



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT / DIPLOMA THESIS

Titel der Diplomarbeit / Title of the Diploma Thesis

“Manifestations of leadership elements
in the American TV show *The 100*”

verfasst von / submitted by

Tamara Gallauner

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Magistra der Philosophie (Mag. Phil.)

Wien, 2021 / Vienna, 2021

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

UA 190 344 313

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Lehramtsstudium UF Englisch UF Geschichte,
Sozialkunde und Politische Bildung

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Sylvia Mieszkowski, MA

Declaration of Authenticity

I hereby declare this thesis to be my own authentic work. The sources consulted to substantiate my ideas are clearly indicated in the text and quoted accordingly. I am aware that the deliberate omission of consulted material and the passing of someone else's ideas as my own is considered plagiarism.

Vienna, February 2021

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I want to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Sylvia Mieszkowski, whose patience allowed me to take the time I needed for my writing process. She never failed to put things in perspective and always guided me in the right direction. Her supervision ultimately led me to produce a thesis that I am immensely proud of.

On further note, I would like to thank my parents, Eveline and Peter who made sure I pursued the goals I strived for. You have always had words of encouragement at hand during tough times and pushed me to develop to my full potential. Also, I have the privilege to be surrounded by five incredible siblings. Martin, Alexander, Patrik, Markus and Vanessa, you mean the world to me. You are the people I feel completely comfortable around and whose company I always enjoy. Thank you, all of you. My life is complete because you are in it.

Furthermore, I want to thank my aunt Renate who is one of the strongest, hard working and most loving people I know. Her kindness and openness has inspired me in many situations. I always cherish our long conversations and the quality time we spend together. Thank you.

Someone who has been by my side for a long time and who I cannot imagine life without is one of my best friends, Tamara. Countless times, you have patiently listened to my troubles and shared your opinion with me. You stood by me even in times I wavered and was not quite myself. The personal growth we encouraged in each other led to the self-confidence I enjoy today. I feel extremely fortunate to call you my friend.

Also, I want to thank my long-term friend Kathrin, who is one of the most authentic, honest and non-judgemental people I know. I feel safe sharing even the most closely guarded things with you. You were there for me in the most difficult moments of my life and have eventually managed to calm my emotional turmoil. Your humor and directness always puts things back into perspective. You ground me.

This work is dedicated to all the people I love.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Popular Culture and Potentials of Media Manipulation	9
3. Approaches and Definitions of Leadership	13
3.1. Leadership Formation and Leaders as Initiators of Change	13
3.2. Effective Leadership	16
3.2.1. A Matter of Personality	16
3.2.2. A Matter of Gender	19
3.2.3. A Matter of Ethics	24
3.2.4. A Matter of Rhetorical Practice	28
4. Manifestations of Leadership Elements in <i>The 100</i>	32
4.1. The Leaders Clarke Griffin and Bellamy Blake	33
4.2. The Leaders's Public Confrontations	38
4.2.1. Instances of Negative Feedback for the Female Leader	38
4.2.2. Instances of Positive Feedback for the Male Leader	45
4.3. The Leaders's Private Interactions and Negotiations	53
4.3.1. Instances of Negative Feedback for the Female Leader	53
4.3.2. Instances of Positive Feedback for the Male Leader	57
4.4. The Leaders's System of Justice	60
4.4.1. Trial by Combat for Dispute Settlement	60
4.4.2. Law of Retaliation for Punishment	62
4.5. The Leaders's Ethical Dilemmas	67
4.5.1. Torturing an Enemy	67
4.5.2. Murdering a Traitor	70
4.6. The Leaders's Responses to Foreign Threat	73
4.6.1. Creating Fear of 'The Other'	73
4.6.2. Guns as Tools for Protection and Defense	76
5. Conclusion	78
6. The Scenes's Transcripts	83
7. Bibliography	93
8. Abstract (English)	99
9. Abstract (German)	100

1. Introduction

The television show *The 100* is based on Kass Morgan's identically named young adult science fiction novel series (2013-2016). In 2014, the pilot aired on the American national cable network The CW, popular for its young adult fiction, fantasy, and dystopian productions.

Popular culture is widely conceptualized as an American import and invention. It stems from the “homogenizing influence of the American culture” (Storey 7). The origins of the United States’s hegemonic status can be historically traced back to the country's successful separation from British rule and subsequent imperialistic endeavors. The victory in the War of Independence against Great Britain created the conception of America as place of liberation and empowerment (Storey 7). During the Progressive Era that lasted from the late 19th to the early 20th century, the cornerstone of America’s foreign policy was the defeat of rebellions threatening its authority. The United States’s influence continued to thrive due to the effective intervention in revolutions located in Latin America and the Pacific and the gradual annexation of those territories. These processes increased The United States’s political relevance and eventually established its sovereignty on the American continent (Zevin 328). Moreover, its emergence as one of the victorious parties during World War I and World War II significantly contributed to the gaining of influence in Europe. Finally, the United States’s assumed authority in its Asian, Middle Eastern and North African colonies, which completed their global impact (Zevin 332). America’s global military presence inevitably resulted in a cultural “Americanization” of the western hemisphere.

In the process of globalization, trends originating from America have rapidly spread during the last decade, influencing modern popular culture on a global scale. Hereby, American television shows have exerted significant “visceral impact” on the socio-cultural environment (Berger 149). As these productions have continuously grown in popularity, they represent a hegemonic constituent of contemporary popular culture and have the power to shape worldwide audiences. The American dystopian television show is of particular relevance in correlating to the conceptualization of America as the “land of the future”, which stems from its “visions of change, progress and development” (Slaughter 61). Among the various different genres of television, especially dystopia indicates today’s society’s shortcomings and problems, thus leaving room for the audience’s critical

approach towards existent modern conventions. Dystopian texts present a “forward view” of social development and offer interpretations of the future based on present trends (Slaughter 77). The post-apocalyptic genre of *The 100* leaves room for the portrayal of people and “foundations of social life” unaffected by contemporary “social rules and regulations” (Slaughter 77,79). Screenwriters of dystopian texts have the power to create innovative storylines and character profiles, both exposing and counteracting present societal flaws, dominant ideologies and stereotypes.

One example of a dominant ideology present in contemporary times is hegemonic masculinity. The feminist movement has and still continues to oppose the struggle against male hegemony. Products of popular culture are particularly able to challenge prevailing masculine hegemony as they “articulate popular genres for feminist politics” (Storey 8,9). By adopting the development process of a female leader as a common theme, the media are given the opportunity to showcase the shortcomings women face in present times. This could be done by adhering to feminist values and by freeing their female lead characters from stereotypical depictions, role expectations and masculine oppression. Taking a closer look at the narrative of leadership emergence, potential leader candidates frequently face instances where they have to prove themselves worthy of leading, steadily evolve and gain depth through serial narration until, ultimately, they become official representatives. One famous example of a contemporary American television show incorporating this narrative style of leadership is HBO’s *Game of Thrones*. Although Daenerys Targaryen is part of a powerful family, she does not exert authority herself, but instead is overshadowed by her brother who perceives himself to be the rightful leader. However, as the story progresses during the show’s first season, Daenerys acknowledges her potential as leader, develops into a character of agency until, ultimately, she assumes power at the end of the season. In *The 100*, Clarke Griffin’s starting point is similar to that of Daenerys’s. She is set in opposition to Bellamy Blake, the male counterpart Clarke has to prevail against in the course of the first season. By narrating the journey of a woman becoming a leader, contemporary media productions are in the position to critically address the hardships of women in positions of power and the difficulties aspiring female leaders are facing at present.

The television format is particularly relevant concerning leadership analysis. Firstly, contrary to movies, television shows are not bound to restricted timeframes, but rather have several episodes available to narrate and develop the story and its characters

(Berger 149). The extended timeframe agrees with the nature of leadership as “process” emerging over a longer period requiring a continuous engagement with individuals (Northouse 8). Secondly, television’s “narrative complexity” contributes to the creation of character depth (Mittell 31). A complex narration becomes evident in the television serials’s recurring narrative structures termed “serielle Elemente” (Eco 156, “serial elements”, my translation). Serial elements encompass a fixed situational framework and a set number of main characters (Eco 159-162). For example, lead characters are surrounded by secondary characters who get replaced in the following episodes alongside changing plot lines. While the viewer believes to be watching an original story, it is a constant repetition of already familiar narratives (Eco 156-159). Upon being confronted with recurring serial elements surrounding the main characters, the viewers’s attention is directed to their progress and development (Eco 155). Furthermore, television is essentially a “man’s world” implementing the bias of “the masculine perspective” as being the ‘norm’ standard (Chandler n.p.). Concerning the representation of women on television, it is limited to the following criteria: “emotional [...] dealings and relationships (as opposed to independence/freedom)” (Starlet n.p.). However, gender bias could be eliminated in fictional narrations, given the authors are aware of its root causes and are willing to avoid it. They hold the power to create lead characters non-conforming to cliché attributes and determine their evaluation.

The global immediacy of the underrepresentation of women in leading positions and actuality of gender-related bias is evident in both the economical and political sector. For example in the area of human resource management, men predominantly hold leadership positions. The percentage of female leaders decreases per career level, a phenomenon that is called the “leaky pipeline”, until it rapidly drops before the top positions have been reached (Spitzer and Wieser 2). The invisible barrier describing the rapid decline of leading women in the highest career levels is called the “glass ceiling” (Spitzer and Wieser 573). In the field of politics, parliaments worldwide register approximately 20% female parliamentarians. Merely 13 out of the 190 existing countries are governed by female leaders (Paxton and Hughes 1). Concerning the gender distribution in the United States’s Congress, although the women’s representation in politics has grown in the past decades, roughly one-fifth of the representatives’s overall body are female (Hora 134). The fact that there still is a lack of female leaders in top positions in America and also on a global scale proves a general gender related power imbalance apparent in contemporary society. Still, a vast majority of men hold political and economical power worldwide.

Starting from the 1950s, leadership studies increasingly investigated whether a leader's gender might have an effect on positive or negative leader evaluation and overall successful leadership. Conducted research in the field of social sciences and psychology confirmed an interrelationship between a leader's gender and subordinate evaluation (Brown 597). To test this theory, the thesis observes and analyzes elements of leadership in the television production *The 100*'s first season.

In specific, by the example of the two lead characters Bellamy Blake and Clarke Griffin, the paper concerns itself with three distinct areas of analysis. Firstly, each individual's leadership claim, the offered reason for the character's selection as a leader figure, is outlined. This aspect includes the leaders's personal backgrounds and the way they stand in contrast. Secondly, varying situational conditions and the leaders's responses are of interest as arising ethical conflicts and dilemmas illustrate the processes of leadership during times of struggle. Those are analyzed according to the leaders's handling of the case and the tools they make use of for a specific purpose in a given situation. The results provide evidence about the system of justice and the kind of community Clarke and Bellamy aim to establish. Thirdly, the thesis enquires into the leaders's acts of leadership throughout the season, manifesting in behavioral patterns and verbal or non-verbal communication. Hereby, the thesis resorts to Bernhard Bass's definition of the subject matter who defines leadership as an instrument to achieve goals (Bass 11). Their nature indicates the leaders's individual character disposition as they can either be altruistic and in accordance with common interests or egoistic and purely self-serving (Burke 41). Concerning the analysis of spoken conversation, of particular relevance are the leaders's applied argumentation strategies to gain their followers's approval and their persuasive power determining the effectiveness of the leaders's argumentation (Burke 41). To gather data for this area of interest, the leaders's rhetorics during public speeches and private interactions are taken into account. The rhetorical analysis is based on Aristotle's manual of "technē rhētorikē", which elaborates on effective means of persuasion (Waterfield ch.c). As far as non-verbal patterns of behavior are concerned, the leaders's body language and gestures are yet one further indicative of their character and leadership style (Bass 14-15). Hereby, Arthur Berger's work on the "mise-en-scène" of film narrativity is consulted, which lists key audiovisual elements that impact character presentation and viewer evaluation (Berger 150). The combined evaluation of the leaders's claims, their acts of leadership and staging would determine their "differentiated role" and "power relation" with each other and followers (Bass 14-15). The leaders's evaluation and feedback answers the question

whether *The 100* deems gender to be a main determinant for effective leadership. Hereby, the paper bases its analysis on Judith Butler's concept of gender performativity, the presupposition that gender, as opposed to the biological sex, is a social construction and is being performed by individuals (Butler *Gender Trouble* vii). This concept is founded on Simone de Beauvoir's statement "one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman" in *The Second Sex* (1973: 301). The thesis enquires into the leaders's tendency to show "prosocial behavior", behavior aligned with "expectations [...] associated more with one sex or another" (Schroeder, and Graziano 376). In consideration of the leaders's portrayal, the show's dissemination of stereotypes of femininity and masculinity or its unsuccessful deconstruction thereof is to be ascertained.

By investigating these aspects on the basis of the aforementioned theoretical framework, the thesis aims to address the following questions:

What specific leader type does the show construct and deem successful?

In how far do stereotypical gender-related traits and styles manifest in the characters's leadership behavior and correlate to positive and negative leader evaluation?

The results reveal either the show's adherence to or subversion of prevalent behavioral gender norms and roles. I hypothesize the following:

The 100 leaders's "role congruity", the construction of a particular type of successful female and male lead kept within both sexes's role expectations (Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie and Reichard 1).

Specifically, I postulate the female leader's exhibition of stereotypical female behavior in the majority of analyzed aspects to be triggering disobedience, negative evaluation, or opposition.

By contrast, a male leader conforming to cliché male role expectations in the majority of analyzed aspects is expected to face obedience, positive evaluation, and limited instances of resistance.

If the hypotheses are confirmed, the show displays both cases of descriptive and prescriptive bias (Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie and Reichard 40). Firstly, *The 100* would promote the idea that traits attributed to women are not conducive to effective leadership, whereas masculine attributes are prerequisites thereof. The show's adherence to gender roles would identify its support of hegemonic masculinity (Bennett, Hickman, and Wall 253-254). Moreover, it would support the idea that female leaders violating their sex role expectations are very likely to face negative feedback. If both hypotheses are confirmed, the show promotes male superiority and the "Great Man Theory", the myth that "*leaders*

are born, not made” and the prevalence of a patriarchal society (Cawthon 2). In case of depicting its woman in power as subjugated by mechanisms of patriarchal hegemony, the show would label the large-scale female leader as mere fiction and strengthen the discourse of female inferiority.

2. Popular Culture and Potentials of Media Manipulation

The 100 is part of 'popular culture' which is a term used to refer to products of culture commercially produced for the masses. The "mass-produced" nature of popular culture suggests its contents being of lower sociological significance (Storey 5). This presumption leaves room for discussion especially concerning television productions as products of popular culture. Due to the technical and digital revolution of the past forty years, forms and providers of televisual content changed drastically. Nowadays, various online platforms are offering on-demand streaming of television shows. These new media formats make fast distribution of and access to the digital content possible on a global scale (Bernsen 13). The global accessibility of popular culture television contents argues for a high sociocultural impact thereof. In general, the range of media influence is extremely broad. On the one hand, media contents are products of culture and thus controlled by its members to a certain degree. On the other hand, media fictionalizations construct cultural representations which in turn affect audiences (Bernsen 28). In fact, a reciprocal connection between media productions and the receiving audience can be concluded.

It is the audience that defines popular culture by evaluating and selecting contents they deem substantial and relevant. As per definition, popular culture "meet[s] the approval of many people" (Storey 4). In sum, products of popular culture are based on a correlation to widespread audience interests and values supported by the masses. Relating to television productions, indicators for a show's degree of influence are its ratings. *The 100's* first season attracted a considerable range of viewers with an average 0.6 rating and a total of 1.85 million viewers worldwide within the age range of 18-49 (TVSeriesFinale n.d.). Regarding the show's performance evaluations, it won the IGN Award for the Best TV Science Fiction Series in 2014 and the Saturn Award for the Best Youth-Oriented Series on Television in 2015 (IMDB 2019). Favorable reviews published in response to *The 100's* first season praised the acting and plot and described the show as "impressive" and "sophisticated" (Derakhshani n.p., VanDerWerff n.p.). Its female characters were publicly described as "best female characters on TV" who "dominate the screen" (Driscoll n.p., Ennis n.p.). One report show to highlight "the many ways women can be strong and powerful" (Ennis n.p.). Concluding from the audience reception and review, the first season of *The 100* was in high demand, widely discussed and affected a broad range of people. Thus, the show clearly was of considerable sociocultural relevance at the time of its launch.

The wide range of television shows inevitably leads to an equally widespread distribution of media messages. As a matter of fact, media messages are produced by “the people for the people” (Storey 7). They originate from actors of the media landscape such as directors, writers and producers who are able to add qualitative substance to the product (Bernsen 55). Media productions operate as instruments of reality construction and occupy a dominant role in conveying socio-cultural norms and ideas through media messages. In a process of “digital storytelling”, fictionalizations “describe what things are” and “reveal how things work” (Bernsen 62, Shanahan x). They refer to actual socio-political events that ought to “alert [the audience] to [predominant] interests, threats, opportunities and challenges” (Shanahan x). Even more so, stories narrated on television “tell us what to do about them” by evaluating certain “behaviors or styles” as either positive or negative (Shanahan x). Therefore, they serve a legitimate “moral purpose and a social function” by suggesting conclusions to fictional actions (Bernsen ix). As John Storey points out, a show’s narrative text suggests “reading positions” for the audience to adopt (Storey 7, Pallaske 40). According to the Gramscian theory of hegemony, media works as “machine” that produces and aims to incorporate dominant concepts, ideologies, ideas and morals into a receptive subordinate group (Storey 7-8). The communication theorist George Gerbner identifies a process of socialization in the televisual endeavor of imposing “roles of gender, [...] vocation and life-style, and offer[ing] models of conformity or targets for rebellion” (Shanahan ix). To sum up, the intended message to the viewership is transferred by the interplay of the dramaturgical story arc and applied audiovisual elements.

Especially the audiovisual staging, the scene’s *mise-en-scène*, conveys information that influences the interpretation of content. The french term “*mise-en-scène*” originates from theater and is translated as “to put on stage” and refers to the frame’s “contents and their organization” (Gibbs 12). The frame’s contents refer to audiovisual elements such as scene’s setting, lightning and music, used objects, character placement, costume and are organized by the camera angle and movement. In fact, the extra-diegetic audience’s “access to the action” is determined by camera position and movement, which enables the director to control the viewership’s experience. (Gibbs 25). On the one hand, camera position and movement can create closeness and establish a character’s approachability. Close-up shots, for example, can trigger emotional involvement by creating a level of intimacy and sympathy between the fictional figure and the viewer. Closeness to the character is also accomplished via the tracking shot. Hereby, the camera follows the actor's movements. This audience-participation technique allows the viewer to visually

accompany the character. Also, rapid camera movements can build tension and thus fixate the viewer's attention on the screen. On the other hand, the position of the camera can construct distance, allowing the viewer to detach him- or herself from the action and observe the situation in a more objective way (Pye 27). Furthermore, the scene's lightning, which refers to the level of the characters's and background's illumination, has a significant impact on the extra-diegetic audience's perception of the scene by initiating "suggestive readings" (Gibbs 12). The control of lightning represents a tactic the director might apply to manipulate the viewers. By directing the viewers's focus to a certain element, they are led to interpret the shown content in a certain way. Also, lightning allows the film-makers to create a mood which triggers a certain desired emotional state. As stated by Annabel Cohen, "[e]motion characterizes the experience of film", it can therefore be argued that *mise-en-scène* elements stirring the extra-diegetic audience's emotions have particular expressive power (Juslin and Sloboda 250). One particular staging element, that of music, has been deemed "one of the strongest sources of emotion in film" (Juslin and Sloboda 250). It can generate "emotional associations" and establish a mood attached to the narrative's topic (Juslin and Sloboda 251). Furthermore, film-makers are able to use color to create emotion and draw the viewers's focus to a detail. In regard to film, especially the colors of background costumes have a considerable impact on the perception of the character.

This leads to a crucial component of staging: the actor's appearance and performance. Whereas staged appearance is understood as a combination of hair, make-up and costume, performance refers to "the way in which a line is delivered, [...] where an actor is looking at a particular moment", movements, gestures and facial expressions (Gibbs 14, 17). By creating a specific image through appearance and the "direction of action", the audience is led to draw inferences about the character and defines the fictional person depicted on screen (Gibbs 17). Apart from that, objects repeatedly appearing on film also carry symbolic meaning which are developed throughout the narrative. Particularly objects regularly used by characters might gain deeper meaning as the storyline progresses (Klevan 146). They could carry gender-specific or "cultural associations" (Gibbs 14). Moreover, objects could eventually serve as identifying symbols of a character or contribute to the establishment of an 'iconic' depiction. These character-based elements provide indication about the character's emotional state and guide the viewer through the scene's narrative, contributing to the interpretation of the content.

The degree of receptiveness to transferred media messages depends on the controllability of the target audience and its ability to criticize manipulative contents and representations. Unaware and uncritical audiences are receptive for manipulation and the unreflected adoption of perceived popular culture messages. To challenge processes of manipulation, it is essential for the audience to be capable of the critical examination of media effects. The practice of media criticism allows for the examination of the “construction of everyday life” in identifying a socio-cultural process and the existent “struggle against the homogenizing forces of [the] [...] dominant culture” (Storey 8). Furthermore, it facilitates the detection of “power relations that constitute this form of everyday life” (Turner 6). The first step in deconstructing media codes is the interpretation of narrative contents in relation to the viewer’s own body of knowledge regarding the content’s subject matter. The critical receiver of medial information in turn conducts a media impact analysis of applied tools, particularly their potential of manipulation. This demonstration of analytical competence implies the individual’s awareness of “social circumstances and historical conditions of production and consumption” (Storey 9). At that stage, the recipient forms value judgements and thereby inevitably becomes a critic of the medial content (Bernsen 55-56). To successfully do that, the viewer has to exhibit knowledge of the show’s techniques of reality construction, for example of audiovisuals and their purposes (Bernsen 28). By conducting media analysis, the viewer is able to uncover televisual elements and observe their mechanisms and effects objectively. The critical viewer is able to distance him- or herself from predefined interpretations and dispositions and can thus enter an informed critical discourse. In relation to this thesis’s object of analysis, consumers of *The 100* have to be aware of the show’s potential for the conveyance of messages about gendered leadership. However, before conducting the analysis, the subsequent section outlines the theoretical framework as rationale to investigate gender-specific manifestations of leadership elements in *The 100*.

3. Approaches and Definitions of Leadership

Leadership as a subject matter has been conceptualized and defined in multiple ways. Since the beginning of the 20th century, the academic disciplines of social sciences have been increasingly concerned with the study of leadership. Alongside the growing body of research, varying approaches to the subject matter have developed (Northouse 2). The psychologist Bernard Bass, whose publications left a fundamental impact in the field of leadership studies, provided an overview of the most common definitions of leadership. Bass summarized leadership as procedure to initiate structure, as instrument to achieve a goal, as list of certain personality traits and behavioral patterns, as style to induce compliance and exercise influence and as form of persuasion (Bass 11). The following chapter will elaborate on these definitions in detail. Particular attention is directed at indicators for leadership effectiveness and gender-specific leadership.

3.1. Leadership Formation and Leaders as Initiators of Change

First and foremost, the two differing processes of a potential leader candidate's formation will be addressed. According to "social identity theory", leaders are "group prototypes" who gain a position of authority because they represent the whole group's identity, values and priorities (Northouse 9). However, there are both external and internal factors contributing to leadership building. External formation processes are either person-dependent or situation-dependent.

