginning with the 1999 cycle of the survey, the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) is now used.

The method used to classify firms during survey processing was revised slightly in 1992. Research has shown that the impact on individual industry estimates was minor. ${ }^{44}$ The current method used to classify firms was discussed previously under "Frame Creation." Methods used for past surveys are discussed in U.S. Bureau of the Census (1995).

## Capturing Small and Nonmanufacturing R\&D Performers ${ }^{45}$

Before the 1992 survey, the sample of firms surveyed was selected at irregular intervals. ${ }^{46}$ In intervening years, a panel of the largest firms known to perform R\&D was surveyed. For example, a sample of about 14,000 firms was selected for the 1987 survey. For the 1988-91 studies, about 1,700 of these firms were resurveyed annually; the other firms did not receive survey forms, and their R\&D data were estimated. This sample design was adequate during the survey's early years because R\&D performance was concentrated in relatively few manufacturing industries. However, as more and more firms began entering the R\&D arena, the old sample design

[^70]proved increasingly deficient because it did not capture births of new R\&D-performing firms. The entry of fledgling R\&D performers into the marketplace was completely missed during panel years. Additionally, beginning in the early 1970s, the need for more detailed R\&D information for nonmanufacturing industries was recognized. At that time, the broad industry classifications "miscellaneous business services" and "miscellaneous services" were added to the list of industry groups for which statistics were published. By 1975, about 3 percent of total $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ was performed by firms in nonmanufacturing industries.

During the mid-1980s, there was evidence that a significant amount of R\&D was being conducted by an increasing number of companies classified among the nonmanufacturing industries. Again the number of industries used to develop the statistics for nonmanufacturers was increased. Consequently, the annual reports in this series for 1987-91 included separate R\&D estimates for firms in the communication, utility, engineering, architectural, research, development, testing, computer programming, and data processing service industries; hospitals; and medical labs. Approximately 9 percent of the estimated industrial R\&D performance during 1987 was undertaken by nonmanufacturing firms.

After the list of industries for which statistics were published was expanded, it became clear that the sample design itself should be changed to reflect the widening population of R\&D performers among firms in the nonmanufacturing industries ${ }^{47}$ and small firms in all industries so as to account better for births of R\&Dperforming firms and to produce more reliable statistics.

[^71]Beginning with the 1992 survey, NSF decided to (1) draw new samples with broader coverage annually, and (2) increase the sample size to approximately 25,000 firms. ${ }^{48}$ As a result of the sample redesign, for 1992 the reported nonmanufacturing share was (and has continued to be) 25-30 percent of total R\&D. ${ }^{49}$

## Time-Series Analyses

The statistics resulting from this survey on R\&D spending and personnel are often used as if they were prepared using the same collection, processing, and tabulation methods over time. Such uniformity has not been the case. Since the survey was first fielded, improvements have been made to increase the reliability of the statistics and to make the survey results more useful. To that end, past practices have been changed and new procedures instituted. Preservation of the comparability of the statistics has, however, been an important consideration in making these improvements. Nonetheless, changes to survey definitions, the industry classification system, and the procedure used to assign industry codes to multi-establishment companies have had some, though not substantial, effects on the comparability of statistics. ${ }^{50}$

The aspect of the survey that had the greatest effect on comparability was the selection of samples at irregular intervals (i.e., 1967, 1971, 1976, 1981, 1987, and 1992) and the use of a subset or panel of the last sample drawn to develop statistics for intervening years. As discussed earlier, this practice introduced cyclical deterioration of the statistics. As compensation for this deterioration, periodic revisions were made to the statistics produced from the panels surveyed between sample years. Early in the survey's history, various methods were used to make these revisions. ${ }^{51}$ After 1976 and until the 1992 advent of annual sampling, a linking procedure called wedging was used. ${ }^{52}$ In wedging, the 2 sample years on each end of a

[^72]series of estimates served as benchmarks in the algorithms used to adjust the estimates for the intervening years. ${ }^{53}$

## Comparisons to Other Statistical Series

NSF collects data on federally financed R\&D from both Federal funding agencies-using the Survey of Federal Funds for Research and Development-and from performers of the R\&D-industry, Federal labs, universities, and other nonprofit organizations-using the Survey of Industrial Research and Development and other surveys. ${ }^{54}$ As reported by Federal agencies, NSF publishes data on Federal R\&D budget authority and outlays, in addition to Federal obligations. These terms are defined below: 55

- Budget authority is the primary source of legal authorization to enter into obligations that will result in outlays. Budget authority is most commonly granted in the form of appropriations by the congressional committees assigned to determine the budget for each function.

[^73]- Obligations represent the amounts for orders placed, contracts awarded, services received, and similar transactions during a given period, regardless of when the funds were appropriated or when future payment of money is required.
- Outlays represent the amounts for checks issued and cash payments made during a given period, regardless of when the funds were appropriated or obligated.

National R\&D expenditure totals in NSF's National Patterns of $R \& D$ Resources report series are primarily constructed with data reported by performers and include estimates of Federal R\&D funding to these sectors. But until performer-reported survey data on Federal R\&D expenditures are available from industry and academia, data collected from the Federal agency funders of R\&D
were used to project R\&D performance. When survey data from the performers subsequently are tabulated, as they were for this report, these statistics replace the projections based on funder expectations. Historically, the two survey systems have tracked fairly closely. For example, in 1980, performers reported using $\$ 29.5$ billion in Federal R\&D funding, and Federal agencies reported total R\&D funding between $\$ 29.2$ billion in outlays and $\$ 29.8$ billion in obligations. ${ }^{56}$ In recent years, however, the two series have diverged considerably. The difference in the Federal R\&D totals appears to be concentrated in funding of industry, primarily aircraft and missile firms, by the Department of Defense. Overall, industrial firms have reported significant declines in Federal R\&D support since 1990 (see table A-1), while Federal agencies have reported level or slightly increased funding of industrial R\&D. ${ }^{57}$ NSF continues to identify and examine the factors behind these divergent trends.

[^74]
## Survey Definitions

## Employment, FTE R\&D Scientists and Engineers

Number of people domestically employed by R\&Dperforming companies who were engaged in scientific or engineering work at a level that required knowledge, gained either formally or by experience, of engineering or of the physical, biological, mathematical, statistical, or computer sciences equivalent to at least that acquired through completion of a 4-year college program with a major in one of those fields. The statistics show full-timeequivalent (FTE) employment of persons employed by the company during the January following the survey year who were assigned full time to $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$, plus a prorated number of employees who worked part time on R\&D.

## Employment, Total

Number of people domestically employed by R\&Dperforming companies in all activities during the pay period that includes the 12th of March, the date most employers use when paying first quarter employment taxes to the Internal Revenue Service.

## Federally Funded R\&D Centers (FFRDCs)

R\&D-performing organizations administered by industrial, academic, or other institutions on a nonprofit basis, and exclusively or substantially financed by the Federal Government. For the statistics in this report, R\&D expenditures of industry-administered FFRDCs were included with the Federal R\&D data of the industry classification of each of the administering firms. The indus-try-administered FFRDCs included in the 2000 survey, their corporate administrators, and location are indicated below. ${ }^{58}$

## FFRDCs Supported by the <br> Department of Energy

- Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Idaho Falls, ID, administered by

[^75]Lockheed Martin Idaho Technologies Co.

- Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, administered by Sandia Corporation a subsidiary of Lockheed Martin Corp.
- Savannah River Technology Center, Aiken, SC, administered by Westinghouse Corp.


## FFRDC Supported by the Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health

- National Cancer Institute (NCI) Frederick Cancer Research Facility, Frederick, MD, administered by Science Applications International Corporation, Advanced Bioscience Laboratories, Inc., Charles River Laboratories, Inc., and Data Management Services, Inc.


## Funds for R\&D, Company and Other Non-Federal

The cost of R\&D performed within the company and funded by the company itself or by other non-Federal sources; does not include the cost of R\&D supported by the company but contracted to outside organizations such as research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, or - to avoid double-countingother companies.

## Funds for R\&D, Federal

The cost of R\&D performed within the company under Federal R\&D contracts or subcontracts and R\&D portions of Federal procurement contracts and subcontracts; does not include the cost of R\&D supported by the Federal Government but contracted to outside organizations such as research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, or other companies.

## Funds for R\&D, Total

The cost of R\&D performed within the company in its own laboratories or in other company-owned or com-pany-operated facilities, including expenses for wages
and salaries, materials and supplies, property and other taxes, maintenance and repairs, depreciation, and an appropriate share of overhead; does not include capital expenditures or the cost of R\&D contracted to outside organizations such as research institutions, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, or-to avoid double-counting-other companies.

## Funds per R\&D Scientist or Engineer

All costs associated with the performance of industrial R\&D (salaries, wages, and fringe benefits paid to R\&D personnel; materials and supplies used for $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$; depreciation on capital equipment and facilities used for R\&D; and any other R\&D costs) divided by the number of $R \& D$ scientists and engineers employed. To obtain a per person cost of $R \& D$ for a given year, the total $R \& D$ expenditures of that year were divided by an approximation of the number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) scientists and engineers engaged in the performance of R\&D for that year. For accuracy, this approximation was the mean of the numbers of such FTE R\&D-performing scientists and engineers as reported in January for the year in question and the subsequent year. For example, the mean of the numbers of FTE R\&D scientists and engineers in January 2000 and January 2001 was divided into total 2000 R\&D expenditures for a total cost per R\&D scientist or engineer in 2000.

## Net Sales and Receipts

Dollar values for goods sold or services rendered by R\&D-performing companies to customers outside the company-including the Federal Government-less such items as returns, allowances, freight, charges, and excise taxes. Domestic intracompany transfers and sales by foreign subsidiaries were excluded, but transfers to foreign subsidiaries and export sales to foreign companies were included.

