

TABLE 35. Funds for industrial R&D performance in the United States, by state: Selected years 1987–2002

(Millions of dollars)

State	1987	1989 <sup>a</sup>	1991 <sup>a</sup>	1993 <sup>b</sup>	1995 <sup>b</sup>	1997 <sup>b</sup>	1998 <sup>b,c,d</sup>	1999 <sup>b,c,d</sup>	2000 <sup>b,c,d</sup>	2001 <sup>b,c,d,e</sup>	2002 <sup>b,d,e</sup>	Percent change 2002/2001
United States	92,155	102,055	116,952	117,400	132,103	157,539	169,180	182,711	199,539	198,505	190,809	-4
Alabama	1,523	430	596	557 (S)	686	589 (S)	845	823	821 (S)	905	846	-7
Alaska	10	9	21	14	30	24 (S)	37 (E)	82 (E)	48 (E)	68	51 (E)	-25
Arizona	809	921	1,080	1,039	1,356 (S)	1,854	1,801	2,109 (S)	2,182 (S)	2,707	3,201	18
Arkansas	129	51	(S)	179	181	118	213 (E)	326	400	254 (E)	225 (E)	-12
California	18,636	23,781	(S)	21,975	28,710	34,011	32,856	36,991	43,459	41,745	39,664	-5
Colorado	1,207	1,167	(S)	1,966	1,865	2,248	3,180	3,266	3,143	3,117	2,823	-9
Connecticut	2,121	2,421	1,756	2,228	3,906	3,014	3,346	4,145 (S)	4,132 (S)	4,686	6,077	30
Delaware	(D)	(D)	(D)	913 (S)	1,077 (S)	1,009 (S)	1,356 (S)	1,295 (S)	1,468 (S)	1,232	1,219	-1
District of Columbia	(D)	(D)	46	515 (S)	672 (S)	(D)	598 (S)	268 (E)	196 (E)	242	194	-20
Florida	2,041	2,352	(S)	2,386	4,101	3,442	3,265	3,482	3,773 (S)	3,755	3,707	-1
Georgia	958	722	993	792	1,175	1,273	1,617	1,904	2,159 (S)	1,912	2,107	10
Hawaii	70	9	13	255	14	87	55 (E)	68 (E)	93 (E)	93	103	11
Idaho	467	(D)	(S)	686	827	1,181 (S)	1,103 (S)	1,239	1,363	884	992	12
Illinois	4,099	4,068	5,750	5,023	5,776 (S)	6,248	7,318	8,102	8,393 (S)	8,232	7,616	-7
Indiana	1,860	1,823	2,274	2,141	2,721 (S)	2,677	2,922	2,863 (S)	2,888 (S)	3,583	3,572	0
Iowa	328	365	527	505	998	578	750	730	762	817	753	-8
Kansas	1,128	406	(S)	280 (S)	569	1,136 (S)	1,384 (S)	1,448 (S)	1,327 (S)	1,299 (S)	1,427 (S)	10
Kentucky	238	227	176	282	452	359	606	777	762	636	656	3
Louisiana	128	169	(S)	106	61	172	377 (E)	516 (E)	364 (E)	316 (E)	248 (E)	-22
Maine	39	33	(S)	(D)	286	83	137	208	255	249	250 (S)	0
Maryland	1,292	1,093	1,376	1,296	1,075	1,425	1,905	2,020	2,213	3,682	3,800	3
Massachusetts	5,255	5,851	(S)	5,960	7,416	8,300	10,367	9,626	10,595	11,378	10,279	-10
Michigan	7,095	8,506	9,283	18,845	12,388	13,009	12,554	16,877	17,489 (S)	14,283	13,565	-5
Minnesota	2,145	2,075	2,070	2,341	2,636 (S)	3,116	3,367	3,695	3,971	4,355	4,460	2
Mississippi	42	56	(S)	51	66	73	183 (E)	224 (E)	242 (E)	219 (E)	224	2
Missouri	1,823	2,391	(S)	1,339 (S)	2,028 (S)	1,290 (S)	1,505	1,664	1,978	1,792	1,592	11
Montana	7	(D)	(S)	(D)	17	92	63	92 (E)	78 (E)	70 (E)	66	-5
Nebraska	59	64	67	93	150	71	195 (E)	217 (E)	335 (E)	306	342	12
Nevada	55	29	95	65	322	380	476	490	433	290	339	17
New Hampshire	90	(D)	(D)	247	472	652	1,138	1,157	722	1,339	1,153	-14
New Jersey	5,876	6,410	8,933	8,009	8,200	11,069	11,107	10,145	10,580	10,164	11,566	14
New Mexico	950	1,039	1,217	(D)	1,461	1,310 (S)	1,450 (S)	1,352 (S)	1,203 (S)	231	331	43
New York	6,276	8,107	9,457	8,597	8,651	9,939 (S)	10,283	12,260	11,622	10,884	9,234	-15
North Carolina	1,666	1,311	1,470	1,886	2,226	3,590	3,483	3,632	4,328	4,138	3,443	-17
North Dakota	57	(S)	(S)	(D)	12	33	46 (E)	95 (E)	83 (E)	347	154	-56

