Creating the Perfect Final Tribal – An Analysis of *Survivor*'s 5 Unanimous Winners

Fernanda Carneiro[1]

[1]Westminster Christian School

ABSTRACT

A show that has maintained popularity over two decades, *Survivor* essentially represents a microchasm of society through its social dynamics. This paper analyzes the five unanimous winners of the show to determine what characteristics make a unanimous Sole Survivor. The unanimous winners were chosen for analysis due to it being such a rare occurrence in a show that has lasted over forty seasons. The study was a content analysis of the five *Survivor* seasons with unanimous winners, with qualitative and quantitative components that analyzed the winners as well as season-specific factors, as well as a winner comparison through the use of a quantitative frequency scale created to analyze traits of various unanimous and not unanimous *Survivor* winners. Results illustrate the necessity for further research into gender roles and bias on Survivor. However, this study developed a new understanding about shared characteristics among all unanimous winners of the show and gave a deeper understanding on common characteristics among unanimous winners and some not unanimous winners of the show.

1 | Introduction

After being off the air for over a year due to COVID-19 restrictions, six million viewers tuned in to watch the first episode of the most recent season of CBS's *Survivor* on September 22, 2021 (TV Series Finale, 2021). The social experiment-turned-reality TV competition show has become very popular among people of all ages in the 21 years since the airing of its first episode in 2000, with season 42 set to release on March 9, 2022. The show has captivated viewers because of its complexity in that it tests contestants' mental and physical strength while in isolation from all familiar aspects of life. By placing contestants alone on a remote island with nothing but the bare minimum of supplies, they are cut to their core. Without the veneer of normal civilization, they engage with philosophical truths and profound questions about the necessity of deceit and the values of loyalty and honesty.

On average, between 8,000 and 10,000 people apply for *Survivor* each season. To be cast, applicants must be at least eighteen years old and be a citizen of the United States or Canada. Of these thousands of applicants, sixteen to twenty are chosen to become contestants, or "castaways" that will compete, connive, and survive for thirty-nine days on a remote island – usually in the South Pacific – to try to become the Sole Survivor. Upon arrival, castaways are separated into tribes – groups with an even number of members – to compete against each other in various reward and immunity challenges. These challenges are holistic and test castaways' physical and mental strength. For example, most challenges include some type of physical stamina test in the form of running or carrying heavy objects, which tests physical abilities, and then solving a puzzle or completing a word scramble, which tests the castaways' mental strength. The losing tribe in the immunity challenge must go to Tribal Council that night to vote off one member from their tribe. When only about eight to thirteen castaways remain (varied by season), the tribes are merged, and it becomes an "individual game." Castaways compete in individual immunity and reward challenges similar to the group ones from earlier in the season, navigating social politics and forming alliances to make it farther into the game. Castaways continue to be periodically voted off, but instead of being sent home, those voted off post-merge are placed in a "jury." Once there are only two or three castaways remaining, they will present their "games" and strategy to the jury at "Final Tribal" on Day 39 to get enough votes from the jury members to win the title of Sole Survivor. This title

has been awarded to 38 different people in the first forty seasons of the show, only five of whom won the show with a unanimous Final Tribal vote or the "perfect" Final Tribal, all of them men. The winner of *Survivor* is awarded one million dollars along with this coveted title. Ever since the first season, research has been done analyzing the psychological effects of *Survivor* on contestants, as well as the development of game strategy and the possibility of predicting a winner based on players' alliances.

2 | Literature Review

2a | Psychology and *Survivor*

The correlation between hunger and anger has been studied extensively through the years, as researchers such as Matthew T. Gailliot of Stephen F. Austin State University concluded, through the analysis of various studies, that hunger could be linked to reduced self-control and anger restraint, as well as "increased racial prejudice and (hypothetical) sexual infidelity" (2013). This correlation, as well as the idea of social politics and competition, have been tested in relation to *Survivor*.