## R\&D and Industrial R\&D

R\&D is the planned, systematic pursuit of new knowledge or understanding toward general application (basic research); the acquisition of knowledge or understanding to meet a specific, recognized need (applied research); or the application of knowledge or understanding toward the production or improvement of a product, service, process, or method (development). Basic research analyzes properties, structures, and relationships toward formulating and testing hypotheses, theories, or laws; applied research is undertaken either to determine possible uses for the findings of basic research or to determine new ways of achieving specific, predetermined objectives; and development draws on research findings or other scientific knowledge for the purpose of producing new or significantly improving products, services, processes, or methods. As used in this survey, industrial basic research is the pursuit of new scientific knowledge or understanding that does not have specific immediate commercial objectives, although it may be in fields of present or potential commercial interest; industrial applied research is investigation that may use findings of basic research toward discovering new scientific knowledge that has specific commercial objectives with respect to new products, services, processes, or methods; and industrial development is the systematic use of the knowledge or understanding gained from research or practical experience directed toward the production or significant improvement of useful products, services, processes, or methods, including the design and development of prototypes, materials, devices, and systems. The survey covers industrial R\&D performed by people trainedeither formally or by experience-in engineering or in the physical, biological, mathematical, statistical, or computer sciences and employed by a publicly or privately owned firm engaged in for-profit activity in the United States. Specifically excluded from the survey are quality control, routine product testing, market research, sales promotion, sales service, and other nontechnological activities; routine technical services; and research in the social sciences or psychology.
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# NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION 

4201 WILSON BOULEVARD

## FROM THE DIRECTOR

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
The National Science Foundation (NSF) requests your company's participation in the 2000 Survey of Industrial Research and Development that the Bureau of the Census is conducting for us. This annual survey is the only source of detailed information on U.S. industry's research and development (R\&D) performance.

Your company's participation is vital to the accuracy of the resulting information. Because R\&D expenditures are concentrated in relatively few companies, a completed response is needed from each surveyed firm -- there is no substitute for the information that you can provide. Your company can be assured of complete confidentiality. Survey data will be released only in aggregate form so that responses of individual companies cannot be identified.

If you have questions concerning the operation of this survey, please direct them to the Census Bureau at (301) 457-1339. Survey results are made available in an annual report entitled Research and Development in Industry. If you would like to receive a copy of the most recent report, please call the NSF publication clearinghouse at (301) 947-2722 or send an e-mail message to paperpubs@nsf.gov.

Thank you for your assistance in this important effort.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Economics and Statistics Administration
U.S. Census Bureau

Washington, DC 20233-0001
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

## FROM THE ACTING DIRECTOR

 USS. CENSUS BUREAUWe have enclosed your company's report form and instructions for the 2000 "Survey of Industrial Research and Development (R\&D)." In addition to the traditional report form, we have included a Computerized Self-Administered Questionnaire diskette that you may use as an alternative format for reporting. Please refer to the instructions for installation. If you have any questions about installing or using the diskette, please contact the Electronic Reporting Staff on 301-457-4125.

The diskette and Form RD-1 contain information from the previous report for your company. Please review the instructions, complete the diskette or the form, and return it within 60 days. Information you report should cover the domestic operations of your consolidated enterprise for calendar year 2000. Federal law requires your response to four items identified on the form. Your voluntary response to all other items is needed to assure useful results.

Data from this survey have many business and policy uses. They provide information for examining R\&D tax credits. Some businesses are able to use R\&D tax credits to reduce their federal tax burden. The data also assist public officials in allocating research funding by state, which may benefit companies like yours. In addition, analysts use the results to compare spending in this country with other countries to ensure that U.S. businesses are not at a competitive disadvantage.

We recognize that providing this information is a burden, and we have worked hard to minimize it. For example, if you do not have book records for any item, you may provide carefully prepared estimates. The law that authorizes this survey (Title 13, United States Code) requires that we keep your report in full confidence. Only sworn Census Bureau employees will see your information, and they will use it only for statistical purposes.

We conduct this survey with National Science Foundation (NSF) support. We have enclosed a letter from the Director of NSF encouraging your response to the survey. If you have any questions, please call my staff on 301-457-1339. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,


William G. Barron
Enclosures

$\left.\begin{array}{l|c|}\begin{array}{l}\text { NOTICE - Your report to the Census Bureau is } \\ \text { confidential by law (Title 13, U.S. Code). It } \\ \text { may be seen only by sworn Census employees } \\ \text { and may be used only for statistical purposes. } \\ \text { The law also provides that copies retained in } \\ \text { your files are immune from legal process. }\end{array} & \text { CENSUS } \\ \text { USE }\end{array}\right]$ SNLY

THIS REPORT SHOULD COVER YOUR ENTIRE CONSOLIDATED DOMESTIC ENTERPRISE, INCLUDING ALL U.S. SUBSIDIARIES AND DIVISIONS.
The term "company" on this form refers to the consolidated domestic enterprise.

- Please complete this form by the date printed at the top of this page and return it in the envelope provided. Make a copy for your records.
- Please read the enclosed instructions before completing this form.
- Report figures in thousands of dollars. Reasonable estimates are acceptable.
- Explain significant changes in year-to-year data in the remarks section.

COVERAGE REVIEW Was this company owned or controlled by another company on December 31, 2000?
$1303 \square$ Yes - See instructions for Coverage Review.
$1304 \square$ No - Continue with item 1

Section I-GENERAL COMPANY DATA

Item 1 - RECEIPTS AND EMPLOYMENT FOR THE COMPANY
A. Sales, operating receipts and revenues from all domestic operations of the company, net of returns and allowances. (Report in thousands of dollars) EXCLUDE domestic intra-company transfers and sales by foreign subsidiaries.
INCLUDE receipts for sales of products and services provided to other companies, individuals, U.S. Government agencies, and foreign countries.
B. Domestic company employment in all activities during the pay period which includes the 12 th of March 2000 (Item 1 of I.R.S. Form 941, if one Form 941 was filled for the entire company.)

| 1999 |  |  | 2000 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bil. | Mil. | Thou. | Bil. | Mil. | Thou. |
| 101 |  |  | 102 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number |  |  | Number |  |  |
| 111 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Item 2 - NUMBER OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS
Apportion on a full-time equivalent basis. See page 4 of the instruction booklet for more detail.

|  | January 2000 | January 2001 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Number | Number |
| A. Federal research and development | 503 | 504 |
| B. Company and other research and development | 505 | 506 |
| C. TOTAL-Sum of lines 2A and $2 B \rightarrow$ | 501 | 502 |

tem 3 - COSTS INCURRED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
Report in thousands of dollars)
A. Performed within the company 1. Basic research

## 2. Applied and <br> development

a. Applied research
b. Development
c. Total - Sum of lines $a$ and $b$
3. Total - Sum of lines 1 and 2.c.
B. Outside the company - Federal funds and company funds for research and development performed by others outside the company within the United States (Exclude from 3A.3. above)
C. Foreign - Company funds for research and development performed by foreign subsidiaries developmen performed by foreign subsidiaries or other organizations outside the United States (Exclude from 3A.3. and 3B. above)
D. TOTAL - Company and other funds, except Federal (This ine represents company sponsored research and development with the exception of
"other funds.") - Sum of 3A.3, B, and C, (column 5)
Item 4 - COMPANY AND OTHER FUNDS, EXCEPT FEDERAL, FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY BUDGETED FOR THE YEAR 2001
(Comparable to the 2000 figure reported in Item 3A.3., column (5).)
Section II- RESEARCHAND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE DOMESTIC COMPANY

Item 5 - COSTS INCURRED FOR FEDERAL RESEARCH ANO DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY BY PRINCIPAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY
Allocate the total reported in ltem 3A., line 3 column (4), Federal funds, into the following principal agencies:

1. Department of Defense
2. National Aeronautics and Space Administration
3. Department of Energy
4. Other Federal agencies
5. TOTAL COSTS - Sum of lines 1 through $4 \rightarrow$

ORM RD-1 (12-12-2000)

| Key <br> code | 1999 <br> (1) |  |  | 2000 <br> (2) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bil. | Mil. | Thou. | Bil. | Mil. | Thou. |
| 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Item 6 - COSTS INCURRED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY BY MAJOR TYPE OF EXPENSE

| Allocate the total reported in Item 3A., line 3, column (6), total company research and development - Exclude lines 3B. and 3C. | Key code <br> 6 | $\begin{gathered} 1999 \\ (1) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ (2) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bil. | Mil. | Thou. | Bil. | Mil. | Thou. |
| 1. Wages and salaries of research and development personnel - Include scientists and engineers, technicians, secretaries, and other personnel. | 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Costs of materials and supplies consumed Do not include in this item components, models, and other materials supplied by other research organizations. | 02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Depreciation on R \& D property and equipment | 05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Other costs - Include service and supporting costs, and share of overhead. | 03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. TOTAL COSTS - Sum of lines 1 through $4 \rightarrow$ | 04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Section II- RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE DOMESTIC COMPANY - Continued

Item 7 - COST OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY BY STATE
 each State. If necessary, you may report up to 10 percent of your total as "Not distributed by State."