TABLE 35. Funds for industrial R&amp;D performance in the United States, by state: Selected years 1987–2002

(Millions of dollars)

State	1987	1989 <sup>a</sup>	1991 <sup>a</sup>	1993 <sup>b</sup>	1995 <sup>b</sup>	1997 <sup>b</sup>	1998 <sup>b,c,d</sup>	1999 <sup>b,c,d</sup>	2000 <sup>b,c,d</sup>	2001 <sup>b,c,d,e</sup>	2002 <sup>b,d,e</sup>	Percent change 2002/2001
Ohio	3,415	3,964	5,406	4,494	4,001	5,608	5,742	6,531	6,245	6,694	6,230	-7
Oklahoma	367	333	448	299	288	428	369	562 (E)	463	543 (E)	412	-24
Oregon	281	357	(S)	455	741	1,102	1,345	1,408	1,533	2,677	2,320	-13
Pennsylvania	4,430	4,653	(S)	4,652	5,331	6,609 (S)	7,393	7,474	8,473	8,967	7,064	-21
Rhode Island	224	140	174	154	520	704 (S)	1,332 (S)	1,317 (S)	1,167 (S)	1,134 (S)	1,121 (S)	-1
South Carolina	500	388	479	461	739	783 (S)	996	922	1,059	921	1,054	14
South Dakota	4	4	6	(D)	19	26	40 (E)	57 (E)	89 (E)	87 (E)	53	-40
Tennessee	621	934	843	788	1,003	1,089	2,440	2,205	1,644	1,503	1,289	-14
Texas	4,077	5,051	5,439	4,562	6,211 (S)	7,265	8,984	8,661	10,048	9,839	10,744	9
Utah	774	389	407	279	803	1,027	1,119	1,028	1,063	1,173	1,116	-5
Vermont	236	(D)	(D)	(D)	248	246	114	346	389	339	286	-15
Virginia	1,284	1,131	1,275	1,046	1,577	1,767	2,540	2,662	2,683	2,957	2,920	-1
Washington	2,939	2,728	3,677	4,575 (S)	4,294 (S)	6,610 (S)	7,072 (S)	7,093 (S)	8,235 (S)	8,933 (S)	8,579 (S)	-4
West Virginia	83	(D)	(D)	100 (S)	243	(D)	335	351	329	211	264	25
Wisconsin	1,165	1,035	1,304	1,296	1,706	1,707	1,929	2,194	2,415	2,469 (S)	2,649	7
Wyoming	4	(D)	2	15	25	28	20 (E)	65 (E)	37 (E)	28 (E)	21 (E)	-26
Undistributed funds <sup>f</sup>	2,281	2,945	772	683	1,773 (S)	7,211 (S)	5,521 (S)	5,647 (S)	9,804 (S)	9,819 (S)	8,406	-14

(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; (T) = data are not separately available but included in total; (E) = indicates imputation of more than 50 percent due to raking of state data.

<sup>a</sup> 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.

<sup>b</sup> As a result of the new sample design, statistics for 1991 and later years are not directly comparable with statistics for years prior to 1991.

<sup>c</sup> Some statistics for 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001 have been revised since originally published.

<sup>d</sup> Beginning with 2001, the methodology to produce statistics by state was modified from previous years to address the recurring problem of large year-to-year variation in many state estimates. This variability was caused by many factors including the potential inefficiency of the sample at state levels, the rarity of R&D expenditures, and the large weights often associated with companies that report R&D in the survey for the first time. Under the new methodology, a portion of the amount of R&D reported by some companies not selected for the sample with certainty is allocated among all the states in which there was industrial activity. Note that there was no change to the methodology for estimating the number of R&D performers in each state. This estimate continued to be calculated by summing the weights of the companies that actually reported R&D activity in a given state.

<sup>e</sup> Beginning with 2001, statistics for total and federally funded industrial R&D exclude data for federally funded research and development centers.

<sup>f</sup> Includes data reported on Form RD-1 that were not allocated to a specific state. Data reported on form RD-1A were allocated to the state in the address on the company's survey form which is usually the company's headquarters.

NOTE: For information on sampling for 1999–2002, see appendix A, Technical Notes.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Industrial Research and Development: 2002.