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ABSTRACT

This study and analysis focused on the representation and depiction of contestants on CBS’s Survivor. Specifically, how are gender, race, and age portrayed throughout the episodes. Areas including survival, strategy, participation and success in competitions, and longevity were used. Cultivation theory served as the primary theoretical foundation for this study.

A content analysis showed that male contestants are overrepresented and are viewed as the dominant contestants and leaders. Additionally, White contestants were overrepresented and minority contestants, especially Hispanic contestants, were very underrepresented. White contestants were also viewed as having a higher level of strategy. Results also found an overrepresentation of contestants between the ages of 18 and 44 and an underrepresentation of contestants over the age of 45.

These results, combined with the beliefs of cultivation theory, allow for audiences to not separate what occurs in reality-competition based television programs from the real world. A lack of representation and portrayal identification can create a misconstrued belief of individuals fitting that demographic for viewers.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

“The tribe has spoken; it’s time for you to go.” These are the final words from long-time Survivor host Jeff Probst when a contestant is voted off their respective tribe on CBS’s long-running television show. However, the ceremonial snuffing of a torch does not provide finality for the contestant. It only ends their participation within the show itself. Both during, and afterwards, the audience establishes perceptions of the contestants as well as groups of contestants. Due to filming twenty-four hours a day, contestants on the program become oblivious to the fact that they are participants on a television program. As the season progresses, television audiences normally have the last say on their beliefs about the competitors; based on their portrayals contestants create impressions, and loyal viewers recall favorite (and not-so-favorite) contestants.

Survivor’s success not only introduced a new genre of programming to the primetime television lineup, it also broke ground in its longevity. The fall of 2013 marked the thirteenth anniversary of the program, and the 27th installment where new contestants were given the opportunity to be the last one standing. It is currently the fifth longest running program on broadcast primetime television (Brooks & Marsh, 2007). Its success not only reveals its continual popularity, but its importance in the history of the medium.

The introduction of the reality-competition genre of television programming provided a new alternative as to how television programs could be produced. Built upon
the belief that ordinary people made interesting television, it added an element of
competition. While previous programs including Candid Camera in the 1960’s, An
American Family in the 1970’s, and The Real World in the 1990’s established people as
the “stars” of the program, the primary focus was simply watching what they would do
(Brooks & Marsh, 2007).

In addition to watching ordinary people, reality-competition television established
what audiences can, and even want, to watch on television (Patkin, 2003). In its
beginning, audiences looked forward to the weekly hour of Survivor (Roth, 2003). There
was a spectacle that prompted surprise, joy, and, at times, discomfort. It was unlike other
programs on television at the time; instead of actors reading scripts, Survivor reinforced
the appeal of “average” people who created their own quasi-characters for the audience.

With this realization of Survivor’s importance in American television culture, it is
equally important to recognize how the program adds to our knowledge of television
portrayals. Specifically, this study will examine gender, race, and age, and how it relates
to this genre of television. The literature consistently shows how demographic roles on
television illustrate inequality and unfairness. Additionally, the study adds to the current
literature on cultivation theory.

1.1 Representation on Television: A Theoretical Perspective

Television provides narratives that tell the stories of our time. Through its history,
genres such as sitcoms, dramas, and action/adventure programs introduced characters to
the viewing audience each week. Because of a subjective perception through this
medium, audiences can develop unrealistic perceptions of the world around them
(Morgan & Shanahan, 2010). Television programming plotlines and thematic narratives can produce inaccurate beliefs on what truly is “reality.”

Because it takes place on the abnormal locations and complete separation from society, *Survivor* can create a higher level of independence of demographic boundaries. In other words, the program’s removal from the outside world creates an opportunity to eliminate titles and specific roles such as husband/wife, mother/father that may not be possible in other genres or reality programs (Brancato, 2007). Thus, contestants on *Survivor* can separate themselves from characteristics within their own social circles, and be defined by their own personal qualities.

### 1.1.1 Cultivation Theory

Do programs such as *Survivor* create an unrealistic perception of society? The cultural indicators paradigm, of which cultivation theory is a piece, examines media, such as television, as a collection of messages with an underlying structure (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, & Signorielli 1994; Morgan, Shanahan, & Signorielli, 2009). The collection of common themes may therefore create repetition of messages to audiences. Thus, such messages may indirectly, or even directly, create stereotypical images of demographics, including gender, race, and age.

As Signorielli and Kahlenberg (2001) explain, television’s role is not to directly reflect reality, but tell stories. Television’s stories typically evolve a complete storyline over a long period of time (Morgan, Shanahan, & Signorielli, 2009). These storylines consist of patterns and common expectations of what should occur next. In other words, popular shows remain on the primetime schedule for a lengthy period of time and not
only are understood by the audiences, but also enable audiences to predict what will come next.

Thus, those who are heavy viewers of television programs, including *Survivor*, are more likely to understand society based on the reality the program presents. There is a commonality across the programs that retain an audience (Signorielli, 2004).

Cultivation theory can thus provide a better understanding of the images presented, including the portrayals of demographics; it therefore may create an understanding of the beliefs of the audiences.

1.1.1.1 Gender on Television

According to Morgan and Shanahan (2010), gender roles on television continue to showcase a more traditional image of women. Carine, Janssens, and Korzilius (2002) note that programs falling under the genre of sitcoms and soap operas promote traditional motherhood; the primary role of the woman in these programs is often as mother/wife rather than a woman in a particular occupation.

In addition to portraying young women as more traditional, there is an absence of airtime for older women. Older women appear infrequently on television (Signorielli, 2004) and when they do appear they are of minor importance to the plot, as well as portrayed with negative, stereotypical representations (Lemish & Muhlbauer, 2012).

Why are these representations popular? If the primary purpose is to exploit gender roles and replace character-actors with non-celebrity personas, what do they explain? On dating-based shows including *The Bachelor*, Cloud (2010) argues there are two primary purposes. One is to invite the notion of romantic fantasy, while simultaneously enjoying
the pleasure of the “fantasy’s folly” (p. 414). Thus, this program creates a nonrealistic belief, while leaving hope that such belief, can in fact, come true.

Other reality programs do not represent gender in terms of sexuality, but rather as domesticated individuals. van der Lippe, Frey, and Tsvetkova (2013) define domestic work as a labor which produces goods and items for utilitarian use. Programs such as HGTV’s House Hunters present scenarios arise about which portions of the home should be delegated to the husband and wife. White (2012) contends that one of the most conflicting areas is the “man cave.” On numerous occasions, the male character establishes a room of his own (the man cave), but the lead women does not have a personal, unique room. These images may thus reinstate the stereotypical phrase “a man’s home is his castle” while the woman is delegated to the kitchen and domestic roles such as cooking and cleaning.

Programs such as The Bachelor and House Hunters depict a separation of roles between gender lines. In other words, men and women are defined through love interests, locations in the house, and/or the blatant use of sexuality based on gender and age. If these components are shown on other reality programs, are they also seen in Survivor? Thus,

RQ₁: How does the sample on Survivor relate to the US population in terms of gender?

H₁: Men will be more likely to “take charge” and have higher leadership roles compared to women.
$H_2$: Women will be presented as more domesticated (i.e.: assigned to duties such as cooking, cleaning, and gathering food) compared to men.

1.1.1.2 Race on Television

On television, race is often distorted and portrayed negatively (Morgan & Shanahan, 2010). In the early days of television, minority racial groups were underrepresented (Signorielli, 2009b). Programs portrayed Black characters as inferior to Whites; they were often shown lacking power and authority (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, & Signorielli, 1982). Furthermore, there were few relationships or partnerships that integrated Blacks and Whites; the races were typically presented as interdependent of one another (Auletta & Hammberback, 1985). In other words, people of color tended to be grouped with others of the same color. Programs such as *Good Times* in the 1970s and *The Cosby Show* in the 1980s featured a large, predominantly Black cast, with only supporting roles for Whites and few interactions between the races; a number of similar all-Black situation comedies were produced and aired until the middle of the first decade of the twenty-first century.

At the end of the twentieth century, the level of equality among Black and White characters on television seemed to reach parity in terms of overall representation and comparisons with the U.S. population (Signorielli, 2009a). In fact, in the 1996 television season, there was complete parity (Mastro & Greenberg, 2000; Glascock, 2001). On the other hand, other minority groups, including Hispanics, Latinos, and Asians were under represented in relation to the U.S. population with little to no interactions with those of other races (Mastro & Greenberg, 2000).
The success of reality programs paved the way for “ordinary people” to be seen on camera. In the 1990s, some of the earliest programs lacked scripts and simply had cameras shooting a group of people. One of the most popular of these reality programs, *COPS* premiered in 1989 and is still aired today. Escholz, Blackwell, Gertz, & Chiricos (2002), in a telephone interview conducted after watching an episode of *COPS*, found a difference in the confidence in the police by respondents of different races. Black respondents exhibited less confidence in the police than White respondents.