Psychology, specifically temper control and self-control, has a crucial effect on how contestants perform on *Survivor*, where controlling temper and maintaining good social connections is crucial to winning. Dr. Karyn M. Frick researched the effects of *Survivor* conditions on the brain, concluding that strains on both psychological and physical factors make the show especially grueling on contestants compared to other reality competition shows such as *Big Brother*, which incorporates physical and mental challenges but is not physically tolling on contestants in that they are put in a house with all the basic necessities such as food, water, shelter, and comfort provided (Frick, 2007). The combination of heightened stress and anger due to the extreme conditions of *Survivor* are what make a perfect Final Tribal so hard to achieve. Navigating social politics is necessary to succeed, and an already complex society is complicated further by putting contestants into extreme conditions; this is what makes *Survivor* a unique game that is worth further analysis.

2b | Gender's Effects on Voting at Tribal Council

In addition to research on the effects of the conditions of *Survivor* on behavior of players, Sophie Truscott, a graduate from Northwestern University, researched the role gender plays on voting at tribal council. Ultimately, she concluded after an analysis of the first thirty-three seasons of *Survivor* that women were more likely to vote against men when in a voting bloc with more women than men. Despite this, at final tribal, jurors' votes did not seem to be affected by their gender, meaning that according to Truscott, gender of jurors would not affect a person's likelihood of winning at Final Tribal (Truscott, 2017). Likewise, Gabrielle Wall, a researcher for the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, found, through analysis of various seasons of the show, that neither men nor women exhibited a tendency to vote consistently for castaways of the opposite sex. However, she also concluded that both sexes had "voting behavior consistent with information-based discrimination against female" castaways (2011). This information can lead one to conclude that though there is generally no natural bias to vote against a person of the opposite sex by default, women may have a disadvantage when the decision of who to vote for is between a man and a woman. Indeed, no woman has won *Survivor* by a unanimous final tribal vote from the jury, which may suggest a heightened level of difficulty for women to win rooted in their sex.

2c | Behavior in the Game

As previously stated, the social aspect of *Survivor* is crucial in the game. Behaviors can be the deciding factor in if and when a castaway is voted out, especially post-merge. Antisocial behaviors, actions that harm or lack consideration

for the well-being of others, in *Survivor* were analyzed by Wilson, Robinson, and Callister. They concluded through the analysis of seven seasons that "indirect aggression and verbal aggression were found to be the most frequently occurring types of antisocial behavior." When comparing results of the analysis to findings of a previous study on a different reality-based television show, *Survivor* had a higher number and rate of antisocial acts in those seven seasons than the other television show did (2012). This further underscores *Survivor*'s unique conditions that cause higher general irritation among most castaways, whereas other reality competition shows such as *Big Brother* may have less because of the much less extreme conditions.

In addition to this naturally increased aggression in castaways, likely partially due to extreme conditions and hunger (Gailliot, 2013), Rebecca J. Roberts analyzed castaways' changed behaviors in the game when compared to behavior in everyday life in her undergraduate thesis paper "Temporarily Machiavellian: Performing the Self on *Survivor*." She concluded that viewers remain hooked on the show due to its cutthroat nature, partially because of positive reactions to the use of aggressive Machiavellian tactics. She emphasizes the importance and use of impression management on the show, where perception is key in a castaway's game. A combination of a person's true self—what they want viewers of *Survivor* to see, and a person's manufactured self—what they want other castaways to see is what determines how a castaway will behave on the island (2018). For many, this ultimately leads to putting aside typical moral values and allowing for some lying and backstabbing, in the name of the game and winning. Most would even say that having a "strong" strategy is characterized by "making moves" and being the one in charge of powerful alliances that did many blindsides, where the person voted out was not expecting it. Strategies have evolved to this point, and many players continue to play with an "old-school" mindset of making alliances and working hard, while others believe more in the importance of making big strategic moves.

2d | Casting Character Archetypes

After the airing of the first season of *Survivor*, a list of character archetypes was developed by producers Jeff Probst and Mark Burnett and casting director Lynne Spiegel Spillman to simplify the latter end casting process. Potential cast members are divided into categories based on similar traits and backgrounds, as well as sex and gender. Since this strategy has been made public, forty *Survivor* character casting archetypes have been created, twenty-three for men and seventeen for women. This gives further justification to the idea that *Survivor* is intentionally complex and deals with several components of a person's character, even before the game has begun. These character archetypes are based on the casting interviews and how potential players portray themselves to the casting directors, and they range from strange characters that are not likely to get along with most of the other castaways to likeable and sociable characters that are young and excited to play. Part of the reasoning behind creating these character archetypes was to ensure that a various number of personalities are cast to maximize viewer enjoyment, but also to make sure that no two seasons have the exact same plot and outcome. Various winners with various archetypes have won, and the archetypes were created for the purpose of making each season unique with different storylines, characters, and winners.