| Key code | State | 1999 |  | 2000 |  | Key code | State | 1999 |  | 2000 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Federal funds $(1)$ | Total funds (2) | Federal funds <br> (1) | Total funds (2) |  |  | Federal funds <br> (1) | Total funds <br> (2) | Federal funds <br> (1) | Total funds <br> (2) |
| 9 |  | Bil. Mil. Thou | Bil. Mil. Thou | Bil. Mil. Thou | Bil. Mil. Thou | 9 |  | Bil. Mil. Thou | Bil. Mil. Thou | Bil. Mil. Thou | Bil. Mil. Thou |
| 01 | AL | 1 | 11 | 11 | 1 | 27 | MT | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1 \quad 1$ |
| 02 | AK | 1 | 1 | 11 | 11 | 28 | NE | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 03 | $A Z$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.1 | 29 | NV | 1 | 1.1 | 1 | 1 |
| 04 | $A R$ | 1 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 30 | NH | 1 | 1 | 11 | 11 |
| 05 | CA | 1 | 11 | 1 | 11 | 31 | NJ | 1 | 1 | I | 1 |
| 06 | CO | $1-1$ | 1 - | 1 | 1 | 32 | NM | 1.1 | 11 | 1 | 1 - |
| 07 | CT | 1 | 1 | 11 | 11 | 33 | NY | 11 | 1 1 | 11 | 11 |
| 08 | DE | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 34 | NC | 1 | I | 11 | 11 |
| 09 | DC | 11 | $1-1$ | 1.1 | 1 - | 35 | ND | 1 | 1.1 | 1 | $\downarrow$ |
| 10 | FL | 11 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 36 | OH | 1 | 1 | 11 | 1 |
| 11 | GA | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 37 | OK | T 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12 | HI | 1 | $1-1$ | 1 | $1-1$ | 38 | OR | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 13 | ID | 11 | 1 | 11 | 11 | 39 | PA | 11 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| 14 | IL | 1 | 1 | 11 | $1 \quad 1$ | 40 | RI | T | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 15 | IN | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1. | 41 | SC | 1.1 | 1.1 | 11 | 1.1 |
| 16 | 1 A | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 42 | SD | 11 | 11 | 11 | 1 |
| 17 | KS | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 43 | TN | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 18 | KY | 1.1 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 44 | TX | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.1 |
| 19 | LA | 1 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 45 | UT | 11 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| 20 | ME | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 46 | VT | 1 | 1 | 1 | T T |
| 21 | MD | 1 | 11 | 1.1 | 1 | 47 | VA | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 22 | MA | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 48 | WA | 11 | , | 1 | 1 |
| 23 | Ml | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 49 | WV | 1 | 1 | 1 | I |
| 24 | MN | 1 1 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 50 | WI | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 25 | MS | 1 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 51 | WY | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 26 | MO | 11 | $1-1$ | T | 1 | 52 | * | 1 | $1-1$ | , | 1 |
| 53 | TOTAL COSTS - Sum of lines 1 through 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll}953 & 1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll}1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll}954 & 1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{array}$ |

## Item 8 - ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY

- Report expenditures for energy research and development by type of energy sources. Include the project cost or portion of type of energy sources. include the project cost or portion project cost incurred for the purpose of increasing energ
resources or capabilities. These expenditures should be included in Item 3.A., line 3, columns (4) and (6).
- Estimate expenditures for energy research by energy source for 2001.
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## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Comprehensive and timely information about the nature and support of corporate research and development activities is an important component in the overall assessment of our nation's scientific and technological resources. The information you provide is used to prepare national measures of industrial research and development (R\&D) not available from any other source. By carefully completing this report, the accuracy of this information is assured.
TAX INCENTIVES - Most states offer some type of incentive for research and development activity. Many of the states offer an income tax credit modeled after the federal research and experimentation tax credit guidelines. Other types of incentives include sales and use tax credits and property tax credit. A few states which offer tax incentives are: California, Minnesota, Washington, and Wisconsin. For further information on state tax incentives, please contact the Comptroller of the Treasury in your state.
DUE DATE - Please complete and return this form in the envelope provided within 60 days. Make a copy for your records.
SURVEY SCOPE - This report covers publicly traded and privately-owned, nonfarm business firms in all sectors of the United States economy. It does not include operations owned by Federal, state or local governments, nonprofit organizations, or trust or pension plans.

If your company is owned by a Federal, state or local government, is a nonprofit organization, or is a trust or pension plan which performs no activity other than investments, do not report. Please note in the remarks section on the back page of the form and return it.
REPORTING ENTITY - Report research and development activities for all domestic operations of your entire consolidated domestic enterprise, including subsidiaries and divisions. The term "company" in these instructions refers to the consolidated domestic enterprise. Report for all parts of the company located in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Report net receipts and employment figures for all parts of the company, even those that do not perform R\&D, as long as they are located in the 50 states or the District of Columbia.
If this form has been directed to a holding company, report for all subsidiaries and operations under the ownership and control of the holding company.
If you report separately for a component of this company based upon an arrangement with the Census Bureau, please continue to do so.
COVERAGE REVIEW - Check the appropriate box if this company was owned or controlled by another company on December 31, 2000. If yes, follow the instructions below:

- If you have been reporting separately for this component of the company based upon an arrangement with the Census Bureau, please complete the form.
- If your company is owned by a foreign company, please complete the form and fill out the new owner information in the remarks section, page 4.
- If your company was purchased by another company on or prior to March 31, 2000, please write the name and address of the new owner in the remarks section, page 4 , sign the form in Item 11, and fax the form to (301) 457-1318.
- If your company was purchased after March 31, 2000, please complete the form for the months prior to the purchase of your company, write the name and address of the new owner in the remarks section, page 4, and return the form in the envelope provided.

If you have questions, please call the R\&D Survey staff at (301) 457-4677 to determine whether you are required to complete the form.

PERIOD COVERED BY THE REPORT - Report figures for calendar year 2000. Fiscal year data are acceptable for all items except for employment, provided your fiscal year ends between September 2000 and March 2001. Please report employment figures (Items 1B and 2) for the specific times indicated for these items.

HOW TO REPORT - Report all value figures in thousands of dollars. If you cannot answer a question from your company records, please estimate the answer carefully.

Example: 1,123,678,599 dollars.

Report | Bil. | Mil. | Thou. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 1$ | 123 | 679 |

If you estimate your answers in millions of dollars, please fill the thousands box with zeros.

Example: 1,124

Report | Bil. | Mil. | Thou. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 1$ | 124 | 000 |

FIGURES FOR 1999 PRINTED ON THE FORM - If
your company reported for 1999, entries from that form have been printed on the present form. If these figures are incorrect, please revise them. Please describe in the "Remarks" section the reasons for any substantial increase or decrease in the 2000 figures entered on this form when compared to corresponding 1999 figures or changes in the 1999 figures. Examples of such reasons are new government contracts, acquisitions and divestitures, and revised accounting method. If you acquired or disposed of a unit performing an important amount of research and development during the 2 -year period, please identify the unit in "Remarks," and give the total amount of research and development accounted for by that unit.
ADDITIONAL FORMS - Photocopies of this form are acceptable. If you require additional forms, write to the U.S. Census Bureau, 1201 East 10th Street, Jeffersonville, IN 47132-0001 or call (812) 218-3331.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS - Continued

FILING EXTENSIONS - If you cannot complete the form in 60 days, request an extension of time by:

- calling the Census Touchtone Data Entry System on 1-800-851-2014 (have your 10-digit Census File Number, "CFN", available. The CFN is printed on the form above your address.)

OR

- writing to the address below (Please include your 10-digit Census File Number):
U.S. Census Bureau

1201 East 10th Street
Jeffersonville, IN 47132-0001

ALTERNATIVE REPORTING FORMATS - Included with the survey form is a computer diskette. Reporting your company information on the diskette is an alternative means of completing the survey. If you do report on the diskette do not mail in the paper form.

Receiving your data on diskette benefits us through reduced processing costs. Please refer questions concerning operation of the diskette to the Electronic Reporting Staff at (301) 457-4125.

BURDEN HOUR ESTIMATE - Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimates or any other aspects of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Suzanne H. Plimpton, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 485, Arlington, VA 22230.
Direct QUESTIONS regarding this form to the U.S. Census Bureau, Manufacturing and Construction Division, ATTN.: Special Studies Branch, Room 2135/4, Washington, DC 20233-6900, call (301) 457-1339 or E-mail to antoinette.j.ralston@census.gov. (Please see the instructions for Item 11 on page 7 for E-mail warning.)

## DEFINITION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

R\&D includes basic and applied research in the sciences and engineering. It also includes design and development of new products and processes and enhancement of existing products and processes.
R\&D includes activities carried on by persons trained, either formally or by experience, in the physical sciences such as chemistry and physics, the biological sciences such as medicine, and engineering and computer science. R\&D includes these activities if the purpose is to do one or more of the following things:

1. Pursue a planned search for new knowledge, whether or not the search has reference to a specific application. (Basic research)
2. Apply existing knowledge to problems involved in the creation of a new product or process, including work required to evaluate possible uses. (Applied research)
3. Apply existing knowledge to problems involved in the improvement of a present product or process. (Development)
Research and development includes the activities described above whether assigned to separate R\&D organizational units of the company or carried out by company laboratories and technical groups not part of an R\&D organization. Reporting the R\&D activities of such latter groups may require the use of estimates for some of your responses.
Activities to be excluded from R\&D:

- R\&D from acquired companies prior to acquisition
- R\&D amortization above actual cost resulting from valuing capitalized R\&D at fair market value for acquisitions accounted for by the purchase method of accounting
- Test and evaluation once a prototype becomes a production model
- Routine product testing
- Geological and geophysical exploration activities
- Technical services such as:
- quality and quantity control
- technical plant sanitation control
- trouble-shooting in connection with breakdowns in full-scale production
- Advertising programs to promote or demonstrate new products or processes
- Assistance in preparation of speeches and publications for persons not engaged in research and development.
- Social Science R\&D which is defined to encompass those activities devoted to further understanding the behavior of groups of human beings or of individuals as members of groups. Some of the topics include the following:
- Personnel R\&D
- Economic R\&D
- Artificial intelligence and expert systems R\&D
- Consumer, market, and opinion R\&D
- Engineering psychology R\&D
- Management and organization R\&D
- Actuarial and demographic R\&D
- Educational processes and applications R\&D
- R\&D in law


## ITEM BY ITEM INSTRUCTIONS

## Section I - GENERAL COMPANY DATA

## Item 1 - RECEIPTS AND EMPLOYMENT FOR THE COMPANY

## Item 1 A - Net Sales, Operating Receipts and Revenues

Include:

- Sales, operating receipts and revenues from all domestic operations of the company, net of returns and allowances. This includes receipts from sales of products and services provided to other companies, individuals, U.S. Government agencies, and foreign countries.
- Net selling value of shipments, f.o.b. plant, after discounts and allowances minus freight charges and excise taxes
- Revenue from investments, rents, and royalties only if it is the principal business of the company. Finance, insurance and real estate companies should include interest, dividends, commissions and rental income as part of revenues.
- Value of assets sold under a capital lease agreement
- Export transfers to your foreign subsidiaries

Exclude:

- Sales and other taxes collected and paid directly to government taxing agencies
- Domestic intra-company transfers
- Receipts from sale of products and services provided by your foreign subsidiaries
- Income from interest, dividends and commissions, (except for companies in the finance, insurance and real estate industries).
- Other nonoperating income (e.g., royalties)


## Item 1 B - Domestic Company Employment

Include:

- The number of full and part-time employees of the company as defined on Treasury Form 941, Employer's Quarterly Federal Tax Return, and Circular E, Employer's Tax Guide, if filed for the entire company.
- The number of employees in all activities in the 50 States and the District of Columbia during the pay period which includes March 12, 2000.
- Persons on paid sick leave, paid holidays, and paid vacations during the pay period which includes March 12, 2000.