According to Tyree (2011), such racial portrayals remain less-than-ideal. Specifically, a number of “emerging stereotypes” separate Black characters and the portrayals they represent (Tyree, 2011, p. 404). Programs including *College Hill, The Real World, Paradise Hotel, and Road to Stardom* consist of Black characters with negative attributes and stereotypes (Tyree, 2011). For example, anger and volatile behavior are strong negative attributes often found in a contestant of color; these contestants may be viewed as confrontational, with a high engagement in arguments, as well exhibiting a bad temper and using offensive language (Tyree, 2011). Therefore, the extremism in offensive language and uncontrolled temper presents the opportunity to more negatively portray such contestants of color compared to White contestants.

Consequently,

*RQ*₂: Will there be a difference in the representation of race on *Survivor*?

*H*₃: Contestants of color (e.g.: Black, Hispanic, and Asian-American) will be underrepresented on *Survivor*; White contestants will be over represented
\( H_4 \): Contestants of color will be presented as more volatile/angry compared to White contestants

\( H_5 \): Contestants of color will be presented with lower strategy skills compared to White contestants

### 1.1.1.3 Age on Television

The elderly are underrepresented in the media, particularly on television (Signorielli, 2004). In the 1970s, elderly characters comprised only 5% of primary characters (Arnoff, 1974; Tedesco, 1974). This trend continued throughout the 1980s, where roughly only 3% of major characters were seen as elderly (Greenberg, Simmons, Hogan, and Atkin, 1980; Gerbner, Gross, Signorielli, & Morgan, 1980b).

Not only are discrepancies prevalent among the varying life cycle ages on television, but little, if any, equality is present relating to age and gender. Gerbner et al. (1980b), found that women are seen as younger than men by about 4 years; yet in terms of the categories of the life cycle men and women are portrayed differently. Women are often cast as young adults. Among younger adult characters, men are often classified as “settled” (middle age) (Gerbner, et al., 1980b). Most interesting, women tend to age faster than the men. Among characters 65 or older, 72 percent of men are portrayed as “old” whereas 90 percent of women are “old” (Gerbner et al., 1980b).

In recent years, television programs have become “counter-hegemonic”; in other words introducing middle-aged/elderly characters with younger characters, and presenting them as equal (Lemish & Muhlhauser, 2012 pp. 168). Programs such as *Modern Family* and *Brothers and Sisters* consist of middle-age and older characters who
are a part of a larger ensemble, and are dependent of one another, rather than independent and completely separated by age. In other words, the defining characteristic is not solely their age, but what impact they have on the group/family as a whole.

Studies have also examined the role of women in reality programs such as *The Bachelor*, *The Real World*, and *Temptation Island*. While these programs cast women in leading roles, the roles they actually play do not always showcase the women as prominent, or even equal, to men. Rather, women in such programs often are over-sexualized (Vandenbosch & Eggermont, 2011). Thus, on *Survivor* are younger women portrayed as over-sexualized while older women are separated from their sexuality?

According to 2010 Census Data, 39.9% of Americans are between 18 and 44, whereas 34.4% are 45 years and older (Howden & Meyer, 2011). Thus, these will be the two primary areas of age examined on the program.

*RQ*₃: Will there be a difference present among the representation of older and younger contestants on *Survivor*?

*H*₆: Using the 2010 census as a guide, older contestants (45 and older) will be underrepresented on *Survivor*.

*H*₇: Using the 2010 census as a guide, younger contestants (18 to 44) will be overrepresented on *Survivor*.

*H*₈: Older contestants will be portrayed as having more intelligence and mental competition skills compared to younger contestants.

*H*₉: Younger contestants will be portrayed as having more brawn and physical competition skills compared to older contestants.
$H_{16}$: Women will be presented as over-sexualized compared to men.

1.1.2 Strategic Representation

The primary theme of Survivor is how ordinary American citizens, stranded in an uninhabited location, survive with each other and the elements for 39 days. Through elimination, one member is declared victorious and noted as the “Sole Survivor” of that season (Burnett, 2000). This study examines how race, age, and gender contribute to “survival” and the emergence of the one victorious contestant.

The victorious contestant from each season is analyzed in detail. The analysis examines, if the winners were portrayed so audience members were more aware of their presence (Roskos-Edwoldsen, Roskos-Ewoldsen, & Carpentier, 2009). In addition to the analysis of the primary contestants in each episode, the study also analyzed how the winners were respectively portrayed, regardless if they were or were not a “major character”.

Examining the representation of winners through their strategic portrayals works in conjunction with the cultivation tradition. The study examines how winners are portrayed throughout the narrative of the series. Put simply, what cues identified the importance of the winner in the season? Prior research examining portrayals in demographics and stereotypes found differences in sports commentary by race, (see Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005) as well as differences in perception of men and women in Rock music videos (see Hansen & Hansen, 1988). Consequently,

$RQ_4$: Throughout the season, how are the winners portrayed?
The previous sections established a starting theoretical framework for this project. It introduced cultivation theory and its importance to television research. Additionally, it examined the three key demographic variables that are analyzed: gender, race, and age. Furthermore, it recognized the importance of the portrayals of winners of each season.

Next, the program *Survivor* is discussed. The basic format of the show is examined, showcasing how the individual elements of the program portray the contestants. This model provides the primary structure to examine how these portrayals are established and continued not only through the show’s individual season, but during its entire run on television.

The previous sections established a starting theoretical framework for this project. It introduced cultivation theory and its importance to television research. Additionally, it examined the three key demographic variables that will be analyzed: gender, race, and age. Furthermore, it recognized the importance of the portrayals of winners of each season.

Next, the primary program and unit of analysis, *Survivor*, are discussed. The basic format of the show will be examined, showcasing how the individual elements of the program portray the contestants. This model will be the primary structure to examine how such portrayals are established and continued not only through the show’s individual season, but the entire history of its run on television.
Chapter 2

METHOD

2.1 Sample & Description of Program Studied

The sample consisted of three episodes from each of the twenty-seven completed seasons of *Survivor* (as of April, 2014): the first episode (also known as the marooning), the merger (the mid-point of the season), and the final episode.

The first episode, or marooning, is the start of each respective season. It introduces the contestants, and the respective tribes for which they will compete, as well as the uninhabited environment. It also establishes early-onset social behaviors, including how the individuals interact with each other, and how the contestants initially survive without essentials and luxuries of daily life (ranging from water to cigarettes). As such it often creates instant impressions of certain contestants. The merger dissolves the two tribes and shifts the focus of the show from a team versus team competition to an individual versus individual competition. Each remaining contestant is given more “on screen” attention, as they participate in individual competitions without the assistance of their former teammates. Finally, the last episode concludes the season, and declares a winner. In addition to the first episode, the finale is often the most watched of the season.
Each *Survivor* season was available for viewing on a number of platforms, including DVD versions, as well as digital episodes available on iTunes and Amazon.com. Programs were compiled from each of these media. The specific episodes of each program coded, including the season and original airdate can be found in Appendix C.

2.2 Unit of Analysis and the Coding Procedure

There were two units of analysis, the television program and the character (contestant). For these units of analysis, two separate recording instruments were created. In each season, 8 to 10 members, divided equally between men and women, make up each tribe. Their respective portrayal on the program was analyzed through participation in the show’s areas, including, but not limited to, camp life and survival, tribal competitions, game strategy, and elimination.

In addition to the major contestants in each respective episode, the ultimate winner of each season was coded. Regardless of their importance in each specific episode, their portrayal was critical to the study’s focus on similarities and differences among demographics. The author was the primary person who collected the data. A colleague coded a subset of the episodes to provide a test of reliability. Two recording instruments, examining the program and character/contestant were used to assess the portrayals throughout the program’s run.

2.2.1 The Program

The first unit of analysis was the television program. Programs ranged in length from one hour to two hours. In each program there were three primary sections that
completed the narrative and furthered the progress of the season as a whole: strategy & survival, challenge (either reward, immunity, or both), and tribal council.

2.2.1.1 The Program Recording Instrument

The program itself was coded in several ways; a copy of the recording instrument can be found in Appendix A. Basic elements of the program’s respective descriptors, including episode number, episode in series (debut, merge, or finale), and year of broadcast were first coded. This was followed by an examination of the cast demographics (gender, race, and age) as a whole.

The next section examined thematic aspects of the program, and their relevancy to the episode’s plot. These elements included family and relationships, environment, geography and heritage (including the location of the program, meetings and interactions with locals, and/or connections to the land/island), food and drink, sports and athleticism, minority groups and people (including foreigners, religions, and other ethnic groups), health portrayals (including the discussion or depiction of illness, disease, or injury), and physical handicap or disabilities. Thematic aspects were coded with a coding scheme of emphasis (no attention paid, minor to plot, significant to plot, outstanding focus of plot).

