The results of the 2019 Social Science Extreme Events Research (SSEER) Census are based on the responses gathered from social scientists who completed the SSEER membership survey between its release date on July 8, 2018 and December 31, 2019.

AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2019, 949 RESEARCHERS SIGNED UP FOR THE SSEER NETWORK.

In many instances in this annual report, we compare the results of the 2019 Census to what we previously published in the 2018 Census. Where possible and relevant, we separate data by year for 2018 and 2019 to provide greater context regarding the growth and evolution of the network.
HOW MANY SOCIAL SCIENTISTS HAVE JOINED THE SSEER NETWORK?

As of December 31, 2019, 949 researchers had joined the SSEER network. This represents a 46.45% increase in membership from December 31, 2018. While the majority of members signed up in 2018 (N = 648; 68.28%), a sizable portion of the SSEER network joined in 2019 (N = 301; 31.72%) (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. SSEER Membership by Year, 2018-19.

The online SSEER interactive map is organized by United Nations (UN) regions and subregions. Users can search for researchers by name, location, disciplinary foci, methodological expertise, or the types of hazards or disasters they study (see Figure 2).

Figure 2. SSEER Interactive Web Map.

Table 1 shows the number of SSEER members by region, subregion, and country. Regional representation changed little between 2018 and 2019. Most members continue to reside in the Americas—and especially in the United States.

72.6% OF ALL SSEER MEMBERS RESIDE IN THE UNITED STATES.

It is not clear if there are actually more social scientists who study disasters in the Americas—and especially the United States—or if that is where we have been most successful at identifying researchers and encouraging them to join SSEER. Historically, there has been a relatively strong investment in social science research in the United States, but the predominance of members here may be more of a reflection of our reach as a U.S.-led network and the fact that the SSEER survey is currently only available in the English language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN Region</th>
<th># of SSEER Members in the Region</th>
<th>UN Subregion</th>
<th># of SSEER Members in the Subregion</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th># of SSEER Members in the Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eastern Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Bahamas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Eastern Asia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of China</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South-Eastern Asia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Union Republic of Myanmar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Asia</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Asia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kingdom of Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Australia and New Zealand</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melanesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. SSEER Researchers by UN Region, Subregion, and Country.
WHAT IS THE DISCIPLINARY BACKGROUND AND EXPERTISE OF SSEER RESEARCHERS?

As noted in our prior annual report, there is no single, universal definition for which disciplines are included in the social sciences. These blurry boundaries are related to what researchers study and the approaches they use in their work. Generally speaking, however, most social scientists who study disasters are concerned with the connections between the natural environment, the built environment, policies, and people. Depending on their disciplinary background and expertise, social scientists may study individuals, groups, institutions, or even entire societies.

The SSEER membership survey asks researchers to identify their primary discipline—or set of disciplines for those with multidisciplinary training—as shown in Table 2. The table, which features both 2018 and 2019 data, does not sum to the total number of SSEER members (N = 949) because researchers could, and often did, select more than one discipline.

Of the 20 disciplines included in the SSEER survey, just under one-third of members identified with Disaster Science (N = 303; 31.93%) (see Figure 4).

### Table 2. SSEER Researchers by Primary Social Science Discipline, 2018-19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>2018 N</th>
<th>2018 %</th>
<th>2019 N</th>
<th>2019 %</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Science</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>29.48</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>37.21</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>31.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>23.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>24.54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>22.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making &amp; Risk Analysis</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>21.30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>21.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration/ Emergency Management</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>21.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>19.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>14.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>11.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health/Medicine/Nursing</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>11.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Finance/Accounting</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; Legal Studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demography</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. SSEER Researchers Self-Identified Disciplinary Background.
NEARLY ONE-THIRD OF SSEER MEMBERS IDENTIFIED DISASTER SCIENCE AS A PRIMARY DISCIPLINE.

The next most frequently selected disciplines included Geography (N = 220; 23.18%) and Sociology (N = 216; 22.76%), which have a long history of leadership in the social science hazards and disaster research space. A substantial number of SSEER members also have training in Decision-Making and Risk Analysis (N = 208; 21.92%) and Public Administration/Emergency Management (N = 204; 21.50%). Other disciplines selected by SSEER members are shown in Figure 4.