2e | Predicting Winners

There have been forty winners total on the show over the course of 21 years, two of whom won two seasons instead of just one. Therefore, it would be inaccurate to assume that all winners have the same or even an extremely similar strategy that made them the Sole Survivor. Also, over the 20-year period that *Survivor* has been on air, society itself has changed, so a strategy that worked well in season 10 may not be as effective in season 36. That being said, there is extremely limited research on predicting the winner of *Survivor*. Far more research has been done to analyze the psychological effects of *Survivor* on castaways, perhaps due to the unique nature of the show that uses real and unique people for every season. In Quinn Theobald's analysis of alliance networks in the first forty seasons of *Survivor*, he ultimately concluded that alliance network centrality "had no predictive power on being the *Sole Survivor*," creating a guess accuracy of 37.5% for eigenvector centrality, 32.5% for betweenness centrality, and a 40% accuracy for

random guessing. Ultimately this statistical analysis led to the conclusion that alliance density is not a factor that can predict the winner of a season of *Survivor* despite alliance formation being one of the central strategies of the game. This research is crucial to the formation of the research question now posed: Can a theory be made to win *Survivor* with a unanimous final tribal vote based on the games and strategies of the five winners who had a unanimous final tribal win?

2f | The Gap

Research has been done to analyze the psychological effects of the conditions of *Survivor* on its contestants and what that says about a winner's resilience (Frick, n.d.), and likewise to see if it is possible to predict the winner of a season based on alliance network of the final three contestants (Theobald, 2021). However, research analyzing the games of the five unanimous winners based on multiple quantitative and qualitative aspects of their individual games does not exist. This research may contribute further to knowledge of the game and how to achieve a win, or even a unanimous win, by focusing on case studies rather than generalizations from all 40 seasons.

Through the analysis of seasons 14, 18, 26, 31, and 33, the five seasons that boast a unanimous winner, a narrower field can be observed and therefore explored in greater detail based on the personal games and character attributes of the five unanimous winners of *Survivor*.

3 | Method

This study aims to create a theory on earning a unanimous final tribal win on *Survivor* based on the performance of the five unanimous winners of *Survivor US*. The goal is to determine if a concrete theory can be made to explain how to achieve a unanimous final tribal vote based on the analysis of these five players. As a popular show which explores themes about surviving not only the wild but also navigating social politics and deceit and morality, this analysis and potential theory can contribute to knowledge on what the most valuable traits held by Survivor players are, the process for voting a winner, as well as the process of getting to Final Tribal. Although research has been conducted to test the possibility of predicting a *Survivor* winner based on alliance network of the final three contestants, concluding that there lacked a statistical correlation between the two, no research has been conducted yet to analyze unanimous winners exclusively or other aspects of these winners' games.

3a | Study Design

The research method used was a content and character analysis of the five seasons of *Survivor US* that had unanimous winners. The seasons were watched and the winners themselves were analyzed in detail on aspects of social game, physical game, strategy, likability, confrontationality, aggressiveness, family situation, and character growth in their season due to the components' impact on a person's likelihood to win *Survivor*. These characteristics were then put into a frequency scale and rated from 0-2, 0 being weak or rarely present and 2 being strong or almost always present. Additionally, a comparison of the winner and the runner(s)-up of each respective season was done qualitatively, in order to analyze how these people may have impacted the winner. Also, a log of challenge wins and immunity idols was made in order to track any patterns or commonalities between the five winners. An obviously important factor in making it to Final Tribal is simply being able to survive all the tribal councils leading up to it. Therefore, it is important to understand if there is a connection between immunity or challenge wins that makes unanimous winners, such as winning every pre-merge challenge. Finally, season-specific data was collected for all seasons under study, including starting number of castaways, starting number of teams, whether there was a pre-merge tribe swap or loved ones visit, and whether it was the winner's first-time playing *Survivor*. This data was collected to understand and analyze the similarities and differences in the structure and organization of each season, which could potentially impact a player's

ability to win unanimously. The potential correlation between these factors, such as how many castaways are first brought onto the beach, may impact a person's likelihood to win unanimously. Further, at a glance, a pre-merge tribe swap seems like a complex structure in the game that may complicate a person's likelihood or ability to win, unanimously or not.