The final section of the program recording instrument examined violence. The Cultural Indicators Project operationalized violence as “the overt expression of physical force (with or without a weapon, against self or others) compelling action against one’s will on pain of being hurt and/or killed” (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, and Signorielli, 1980a, pp. 11). This definition does not include any non-physical abuse, including, but not limited to, verbal abuse, psychological abuse, and emotional abuse. Violence at the
program level was coded through a number of platforms. These included the seriousness of such violence (no violence, strictly humorous, partly humorous, most real, serious), the significance (no violence, some, incidental violence, significant violence, outstanding violence), the intentionality (cannot ascertain intention, no violence, mostly unintentional, mostly intentional), as well as the type; (either violence towards property only, towards others (i.e.: physical violence), or both).

2.2.2 The Characters/Contestants

The second unit of analysis examined characters/contestants on the program. This analysis included major/leading contestants as well as supporting contestants in each episode. Contestants who could be removed from the episode without altering the primary plotline were not analyzed.

2.2.2.1 The Character Recording Instrument

The Character Recording Instrument can be found in Appendix B. Contestants vital to the respective episode were first coded for demographic information, including race, age, and gender. Additionally, physical descriptive characteristics, including body weight, hair color, and attractiveness, were examined.

Following this descriptor and demographic analysis, each contestant was coded based on their participation within the episode and the “game” of Survivor. First, coders analyzed the contestant’s survival skills. Each contestant was rated as poor, and needing to rely on others, average, or high, the primary provider. These included skills or
elements such as building shelter, deep sea fishing (using a spear/Hawaiian sling to catch fish), cooking meals, finding food and water, building a fire.

Furthermore, areas of social skills and strategy were coded. These included social skills (low, average, high, extreme), use of offensive language (infrequent, moderate, frequent), position in tribe (low/weak, medium/”flying under the radar”, high/leader of tribe), and member of alliance (member or nonmember).

Next, an examination of the contestant’s competition and challenge skills were coded. Within the framework of Survivor, most competitions took place within one of three categories: physical, mental, or endurance. Each contestant was coded based on their participation in the challenge, and their ability to compete successfully (low/reliance on others, mixed/average, high/dominant). Furthermore, the contestant was coded on their individual impact and direct influence on the victory or loss of the competition (directly influenced loss, no direct impact, directly influenced victory).

Finally, contestants were coded on their activity in the final portion of the episode: tribal council. Areas including voting with the majority, being voted out, and ultimately being the winner of the season were coded. Additionally, using and playing immunity idols (a protection from being voted out at tribal council) were coded (played hidden immunity idol on oneself, did not play hidden immunity idol, gave hidden immunity idol to tribe member, was given hidden immunity idol from tribe member, gave up immunity directly won from challenge, was given immunity directly won from challenge, played “fake” idol). As the program evolved, the use of hidden immunity idols has become an important primary element of the program.
2.3 Coder Training

Two coders were responsible for this study: the primary author and a fellow graduate student trained in quantitative methods and content analysis. Prior to research, the coder and researcher examined the recording instruments and clarified any unknown questions. To clarify any questions and concerns the coder and researcher watched an episode of *Survivor*, not included in the sample.

2.4 Reliability Analysis

Krippendorff’s Alpha was used to assess intercoder reliability (Krippendorff, 1980). Variables with an alpha of .60 or higher were used in the analysis. Some of the reasons why so many variables were not reliable (i.e., had a value of alpha less than .60) will be discussed in the limitations of the study as well as in the implications for future research. Furthermore, percent agreement was used to examine reliability for lopsided variable distributions. These variables were most often categorized as “cannot code” or “did not appear” and essentially added very little, if any, information to the analysis. Many of the variables, particularly thematic elements in the program and as they related to the contestants were not reliable and not included in the data analysis. Reliability results can be found in Table 2.1 (Program) and Table 2.2 (Character/Contestant).

Several variables were not included in the analysis. Due to low levels of reliability, and the focus of the study, most of the variables coded in Table 2.1 (Program) were not analyzed. The absence of these variables does not have a detrimental effect on the primary purpose of the study: analyzing the program’s contestants.
Table 2.1  Program Reliability: Krippendorff’s Alpha for Program Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program ID</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Food/Drink</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Sports/Athleticism</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Type</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Minority Groups</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast-Race</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Physical Handicap</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast-Gender</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Violence-Serious</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast-Age</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Violence-Signif.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>Violence-Intention</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>Type of Violence</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography/Heritage</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2  Character/Contestant Reliability: Krippendorff’s Alpha for Character/Contestant Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program ID</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Type</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast-Race</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast-Gender</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast-Age</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Member</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chron. Age</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Age</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair color</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body weight</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body attractiveness</td>
<td>.52 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face attractiveness</td>
<td>.40 (85%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Char. type</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence by</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic in competition</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>.40 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive language</td>
<td>.29 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position in tribe</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys compet skills</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental compet skills</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance skills</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council vote</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote out</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idols</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winner</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3
RESULTS

3.1 Description of the Sample: the Program

81 episodes of Survivor were analyzed from its 27-season run. Three episodes per season were coded: the first episode (also known as the marooning), a mid-point episode (the merger; where the two tribes merge and the game shifts from tribal to individual), and the final episode.

3.2 Description of the Sample: the Contestants

There were 403 contestants in the sample: 58.6% were male and 41.4% were female (see Table 3.1) Table 3.2 shows the distribution of the sample by race: most of the contestants, 82.1%, were White, 10.2% were Black, 5.7% were Asian, 2.0% were Hispanic. There were no Native Americans, and none were classified as belonging to an ‘other’ race. The distribution by chronological age is found in Table 3.3. The majority of contestants fall between the ages of 25-44 (62.3%); the rest were 18-24 (19.9%), 45-64 (17.1%), or 65 or older (0.7%). For the analysis two categories were used: contestants (1) between 18 and 44 and (2) 45 and older.
Table 3.1 Frequency of Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Frequency of Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 Frequency of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Hypotheses and Research Questions

The following sections give the results for the research questions and stated hypotheses.
3.3.1 Representation of Gender

RQ₁: How does the sample on Survivor relate to the US population in terms of gender?

Table 3.4 shows that compared to the United States Census, male contestants were overrepresented (58.6% to 49.2%) and female contestants were underrepresented (41.4% to 50.8%); a difference that is statistically significant \( \chi^2 (3, N=403) =13.76, \) \( p<.001 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Observed Frequency N</th>
<th>Observed %</th>
<th>Frequency Based on US population N</th>
<th>Expected % Based on US population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>198.2</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>204.8</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 7.15, \) df = 1, \( p < .01 \)

3.3.2 Portrayal of Gender

H₁: Men will be more likely to “take charge” and have higher leadership roles compared to women.

To examine this hypothesis, a cross-tabulation tested by Chi-Square was conducted. Table 3.5 shows the distribution of gender by position in tribe. More women (34.7%) than men (27.5%) were categorized in the low position while more men (29.7%)
than women (18.0%) were categorized in the high position. The hypothesis approached statistical significance, $\chi^2 (3, N=403) = 7.788, p = .059$

Table 3.5 Gender by Position in Tribe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in Tribe</th>
<th>Men N=236</th>
<th>Women N=167</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
<td>R%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot Code</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 = 7.788$, df = 3, $p = .059$
R% = Row Percentages; C% = Column Percentages

H$_2$: Women will be presented as more domesticated (i.e.: were seen performing duties such as cooking, cleaning, and gathering food) compared to men

Domestic work was defined as cooking, building the shelter, and finding food. Tables 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8 each show the three areas of domestic work in the program. Each table shows that most of the participants were not seen doing any type of domestic work. No significant differences were found regarding gender and domesticity.
Table 3.6 Gender by Building Shelter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Shelter</th>
<th>Men N=236</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women N=167</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot Code</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low, Dependent</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High, Primary Provider</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 = 2.512$, df = 3, p = .473  
R% = Row Percentages; C% = Column Percentages

Table 3.7 Gender by Cooking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooking</th>
<th>Males N=236</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females N=167</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot Code</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low, Dependent</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High, Primary Provider</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 = 5.127$, df = 3, p = .163  
R% = Row Percentages; C% = Column Percentages

Table 3.8 Gender by Finding Food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Food</th>
<th>Males N=236</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females N=167</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot Code</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low, Dependent</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High, Primary Provider</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 = 2.950$, df = 3, p = .399  
R% = Row Percentages; C% = Column Percentages
3.3.3 Representation of Race

RQ$_2$: Will there be a difference in the representation of race on *Survivor*?

H$_3$: Contestants of color (e.g.: Black, Hispanic, and Asian-American) will be underrepresented on *Survivor*; White contestants will be over represented.