Report the number of employees, not payroll.

## Item 2 - NUMBER OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Scientists and engineers are defined for this survey as all persons engaged in scientific or engineering work at a level which requires a knowledge of physical or life sciences or engineering or mathematics. Their experience is equivalent to completion of a 4-year college course with a major in these fields, regardless of whether or not they actually hold a degree in this field.

The figure on R\&D scientists and engineers will be obtained primarily from two sources:

1. For company laboratories performing only research and development, report the number of scientists and engineers employed in January, 2001.
2. For employees whose activities are not solely devoted to R\&D, report the proportion of their time that is devoted to R\&D. For example, if a company had the full-time equivalent of 60 scientists and engineers in January 2001 and one-fourth of their time was charged to R\&D projects, the figure for the number of R\&D scientists and engineers for this company would be 15 .

## Item 3 - COSTS INCURRED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

## Source of Funds for Research and Development Costs

## Federal funds

Include:

- Federally-sponsored research and development performed within the company. Include only the amount of work done on Federal R\&D contracts or subcontracts in the current year.
- R\&D portion of procurement contracts or subcontracts


## Exclude:

- For Item 3A exclude Federal R\&D contracts and R\&D portions of procurement contracts that your company subcontracted to other R\&D organizations. Including these funds would cause duplication in the statistical totals, which include data on work actually performed by each company. Report subcontracted costs in Item 3B.
- Expenditures for independent research and development (IR\&D). These are included in company funds. (See definition below.)


## Company and other funds

## Include:

- Company-sponsored research and development performed within the company and R\&D performed under contract from non-Federal sources


## ITEM BY ITEM INSTRUCTIONS - Continued

## Item 3 - COSTS INCURRED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT - Continued

## Company and other funds - Continued

Include:

- Costs for independent research and development (IR\&D). We define IR\&D funds as R\&D performed by the company for which you anticipate reimbursement by the government through indirect charges for the purchase of products or services. Qualified projects usually have potential interest to the Department of Defense or other agencies of the Federal government. These IR\&D funds are excluded from federal funds received for federally-sponsored research and development contracts.
- Costs for which you anticipate reimbursement as company funds. Report expenditures in the period for which they are incurred. Do not include the actual reimbursement.
Item 3A - PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY


## Types of R\&D Costs

Include as R\&D costs:

- Wages, salaries, and related costs
- Materials and supplies consumed
- R\&D depreciation
- Cost of computer software used in R\&D activities
- Utilities, such as telephone, telex, electricity, water, and gas
- Travel costs and professional dues
- Property taxes and other taxes (except income taxes) incurred on account of the R\&D organization or the facilities they use
- Insurance expenses
- Maintenance and repair, including maintenance of buildings and grounds
- Company overhead including: personnel, accounting, procurement and inventory, and salaries of research executives not on the payroll of the R\&D organization

Exclude as R\&D costs:

- R\&D from acquired companies prior to acquisition
- R\&D amortization above actual cost resulting from valuing capitalized R\&D at fair market value for acquisitions accounted for by the purchase method of accounting
- Capital expenditures
- Test and evaluation once a prototype becomes a production model
- Patent expenses
- Income taxes and interest
- R\&D performed abroad (see Item 3C), such as in Canada and Puerto Rico
- R\&D performed by non-company R\&D organizations of any kind (see Item 3B)
- Portion of company-held R\&D contracts that are subcontracted outside the reporting company (see Item 3B)
- Fellowships, grants, and gifts to promote R\&D or the study of science and engineering


## Item 3A. 1 - Basic Research

Include the cost of research projects which represent original investigation for the advancement of scientific knowledge and which do not have specific immediate commercial objectives, although they may be in the fields of present or potential interest to the reporting company.

## Item 3A.2a - Applied Research

Include the cost of research projects which represent investigation in discovery of new scientific knowledge and which have specific commercial objectives with respect to either products or processes.

## Item 3A.2b - Development

Include the cost of projects which represent technical activity concerned with non-routine problems encountered in translating research into products or processes.
Include:

- Expenditures for designing and conducting clinical trials of drugs, pharmaceuticals, or other products that have not been marketed
- Software development
- Designing and/or adapting software if the application has commercial value (exclude software development for internal use)
- Beta version of software being developed which has potential commercial application
- Design and operation of pilot plants and semi-work plants
- Engineering activity required to advance the design of a product or process so it meets specific functional and economic requirements
- Design, construction, and testing of prototypes and models including test models for defense contracts
- Designs for special manufacturing equipment and tools
- Preparation of reports, drawings, formulas, specifications, standard practice instructions, or operating manuals


## Exclude:

- Software development intended for within company use only
- Beta version of software being developed which does not have potential commercial application
- Routine technical services to customers
- Toolmaking and tool tryout
- Production of detailed construction drawings and manufacturing blueprints


## ITEM BY ITEM INSTRUCTIONS - Continued

## Item 3A.2c - Total Costs for Applied Research and Development

Add line 3A.2a and line 3A.2b.
Item 3A. 3 - Total Costs for Basic and Applied Research and Development Performed Within the Company

Add line 3A. 1 and line 3A.2c.
Estimating basic, applied, and development expenditures

If your company does not keep records that can be allocated to these specific categories, estimate by the following:

1. Isolate projects that clearly fall into the development category of R\&D costs. If your company fabricates products, development activity will include the design, construction, and testing of prototypes and models. If your company's R\&D involves the development of a "process" as in chemicals and petroleum, this development activity would primarily include the design and operation of pilot plants or semi-work plants.
2. Isolate the organizational units which have $R \& D$ activities that can be readily classified based on the function assigned to the unit. R\&D work performed in production units as well as in various laboratories is generally classified as development R\&D.
3. Distribute the balance of $R \& D$ costs on the basis of individual projects or on the basis of other summaries of the work.

## Item 3B - OUTSIDE THE COMPANY

Report payments in the form of contracts, grants, and fellowships made to other industrial firms, commercial laboratories, consultants, educational institutions, hospitals, and research institutions or other organizations.
Federal Funds (column 4): Report R\&D activities that your company subcontracted to other organizations using federal funds you received for R\&D contracts and R\&D portions of procurement contracts.
Company and Other Funds (column 5): Report R\&D activities that your company subcontracted to other organizations using company or other nonfederal funds.

## Item 3C - FOREIGN

Report the amount of R\&D financed by the U.S. parent or its foreign subsidiaries, including Canada and Puerto Rico, and performed by company R\&D laboratories, branch plants, or other organizations, located outside the United States. Foreign subsidiaries are those outside the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Exclude R\&D activities performed by foreign subsidiaries which were financed by foreign governments or other outside organizations.

## Item 3D - TOTAL

With the exception of "Other funds," this number represents company-sponsored R\&D. It is comparable to information reported on Form 10K, if you report to the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Add line 3A. 3 (column 5), line 3B (column 5), and line 3 C .

## Item 4 - COMPANY AND OTHER FUNDS, EXCEPT FEDERAL, FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY BUDGETED FOR THE YEAR 2001

Report the estimated cost of company and other nonfederally sponsored R\&D that will be performed within the 50 states and the District of Columbia in 2001. This item is comparable to the 2000 figure reported in Item 3A.3, column 5.

## Section II - RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE DOMESTIC COMPANY

Item 5 - COSTS INCURRED FOR FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY BY PRINCIPAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY
Distribute the cost of Federal research and development work (ltem 3A, line 3, columns 1 and 4) by Federal agency - If exact figures are not available by agency, please estimate or apportion according to the number of scientists and engineers working on the Federal projects and/or the costs of Federal programs.

## Item 6 - COSTS INCURRED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY BY MAJOR TYPE OF EXPENSE

If most R\&D is performed in units where summaries are regularly prepared by element of cost, base the breakdown of research and development costs upon the records of such units. If existing records do not yield figures for this item, the item may be estimated.

## Item 6.1 - Wages and Salaries

Report the gross earnings paid in calendar year 2000 to employees engaged in R\&D (follow the definition of salaries and wages that is used for calculating the withholding tax). Include salaries of officers in the research establishment(s) if a corporation; exclude payments to proprietor or partners if an unincorporated concern. (Scientists and engineers are defined in item 2.) Exclude employee fringe benefits which are to be reported in Item 6.3-Other Costs.

## ITEM BY ITEM INSTRUCTIONS - Continued

## Item 6.2 - Materials and Supplies

Report the delivered cost for all purchased materials consumed, whether received from other companies, withdrawn from inventory, or received from other establishments of this company. Include all work that was done for your laboratories and other technical units by non-company organizations (for example, model construction by a non-company model shop). Exclude purchases from other R\&D organizations.