Starting with the former, a leader can be appointed either by assignment or in a long-term process of emergence. "Assigned leadership" means that a person has been assigned to a leadership position by significant people in power (Northouse 8). Contrary to that, the "emergence of leadership" describes a process happening "over a period through communication" where a person is chosen by the community as their suitable representative (Northouse 8). Both leadership procedures follow a process of selection, assigned leaders being chosen by their own superiors and emergent leaders by the group they represent. Comparing those two types, assigned leaders might find it more challenging to hold the leading position within the community for the longer term. They have not earned leader qualification and respect in the eyes of the community, but it was rather allocated to them by community leaders. Quite often, the leadership claim of assigned leaders rests on prestige (Bass 12). Assuming that the support of superior

powers stopped, assigned leadership might be threatened. Emergent leaders, however, as they enjoy the community's support and acknowledgement, would possibly find it easier to withstand challenges. Concerning both processes, the key leadership building moment refers to the moment the potential candidate internally assumes the power to influence structural processes and decides on a course of action for a large group of people (Bennis and Nanus 221). In his work on political philosophy *Politics*, the Greek philosopher Aristotle defined a leader as the "origin" of actions, "the one who decides which actions will be taken" (Deslauriers 48). If the candidate abstains from taking action, he or she is automatically ruled out as leader.

To further elaborate on situation-dependent formation processes, external situations of conflict contribute to a leader's building. Social conflicts are paralleled by the "clash of values and interests" or the "tension between what is and what [...] ought to be" (Burns 425, Coser 197). Discontent with momentary circumstances prompt the generation of new norms and a general reorganization (Coser 198). Once a leader has assumed authority, he or she is able to be the initiator of change. The change of social structures can be caused by reform or revolutionary movements (Alexander 35).

A reform movement advocates a change that will preserve the existing values but will provide improved means of implementing them. A revolutionary movement is regarded as advocating replacement of existing values (Alexander 28).

In that sense, leaders have the potential to leave a strong impact on structures of social life, rules and values existent in a community.

Once official, leaders hold the power to arrange a situation and mobilize energy towards a definite goal. They perform "leadership acts", which encompass all organizational processes performed either consciously or subconsciously by the leader that influence subordinates in the desired direction (Burns 425). Kotter (1990) categorizes acts of leadership into three areas of function:

- the establishment of direction by sorting out a problem, communicating a goal as solution and setting strategies on how to achieve it,
- the alignment of people by seeking the subordinates's commitment to the task and "building teams and coalitions" for task-achievement and
- the motivation and inspiration of people to "move [...] from their own interests to unite for higher ends" by empowering them (Bass 9, Northouse 6,12).

Varying factors have been identified to either generate or hinder the subordinates's motivation to cooperate and exhibit task-commitment.

Certain leadership styles and approaches affect the implementation of the desired action. For example, the leader can adopt a "transactional style" which operates on "trade-offs of the leaders's and followers's personal goals" upholding both parties's individual agendas (Kuhnert and Lewis 651). Furthermore, leaders have the choice to exercise transformational leadership. This style triggers the followers's adoption of the leader's end values and the inherent motivation to contribute to the community's improvement and change (Northouse 4, Kuhnert and Lewis 653). The essence of a transformational style is the process of "convinc[ing] an audience to adopt a new belief" (Broda-Bahm and Kempf 186). The community would then "raise one another to higher levels of motivation" and would ultimately accomplish more (Burns 83, Northouse 5). Moreover, leaders have the choice to exercise leadership either by coercion or persuasion. Their choice determines the "quality of [the subjects's] relationship with their superiors" and long-term leadership maintenance (Bass 8). To go into detail, the purpose of leadership by coercion is the leaders's domination over their followers by "molding the group to [their] will" (Bass 13). In order to induce obedience, the coercive leader follows the method of "compelling a body of people by intimidation or force to follow a line of action" (Moore 124, Bass 14). This approach was termed the theory of compliance-induction which is based on an unbalanced power relationship between leader and followers and comes along with rigorous control of subjects and forced process implementation (Northouse 5). In his book *Psychology and the soldier*, the author Norman Copeland critically engaged with leadership by coercion and termed it "drivership" (Bass 14). Drivership mainly operates on creating a sense of fear, intimidation and threat. People who exercise drivership often employ a "single-minded vision" and mostly pursue selfish goals and agendas at the expense of the people (Kuhnert and Lewis 651). Nevertheless, in order to evade unpleasant consequences, the chances of the subordinates's cooperation with the leader are relatively high. In comparison, the essence of leadership by persuasion is the high value of communal deliberation in the decision making process. Hereby, the followers are persuaded to cooperate "by the merits of the argument, not by the coercive power of the arguer" (Bass 14). This represents the core values of the "leadership-influence" theory which promotes the reciprocal power relationship between the leader and followers (Rost 150). The leader is "influenced by the needs and wishes of the group members" and pursues "high valence" goals which are determined by the collective communal welfare

(Bass 15). In doing so, the subordinates's "trust, commitment, respect" and "mutual support" is ensured (Northouse 9). In times of weakness, it has been observed that the followers's loyalty is ensured if they acknowledge "the importance of [the leader's] status" as their representative and feel valued as individuals (Bass 16). Then, the leader is "acknowledged and conferred by other members of the group" to having "the right to prescribe behavior patterns" for them (Bass 15,16). In consideration of the nature of coercive leadership, it can be concluded that the leader's authority and influence would always rely on sheer force and superior power. Once the leader's power is weakened, leadership might be hard to maintain. Concerning leadership by persuasion, the subordinates act according to the leader's wishes because of their own conviction, not because they are forced to do so. Alongside the leader's adopted approach to leadership, other determinants have been recognized to impact the leader's success in realizing their goals.

3.2. Effective Leadership

The leader's degree of effectiveness can be measured by the success or failure of the intended action's implementation. If the leader shows "effort to change the behavior of others" but eventually fails to bring about the desired change, this falls under the category of "attempted leadership" (Bass 13). In case of the subordinates's cooperation and the successful implementation of the aspired goal, the leader has accomplished "successful leadership" (Bass 13). This section elaborates on person-based determinants increasing leadership effectiveness. In specific, the impact of exhibited personality traits, the leader's gender and rhetorical practice thereon is explored.

3.2.1. A Matter of Personality

During the 1980s, an era that represented the zenith of leadership study, academic works focused on identifying ideal personal traits conducive to leadership effectiveness. This "trait approach" to leadership conceptualizes it as "a matter of personality [as well as] particular behaviors" (Northouse 29, Bass 11). Extensive research on ideal leader characteristics in the field of psychology led to the formation of the "Big Five" personality traits, which gained popularity in 1992 (Northouse 7). A study conducted by Judge, Bono, Ilies and Gerhardt in 2002 investigated the impact of the "Big Five" neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness on leadership

effectiveness and indeed confirmed an interrelationship (Northouse 27). An overview of the most prominent traits are given below which increase the chance of the leader receiving positive feedback.

First of all, a high degree of extraversion is conducive to effective leadership. In specific, extraversion is associated with a “higher degree of sociability, [...] talkativeness” which facilitates coming into contact with new people (Komarraju, Karau, Schmeck, Avdic, 472). This might especially benefit new leaders who have not yet forged strong ties with the community. Furthermore, it is linked to assertiveness and self-confidence, being “secure with self, free of doubts” and “act[ing] with certainty” even in challenging moments (Northouse 38). Extroverts possess the certainty about their competence in successfully meeting challenges (Northouse 8). However challenging the task seems to be, extroverts display “persistence, dominance, and drive” in the pursuit of the goal and stay optimistic (Northouse 25, Özbağ 238). There is a strong possibility that extroverted leaders’s initiative and determination in taking on tasks might benefit them to receive recognition among subordinates.

The second and third trait, conscientiousness and openness to experience, are almost equally as impactful on effective leadership. Task-related conscientiousness refers to task knowledge, task-related confidence and task-achievement orientation, which is the overall “tendency to be thorough, organized, [...] and decisive” in dealing with a matter at hand (Northouse 27, Komarraju, Karau, Schmeck, and Avdic 472). Task based openness is shown in the leader’s resourcefulness and creativity in approaching and adapting to tasks (Northouse 27). Ethical conscientiousness and responsibility finds expression in the individual’s integrity, a “strong set of principles” and “high degree of moral obligation” in regard to community welfare (Northouse 6,25, Özbağ 238). In displaying these characteristics, the leader would strengthen the follower’s faith in his or her capability and would build up their trust in arriving at the best possible conclusions.

The forth and fifth trait both refer to the leader’s exhibition and management of emotions. In fact, very low neuroticism is essential for credibility. Exhibited neuroticism, the “tendency to be depressed, anxious, insecure, vulnerable, and hostile”, has been identified to have a negative impact on leadership effectiveness (Northouse 27). Instead, the “predictability and consistency in emotional reactions”, for example anger, anxiety or fear, in combination with high stress tolerance and composure has proven to be a prerequisite thereof

(Komarraju, Karau, Schmeck, Avdic, 472). Furthermore, a leader's agreeableness, the "tendency to be accepting, conforming, trusting, and nurturing", leads to continued success (Northouse 27). Agreeableness refers to the quality of "being helpful, cooperative, and sympathetic towards others" and showing "kindness and warmth" (Northouse 8). Whereas a leader showing emotional stability seems to be reliable and dependable in any kind of upcoming situation, emotional involvement evident in the leader's interest in the needs and well-being of the people builds up the impression of the leader having the best intentions towards the subordinates.

The following table provides a summary of the five traits and their affiliate sub-characteristics. This compilation will be predominately used for the analysis.

Effective Leadership Traits	Determinants	
extraversion		sociable, assertive, self-confident
conscientiousness	task-related	thorough, organized, controlled, dependable, decisive
	ethical	establishing moral codex
		adhering to moral codex (making moral decisions, being truthful, honest)
		communicating moral codex
		treating subordinates with respect and dignity
		challenging code violations (criticizing code violations)
openness to experience		informed, creative, insightful
low neuroticism		emotionally stable, composed, steadfast
agreeableness		emotionally involved, cooperative, sympathetic, empathetic

3.2.2. A Matter of Gender

Cliché attributes ascribed to masculinity and femininity have influenced the assertiveness of women and men for a long time. The association of traits with a certain gender is rooted in a strict role allocation which initiated a debate on the 'true nature' of the sexes (Pieper 304). The philosophical debate on the nature of men and women can be traced back to ancient Greek philosophy. In specific to Aristotle's reflections on role allocations in the 'traditional' Greek household which he took as foundation for his theory on "rule (*archê*)" (Deslauriers 46-48). During Aristotelian times, men had the purpose to actively acquire (*ktasthai*) whereas women kept and guarded (*phulattein*) in domestic spheres (Politics 1277b24 –30, qtd. in Deslauriers 57). Based on this 'traditional' role allocation of men and women, the philosopher concluded a 'natural' "relation of superior (*kreitton*) to inferior (*cheiron*) and ruler to ruled" (Politics 1254b13–14, qtd. in Deslauriers 49). As a consequence to the 'natural' unequal power relation between the sexes, women were generally lacking in authority in ancient Greece. According to Aristotle's theory about "rule (*archê*)", "the male (*to arren*) is by nature more expert at leading than the female (*thêleos*)" (*akuros*) (Deslauriers 46-51). According to him, men ought to be the origin of actions because they predominately exercise their intellect and practical wisdom in making decisions (Deslauriers 51-62). Aristotle's main argument against the emergence of female leaders is the preconception that women tend to let emotions direct their actions (Politics 1254b6–14, qtd. in Deslauriers 57). Therefore, Aristotle argued women to be better fit to carry out a deliberative function. In ancient Greek politics, for example, women were granted a voice to express their "true opinion (*doxa alêthês*)" but denied an official vote on decisional matters (Deslauriers 27,61). In sum, the philosopher's reflections strengthened the consensus of inferior and inept female leadership as opposed to superior and competent male leadership.

19th century philosophy continued the 'nature' of the sexes debate. Similar to Aristotle, the Swiss philosopher of the Enlightenment Jean Jacques Rousseau viewed the man as definer of norms and the woman as applier thereof in a practical manner (Rousseau 421). He clearly positioned the man as leading actor opposite the woman as following executor. The German idealist philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel even saw potential danger for the state if women happened to emerge as leaders thereof. He founded his statement on the claim that women would merely arrive at subjective and emotionally driven decisions (Hegel 166). Auguste Comte, a french positivist philosopher, argued

women's ineptitude for leadership due to an alleged lacking mental capacity and intelligence (Comte 124). The philosophers's common consensus regarded women as 'naturally' incapable to rule in the interest of the public at large. It entirely stripped women of autonomy and instead firmly kept them within a domestic environment.

Additionally to this ruling consensus based on theoretical philosophical reflections, gender-specific traits putting further limitations on women were recorded in writing for the first time in the early 19th century (Hausen 19). As the table below shows, women are generally stereotyped with communal characteristics whereas men are predominantly stereotyped with agentic characteristics.

Stereotypical Female Traits	Stereotypical Male Traits
weakness	strength, energy, assertiveness
doubtful, insecurity	confidence, assuredness
dependence	independence
irrationality	rationaliy
passivity, reluctance	activity, decisiveness, determination
emotionality	emotional stability
sensitivity, caring, empathic	insensitivity
democracy	autocracy

(Meyer 742)

Summarizing the gist of the debate about the sexes's respective 'nature' and leadership aptitude, the following consensus prevailed: The man was conceptualized as reasonable being basing his actions on rationality. Thus, he was viewed as superior and suitable for positions of authority. The woman, however, letting sentiment rule her choices, was deemed inferior and incompetent to hold a leading position.

This stereotype-based, determinative consensus was met with severe criticism by representatives of the feminist movement in the 20th century. Feminism argued gender to be a social construct rather than a 'natural' determinant (Pieper 310). Moreover, the movement deemed superior masculine and inferior feminine identities as constructs of male hegemony internalizing patriarchal gender norms instead of being 'natural' preconditions (Pieper 311). One of the most vehement critics of this alleged 'nature' of

women was the french philosopher and feminist Simone de Beauvoir. Her work *Le Deuxième Sexe* (1949), translated in English to *The second sex*, opened with the famous quote “On ne naît pas femme: on le devient” - “One is not born a woman, but rather becomes one” (Borde and Malovany-Chevallier 18). She issued the urgent demand for gender equality and denounced the consensus of defining the woman as the ‘other’, an object dependent on the man (Pieper 308, Borde and Malovany-Chevallier 14). Beauvoir pressed for the escape from socially constructed, allocated gender roles defining women’s identities for generations (Pieper 308). Alike Beauvoir, the American ethicist Carol Gilligan accused in her work *In a Different Voice* (1982) the prevalence of androcentrism and denied the validity of biological or genetic factors deeming women inferior to men (Pieper 308). She held the opinion that the differing evaluation of girls’s and boys’s developmental processes led to women’s discrimination (Pieper 309). The French philosopher Luce Irigaray viewed the continuing phallogocentrism, the theory of continuous male privileging, as true hindrance to women’s progress (Pieper 310). In specific, she saw hegemonic structures of masculinity as main factor forcing women to renunciate their identity and adjust to the male norm (Pieper 311). In sum, feminist philosophers counteracted the repercussions of the hegemonic system of patriarchy. They all agreed among themselves that the creation and rigorous enforcement of stereotypical gender roles is conducive to the preservation of male hegemony in all areas of society.

At the end of the 20th century, queer theory inquired into another perspective: gender as performative act. One of the “founding texts” thereof is the American philosopher Judith Butler’s work *Gender Trouble* (1990) (Butler *Gender Trouble* vii). In her work, she firstly sets the focus on the distinction between sex and gender. Whereas “the sexed body” as biological entity is unaffected by sociocultural norms, it represents the “site of cultural inscription” (Butler *Gender Trouble* 175). The ‘gendered body’, however, is affected by normative discourses and is generally determined by the masculine/feminine binary. Explaining the construction of gender, Butler refers to Foucault’s “genealogical critique”, which investigates the “cause [of] [gender] identity categories” (Butler *Gender Trouble* xxix). According to him, gender identities are “effects of a specific formation of power”, for example of hegemonic “institutions, practices, [or] discourses” (Butler *Gender Trouble* xxix). Based on that, Butler concluded “phallogocentrism and compulsory heterosexuality” as two institutions most influential on the formation of gender identities (Butler *Gender Trouble* xxix). The gendered self is constituted by said institutions and a socialized “performance that is *repeated*” with “the strategic aim of maintaining gender within its

binary frame” (Butler Gender Trouble 178-179). Repetitive performative acts encompass “bodily gestures, movements, and styles of various kinds” (Butler Gender Trouble 179). Although internalized in a process of socialization, ‘gendered’ behavior can be unlearned and reprogrammed in Butler’s opinion (Cameron 329). She perceives individuals as being conscious of their socialization capable to “engage in acts of [...] resistance” against determining criteria (Cameron 329). Her publication was publicly titled an “intervention” in feminist theory which restricted ‘gender’ solely to norms of masculinity and femininity (Butler Undoing Gender vii-1). To completely break free from the determinative masculine/feminine binary, Butler argues for the radical elimination of gender per se as determinative criterion as it represents a “sign of subordination for women” (Butler xiii). In sum, Butler presupposes the bias of feminine gender performances as opposed to non-biased masculine gender performances.

Due to an increase of women in corporate and political leadership positions in the second half of the 20th century, the interrelationship between gender and leadership effectiveness shifted into the focus of attention. Ever since, empirical research investigated this correlation. Researchers such as Henning and Anne investigated the performance of female executives in the economic sector. Based on their findings, they concluded women to be inferior leaders in their book *The Managerial Woman* (1977). Later researchers, for example Helgesen, argued the opposite in her work *The Female Advantage: Women’s Ways of Leadership* (1990). She held the opinion that ‘female leadership tendencies’ are conducive to leadership effectiveness superior to men (Northouse 349). Others, for example van der Leeden and Willemsen, found no significant link between gender and leadership effectiveness in their field study *Gender, context and leadership styles* (2001) (Northouse 350). Due to varying results on female leader effectiveness, meta-analyses and further studies focused on eliciting the most ‘common’ female leadership styles and observed instances of positive and negative response thereof.

In specific, female leadership studies and meta-analyses aimed to identify the causes of female leader devaluation. Altogether, a palpable ‘female leadership tendency’ has been found to be mainly influencing female leadership effectiveness (Northouse 354). To further elaborate on the ‘female leadership tendency’, Andrews’s group research *Sex and gender differences in group communication* (1992) found that women tended to refrain from promoting themselves as official leaders but instead appeared as informal organizers. Otherwise, they were increasingly confronted with gender bias (Northouse 357). The meta

analyses *Gender and leadership style* (1990) by Eagly and Johnson and *Sex and leadership styles* (2004) by van Engen and Willemsen identified women's general tendency to follow a democratic and participative leadership style which was likely to be met with positive leader evaluation (Northouse 350). In comparison, Bartol and Butterfield's study *Sex effects in evaluating leaders* (1976) revealed negative leader evaluation to female leaders adopting an autocratic or directive style (Northouse 351). Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt and van Engen's meta-analysis *Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles* (2003) confirmed women's preference to adopt a transformational rather than transactional leadership style. Gathering from the studies, the 'female leadership tendency' corresponds to female role expectations. The psychologists Eagly, Karau and Makhijani confirmed in their meta-analysis *Gender and the effectiveness of leaders* (1995) that female leaders fulfilling female role expectations were more likely to generate positive evaluation (Northouse 351). Research clearly identified women's exhibition of gender-specific traits as determinant of their assertiveness.

Based on the findings, theorists aimed to formulate a theory explaining lower female leadership effectiveness. In 2002, the psychologists Alice Eagly and Steven Karau formulated the theory of "role congruity" (Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie and Reichard 1). According to the theory, female leaders exhibiting stereotypical male traits are in violation of their role expectation. This circumstance would create prescriptive bias leading to negative leader evaluation (Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, and Reichard 40). In comparison, men displaying male leadership traits ought to be highly likely to receive positive leader evaluation. Role congruity theory suggests that the core "leadership prototype" attribute is strength which is inherent to the male role (Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, and Reichard 43). This circumstance promotes "descriptive bias", the conclusion that there exists a "lack of fit between the feminine role and the leader role" (Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, and Reichard 40). There exists an incongruity between stereotypical female traits and the norm requirements of leadership effectiveness (Brown 574). In other words, in case both male and female leaders fulfilled their respective role expectations, women would still be perceived as inferior. This is because the prototype trait for successful leadership does not fit female role expectations (Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, and Reichard 40). The preconception of women being less capable as leaders is rooted within that particular bias (Ciulla 86). Summarized, the female leadership research shows that female leaders continue to face devaluation and are disadvantaged as long as they perform according to preexistent gender-related prejudices.

3.2.3. A Matter of Ethics

As mentioned in chapter 3.2.1, ethical conscientiousness is a prerequisite for effective leadership. The requirement for ethical conscientiousness is the own awareness of the factors that constitute an act as 'moral' and the adherence to this 'model'. The roots of the establishment of a model of morality lie in ancient Greece of the 4th century BC. Then, the philosopher Aristotle officially ascribed ethics to the field of practical philosophy, the discipline concerning human actions and consequences. The principal focus of ethics is the evaluation and judgement of moral behavior (Pieper 24). During the Middle Ages, ethical theory was further developed by Thomas Aquinas who enquired into the dichotomies good / bad and right / wrong. He started with observations of the human nature and drew the following conclusion: "The purpose of human existence is happiness" (Mendonca and Kanungo 12). According to Thomas Aquinas, happiness is the result of the own knowledge of moral codes and the reasonable, well-intended application thereof. From that line of thought, he derived his definition of good and evil. He viewed "the good of man [...] to be in accordance with reason, and evil [...] to be against reason" (Mothershead 288). Simply put, the Aquinian ethical theory measured the morality of an act by its degree of rationality.

Aquinas's theoretical framework of morality was applied by modern researchers. The aim was to find universally "true moral principles" generally applicable for moral judgements (Mendonca and Kanungo 11). They resorted to the Aquinian "three-part structure of a moral act", which encompasses

- "the objective act itself,
- the subjective motive of the actor, and
- the situation or circumstances in which the act is done" (13).

According to the Aquinian school of thought, all three aspects mentioned above must be constructive in order to label an act as 'moral'. In detail, the act, the actor's motive and the situational framework have to conform to the moral code of conduct, the interest and benefit of the collective and have to ensure their well-being and humane treatment (Pieper 176). By comparison, immoral acts are destructive in one or more part. They manifest, for example, in a direct violation of the moral code, in the pursuit of egotistic motives at somebody's expense or in the harmful and inhumane treatment of someone else (Pieper 178, Mendonca and Kanungo 12). In the following, leadership research focused on identifying principles of ethical leadership adhering to this moral conduct. To ensure ethical

behavior as leader, s/he has to officially establish a normatively appropriate moral code of conduct, communicate and proactively promote the ethical code of conduct to subordinates, perform moral acts in line with the code of conduct, voice criticism in case of committed code violations and punish ethical code violations (Pieper 26, Brown, Trevino and Harrison 120, Özbağ 236-238). As can be observed, the Aquinian model of morality offers a legitimate basis for ethical leadership.

Other schools of thought are lacking in 'moral proof' and offer rather dubious models for ethical leadership. For example, "situation ethics" only focuses on the situation and circumstances to label an act as 'moral' (Mendonca and Kanungo 13). Hereby, the individuals believe that the "end justifies the means" and do whatever has to be done to attain their set goal (13). However, if the 'means' per se result in someone's harmful or inhumane treatment, the act's moral value diminishes. Another approach dealing with the question of morality, traced back to the ancient Grecian Cyrenaics and Epicureans, is egoistic hedonism. It defines an act as 'moral' if it mainly benefits the actor in the long run (Mendonca and Kanungo, 14). This is a very self-centered, subjective and authoritarian approach and is based on self-empowered decisions disregarding other's needs. Furthermore, an egoistic hedonist has a very individual definition of 'right' and 'wrong' which does not apply to everyone's conception of the matter. Therefore, this approach cannot be classified as legitimate normative model of morality. Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill developed yet another approach determining the morality of an act. According to their ethical theory of utilitarianism, a moral act brings the greatest benefit for the largest quantity of people (Mendonca and Kanungo 15). This approach is directed at a rather exclusive target group and there still remains a minority experiencing disadvantages or harm by the act. In fact, all of the aforementioned models lack the thorough 'moral proof' of the Aquinian model.