To test H5, a chi-square goodness of fit test was conducted. Table 3.10 shows the results that support the hypothesis, $\chi^2 (1, N=403) = 78.56, p < 0.0001$. Compared to the United States Census, White contestants were overrepresented (82.1% to 63.0%) whereas Hispanic (3.2% to 16.9%) and Black contestants (10.2% to 13.1%) were underrepresented.

### Table 3.9 Chi-Square Goodness of Fit: Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Observed %</th>
<th>Expected Frequency</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>253.9</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 78.56, df = 5, p < .0001$
3.3.4 Portrayal of Race

H₄: Contestants of color will be presented as more volatile/angry compared to White contestants

For RQ2 and H₄, the contestants were placed in one of two categories: White or a person of color. A cross tabulation was calculated with significance tested by Chi Square. Table 3.10 shows the distribution of race by the use of offensive language

Most of the contestants do not use offensive language: Eight out of ten White contestants compared to seven out of nineteen contestants of color did not use offensive language. White contestants were slightly more likely to use offensive language infrequently (17.5%) than contestants of color (17.1%). None of the racial groups used offensive language frequently. There was no support for H₃, $\chi^2(2, N=403) = 15.261, p = .086$.

### Table 3.10 Offensive Language by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offensive Language</th>
<th>White N=331</th>
<th>Person of Color N=72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot Code</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 = 4.913, df = 2, p = .086$
R% = Row Percentages; C% = Column Percentages
H₅: Contestants of color will be presented with lower strategy skills compared to White contestants

To test H₅, a scale was created regarding strategy, examining position in tribe, social skills, alliance membership, and tribal council voting. Each of these variables was recoded as binary, either placing the contestant as one who was portrayed positively through participation in the activity or the contestant did not participate in this activity. These values were summed to get each contestant’s strategy score. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to assess the internal consistency of the scale (α = .63, M = 1.89, SD = 1.31).

H₄ was tested using a cross-tabulation of the scale and race. Table 3.11 shows the differences between White contestants and contestants of color regarding strategy, $\chi^2 (4, N=403) = 4.226, p = .376$. While not statistically significant, White contestants had the highest level of strategy compared to contestants of color (13.6% to 8.5%) and contestants of color were more likely to have a below average level of strategy (21.1%) than White contestants (16.6%).

### Table 3.11 Strategy by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>White N=331</th>
<th>Color N=72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot Code</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 = 4.226, df = 4, p = .376$
R% = Row Percentages; C% = Column Percentages
3.3.5 Representation of Age

RQ₃: Will there be a difference in the age representation of contestants on *Survivor*?

H₆: Using the 2010 census as a guide, older contestants (45 and older) will be underrepresented on *Survivor*.

H₇: Using the 2010 census as a guide, younger contestants (18 to 44) will be overrepresented on *Survivor*.

To test H₆ and H₇, a chi-square goodness of fit test was conducted. Table 3.12 shows the results that support the hypothesis, $\chi^2 (4, N=403) = 221.08, p < 0.001$. Comparing numbers to the 2010 United States Census, younger contestants between the ages of 18 and 24 were overrepresented (19.9% to 9.9%) as were those between 25 and 44 (62.3% to 26.6%). Overall younger contestants between 18 and 44 were very over represented when compared to the US. population (82.1% to 36.5%). Older contestants between 45 and 64, on the other hand, were very under represented (17.1% to 26.4%) and those over 65 were just about invisible (0.7% compared to 14.0%). Overall older contestants 45 and older were underrepresented when compared to the U.S. population (17.8% to 39.4%).
Table 3.12 Chi-Square Goodness of Fit for Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Observed Frequency N</th>
<th>Observed %</th>
<th>Expected Frequency N</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>402.6</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 221.08$, df = 4, p < .0001

3.3.6 Portrayal of Age

$H_8$: Older contestants will be portrayed as having more intelligence and mental competition skills compared to younger contestants

In order to streamline the analyses by age, the contestants were combined into two groups by age: those between 18 and 44 (82.1%) and those 45 and older (17.8%). To test $H_8$ and $H_9$, a cross tabulation was calculated with significance tested by Chi Square. Table 3.13 shows the distribution of younger (18-44) and older (45 and older) contestants by the mental competition variables. $H_8$ was not supported; younger contestants were not portrayed with stronger mental competition skills than the older contestants. Roughly the same percent (4.5% of the younger contestants) and 4.2% of the older contestants) were categorized as dominant in the mental competitions, $\chi^2 (3, N=403) = 5.950$, p=.114. Overall, most of the contestants were not categorized as possessing these characteristics.
Table 3.13 Mental Competitions by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Competition</th>
<th>18-44 N=331</th>
<th>45 and older N=72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot Code</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low/Reliance on Others</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium/Holds Own Weight</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High/Dominant</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 = 5.950$, df = 3, p=.114
R% = Row Percentages; C% = Column Percentages

H$_{9}$: Younger contestants will be portrayed as having more brawn and physical attributes compared to older contestants.

Table 3.14 shows the distribution by age (18-44, 45 and older) with regards to physical attributes. There was support for H$_{9}$. More than one in ten (11.5%) of the younger contestants were portrayed as high and dominant in these competitions, whereas only 8.3% of contestants over the age of 45 were portrayed with these characteristics, $\chi^2 (3, N=403) = 9.372$, p<.05. Additionally, almost a quarter (22.2%) of contestants 45 and older, compared to only 12.4% of the younger (18 to 44) contestants, were viewed as weak and needed to rely on others in physical competitions.
Table 3.14 Physical Competitions by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Competition</th>
<th>18-44 N=331</th>
<th>45 and older N=72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot Code</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low/Reliance on Others</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium/Holds Own Weight</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High/Dominant</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 = 9.372$, df = 3, p < .05
R% = Row Percentages; C% = Column Percentages

H10: Women will be presented as over-sexualized compared to men

To test H10, an attractiveness scale (body and facial) was created using Cronbach’s alpha to assess the internal consistency of the scale ($\alpha = .79$, $M = 4.31$, $SD = 0.69$). H10 was tested using a cross-tabulation of the scale by gender. Table 3.15 shows the differences between men and women regarding attractiveness and sexuality, $\chi^2 (3, N=403) = 11.910$, p < .01. While most of the contestants were categorized as average in attractiveness, proportionately more of the women were categorized as being very attractive; 16.2% of the women compared to 6.4% of the men were very attractive.
### Table 3.15 Gender by Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Men N=236</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women N=167</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Attractiveness</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Average</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness Very Attractive</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 = 11.910$, df = 3, p < .01
R% = Row Percentages; C% = Column Percentages

### 3.3.7 Portrayal of Winners

RQ4: Throughout the season, how are the winners portrayed?

To examine RQ4, a strategy scale was created, examining position in tribe, social skills, alliance membership, and tribal council voting. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to assess the internal consistency of the scale ($\alpha = .63$, M = 1.89, SD = 1.31). RQ4 was tested using a cross-tabulation of the scale and whether or not the contestant was a winner. Table 3.16 shows the differences between winners and strategy portrayal, $\chi^2 (4$, N=402) = 11.190, p < .01. Winners were portrayed as having the highest level of strategy compared to non-winners, 30.6% to 7.9%. Furthermore, almost one fifth of the contestants who were did not win their respective season, compared to less than one tenth of the winners, and were categorized as “below average” in strategy.
Table 3.16 Winner by Strategy Portrayal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Winners N=85</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Winners N=317</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
<td>R%</td>
<td>C%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot Code</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 = 11.910$, df = 3, p < .01
R% = Row Percentages; C% = Column Percentages
Chapter 4
SUMMARY & DISCUSSION

4.1 Summary

The primary purpose of this analysis was to examine and describe the portrayal of contestants on CBS’s *Survivor*. Specifically, the study examined the demography of contestants, their participation, and their success within various aspects of the program. Cultivation theory provided the theoretical framework for the research. Three episodes from each season, along with the major characters (contestants) in each episode were coded. Items in the recording instrument included demographics (gender, race, and chronological age) along with survival skills, social skills, and competition skills, seen during the season.

To analyze survival, contestants were coded based on their ability to complete skills such as building a shelter, cooking, finding food, and building a fire. Social skills were analyzed by examining participation within the tribe, use of offensive language, position in the tribe, and member of an alliance. During competitions, contestants were coded not only on their participation and success, but on the type of competition. Finally, longevity in the season was coded based on voting with the majority at tribal council, whether or not the contestant was voted out in that episode, or if the contestant was the winner of the season.
Results found that women are underrepresented, White contestants are overrepresented, and contestants between the ages of 18 and 44 are overrepresented. Additionally, traditional domestic roles, including cooking, finding food, and building shelter were not exhibited by either women or men. Furthermore there was a difference in competitions between age groups, but only when these competitions were physical, rather than mental, in nature. This chapter will examine each of the findings in greater detail; it will also give limitations of the study and directions for future research.

