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Abstract: The purpose of this essay is to compare and contrast the two novels by focusing on leadership and group dynamics. First, I explain some general terms like primary and secondary groups, leader and leadership, and five different leadership styles (autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, task-motivated and relationship-motivated leader), and then I apply the terms to the novels. In the analysis I examine how some followers and group constellations react to different kinds of leadership, and how the three leaders choose to approach their roles and why they become successful or not.

The effect the democratic leadership has on both leaders and followers differs between the novels. Homer in *Tomorrow, When the War Began* trusts his leadership skills and gets appreciation from the primary group of friends he leads, while Ralph in *Lord of the Flies* is disobeyed and challenged by his secondary group. The group of teenagers grows stronger together, while the island boys disband as a result of the power struggle between Ralph and Jack. The latter trusts his charisma and threatens and punishes the boys in order to keep them under control. Jack seems successful as an autocratic leader, since his followers carry out his orders and let him be the unquestioned leader, but he is in the final analysis unsuccessful since he fails to put the needs of his followers before his own strong desire for power. Both Homer and Jack are strong leaders of their own primary group, and one argument why they are more successful than Ralph is the loyalty they receive from their followers. However, the reason for their faithfulness differs. In Homer’s case it is friendship, and in Jack’s case it is fear of what he will do to them if they defy him.
Even though there is almost forty years between the first publications of William Golding’s *Lord of the Flies* (1954) and John Marsden’s *Tomorrow, When the War Began* (1993), both novels deal with the same topic: young people who have to find a way of surviving without the guidance of adults in a world at war. In the first novel a group of schoolboys of different ages ends up on a deserted island after a plane crash. In the latter, eight teenagers (four girls and four boys) become resistance fighters who hide out in a secluded mountainous area when their country is invaded by a foreign army. Both the children and the teenagers have to rely on themselves for survival. The two groups use different strategies to cope with these new conditions, including trying out various forms of leadership. The young leaders soon realise that new rules and values apply to these unfamiliar circumstances. The pressure on the groups increases over time, and like a pressure cooker the steam eventually has to be let out. In *Lord of the Flies* (*Lord*) we can follow how the tension escalates into animosity and death, but in *Tomorrow, When the War Began* (*Tomorrow*), we do not see the total breakdown, because this is only the first novel in a series of seven books.¹ However, Georges T. Dodds states that the characters in *Tomorrow* are on the verge of “developing […] shell shock” and they do suffer from posttraumatic stress in the subsequent novels (n.p.). Moreover, Richard Simpson mentions that they kill enemies, not in self-defence, but in order to relieve some of the stress they have built up (Simpson, *Overview*).

This essay will compare and contrast the two novels by focusing on leadership. Since it is almost impossible to analyse leadership without looking at group dynamics, I will also examine how various forms of leadership affect certain group members as well as the group dynamics. I begin with defining terms such as “leadership” and “leadership styles”, as well as “primary” and “secondary” groups, before I move on to the analysis of the novels where the terms are applied. I choose to analyse and compare the two democratic leaders, Ralph and Homer, before I take a closer look at the authoritarian style represented by Jack, and compare his leadership to the other boys’. In the last part of the essay the focus is on some of the followers.

First of all, I want to elucidate the terms “leader” and “leadership”. One definition of leader is someone “who is given responsibility for directing and monitoring a group’s activities or who assumes primary responsibility for the group’s tasks” (“Leader”). If a leader becomes successful or not depends on his or her ability to “influence the activities of a group,

¹ The main reason why I only use one of the books in the *Tomorrow* Series, is because it is necessary to limit the analysis of primary sources since this is only a C-essay.
by initiating structures (such as goal setting), which enable the group to successfully overcome mutual problems and to achieve their group goals” (“Leadership behaviour”). Furthermore, the leadership is dependent on the “forces in the leader […] the followers and […] the situation”, which for example include the extent to which the leader trusts his or her own capability, how inclined the other group members are to take on some responsibility, and how complicated the problems the group has to solve are (“Tannenbaum-Schmidt continuum”). Another important factor of leadership is whether or not the leader has charisma. A charismatic leader is good at communicating his or her vision and motivating the subordinates “through personal magnetism”, but the manners can sometimes be bizarre or unconventional (“Charismatic leader”).