Especially during times of war, leaders quite frequently are faced with morally questionable situations requiring them to arrive at a decision, however difficult it may be. The question 'how' to fight a war within moral boundaries is addressed in the field of military ethics (Patterson 2). The "Lieber's Code", named after its author Francis J. Lieber, a law and armed conflict professor in the 19th century, has been established as normative moral code for military conduct towards enemies (Patterson 4; Hartigan 2). According to the code, six criteria classify the use of military force as "just decision (*jus ad bellum*)":

- The actor's "legitimate authority",

- the act's "just cause" given in situations of self-defense and "if [the act] rights a past wrong, punishes wrongdoers, or prevents further wrongful acts,
- the actor's "right intent" which labels "violence intended for the purpose of order, justice, and ultimate conciliation" as just but "violence for the sake of hatred, revenge, and destruction" as unjust,
- the act's "likelihood of success",
- the "proportionality of ends", the question if the outcome justifies "the cost in lives and material resources" and
- the act being the "last resort" after "diplomatic and other efforts [have] been reasonably employed in order to avoid outright bloodshed" (Patterson 5).

As can be gathered from these points, morality is a matter of definition and exists within a framework (Özbağ, 236). Consequently, non-existent or poorly defined moral codes increase the chance for arising ethical dilemmas.

To elaborate further on this matter, two distinct ethical dilemmas can be identified: torture and murder. As per definition, torture describes the act of inflicting pain on a defenseless human being (Gross 123). The act clearly counts among immoral behavior as it is an "erosion of civil liberties" and direct human rights violation (125). Nowadays, the practice of torture is legally prohibited and liable to prosecution in democratic societies. The contemporary human rights treaty, the *United Nations Convention against Torture*, imposes this absolute ban on torture (Shaw 289). At present, the convention is signed by 170 state parties, among which the United States of America are part of (290). Although strictly regulated, the theoretical discourse about torture is still ongoing. For example, the "torture debate" concerns the theoretical, open discussion of "exceptions to the ban on torture" (Gross 122). Center to the debate is the "dilemma of torture", which addresses the question if certain "conditions" justified the option to "save the lives of innocent civilians" (Gross 125). For example, the practice of "enhanced interrogation", the subject-specific reformulation, is often justified as a "way of war" to "obtain information" from "insurgents who threaten national security" (126). In this case, the practice of torture is handled as the exception to the 'moral' rule as it clearly exists outside the moral framework.

As far as the dilemma of murder is concerned, the Truman dilemma is a rather famous example thereof. It concerns the question whether destructive attacks on the enemy are justified in view of the top-priority security of the 'own people' (Patterson 115). The

dilemma is named after the former U.S. president Harry S. Truman who ordered the Hiroshima and Nagasaki nuclear bombing to force Japan into surrender in World War II (Patterson 117). The act itself lacks moral value according to the Aquinian model as the deployment of lethal nuclear weapons resulted in the death of innumerable innocent civilians. However, taking the Lieber's Code into consideration, the act's just cause and the actor's righteous intention can be confirmed. The president's motive was to ensure the safety of American military personnel, citizens the president of the United States is responsible for, and to put an end to World War II. If successful, the war's end would on a grander scale save countless future lives. As it was expected, the ferocity of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombing caused countless Japanese civilian casualties. To prevent further attack, the Japanese government was forced into surrender, calling an end to the war. Ultimately, President Truman's decision produced the desired effect. In consideration of the processes inherent to the "Truman dilemma", they conform to the Lieber's Code of military morality and classify Truman's order as "*jus ad bellum*" (Patterson 117). Gathered from the two examples of ethical dilemmas, whether or not an act is classified as 'moral' is a matter of interpretation and dependent on the model of morality the act is judged by.

The theoretical debate about the 'nature' of the sexes introduced in chapter 3.2.2 initiated reflections on the way men and women handle moral questions and whether there are differences to be observed. Kept within role-conforming domestic spheres, women were mainly responsible for child management and occupied a mediating role on matters requiring judgement and just evaluation (Pieper 306). This furthered the perception of women as 'protectors' of virtue and 'keepers' of demureness and forbearance, as proclaimed by the German philosopher Max Scheler (Pieper 303). Stereotyping women with communal characteristics originated the theory of them allegedly possessing higher moral competence than men (Pieper 303). According to Carol Gilligan, the empathy-oriented "care perspective" to morality, basing moral consciousness and judgement on compassion, is worth to be held in high esteem. To her, it deserves equal recognition as the "justice perspective" to morality, which is founded on the universal code of conduct discussed above (Pieper 309). This theory suggests a gender-specific approach to morality determining the individual's assertion of ethical leadership.

3.2.4. A Matter of Rhetorical Practice

As mentioned in chapter 3.2.1, articulateness is a critical determinant for effective leadership. According to research, articulate leaders are “highly effective [...] orator[s]” who exhibit exceptional rhetorical skills (Shamir, Arthur and House 25). Rhetoric is a “discipline of argumentation” and describes certain speech techniques that generate the listeners’s motivation to judge in the orator’s favor (Eves 149). Applied effectively, rhetoric is able to “remove inhibition” and “empower people to act and believe” (Rivkin 103). In fact, building a connection to the audience is the principal purpose of rhetorical practice. Ultimately, it is the audience that “gives a speech its end” by evaluating the presented content (Waterfield ch.2a). Therefore, effective rhetorical practice is key to realize a course of action. The roots of “*technē rhētorikē*”, the art of rhetoric, can be traced back to Athens (Waterfield ch.c). Athens was “the largest, most democratic, and most powerful *polis*” of ancient Greece and the center of public discourse during the fifth century (Waterfield ch.a-ch.b). At that time, manuals of rhetoric on the technique of persuasion emerged (Kangira and Mungenga 110). One of the most renowned rhetorical manuals is the Aristotelian treatise *Rhetoric*, which elaborates on effective rhetorical means to captivate an audience throughout the whole speech and persuade the people in the end. Aristotle lists three types of rhetorical “‘proof’ (*pistis*)” he views as substantial, sound arguments (Waterfield xvi). Argument proofs optimally engage the audience in practical reasoning and fall into three categories.

Some rely on the speaker’s character [character, *ēthos*], some on putting the listener in a certain frame of mind [emotion, *pathos*], and some on the argument itself, through demonstrating or seeming to demonstrate something [argument, *logos*]. (Waterfield ch.2c)

Simply put, the speaker’s character, the approach to trigger the audience’s emotions and the argumentative strength can hold strong persuasive value under certain conditions. The speaker’s character and reputation might increase or lessen the chance of receiving positive audience response (Waterfield ch.2g). Proof of *ēthos* is the exhibition of traits such as credibility and trustworthiness, practical intelligence, ethical conscientiousness and goodwill towards the audience (Waterfield ch.2, ch.5). In specific, the recognition of the community’s concerns, the will and courage to better the community and a strong sense of fairness in doing so is valid proof of character (Olmsted 14). If the people approve of the speaker’s character, they respect him or her as worthy representative of their community and the arguments brought forward will likely be deemed relevant.

Arguments of *pathos* help the orator with the pursuit of a specific goal that requires the audience to feel a certain way about the outcome. It is a fact that effective speakers have the power to “put[...] the listener[s] in a certain frame of mind” which leads them to judge matters differently (Waterfield ch.2c). There are both positive and negative sentiments that have a recognizable impact on the audience’s judgement of the speaker’s proposed goal. Positive sentiments are feelings of hope for a better future, empowerment and self-worth. Those are triggered by mentioning “collective efficacy“, the people’s capability of meeting the set demands (Northouse 28, Waterfield xvi). Negative emotions affecting the audience’s judgement are anger, hate and fear. The audience’s anger is provocatively triggered when pointing out “*visible* disparagement by a man who has no business disparaging one or people dear to one” (Waterfield ch.2f). The audience’s hate is aroused upon the indication that someone has “undeservedly [experienced] [...] good fortune” (Waterfield ch.2f). Fear stems from “a *mental image* of imminent evil of a life-threatening or painful kind” the speaker manages to conjure up during his speech (Waterfield 2f). Altogether, rhetoric expressing emotions “accompanied by pleasure and pain” are particularly persuasive “sources of energy for practical action” (Olmsted 18, Waterfield ch.5). Among the mechanisms of arousing emotion, the “excitation-transfer-effect” has particular manipulative power (Bernsen 57). Hereby, previously subconsciously formed emotions are transferred to another entity, individual or social group. If the recipient has already adopted a position to certain matters, rhetoric has the ability to enforce it. The application of arguments of *pathos* to win over an audience has been met with criticism as well. The Greek philosopher Aristotle, for example, excludes the application of “emotion-arousing techniques” during one’s speech from the “noble art of rhetoric” and primarily views it as manipulative trick to sway the audience (Waterfield ch.2f). Although the potential dangers for manipulation have to be recognized, the persuasive strength of emotions remains without doubt.

The prerequisite for an argument of *logos* to become rhetorical proof is its rationality and demonstration of truth (Waterfield ch.5). For example, facts and probabilities work as rational basis and “lead to a logical conclusion” (Olmsted 13). Pre-known, legitimate facts are already existing evidence of present or past events that ought to teach a lesson. They objectively inform the audience and thus optimally “engage[...] in a form of practical reasoning” (Waterfield xvi, ch.b). The mere implication of negative events in the past possibly repeating themselves in the future would lead to avoidance behavior. On the other hand, the mentioning of past positive events might trigger a desire for repetition.

Probabilities refer to future events that might either be fortunate or unfortunate which leads to the group's pleasant or fearful anticipation thereof (Olmsted 22, Waterfield ch.2a-2c). In all cases, those forms of demonstration might "diminish and amplify the importance of things" by the comparison and contrasting of matters, the demonstration of trends and developments, a presentation of supposedly wise choices and actions and the judgement and assessment on matters at hand (Waterfield ch.2d). Evaluating Aristotle's theory, it can be concluded that proofs of *logos* strengthen the audience's positive identification with and commitment to the speaker's goal.

Aristotle's rhetorical theory represented a renowned source for future considerations about effective speech-related mechanisms and had an enormous impact on the way speeches were created in fictional works. Shakespeare, for example, took inspiration from classical rhetorical principles and adopted a "framework of rhetoric" based on rhetorical practices he believed to be effective (Rivkin 103). In his drama *Julius Caesar*, he demonstrates his system of effective rhetoric by the example of Cassius's, Brutus's and Mark Antony's "dueling eulogies" in front of a large audience, the Plebeians (Rivkin 107). Considering the impact of arguments of *ēthos*, one example thereof are Brutus's and Mark Anthony's respective speeches. For example the scene at Caesar's funeral, Mark Anthony manages to captivate the people whereas Brutus experiences negative audience response. This has been attributed to one noticeable circumstance. Starting with Brutus, he appears before the audience as the first speaker. His rhetoric has been described as "lofty", "supercilious" and proud (Rivkin 107-108). Mark Anthony, on the other hand, speaks after his opponent and chooses a more "down-to-earth" approach (Rivkin 107). The latter thus appears more approachable which has been proven to be particularly appealing to a crowd (Kennedy 79). Furthermore, Shakespeare demonstrates in his work that a master rhetorician does not necessarily have to hold high moral standards, but still be successful. This relates to the view of Petrus Ramus, an Elizabethan philosopher, who deemed the consideration of the speaker's exhibited ethical values "superfluous" (Bizzel and Herzberg 565). As shown in *Julius Caesar* by the example of Brutus, he is less successful with his rhetoric although morally superior to his counterpart Cassius (Rivkin 108). The latter's success is based on his focus on the Plebeians's wishes and desires and the communication of personal interest therein (Rivkin 108). The fact that audience-orientation outranks high moral standards suggests a varying impact of *ēthos* determinants. Shakespeare also acknowledges the efficacy of emotion-arousing techniques. He deliberately uses emotional triggers to paint his characters as sympathetic. For example, when mourning the loss of

Caesar in *Julius Caesar*, Mark Anthony starts to cry and the emotional atmosphere ultimately sways his audience (Rivkin 108). The author also points out one limitation of rhetoric, which is the constancy of people's inner nature unalterable by external factors. Even the most effective rhetorical practices should fail to convince if the arguments do not correspond to the addressee's steadfast morale, mindset or attitude towards someone or something (Rivkin 103). This limitation is demonstrated in *Julius Caesar* by the example of Cassius and Brutus's interaction. Cassius's aim is to convince Brutus that Caesar is unfit as king of Rome. As Cassius brings forth this implication and is successful with his rhetoric as it resonates with Brutus's own beliefs about the capability of Caesar as king. However, Cassius's rhetoric fails when he proceeds with a more aggressive approach and attacks Caesar as a person. Ultimately, Brutus's personal admiration for Caesar hinders his receptiveness to Cassius's rhetoric (Rivkin 105-106). In sum, Shakespeare's fictional eulogies all offer insight in rhetorical mechanisms officially considered to be effective. The author's application of Aristotle's rhetorical theory demonstrates its validity for authors of fictional texts.

In case of the show *The 100*, which is narrating a story of leadership, the characters's adopted rhetorical elements provide indication on how they intend to lead. Their adopted rhetorical elements indicate their character, individual dispositions, morals and way of argumentation. The following chapter will use this chapter's theoretical framework to conduct the analysis thereof.

4. Manifestations of Leadership Elements in *The 100*

The 100 starts approximately one hundred years after an atomic war has led to the near extinction of the human race on earth. Only selected representatives of each nation have escaped to a constructed space-station, the Ark, which has served as the place of the people's community since then. Upon the discovery of a technical defect of their station's oxygen supply system, the Ark's government sends 100 juvenile prisoners to earth to investigate its habitability in a rushed attempt to save their people.

In the first episode, one hundred teenagers arrive on an American post-apocalyptic, dystopian life-world. They establish 'first contact' with, to their knowledge, uninhabited land, a "terra nullius" or "no-ones's land" (Sen 946). This situational precondition allows them the freedom to build their own community founded on norms they deem relevant. In fact, this narrative parallels the fictional plot of William Golding's novel *Lord of the Flies* (1954) which tells the story of a group of boys stranded on an uninhabited island after surviving an airplane crash. Alas, an uneven power balance within the group persists until eventually, chaos rules (Francis, Bennett and Stockwin 17, 42). At the end, the book concluded inevitable chaos following the leaders's discord and intergroup conflict. Comparable to the *Lord of the Flies* starting point, *The 100*'s first episodes narrate the formation of a community under the leadership of Clarke Griffin and Bellamy Blake. The group settles around its drop ship and builds a camp, which serves as newfound community place. In the course of the season, the leaders publicly compete for *The 100*'s recognition. Similar to the *Lord of the Flies* dynamic, internal conflict emerges. The narrative arc of their external conflict represents a serial reconstruction of the American colonial history. Similar to European colonists, *The 100* arrive at a country which, unbeknownst to them at start, had already been settled by indigenous peoples. Quite at the beginning of the show, *The 100* discover that people have survived the war, who are called Grounders and become the main antagonists of the first season. They have grouped themselves into tribal clans, comparable to the Native Americans's traditional social division. As the show progresses, *The 100* perceive the Grounders as threat and start waging war. This narrative replicates the dynamics of settler colonialism which is based on xenophobia, repression and eventually genocide. However, as leaders, Clarke and Bellamy possess the authority and means to regulate group relations. The analysis will reveal whether they prove to be capable to produce a favorable outcome for both parties.

4.1. The Leaders Clarke Griffin and Bellamy Blake

In the opening scene of the pilot episode, the viewer is introduced to the leading female character Clarke Griffin, who is part of one hundred imprisoned juvenile criminals who are sent down to earth to investigate its habitability. Before The 100's departure, Clarke's mother Abigail Griffin approaches her daughter and tells her the following: "Your instincts will tell you to take care of everybody else first. Just like your father" (Episode 1, 00:02:16). After The 100's arrival on earth, Clarke's backstory is narrated in more detail. In episode 3, Clarke is introduced as daughter of Jake Griffin, the Ark's chief engineer and deputy resource officer, and Abigail Griffin, the chief medical officer and council member (Episode 3, 00:01:50). Both her parents hold a high social status on the Ark based on honor and prestige. From a sociological point of view, social status

may be ascribed—that is, assigned to individuals at birth without reference to any innate abilities—or achieved, requiring special qualities and gained through competition and individual effort (Alexander 31).

In Clarke's case, her high social status has been "assigned" to her at birth and, due to her family background, she has experienced good fortune almost her entire life. Similar to her social status, leadership is assigned to her as well. "Assigned leadership" describes the leader's formation as consequence of a selection made by a prestigious community leader holding authority, in this case her mother, a powerful council member on the Ark (Northouse 8). According to research, assigned leaders find it more challenging to hold the leading position within the community for the longer term. They have not yet earned leader qualification and respect in the eyes of the whole community, which makes it quite common for assigned leadership to be threatened once the support of superior powers stops (Bass 12). To ensure the follower's loyalty even in times of weakness, "the importance of [the leader's] status" as community representative has to be officially acknowledged by the majority of people (Bass 16). In this particular case, the power Clarke holds as leader at the beginning is solely based on the respect and appreciation her parents inspired by their leadership, especially her father. By a "transfer of leadership", those values are projected to Clarke, presenting her as justified and legitimate successor to her father (Davis 403). This narration of her leader formation provides her with an essential disadvantage as leader of The 100. Indeed, at the very beginning of the show, Clarke's supporters are narrowed down to those who have already established personal ties with her or her parents beforehand. One example thereof is the chancellor's son Wells Jaha who counts among Clarke's strongest supporters at the beginning. Due to his close

friendship with Clarke, he deliberately committed a crime to be part of The 100 in order to be able to protect her on earth. It is clear that his support of her as leader is based on a previously formed personal attachment and not because of his conviction of her leading capabilities. In fact, the majority of The 100 does not yet regard Clarke as their legitimate representative at the start of the season. Therefore, the show's narration of its aspiring female leader's background promotes the notion that a leading woman simply cannot be a 'nobody'. She rather has to be exceptional in order to legitimize her eligibility as leader.

Clarke's personal motivation to lead is narrated in detail in episode 3. The scene shows Jake Griffin getting informed about a failure detected in the Ark's oxygen system, limiting the supply to a maximum of one year (Episode 3, 00:10:30). He immediately insists on informing the public, whereupon his wife Abby tries to persuade him to keep this sensible information secret to avoid panic and risk anarchy. Jake, however, remains steadfast on his decision to inform the community against the council's orders. According to the Ark government's system of justice, law violations are punishable by death for adults above the age of 18 and by imprisonment for minors. Abby further tries to convince him of the contrary to avoid the death penalty, prompting him to "do it for Clarke" and stay alive for the sake of their child (Episode 3, 00:11:35). He matter-of-factly replies that he, in fact, is "doing this for Clarke" by revealing the people's collective endangerment to the general public. His response clearly identifies his leadership as altruistic, selfless, people-oriented and common goal-pursuing as he is aware of the impending prosecution and execution. As the scene ends, the camera zooms out and reveals a shocked Clarke standing in the corner, having overheard her parents's entire conversation, unbeknownst to them. A subsequent scene shows Clarke sharing this sensible information with Wells Jaha, her then best friend (Episode 3, 00:17:00). Quite like her father, Clarke takes up the same position, to share the information of the Ark's failing oxygen system with the public. When Jake Griffin records himself sharing the information in their cabin, Clarke walks in and confronts him about his intention (Episode 3, 00:24:45). She immediately shows her ambition to cooperate by spreading their knowledge, which shows her personal commitment and loyalty to her family and also a sense of obligation towards the Ark population. However, before her father could answer, guards forcefully enter the cabin and arrest him. Jake Griffin is charged with treason and later executed by 'floating', the process of releasing convicts into space unprotected, causing them to freeze to death immediately. Before he is taken away, a frantic Clarke promises to warn the people and carry out her father's mission. Altogether, the scene reveals a strong personal motivation of Clarke's to

become a leader. She clearly aspires to step into his footsteps and shows the ambition to adopt her father's leadership values of altruism, the pursuit of a common goal and transparency herself.

Taking a closer look at the male lead Bellamy Blake, he is introduced shortly after The 100's landing on earth. There, he publicly reunites with his sister Octavia and the emotional scene initiates a brief narration of his and his family's backstory. Contrary to Clarke, Bellamy lacks the narrative of a privileged personal background justifying his 'right' to lead. Instead, he is part of the working class as the son of Aurora Blake, a seamstress and single mother. Due to that, Bellamy can be described as emergent leader as his leader status is "achieved" (Alexander 31). In general, the "emergence of leadership" as process of leader formation describes an "interaction process" happening "over a period through communication" (Bass 17). Emergent leaders are chosen by the community as their suitable representatives based on exhibited traits and goals (Northouse 8). By narrating Bellamy as emergent leader, the show gives him the opportunity to start as leader without pre-constructed bias as it is the case with Clarke. As the show equips its male leader with a social status similar to the majority of The 100, Bellamy largely manages to secure this position due to his approachability. As 'one of them', he appears accessible and relatable to most of the people. Therefore, arising challenges would be easier to withstand for him which provides him with an essential advantage.

Bellamy's sense of obligation, protectiveness and loyalty towards his people becomes evident in flashback scenes in episode 6 by the example of his relationship with his sister. After Octavia's birth, Bellamy's mother faces her son and whispers "Your sister, your responsibility." (Episode 6, 00:02:57). As the scene ends, he promises that he "won't let anything bad" happen to her (Episode 6, 00:03:28). During her entire childhood and adolescence, Bellamy goes to great lengths to hide Octavia in their cabin and secure her safety. After the discovery and imprisonment of Octavia and the execution of his mother, Bellamy is approached by commander Shumway. The commander privately asks him if he still would do anything to protect Octavia whereupon Bellamy immediately anxiously enquires about her well-being (Episode 6, 00:37:30). Thereupon, Shumway informs Bellamy about the planned mission to send 100 juvenile prisoners to earth, Octavia being one of them. He offers Bellamy a seat on the drop ship which would allow Bellamy to ensure Octavia's safety. In exchange, he requires Bellamy to "kill the chancellor" and hands him a gun (Episode 6, 00:38:13). In fact, this act of treason is initiated by the former

chancellor Diana Sydney to overthrow the government and seize power herself. Bellamy agrees to the terms and thereby demonstrates his willingness to take extreme measures to protect his sister. Additionally, the treasonous act represents an attempt of a forceful subversion of the government. Despite the failure of the chancellor's assassination, Bellamy manages to stow away on board of the drop ship. Physically separated from the system that oppressed him, he seizes the chance to rise in status and assume power to provoke a rebellion against it. His motive is clearly a personal act of revenge for experienced injustice, especially the maltreatment of his sister Octavia and execution of their mother by council law. Due to his obvious demonstration of loyalty to his family and The 100 as oppressed 'outsider' group, Bellamy lends himself as their 'protector'. Thereby, Bellamy's chances to quickly connect with the people and secure their support are enhanced.