4.2 Findings and Implications

The findings of the data analysis, along with potential implications are found in the following section. Due to the nature of this study, a content analysis rather than an effects study, implications for the study can only be discussed as speculation.

4.2.1 Description of Contestant Portrayal and Representation

Within this sample, more men than women were present. Most contestants were White, and between the ages of 18 and 44.

4.2.2 Gender Composition and Representation

RQ1 examined if a difference would be present among the representation of men and women based on the U.S. population: a statistically significant difference was found. The outnumbering of men to women is unfortunately not uncommon (see Basow, 1992). Such underrepresentation on a reality-competition based program indicates that the
continued underrepresentation of women found on scripted-based primetime programming such as sitcoms and dramas has evolved into the reality programming of the twenty-first century. In other words, reality-competition programs, including *Survivor*, continue trends of gender disparity, rather than attempting to reach parity.

### 4.2.3 Gender Portrayal

The first (H1) and second (H2) hypotheses specifically examined the portrayal of gender. H1 was approached statistical significance, showing that men, compared to women, are more likely to take on leadership roles and be viewed as the leaders of the tribe. For every five men who were viewed in a leadership role, there were only three women at the same level. This may indicate the importance of men in the tribe and the way they are separated from their other tribe mates. Women also outnumbered men, 34.7% to 27.5%, as weak or unnecessary for long-term tribal success. The combination of these two portrayals indicates that while men are not only viewed as the primary “leaders,” they are the primary focal points of the contestants. Interestingly enough, host and executive producer Jeff Probst expressed this sentiment, stating that “there just aren’t as many colorful women in *Survivor* history” (Ross, 2012). In recent years, the program has gone above and beyond to create the impression that men are superior contestants compared to women. Seasons 22, 23, and 25 each brought back past contestants, all of whom were men. They were initially portrayed as the de facto tribe leaders and a large amount of attention was spent on them, even though they were a minority compared to the “new” contestants.
H2, examining a difference in domestic work by gender, was not supported. Each of the three areas examined for domesticity (cooking, building shelter, and finding food) had no significant difference by gender. Moreover, in each of the three areas, men were viewed as the primary provider. While women were not seen in traditional domestic roles compared to other genres (see Carine, Janssens, & Korzilius, 2002) the portrayal by gender again presented men as the primary focal point for any domestic roles. They were portrayed as responsible for keeping the camp upright; interestingly, the program did not portray female contestants as able to complete such tasks.

Additionally, H10 hypothesized that women would appear over-sexualized compared to men. The significant difference regarding the highest level of attractiveness indicates the continuation of sexual themes on television (see Vandenbosch & Eggermont, 2011), and may create a difficult distinction for an audience member as to whether a contestant, particularly a woman, can be both attractive and a strategic player.

### 4.2.4 Race Composition and Representation

RQ2 asked if a difference would be present with regards to racial representation and H3 postulated that contestants of color would be underrepresented and White contestants would be overrepresented. Support was found for H3, as a significant difference indicated the large overrepresentation of White contestants compared to minority contestants (82.1% to 18.9%). This skewness aligns with previous findings of minority underrepresentation, including the lack of parity in the representation of black characters in prime time network programs (Signorielli, 2009a).
Certain contestants of color were very underrepresented. Similar to findings of Mastro and Greenberg (2000), minorities including Hispanics had little to no representation and lacked major roles within the coded episodes (2.0% to 16.9%) and, as of season 27, there has never been a major Native American contestant on the program. While the numbers of Hispanics have unfortunately failed to reach parity, the fact that the only two-time Survivor winner (Sandra Diaz-Twine) and a highly popular three-time returning contestant (Ozzy Lusth), are Hispanic, is not enough to increase the influence of Hispanic contestants and their representation on the show.

Interestingly enough, Asian-American contestants were close to reaching parity compared to their percentage in the U.S. population for two potential reasons. Season 13’s winner, Yul Kwon, was the first, and only, Asian-American winner of the series. Furthermore, the season, Survivor: Cook Islands and the season that followed, Survivor: Fiji, both attempted to diversify their casts. Eleven of the 18 Asian-Americans, or 61% of major Asian-American contestants, were found in these two seasons. Yet, in the remaining 25 seasons, only 7 major contestants were Asian-American.

4.2.5 Race Portrayal

H4 posited that contestants of color would have higher levels of anger compared to White contestants. Tyree (2011) found that, in particular, Black contestants on reality programs were more likely to be volatile, emit anger, and use offensive language. As a whole, contestants of color had more moderate use of offensive language compared to
white contestants. However, this occurred very infrequently, only three times in 81 episodes.

There are two possible explanations for this discrepancy: Tyree (2011) specifically studied Black contestants on a variety of reality programs, including non-reality competition programs, programs on cable networks, as well as programs where violence, confrontation, and the use of offensive or derogatory language may have been more common. Second, the placement of Survivor on the broadcast network lineup may not completely allow for heightened offensive language use, either in a playful or offensive manner. The program has been broadcast at 8:00 PM, and highly pejorative and adult themes are frequently bleeped out, blurred out, or “discussed” rather than seen. In other words, rather than broadcasting a troublesome scene, contestants may reveal in a confessional certain outbreaks, or incidents that may not be appropriate for all audiences.

H5 examined the levels of strategy between White and contestants of color. A number of areas were analyzed, including position in tribe, social skills, membership in an alliance, and voting with the majority at tribal council. While H4 was not supported, White contestants were portrayed as more strategic compared to contestants of color. Of the entire 403 contestants that include 71 contestants of color, only six contestants of color were portrayed as having a high level of strategy, compared to 45 White contestants. An interesting point of note: only three contestants of color, Vecepia Towery, Earl Cole, and Sandra Diaz-Twine won Survivor during its 27 season run. Overall, 23 White contestants won their respective season.
The underrepresentation and portrayal differences of race on *Survivor* show that the program needs to consider not only diversifying, but doing so naturally. As stated earlier, the program twice attempted to increase the level of minorities, both times resulting in a minority winning the season. However, they continued a storyline similar to other genres that came before them (see Auletta & Hammberback, 1985); one that highlighted race-inclusive and segregated tribes, rather than integrated racial tribes that were interdependent rather than separate.

### 4.2.5 Age Representation

RQ3, H6, and H7 each examined differences in representation by age and how age breakdowns compared to the United States population. Age was divided into two groups: 18-44 and 45 and older. The analysis found a significant difference by age; there were significantly more contestants between the ages of 18 and 44 compared to contestants over the age of 44.

While such a difference, particularly the lack of elderly characters is not uncommon (see Signorielli, 2004), there are a number of explanations that support this extreme difference. First, may be the importance of the 18-49 age demographic to both television programmers and executives as well as advertisers. According to Storey (2009), viewers who are not in this age bracket lower the advertising dollars to the network, even if a program is popular and successful.

Additionally, the inability for children and adolescents to participate in the program (*Survivor’s* minimum age is now 18 but was 21 until 2008) may skew a higher number of young adults and college students among the contestants. The lack of older
contestants, however, allows for no reasoning other than the continual underrepresentation of older people in the media, particularly television (Signorielli, 2004). An interesting point of note is that the oldest contestant, Rudy Boesch (72), appeared in the first season. In the 26 seasons that followed, no contestant over the age of 66 was coded as a major and important contestant in a given episode. Yet, it is reasonable to speculate that older contestants are not included due to the physical constraints of aging.

4.2.6 Age Portrayal

H8 and H9 examined the portrayals of age through an important aspect of Survivor, the competitions. Specifically, two categories of competitions, mental and physical, were analyzed. Although the variables included in the mental competitions were not reliable, it is important to recognize the difference apparent between age lines; further detail as to how to more appropriately code will be examined in future directions for research.

H8 posited that older contestants would be more likely to participate in mental competitions than younger contestants. The lack of support for this hypothesis lies in two areas: lack of competitions that were mental in nature, and the lack of older contestants (those 45 and up). Out of the 403 contestants coded, only 19% were portrayed as participants in a mental competition. This disparity may be a result of the sample parameters because the three episodes coded in the sample (the first, merge, and final), favor intensive physical competitions, or high-maintenance endurance competitions.
Thus, the lack of involvement of contestants in mental competitions may not adequately represent their true ability and strengths.

On the other hand, H9 that postulated younger contestants were more likely to be seen and dominant in physical competitions was supported. Of the 72 older contestants, only 6 were viewed as high and dominant in physical competitions, whereas 38 younger contestants were portrayed in this way. While more contestants participated in physical competitions, it is an interesting that over one-third of younger contestants were seen in a physical competition, compared to roughly under one-fourth of older contestants (38.7% to 23.6%).