3b | Subjects

Survivor winners Earl Cole, JT Thomas, John Cochran, Jeremy Collins, and Adam Klein were the primary subjects of the study, being the unanimous winners of seasons 14, 18, 26, 31, and 33 of *Survivor*, respectively. An additional sub-analysis was conducted on several key players who were the runners-up in those seasons in order to compare the social dynamics that contributed to the five winners' successes. Further, one nonunanimous male winner and six female winners were chosen to analyze in comparison to the unanimous winners on the frequency scale. The specific six female winners were chosen due to them having won in the same range of seasons as the unanimous male winners. Additionally, all of these winners were noted as iconic and great winners on *Survivor* by fans, critics, and producer Jeff Probst alike.

3c | Research Measures

The analysis of the five seasons under study were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Qualitatively, the winners were each analyzed on their challenge wins and losses, physical attributes, social attributes, character archetype as defined by Jeff Probst – which is used during the casting process for every season – their age when they won, a final three or two analysis depending on the season, willingness to "play the game", and general information from each season: starting number of castaways, if there was a tribe swap, if there was a loved one's visit, and if it was that winner's first time playing.

Quantitatively, the winners were analyzed based on how many votes they had against them per tribal council and how many players were on the jury that were also on the winner's original tribe. In addition, the winners were rated on the aforementioned frequency scale of 0-2 on various aspects of their portrayed character on their respective seasons, 1 being occasionally present, and 2 being a strong characteristic. This scale was chosen as *Survivor* can be a very subjective show due to varying viewer perception and editing done in the production process; this scale gave a most accurate description of the winners while maximizing the objectivity of the analysis. After being rated on these aspects, the winners were then compared, using a sum of the "positive" traits (i.e. likability and social game, which are more positive the more they are present) with a maximum of six points total, a sum of the "negative" traits (i.e. aggressiveness and confrontationality, which cause conflict and can lessen chances of earning jury votes) with a maximum of two points total, and a sum of "neutral" traits (i.e. strategy and character growth in season, which are not consistently looked for by most jury members and therefore do not have mainly positive or negative effect normally) with a maximum of six points total.

3d | Procedures

Seasons 14, 18, 26, 31, and 33 were specifically chosen for analysis because these were the only seasons of *Survivor US* that had unanimous winners, as previously stated. Season specific data was collected in addition to the season analyses, and qualities of the five winners under analysis were quantified and compared to other nonunanimous winners of *Survivor*.

Table 1 - Season Characteristics

	Starting Number of Castaways	Starting Number of Teams	Tribe Swap	Loved Ones Visit	First Time Playing
Earl Season 14	19	2	Yes	No	Yes
JT Season 18	16	2	No	Yes	Yes
Cochran Season 26	20	2	Yes	Yes	No
Jeremy Season 31	20	2	Yes, twice	Yes	No
Adam Season 33	20	2	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 2 - Character Information (Unanimous Winners Only)

	Character Archetype	Votes Against Them (Total)	Age When Won	Players on Jury from their Original Tribe	Physical/Social Attributes
Earl Season 14	Con Man subtype The Mentalist	1	36	5 of 8 total	Decent at challenges, charismatic & likeable
JT Season 18	The Good Old Boy subtype Captain America	0	25	1 of 7 total	Strong in challenges, likeable/charming & a leader
Cochran Season 26	The Nervous Nerd subtype The Know-It-All	0	25	5 of 8 total	Good at challenges, likeable & quirky
Jeremy Season 31	The Family Man subtype Captain America	3	37	7 of 10 total	Strong in challenges, likeable/charming & a leader
Adam Season 33	The Know-It-All subtype Mr. Nice Guy	5	25	5 of 10 total	Good at challenges, nervous but mostly likeable