His family's lack of authority and social connections led to a life in poverty and oppression which in turn triggered his aversion against unearned privilege. In episode 6, short flashback scenes to Bellamy's past illustrate the hardships in detail. One scene shows Bellamy as child attending his mother who is just about to give birth to his sister Octavia in their cabin (Episode 6, 00:01:20). She teaches him the council law, a strict one-child policy which regulates population size on the space station and whose violation is punishable by death. Bellamy severely questions the legitimacy of the law, demonstrating a sense of justice. Apparently, Bellamy has been aware of social injustices and has critically engaged with these matters from an early age onwards. After Bellamy's mother delivers the baby, she faces Bellamy with the words "You have a sister. You should name her" whereupon he replies that "Augustus had a sister, Octavia" (Episode 6, 00:02:27). In this situation, he compares himself to the autocratic emperor Augustus who held supreme executive power during his reign. The emperor and his sister belonged to a family of high status and power who unlikely experienced class-related maltreatment. This is a goal Bellamy quite evidently pursues himself, albeit not aware at the time. Another short scene, taking place several years later, shows his mother interacting with the commander of the Ark's guard in private to create a job opportunity for her adolescent son as member of the guard. In exchange, she acts in a humble way and offers her services to the commander to stand in his favor. Due to her docile demeanor and endurance of humiliation, she is successful. Upon witnessing the situation and the treatment of his mother, Bellamy is barely able to contain his anger and frustration directed at the people in power. In fact, his anger and hate, specifically directed at the Ark government and other external sources oppressing his

people, prove to be the main motivator for his actions as 'liberator' of The 100 throughout the season. Quite evidently, the show chooses a 'zero-to-hero' narrative for its male lead, laying the foundation for a story about male advancement.

Although differing backgrounds and experiences, both leaders faced the loss of a family member in their past which might have an effect on their future leadership acts. From a psychological point of view, the experienced loss of a loved one "can result in overwhelming grief and intense feelings", including anger and hate (Stuckless 1). Especially the deliberate, violent act of causing death to the person concerned is accompanied by intense emotional trauma (Stuckless 1). People undergoing this fate are referred to as "*survivor-victims*", which Clarke and Bellamy count among by losing their parent at the hands of the Ark government (1). Research within the field of psychology, conducted by Klass (1988) and Sprang, McNeil, & Wright (1989), has revealed survivor-victims to show the emotional response of increased anger, resulting in "difficulties with the justice system, strong unrequited feelings of revenge" and the exhibition of violent and destructive behavioral patterns (Stuckless 2). A study conducted by Sprang et al. (1993) on victims of violence revealed "gender differences" in regard to the experience and processing of loss (Stuckless 6). Male survivor-victims tended to stay in a state of mourning for a longer period of time compared to women and showed a stronger inclination for aggressive behavioral patterns accompanied by experienced past injustice (6). This would mean that Bellamy ought to be affected to a greater extent by his traumatic past and thus might be inclined to exhibit more aggressive leadership tendencies than Clarke in the pursuit of his goals.

4.2. The Leaders's Public Confrontations

Throughout the season, Clarke Griffin and Bellamy Blake contest for authority and official leadership. To determine who emerges as the dominant leader, *The 100* opts for the public confrontation between as situational framework. According to the theory of "leadership emergence", potential leaders emerge in situations of conflict (Burns 425). Social conflict is defined as "tension between what is and what [...] ought to be" and arises from the "clash of values and interests" of two or more parties within a social group demonstrating their respective viewpoints (Collier 1). In this chapter, public conflicts between the two potential leaders of *The 100* are analyzed. In all of the scenes, the two leaders aim to win over the diegetic audience with a distinctive line of argumentation. The end result of their confrontation is immediate audience feedback and evaluation which determines the dominant contender.

4.2.1. Instances of Negative Feedback for the Female Leader

When *The 100* are descending to earth on a drop ship in scene 1, they are shown a video tape by Chancellor Jaha who allocates them the mission to retrieve stored supplies from Mount Weather, a military base built before the war, located close to their landing site. He stresses that they were chosen for the mission because of their expandability and given a "second chance" to prove themselves to the government (Episode 1, 00:03:25). In case of successful completion of the assigned mission, *The 100*'s criminal records would be cleared, as promised by the chancellor at the end of the video (Episode 1, 00:03:50). As shown in scene 1, Clarke obeys chancellor Jaha's order and immediately starts organizing their allocated mission to Mount Weather together with her supporter Wells.

After Wells's public call for departure "We need to find Mount Weather. You heard my father's message. That has to be our first priority." (Episode 1, 00:11:55). Immediately, Octavia Blake, Bellamy's sister, interferes with "Screw your father. What? Do you think you're in charge here? You and the little princess?" (Episode 1, 00:12:00). She poses the question if Clarke and her supporter Wells assumed they were in charge of *The 100* in view of the absence of the Ark's authority. Thereby, she clearly objects to the cooperation with the government and execution of the allocated mission. More importantly, she personally attacks Clarke and openly challenges her attempted leadership. She uses the nickname "little princess" to refer to her, which is worth discussing for two reasons

(Episode 1: 00:12:00). First of all, the nickname as such originates from Clarke's status as daughter of parents in leading positions. It refers to someone acting entitled, as someone who feels s/he has been given the right to act as leader and give commands. Thereby, Octavia openly voices criticism against the legitimacy of the government's leaders. Secondly, the nickname evokes connotations of weakness, helplessness, fastidiousness and haughtiness. First and foremost, the mentioned traits are in line with the stereotype of female weakness which identifies Octavia's reference to Clarke as clearly classist (Meyer 742). Furthermore, these characteristics do not correlate to determinants of effective leadership, in particular social dominance and assuredness (Northouse 38). In fact, they rather contribute to an overall loss of a leader's credibility (356). Considering this, Octavia's belittling and mocking reference to Clarke carries the implication of lack of respect and faith in her capability as a leader and is the first instance of personal negative feedback Clarke receives. On a broader sense, the show constructs the following narrative: A woman showing aspirations to lead faces negative response from both women and men in the form of belittlement and mockery. Her leading capability is doubted rather than presumed and she rather has to 'prove' her worth before officially rising to power.

Clarke's response ultimately demonstrates her ability to assert her authority in view of Octavia's challenge. Albeit, her initial reaction "Do you think we care who's in charge?" directs the attention away from the question of who might emerge as leader, refraining from self-promotion (Episode 1, 00:12:05). According to research, self-promoting female leaders confident with their own capability of leading despite facing challenges face a higher risk of experiencing gender bias and discouragement which would in turn prevent their advancement (Northouse 357). Thereby, Clarke fulfills female leader expectations by not assuming the active, official leader role but rather by presenting herself as informal organizer of an important task at hand. Although this behavior diminishes her assertion as leader, it should theoretically improve the chances of the group's positive disposition towards her.

Introducing her argumentation to implement her goal, Clarke states the following: "We need to get to Mount Weather. Not because the Chancellor said so but because the longer we wait, the hungrier we'll get and the harder this will be. How long do you think we'll last without those supplies?" (Episode 1, 00:12:08). This instance represents the "leadership building" of Clarke (Vroom and Slocum 82). Leadership is built by an individual's conscious decision-making for a group and the public proposition of a course of action (82). If the

candidate shows the inclination to implement pursued goals as well, he or she takes over a leading role (Bennis and Nanus 221). Despite not presenting herself as leader, Clarke is acting as such. Her behavior clearly proves that she is up for the task. Her promotion of the collective departure to Mount Weather holds persuasive strength for a number of reasons. First and foremost, the retrieval of essential supplies is a "value-laden goal" beneficial for the whole community (Bass 9, Shamir, Arthur, and House 28). Furthermore, her argument to do so is based on a fact, The 100's limited resources and the imminent existential threat if they refused to obtain the supplies. The hint at the negative outcome ought to ensure The 100's positive identification with her goal and ought to "lead to a logical conclusion", the immediate departure (Olmsted 13, Waterfield xvi). Clarke obviously expresses "concern[...] with future consequences" for the whole group indicates a high personal involvement (Olmsted 14-16). Showcasing involvement in communal matters ought to facilitate the establishment of connections with the group and the ability to withstand challenges (Bass 472). This should prove to be beneficial for Clarke as a new, assigned leader who has not yet forged strong ties with the community. Her comment "We're looking at a 20 mile track. Okay? So if we want to get there before dark we need to leave. Now!" (Episode 1: 00:12:10) makes aware of the large distance to Mount Weather and their limited timeframe to reach the destination before nightfall which puts emphasis on the immediacy of the departure. She clearly demonstrates task knowledge by being informed about the task at hand, its nature and possible challenging aspects. These are valuable leader qualities of achievement-orientation and high work ethic, characteristics associated with "successful leadership" (Northouse 8, Komarraju, Karau, Schmeck, and Avdic 472). By ending her argumentation with a call for action, Clarke demonstrates determination and assertiveness in the pursuit of the goal.



Fig. 1: Clarke giving a speech to convince The 100 to carry out the government's mission assigned to them (Episode 1: 00:12:09).



Fig. 2: Clarke's supporter Wells Jaha captured by Clarke's speech (Episode 1: 00:12:20).

During her speech, she is shown in a medium close-up shot while the camera slowly approaches her, creating closeness to her character. Clarke is placed at the head of her supporters, the position alone presenting her as leading figure. She appears in sharp focus with her face and upper body visibly illuminated. The remaining people at the back are slightly blurred and kept in the dark. By visually foregrounding Clarke, the viewer's focus on her alone is ensured which strengthens the impact of her first appearance as leader. During the delivery of her argumentation, Clarke turns away from the camera and faces her audience, the directed performance establishing a connection between her and the audience she aims to win over. Consequently, the viewer is made aware of the fact that the diegetic audience of *The 100* is the center of her attention. She remains static on one spot during the entire speech, visually standing her ground. Clarke's voice is loud and strong, gradually increasing in volume as her appeal progresses. The music, starting out faintly in the background, also increases in volume and accelerates. These factors gradually add more force to the content of her speech. Wells, one of her supporters, beholds her with rapt attention, whereas her opponents are barely visible in the background. Clarke is not only able to capture the fictional audience's, but also the viewers's attention. The staging of her first appearance as leader contributes to a strong character entrance.

Scene 4 shows Clarke giving a speech to dissuade *The 100* from forcefully removing their electronic wristbands. The gadgets work as connecting and tracking devices and are needed to report back to the Ark that the earth is indeed survivable again as well as to acquire *The 100*'s exact location on the ship's landing. Their removal would mean a physical separation from the Ark's control.



Fig. 3: Clarke giving a passionate speech to dissuade *The 100* from removing their wristbands (Episode 2: 00:08:35).



Fig. 4: Clarke's staging during her speech (Episode 2: 00:08:43).

When Clarke becomes aware of the people's intention, she faces the crowd, casts a quick glance over them in silence, preparing the viewer for her upcoming speech. The camera tracks her in a medium close-up, securing the viewer's undivided attention. Before her speech begins, the camera turns again to a medium frontal close-up of Clarke, who is foregrounded by appearing in sharp focus while the rest of the background is blurred. In a subsequent shot, the two leaders is shown standing in a forest clearing with the audience looking down on them on elevated ground. The disposition of the characters and camera turns the space into a theatrical stage, at the center of which two opposing leaders compete for their audience's favor. Here, the viewer becomes part of her crowd she aims to win over and consequently becomes more involved in the process.

She starts her speech with insulting the people who have taken the devices off, calling them "idiots" for doing so (Episode 2, 00:10:00). By getting personal and suppressing the people's self-esteem, Clarke comes across disrespectful and condescending. In adopting an aggressive attitude at the beginning of her argumentation, Clarke's action is in direct violation of her sex role expectation (Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, and Reichard 40). This mere fact is a poor condition to win the argument. Concerning her line of argumentation, she proceeds by stating the following: „Life support on the Ark is failing. That's why they brought us down here." (Episode 2, 00:11:00). Her voice is slightly shaking, whereby she comes across as fearful and emotional. The statement as such contains argument proof by stating a fact about the Ark's failing oxygen system and the threat of the residents's imminent death if The 100 fail to confirm the earth's habitability. Thereby, she appeals on The 100's conscience and morality, to put the lives of hundreds of people above their own freedom. Clarke's leadership acts apparently display ethical conscientiousness and moral obligation towards the Ark people. She clearly values their survival higher than The 100's collective freedom from the Ark government. The second point Clarke puts forward in favor of them keeping on their wristbands is their mutual co-dependence she illustrates with the following statement: "They need to know that the ground is survivable again and we need their help against whoever is out there. If you take off your wristbands you're not just killing them, you're killing us!" (Episode 2, 00:13:00). Clarke indicates that all their lives are on the line if they decide to continue with the destruction of wristbands. As The 100 evidently require assistance in the fight against the Grounders, her argumentation for keeping the wristbands intact gains strength by promising collective safety.

In the last scene, scene 14, Clarke gives a pro-flight speech in view of the imminent attack of the Grounders to convince The 100 to flee the camp instead of fighting their attackers. She starts her argumentation with claiming that "Bellamy's right." and the assurance "If we leave, we may never find a place as safe as this. And God knows, in this world, we can be faced with something even worse tomorrow." (Episode 12, 00:51:00). Clarke thus openly agrees with him, showing her support of his arguments. This demeanor has a lot to say about her self-perception as leader and her disposition towards Bellamy as her co-leader. First of all, she indirectly strengthens his authority as leader by directing the attention to the voice of her male counterpart and simultaneously away from her. She takes the argumentative strength of Bellamy's speech as starting point rather than presenting her audience with her own viewpoint at the beginning of her speech. She introduces her counter-argument in favor of collective flight with the statement "But that doesn't change the simple fact, that if we stay here, we will die tonight. So pack your things. Just take what you can carry. Now!" (Episode 12, 00:59:00). Overall, her goal's persuasive power is limited in being mainly built on the trust she bestows on the Grounder Lincoln, whose credibility has been challenged by Bellamy beforehand. The 100 thus form an initial skepticism in regard to their safety with a dubious Grounder. Furthermore, Clarke's goal would uproot the community by removing them from a location they have forged strong emotional bonds with. By proposing this course of action which goes in line with a general unpredictability of their fate, she expects The 100 to embark on an uncertain journey towards an unknown destination. Therefore, her goal would have a negative impact on The 100's involvement as community by lacking a concrete outcome. Nevertheless, by urging The 100 to abandon the camp in order to secure their survival, the chief argument Clarke puts forward is The 100's collective safety. The pursuit of this goal gives evidence about her priorities as leader in opposition to Bellamy's. First of all, it becomes obvious that she holds the community's safety in higher regard than the protection and defense of their camp. She vehemently claims that despite The 100's superior weaponry and combat experience, it is not a given fact that they will emerge as winners. According to her reasonable line of argumentation, their possibility of survival is greater if they abandoned the camp and fled and proposes that there is simply no need for them to deliberately endanger themselves. In sum, rather than taking hazards and risk her subjects's peril by having them stay behind and fight the Grounders, Clarke chooses the more secure option of flight to save everyone. The show thus narrates its female leader as a woman taking fewer risks than the man and instead always searching for a safe alternative. This is yet another evidence for her conforming to female role expectations, which in theory should

strengthen her impact as leader. Alas, at the end, she is again overpowered by Bellamy's forceful and strong demeanor.



Fig. 5: Clarke giving a speech to convince The 100 to flee from the Grounders (Episode 12: 00:38:03).

In regard to the scene's staging, the camera's perspective differs as she is depicted in a wide shot at the beginning of her speech. This creates distance and the viewer is automatically less involved in the content she brings forth. Only at the end of her speech, the camera changes to a close-up of her. Thereby, the intended effect of grasping the viewer's attention throughout her whole speech fails to fully materialize. Concerning the background music, its volume decreases and transforms into a more steady rhythm once she starts her speech. The steady atmosphere accompanying her speech bolsters the impression of Clarke having good intentions and her arguments being reasonable, which by itself corresponds to the stereotypical female inclination to a sensitive approach in regard to argumentation. Simultaneously, especially in combination with the created distance to her character, the impression of inactiveness and low agency is evoked. Concerning the element of voice, Clarke does raise her voice throughout her speech, but not to the same extent as Bellamy. To the end of her speech, she decreases her voice and steadily prompts The 100 to pack and leave. She mainly resorts to the extended pause as element of speech to emphasize her crucial points of safety and the prospect of death if The 100 stayed behind at the camp. Although the pause also represents an effective element of word stress, it is overshadowed by the sheer force of Bellamy shouting out speech contents of importance and conveys the impression of inactiveness. Another noticeable factor is her apparent shortness of breath and audible gasping while delivering her speech. This leaves the impression of her experiencing immense emotional stress

concerning the topic of discussion. Clarke's displayed emotionality in the face of an urgent and pressing issue conveys the message of the frantic woman in the face of stress. The scene's staging in combination of her emotional demeanor provides her with a weak exit as leader.

4.2.2. Instances of Positive Feedback for the Male Leader

In scene 1, Bellamy dissuades from undertaking the chancellor's allocated mission: the departure to Mount Weather. He starts his response by publicly claiming "I got a better idea." for The 100's next course of action (Episode 1: 00:12:12). The blunt and factual statement declaring his subsequent proposition superior to Clarke's leaves little room for objection. In "act[ing] with certainty", he comes off as free of doubts even in challenging moments and openly displays confidence and self-assuredness (Northouse 38). Basically, in the moment of his introduction as potential leader candidate, he self-proclaims himself as the 'better' leader which aids his leadership building. Bellamy's demand "You two go! Find it for us!" is directly addressed to both Clarke and Wells and implies his goal to have the two depart to Mount Weather alone and retrieve the supplies for the rest of The 100 (Episode 1: 00:12:12). The remark is worth analyzing for a number of reasons. First of all, it reveals Bellamy's egoistic motive, namely to rid himself of his two opponents contesting his position as leader. Then, contrary to Clarke, Bellamy does not present a sound line of argumentation to persuade the diegetic audience but instead places a direct order. In combination with his use of short sentences, force and aggressiveness is added to his lines. By this demeanor, he displays a high level of agency, extraversion and dominance in combination with assertiveness and decisiveness which are all essential determinants for leadership effectiveness (Northouse 38, Revelle, and Eysenck 36). Bellamy proceeds by urging The 100 to "let the privileged do the hard work for a change.", specifically referring to Clarke and Wells as the privileged in question (Episode 1: 00:12:14). Bellamy implies that they experienced good fortune out of habit, without making an effort by simply being part of the privileged group most of The 100 have been previously victimized by. Consequently, negative sentiments of envy and suspicion against Clarke's genuineness towards The 100 are conjured up, which deliberately fuels intergroup bias. He strategically paints Clarke and Wells as the outsiders, supporters of the 'enemy' not fit to act as their representatives. Thereby, Bellamy draws on the notion of "us and them", which distinguishes the "desirable [from] the undesirable" and the "genuine [from] the bogus" (Anderson 2). This distinction fits the concept of "ethnocentrism", a technical term

coined by the political scientist and sociologist William Graham Sumner describing the practice of sorting people in a superior “in-group” and an inferior “out-group” (Kinder and Kam vii). In this case, he deliberately paints Clarke, who has as of yet been part of the privileged in-group, as the new outsider to fuel The 100’s negative evaluation of her. The fact that he is successful with the endeavor proves his considerable power of manipulation over the crowd that he apparently possesses already, even at these early stages of leadership emergence. His leadership-style can thus be described as highly transformational in the negative sense as he succeeds in persuading The 100 to adopt a negative disposition towards Clarke and the group she represents (Broda-Bahm, Kempf, and Driscoll 186). In opposition to Clarke and Wells, he portrays himself as genuine leader and more desirable choice for The 100, which can be yet again viewed as a manipulative polarization.



Fig. 6: Bellamy dissuading The 100 from carrying out the government’s assigned mission (Episode 1: 00:12:31).



Fig. 7: The 100’s feedback to Bellamy’s response (Episode 1: 00:12:35).

Bellamy is staged as the challenger to Clarke’s leadership in scene 1. When Bellamy starts his ‘anti-government’ speech, the camera perspective changes to an over-the-shoulder-shot of Clarke. By regarding Bellamy from Clarke’s perspective, the viewer is enabled to empathize with her. This leads to a higher degree of viewer involvement in relation to Clarke. Visually, both Clarke and the viewer are the receivers of Bellamy’s challenge. Concerning the camera perspective, Bellamy is shown in a medium shot depicting his entire upper body, which creates distance to his character. During his response, the background music changes into deeper, darker tones which creates a charged atmosphere. This builds up strong tension which automatically fuels the viewer’s perception of Bellamy as the threatening force. His gaze is steadfastly directed at the camera, keeping a stern expression which creates the effect of intimidation. The people surrounding Bellamy keep their gazes directed at him the entire time, signaling their

undivided attention and allegiance to him. Although the elements of *mise-en-scène* add strength to his introduction, they are conducive to a varying perception of Bellamy as leader as compared to Clarke. The elements of *mise-en-scène* clearly present Bellamy as strong opponent, the challenger to her leadership.

Scene 4 shows Bellamy giving a speech to persuade The 100 to cut the connection to the Ark and have all wristbands removed and destroyed. Bellamy's motive for choosing to promote the destruction of their wristbands is strictly personal and he pursues an entirely selfish goal. He strives for the escape from the system he grew up in which is responsible for his mother's execution and his sister's persecution. Bellamy would further face judgement for the attempted murder of the Ark's chancellor, which is punishable by death according to the government's law. He has not yet shared this information which is the main drive for his actions but does not influence the group's decision. As the removal of the devices would render each person untraceable to the government and provide indication about the earth's uninhabitability, he strives for their destruction which would likely prevent the people on the Ark to follow down to earth. To implement his agenda, he pursues a different approach than Clarke. His use of the imperative "Don't listen to her!" openly commands the others's disregard of his opponent's argumentation (Episode 2, 00:08:36). Bellamy's statement "We can take care of ourselves" is an indication of firm conviction and confidence in The 100's capability of meeting demands without outside assistance which builds up their self-belief (Episode 2, 00:08:39). He thus appears as charismatic leader who emphasizes his followers's capability of meeting the demands. He communicates "collective efficacy", which triggers a feeling of empowerment within followers as their individual worth and performance ability is highlighted (Shamir, Arthur, and House 28). The feeling is further strengthened by his praise, calling The 100 "fighters" and "survivors" (Episode 2, 00:08:46). Altogether, Bellamy's statements have an enormous motivational effect on The 100. However, his use of "distracting language" is classified as means for rhetorical manipulation of the audience (Waterfield ch.2f). Although the heroization elevates The 100's sense of self-worth and creates a new positively connoted identity for them, it also plays on their emotions. He thereby manipulates them into believing they have been unfairly treated and rather appeals to their autonomy and innate strength as collective to rebel against the system.

Bellamy continues with the argument that Clarke will continue receiving privileged treatment once the Ark residents arrived on earth. He thereby insinuates Clarke's egoistic

motivation in the pursuit of her goal. His rhetorical question “How many of you can say the same?” implies that, contrary to Clarke, the majority of The 100 are likely to face maltreatment (Episode 2, 00:08:37). The remark holds the further prosecution of The 100 as implicit assertion. This creates trepidation and anger against the government and further provokes The 100’s perception as victims of injustice. As The 100 probably hope to evade unpleasant consequences, fear of prosecution likely ensures their obedience and cooperation. Yet again, Bellamy makes use of negative emotions to manipulatively fuel intergroup conflict. By his argumentation, he initiates a dissociation of the Ark government that has previously sealed their fate as criminals.

Bellamy strategically transfers symbolic value on the wristband as symbol for oppression and lack of freedom. His statement “That wristband on your arm - it makes you a prisoner” thus has particular persuasive impact (Episode 2, 00:08:42). Now Bellamy’s goal, the destruction of the gadget, would be an act of gaining the much desired freedom from the government. The prospect of escaping the law and gaining freedom instead works as impulse for rebellious activity and manipulates The 100’s judgement. By aligning the content of his goal with The 100’s core interests, he displays one characteristic of effective charismatic leadership (Shamir, Arthur, and House 28). He thereby functions as “group prototype” for The 100’s general negative inclination towards the government (Northouse 9). Bellamy repeatedly uses the pronoun ‘we’ when stressing his conviction of The 100’s collective strength and autonomy. By its application, he presents himself as equal to The 100. Bellamy therefore increases his “referent power”, a leader’s quality of being liked among his followers, which in theory increases his chance to win future confrontations (French and Raven 263). Leadership effectiveness and positive audience evaluation depends on the “quality of [the subjects’s] relationship with their superiors” (Bass 8). Successful leadership demands having strong ties with the group (Zaleznik 67). His use of inclusive rhetoric thus conveys his best intention in regard to him as leader and simultaneously demonstrates an act of self-proclaimed authority as worthy representative of their community. He vehemently posits The 100’s autonomy whereas Clarke offers The 100 the faint possibility to gain freedom if the chancellor’s orders are obeyed. In fact, the male leader as forceful ‘liberator’ from oppression holds more authority.