4.2.7 Winner Portrayal

RQ10 asked if winners would be portrayed differently compared to the other contestants. Using the same strategy scale used to test H4, contestants were ranked on a scale from 1 to 4 based on their position in the tribe, social skills, membership in an alliance, and voting with the majority at tribal council. While significance was found, this may be in part to the larger number of non-winners compared to winners. Only one area, high strategy, showed more winners portrayed as having the highest combination of the four areas listed earlier.

It may be more revealing to examine how the winner is portrayed strategically compared to the runner-up or contestants in the final episode. Due to the nature of this study, contestants who finished second or made the final episode were not coded in all
episodes; future research may consider focusing on contestants who make it to the final episode to ascertain if significant differences exist in their strategic portrayals.

4.3 Furthering of Theoretical Framework

This study, through its examination of representation and portrayal on Survivor, furthers the research of cultivation by not only presenting what is shown on the program, but how it is shown. The underrepresentation of certain demographics, including the elderly, and individuals of color reveals an unfortunate continuation of the ongoing underrepresentation found in previous studies of characters on television. These representations could further the conceptions of misrepresentation of these demographic groups by those who spend more time watching television, whether watching reality programs or just television in general. While this study cannot address if this is true, it certainly lays the groundwork for future studies of television’s effects, particularly within the framework of cultivation theory.

Additionally, the examination of portrayal indicates how contestants are depicted, and what “roles” they are placed into within their respective season; in short, how Survivor frames its contestants. Due to the nature of the program, producers attempt to give audiences the impression that the contestants are “ordinary Americans” yet the way most contestants are framed paints pictures of how certain demographics should act outside of the show. Again, the results of this study provide information that could be used to develop future studies how television programs may frame viewers’ beliefs and ideas about specific demographic groups.
Survivor and similar reality-competition programs may add a new dimension for audiences’ perceptions of “reality.” In other words, programs such as Survivor attempt to let audiences know that the contestants are not scripted. Rather, the contestants are real people who come from all walks of life. At the same time, however, this representation and portrayal may create other effects. Because audiences are given information about the contestant, including their age, occupation, and hometown, audience members may foster a belief system showing how others who live in those areas or work in those jobs are supposed to act. In short, the program may help viewers develop beliefs that are similar to those of the contestants on Survivor.

4.4 Limitations

There are a number of limitations in this study. As the research is a content analysis, there are no direct effects discussed. But, it is important to note that effects studies can only be adequately designed by the knowledge that comes from content analyses. Effects can only be adequately studied if we know what viewers are seeing. There are a number of potential implications due to the portrayals and representation of the contestants on Survivor. But, further analysis of the direct impact on the audience, can only be found in a direct study of effects.

While the sample size of 81 episodes gave an initial picture of the narrative and the most important contestants future research should consider adding additional episodes. For example, a large portion of the first episode revolved around initial interactions, setting up camp, and beginning interpersonal interactions / creation of
alliances. It may be interesting to see if the second episode of each season continues the narrative set out by the initial impressions, or portrays contestants in a different light.

An additional limitation occurred because many variables had to be excluded because of low levels of reliability. There are a number of potential explanations for this occurrence. First, there was a difference in the knowledge of the program and its respective seasons between the primary researcher and the second coder. While the secondary coder had some knowledge of the program and its history, the primary researcher had considerably more familiarity of the program and the season, due to watching the episodes in the sample many times before the coding process began. Furthermore, a more specific definition of competitions should have been implemented. A number of competitions on Survivor combine elements of puzzles, mazes, and athleticism, and the ability to classify one in a specific category was not always clear.

Thus, it falls on the responsibility of the primary researcher to ensure that the coder has full understanding of the season, episode, and contestants. While non-sample episodes were included in training, it may have been helpful to increase training, and have the researcher and coder examine a number of episodes throughout the program’s 27-season run.

4.5 Directions for Future Research

This study created a starting point for the examination of representation and portrayal on reality-competition programming, using Survivor as the primary platform of analysis. As stated earlier, future research could begin examining the program in greater depth, adding more episodes to the sample with the intention of creating a higher
understanding of contestant representation and portrayal. A comparative analysis might also be helpful; future researchers could separate the program into halves, examining the representation and portrayal during the first fourteen seasons, and comparing/contrasting it with the most recent fourteen seasons.

Additionally, other programs modeling the reality-competition format should be analyzed. How much of an impact on the television landscape does Survivor truly have? Did it actually create a model for future programs to copy and create a similar paradigm? It would be interesting to first see if other programs created by Mark Burnett, including The Apprentice and The Voice, follow similar formats.

There are a number of natural divisions in reality-competition programs, and such differences may need to be examined. For example, are there different levels of representation in programs that follow a reality-competition-drama subgenre, including Survivor, Big Brother, The Amazing Race, and The Apprentice compared to programs that can be classified as reality-competition-talent, such as American Idol and The Voice? These are a number of the programs that redefined the television landscape, but it may be interesting to see how it has evolved in the 14 years since Survivor premiered in 2000.

As stated in limitations, this study was a content analysis, with no direct effects studied. To gain a greater understanding of the effects such representation and portrayals have on audiences, a direct effects study should be conducted. This could include a survey on viewer’s habits, frequency of watching, and how viewers perceive demographics, including gender, race, and age, and their respective ability to participate and complete in a number of tasks. This study could reveal the impact of reality-
competition programming on audiences. Furthermore, a direct experiment could allow a quicker response of viewing. Future researchers could see if certain reality-competition programs, including Survivor, prime audiences with beliefs, or if certain beliefs are apparent regardless of program genre or type.

4.6 Conclusion

This study created a starting point for the examination and analysis of representation and portrayal on reality-competition programming. Using Survivor as the primary platform, due in part to its longevity and groundbreaking presence in television history, the study attempted to see how such messages were shown. It is necessary to understand not only how this program represents demographics, but how the reality-competition genre, based on their presentation of contestants as “real people” compared to scripted characters, influences audiences perception of reality.

Through a number of outlets, Survivor has shown it is a primary White, young adult, male-dominated program. Interestingly enough, however, only about 56% of Survivor’s winners have been men. Yet, male contestants are viewed as the primary leaders, and the primary survivalists. This one-sided message creates an unfortunate representation and depiction of women. Although they were the winners of as many seasons as men, having a negative portrayal throughout the season, and even being questionably deserving of winning may not outweigh such benefits. While Survivor has attempted to have men versus women seasons, it would be interesting to see if the program completed a single-gendered season, and examined all aspects of being a
man/woman, rather than creating stereotypical portrayals based on age, race, or occupation.

While women have the opportunity to see their gender represented, certain races do not. The inexplicable lack of racial backgrounds, most notably Hispanics, does not create a complete picture of reality. The program needs to evolve, but do so in a way that does not make apparent the inclusion of minorities in a season, but rather the integration of such. If reality-competition programs on television continue to create an image of difference rather than equality, audiences may have a more difficult time integrating rather than separating.

Furthermore, new television programs in the twenty-first century need to rip out the pages of the medium’s history and attempt to represent and highlight age throughout all stages of the life cycle. Having an absence of older contestants can create an image that they are not capable of such extreme conditions, and have no positions after certain ages (in this case, 44). A disservice is created through the misconstrued belief that the majority of society is between the ages of 18 and 44. Although not included in this sample, other programs, including The Amazing Race and The Voice have attempted to represent children and adolescents as major contestants.

As stated previously, a number of implications could be communicated in the messages of Survivor. Viewers of such programs might create misconceptions of reality and representation as cultivation theory would suggest. Future research may want to solidify such notions and see the true presence and impact the program and genre as a whole has created.
When *Survivor* premiered in 2000, it shocked the television landscape. Fourteen years later, it is still on the air, and had been indirectly responsible for the creation of some of the most popular programs of the past decade. Yet, with such power comes a responsibility to at least attempt to depict reality, rather than create it. A lack of willingness to represent people across all demographic lines and portray them as equal and participatory not only may give audiences of that program and incomplete or incorrect belief of the world around them, but future creators and producers may use such model as well. While such programs may be cheap to produce, they should not lack an ability to show audiences what people of all walks of life truly are, and what they can do.
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Appendix A

RECORDING INSTRUMENT FOR THE PROGRAM RECORDING UNIT

1. PROGRAM ID NUMBER
2. CODER ID NUMBER
3. EPISODE NUMBER
4. EPISODE
   a. DEBUT
   b. MERGER
   c. FINALE
5. YEAR
6. CAST: RACE
   0 = CANNOT CODE
   1 = ALL WHITE
   2 = MOSTLY WHITE (some minorities appear)
   3 = MIXED
   4 = MOSTLY MINORITY (some whites appear)
   5 = ALL MINORITY
7. CAST: GENDER
   0 = CANNOT CODE
   1 = ALL MALE
   2 = MOSTLY MALE (some females appear)
   3 = MIXED
   4 = MOSTLY FEMALE (some males appear)
   5 = ALL FEMALE
8. CAST: AGE
   0 = CANNOT CODE
   1 = ALL YOUNGER (> 44 years of age)
   2 = MOSTLY YOUNGER (some individuals < 44 years of age)
   3 = MIXED
   4 = MOSTLY OLDER (some individuals > 45 years of age)
   5 = ALL OLDER (> 45 years of age)