WHAT ARE THE EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF SSEER RESEARCHERS?

The SSEER membership survey prompts researchers to share information about their highest level of education completed (see Figure 5). Most SSEER researchers hold a doctoral degree (N = 598; 63.01%). The second most common degree held by SSEER researchers is a master’s degree (N = 247; 26.03%). Fewer members held a bachelor’s degree (N = 59; 6.22%), associate’s degree (N = 9; .95%), or professional degree (n = 1; .11%). One pattern of note is that in 2019, there was an increase in SSEER membership among those who have not obtained a doctoral degree.

MORE THAN 89% OF SSEER MEMBERS HAVE ATTAINED A DOCTORAL OR MASTER’S DEGREE.

In terms of primary professional status, most SSEER researchers self-identified as academic researchers (N = 554; 58.38%), followed by students (N = 163; 17.18%) and government researchers (N = 88; 9.27%). Fewer members identify as non-profit researchers (N = 43; 4.53%), independent researchers (N = 41; 4.32%), or private sector researchers (N = 25; 2.63%). The remaining members identified as another kind of professional or indicated they are retired. Table 3 shows that the primary professional statuses of SSEER members were fairly consistent across 2018 and 2019.

NEARLY 60% OF SSEER MEMBERS ARE AFFILIATED WITH ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS.

WHAT IS THE LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT OF SSEER MEMBERS IN HAZARDS AND DISASTER RESEARCH?

In the 2006 National Research Council consensus study, Facing Hazards and Disasters: Understanding Human Dimensions, the authors raised a number of questions regarding the state of the social science research workforce. In response to their calls for a more precise description of levels of engagement among the members of this community, our team published a typology of research involvement (see Peek, Champeau, Austin, et al. 2020). We use the typology in the SSEER membership survey and ask researchers to select which of the following best describes their current status as a hazards and disaster researcher:

• Core Researcher: Strongly self-identifies as a hazards/disaster researcher, has a deep commitment to the field, and has engaged in hazards and disaster research for a sustained amount of time.
WHAT METHODS AND APPROACHES DO SSEER RESEARCHERS USE IN THEIR WORK?

Social scientists use a range of methods and approaches to collect and analyze data. To characterize the methodological skills among this community, the SSEER membership survey asks researchers to identify each of their primary approaches to data collection and analysis. As summarized in Table 4, the most popular methodological approaches include case studies (N = 574; 60.48%), survey research (N = 565; 59.54%), and in-depth interviews (N = 562; 59.22%). The numbers in the table do not sum to the sample size of 949 because researchers had the option to choose more than one approach, and most did so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodological Approach</th>
<th>2018 N</th>
<th>2019 N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Research</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Depth Interviews</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Content Analysis</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Participatory Research</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Analysis of Primary Data</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Analysis of Secondary Data</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Content Analysis</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geospatial Analysis/GIS</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Action Research</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Analysis</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network Analysis</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Social Media Data</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-Experimental</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent-Based Modeling</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photovoice</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling Research</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Preferred Methodological Approaches of SSEER Researchers, 2018-19.

As shown in Figure 6, most SSEER members self-identify as core researchers (N = 433; 45.63%), followed by emerging researchers (N = 227; 23.92%), periodic researchers (N = 189; 19.92%), and situational researchers (N = 53; 5.58%).

JUST OVER 45% OF SSEER MEMBERS IDENTIFY AS CORE RESEARCHERS, MEANING THEY HAVE A DEEP COMMITMENT TO THE FIELD AND HAVE ENGAGED IN DISASTER RESEARCH FOR A SUSTAINED AMOUNT OF TIME.

Figure 6. SSEER Researchers by Level of Involvement in the Field, 2018-19.

• **Periodic Researcher**: Is not primarily engaged in hazards and disaster research but focuses on related topics from time to time throughout one’s professional career.

• **Situational Researcher**: Not previously trained or involved in the hazards and disaster field but had the opportunity to study new phenomena or processes based on a situational event; for example, a researcher who undertook a study after their community was affected by a major disaster.