The staging of Bellamy in scene 4 shows how the male leader captivates an audience’s attention. After Clarke’s speech, the camera cuts to medium frontal shot of Bellamy, visualizing Clarke’s perception of Bellamy. For a few seconds, he remains entirely still, his



Fig. 8: Bellamy giving a speech to convince The 100 to remove their wristbands (Episode 2: 00:09:21).



Fig. 9: Bellamy's staging during his speech (Episode 2: 00:09:01).

gaze directed straightly at the camera and thus at Clarke which shifts the viewer's focus to him. When starting his 'pro-separation' of the wristbands speech, he faces the crowd, moves towards them and addresses them with a loud and sonorous voice. Bellamy starts to move alongside the group's front. The camera tracks his strides in a medium long side shot, tilting up when he directly addresses the people. A noticeable pause follows which enhances the severity of his argument. At that point, his voice has considerably increased in volume and he is almost shouting at the crowd. Each of his sentences are followed by the crowd's increasing murmuring and shouts of approval.

In Scene 14, in the very last episode, The 100 are informed of an immediate attack the Grounders are planning to carry out on them by an external source, the exiled Grounder Lincoln. After Clarke's 'pro-flight' speech, Bellamy argues for staying back at the camp and fighting the Grounders. Concerning Bellamy's line of argumentation, the choice of words and his argument's subject matter hold particular persuasive value for a number of reasons. He starts with shouting "This is our home now. We built this from nothing with our bare hands." (Episode 12, 00:37:23). First of all, the term 'home' conjures up notions of belonging associated with property and accomplishment. Bellamy especially emphasizes The 100's effort, hard work and accomplishment in the formation of the camp. Thereby, Bellamy builds on the "labour theory" which refers to the tendency to claim ownership and possession over everything self-made (Weir 17). The camp represents The 100's communal land, which, in a geographical and spacial sense, has physical boundaries separating one community from the other (Paul 19). The 100's camp represents an example for the spacial realization of their community. Their drop-ship serves as base, the center of communal activity whereas the sturdy trunk fence surrounding it represents the physical boundary enclosing their community. The existing spatiality of their community,

their land claim, bestows an economical form of power on them (Cousins 2). By his argumentation, Bellamy expresses the conviction that once a territory has been occupied, especially if the process of occupation demanded an excessive amount of effort, it is to be protected against foreign threats irrespective of the circumstances or consequences. According to him, surrender and abandonment of their land holding is simply out of the question. The 100 leaving their base camp and embarking on a cleared area which would leave them vulnerable, a risk Bellamy is not prepared to take. In regard to his male role fulfillment, by drawing on the theme of territory, he conforms to the culturally constructed stereotype of the man being territorial and possessive.

Second of all, the term 'home' conjures up notions of belonging associated with emotional attachment. By reminding The 100 that "Our dead are buried behind this wall.", he strengthens The 100's understanding of the camp as their site of emotional belonging (Episode 12, 00:37:25). Bellamy's finishing remark "They think that because we came from the sky we don't belong here. But they're yet to realize one very important fact. We're on the ground now." is followed by the fervent exclamation "And that means we are Grounders!" (Episode 12, 00:37:33). His final words and their powerful delivery further The 100's construction of identity as being part of this world. The "value-laden" goal of belonging in a psychological sense is proven to be particularly motivational for the people (Shamir, Arthur, and House 28). Thus, it can be argued that Bellamy resorts to means of particular persuasive power concerning this statement. He proceeds with "The Grounders think they can take that away.", implying that the Grounders aim to take their 'home' from them (Episode 12, 00:37:30). Bellamy establishes the prospect of losing their site of belonging to the 'foreigner' as plain fact if they resist fighting back. Consequently, The 100's fear of the loss of their 'home' triggers their anger towards the Grounders is triggered. He deliberately conjures up strong positive emotions in regard to their camp and negative emotions to the Grounders. He strengthens The 100's sense of a "community of value", a "form[...] of social relations" between people of shared values worthy of preservation (Anderson 2). The paragon of a "community of value" is "the good citizen" who is "stable", "respectable", "rational, self-owning, and independent, with a moral compass that enables him [or her] to consider the interest of others" (Anderson 2-3). "The Good Citizen" is set in opposition to the "non-citizen", the outsider or foreigner, who does not share the same and thus "right values" (Anderson 3). The "non-citizen" is seen as the antagonist and intruder the community of value needs protection from (Anderson 3). He treats the Grounders as "non-citizens" and antagonists The 100 need protection from

(Anderson 3). As Lincoln is part of the enemy Grounders, despite being an exiled member, Bellamy as leader of The 100 does not have enough evidence proving the trustworthiness of Lincoln's intentions. Bellamy's arguments resorting to the distrust and fear of the 'other' are strong indicators for his implementation of the rightwing notion of xenophobia and ethnocentrism. Xenophobia, the "fear[...] of foreign domination", the general fear of outsiders and foreigners is put on a level with racism, intolerance and discrimination (Wimmer 19). Ethnocentrism mainly promotes a non-convergent and non-cooperative attitude towards other cultures, foregrounds notions of difference and incompatibility and pursues the elimination of foreign threats (Doolen xiii, McCartney 1). By painting the Grounders as the enemy and promoting the distrust of anyone involved with them, Bellamy promotes the subjugation of the ethnic 'other' and leads towards a community built on ethnocentrism. Furthermore, by drawing on emotions as "sources of energy for practical action", in this case The 100's fight, Bellamy applies a manipulative strategy of implementing leader goals (Olmsted 18). His appliance of powerful rhetorical means proves to be fruitful and he finishes his speech with the crowd's rousing cheers.



Fig. 10: Bellamy giving a speech to convince The 100 to fight the Grounders (Episode 12: 00:37:29).

During Bellamy's 'pro-fight' speech, the camera circles the leaders, which adds movement to the scene and holds the viewer's attention. It gradually moves closer to him, starting with a close-up shot and transforming in an extreme close-up. Therefore, the viewing audience is visually lured into his speech. Simultaneously, battle background music is gradually building up, adding force and creating a dramatic effect accompanying his speech. This lays emphasis on the urgency of his proposed action to fight. Position-wise, he remains on the same spot the entire time, although moving his body along with the

camera for the viewers to constantly behold the front of him. This method visually foregrounds the male lead, fixating the viewer's attention to a high degree. Particularly interesting to analyze is Bellamy's strong use of voice and excessive nonverbal communication in the form of hand gestures. Concerning the volume of his voice, Bellamy is shouting throughout the entire speech, his behavior corresponding to the myth of the shouting military commander. He almost screams out the phrases "bare hands", "our ground", "We are Grounders" while strongly motioning to the ground and to himself with his hand. In regard to gesturing, Nancy Henley (1994) classified excessive gesturing as socialized male behavioral trait and the exhibition thereof demonstrating "confidence and power" and simultaneously "reinforce[ing] the inferior role model concept" (Donald, and MacDonald 3). The elements of voice and gesturing serve as particularly effective means for word stress and put considerable emphasis on the message of belonging he aims to deliver. Given the analysis, the elements depict Bellamy as forceful, loud and close to the viewer and stage him as agentic and dominating character.

The situational framework of the public confrontation serves as medium for the initiation of Bellamy's act of rebellion against the government and his call for battle against the Grounders. The endeavor of rebellion is an intense form of protest generating new norms and social reorganization (Coser 198). In fact, Bellamy succeeds in initiating their separation from the Ark government and fight against their enemy by generating The 100's sense of freedom and unity as a community.

4.3. The Leaders's Private Interactions and Negotiations

Similar to the leaders's public confrontations, their private interactions aim to persuade the addressed individuals and work as a means for them to assume authority. The addressee's feedback ascertains the leader's success with the endeavor. Similar to the outcome of the leaders's public confrontations, the following outcomes determine the dominant leader of The 100 as well as the development of their community.

4.3.1. Instances of Negative Feedback for the Female Leader

Scene 10 starts with Bellamy and Clarke coming forward as united leaders of The 100 in front of the Ark chancellor to appeal for Bellamy's pardon for his crimes against the government. Before Bellamy and the chancellor start their interaction, Clarke intervenes, acting as intermediary. Her aim is to support her male co-leader and provide solid arguments in favor of his pardon. To win the appeal, Clarke chooses to start with the open accusation "When you sent us down here, you sent us to die." (Episode 4, 00:38:05). The statement is based on the fact that the government was willing to sacrifice 100 delinquent teenagers for the sake of their mission. The moral dubiousness of the act is used to stir the chancellor's conscience and trigger a feeling of guilt. She proceeds with the heroization of Bellamy, claiming that The 100 have survived almost entirely because of his leadership (Episode 4, 00:38:10). His value for the community is further emphasized by the emotional declaration: "He is one of us." (Episode 4, 00:38:15). She thus counts on the persuasive strength of the emotionally connoted sense of belonging which symbolizes a strong intergroup link. Alas, her appeal fails and she is denied by the chancellor. To him, the matter is "not that simple" to grant the pardon (Episode 4, 00:38:20). The chancellor straightforwardly dismisses the arguments she brought forward and denies their validity. Despite the factuality and rationality of her line of argumentation, it is deemed not impactful enough to realize her goal. At the end, Clarke's approach failed to convince the chancellor and it is left to Bellamy to argue for his case.

Scene 12 is about the attempted peace negotiation between Clarke, who acts as representative of The 100, and Anya, who meets her as spokesperson of the Grounders. This instance is the two leaders's first meeting in person. The scene offers insight in the visual presentation of Clarke and Anya as direct representatives, the 'faces', of their feuding communities. To begin with their appearance, Clarke's blonde strands fall down in



Fig. 11: Anya's appearance and demeanor during the negotiation (Episode 9: 00:33:58).



Fig. 12: Clarke's appearance and demeanor during the negotiation (Episode 9: 00:33:56).

a smooth and wavy manner, her face is rosy-cheeked and lacks discernible make-up. Her ordinary blue jacket is open, revealing a basic low cut green shirt underneath. She comes across as stereotypical western girl who has not yet experienced a lot of grim situations. Contrary to her, Anya's dark brown hair is roughly styled in braids and she wears heavy make-up. The big, dark circles of black painted around her eyes and the red lines on her cheeks sharpening her bone structure could be compared to warpaint. Face paint has been a popular technique of film culture, functioning as a "representation of the savage" (Paul 103). In Anya's case, her excessive face make-up works as western trope of "tribalism", an ethnic marker for tribal belonging and means for tribal identity construction (Paul 2,4). Concerning her clothing, Anya's black leather coat is wrapped tightly around her body as if being worn for the sole purpose of protection, suggesting a warrior background. Appearance-wise, Anya is depicted as part of a 'barbaric' tribe compared to Clarke's 'civilized' presentation as the representative of the western The 100. Apart from their looks, their demeanors could not be more of a contrast. Clarke beholds Anya with a guarded expression and slight unease, which portends a general insecurity and tentativeness in face of this challenging situation. This demeanor initially decreases her character's power of self-assertion, a poor precondition for a leader who ought to appear sure of herself and the group she represents. Moving over to Anya, she throws Clarke a fierce and grim look which obviously conveys her anger at The 100's past deeds and her own determination to take a stand for her group. Anya's slight condescending gaze while examining her opponent affirms her biased predisposition and personal judgement against the other leader. As far as her first impression of Clarke is concerned, she clearly considers her to be inferior.

Clarke's ability to assert herself in this negotiation with the 'enemy' will prove to be critical for her development as leader. Their introduction starts when Anya breaks the silence by inquiring if her opposite's name was Clarke (Episode 9, 00:30:15). Her question indicates that she, judging from the male connoted name, originally assumed Clarke to be a male leader, not female. Thereby, the show directly addresses the choice of giving a female leader a name stereotypically used for men. In doing so, the gender myth of the 'naturalness' of a leader to be male is broached. After their introduction, Clarke puts out her hand to shake Anya's in a first attempt at reconciliation. A handshake between two opposing parties works as symbol for peace settlement and can be labelled as a democratic gesture to show respect. Anya, however, shows no inclination to shake Clarke's hand, implying her reluctance to make an effort to meet halfway. Concerning their different postures, Clarke's body language remains open whereas Anya keeps her arms crossed and thus creates distance between them. Her demeanor suggests an initial aversion to Clarke and the community she represents. Realizing that, Clarke drops her hand after a few seconds in defeat. She proceeds with addressing the case at hand, stating that despite their "rough start" (Episode 9, 00:30:20), it should be in their collective interest to establish peace. Again, she chooses a democratic and open approach to start the conversation. At that, Anya plainly raises an eyebrow in disbelief and doubt before expressing the Grounders's firm conviction that it was The 100 who started this war. Shocked and confused at the allegation, Clarke vehemently stresses that her community "didn't start anything" (Episode 9, 00:30:23). In an agitated manner, she accuses the Grounders of having attacked them first "for no reason" (Episode 9, 00:30:25). Judging from her demeanor, Clarke clearly is emotionally affected by the other's charges against her people and is not conscious of any guilt. Anya states the Grounders's reason for the assumption, that the missiles The 100 "launched burned a village to the ground" (Episode 9, 00:30:28). Taken aback, Clarke denies the accusation of deliberately launching the flares to attack the Grounders brought against her people. She proceeds by explaining the actual purpose thereof, to signal their position to the Ark and further stresses their innocence. Interrupting her attempt at explaining the situation, Anya calls The 100 "invaders" (Episode 9, 00:30:33) as they landed on Grounder territory whereupon Clarke calmly declares their unawareness thereof. In fact, Clarke is truthful in her claim that The 100 trespassed the Grounders's land without knowledge of their existence or ill intention. Undermining the legitimacy of Clarke's claim, Anya responds that The 100 "knew [the Grounders] were here when [they] sent an armed raiding party to capture and torture" Lincoln, one of their own (Episode 9, 00:30:38). She insists that "these are all acts of

war” (Episode 9, 00:30:40). Clarke nods in defeat, admitting to their actions. She relents and admits to see the other leader’s point when in fact, it was the Grounders who issued the first ‘act of war’ when fatally wounding one of The 100’s members shortly after their landing (Episode 9, 00:30:42). Thereby, Clarke accepts The 100’s main responsibility for their continuous warfare and Anya is successful in damaging the credibility of Clarke’s argumentation. Altogether, their initial interaction encompasses typical incidents of mutual assignments of blame, resulting in the accused’s defensive state. During the entire first half of their conversation, Clarke defends herself and The 100 and is held back from entering a discourse of reconciliation.

After that, Anya and Clarke start the negotiation. Yet again, Clarke stresses the importance to “put an end to all of this” and make peace (Episode 9, 00:30:45). Thereafter, Anya inquires if Lincoln has informed them correctly that The 100 expect to welcome more of their people, apparently “warriors” (Episode 9, 00:30:49). In this moment, the Grounders’s main, self-serving motive for agreeing to the meeting becomes clear. They clearly aim to get an idea of their force of arms to prepare themselves accordingly. Although affirming the fact that the armed guard will indeed be coming down, Clarke assures her that farmers, doctors and engineers are also to arrive. Her main argument for the establishment of peace is the fact that the two parties could benefit from each other (Episode 9, 00:30:55). Alas, Clarke conditions her people’s help on a mutual peace agreement and conveys her primary focus on a common good. Anya thereupon demands to know whether the new arrivals will abide by the terms she and Clarke will set and refrain from issuing an attack on them (Episode 9, 00:31:00). Clarke assures her to try her best to convince the people from the Ark of their terms in a serious and sincere manner (Episode 9, 00:31:03). By that, she shows willingness to cooperate and offering her help in establishing peace between the two parties. Anya, however, remains suspicious and demands a reason to trust Clarke’s word “that [her] people can break the moment they get [down to earth]” (Episode 9, 00:31:08). At that, Clarke points out the guard’s reluctance to engage in negotiations if they happen to be attacked by the Grounders. Furthermore, she claims confidently that if her people started a counter attack, their advanced weapon technology would wipe the Grounders out (Episode 9, 00:31:14). Colonial history has shown that many tribal communities have fallen victim to western colonies and their superior armed force (Giddens 255). As she is confronted with Anya’s continuous wariness and defiance, Clarke’s remark is intended as threat to put the other leader under pressure to start negotiating terms. Alas, Anya merely replies that “they wouldn’t be the first to try” (Episode

9, 00:31:18). Evidently, Anya dismisses both the argumentation brought forward by Clarke in support of peace establishment and the threat issued against her people in case of ongoing war. She remains confident of their capabilities without a cooperation with The 100.

In this case, Clarke acts as the part of the 'peacemaker'. She approaches her opponent in a diplomatic and open manner, prepared to reconcile with The 100's enemy party and pursues a common goal, the Grounders. Unfortunately for Clarke, she lacks conviction during the negotiation and ultimately fails to reach an agreement with her opponent's leader. Consequently, the Grounders attack the camp of The 100 and the two parties start waging war in a struggle for supremacy, analogous with colonists's "imperial tendency" during the period of settlement (Sen 946). This narrative *The 100* develops is similar to the process and dynamics of colonial history which led to the genocide of the inferior group. As a leader, Clarke was in charge to avert this development, but failed the task. Consequently, she loses credibility not only as a representative of The 100 among their enemy, but also among her own people.

4.3.2. Instances of Positive Feedback for the Male Leader

Scene 2 presents an instance of Bellamy's ability to assert his authority when facing one of his objectors. After the chancellor's son Wells's critique of Bellamy's leading practices, he swiftly approaches him, stating "You still don't get it, do you, Chancellor? This is home now. Your father's rules no longer apply." (Episode 2: 00:05:35). By addressing Wells as 'chancellor', he both mocks him and the authority his father holds on the Ark. This strategy removes his addressee's power of self-assertion while strengthening his own. In a last attempt at defiance, Wells questions whether Bellamy aims to lead to chaos whereby the latter smugly answers "What's wrong with a little chaos?" (Episode 2: 00:05:35). Thereby, Bellamy clearly articulates his agenda, the disruption from the old Ark system and rebellion against the government. His last remark hints at his inclination to promote a lawless society. Ultimately, Wells withdraws and admits defeat. As a consequence, Bellamy's status of authority is substantiated.

Bellamy's staging of scene 2 demonstrates the show's visual depiction of the male leader in charge. Appearance wise, Bellamy is shown topless, his muscular torso exposed, wearing black pants and having a gun tucked into his pants. A study has been conducted



Fig. 13: Bellamy's depiction as leader of The 100 (Episode 2: 00:05:25).

by Mary Zeiss Stange and Carol Oyster in the field of psychology on the symbolic function of the gun in popular culture television. It argues for the gun as symbol of hegemonic masculinity, particularly of “power, force, aggressiveness, decisiveness, [...] cold rationality” (Stange, Zeiss and Oyster 22). By equipping its male leader with the tool, the show feeds into this hypothesis. In this case, Bellamy's gun symbolically emphasizes his superiority, strength, dominance and enforce his empowerment as leader. It adds to the socially constructed gender characteristic of men expected to be strong and dominant (Schroeder, and Graziano 378). Furthermore, the gun has been conceptualized as “cultural object” carrying a symbolic meaning of revolution, rebellion, independence, self-defense and self-preservation, values Bellamy holds and encourages (Johnson 110). Altogether, the scene provides an example of the show's apparent visual depiction of stereotypical masculinity.

In episode 1, Bellamy has managed to convince a large number of The 100 to remove their wristbands. To seek assistance in his quest, he privately approaches two rebels among their group who have voiced criticism against the Ark officials and government before. To generate their compliance in his quest, Bellamy states “They locked you up, dumped you down here like lab rats to die. So why are you helping them?” (Episode 1, 00:20:27). He starts with a list of the government's misdeeds to further trigger their initiate anger against their Ark superiors. Thereby, he quite plainly shows them their ‘idiocy’ in doing their bidding. To enforce the urgency of the situation, Bellamy stresses the Ark

guards's soon arrival, unless they took initiative to hinder their departure to earth. Thereby, he manages to capture the rebels's attention, apparent by the rebel John Murphy's inquiry on how Bellamy plans to stop the Ark residents's departure. Bellamy responds "Take them off. The Ark will think you're dead and that it's not safe to follow. You follow?" (Episode 1, 00:20:43). Bellamy intently holds Murphy's gaze in a superior manner. Considering the proposition, Murphy enquires on how they would profit in return for their compliance, whereupon Bellamy replies "Someone's gonna help me around things." (Episode 1, 00:20:51). Thereby, Bellamy both implies his goal to establish himself as leader of The 100 and promises his followers to rise up in station and power once he manages to occupy the position. Considering his strategy to motivate subordinates, he resorts to the manipulative strategy of using his addressees's negative attitude towards the government to his advantage. Furthermore, his approach can be classified as purely transactional.

Scene 10 shows Bellamy's strategy in persuading the Ark chancellor to grant him a pardon for his crimes. In fact, when Bellamy takes over from Clarke, he pursues a whole different strategy of persuasion to obtain his goal. He uses the information about the main organizers of the coup to usurp the chancellor aggressively as leverage to shift the deal in his favor. He is fully aware of the value of said information to Jaha before exposing himself to the chancellor's judgement. His approach is purely transactional. Therefore, Bellamy's agreement to the meeting is a conscious act of calculation on his side in regard to its outcome. His strategy proves to be successful as Jaha grants the pardon, absolving him of all his crimes. This scene shows *The 100's* male leader conforming to male role expectations in exhibiting agency and by adopting a powerful and aggressive approach to implement his goal. The scene's outcome transfers the following message: a dominant male leader has to be successful, even if the odds are against him. Concerning Bellamy's narrative as leader, the chancellor's decision has an impact on Bellamy's character development. After the scene, he is officially recognized as co-leader of The 100 without fearing the prosecution of the government.

4.4. The Leaders's System of Justice

This chapter focuses on the leaders's individual sense of justice and their followed course of action to regulate group internal disputes and moral code violations. In specific, the scenes's analysis will yield the leaders's administered form of punishment they deem appropriate for their subordinates's offense. At the end of the chapter, the analysis identifies the principles each leader aims to establish as well as the dominant individual. On a larger scale, the chapter reveals the direction The 100 are taking under the leadership of the most effective leader.

4.4.1. Trial by Combat for Dispute Settlement

At the beginning of this scene 3, Murphy holds a girl close to a bonfire who is struggling to get released, a look of terror on her face. Murphy calls for Bellamy and states his plan to distress her before forcefully removing her wristband in order to deceive their Ark supervisors. The wristbands transmitting The 100's vitals serve the Ark officials as sole indicator for the effect environmental conditions have on them. An increased heart rate, blood pressure and body temperature followed by an abrupt signal cut would suggest a high level of stress before immediate death. By deliberately manipulating the data, the false impression of The 100 being exposed to danger is created. This information might in turn hinder the rest of the Ark population to descend to earth, which would be in accordance with Bellamy's personal agenda. Approaching the situation, Bellamy calmly beholds the situation with crossed arms, having no intention to stop his first recruit's victimization of the girl.



Fig. 14: John Murphy forcing a girl to remove her wristband (Episode 2: 00:06:00).



Fig. 15: Bellamy initiating trial by combat (Episode 2: 00:06:48).