THEMES AND ASPECTS OF LIFE – EMPHASIS
   0 = no attention is paid to the theme
   1 = theme is minor part of plot
   2 = theme is significant to plot
   3 = theme is outstanding focus of plot
9. FAMILY, marriage, children, family relationships
10. ENVIRONMENT
11. GEOGRAPHY & HERITAGE (location of program, meetings with locals, connections to the land/island)
12. FOOD & DRINK (cooking, nutrition, food safety, etc.)
13. SPORTS & ATHLETICISM
14. MINORITY GROUPS and PEOPLE (foreigners, religious, ethnic)
15. HEALTH PORTRAYALS (including the discussion or depiction of illness, disease, or injury).
16. PHYSICAL HANDICAP, or disability

VIOLENCE

17. SERIOUSNESS (or potential seriousness) OF VIOLENCE
   0 = no violence
   1 = strictly humorous, comic
   2 = partly humorous; ambivalent
   3 = most real, serious violence

18. SIGNIFICANCE OF VIOLENCE
   0 = no violence
   1 = some violence, incidental to plot
   2 = violence is significant to plot, it matters considerably for the story and major characters
   3 = violence is the major outstanding feature or climax, highlight, or resolution of the plot

19. INTENTIONALITY OF VIOLENCE
   0 = cannot ascertain intention
   1 = no violence
   2 = violence mostly unintentional
   3 = violence both intentional and unintentional
   4 = violence mostly intentional

20. TYPE OF VIOLENCE
   0 = no violence
   1 = violence against property only
   2 = physical violence only
   3 = both physical and property
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RECORDING INSTRUMENT FOR THE CHARACTER RECORDING UNIT

21. PROGRAM ID NUMBER
22. CODER ID NUMBER
23. EPISODE NUMBER
24. EPISODE
   a. = DEBUT
   b. = MERGER
   c. = FINALE
25. YEAR
26. CAST: RACE
    0 = CANNOT CODE
    1 = ALL WHITE
    2 = MOSTLY WHITE (some minorities appear)
    3 = MIXED
    4 = MOSTLY MINORITY (some whites appear)
    5 = ALL MINORITY
27. CAST: GENDER
    0 = CANNOT CODE
    1 = ALL MALE
    2 = MOSTLY MALE (some females appear)
    3 = MIXED (EQUAL HALVES)
    4 = MOSTLY FEMALE (some males appear)
    5 = ALL FEMALE
28. CAST: AGE
    0 = CANNOT CODE
    1 = ALL YOUNGER (> 44 years of age)
    2 = MOSTLY YOUNGER (some individuals < 44 years of age)
    3 = MIXED
    4 = MOSTLY OLDER (some individuals >45 years of age)
    5 = ALL OLDER (> 45 years of age)
29. CHARACTER ID
30. CHARACTER STATUS
    1 = MAJOR/LEADING CHARACTER
    2 = SUPPORTING CHARACTER
    3 = MINOR CHARACTER
31. JURY MEMBER (FOR FINALE ONLY)
    0 = CANNOT CODE
    1 = MEMBER OF JURY
    2 = NOT ON JURY
    3 = MIXED
32. CHARACTER PRESENCE
   0 = CANNOT CODE
   1 = FIRST TIME ON PROGRAM
   2 = RETURNING CHARACTER FROM PRIOR SEASON

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
33. “REAL LIFE” OCCUPATION
34. GENDER/SEX
   0 = CANNOT CODE
   1 = MALE
   2 = FEMALE

35. RACE/ETHNICITY
   0 = CANNOT CODE
   1 = WHITE
   2 = BLACK
   3 = ASIAN
   4 = HISPANIC
   5 = NATIVE AMERICAN
   6 = OTHER

36. CHRONOLOGICAL AGE __________________
37. SOCIAL AGE
   0 = CANNOT CODE
   1 = CHILD/ASOLESCENT
   2 = YOUNG ADULT (few or no family responsibilities; can be from late teens to mid-thirties)
   3 = SETTLED ADULT (family, established career)
   4 = ELDERLY, OLD

38. HAIR COLOR
   0 = CANNOT CODE
   1 = BLOND
   2 = RED/AUBURN
   3 = LIGHT BROWN
   4 = BROWN
   5 = BLACK
   6 = BALD/BALDING
   7 = GREY
   8 = OTHER
39. BODY WEIGHT
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = THIN
2 = TONED/FIT/AVERAGE
3 = SLIGHTLY OVERWEIGHT
4 = OVERWEIGHT/OBESE

40. BODY ATTRACTIVENESS
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = NOT VERY ATTRACTIVE
2 = AVERAGE, TYPICAL ATTRACTIVENESS
3 = VERY ATTRACTIVE

41. FACIAL ATTRACTIVENESS
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = NOT VERY ATTRACTIVE
2 = AVERAGE, TYPICAL ATTRACTIVENESS
3 = VERY ATTRACTIVE

42. MARITAL STATUS
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = APPARENTLY NOT MARRIED / NO REFERENCE
2 = IMPENDING MARRIAGE
3 = PRESENTLY MARRIED
4 = SEPARATED
5 = FORMERLY, BUT NO LONGER MARRIED (DIVORCED, WIDOWED)
6 = REMARRIED
7 = MIXED
8 = COHABITING, “LIVING WITH” SOMEONE; MUST BE OF THE OPPOSITE SEX
9 = INVOLVED IN A HOMOSEXUAL OR LESBIAN RELATIONSHIP

43. CHARACTER TYPE
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = “GOOD” – PROTAGONIST, HERO TYPE
2 = MIXED
3 = “BAD” – ANTAGONIST, VILLAIN TYPE

VIOLENCE
44. VIOLENCE COMMITTED BY CHARACTER (Does the character commit any violence? Code highest degree).
0 = DOES NOT COMMIT VIOLENCE
1 = COMMITS NON-FATAL VIOLENCE; HURTS BUT DOES NOT APPEAR TO KILL ANYONE
2 = COMMITS FATAL VIOLENCE; KILLS OR APPEARS TO KILL; FATAL CONSEQUENCES INDICATED

45. VIOLENCE SUFFERED BY CHARACTER; VICTIMIZATION (Is the character subjected to any violence; code highest degree).
   0 = NOT SUBJECTED TO VIOLENCE
   1 = SUFFERS NON-FATAL VIOLENCE; HURT BUT RECOVERS OR RECOVERY INDICATED
   2 = SUFFERS FATAL VIOLENCE; DIES VIOLENT DEATH, OR FATAL RESULT IS INDICATED

46. VIOLENCE SUFFERED BY CHARACTER IN COMPETITION; (Is the character subjected to any violence specifically in a competition; code highest degree).
   0 = NOT SUBJECTED TO VIOLENCE
   1 = SUFFERS NON-FATAL VIOLENCE; HURT BUT RECOVERS OR RECOVERY INDICATED
   2 = SUFFERS FATAL VIOLENCE; DIES VIOLENT DEATH, OR FATAL RESULT IS INDICATED

STRATEGY & SURVIVAL SKILLS

PHYSICAL SURVIVAL SKILLS

47. BUILDING SHELTER
   0 = CANNOT CODE
   1 = POOR, NEED TO RELY ON OTHERS
   2 = AVERAGE
   3 = HIGH, PRIMARY PROVIDER

48. DEEP SEA FISHING
   0 = CANNOT CODE
   1 = POOR, NEED TO RELY ON OTHERS
   2 = AVERAGE
   3 = HIGH, PRIMARY PROVIDER

ADDITIONAL SURVIVAL SKILLS

49. COOKING MEALS
   0 = CANNOT CODE
   1 = POOR, NEED TO RELY ON OTHERS
   2 = AVERAGE
   3 = HIGH, PRIMARY PROVIDER

50. FINDING FOOD
   0 = CANNOT CODE
   1 = POOR, NEED TO RELY ON OTHERS
   2 = AVERAGE
   3 = HIGH, PRIMARY PROVIDER
51. BUILDING A FIRE
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = POOR, NEED TO RELY ON OTHERS
2 = AVERAGE
3 = HIGH, PRIMARY PROVIDER

52. SOCIAL SKILLS
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = LOW: SET APART FROM OTHERS, SECLUDED
2 = AVERAGE
3 = HIGH: AWARE OF POSITION IN GAME AT ALL TIMES
4 = EXTREME: TOO TALKATIVE, VOCAL, TRYING TOO HARD TO BE PART OF TRIBE

53. USE OF OFFENSIVE LANGUAGE
0 = NO OFFENSIVE LANGUAGE
1 = INFREQUENT USE OF OFFENSIVE LANGUAGE
2 = MODERATE USE OF OFFENSIVE LANGUAGE
3 = FREQUENT USE OF OFFENSIVE LANGUAGE