In Table 1, season characteristics were noted to see potential correlations between the five seasons that may have had an impact on why each man was able to win unanimously. In Table 2, a qualitative analysis of the five winners was conducted, listing traits as well as season-specific data that specifically regards to the winner in question, such as the number of votes against him or members of the jury from his original tribe. In Tables 3-4, the five unanimous winners under study were analyzed quantitatively in comparison to other winners of *Survivor*, including one other male winner who did not win unanimously and six female winners with similar games or strategies to some of the unanimous winners. This data was used to add to the theory and potentially find a correlation that explains why

no women have won *Survivor* unanimously. Finally, a statistical analysis was done through the use of t-tests in order to add credibility to the conclusions made from the quantitative data analysis. T-tests were used because they were most useful in comparing data of the unanimous winners to the female winners, and male winners to female winners, showing if the data varied or changed significantly when comparing the two groups quantitatively.

3e | Delimitations

Due to the research question being focused on unanimous winners of *Survivor US* only, seasons that did not have a unanimous winner were excluded from the research process. Additionally, episodes in the seasons that were considered "Recap" episodes were not included in the research, as they would not be offering new information about the winners. The Cast Reunion episodes of all five seasons were also not used in the research process as the winner of each season was revealed in the final episode before the reunion. Due to accessibility and focus of the research, only seasons from *Survivor US* were used. The data acquired about blindside plays and being blindsided was also discarded in the final analysis of data, as it did not prove significant enough to contribute an answer to the research question since only two of the winners attempted blindsides more than once in their seasons, and none were ever blindsided.

4 | Findings and Discussion

Ultimately, there were three new understandings found through the research. Firstly, through the quantitative frequency scale in Tables 3-5 analyzing positive, negative, and neutral traits, it was concluded that to win unanimously, one must have a positive trait sum of at least 4 and have no more than one point in negative traits. Neutral traits did not have a significant effect on unanimous wins over other types of wins, as results varied with no pattern when comparing the neutral trait sums of various winners, most scoring a 2.

Table 3 - Positive Attributes (Unanimous Winners, 1 Male Winner, and 6 Female Winners)

	Likability	Social Game	Physical Game	Sum
Earl Season 14	2	2	1	5
JT Season 18	2	2	2	6
Cochran Season 26	2	2	1	5
Jeremy Season 31	2	2	2	6
Adam Season 33	1	1	2	4
Boston Rob Season 22	1	1	2	4
Sandra Season 20	2	1	0	3
Kim Season 24	2	2	2	6
Natalie Season 29	2	1	2	5
Denise Season 25	2	2	2	6
Parvati Season 16	1	2	2	5
Sarah Season 34	2	2	2	6

Table 4 - Negative Attributes (Unanimous Winners, 1 Male Winner, and 6 Female Winners)

	Confrontationality	Aggressiveness	Sum
Earl	0	0	0
JT	0	0	0
Cochran	0	0	0
Jeremy	1	0	1
Adam	0	0	0
Boston Rob	1	1	2
Sandra	1	0	1
Kim	0	0	0
Natalie	1	0	1
Denise	0	0	0
Parvati	0	0	0
Sarah	0	0	0

Table 5 - Neutral Attributes (Unanimous Winners, 1 Male Winner, and 6 Female Winners)

	Family Situation	Character Growth in Season	Intentional Strategy	Sum
Earl	0	0	2	2
JT	1	0	0	1
Cochran	0	1	2	3
Jeremy	2	0	2	4
Adam	2	1	2	5
Boston Rob	0	0	2	2
Sandra	1	0	2	3
Kim	0	0	2	2
Natalie	1	0	1	2
Denise	0	0	2	2
Parvati	0	0	2	2
Sarah	0	0	2	2

Additionally, through this analysis, it was concluded that although a sum of at least 4 positive traits was necessary for a unanimous Final Tribal win, women with even higher sums of positive traits and no points for negative traits could not achieve a unanimous final tribal win. Therefore, although concluded by Wall and Truscott that gender had no effect on voting at tribal council, women with equal or better traits than the unanimous male winners were still unable to achieve a unanimous win. This leaves room for further research to question this discrepancy, if voting is not directly or significantly affected by sex based on previous research. Further, jury members from a player's original team seem to have no effect on a player's likelihood of winning unanimously, as the winners ranged from having one original teammate on the jury to all but one. In the analysis of season specific data, starting number of castaways, the presence of a tribe swap or loved one's visit, and whether it was a player's first time on *Survivor* varied from seasons 14, 18, 26, 31, and 33, meaning there is no significant correlation between these factors and a player's likelihood of winning unanimously.