In that moment, Wells, who has witnessed the situation as well, approaches Murphy, shoves him off the girl and the two start a fight. To illustrate the ferocity of the fight, rapid camera movements trace the fighters's fast movements and brutal attacks. The camera follows their movements, circling them which brings about a restless and frantic effect. Regarding the fight-action, Murphy throws Wells to the ground and rapidly punches his face, demonstrating mercilessness, cruelty and disregard for their brutal action's consequences. Concerning the function of violence on television, depictions thereof always convey "messages about violence" (Gerbner 5). In this case, as Bellamy shows no inclination to stop the fight, he clearly supports a community founded on a culture of violence.

Alas, when Murphy takes his dagger and approaches Wells with the intent to kill, Bellamy intervenes and commands him to stop. Facing Wells, Bellamy holds up his own dagger, throws it at Wells's feet and with the words "fair fight" lets their fight proceed (Episode 2: 00:06:15). Bellamy thus appears as litigant for the introduction of the judicial duel for the regulation of disputes which promotes the new system of justice Bellamy advocates for. "Trial by combat" is historically rooted in the feudal ages and can be traced back to a cultural custom common among Northern European tribes symbolizing "manhood" (Neilson 1). In general, combat has been labelled as "gendering activity", counting among "male experiences" (Donald, and MacDonald 1). The ordeal by battle, its essence being the "voice of God" delivering judgement, originated in the ancient Roman age in central European Germanic tribes, which mainly based jurisprudence on divine judgement (Neilson 3). The practice has faced severe criticism by ancient Roman scholars who denoted the method as uncivilized and barbaric (3). Ancient Roman scholars believed in the power of law to settle matters in a civilized way. Thus, the Roman political system set the framework for modern civil law (4). By initiating and promoting trial by combat as method to settle disputes, Bellamy adopts uncivilized, 'barbaric' and morally questionable methods.

Scene 3 shows that Bellamy singlehandedly promotes a community based on the judicial power of one individual. In fact, Bellamy elevates himself to a divine leader beyond the influence of civil law system, empowered to have those selected he deems worthy of being part of the community. Moreover, if Murphy happened to emerge as winner, Bellamy would have to face one less of his strongest opponents. Hence, he tolerates morally questionable behavior for the sake of his own agenda.

4.4.2. Law of Retaliation for Punishment

In scene 6, after identifying Murphy as murderer of Clarke's closest supporter Wells Jaha, Clarke publicly confronts the culprit in the presence of her co-leader. She quickly approaches Murphy, shoves him and calls him a "son of a bitch" (Episode 4, 00:11:19). Initially, the deliberate insult lets her come across as angry and aggressive. She holds up Murphy's knife, the murder weapon, as solid evidence and openly accuses him to have killed Wells (Episode 4, 00:11:24). At that, Murphy vehemently denies the accusation whereupon Clarke further persists on its accuracy. This demeanor shows conviction about her own judgement and confidence in her actions. Determined, she assures the accused that he is "gonna pay for it" and face punishment for his crime (Episode 4, 00:11:29). Thereupon, Murphy's demeanor immediately changes and he replies "really" in a condescending, smug and defiant manner, then turning to Bellamy and loftily asking him if he believed Clarke's "crap" (Episode 4, 00:11:32). Evidently, Clarke's affronting and attacking demeanor immediately elicits negative feedback from the male recipient. In fact, Murphy dismisses both Clarke as leader and the accusation she makes. Substantiating her claim, Clarke vehemently draws the attention to the fact of Murphy's inherent aversion against Wells, that Murphy "hated Wells" and "got in a knife fight with him" (Episode 4, 00:11:38). She presents Murphy's past aversion towards Wells and their former physical dispute as evidence proving the crime. However, this constitutes an emotional motive for Wells's murder, not solid proof of evidence. Aware of the weakness of her argumentation, Murphy assumes a smug, lofty expression and languidly replies that "plenty of people hated Wells" and that "this is ridiculous" (Episode 4, 00:11:44). Yet again, he deems her accusation groundless and does not take her seriously. By his final statement "I don't have to answer to you." (Episode 4, 00:11:47), Murphy communicates that he does not feel accountable to her, openly disrespects Clarke and calls her authority as leader into question. This is an instance of a voiceless female who is not heard, despite the validity of her argumentation. Upon being confronted with Murphy's condescension and disdain, Clarke is extremely distraught. Exhibiting emotional behavior instead of facing her opponent in a calm and collected way in a stressful situation is a response labelled as stereotypically female. Besides the lacking solidity of her arguments, this further decreases her credibility. Clarke proceeds by addressing the public whether this was "the kind of society" The 100 aspired to establish, a society based on a lack of rules and regulations (Episode 4, 00:12:04). Thereby, she expresses fundamental criticism against The 100's

descend into anarchy since Bellamy's rebellion against the Ark government. She fights for the prevalence of a system of justice regulating criminal offenses.



Fig. 16: Clarke accusing Murphy of Wells's murder (Episode 4, 00:11:09).



Fig. 17: Bellamy sharing his suspicion of Murphy being Wells's murderer (Episode 4, 00:11:33).

After Clarke and Murphy's interaction, the camera switches to a close-up of Bellamy, beholding the scene unfolding in front of him with his arms interlocked and his head tilted upward. He is shown in a low shot, which has been linked to impressions of "strength, action, and superiority" (Baranowski, and Hecht 92). Altogether, his posture demonstrates self-assuredness and intimidation. When Murphy stresses that he does not "have to answer to anyone", Bellamy calmly asks him to "come again" (Episode 4, 00:11:53). Bellamy's challenge is followed by an extended silence of the group, which overall creates a tense atmosphere. The group's reaction to him reveals the significant impact he already possesses as leader. As far as Murphy is concerned, his manner changes abruptly and he looks at Bellamy with an expression of seriousness and slight dread. He slowly walks towards Bellamy, intently asserting his innocence in a low voice, quite evidently feeling cowed by him. Murphy's changing demeanor following Bellamy's response affirms his acknowledgement of Bellamy's authority as leader. Calmly, Bellamy states that they "found [Wells's] fingers on the ground with [Murphy's] knife" (Episode 4, 00:12:00). He presents solid evidence based on facts, which substantially damages Murphy's credibility. Murphy's varying demeanor upon being confronted with female and male accusation provides an example of a male leader whose judgement is respected.

Upon being confronted with the crime, the crowd demands capital punishment for the culprit. One of Bellamy's associates suggests to "float him" (Episode 4, 00:12:08). 'Floating' a convict into space was the predominant method of execution and capital

punishment for criminal behavior employed by the Ark government. Connor's suggestion to resort to the old system of punishment is met with the crowd's rousing cheers, loudly demanding Murphy's execution. At that, Clarke claims that "revenge isn't justice", clearly rejecting the practice of capital punishment and vehemently opposing the death penalty (Episode 4, 00:12:12). However, her interjection is dismissed and The 100 persist to carry out the punishment.



Fig. 18: The 100 dragging John Murphy to his execution (Episode 4, 00:12:29).



Fig. 19: Clarke insistently reasoning with Bellamy to stop the execution (Episode 4, 00:12:52).

Key elements of mise-en-scène are applied to visualize the severity of Murphy's execution and the leaders's respective reactions to the situation. A rapid seriality of fast camera movements depicting The 100's increasing frenzy in hitting, beating, gagging and hanging Murphy enhances the violent process. In combination with a general darkness of the scene, a gloomy and threatening atmosphere is created. Those elements act as initial deterrents to the viewers and increase their anticipation of the leaders's reaction to the event unfolding in front of them. A close-up shot depicts a desperate Clarke, yelling in despair that he "can stop this" and that The 100 will listen to him (Episode 4, 00:12:20). In that very situation, she gives up her agency as leader and transfers judgement power to Bellamy. Jolting camera movements illustrate her physical 'fight' for Murphy's rights. Alas, despite her struggle to reach him, she is held back. Realizing her helplessness, Clarke appeals to Bellamy's conscience by insisting that she does not believe him to be a killer and starts yelling at him (Episode 4, 00:12:25). Alas, her attempt to appeal to his morality still proves to be unsuccessful. A close-up of Bellamy shows him intently looking at Murphy standing on the stool with a noose tied around his neck, beholding him with a horrified expression. Murphy weakly shakes his head, pleading with Bellamy to rule in his favor. In that very moment, the music accelerates and intensifies the dramatic effect of the moment. Hence, the viewers's anticipation is built up, dreading the outcome of Bellamy's judgement. The 100 start chanting Bellamy's name, demanding death and thereby laying pressure on him to act in their favor. Bellamy approaches Murphy wearing an emotionless expression

and kicks the stool away, sealing Murphy's fate. Witnessing Bellamy's judgement, Clarke cries out in agony, showing absolute horror beholding the situation. Clarke's extreme emotional response illustrates her complete loss of composure in extreme, morally condemnable situations. In comparison, Bellamy remains stoic and seems to be unaffected by the brutality and violence transpiring in front of him.



Fig. 20: Clarke's reaction to Murphy's execution (Episode 4, 00:13:28).



Fig. 21: Bellamy blaming Clarke for Murphy's execution (Episode 4, 00:13:30).

After Murphy is hanged, Clarke and Bellamy confront each other about the allocation of blame for the situation's outcome. Bellamy approaches Clarke again with the words "This is on you, princess. You should've kept your mouth shut." (Episode 4, 00:12:35). His statement raises the attention to three aspects worth addressing. First of all, he is clearing himself from blame by transferring guilt to Clarke, assigning the responsibility of the situation's outcome to her. Clarke ought to feel guilty for having the audacity to demand justice and publicly accuse someone. Second of all, he belittles her by resorting to her old nickname, stripping Clarke of her credibility, leading power and respectability. Third of all, he aggressively silences her and puts her in her 'rightful' place in view of her attempts to speak up and stop an action she viewed as despicable and condemnable. It becomes clear that Bellamy's actions represent the exercise of revenge for her previous public challenge of his authority. However, Bellamy stops the process of Murphy's execution when Finn, Clarke's supporter, arrives and informs The 100 of his innocence. As it turns out, Bellamy would have had an innocent killed. In regard to Murphy's fate, Clarke and Bellamy decide to exile him on the condition to carry out his death sentence once he returns.

According to Bellamy, as Murphy has been convicted of committing murder, he himself should meet the same fate. He thereby advocates for the implementation of the law of

retaliation: “an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, measure for measure” (Miller ix). The law envisions the human “body [...] as *the* measure of value” that “serve as the means of payment for [...] the judgements entered against them” (ix-x). Bellamy thus leads towards a “[t]alionic culture”, which supports a system of justice based on vengeance (x). Given the two leader’s respective actions, the scenes provide solid evidence for both Bellamy and Clarke supporting a system of judgement clearly not based on contemporary notions of human rights. The woman as critic of immorality and injustice corresponds to her social role of the sympathetic ‘caretaker’. She is put in contradiction to the male aggressor, threatening the prevalence of fairness and civility in their society. In this case, Bellamy acts as the ‘true’ leader, being in command of The 100.

4.5. The Leaders's Ethical Dilemmas

The upcoming subchapters include the scenes that address the show's approach to the ethical dilemmas of torture and murder. As far as the analysis is concerned, The 100's leaders's decisions and acts in times of war with the Grounders constitute the main area of interest. Each leader's own way of confronting the dilemmas indicates their own moral framework they abide by.

4.5.1. Torturing an Enemy

The show enters the debate about torture when the male leader decides to captivate and torture the Grounder Lincoln to obtain inside information, essential for The 100's advantage in times of war. When Bellamy lets his intention of torturing Lincoln known in scene 7, she firmly stresses that "this is not who we are" (Episode 7, 00:07:35). She thus recognizes torture as "ethically undesirable behavior" and displays a moral act when openly expressing her belief that it is against The 100's fundamental principles (Zevin 316). Thereat, Bellamy only claims that "it is now" and proceeds with his intention (Episode 7, 00:07:38). Concerning Clarke, she initially adheres to democratic principles in line with the contemporary human rights system and thus opposes the act of torture. Bellamy, however, regards enhanced interrogation as tolerable practice during times of war to gain advantage against their enemy and thereby shows his development of a military mindset.



Fig. 22: Clarke beholding the tortured Grounder Lincoln (Episode 7: 00:17:24).



Fig. 23: Close-up of the shackled and tortured Grounder Lincoln (Episode 7: 00:18:15).

When Clarke approaches the shackled Lincoln in scene 8, the extra-diegetic viewer beholds the severity of Lincoln's torture. In that moment, the camera is directed at her the entire time. Therefore, the viewer is allowed to witness her reaction to the situation she beholds in front of her. Her expression displays a forced collectedness at first, followed by

shock and horror upon gazing at the extent of his wounds which are shown in detail in a close-up-shot. A moment of silence follows, allowing the viewer to process the gravity and brutality of the situation. A close-up of Clarke displays emotionality in showing concern, worry and dismay. Bellamy, on the other hand, is displayed in the background and appears to be calm, collected and unaffected by the situation. Comparing the two leaders's demeanor, Clarke illustrates a high emotional involvement and sympathy towards Lincoln's fate whereas Bellamy shows his emotional distance to the captive. In fact, they both conform their role expectations in this case.

Clarke presents other arguments warranting her criticism of Bellamy's choice to conduct enhanced interrogation. She stresses that Lincoln possibly hates The 100 for unrightfully torturing him and thus aims to trigger Bellamy's empathy towards Lincoln as a person. Bellamy, however, just exclaims "who cares" (Episode 7, 00:17:17). He thereby demonstrates utmost disregard for her concerns and indifference to the situation. In this case, the male leader affirms his trivialization of the act of torture. Proceeding in her quest to dissuade Bellamy from continuing the torture, she states the possibility of the Grounders learning about their actions against one of their own (Episode 7, 00:17:20). In view of Clarke's critical and doubtful stance, Bellamy, tells her to "relax" (Episode 7, 00:17:25). He proceeds by presenting points against her 'unwarranted' criticism in an explanatory manner by assuring her of the other party's unawareness of their actions (Episode 7, 00:17:26). At the end, he sternly stresses the importance for her to come to the realization that The 100 are "fighting a war", presenting the nature of the situation as justification for the act of torture (Episode 7, 00:17:32). Bellamy makes clear that, according to him, conducting enhanced interrogation in times of warfare is a necessity to eliminate foreign threats and secure The 100's safety. He considers it to be the "lesser evil" than the acceptance of the harm of the 'innocent' The 100 (Gross 134). His argument mirrors the prominent justification for the practice of torture as being the prospect of saving the lives of a large quantity of people. She points out the Grounders's physical superiority by the example of their captive. Contrary to the Grounders, The 100 are "not soldiers" and not experienced in warfare (Episode 7, 00:17:38). Although Bellamy acknowledges the validity of her argument, he also sees this possibility in the scenario if The 100 refrain from fighting. To emphasize the significance of his statement, he puts rhetorical stress on every word and thereby ends their discussion. Altogether, despite her efforts, Clarke loses the fight to stop Bellamy from continuing the practice of torture and Bellamy ultimately emerges as the leader of agency in that matter.



Fig. 24: Bellamy approaching the Grounder Lincoln to proceed with enhanced interrogation (Episode 7: 00:18:33).

At the end of scene 8, Bellamy's role as ruthless practitioner of torture becomes clear to the viewing audience yet again. After Clarke's exit, Bellamy firmly closes the trapdoor leading downstairs, keeping further interruptions out. A close-up shot depicts a shackled Lincoln, keeping his emotionless gaze locked to the ground away from his opponent, a small act of defiance. Although the dark surrounds him, his face is slightly illuminated by the light from above, the facial wounds clearly visible to the viewer. The camera switches to a close-up of Bellamy facing his captive. He is completely kept in the dark, beholding Lincoln with grim determination, his gaze devoid of sympathy. Simultaneously, the background music accelerates and builds up to a loud drum roll, increasing in volume. These staging elements highlight the imminent threat Bellamy poses in this very situation. The scene closes with Bellamy taking a step towards Lincoln, predatorily approaching his defenseless victim to continue with the enhanced interrogation.

Gathered from the leaders's acts and demeanor in the scenes, they definitely implement different moral frameworks. As far as Clarke is concerned, she clearly condemns the practice of torture. She displays ethical behavior in publicly opposing the act and thus makes her stance commonly known and also in directly confronting and challenging Bellamy about his practice of enhanced interrogation. In that sense, Clarke leads towards a society based on a civil rights system. Bellamy, on the other hand, does not rule out the practice of torture per se. Contrary to Clarke, he regards torture as justifiable practice in extreme situations, for example if the people he represents are in jeopardy.

4.5.2. Murdering a Traitor

At the beginning of Scene 13, the exiled Murphy has returned back to The 100 having released vital inside information to the Grounders as a consequence to him being tortured. He is captured and brought to Bellamy and Clarke to receive judgement for this act of treason. Bellamy immediately raises his gun, aims it at Murphy while matter-of-factly announcing that “in that case” he would proceed with the traitor’s execution (Episode 10, 00:04:55). Bellamy’s complete lack of emotion demonstrates an absence of inner conflict with the idea of execution. Clearly, he shows no hesitation to kill Murphy in view of the latter’s treacherous actions. In fact, Bellamy only reconsiders due to the possibility of Murphy having obtained inside information about the Grounders during his time as their captive, which would give The 100 the upper hand in the war against the Grounders. Thereby, Bellamy indicates a complete disregard for Murphy as individual having human rights, but instead bases his fate solely on his value as informant. Contrary to Bellamy, Clarke desists from punishing him for returning to the camp.

Worth discussing is the scene’s staging of Murphy and its effect on viewer’s assessment of the leader’s proposed action. When Bellamy announces his decision to execute Murphy for treason, the overall atmosphere becomes charged, putting emphasis on the severity of the situation. The camera switches to a high-angle shot of a terrified and shaken Murphy, pleadingly looking in the eyes of his potential executor. A study conducted by the cognitive psychologist Robert Kraft (1987) has shown that a high camera angle shot left the viewers with “impressions of weakness, passivity, and insignificance” (Baranowski, and Hecht 92). His wounds are depicted in an extreme close-up shot in detail, enabling the viewer to experience first-hand the repercussions of his torture and to relate to his physical pain. His position, squatting in a dark corner within the camp’s base and keeping his arms close to his body as if protecting it from expected harm, signals absolute helplessness. This technique produces a dramatic and traumatic effect and portrays Murphy as defenseless victim, evoking the viewer’s feelings of sympathy and pity. Thereby, Murphy’s staging invites the viewer to adopt a critical stand on the questionable morality of Bellamy’s decision.



Fig. 25: A close-up of the tortured Murphy (Episode 10: 00:04:43).



Fig. 26: Clarke tending to Murphy's wounds (Episode 10: 00:05:52).

In this critical moment, Clarke steps forward and, to Bellamy's horror, approaches and tends to Murphy. As she carefully inspects his wounds, the camera zooms in to an extreme-close-up shot of his bloodied and damaged hands. Consequently, Clarke draws the conclusion that Murphy has indeed been tortured by the Grounders. The look on Clarke's face is serious, grim and compassionate beholding his wounds. Then, Clarke gets up and approaches Bellamy with a sad expression on her face. She is depicted in an over-the-shoulder shot of Bellamy when addressing him. Calm but firm, she shares her decision to let Murphy heal before finding out what he knows about their enemy. Contrary to her male co-leader, Clarke decides against murdering the treacherous Murphy.



Fig. 27: Clarke issuing her judgement on Murphy's fate (Episode 10: 00:06:05).

At the end of the scene, Bellamy enquires what they would do with Murphy if he refused to leave whereupon Clarke replies "Then we kill him" (Episode 10, 00:05:20). This moment

represents an instance of Clarke being the one having decisional power over Murphy's fate. Her high level of agency in this moment is visually demonstrated by the scene's mise-en-scène. When Clarke faces him, the camera zooms in on her, directing the whole focus and attention on her. Her gaze drifts to their captive, who, in a following close-up shot, stares at her in a dreading manner as if already knowing that his fate is sealed. Back at Clarke, the camera approaches her while the moment is further stretched, triggering the viewer's anticipation. Simultaneously, the music builds up and produces a dramatic effect, further laying emphasis on the momentousness of this climactic conclusion of the scene. Her statement in combination with the scene's composition transfers the following message: At that moment, Clarke is in charge. Bellamy is not even allowed to interpose. Her decision to kill Murphy represents an act of implementing capital punishment as consequence for the criminal offense of treason.

4.6. The Leaders's Responses to Foreign Threat

The scenes focus on the processes of leadership during times of conflict and war, in specific the leaders's handling of their enemy and response to foreign threats. Concerning their handling of the threat the Grounders pose, Clarke and Bellamy have different attitudes towards the matter and as a consequence perform different leadership acts.

4.6.1. Creating Fear of 'The Other'

At the beginning of scene 5, Clarke aims to publicly bring the murderer of Wells Jaha, one of their own, to justice. To her surprise, Bellamy stops her midway. Determined, Clarke orders Bellamy to step out of her way (Episode 4, 00:09:40). Suasively and pacifying, he asks her to be "smart about this" (Episode 4, 00:09:45). Apparently, he beliefs her decision to denounce one of their own to be hasty and not well thought through.

Bellamy aims to withhold The 100 the information about the true murderer and instead assign guilt to the Grounders and maintain the 'threat' their enemy poses. This approach can be connected to a contemporary procedure followed by the United States's republican foreign policy. Since the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the republicans have developed the main concern to "strengthen national security to meet [...] evolving threat[s]" (Uhl 264). Similar to the political party's agenda, Bellamy's chief interest lays in the maintenance of The 100's protection against the foreign threat. To convince her to halt and reconsider their next move, he firstly draws her attention to their achievements as community: "The wall, the patrols" (Episode 4, 00:09:48). According to Bellamy, The 100's 'main achievement' represents the erection of the outer wall enclosing their camp. He argues their wall, a massive physical barrier, as being a necessary means ensuring their community's security. Symbolically, a 'wall' is associated with protection and segregation. In contemporary times, the wall as symbol for excluding the 'foreign', the 'other' has emerged as common theme within ethnocentric and xenophobic narratives. In this case, The 100's wall ought to provide security during their feud with the Grounders, which he strongly believes to be in jeopardy if upheaval is provoked among their own ranks. Therefore, he argues against exposing Murphy's crime and instead to keep The 100's fear and hate directed at the Grounders. He insists that "fear of the Grounders is building that wall", that it has worked as impulse prompting The 100's motivation, sense of unity and purpose which produced tangible results (Episode 4, 00:10:05). According to him, fostering this "*mental image* of

imminent evil of a life-threatening or painful kind” is “good for all of [them]” as their motivation to fight this ‘evil entity’ would likely increase (Waterfield 2f) (Episode 4, 00:10:02). Thereby, he makes use of the persuasive strength of intense emotions to implement his goal.



Fig. 28: Bellamy trying to convince Clarke to withhold the information about Wells's identified murderer (Episode 4: 00:10:19).



Fig. 29: Clarke insisting on sharing the murderer's true identity with The 100 (Episode 4: 00:10:25).

Clarke severely criticizes Bellamy's pursuit of this manipulative strategy. To confront him, she provocatively exposes his plan to conceal the truth and “keep people afraid” of the Grounders to secure their loyalty and support as selfish and manipulative goal (Episode 4, 00:09:55). She openly disparages the endeavor of promoting notions of xenophobia and ethnocentrism to follow his own agenda. Becoming aware of Clarke's dismissal of his arguments, he chooses another approach to induce her cooperation. He meets her serious objection with condescension and mockery by inquiring how Clarke aims to identify the culprit, whether she planned to “just step out there and ask the killer to step forward” (Episode 4, 00:10:09). In unconsciously belittling her in regard to her ability to arrive at sound conclusions, the power difference between them becomes evident. He deliberately articulates her situational inferiority and undermines her decisional power in regard to a matter that ought to be their shared responsibility. Moreover, his attempt to mold Clarke to his will is associated with “drivership”, leadership by coercion and inspired by personal motives (Bass 13, Kuhnert and Lewis 651). Drivership mainly operates on presenting inconvenient possibilities to induce compliance (Moore 124, Northouse 5). Yet again, Bellamy resorts to a manipulative leadership strategy. However, unbeknownst to Bellamy, Clarke has already drawn a conclusion based on initials engraved on the murder weapon, identifying the knife to belong to John Murphy, one of their own people. She confidently and vehemently insists on the people's “right to know”, demanding transparency concerning criminal offenses (Episode 4, 00:10:15). Thus, Clarke is

presented as the democratic leader, leading towards a society based on the public's right to information. Historically, the Freedom of Information Act "has entitled the public to obtain certain information through mandatory government disclosures" since 1967 and since then has been one of the United States's core democratic principles (Uhl 263-264). Clarke vehemently defends those principles and remains unwavering in the face of Bellamy's counter-arguments. Her sense of justice strictly forbids the manipulation of her own people.