54. POSITION IN TRIBE
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = LOW: PORTRAYED UNNECESSARY FOR LONG-TERM TRIBAL SUCCESS
2 = MEDIUM: PORTRAYED AS “FLYING UNDER THE RADAR”: NOT CAUSING MANY RUFFLES, BUT NOT VIEWED AS TRIBAL LEADER
3 = HIGH: PORTRAYED AS LEADER OF TRIBE, PRIMARY DECISION MAKER FOR TRIBAL DECISIONS & VOTING

55. MEMBER OF ALLIANCE (either majority or minority)
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = MEMBER OF ALLIANCE
2 = NOT IN ALLIANCE

COMPETITION & CHALLENGE SKILLS
56. PHYSICAL COMPETITION SKILLS
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = LOW: RELIANCE ON OTHERS IN CHALLENGES, CANNOT HOLD OWN WEIGHT
2 = MIXED/AVERAGE
3 = HIGH: ATHLETIC, DOMINANT IN CHALLENGES

57. MENTAL COMPETITION SKILLS
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = LOW: RELIANCE ON OTHERS IN CHALLENGES, CANNOT HOLD OWN WEIGHT
2 = MIXED/AVERAGE
3 = HIGH: MENTALLY ACUTE, DOMINANT IN CHALLENGES

58. ENDURANCE COMPETITION SKILLS
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = LOW: RELIANCE ON OTHERS IN CHALLENGES, CANNOT HOLD OWN WEIGHT
2 = MIXED/AVERAGE
3 = HIGH: ENDURANCELLY ACUTE, DOMINANT IN CHALLENGES

59. IMPACT OF COMPETITION VICTORY/LOSS
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = DIRECTLY INFLUENCED LOSS OF COMPETITION
2 = NO DIRECT IMPACT
3 = DIRECTLY INFLUENCED VICTORY OF COMPETITION

TRIBAL COUNCIL & LONGEVTIVITY IN GAME

60. TRIBAL COUNCIL VOTING
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = VOTE WITH MAJORITY TO VOTE OUT PERSON FROM GAME
2 = DID NOT VOTE WITH MAJORITY TO VOTE OUT PERSON ELIMINATED FROM GAME
3 = MIXED (ONLY OCCURRING IN TWO VOTE-OUT EPISODES)

61. VOTED OUT
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = VOTED OUT OF GAME
2 = NOT VOTED OUT OF GAME

62. USE OF IMMUNITY IDOLS
0 = CANNOT CODE
1 = PLAYED HIDDEN IMMUNITY IDOL ON ONESELF
2 = DID NOT PLAY HIDDEN IMMUNITY IDOL; KEPT POSSESSION OF HIDDEN IMMUNITY IDOL
3 = GAVE HIDDEN IMMUNITY IDOL TO TRIBE MEMBER
4 = WAS GIVEN HIDDEN IMMUNITY IDOL FROM TRIBE MEMBER
5 = GAVE UP IMMUNITY (DIRECTLY WON FROM THE IMMUNITY CHALLENGE)
6 = WAS GIVEN IMMUNITY (DIRECTLY WON FROM THE IMMUNITY CHALLENGE)
7  = INCORRECTLY PLAYED “FAKE” IMMUNITY IDOL

63. WINNER

1 = WINNER OF SEASON
2 = NON-WINNER
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SAMPLE OF EPISODE AIRDATES, SEASONS, AND TITLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Date</th>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Episode Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31-May-00</td>
<td>Borneo</td>
<td>The Marooning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Jul-00</td>
<td>Borneo</td>
<td>The Merger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Aug-00</td>
<td>Borneo</td>
<td>The Final Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Jan-01</td>
<td>Australian Outback</td>
<td>Stranded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Mar-01</td>
<td>Australian Outback</td>
<td>The Merge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-May-01</td>
<td>Australian Outback</td>
<td>The Most Deserving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Oct-01</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Question of Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Nov-01</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Will There be a Feast Tonight?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Jan-02</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>The Final Four: No Regrets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Feb-02</td>
<td>Marquesas</td>
<td>Back to the Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Apr-02</td>
<td>Marquesas</td>
<td>True Lies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-02</td>
<td>Marquesas</td>
<td>The Sole Survivor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Sep-02</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>The Importance of Being Eldest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Nov-02</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Sleeping with the Enemy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Dec-02</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Slip through Your Fingers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Feb-03</td>
<td>The Amazon</td>
<td>Boys vs Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Mar-03</td>
<td>The Amazon</td>
<td>Girls Gone Wilder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-May-03</td>
<td>The Amazon</td>
<td>And then There Were Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Sep-03</td>
<td>Pearl Islands</td>
<td>Beg, Barter, Steal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Nov-03</td>
<td>Pearl Islands</td>
<td>What the...? (Part 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Dec-03</td>
<td>Pearl Islands</td>
<td>Girls Gone Wilder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb-04</td>
<td>All-Stars</td>
<td>They're Back!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Apr-04</td>
<td>All-Stars</td>
<td>Anger, Tears and Chaos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-May-04</td>
<td>All-Stars</td>
<td>The Sole Surviving All-Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Sep-04</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>They Came at Us with Spears!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Nov-04</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>Now the Battle Really Begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Dec-04</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>Spirits and the Final Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Feb-05</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>This Has Never Happened Before!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Apr-05</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>I Will Not Give Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-May-05</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>The Ultimate Shock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Sep-05</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Big Trek, Big Trouble, Big Surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Nov-05</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>The Hidden Immunity Idol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Dec-05</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Thunder Storms and Sacrifice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Feb-06</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>The First Exile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Mar-06</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>An Emerging Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-May-06</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>The Final Showdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Sep-06</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>I Can Forgive Her but I Don't Have to Because She Screwed with My Chickens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Nov-06</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>Why Would You Trust Me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Dec-06</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>This Tribe Will Self-Destruct in 5, 4, 3...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Feb-07</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Something Cruel Is About to Happen... Real Soon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Apr-07</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Are We Gonna Live on Exile Island?!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-May-07</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>You've Got That Puzzled Look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Sep-07</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>A Chicken's a Little Bit Smarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nov-07</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>I'm Not as Dumb as I Look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Dec-07</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>A Slippery Little Sucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Feb-08</td>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td>You Guys Are Dumber than You Look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Apr-08</td>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td>I'm in Such a Hot Pickle!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-May-08</td>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td>Stir the Pot!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-08</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Want to See the Elephant Dung? (Part 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Nov-08</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>The Brains Behind Everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Dec-08</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Say Goodbye to Gabon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Feb-09</td>
<td>Tocantins</td>
<td>Let's Get Rid of the Weak Players Before We Even Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Apr-09</td>
<td>Tocantins</td>
<td>The Dragon Slayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-May-09</td>
<td>Tocantins</td>
<td>I Trust You but I Trust Me More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Sep-09</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>The Puppet Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Nov-09</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>All Hell Breaks Loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Dec-09</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>This Game Ain't Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Feb-10</td>
<td>Heroes vs Villains</td>
<td>Slay Everyone, Trust No One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Apr-10</td>
<td>Heroes vs Villains</td>
<td>Going Down in Flames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-May-10</td>
<td>Heroes vs Villains</td>
<td>Anything Could Happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Sep-10</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Young at Heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Nov-10</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Company Will Be Arriving Soon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Dec-10</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>What About Me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Feb-11</td>
<td>Redemption Island</td>
<td>You're Looking at the New Leader of Your Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Apr-11</td>
<td>Redemption Island</td>
<td>This Game Respects Big Moves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-May-11</td>
<td>Redemption Island</td>
<td>Seems Like a No Brainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Sep-11</td>
<td>South Pacific</td>
<td>I Need Redemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Nov-11</td>
<td>South Pacific</td>
<td>Double Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Dec-11</td>
<td>South Pacific</td>
<td>Loyalties Will Be Broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-12</td>
<td>One World</td>
<td>Two Tribes, One Camp, No Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Mar-12</td>
<td>One World</td>
<td>The Beauty in a Merge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-May-12</td>
<td>One World</td>
<td>Perception Is Not Always Reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Sep-12</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Survivor Smacked Me in the Chops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Oct-12</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Not the Only Actor on This Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Episode Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Dec-12</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Million Dollar Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Feb-13</td>
<td>Caramoan</td>
<td>She Annoys Me Greatly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Apr-13</td>
<td>Caramoan</td>
<td>Blindside Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-May-13</td>
<td>Caramoan</td>
<td>Last Push</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Sep-13</td>
<td>Blood vs Water</td>
<td>Blood Is Thicker than Anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Nov-13</td>
<td>Blood vs Water</td>
<td>Skin of My Teeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Dec-13</td>
<td>Blood vs Water</td>
<td>It's My Night</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>