• **Emerging Researcher**: Includes students and others who are new to the field and who are still learning about its disciplinary, multidisciplinary, or interdisciplinary histories, theories, methods, and approaches. Emerging researchers may have limited experience or may not have yet conducted their own original empirical research.

As shown in Figure 6, most SSEER members self-identify as core researchers (N = 433; 45.63%), followed by emerging researchers (N = 227; 23.92%), periodic researchers (N = 189; 19.92%), and situational researchers (N = 53; 5.58%).
WHAT PHASES OF THE DISASTER CYCLE HAVE SSEER RESEARCHERS STUDIED?

Social scientists who research hazards and disasters often study distinct disaster phases including preparedness, emergency response, short-term reconstruction, long-term recovery, and mitigation (see Figure 7).

Figure 7. The Disaster Cycle.

Figure 8 shows the different phases across the disaster cycle that SSEER researchers have studied. Most SSEER researchers have focused on disaster preparedness (N = 734; 77.34%), followed by mitigation (N = 598; 63.01%), emergency response (N = 547; 57.64%), long-term recovery (N = 544; 57.32%), and short-term reconstruction (N = 339; 35.72%). The numbers here and in the figure below do not sum to the sample size of 949 because researchers had the option to choose more than one phase.

MORE SSEER MEMBERS REPORTED STUDYING DISASTER PREPAREDNESS THAN ANY OTHER PHASE OF THE DISASTER CYCLE.

WHAT HAZARD TYPES AND DISASTERS HAVE SSEER RESEARCHERS STUDIED?

Figure 9 includes a summary of all disaster types that SSEER members indicated having studied. As shown, the majority of SSEER members study natural hazards (N = 879; 92.62%), which include geophysical, meteorological, hydrological, climatological, biological, and extraterrestrial events. Just over one-quarter of the respondents indicated that they study technological hazards (N = 268; 28.24%) such as industrial accidents, transport accidents, and toxic exposures. The smallest portion of SSEER respondents indicated that they focus on terrorism or other willful acts of violence (N = 175; 18.44%). The numbers in the figure do not sum to the sample size of 949 because researchers had the option to choose more than one disaster type that they study.

Figure 9. Hazard and Disaster Types Studied by SSEER Researchers, 2018-19.

The SSEER membership survey asks respondents to identify up to 10 specific disaster events that they have studied during their career. In 2018 and 2019, we received more than 1,000 unique responses to this question, which include disasters studied across several centuries and multiple geographies. The disasters that SSEER researchers have studied, along with keywords characterizing research expertise, are viewable through each researcher’s profile in the SSEER map.

SSEER RESEARCHERS HAVE STUDIED MORE THAN 1,000 UNIQUE DISASTER EVENTS.
Based on responses detailing disasters studied by name of event and year, 24.76% of SSEER members either refrained from responding to the question or had not studied any disasters (N = 235). From there, a nearly linear pattern emerged in the data such that, for the most part, SSEER members were more likely to respond that they had studied fewer events than more events. Specifically, nearly as many respondents had studied one disaster event (N = 124; 13.07%) as had studied two (N = 121; 12.75%) or three (N = 117; 12.33%) disaster events. A moderate number of SSEER members studied four (N = 83; 8.75%), five (N = 72; 7.59%), or six events (N = 51; 5.37%). Less than 5% of SSEER members had researched seven (N = 38; 4.00%), eight (N = 22; 2.32%), or nine events (N = 18; 1.90%), respectively. Just over 5% of members had researched 10 events (N = 48; 5.06%), and a small number of members responded with 11 or more events (N = 20; 2.11%) (see Figure 10).

As noted, SSEER researchers have studied a wide range of events. The top 13 most frequently studied disasters, however, all occurred in the 21st century and most of these events happened in the United States (see Table 5). These results should be interpreted with care since this is not yet a complete census of the entire social science disaster research community, and SSEER membership is heavily concentrated in the United States. The results are still suggestive of which events receive the most attention and in which parts of the world.