In scene 11, Clarke approaches Bellamy to discuss a neutral meeting with the Grounders to attempt peace negotiations. She informs him of her decision to meet with the Grounders's leader, whereby he perplexed asks if she "lost [her] damn mind" to meet with people who showed brutality towards one of their own in the past and passes a mocking remark to illustrate the idiocy of the matter (Episode 9, 00:19:38). In openly questioning her sanity, Bellamy illustrates that he believes her to display poor leadership qualities in making unwise decisions. By further taunting her, he makes clear that he does not take her seriously as leader in that moment. Despite his deprecating response, Clarke persists to attend the meeting and her argument for it is that The 100 "do have to live with these people" (Episode 9, 00:19:45). Therefore, she insists on the necessity of negotiating a truce between The 100 and the Grounders. Thereat, Bellamy derisively replies that the Grounders would probably just "string [her] up as a warning", referring to the treatment they showed to one of their own in the past (Episode 9, 00:19:49). Clarke merely shakes her head in annoyance, being fully aware of his disregard for her decision but unwilling to respond to it.

At the end of the scenes, despite Bellamy's efforts, Clarke has her will and proceeds with her initial intentions. She chooses the diplomatic approach of entering into peace negotiations to avoid a war between the two parties, whereas Bellamy prefers to fight their enemy. On a larger scale, the show expresses criticism of a culture based on xenophobia and ethnocentrism and the procedure of strategically fostering these notions to implement an egoistic agenda.

4.6.2. Guns as Tools for Protection and Defense

In the course of the season, The 100 obtain supplies from Mount Weather, a former military base. Among the goods are handguns and fire arms Bellamy and his supporters quickly equip themselves with. Now this chapter focuses on Clarke and Bellamy's ethical concerns of using guns and their varying views on the tools's purpose.

The first instance Clarke engages herself in the prospect of making use of their weapons is at the beginning of scene 9. When Bellamy aims to persuade Clarke of using their guns to fight the Grounders, she emphasizes that "these are weapons [...] not toys" (Episode 8, 00:36:15). She addresses the moral aspect of the matter and generates the awareness of a certain responsibility towards the use of arms. As far as the purpose of their guns is concerned, Clarke regards the tools as means to "help keep [The 100] safe" (Episode 8, 00:36:18). So at first, she regards guns as means for protection. The second purpose of the guns she bears in mind is to use the threat the tools pose for her people's advantage. In scene 11, Finn, Clarke's supporter, informs her about the prospect of a neutral meeting with the Grounders to negotiate a truce. Clarke initially claims that The 100 "can't live in peace with people who've done nothing but kill" them (Episode 9, 00:19:02). She vehemently points out the two communities's poor preconditions to establish peace, whereupon she founds her initial skepticism of a meeting's success. Her attitude is based on the factuality of past events, providing a logical foundation to her concerns. When Finn asks her if she can "think of a better way to stop the bloodshed", Clarke responds that indeed, she does with the help of "the guns that the guards bring down" (Episode 9, 00:19:10). She thereby indicates that she views guns as tools for intimidation, which, according to her theory, would naturally scare their opponents and discourage them from issuing and attack. Continuing their conversation, Finn emphatically enquires whether Clarke "really want[s] a war" and that he is positive they "can do better" (Episode 9, 00:19:20). As he is not aware of the extent she aims to use the guns against the Grounders, he directly addresses her initial inclination to rather naturally distrust her opponents than respectfully agree to their terms and arrive unarmed. Even after Finn's moral input, Clarke still insists that "if [they] go [to the meeting], [they] have to bring backup" (Episode 9, 00:19:28). Although Clarke respects and positively responds to the morality and rationality of his arguments, she nevertheless views bringing guns for intimidation and protection as necessary.

Bellamy's attitude towards guns becomes clear when he aims to convince Clarke to utilize their guns in the fight with the Grounders. In a private conversation with her, he severely criticizes The 100's continuing fear of the Grounders and their inferior weaponry of "knives and spears" (Episode 8, 00:36:05). He deliberately downplays the threat the Grounders pose and dismisses their assertiveness. Furthermore, he vehemently stresses that he is "tired of being afraid" and thereby demonstrates agency in attempting to change the situation and fight the Grounders (Episode 8, 00:36:10). In that sense, Bellamy presents their guns as 'problem-solving' means, the 'problem' being the Grounders. According to Bellamy, their guns ensure that "if the Grounders come, [The 100] are gonna be ready to fight" and, even more so, stand high chances to succeed (Episode 8, 00:36:18). He not only confronts his co-leader with his intentions, but also publicly announces them in scene 14, after the end of his 'pro-fight' speech. When one male crowd member shouts out that they are in the possession of guns, the comment results in Bellamy openly daring the Grounders to come and attack The 100 under these circumstances (Episode 12, 00:37:39). His response raises the attention to two aspects worth discussing. First of all, he develops the fact of their possession of guns as main argument to stay and fight, provocatively proclaiming The 100's military superiority due to their advanced weapon technology as main advantage over the Grounders, as he did in his private interaction with Clarke. Hereby, he clearly argues from a military point of view. In fact, The 100 are in the position of the defenders, familiar with the setting of the impending battle and the potential of their resources. Their weaponry and camp's wall as line of defense provide them with superior firepower, coverage and fire protection, which are crucial requirements to gain the upper hand in the event of a fight. Therefore, The 100 are adequately prepared for battle, requiring the attacker to demonstrate higher military force to emerge as the winner. Contrary to The 100, the Grounders as attackers would have to enter a territory unknown to them, equipped with native weaponry, which would put them into a greater disadvantage. These situational factors prove to be vital prerequisites supporting his argument and reduce the impact of the Grounder's posed threat. Judging from his positive inclination to the use of guns, Bellamy leads towards the pervasiveness of a "gun culture" within The 100's community (Johnson 112). By the example of its male lead character's aims and displayed manner, the show narrates the construction of the typical male soldier fighting his enemies. The "making of a soldier" is based on the "celebration and reinforcement of some of the most aggressive, and most insecure, elements of masculinity: those that promote violence" (Whitworth 3). Bellamy clearly views them as tools essential for combat and indicates his intent to use them in a destructive manner.

5. Conclusion

To refer back to the introduction, the thesis's research question concerned *The 100's* creation of 'the' successful leader. Moreover, the thesis intended to reveal the show's correlation between the manifestation of its lead characters's stereotypical characteristics and their individual evaluation. Before conducting the analysis, I hypothesized that *The 100's* successful male and female leader conducts him-/herself according to his/her role expectations in the majority of instances. In specific, the female leader's negative evaluation was postulated in the event of gender-specific prosocial behavior. By contrast, the male leader's gender-specific conduct ought to elicit positive feedback. In general, the show presents foundational instances of leadership building. At the beginning of the season, *The 100* start out as prisoners and non-homogenous, scattered and divided group. Throughout the season, the show contains strong intergroup conflict in the form of rebellion, treason and disputes as well as growing out-group conflict. In combination with emergent and strong leadership, these factors bring about change. As observed in the analysis, the two leaders Bellamy Blake and Clarke Griffin are the two driving forces of said change. However, it has been found that the nature and direction of their leadership diverges.

First of all, the leaders's varying rhetorical practice and leadership styles are outlined. As it was the case in his confrontations, Bellamy takes a firm line when presenting his main points and comes across as serious, focused and determined. Concerning Bellamy's strategy of argumentation, he presents legitimate argument proof of facts in two instances of the analyzed public confrontations. However, his exhibition of manipulative language in appealing to the recipient's negative and positive emotions is particularly noticeable. For example, he deliberately triggers *The 100's* anger and hate to create bias and resorts to an 'us and them' rhetoric to construct an 'enemy'. Also, he praises *The 100* and emphasizes their collective strength to stir up their feeling of empowerment and positive inclination towards him. To receive support, he talks potential followers into believing that it would be an 'idiocy' to not support him. Furthermore, he presents weak argument proof in insinuating mere negative possibilities to dissuade his opponents. As it was the case in one of the public confrontations, rather than presenting rhetorical proof, he resorts to placing a direct order, coercing his followers to implement his egoistic agenda. Therefore, Bellamy hinders the process of rational deliberation and judgement but rather abuses rhetoric as tool for the forceful process implementation. Overall, Bellamy shows the

tendency to pursue his goals in a rhetorically aggressive and manipulative manner. In case he is met with defiance, he responds with open mockery, condescension and dismissal, a clear indicator of disrespect and autocracy. This behavior should in theory be proof of Bellamy's dubious character.

In regard to Bellamy's preferred styles, it has been identified that he adopts a transformational style in the negative sense in his practice of polarization. In other cases, particularly when he needs people's assistance in reaching his goals, he uses a transactional leadership style where he proposes a transaction of benefits and information. If the addressees support him, he promises them to enjoy advantages in the future. Or, if he is granted his goal, he assures to reveal valuable information the other party requires. Besides pursuing this rather egoistic style, Bellamy autocratically promotes the judicial power of one individual - himself. Throughout the show, Bellamy demonstrates self-promotion, certainty, conviction, confidence, agency, extraversion, energy, strength, assertiveness, assuredness, decisiveness, emotional stability, insensitivity and autocracy in the pursuit of his goals. Concerning his ethical conscientiousness, he appears to be calm, collected and serious in grave or immoral situations. His absence of inner conflict is mirrored in him having no hesitation to kill or torture an 'enemy' and in supporting his subordinates's violent behavior. During key scenes indicating his morality, Bellamy shows disregard for the contemporary system of human rights. Also, he chooses to withhold information to the public to maintain his power and influence as leader. The vision of a democratic community is destroyed the moment Bellamy opts for enhanced interrogation and information restriction. In The 100's feud with the Grounders, Bellamy opposes peace negotiations and instead promotes the two party's ongoing war. Hereby, he makes use of guns as tools to exercise his leadership and primarily views them as means for destruction and combat. He also uses the situational condition of their warfare as justification for his actions to absolve himself of any kind of responsibility. Overall, his leadership acts indicates his pro-war and pro-gun demeanor. Although seemingly 'freeing' The 100 from old oppressive values, he leads towards a community founded on violence, militarism, ethnocentrism and xenophobia.

Concerning Clarke's leadership, she presents solid argument proof by substantiating her arguments with factual information and inspiring her motives by corporate good. Her overall pursuit of a common goal mirrors a sense of obligation to both The 100 and the people on the Ark. She coordinates her end values with The 100's needs and in order to

ensure collective safety, she refrains from risk-taking. In order to realize her goals, she demonstrates a high work ethic and determination. Furthermore, to rule out misunderstandings and ensure transparency, she offers explanations for her actions and decisions. Similar to Bellamy, she also makes use of the effective strategy of persuasion in appealing to her audience's emotions of guilt, fear and belonging. However, she uses this technique to build the people's awareness of the corporate good of certain propositions and does not aim to manipulate their dispositions for her own advantage. In all instances, she acknowledges the decisional power to be residing with the people. She advocates for deliberative democracy, which is based on the endeavor of "put[ting] the question to the people" and let them collectively "choos[e] among competing products" (Gutman, and Thompson 14). She only delivers "deliberative" speeches where the audience is part of the decision making process (Waterfield ch.5). This approach correlates to the understanding of leadership as persuasion without coercion where "followers are convinced by the [substantiality and] merits of the argument, not by the coercive power of the arguer" (Bass 14). As her strategy of argumentation incorporates solid and effective means of persuasion, it ought to ensure the audience's positive inclination towards her.

In regard to her character, she shows compassion and empathy for victims of inhumane treatment which suggests a strong ethical conscientiousness. Her high sense of morality becomes clear when she publicly appeals for justice and order and condemns immoral acts. Even more so, Clarke is self-aware and takes on responsibility for her actions. For example, she demonstrates responsibility in regard to the handling of guns and views them solely as tools for protection and deterrence. Moreover, she shows the capability to self-reflect about questionable past decisions which becomes particularly evident during the negotiation with The 100's enemy. These behaviors are proof of impeccable character and genuine intentions. However, in critical and stressful situations, she shows a lack of "emotional stability", one of the idealized personality traits promoting effective leadership (Komarraju, Karau, Schmeck, Avdic 472). Her neuroticism is realized in her tendency to display anxiety, agitation, fear and despair when experiencing injustice and immoral behavior. She also tends to insult and accuse her subordinates whenever they defy her which lets her come off as rather aggressive which, according to female leadership theory, diminishes her chance of positive evaluation. Nevertheless, this behavior is the exception rather than rule. In general, her overall practice of a democratic, transformational leadership style should, in theory, strengthen the people's identification with her proposed goals which is conducive to her positive evaluation as leader. She promotes freedom of

information and is interested in the establishment of peace, which are fundamental values of a democracy. In case of her success, her focus on these values would guarantee the establishment of a democracy-resemblant community.

In regard to the show's *mise-en-scène* elements, Bellamy and Clarke are staged in a different manner. As far as Bellamy's staging is concerned, a close and low camera perspective is used in his key scenes to convey his significance and superiority. In fact, he is more often visually foregrounded than distanced. During scenes that demonstrate his agency and determination, he is kept in the dark and shown with a grim demeanor. The tunes accompanying his performance are deeper. During his speeches, accelerating battle music creates a charged atmosphere. Bellamy delivers his speeches in a loud and sonorous voice. To emphasize particular contents, he practices excessive gesturing which additionally captures the extra-diegetic audience's attention. As far as his appearance is concerned, Bellamy is dressed in black clothing and often equipped with a visible handgun. Apart from his rhetoric and leadership acts, these *mise-en-scène* elements promote the perception of him as dominant leader of agency, conforming to his respective gender's stereotypical behavioral norms and expectations. In regard to Clarke's staging, Clarke is visual foregrounded in the majority of her speeches as well, which also builds a strong connection to the extra-diegetic audience. Overall, she speaks in a loud and strong manner and captivates her audience's attention, similar to her male counterpart. However, in particularly challenging situations, her voice tends to tremble and she experiences a shortness of breath. Then, Clarke wears a guarded expression which indicates her insecurity and wariness. Her generally open body language demonstrates her willingness to reach a positive outcome and conveys approachability. Throughout the season, Clarke wears minimal make-up and is clad in ordinary, 'western' clothing. Contrary to her male co-leader, she is not equipped with any kind of gun. Thereby, the show opts for a rather 'civilized' presentation of the female leader as opposed to the male leader's offensive presentation.

In view of the facts, the following hypothesis can be verified: The leaders's respective demeanor largely overlaps with stereotypical attributes ascribed to masculinity and femininity. However, Clarke displays characteristics of a successful leader similar to her male counterpart. Alas, there exists a palpable, unbalanced power relationship between Bellamy and Clarke, despite the show's presentation of them as co-leaders. At the end, Bellamy emerges as *The 100*'s "group prototype", the representative of the community's

collective aspirations (Bass 3). He earns *The 100*'s approval in all cases and his leadership remained effective throughout the season. Thus, Bellamy has accomplished "successful leadership" (Bass 13). In comparison, Clarke fails to "change the behavior of others", the essential end goal of leadership (Bass 13). Clarke's failure to bring about the desired change in the majority of cases falls under the category of "attempted leadership" (13). The show thus opts for the narrative of an aspiring female leader facing open rejection despite a rational line of argumentation and the obvious demonstration of effective leadership traits assuring her potential. Thus, Clarke cannot even be described as true 'leader' of *The 100* as apart from Bellamy. Although Clarke is quite literally 'born' to be a leader based on her exceptional personal background, the show suggests that she is not 'made' for the task due to her sex alone. The female leader, despite occupying the same position and level of influence as her male counterpart, still performs according to her stereotypical submissive role when confronted with male input. In general, the reaction to Clarke's leadership is defiance and disrespect in the form of personal attacks, mockery, condescension and belittlement. Thereby, *The 100* promotes "descriptive bias" in its female leader construction, the conclusion that there exists a "lack of fit between the feminine role and the leader role" (Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, and Reichard 40). Thereby, the show conveys the message that regardless of a woman holding the same position in power as a man, she does not possess the same level of perseverance and respect. *The 100*'s female leader exhibiting traits conforming to her gender's expectation is to face negative evaluation. On a larger scale, although the first season of *The 100* successfully addresses the hardships female leaders are facing, it fails to critically and effectively challenge these issues. In fact, the sexes's power imbalance is apparent throughout the show. Alas, its narrative imposes chauvinistic values, male hegemony, female inferiority, sexism and patriarchalism.

6. The Scenes's Transcripts

SCENE 1: *The 100: Season 1, Episode 1: 00:11:55*

The 100 engage in a conflict about chancellor's order to head to Mount Weather to retrieve supplies.

WELLS [to the crowd] We need to find Mount Weather. You heard my father's message. That has to be our first priority.

OCTAVIA [to Wells] Screw your father. What? Do you think you're in charge here? You and the little princess?

CLARKE [to Octavia] Do you think we care who's in charge?

[to the crowd] We need to get to Mount Weather. Not because the Chancellor said so but because the longer we wait, the hungrier we'll get and the harder this will be. How long do you think we'll last without those supplies? We're looking at a 20 mile track. Okay? So if we want to get there before dark we need to leave. Now!

BELLAMY [to Clarke] I got a better idea. You two go! Find it for us!

[to the crowd] Let the privileged do the hard work for a change.

CROWD Yeah!

SCENE 2: *The 100: Season 1, Episode 2: 00:05:25*

Wells carries clothes he collected from two people dying during the landing back to the camp. Atom tries to take them away but Wells pulls them close to himself.

WELLS Share based on need. Just like back home.

Bellamy approaches them.

BELLAMY You still don't get it, do you, Chancellor? This is home now. Your father's rules no longer apply.

Bellamy rips away clothes Wells collected from two people dying during the landing.

You want it back? Take it.

Wells stares at Bellamy before throwing the bag of clothes away to the ground in an exasperated yet defeated manner.

WELLS Is this what you want? Chaos?

BELLAMY What's wrong with a little chaos?

Murphy is forcefully holding a struggling woman close to a bonfire.

Bellamy! We want the Ark to think that the Grounders are killing us, right? Figured it'll look better if we suffered a little.

WELLS [to Murphy]

[to Bellamy]

Stop this? I'm just getting started.

Don't you see you can control this?

MURPHY [to Wells]

BELLAMY [to the fighters]

[to Wells]

This is for my father!

Wells! Let him go!

Enough, Murphy!

CLARKE [to Murphy]

24 and counting.

CLARKE [to the crowd]

84

against whoever is out there. If you take off your wristbands you're not just killing them, you're killing us!

BELLAMY [to the crowd] We're stronger than you think. Don't listen to her! She's one of the privileged. If they come down, she'll have it good. How many of you can say the same? We can take care of ourselves. That wristband on your arm - it makes you a prisoner. We're not prisoners anymore. They say they forgive your crimes. I say you're not criminals. You're fighters! Survivors! The Grounders should worry about us.

CROWD [starts cheering] Yeah.

SCENE 5: *The 100: Season 1, Episode 4: 00:09:40*

Clarke, Bellamy and their closest associates have found Wells's murder weapon. Clarke decides to inform the people. As she aims to exit the tent, Bellamy stops her midway.

CLARKE Get out of my way, Bellamy.

BELLAMY Be smart about this. Look at what we've achieved: The wall, the patrols. Like it or not, thinking the Grounders killed Wells is good for us.

CLARKE Oh, good for you, you mean. What? Keep people afraid and they work for you. Is that it?

BELLAMY Yeah, that's it. It's good for all of us. Fear of the Grounders is building that wall. And besides, what are you gonna do? Just step out there and ask the killer to step forward? You don't even know whose knife that is.

CLARKE Oh. Really?

Clarke shows Bellamy the initials J.M. which are clearly visible on the knife's handle.

J.M. John Murphy. The people have a right to know.

SCENE 6: *The 100: Season 1, Episode 4: 00:11:18*

In public, Clarke accuses Murphy of killing Wells. He vehemently denies her accusations.

CLARKE [shoving Murphy] You son of a bitch.

MURPHY What's your problem?

CLARKE [holds up knife] Recognize this?

MURPHY It's my knife. Where did you find it?

CLAKE Where you dropped it after you killed Wells.

MURPHY Wait what? The Grounders killed Wells, not me.

CLARKE I know what you did. And you are gonna pay for it.

MURPHY Really? Bellamy, do you really believe this crap?

CLARKE You threatened to kill him. We all heard you. You hated Wells.

MURPHY Plenty of people hated Wells. His father was the chancellor that locked us up.

CLARKE Yeah. But you are the only one who got in a knife fight with him.
[...]

MURPHY Come on. This is ridiculous. I don't have to answer to you. I don't have to answer to anyone.

BELLAMY Come again?

MURPHY Bellamy, look, I'm telling you, man. I didn't do this.

BELLAMY They found his fingers on the ground with your knife.

CLARKE [to the crowd] Is this the kind of society that we want? You say there should be no rules. Does that mean that we can kill each other without punishment?

MURPHY I already told you. I didn't kill anyone.

CONNOR I say we float him.

The crowd cries out in agreement.

CLARKE That's not what I'm saying.

CONNOR Why not? He deserves to float. It's justice.

CLARKE Revenge isn't justice.

CONNOR It's justice. Float him!

Connor starts chanting 'Float him' and the crowd joins in.

CLARKE No! Get off him! Get off of him! Let him go! You can't do this!

[to Bellamy] You can stop this! They'll listen to you!

CONNOR Bellamy! You should do it.

The crowd starts chanting Bellamy's name.

CLARKE [...] I know you're not a killer. Bellamy, don't do this. Don't do this.

Bellamy approaches the stool Murphy stands on.

CLARKE Don't. Bellamy. No! No! You can't do this, Bellamy.

Bellamy turns around to Murphy who is pleading with him. He kicks the stool away.

CLARKE Oh God. No! How could you?

BELLAMY [to Clarke] This is on you, princess. You should've kept your mouth shut.

SCENE 7: *The 100: Season 1, Episode 7: 00:07:29*

Bellamy and his followers drag Lincoln into their base.

BELLAMY [to Clarke] It's time to get some answers.

OCTAVIA Oh you mean revenge?

BELLAMY I mean interrogation. Get him upstairs.

CLARKE She's right. Look, this is not who we are.

BELLAMY It is now.

SCENE 8: *The 100: Season 1, Episode 7: 00:17:12*

Clarke enters the basement where Lincoln is kept. Her way is blocked by one of Bellamy's recruits.

CLARKE Get the hell out of my way.

BELLAMY It's okay. Let her through.

Clarke enters the room and perceives a bloody Lincoln whose hands and feet are shackled and is held up by the ropes.

CLARKE Well, if he didn't hate us before he does now.

BELLAMY Who cares. How's Finn?

CLARKE Alive. His people will care. How long until they figure out where he is? And what happens when they do? I mean, when they come looking for him? They will, Bellamy!

BELLAMY Relax, princess! No one saw us take him. He was chained up in that cave the entire time and thanks to the storm, we didn't see a soul on the way back. In case you're interested, his people are already killing us. How many of our people will need to die until you realize we're fighting a war?

CLARKE We're not soldiers, Bellamy. Look at him! We can't win!