## Item 6.3-Depreciation

Report depreciation on R\&D property and equipment related to your R\&D activities.

## Item 6.4-Other Costs

Include items related to your R\&D activities and not included in Items 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3. Include utilities, books and periodicals, property and other taxes, employee fringe benefits, and company overhead.

## Item 7 - COST OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY BY STATE

Report the cost of R\&D for each State in which your company has research and development laboratories or facilities. It is not necessary to calculate separately individual assignments which may be made outside the home State of a particular research staff.
As much as 10 percent of the total may, if desired, be reported in line 52 as "Not distributed by State."

## Item 8 - ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY

Include all spending for R\&D to increase energy resources or capabilities, including the development of energy equipment. Energy research and development can include costs of R\&D projects (both product and process) on exploration, extraction, transportation, processing, storage, generation (including conversion), distribution, conservation, etc., of present, new, or improved forms of energy. Record energy R\&D spending according to type of energy in Items 8A through 8D.
If R\&D spending is for joint or multiple purposes, estimate and report the portion of cost incurred for the energy purpose. In the limited number of cases where the separation of joint (multiple) costs by type of energy cannot be estimated, include the total cost of the R\&D project when the primary purpose of the project is energy research and development. If the project is not primarily for energy research and development then exclude all of the project cost.

[^76]
## Item 8C - "Conservation and Utilization"

Includes R\&D activities undertaken to reduce consumption either at the point of energy use or in the transmission, transportation, storage, and conversion of energy. Examples of such are R\&D undertaken primarily to reduce fuel consumption in manufacturing, to improve the efficiency of transportation of energy products, or to produce an end product which is more efficient in energy consumption.

## Item 8D - "All Other Energy"

Includes areas such as wind, waste, hydroelectric, etc. Also include in this category the development of energy equipment which cannot be readily classified in Items 8A through 8C.

## Section III - RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED OUTSIDE THE DOMESTIC COMPANY WITH COMPANY FUNDS

This section of the report form covers the R\&D reported in item 3.C of section I, on page two.

## Item 9 - FOREIGN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BY COUNTRY

Allocate the totals reported in Item 3.C., column 5 by the country in which your various research and development takes place. Estimate the costs associated with each country. If necessary, you may write in countries not listed.

## Item 10 - COVERAGE AND OPERATIONAL STATUS

Check the appropriate box if the domestic company expenditures on this form, including all subsidiaries, have R\&D. If no, please explain in remarks section or in a transmittal letter.

## Item 11 - CERTIFICATION

Report the name and telephone number of the person to contact regarding this report. Please sign and date the form.

If you wish to correspond by E-mail, please provide your E-mail address in the "Remarks" section.

## WARNING CONCERNING ELECTRONIC MAIL -

The Internet is NOT a secure means of transmitting information unless it is encrypted. If you choose to communicate with the Census Bureau via electronic mail, the Census Bureau cannot guarantee the privacy of the information while transmitted, but will safeguard it in accordance with Title 13. Be advised that making inquires regarding this survey via electronic mail may divulge your participation in this survey.

| NOTICE - Your report to the |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Census Bureau is confidential | Form <br> (1-29-2001) | SD -iA |
| by law (title 13, U.S. Code). |  |  |

The instructions and definitions on this form are not complete. Please read the enclosed instruction sheet before completing this form.

## RETURN TO

## USS. CENSUS BUREAU 1201 East 10th Street

 Jeffersonville, IN 47132-0001MANDATORY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
Data supplied in items 2A and $B$ and in item 3.A.3, columns 1 and 3 for 2000 on this form will satisfy the mandatory reporting requirements (title 13, U.S. Code).

## FROM THE ACTING DIRECTOR

## USS. CENSUS BUREAU

We have enclosed your company's report form and instructions for the 2000 Survey of Industrial Research and Development (R\&D). Please read the definition of R\&D on page 2 of the form and review Item 1. If your company does not conduct R\&D, please call the Touchstone Data Entry system to report on 1-800-851-2014. If your company conducted R\&D in 2000, please review the instructions, complete the form, and return it within 30 days. Federal law requires your response to four items identified on the form. Your voluntary response to all other items is needed to assure useful results.

This survey provides information for examining R\&D tax credits. Some businesses are able to use R\&D tax credits to reduce their Federal tax burden. The data assist public officials in allocating research funding by state, which may benefit companies like yours. Analysts also use the results to compare R\&D spending in this country with other countries to ensure that U.S. businesses are not at a competitive disadvantage.

Information you report should cover the domestic operations of your consolidated enterprise for calendar year 2000 . We recognize that providing this information is a burden, and we have worked hard to minimize it. For example, if you do not have book records for any item, you may provide carefully prepared estimates. The law that authorizes this survey (Title 13, United States Code) requires that we keep your report in full confidence. Only sworn U.S. Census Bureau employees will see your information, and they will use it only for statistical purposes.

We conduct this survey with National Science Foundation (NSF) support. We have enclosed a letter from the Director of the NSF encouraging your response to the survey. If you have any questions, please call my staff on (301) 457-1339. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

## Sincerely,



William G. Barron

## Enclosures

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

R\&D includes basic and applied research in the sciences and engineering. It also includes design and development of new products and processes and enhancement of existing products and processes.
R\&D includes activities carried on by persons trained, either formally or by experience, in the physical sciences such as chemistry and physics, the biological sciences such as medicine, and engineering and computer science. R\&D includes these activities if the purpose is to do one or more of the following things:

1. Pursue a planned search for new knowledge, whether or not the search has reference to a specific application. (Basic Research)
2. Apply existing knowledge to problems involved in the creation of a new product or process including work required to evaluate possible uses. (Applied Research)
3. Apply existing knowledge to problems involved in the improvement of a present product or process. (Development)

Research and development includes the activities described above whether assigned to separate R\&D organizational units of the company or carried out by company laboratories and technical groups not part of an R\&D organization. Reporting the R\&D activities of such latter groups may require the use of estimates for some of your responses.

Activities to be excluded from R\&D are as follows: research in social sciences or psychology, routine product testing, geological and geophysical exploration activities and technical services.

## Item 1 - CHECK FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mark ( $X$ ) the appropriate box.$\square$ Company had R\&D in 2000 - Complete form, enter zeros where applicable, and return this formCompany does not conduct R\&D - Either call TDE to report (1-800-851-2014) OR mark the 203 box and mail the form.

NOTE - After reviewing Item 1 if you need further assistance please call (301) 457-1339.

## Item 2 - RECEIPTS, EMPLOYMENT AND NUMBER OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS FOR COMPANY

A. Sales, operating receipts and revenues from all domestic operations of the company, net of returns and allowances. (Report in thousands of dollars)
INCLUDE receipts for sales of products and services provided to other companies, individuals, U.S. Government agencies, and foreign countries from all domestic operations of your company.

| 2000 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bil. | Mil. | Thou. | Dol. |
| 102 | 1 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\$$ |  |  | 000 |
| 2000 |  |  |  |
| Number |  |  |  |

B. Report domestic company employment in all activities during the pay period which includes the 12th of March 2000. (Item 1 of I.R.S. Form 941, if Form 941 was filed for the entire company.)
C. Report the full-time equivalent number of R\&D scientists and engineers employed in January 2001.

Number
For employees whose activities are not solely devoted to research and development, report the proportion of their time that is devoted to research and development. (See instructions for examples)

Item 3-COSTS INCURRED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN 2000



## INSTRUCTIONS FOR SURVEY OF INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DURING 2000 FORM RD-1A
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Item 3 - Costs Incurred for Research and Development ..... 4
Item 4 - Company and other Funds, Except Federal, for Research and Development Performed Within the Company Budgeted for the Year 2001 ..... 6
Item 5 - Coverage and Operational Status ..... 6
Item 6 - Certification ..... 6

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Comprehensive and timely information about the nature and support of corporate research and development activities is an important component in the overall assessment of our nation's scientific and technological resources. The information you provide is used to prepare national measures of industrial research and development (R\&D) not available from any other source. By carefully completing this report, the accuracy of this information is assured.
TAX INCENTATIVES - Most states offer some type of incentive for research and development activity. Many of the states offer an income tax credit modeled after the federal research and experimentation tax credit guidelines. Other types of incentives include sales and use tax credits and property tax credit. A few states which offer incentives are California, Minnesota, Washington, and Wisconsin. For further information on state tax incentives, please contact the Comptroller of the Treasury in your state.
DUE DATE - Please complete and return this form in the envelope provided within 30 days. Make a copy for your records.
SURVEY SCOPE - This report covers publicly traded and privately-owned, nonfarm business firms in all sectors of the United States economy. It does not include operations owned by Federal, state or local governments, nonprofit organizations, or trust or pension plans.
If your company is owned by a Federal, state or local government, is a nonprofit organization, or is a trust or pension plan which performs no activity other than investments, do not report. Please note in the remarks section on the back page of the form and return it.
REPORTING ENTITY - Report research and development activities for all domestic operations of your entire consolidated domestic enterprise, including subsidiaries and divisions. The term "company" in these instructions refers to the consolidated domestic enterprise. Report for all parts of the company located in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Report net receipts and employment figures for all parts of the company, even those that do not perform R\&D, as long as they are located in the 50 states or the District of Columbia.
If this form has been directed to a holding company, report for all subsidiaries and operations under the ownership and control of the holding company.
COVERAGE REVIEW - Check the appropriate box if this company was owned or controlled by another company on December 31, 2000. If yes, follow the instructions below:

- If your company is owned by a foreign company, please complete the form and fill out the new owner information on the back page of the form.
- If your company was purchased by another company on or prior to March 31, 2000, please complete the new owner information on the back page of the form, sign the form in Item 6, and fax the form to (301) 457-1318.
- If your company was purchased after March 31, 2000, please complete the form for the months prior to the purchase of your company, fill out the new owner information on the back page of the form, and return the form in the envelope provided.
If you have questions, please call the R\&D Survey staff at (301) 457-4677 to determine whether you are required to complete the form.