**Hurricane Katrina** is the most studied disaster in the SSEER database.

### Table 5. Most Commonly Researched Disaster Events by SSEER Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane Katrina, 2005</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>20.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane Harvey, 2017</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>13.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane Sandy, 2012</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane Maria, 2017</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane Irma, 2017</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Ocean Earthquake and Tsunami, 2004</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11 Terrorist Attacks, 2001</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukushima/Great East Japan Earthquake and Tsunami, 2011</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP Deep Water Horizon Oil Spill, 2010</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti Earthquake, 2010</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane Ike, 2008</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Earthquakes, 2010-11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal Earthquake and Flooding, 2015</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT IS THE DEMOGRAPHIC COMPOSITION OF THE SSEER RESEARCH WORKFORCE?**

The demographic composition of the hazards and disaster research workforce has long been of interest to leaders within the field. One area of special concern is whether or not those researching disasters reflect the demographic characteristics of the populations and places being studied.

With this in mind, the SSEER membership survey ends with a series of questions regarding respondent age, years of experience, racial and ethnic identity, and gender identity.
In the 2019 Census, SSEER researchers ranged in age from 21 to 78 years. The average SSEER researcher is 41.48 years old and has 9.66 years of research experience in the hazards and disaster field. Interestingly, 18.12% (N = 172) of SSEER respondents did not provide their age in the membership survey.

SSEER survey respondents were asked to select which racial and ethnic categories best describe their identity. When prompted, most SSEER respondents said they identified as White (N = 569; 59.96%). Fewer SSEER members identified as Asian/Asian American (N = 126; 13.28%), Hispanic/Latino (N = 53; 5.58%), or Black/African American (N = 44; 4.64%). A small percentage of respondents selected two or more racial or ethnic categories (N = 25; 2.63%) or some other provided identity option (N = 7; .74%) such as Indigenous, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, or Arab/Arabic American/Middle Eastern.

The survey also includes “prefer not to answer” and “prefer to self-describe” response options, in recognition that some respondents both inside and outside the United States may be uncomfortable with available fixed identity categories. A sizeable minority (N = 125; 13.17%) of SSEER respondents were coded as “missing” because they did not respond to the race/ethnicity question, chose “prefer not to answer,” or selected “prefer to self-describe” (see Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>61.73</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian American</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more racial/ethnic identities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other provided racial/ethnic identity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


More women (N = 492; 51.84%) than men (N = 398; 41.94%) have joined the SSEER network. Additionally, a small portion of members provided some other answer (N = 59; 6.22%), including refraining from responding or identifying as nonconforming/nonbinary. Responses regarding the gender identity of SSEER members for 2018 and 2019 appear in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>52.47</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>42.28</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other answer</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Gender Identity of SSEER Researchers, 2018-19.

CONCLUSION

This annual report on the status of the SSEER network has allowed us to characterize the location, demographic composition, disciplinary background, levels of involvement in the field, and other attributes among this dynamic research community. Since our first census release in 2018, the SSEER network has grown by 301 new members and now includes a total of 949 researchers from 54 countries. SSEER members are predominantly located in the United States and have studied a wide range of disaster types and events using various social science and interdisciplinary methods and approaches. The research community is more demographically diverse than had previously been acknowledged, although further analyses are warranted to understand more regarding the roles and activities of specific segments of the SSEER population.

We will continue to release the SSEER Census results annually via the CONVERGE website so that we can regularly assess the status of the social science hazards and disaster research field. We also update the interactive SSEER map quarterly, so if you are a social scientist who studies extreme events and have not yet joined, you are invited to do so by completing the SSEER membership survey.
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The Social Science Extreme Events Research—SSEER—network identifies and maps social scientists involved in hazards and disaster research in order to highlight their expertise and connect social science researchers to one another, to interdisciplinary teams, and to communities at risk to hazards and affected by disasters. The goals of SSEER are to amplify the contributions of social scientists, to advance the field through expanding the available social science evidence base, and to enhance collective well-being. SSEER is part of a larger ecosystem of National Science Foundation-funded extreme events research and reconnaissance networks designed to help coordinate disciplinary communities in engineering and the sciences, while also encouraging cross-disciplinary information sharing and interdisciplinary integration. More information on SSEER and the other networks is available on the CONVERGE website.