However, all of the seasons under analysis started with two teams, rather than three or four, which shows a correlation between the starting number of teams and if a player may win unanimously. This is not a causation, as there are several other seasons with two starting teams, nor does this suggest that a player cannot win unanimously if their season starts with more than two teams, but shows that currently, all unanimous winners have played on seasons with only two starting teams. Additionally, all unanimous winners had no more than five votes against them over their

entire season, reinforcing the idea that a winner must be able to navigate social politics well and maintain a positive perception among others in order to win at all, but especially to win unanimously. Roberts' research which concluded that most players allow themselves to adopt "Machiavellian", or "cunning, scheming, and unscrupulous", behaviors in order to win is countered by the research in this study, as all five of the unanimous winners were not significantly deceptive or malicious in their gameplay, and actually used a lot of alliances and relationship building to help them succeed in the game.

These conclusions were justified by a statistical significance test, t-tests. The p-values from the tests are shown in Table 6.

Table 6 - Statistical Analysis Comparing Unanimous to Nonunanimous Winners & Male to Female Winners

	Positive Sum T-Test P-Value	Negative Sum T-Test P-Value	Neutral Sum T-Test P-Value
Unanimous Winners vs. Nonunanimous Winners	0.7351	0.325197	0.29584241
Male Winners vs. Female Winners	0.7875	0.688469	0.32775633

Ultimately, no statistical significance was found when comparing either the unanimous winners to nonunanimous winners or men to women, showing that there is no statistical difference between the unanimous and nonunanimous winners' traits. These results may partially be attributed to a small population but are also clearly seen in a comparison of the sums of all winners studied. These results show that the difference between the winners studied is minimal, putting into question whether there is truly no gender bias in voting on *Survivor*. Future research may look into this idea further, analyzing specifically the behavior of jury members at the Final Tribal of various seasons of the show in order to find an explanation for this discrepancy.

With regards to the character archetypes used in casting by Jeff Probst, no significant correlation was found between the five unanimous winners. Two of them, JT and Jeremy from seasons 18 and 31 respectively, both had a subtype of Captain America, but had different main archetypes. Also, Cochran from season 26 had a subtype of The Know-It-All, the main character archetype of Adam from season 33. However, all five unanimous winners did not share a character archetype, meaning that no specific male character archetype is necessarily more inclined to win unanimously. However, all of the five unanimous winners did have archetypes that were characterized by friendlier, more likeable traits than other character archetypes, which reinforces the idea that in order to win unanimously, one must have primarily positive traits when interacting with others in the game.

The findings also indicate that the purpose of creating the casting character archetypes is achieved on the show, as several different subtypes and main archetypes for men were found winning unanimously. Where the Captain America archetype seen in JT and Jeremy is characterized by physical strength, the Know-It-All archetype seen in Cochran and Adam is characterized by mental strength. These two archetypes in unanimous winners reinforce the idea that there is no one "correct" way to play the game to win, and that the game is balanced in a way that makes it possible to win without having a significant amount of brute strength but significant mental strength and vice versa.

The final theory formed based on the new understanding is that to win unanimously, a man must have a sum of four or more positive traits and no more than one negative trait on the frequency scale used in the study. Additionally, he should have no more than five votes against him in a season and should be in a season that starts with two teams. Women with these same or similar traits have not yet been able to replicate the same results, so these conclusions can only definitively be made for male castaways.