PERIOD COVERED BY THE REPORT - Report figures for calendar year 2000. Fiscal year data are acceptable for all items except for employment, provided your fiscal year ends between September 2000 and March 2001. Please report employment figures (Items 2B and 2C) for the specific times indicated for these items.

HOW TO REPORT - Report all value figures in thousands of dollars. If you cannot answer a question from your company records, please estimate the answer carefully.
Example: 1,123,678,599 dollars.

Report | Bil. | Mil. | Thou. | Dol. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\$ 1$ | 123 | 679 | 000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

If you estimate your answers in millions of dollars, please fill the thousands box with zeros.
Example: 1,124

Report | Bil. | Mil. | Thou. | Dol. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 1$ | 124 | 000 | 000 |

ADDITIONAL FORMS - Photocopies of this form are acceptable. If you require additional forms, write to the U.S. Census Bureau, 1201 East 10th Street, Jeffersonville, IN 47132-0001 or call (812) 218-3331.

FILING EXTENSIONS - If you cannot complete the form in 30 days, request an extension of time by:

- calling the Census Touchtone Data Entry System on 1-800-851-2014 (have your 10-digit Census File Number, "CFN", available. The CFN is printed on the form above your address.)
OR
- writing to the address below (Please include your 10-digit Census File Number):
U.S. Census Bureau

1201 East 10th Street
Jeffersonville, IN 47132-0001
BURDEN HOUR ESTIMATE - Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimates or any other aspects of this collection of information including suggestions for reducing this burden to Gail A. McHenry, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 485, Arlington, VA 22230.

Direct QUESTIONS regarding this form to the U.S. Census Bureau, Manufacturing and Construction Division, ATTN.: Special Studies Branch, Room 2135/4, Washington, DC 20233-6900, call (301) 457-1339 or E-mail to antoinette.j.ralston@census.gov. (Please see the instructions for Item 6 on page 6 for E -mail warning.)

## DEFINITION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

R\&D includes basic and applied research in the sciences and engineering. It also includes design and development of new products and processes and enhancement of existing products and processes.

R\&D includes activities carried on by persons trained, either formally or by experience, in the physical sciences such as chemistry and physics, the biological sciences such as medicine, and engineering and computer science. R\&D includes these activities if the purpose is to do one or more of the following things:

1. Pursue a planned search for new knowledge, whether or not the search has reference to a specific application. (Basic research)
2. Apply existing knowledge to problems involved in the creation of a new product or process, including work required to evaluate possible uses. (Applied research)
3. Apply existing knowledge to problems involved in the improvement of a present product or process. (Development)

Research and development includes the activities described above whether assigned to separate R\&D organizational units of the company or carried out by company laboratories and technical groups not part of an R\&D organization. Reporting the R\&D activities of such latter groups may require the use of estimates for some of your responses.

Activities to be EXCLUDED from R\&D:

- R\&D from acquired companies prior to acquisition
- R\&D amortization above actual cost resulting from valuing capitalized R\&D at fair market value for acquisitions accounted for by the purchase method of accounting.
- Test and evaluation once a prototype becomes a production model
- Routine product testing
- Geological and geophysical exploration activities
- Technical services such as:
- quality and quantity control
- technical plant sanitation control
- trouble-shooting in connection with breakdowns in full-scale production
- Advertising programs to promote or demonstrate new products or processes
- Assistance in preparation of speeches and publications for persons not engaged in research and development.
- Social Science R\&D which is defined to encompass those activities devoted to further understanding the behavior of groups of human beings or of individuals as members of groups. Some of the topics include the following:
- Personnel R\&D
- Economic R\&D
- Artificial intelligence and expert systems R\&D
- Consumer, market, and opinion R\&D
- Engineering psychology R\&D
- Management and organization R\&D
- Actuarial and demographic R\&D
- Educational processes and applications R\&D
- R\&D in law


## ITEM BY ITEM INSTRUCTIONS

## Item 1 - CHECK FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Check the box that best describes the R\&D activities of your company. If your company performed R\&D in 2000 then check box 201 and continue with Item 2.
If your company did not conduct R\&D in 2000 then call the Census Touchtone Data Entry system at 1-800-851-2014 to complete the survey. Have your 10 -digit Census File Number (CFN) ready before calling. The CFN is located above the address. This system will allow you to report that your company performed no R\&D in 2000. Do not mail in the form.
Alternatively, check the appropriate box, 203, on the form. Do not complete the data items. Go to Item 6, sign and return the form in the envelope provided.
You must call or mail in the form to complete your reporting requirements for the survey.

Item 2 - RECEIPTS, EMPLOYMENT AND NUMBER OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS FOR COMPANY

## Item 2A - Net Sales, Operating Receipts and Revenues

Include:

- Sales, operating receipts and revenues from all domestic operations of the company, net of returns and allowances. This includes receipts from sales of products and services provided to other companies, individuals, U.S. Government agencies, and foreign countries.
- Net selling value of shipments, f.o.b. plant, after discounts and allowances minus freight charges and excise taxes.
- Revenue from investments, rents, and royalties only if it is the principal business of the company. Finance, insurance and real estate companies should include interest, dividends, commissions and rental income as part of revenues.
- Value of assets sold under a capital lease agreement
- Export transfers to your foreign subsidiaries


## ITEM BY ITEM INSTRUCTIONS - Continued

## Item 2A - Net Sales, Operating Receipts and Revenues - Continued

Exclude:

- Sales and other taxes collected and paid directly to government taxing agencies
- Domestic intra-company transfers
- Receipts from sale of products and services provided by your foreign subsidiaries
- Income from interest, dividends and commissions, (except for companies in finance, insurance and real estate industries).
- Other nonoperating income (e.g., royalties)


## Item 2B - Domestic Company Employment

Include:

- The number of full/part-time employees of the company as defined on Treasury Form 941, Employer's Quarterly Federal Tax Return, and Circular E, Employer's Tax Guide, if filed for the entire company.
- The number of employees in all activities in the 50 States and the District of Columbia during the pay period which includes March 12, 2000.
- Persons on paid sick leave, paid holidays, and paid vacations during the pay period which includes March 12, 2000.

Report the number of employees, not payroll.

## Item 2C - Number of Research and Development Scientists and Engineers

Scientists and engineers are defined for this survey as all persons engaged in scientific or engineering work at a level which requires a knowledge of physical or life sciences or engineering or mathematics. Their experience is equivalent to completion of a 4 -year college course with a major in these fields, regardless of whether or not they actually hold a degree in this field.

The figure on R\&D scientists and engineers will be obtained primarily from two sources:

1. For company laboratories performing only research and development, report the number of scientists and engineers employed in January, 2001.
2. For employees whose activities are not solely devoted to R\&D, report the proportion of their time that is devoted to R\&D. For example, if a company had the full-time equivalent of 60 scientists and engineers in January 2001 and one-fourth of their time was charged to R\&D projects, the figure for the number of R\&D scientists and engineers for this company would be 15 .

## Item 3 - COSTS INCURRED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

## Source of Funds for Research and Development Costs

## Federal funds

Include:

- Federally-sponsored research and development performed within the company. Include only the amount of work done on Federal R\&D contracts or subcontracts in the current year.
- R\&D portion of procurement contracts or subcontracts

Exclude:

- For Item 3A exclude Federal R\&D contracts and R\&D portions of procurement contracts that your company subcontracted to other R\&D organizations. Including these funds would cause duplication in the statistical totals, which include data on work actually performed by each company. Report subcontracted costs in Item 3B.
- Expenditures for independent research and development (IR\&D). These are included in company funds. (See definition below.)


## Company and other funds

Include:

- Company-sponsored research and development performed within the company and R\&D performed under contract from non-Federal sources
- Costs for independent research and development (IR\&D). We define IR\&D funds as R\&D performed by the company for which you anticipate reimbursement by the government through indirect charges for the purchase of products or services. Qualified projects usually have potential interest to the Department of Defense or other agencies of the Federal government. These IR\&D funds are excluded from federal funds received for federally-sponsored research and development contracts.
- Costs for which you anticipate reimbursement as company funds. Report expenditures in the period for which they are incurred. Do not include the actual reimbursement.


## Item 3A - PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY

## - Types of R\&D Costs

Include as R\&D costs:

- Wages, salaries, and related costs
- Materials and supplies consumed
- R\&D depreciation


## ITEM BY ITEM INSTRUCTIONS - Continued

## Item 3A - PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY Continued

## Types of R\&D Costs - Continued

Include as R\&D costs - Continued:

- Cost of computer software used in R\&D activities
- Utilities, such as telephone, telex, electricity, water, and gas
- Travel costs and professional dues
- Property taxes and other taxes (except income taxes) incurred on account of the R\&D organization or the facilities they use
- Insurance expenses
- Maintenance and repair, including maintenance of buildings and grounds
- Company overhead including: personnel, accounting, procurement and inventory, and salaries of research executives not on the payroll of the R\&D organization

Exclude as R\&D costs:

- R\&D from acquired companies prior to acquisition
- R\&D amortization above actual cost resulting from valuing capitalized R\&D at fair market value for acquisitions accounted for by the purchase method of accounting.
- Capital expenditures
- Test and evaluation once a prototype becomes a production model
- Patent expenses
- Income taxes and interest
- R\&D performed abroad (see Item 3C), such as in Canada and Puerto Rico
- R\&D performed by non-company R\&D organizations of any kind (see Item 3B)
- Portion of company-held R\&D contracts that are subcontracted outside the reporting company (see Item 3B)
- Fellowships, grants, and gifts to promote R\&D or the study of science and engineering


## Item 3A. 1 - Basic Research

Include the cost of research projects which represent original investigation for the advancement of scientific knowledge and which do not have specific immediate commercial objectives, although they may be in the fields of present or potential interest to the reporting company.