BELLAMY You're right, we can't. If. We don't. Fight.

SCENE 9: *The 100: Season 1, Episode 8: 00:36:00*

BELLAMY Let the Grounders come. We've been afraid of them far too long. Because of their knives and spears. Well, I don't know about you, but I am tired of being afraid.

CLARKE These are weapons, okay? Not toys. And we have to be prepared to give them up to the guard when the drop ships come. But until then, they are gonna help keep us safe.

BELLAMY And there are plenty more where these came from. Tomorrow we start training. If the Grounders come, we're gonna be ready to fight.

SCENE 10: *The 100: Season 1, Episode 8: 00:38:01*

JAHA Mr. Blake. I've wanted to talk to you for a long time now.

CLARKE Before you do, I'd like to say something. When you sent us down here, you sent us to die. But, miraculously, most of us are still alive. In large part, that is because of him, because of Bellamy. He's one of us, and he deserves to be pardoned of his crimes, just like the rest of us.

JAHA Clarke, I appreciate your point of view, but it's not that simple.

BELLAMY It is, if you wanna know who on the Ark wants you dead.

JAHA Bellamy Blake, you are pardoned for your crimes. Now tell me who gave you the gun.

SCENE 11: *The 100: Season 1, Episode 9: 00:18:50*

During The 100's celebration, Finn approaches Clarke. He privately tells her about his talk with the Grounder Lincoln and his agreement to a meeting with their leader.

FINN I need you to come with me but I can't tell you why.

CLARKE Finn, tell me why.

FINN I set up a meeting with the Grounders.

CLARKE A meeting? I don't understand. With who? How?

FINN I was just with the Grounder that we had in the drop ship. His name is Lincoln.

CLARKE Wait a second. He spoke to you?

FINN It's not important. If we want to live in peace...

CLARKE Finn, we can't live in peace with people who've done nothing but kill us.

FINN Can you think of a better way to stop the bloodshed.

CLARKE Yeah, with the guns that the guards bring down.

FINN Do you really want a war? At this rate, that's what's coming. Look, I know it's a long shot. But this is our world now and I think we can do better than the first time round. I trust him.

CLARKE I don't. But if we go, we have to bring backup!

FINN No way. We're not bringing guns. Those weren't the terms. And if we're gonna do this, we have to give it a fair shot.

CLARKE Ok, I'll get my pack and I'll meet you at the gate.
[...]

Clarke approaches Bellamy and informs him about the meeting with the Grounders.

CLARKE Hey! I need to talk to you!

BELLAMY Having fun yet, princess?

CLARKE I'm serious!

BELLAMY You always are. So talk!

CLARKE Finn set up a meeting with the Grounders. I'm leaving to go talk to them.

BELLAMY So you forget that impaling people on spears is cold for "Let's be friends"? You lost your damn mind?

CLARKE I think it might be worth a shot! I mean, we do have to live with these people!

BELLAMY He probably guts you, string you up as a warning.

CLARKE That's why I'm here. I need you to follow us. Be our backup.

BELLAMY Does Finn know about this?

CLARKE Finn doesn't need to know. And, Bellamy? Bring guns.

SCENE 12: *The 100: Season 1, Episode 9: 00:30:15*

Anja and Clarke approach each other.

ANJA Your name is Clarke?

CLARKE Yes.

ANJA I'm Anja.

Clarke holds out her hand to Anja, who does not show any inclination of shaking it but calmly assesses her.

CLARKE I think we got off to a rough start. But we wanna find a way to live together. In peace.

ANJA I understand. You started a war you don't know how to end.

CLARKE What? No. We didn't start anything. You attacked us for no reason.

ANJA No reason? The missiles you launched burned a village to the ground.

CLARKE The flares? No. That was a signal. Meant for our families. We had no idea.

ANJA You're invaders. Your ship landed in our territory.

CLARKE We didn't know anyone was here. We thought the ground was uninhabited.

ANJA You knew we were here when you sent an armed raiding party to capture and torture him. These are all acts of war.

CLARKE I see your point. That's why we need to put an end to all of this.

ANJA Lincoln said there are more of you coming down. Warriors.

CLARKE The guard, yes. But also farmers, doctors, engineers. We can help each other. But not if we're at war.

ANJA Can you promise that these new arrivals won't attack us? That they respect the terms you and I agree on?

CLARKE I promise I will do anything I can to convince them to honor the terms we set.

ANJA Why would I agree on an alliance that your people can break the moment they get here?

[...]

CLARKE Those people coming down won't bother negotiating. Our technology. They will wipe you out.

ANJA They wouldn't be the first to try.

SCENE 13: *The 100: Season 1, Episode 10: 00:04:45*

Bellamy and Clarke enter the tent Murphy is held captive.

BELLAMY [to the people] Where is he?

The behold Murphy sitting on the ground severely wounded, apparently having been tortured.

[to the people] Everyone but Con and Derek out! Now!

DEREK He claims he's with the Grounders.

CONNOR We caught him trying to sneak back into the camp.

MURPHY I wasn't sneaking. I was running from the Grounders.

BELLAMY Anyone see Grounders?

Con and Derek shake their heads.

BELLAMY Well, in that case.

Bellamy raises his gun and aims at Murphy.

FINN What the hell is wrong with you?

BELLAMY We were clear what would happen if he came back!

FINN No! If he was with the Grounders then he knows things that can help us!

BELLAMY Help us? We hanged him, we banished him, and now we're gonna kill him. Get the hell out of my way!

CLARKE No! Finn's right!

Clarke approaches Murphy and tends to him.

BELLAMY Like hell he is! Clarke! Think about Charlotte!

CLARKE I am thinking about her. But what happened to Charlotte was as much our fault as his. He's not lying. His fingernails were torn off. They tortured him.

FINN You and the Grounders should compare notes.

BELLAMY [to Finn] The Grounders know we're at war.

[to Murphy] What did you tell them about us?

MURPHY Everything.

Clarke gets up and walks up to Bellamy.

CLARKE [to Bellamy] Once he's better, we find out what he knows and then he's out of here, ok?

Clarke walks towards the tent's exit.

BELLAMY [to Clarke] And what if he refuses to leave? What do we do with him then?

CLARKE Then we kill him.

SCENE 14: *The 100: Season 1, Episode 12: 00:37:23*

BELLAMY This is our home now. We built this from nothing with our bare hands. Our dead are buried behind this wall. In this ground. Our ground. The Grounders think they can take that away. They think that because we came from the sky we don't belong here. But they're yet to realize one very important fact. We're on the ground now. And that means we are Grounders.

MAN And we have guns!

BELLAMY Damn right! I say let 'em come!

CLARKE Bellamy's right. If we leave, we may never find a place as safe as this. And God knows, in this world, we can be faced with something even worse tomorrow. But that doesn't change the simple fact, that if we stay here, we will die tonight. So pack your things. Just take what you can carry. Now!

7. Bibliography

Primary Sources

The 100. Season 1. Created by The CW. Produced by Jason Rothenberg. 2014-. Warner Bros. Television.

- Episode 1 "Pilot". *The 100*. Screenplay by Jason Rothenberg. Director Jason Rothenberg. The CW. March 19, 2014.
- Episode 2 "Earth Skills". *The 100*. Screenplay by Jason Rothenberg. Director Dean White. The CW. March 26, 2014.
- Episode 3 "Earth Kills". *The 100*. Screenplay by Jason Rothenberg, Sarah Fain, Elizabeth Craft, Akela Cooper. Director Dean White. The CW. April 2, 2014.
- Episode 4 "Murphy's Law". *The 100*. Screenplay by T.J. Brady, Rasheed Newson. Director P.J. Pesce. The CW. April 9, 2014.
- Episode 6 "His Sister's Keeper". *The 100*. Screenplay by Jason Rothenberg, Tracy Bellomo, Dorothy Fortenberry, Akela Cooper. Director Wayne Rose. The CW. April 23, 2014.
- Episode 7 "Contents Under Pressure". *The 100*. Screenplay by Jason Rothenberg, Akela Cooper, Kira Snyder. Director John F. Showalter. April 30, 2014.
- Episode 8 "Day Trip". *The 100*. Screenplay by Jason Rothenberg, Elizabeth Craft, Sarah Fain, Andrei Haq. Director Matt Barber. May 7, 2014.
- Episode 9 "Unity Day". *The 100*. Screenplay by Jason Rothenberg, Kim Shumway, Kira Snyder. Director John Behring. The CW. May 14, 2014.
- Episode 10 "I Am Become Death". *The 100*. Screenplay by Jason Rothenberg, T.J. Brady, Rasheed Newson. Director Omar Madha. The CW. May 21, 2014.
- Episode 12 "We Are Grounders: Part 2". *The 100*. Screenplay by Jason Rothenberg. Director Dean White. The CW. June 11, 2014.

Secondary Sources

- Anderson, Bridget. *Us and Them? The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Baranowski, Andreas; Hecht, Michael Heiko. "Effect of Camera Angle on Perception of Trust and Attractiveness". *Empirical Studies of the Arts* 36 (1) (2018): 90-100.
- Bass, Bernard. *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership. Theory, Research & Managerial Applications*. New York: The Free Press, 1990.
- Bennett, Tony. "Popular Culture and the Turn to Gramsci". *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: A Reader*. 4th edition. London: Pearson Education, 2009.
- Bennis, Warren Gamaliel; Nanus, Burton. *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

- Berger, Arthur Asa. *Narratives in Popular Culture, Media, and Everyday Life*. California: SAGE Publications, 1997.
- Bernsen, Daniel. *Praxishandbuch historisches Lernen und Medienbildung im digitalen Zeitalter*. Opladen, Berlin, Toronto: Barbara Budrich, 2017.
- Bizzel, Patricia; Herzberg, Bruce. *The Rhetorical Tradition. Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Boston: Bedford, 1990.
- Broda-Bahm, Kenneth T., Kempf, Daniela; Driscoll, William J. *Argument and Audience: Presenting Debates in Public Settings*. New York: The International Debate Education Association, 2004.
- Brown, Michael E., Trevino, Linda K., Harrison, David A. "Ethical leadership: A Social Learning Perspective for Construct Development and Testing". *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 97 (2005): 117–134.
- Brown, Stephen M. "Male Versus Female Leaders/ A Comparison of Empirical Studies". *Sex Roles* (5) (1979): 595-611.
- Burns, James MacGregor. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Butler, Judith. "Critically Queer". *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 1 (1993): 17-32.
- Butler, Judith. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge. 2004.
- Cameron, Deborah. "Performing Gender Identity: Young Men's Talk and the Construction of Heterosexual Masculinity". Ed. Johnson, Sally; Meinhof, Ulrike Hanna. *Language and Masculinity*. Oxford: Blackwell. 1997.
- Cawthon, David L. "Leadership: The great man theory revisited." *Business Horizons* 39 (3) (1996): 1-4.
- Ciulla, Joanne B. *Ethics, the Heart of Leadership*. California: ABY-CLIO, LLC, 2014.
- Collier, Paul. *Economic Causes of Civil Conflict and their Implications for Policy*. Washington D.C.: Economics of Crime and Violence Paper, 2006.
- Coser, Lewis A. "Social Conflict and the Theory of Social Change". *The British Journal of Sociology* 8 (3) (1957): 197-207.
- Cousins, Ben. "Potential and pitfalls of 'communal' land tenure reform: experience in Africa and implications for South Africa. Paper for World Bank conference on 'Land Governance in support of the MDGs: Responding to new challenges'". *Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS), University of the Western Cape* (2009): 1-21.
- Davis, Stanley M. "Enterpreneurial Succession". *Administrative Science Quarterly. Special Issue on Organizations and Social Development* 13 (3) (1968): 402-416.
- Donald, Ralph; MacDonald, Karen. *Women in War Film: From Helpless Heroine to G.I. Jane*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2014.
- Doolen, Andy. *Fugitive Empire. Locating Early American Imperialism*. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Eagly, Alice H., Johannesen-Schmidt, Mary C. "The Leadership Styles of Women and Men". *Journal of Social Issues* 57 (4) (2001): 781-797.
- Eco, Umberto. *Über Spiegel und andere Phänomene*. München: Carl Hanser, 1988.

- Francis, Robert; Bennett, Sue; Stockwin, Dave. *Lord of the Flies by William Golding. Study and Revise for GCSE*. London: Hodder Education Group, 2016.
- French, John R.P.; Raven, Bertram. "The bases of social power". *Studies in social power*. (1959): 259-269.
- Gerbner, George. *Violence In TV Drama: A Study Of Trends & Symbolic Functions*. Pennsylvania: Annenberg School of Communications, 1970.
- Gibbs, John Edward. *Mise-en-scène. Film Style and Interpretation*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Giddens, Anthony, *The Nation-State and Violence: Volume Two of a Historical Critique of Historical Materialism*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1985.
- Gross, Michael L. *Moral Dilemmas of Modern War. Torture, Assassination, and Blackmail in an Age of Asymmetric Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2009.
- Gutman, Amy; Thompson, Dennis F. *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Hartigan, Richard Shelly, *Lieber's Code and the Law of War*. Chicago: Precedent Press, 1983.
- Hausen, Karin. *Geschlechtergeschichte als Gesellschaftsgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Grundlagen der Philosophie des Rechts, Theorie Werkausgabe*. 7th edition. Frankfurt/Main, 1971.
- Hora, Jasneet. "Shattering the highest and hardest glass ceiling, once and for all: How the 2020 election can change governance in the U.S. and beyond". *Journal of International Affairs* 72 (2) (2019): 133-144.
- Johnson, John M. "Guns as a Symbol of (Fill-in-the-Blank)". *Journal of Cultural Studies and Critical Methodologies* 17 (2) (2017): 110-113.
- Johnson, Stefanie K.; Murphy, Susan Elaine; Zewdie, Selamawit; Reichard, Rebecca J. "The strong, sensitive type: Effects of gender stereotypes and leadership prototypes on the evaluation of male and female leaders." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 106 (2008): 39-60.
- Juslin, Patrik; Sloboda, John. *Music and emotion: Theory and Research. Series in affective science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Kennedy, George Alexander. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Kinder, Donald R.; Kam, Cindy D. *Us Against Them. Ethnocentric Foundations of American Opinion*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Klevan, Andrew. *Disclosure of the Everyday: Undramatic Achievement in Narrative Film*. Trowbridge: Flicks Books, 2000.
- Komarraju, Meera; Karau, Steven J., Schmeck, Ronald R., Avdic, Alen. "The Big Five personality traits, learning styles, and academic achievement". *Personality and Individual Differences* (51) (2011): 472-477.
- Kuhnert, Karl W., Lewis, Philip. "Transactional and Transformational Leadership: A Constructive / Developmental Analysis". *The Academy of Management Review* 12(4) (1987). 648-657.

- McCartney, Paul. *Power and Progress. American National Identity, the War of 1898, and the Rise of American Imperialism*. Louisiana: State University Press, 2006.
- McLuhan, Marshall. *Die magischen Kanäle. Understanding Media*. Düsseldorf - Wien: Econ, 1968.
- Meyer, Herrmann Julius. *Das große Conversations-Lexikon*. 12th ed. Hildburghausen: Bibliographische Institut, 1848.
- Miller, William Ian. *Eye for an Eye*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Mittell, Jason. "Narrative Complexity in Contemporary American Television." *The Velvet Light Trap* 58 (1) (2006): 29-40.
- Mendonca, Manuel; Kanungo, Rabindra Nath. *Ethical Leadership*. New York: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press, 2007.
- Moore, B.V. "The May conference on leadership". *Personnel Journal* 6 (1927): 124-128.
- Mothershead, J.L. *Ethics: Modern Conceptions of the Principles of Right*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1955.
- Neilson, George. *Trial by combat*. New York: Macmillan, 1891.
- Northouse, Peter G. *Leadership. Theory and Practice*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, 2013.
- Nünning, Ansgar; Nünning, Vera. *Konzepte der Kulturwissenschaften. Theoretische Grundlagen - Ansätze - Perspektiven*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 2003.
- Olmsted, Wendy. *Rhetoric. An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Özbağ, Gönül Kaya. "The Role of Personality in Leadership: Five Factor Personality Traits and Ethical Leadership". *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 235 (2016): 235-242.
- Pallaske, Christoph. *Medien machen Geschichte. Neue Anforderungen an den geschichtsdidaktischen Medienbegriff im digitalen Wandel*. Berlin: Logos, 2015.
- Paul, James. *Globalism, Nationalism, Tribalism: Bringing Theory Back in. Towards a Theory of Abstract Community*. 2nd edition. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2006.
- Paxton, Pamela; Hughes, Melanie. *Women, Politics and Power. A Global Perspective Second Edition*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, 2014.
- Pieper, Annemarie. *Einführung in die Ethik*. 6th edition. Tübingen and Basel: A. Francke Verlag, 2007.
- Pye, Doug. "Movies and Point of View". *Movie* 36 (2000): 2-34.
- Revelle, William; Eysenck, Hans. "Personality theorist". *Personality and Individual Differences* (103) (2016): 32-39.
- Rivkin, Naphtali. "Julius Caesar and the Art of Rhetoric". *Future Human Image* 4 (1) (2014): 102-109.
- Rost, Joseph C. *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger, 1991.
- Schroeder, David; Graziano, William. *The Oxford Handbook of Prosocial Behavior*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2015.
- Sen, Udit. "Developing Terra Nullius: Colonialism, Nationalism, and Indigeneity in the Andaman Islands. South Asian Studies and History". *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 59 (4) (2017): 944–973.

- Shamir, Boas; Arthur, Michael B.; House, Robert J. "The Rhetoric of Charismatic Leadership: A Theoretical Extension, A Case Study, and Implications for Research." *Leadership Quarterly* 5 (1) (1994): 25-42.
- Shanahan, James. *Television and its viewers: Cultivation theory and research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Shaw, Christopher. "The International Proscription against Torture and The United States' categorial and qualified responses". *Boston College International & Comparative Law Review* 32 (2) (2009): 289-303.
- Slaughter, Richard A. *Futures Beyond Dystopia. Creating Social Foresight*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Spitzer, Sonja; Wieser, Christina. *Frauen.Management.Report 2017. Aufsichtsrat, Geschäftsführung und Prokura*. Wien: Kammer für Arbeiter und Angestellte für Wien, 2017.
- Stange, Mary Zeiss, Oyster, Carol K. *Gun women: Firearms and feminism in contemporary America*. New York: New York University Press, 2000.
- Storey, John. *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: An Introduction*. 4th edition. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2009.
- Stuckless, Noreen. "The Influence of Anger, Perceived Injustice, Revenge, and Time on the Quality of Life of survivor-victims". Diss. York University, 1996.
- Turner, Graeme. *British Cultural Studies: An Introduction*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Uhl, Kristen Elizabeth. "Freedom of Information Act Post-9/11: Balancing the Public's Right to Know, Critical Infrastructure Protection, and Homeland Security". *American University Law Review* 53 (1) (2003): 261-311.
- Vroom, Victor; Slocum, John. "Leadership and the decision-making process". *Organizational Dynamics* 28 (4) (2000): 82-94.
- Waterfield, Robin. *Aristotle. The Art of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. Kindle file.
- Weir, Michael. "Concepts of property". *The National Legal Eagle* 7(1) (2001).
- Whitworth, Sandra. *Men, Militarism, and UN Peacekeeping: A Gendered Analysis*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2004
- Wimmer, Andreas. "Explaining xenophobia and racism: A critical review of current research approaches". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 20 (1): 17-41.
- Zaleznik, Abraham. "Managers and leaders: Are they different?" *Harvard Business Review* 55 (1977): 67-78.
- Zevin, Robert. "An Interpretation of American Imperialism". *The Journal of Economic History* 32 (1): 316 - 360.

Internet Sources

- The 100 buries a grim heart beneath layers of sexy fun*. Ed. Emily VanDerWerff. The A.V. Club. 19 March 2014.

<<https://tv.avclub.com/the-100-buries-a-grim-heart-beneath-layers-of-sexy-fun-1798179857>>

The 100. International Movie Database (IMDB). 13 Oct. 2019.

<<https://pro.imdb.com/title/tt2661044/>>

The 100: Season One Ratings. TVSeriesFinale.com. My Design Studio. 13 Jan. 2020.

<<https://tvseriesfinale.com/tv-show/the-100-season-one-ratings-31866/>>

Two new cable series for Wednesday night. Ed. Tirdad Derakhshani. Philadelphia Inquirer. 19 March 2014.

<https://www.inquirer.com/philly/entertainment/television/20140319_Two_new_cables_series_for_Wednesday_night.html>

Women in Action Movies: Empowered Role Models or Chicks with Guns?

Ed. Charlotte Starlet. Helium. 9 May 2007.

<www.helium.com/items/125634-women-in-action-movies-empowered-role-models-or-chicks-with-guns.>

8. Abstract (English)

Women occupying leadership positions have encountered gender-related bias up until contemporary times. To challenge this issue, recent shows such as *The 100*, a dystopian young adult production, have adopted the narrative of female leadership. As a matter of fact, popular media productions exert immense influence on a large viewership. Thus, their show-runners bear the responsibility to produce contents encouraging a process of reflection within their extra-diegetic audience. In fact, they are given the realistic chance to reverse stereotypical representations of female leaders and influence their reception.

Concerning *The 100*, the development of the show's two leaders, Bellamy Blake and Clarke Griffin, provides insight in the diegetic presentation of both an aspiring female and male leader. This allows for their comparison and critical evaluation in terms of gender role expectations. To gather data, the lead characters's rhetorical practice, their leadership acts, exhibited behavior and respective staging is analyzed and compared to research conducted in the field of female and male leadership studies. These areas provide evidence in how far the leaders conform to stereotypical characteristics. Central to the analysis is the leaders's ability to engage the people for intended goals and receive positive feedback, which provides evidence about the leader's success. At the end of this thesis, the reader is going to learn whether the successful female leader unaffected by gender bias is still a myth in both contemporary reality and fiction.

9. Abstract (German)

Noch in der heutigen Zeit haben Frauen in Führungspositionen mit geschlechtsspezifischen Vorurteilen zu kämpfen. Um gegen diese Problematik vorzugehen haben einige zeitgenössische Serien, unter anderem *The 100*, eine amerikanische Science-Fiction Serie, die Thematik der weiblichen Führung aufgegriffen. Tatsächlich üben Produkte der Massenmedien durch ihre Reichweite einen immensen Einfluss auf ein breitgefächertes Publikum aus. Daher haben die Produzenten und Produzentinnen solcher Medien die Verantwortung, Inhalte zu veröffentlichen, welche zur kritischen Auseinandersetzung kontroverser Thematiken anregen. Dementsprechend bieten fiktive Narrative die Möglichkeit, Stereotypen der Männlichkeit und Weiblichkeit und die ungleiche Machtverteilung zwischen den Geschlechtern zu dekonstruieren.

Im Fall der Serie *The 100*, die Narration des Werdegangs der zwei Anführer Bellamy Blake und Clarke Griffin ist ein Beispiel einer fiktiven Darstellung zweier Führungskandidaten unterschiedlichen Geschlechts. Diese Gegebenheit macht den direkten Vergleich und die Evaluierung der Charaktere hinsichtlich gängiger Geschlechterrollen möglich. Um diesbezüglich Daten zu erheben werden rhetorische Praktiken, Führungsstrategien, Verhaltensmuster und Inszenierungen der Anführer analysiert. Die Resultate verweisen darauf, inwiefern die zwei Führungskräfte Stereotypen entsprechen. Ein zentraler Fokus der Analyse ist deren Fähigkeit, ihr Publikum für sich zu gewinnen. Gegen Ende der Arbeit soll aufgeklärt werden, ob die erfolgreiche weibliche Führungskraft unbeeinflusst von geschlechtsspezifischen Vorurteilen nicht nur in der Realität, sondern auch in fiktionalen Narrativen ein Mythos ist.