4a | Discussion

The season analyses findings showed that over time, unanimous winners were able to receive more votes against them throughout their seasons and still win unanimously in the end. This shows that as time progresses, the complexity of strategic gameplay increases, and one does not necessarily need to have a "perfect" game in order to win. Rather, it is far more important to be able to justify actions and maintain good relationships in order to win over the jury, further reinforcing the conclusions made from the data analysis. While this is clearly true for men, this may make it more difficult for women to achieve a unanimous win at final tribal, as men are not being held to a "perfect game" standard to get jury votes, but women still have not achieved a unanimous win, regardless of the road they choose to pursue. In addition to this finding, many other *Survivor* castaways end up at the final tribal council without receiving any votes against them, but then fail to win. Therefore, it can be concluded that a good strategy or the formation of strong alliances and relationships is far more important than not being voted against at all throughout the season. In future research, analyses of strategy or specific aspects of strategy may be conducted in order to see specifically how it impacts one's ability of becoming the Sole Survivor.

4b | Limitations

Though working on adding to the academic conversation on *Survivor*, the study was limited in some components itself. The most detailed part of the study only analyzed the five unanimous winners of the show and added only seven other winners for the frequency scale comparison and analysis.

4c | Implications

Although the casting character archetypes have been successful in creating diverse stories, casts, and winners on the show, producers have yet to fully break the barrier between men and women, seen in the fact that no woman, despite having the same or better traits than unanimous winners, has ever been able to win unanimously. Therefore, producers of the show should consider ways that this may be prevented moving forward, considering that on paper, the women studied should have been able to achieve a unanimous win.

Further, it was concluded based on the findings that jury members' votes are not swayed by whether they were on the same tribe as a potential winner or not. Therefore, although a possibility considered before completing the study, original tribes do not seem to have a significant effect on the jury voting decisions.

4d | Areas for Future Research

To expand upon this study, future research may utilize the frequency scale model used in the quantitative part of the analysis using all winners, instead of just the twelve chosen for this study. This may help draw better conclusions about traits needed in any winners, unanimous or not, and may also give perspective into how the dynamic of male winners is different from female winners. Additionally, a deeper analysis of female games in particular should be conducted in order to understand the difference in dynamics, and potentially figure out the factor that has prevented women from winning unanimously. Finally, a study on the effects of the uncontrollable factors of the game on contestants should be conducted, analyzing how specifically environmental factors such as natural abundance of food and rainy weather or climate impact the social dynamics of the game, considering the previous knowledge that hunger causes more irritation and conflict among players (Gaillot, 2013).

References

Frick, K. M. (n.d.). The Neuroscience of Survivor. Retrieved from
https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=FdrILXwh7nEC&oi=fnd&pg=PA33&dq=survivorwinners&ots=tW
SVRKxrfU&sig=xjQzr5avD8662nDgivMNoMl6YLo#v=onepage&q=survivor winners&f=false

Gailliot, M. T. (2013). Hunger and Reduced Self-Control in the Laboratory and across the
World: Reducing Hunger as a Self-Control Panacea. Retrieved from
https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/psychology_facultypubs/9/

Roberts, R. J. (2018, May). TEMPORARILY MACHIAVELLIAN: PERFORMING THE SELF   ON SURVIVOR.
Retrieved from https://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/bitstream/handle/1969.1/166501/ROBERTS-FINALTHESIS-
2018.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Theobald, Q. (2021, September 06). Predicting the Sole Survivor. Retrieved from
https://medium.com/analytics-vidhya/predicting-the-sole-survivor-bcece62207e5

Truscott, S. (2017, June). Battle of the Sexes: The Role of Gender in Survivor. Retrieved from
https://mmss.wcas.northwestern.edu/thesis/articles/get/958/Truscott Thesis.pdf

TV Series Finale. (2021, December 09). Survivor: Season 41 Ratings. Retrieved from
https://tvseriesfinale.com/tv-show/survivor-season-41-ratings/

Wall, G. (2011, April 14). Outwit, outplay, outcast? Sex discrimination in voting behaviour in the reality television
show Survivor. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00779954.2011.556078

Wilson, C., Robinson, T., & Callister, M. (2012, February 9). Surviving Survivor: A Content Analysis of Antisocial
Behavior and Its Context in a Popular Reality Television Show. Retrieved from
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15205436.2011.567346