## Item 3A.2a - Applied Research

Include the cost of research projects which represent investigation in discovery of new scientific knowledge and which have specific commercial objectives with respect to either products or processes.

## Item 3A.2b - Development

Include the cost of projects which represent technical activity concerned with non-routine problems encountered in translating research into products or processes.

Include:

- Expenditures for designing and conducting clinical trials of drugs, pharmaceuticals, or other products that have not been marketed
- Software development
- Designing and/or adapting software if the application has commercial value (exclude software development for internal use)
- Beta version of software being developed which has potential commercial application
- Design and operation of pilot plants and semi-work plants
- Engineering activity required to advance the design of a product or process so it meets specific functional and economic requirements
- Design, construction, and testing of prototypes and models including test models for defense contracts
- Designs for special manufacturing equipment and tools
- Preparation of reports, drawings, formulas, specifications, standard practice instructions, or operating manuals

Exclude:

- Routine technical services to customers
- Toolmaking and tool tryout
- Production of detailed construction drawings and manufacturing blueprints
- Software development intended for within company use only
- Beta version of software being developed which does not have potential commercial application

Item 3A.2c - Total Costs for Applied Research and Development

Add line 3A.2a and line 3A.2b.

## ITEM BY ITEM INSTRUCTIONS - Continued

## Item 3A. 3 - Total Costs for Basic and Applied Research and Development Performed Within the Company

Add line 3A. 1 and line 3A.2c.

## Estimating basic, applied, and development expenditures

If your company does not keep records that can be allocated to these specific categories, estimate by the following:

1. Isolate projects that clearly fall into the development category of R\&D costs. If your company fabricates products, development activity will include the design, construction, and testing of prototypes and models. If your company's R\&D involves the development of a "process" as in chemicals and petroleum, this development activity would primarily include the design and operation of pilot plants or semi-work plants.
2. Isolate the organizational units which have R\&D activities that can be readily classified based on the function assigned to the unit. R\&D work performed in production units as well as in various laboratories is generally classified as development R\&D.
3. Distribute the balance of R\&D costs on the basis of individual projects or on the basis of other summaries of the work.

## Item 3B - OUTSIDE THE COMPANY

Report payments in the form of contracts, grants, and fellowships made to other industrial firms, commercial laboratories, consultants, educational institutions, hospitals, and research institutions or other organizations.
Federal Funds (column 1): Report R\&D activities that your company subcontracted to other organizations using federal funds you received for R\&D contracts and R\&D portions of procurement contracts.
Company and Other Funds (column 2): Report R\&D activities that your company subcontracted to other organizations using company or other nonfederal funds.

## Item 3C - FOREIGN

Report the amount of R\&D financed by the U.S. parent or its foreign subsidiaries, including Canada and Puerto Rico, and performed by company R\&D laboratories, branch plants, or other organizations, located outside the United States. Foreign subsidiaries are those outside the 50 States and the District of Columbia.
Exclude R\&D activities performed by foreign subsidiaries which were financed by foreign governments or other outside organizations.

## Item 3D - TOTAL

With the exception of "Other funds," this number represents company-sponsored R\&D. It is comparable to information reported on Form 10K, if you report to the Securities and Exchange Commission.
Add line 3A. 3 (column 2), line 3B (column 2), and line 3 C .

Item 4 - COMPANY AND OTHER FUNDS, EXCEPT FEDERAL, FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMED WITHIN THE COMPANY BUDGETED FOR THE YEAR 2001

Report the estimated cost of company and other nonfederally sponsored R\&D that will be performed within the 50 states and the District of Columbia in 2001. This item is comparable to the 2000 figure reported in Item 3A.3, column 2.

## Item 5A - COVERAGE AND OPERATIONAL STATUS

Check the appropriate box indicating whether or not R\&D costs for the entire consolidated domestic enterprise, including subsidiaries were reported on this form. If no, please explain in the remarks section.

Check the appropriate box whether this company was owned or controlled by another company on December 31, 2000. If yes, please report the month and year your company was acquired and fill out the new owner information in Item 5B. Please see "COVERAGE REVIEW" in the General Instructions for a description of how to proceed in filling out the form.

## Item 5B - NEW OWNER INFORMATION

If the company was owned or controlled by another company on December 31, 2000, provide the name and address of the new owner. In the "Remarks" section, specify the change or correction, e.g., wholly-owned subsidiary of ABC Company", "merger with XYZ Company", "acquired by 123 Corporation".

## CHECK ITEM

Mark "Yes" or "No" as appropriate for each of the checks in this item. If the answer is "No" provide an explanation in the remarks section.

## Item 6 - CERTIFICATION

Report the name and telephone number of the person to contact regarding this report. Please sign and date the form.

If you wish to correspond by E-mail, please put your E-mail address in the remarks section.

WARNING CONCERNING ELECTRONIC MAIL: The Internet is not a secure means of transmitting information unless it is encrypted. If you choose to communicate with the Census Bureau via electronic mail, the Census Bureau cannot guarantee the privacy of the information while transmitted, but will safeguard it in accordance with Title 13. Be advised that making inquiries regarding this survey via electronic mail may divulge your participation in this survey.


5
he National Science Foundation promotes and advances scientific progress in the United States by competitively awarding grants for research and education in the sciences, mathematics and engineering.

To get the latest information about program deadlines, to download copies of NSF publications, and to access abstracts of awards, visit the NSF Web site at:

## http://www.nsf.gov

Location:
4201 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22230

For General Information (NSF Information Center):
(703) 292-1111

TDD (for the hearing-impaired):
(703) 292~5090

To Order Publications or Forms:
Send an e-mail to:
paperpubs@nsf.gov
or telephone:
(301) 947-2722

To Locate NSF Employees:
(703) 292~8183

The Foundation provides awards for research and education in the sciences and engineering. The awardee is wholly responsible for the conduct of such research and preparation of the results for publication. The Foundation, therefore, does not assume responsibility for the research findings or their interpretation.

The Foundation welcomes proposals from all qualified scientists and engineers and strongly encourages women, minorities, and persons with disabilities to compete fully in any of the research and education related programs described here. In accordance with Federal statutes, regulations, and NSF policies, no person on grounds of race, color, age, sex, national origin, or disability shall be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving financial assistance from the National Science Foundation.

Facilitation Awards for Scientists and Engineers with Disabilities (FASED) provide funding for special assistance or equipment to enable persons with disabilities (investigators and other staff, including student research assistants) to work on NSF projects. See the program announcement or contact the program coordinator at 703-292-8636.

The National Science Foundation has TDD (Telephonic Device for the Deaf) capability, which enables individuals with hearing impairment to communicate with the Foundation about NSF programs, employment, or general information. To access NSF TDD dial 703-292-5090; for FIRS, 1-800-877-8339.



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ See NSF (2002a).
    ${ }^{2}$ See NSF (2001).

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ See NSF (1956) and NSF (1960).
    ${ }^{4}$ Data obtained in the earlier BLS surveys are not directly comparable with Census figures because of methodological and other differences.
    ${ }^{5}$ In some tables in this report, the symbol "(D)" is used to indicate that estimates were withheld to avoid possible disclosure of information about operations of individual companies.

[^2]:    ${ }^{6}$ Data on R\&D performed at universities and colleges are collected in the annual Survey of Research and Development Expenditures at Universities and Colleges. More information about this survey is available from NSF's Division of Science Resources Statistics website at http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/rdexp/start.htm.
    ${ }^{7}$ See "Comparisons to Other Statistical Series" in section B for definitions of these terms.

[^3]:    ${ }^{8}$ See "Identifying Certainty Companies" in section B for more information about the employee cutoff and certainty threshold.
    ${ }^{9}$ In the Survey of Industrial Research and Development and in the publications presenting statistics resulting from the survey, the terms "firm," "company," and "enterprise" are used interchangeably. "Industry" refers to the 2-, 3-, or 4-digit North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes or group of NAICS codes used to publish statistics resulting from the survey.
    ${ }^{10}$ See "Frame Creation" in section B for more information about industry classification.

[^4]:    ${ }^{11}$ For a detailed comparison of NAICS to the Standard Industrial Classification (1987) of the United States, visit http://www.census.gov/ epcd/www/naics.html.

[^5]:    ${ }^{12}$ For more information, visit the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) website at http://www.oecd.org.

[^6]:    ${ }^{14}$ See "Frame Creation" and "Sample Selection" in section B for more information on the 5-employee cut-off and partitioning of the statistictical sample.

[^7]:    ${ }^{15}$ See "Comparability of Statistics" in section B for information on NAICS and how it compares with the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system used in reports prior to the 1999 edition.
    ${ }^{16}$ The 1997 version of NAICS was used for the 1999 survey.

[^8]:    ${ }^{17}$ See "Survey Nonresponse" in section B for more information on the reasons for unit and item nonresponse.

[^9]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^10]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table

[^11]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^12]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^13]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^14]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^15]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table

[^16]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^17]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table

[^18]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^19]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table

[^20]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^21]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^22]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^23]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^24]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^25]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^26]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^27]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^28]:    SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2000

[^29]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table

[^30]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^31]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^32]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^33]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^34]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^35]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^36]:    ${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with employment of 50 or more were included in the large company partition. In the nonmanufacturing sector, companies with employment of 15 or more were included in the large company partition. Companies in the respective sectors with employment below these values, but with at least 5 employees, were included in the small company partition. The purpose of partitioning the sample this way was to reduce the variability in industry estimates largely attributed to the random year-to-year selection of small companies by industry and the high sampling weights that sometimes were assigned to them. Because of this, detailed industry statistics were possible only from the large company partition; detailed industry statistics from the small company partition were not possible. Statistics from the small company partition are shown separately and are included in manufacturing, nonmanufacturing, and all industries totals. For more information, see "frame creation" and "sample selection" in the technical notes in Section B.

[^37]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^38]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^39]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^40]:    ${ }^{1}$ Statistics for 1999 have been revised since originally published.

[^41]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^42]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^43]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^44]:    ${ }^{20}$ Copies of the technical papers cited can be obtained from NSF's Research and Development Statistics Program in the Division of Science Resources Statistics.
    ${ }^{21}$ In the Survey of Industrial Research and Development and in the publications presenting statistics resulting from the survey, the terms "company," "firm," and "enterprise" are used interchangeably. "Industry" refers to the 2-, 3-, or 4-digit North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes or group of NAICS codes used to publish statistics resulting from the survey.
    ${ }^{22}$ The 1999 survey was the first year that companies were classified using NAICS. Prior to 1999, the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system was used. The two systems are discussed later under "Comparability of Statistics."

[^45]:    ${ }^{23}$ Both issues are discussed later in this section.
    ${ }^{24}$ See U.S. Bureau of the Census (1994d).
    ${ }^{25}$ These industries are listed and discussed below under "Comparability of Statistics."

[^46]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^47]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^48]:    ${ }^{26}$ Before 1994, companies with 1,000 or more employees had been selected with certainty, but it was observed that the level of spending varied considerably and that many of these companies reported no R\&D expenditures each year. For these reasons, it was determined that these companies should be given chances of selection based upon the size of their R\&D spending if they were in the previous survey or upon an estimated $R \& D$ value if they were not. Consequently, the size criterion based on the number of employees was dropped for surveys after 1994. With a fixed total sample size, there was concern that the representation of the very large noncertainty universe by a smaller sample each year would be inadequate. So, to limit the growth occurring each year in the number of certainty cases within the total sample, the certainty criterion was raised for the 1996 survey from $\$ 1$ million to $\$ 5$ million in total R\&D expenditures based on data gathered from the 1995 survey.

[^49]:    ${ }^{27}$ For comparison, these counts in the 1999 survey were 613,257 and 1.3 million, respectively.

[^50]:    ${ }^{28} \mathrm{Had}$ there been a zero-industry stratum in the 2000 sample, it would have been sampled using srs as discussed previously under "Identifying "Zero" Industries."

[^51]:    ${ }^{29}$ Companies that were missing or had an incomplete North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) code at the time of sampling were assigned to an "unclassified" industry category temporarily. If an "unclassified" company reported $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ expenditures, its primary industrial activity was investigated and a NAICS code was assigned during statistical processing.

[^52]:    ${ }^{30}$ The relative standard error (RSE) is a percentage that can be added to and subtracted from the published estimate to allow the user to construct an interval with prescribed confidence that the interval includes the actual value. The 1999 and 2000 survey samples were designed to produce RSEs targeted at 2 percent for industries in which there is a large amount of $\mathrm{R} \& D$ expenditures and 5 percent for industries in which there is a moderate amount of R\&D expenditures. For industries in which there is little expenditure for R\&D, the RSEs typically are larger.
    ${ }^{31}$ See "Weighting and Maximum Weights" later in this section.

[^53]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table

[^54]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^55]:    ${ }^{32}$ See U.S. Bureau of Census (1995).
    ${ }^{33}$ See "Revisions to Historical and Immediate Prior-Year Statistics" later in this section.

[^56]:    ${ }^{34}$ Even though data on federally funded contracted-out $R \& D$ are collected, the tables based on the data tend to be "spotty." That is, because federally funded contracted-out R\&D is reported by so few companies, most of the resulting statistics arrayed by industry have to be suppressed because of confidentiality. Further, because of the sporadic nature of Federal funding of R\&D in some industries, even in the aggregate, year-to-year changes can be quite large. Consequently, the tables containing the statistics are not published. Following are the results of recent data collections. In the 1997 table, the "all industries" total had to be suppressed, so no meaningful estimate could be made for that year. For 1998, the "all industries" total was $\$ 4.3$ billion; for 1999, the data were not tabulated; and for 2000, the "all industries" total was $\$ 0.8$ billion. We will continue to tabulate this item and report the aggregate estimate when possible.
    ${ }^{35}$ For detailed discussions on the sources, control, and measurement error resulting from item nonresponse, see U.S. Bureau of the Census (1994b).

[^57]:    ${ }^{36}$ All but four items-total R\&D, Federal R\&D, net sales, and total employment, which are included in the Census Bureau's annual mandatory statistical program-are voluntary. See further discussion under "Response Rates and Mandatory Versus Voluntary Reporting" later in this section.

[^58]:    ${ }^{37}$ For detailed descriptions and analyses of the imputation methods and algorithms used, see U.S. Bureau of the Census (1994c).

[^59]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^60]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^61]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^62]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table.

[^63]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table

[^64]:    See explanatory information and SOURCE at end of table

[^65]:    ${ }^{1}$ The frame from which the statistical sample was selected was divided into two partitions based on total company employment. In the manufacturing sector, companies with

[^66]:    ${ }^{38}$ The Bowker Directory, last available for 1997, is no longer being published.

[^67]:    ${ }^{39}$ See also NSF (2002a) and U.S. Bureau of the Census (1995).
    ${ }^{40}$ For a detailed comparison of NAICS to the Standard Industrial Classification (1987) of the United States, visit http://www.census.gov/ epcd/www/naics.html.

[^68]:    ${ }^{41}$ NSF (2001).
    ${ }^{42}$ For more information, visit the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) website at http://www.oecd.org.

[^69]:    ${ }^{43} \mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{D}$ estimates for the company also were affected, however, the amount of $R \& D$ reported was relatively small, even after weighting.

[^70]:    ${ }^{44}$ The effects of changes in the way companies were classified during survey processing are discussed in detail in U.S. Bureau of the Census (1994a and 1994e).
    ${ }^{45}$ See also NSF (1994, 1995, and 1996a).
    ${ }^{46}$ Until 1967, samples were selected every 5 years. Subsequent samples were selected for 1971, 1976, 1981, and 1987.

[^71]:    ${ }^{47}$ For the 1992 survey, 25 new nonmanufacturing industry and industry groups were added to the sample frame: agricultural services (SIC 07); fishing, hunting, and trapping (SIC 09); wholesale tradenondurables (SIC 51); stationery and office supply stores (SIC 5112); industrial and personal service paper (SIC 5113); groceries and related products (SIC 514); chemicals and allied products (SIC 516); miscellaneous nondurable goods (SIC 519); home furniture, furnishings, and equipment stores (SIC 57); radio, TV, consumer electronics, and music stores (SIC 573); eating and drinking places (SIC 581); miscellaneous retail (SIC 59); nonstore retailers (SIC 596); real estate (SIC 65); holding and other investment offices (SIC 67); hotels, rooming houses, camps, and other lodging places (SIC 70); automotive repair, services, and parking (SIC 75); miscellaneous repair services (SIC 76); amusement and recreation services (SIC 79); health services (SIC 80); offices and clinics of medical doctors (SIC 801); offices and clinics of other health practitioners (SIC 804); miscellaneous health and allied services not elsewhere classified (SIC 809); engineering, accounting, research, management, and related services (SIC 87); and management and public relations services (SIC 874).

[^72]:    ${ }^{48}$ Annual sampling also remedies the cyclical deterioration of the statistics that results from changes in a company's payroll composition because of product line and corporate structural changes.
    ${ }^{49}$ See also NSF (1997, 1998, 1999b, 2000, 2001, and 2002b).
    ${ }^{50}$ For discussions of each of these changes, see U.S. Bureau of the Census (1994g); for considerations of comparability, see U.S. Bureau of the Census (1993 and 1994e).
    ${ }^{51}$ See U.S. Bureau of the Census (1995).
    ${ }^{52}$ The process was dubbed wedging because of the wedgelike area produced on a graph that compares originally reported statistics with the revised statistics that resulted after linking.

[^73]:    ${ }^{53}$ For a full discussion of the mathematical algorithm used for the wedging process that linked statistics from the 1992 survey with those from the 1987 survey, see U.S. Bureau of the Census (1994g). In general, wedging
    takes full advantage of the fact that in the first year of a new panel [when a new sample is selected], both current year and prior-year estimates are derived. Thus, two independent estimates exist for the prior year. The estimates from the new panel are treated as superior primarily because the new panel is based on updated classifications [the industry classifications in the prior panel are frozen] and is more fully representative of the current universe (the prior panel suffers from panel deterioration, especially a lack of birth updating). The limitations in the prior panel caused by these factors are naturally assumed to increase with time, so that in the revised series, we desire a gradual increase in the level or revision over time which culminates in the real difference observed between the two independent sample estimates of the prior year. At the same time, we desire that the annual movement of the original series be preserved to the degree possible in the revised series (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1994).
    To that end, the wedging algorithm does not change estimates from sample years and adjusts estimates from panel years, recognizing that deterioration of the panel is progressive over time. One of the primary reasons for deciding to select a new sample annually rather than at irregular intervals was to avoid applying global revision processes such as wedging. Consequently, the 1992 survey was intended to be the last one affected by the wedging procedure.
    ${ }^{54}$ For information about and results from other NSF surveys, visit http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/pubdata.htm.
    ${ }^{55}$ NSF (2002b).

[^74]:    ${ }^{56}$ NSF (1996b).
    ${ }^{57} \mathrm{NSF}$ (1999a).

[^75]:    ${ }^{58}$ For current lists of FFRDCs, visit http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/ ffrdc/start.htm.

[^76]:    Item 8B - "Fossil Fuels" Include "Synthetic Fuels" and "Mining"
    "Synthetic fuels" includes programs designed to convert coal to gaseous and liquid products.
    "Mining" is composed of programs for developing equipment and techniques to improve the productivity and recovery rates of coal mining.