Leadership can be classified into several types and in this essay I will deal with five of them. I am going to apply some significant traits to the three leaders Homer, Ralph and Jack in order to illustrate their different approaches to the task of being a leader. The following classification is put together by me using the Internet based Dictionary of Business and Management. The first two leadership types are taken from the Tannenbaum-Schmidt continuum which states that at the one end of the scale there is the “leader-centred (autocratic)” style and at the other end there is the “subordinate-centred (democratic)” style. The autocratic or authoritarian leader “makes all major decisions himself or herself and takes a highly dominant role in interactions with subordinates”, whereas the democratic leader strives to make the group members feel as if they are all equal, and he or she is therefore willing to transfer some of the responsibilities concerning for instance “planning [and] decision making […] to followers”. In my analysis of the novels I will show that both autocratic and democratic leadership are represented. However, there are other types of leadership styles that are not based on the continuum mentioned above. A third type of leadership style, called the “laissez-faire leader”, gives the followers freedom to carry out the work by themselves without any guidelines. One can even say that this type of leader has resigned from his or her role of authority. Furthermore, Fred Fiedler suggests another classification of two other leadership styles where the focus is either on work or relations (as quoted in “Contingency theories of leadership”). In the first case, that is, when the leader is task-motivated, it is of primary interest to define “goals and the means to achieve them”, as well as “defining roles and responsibilities”. In the latter case, when the leader is relationship-motivated, he or she

---

2 All leadership terms used in this paragraph can be found through Oxford Reference Online. For further information see the entry on Law in Works cited.
tries to assist and inspire the subordinates, eliminate any grounds for conflicts and also raise
the morale within the group. In addition, the relationship-motivated leader has confidence in
the followers’ competence, is interested in their ideas and is sensitive towards their feelings.

So far the focus has been on the leader and the supervision of the group, but the analysis
of leadership also demands a closer look at the followers and the bond between them and the
leader (Schneider 9). The study of group dynamics involves the examination of the
organisation of the group and the interaction between the members, to mention just a few
aspects (“Group”). One can distinguish between a primary group and a secondary group by
observing how extensive the eye-to-eye communication is, if there are any close connections
between the members, and also by considering if there is a “mutual identification among [the]
individuals” (“Primary groups”). A primary group is an intimate constellation consisting of
family and close friends. These people are very important in the creation of a personal
identity, but also in the development of the identity one shares within the group. In a
secondary group, on the contrary, the members have a more impersonal relationship based on
a spontaneous alliance and have little, if any, face-to-face contact and therefore these
members do not have a strong sense of loyalty towards the others (“Primary groups”).

The first chapter of Lord gives the impression that it is an ordinary adventure story about
male friendship, mainly because a group of boys is stranded on an island without parents,
teachers or any other adult authority. The boys experience the island like an Eden on earth
(Friedman 65). They play in the water, and can easily find fruits to eat and fresh water to
drink, but it is all an illusion that later turns into a living hell when the power struggle for the
leadership between the two oldest boys, Ralph and Jack, spins out of control. The original
group, consisting of all schoolboys, can be termed a secondary group, since there are no
family ties between the boys, except for the twins Sam and Eric. However, some are members
of a choir, who can be regarded as a primary group within the larger group because it is
apparent that this constellation was established before the plane crash. The first time they are
introduced to the reader they sing while they march on the beach to the assembly. The
hierarchy in this primary group is strict. Jack is in command, and he shouts orders to the
singers and they obey him. In fact, the members of the choir are the only ones who vote for
Jack as leader in the following election. They support him reluctantly, and as soon as Ralph is
appointed they applaud and are pleased with the result. Ralph treats the choirboys as a unit,
and he immediately acknowledges that Jack is their leader. No one objects when Jack, with
the support of Ralph, turns the choir into a hunting team. Now Jack’s group has a specific task
to carry out, but most importantly it is allowed to stay intact, which puts Jack in a better position when he later challenges Ralph, because he knows he has some allies.

Looking at the way the power struggle, violence and evil actions escalate in Lord, one can say that the novel ends in a hell of terror and murder, while Tomorrow starts there, because the teenagers seek adventure on a camping trip in an isolated area called Hell. Despite the name it is a peaceful place where they relax, read books or take a walk in the surroundings. One easily thinks of an Eden, and just as in Paradise the harmony is interrupted by a snake, but in this case it is trapped in a sleeping bag before it is set free. The incident is important for two reasons: it scatters the group for the first time when everyone tries to save himself or herself without thinking about the others’ safety, and it is also a premonition that something bad is going to happen. Later that night Ellie wakes up and hears a sound in the distance, and when she looks up she sees some sort of aircraft:

[L]ike black bats screaming out of the sky, blotting out the stars, a V-shaped line of jets raced overhead, very low overhead. Then another, then another, till six lines in all had stormed through the sky above me. Their noise, their speed, their darkness frightened me. [...] It seemed that they were gone. [...] But something remained. The air didn’t seem as clear, as pure. (Marsden 38)

Afterwards, Ellie states that an enemy does not “have to walk into a place to invade it” (Marsden 38). Their Eden is gone, and they are literally in Hell.

In contrast to the boys in Lord, these teenagers form a primary group, since most of them are friends who go to the same school, some are neighbours and one couple is boyfriend and girlfriend. Ellie even considers Homer to be her adopted brother. The group solidarity is very strong. It is “[a]ll for one and one for all” (Marsden 79), as illustrated in the aftermath of the jet attack on Corrie’s house. She is hysterical and the others cannot get through to her. Nothing calms her down, and all the group can do is “stay there and wait, hoping the planes would not come back, hoping they would not send soldiers in trucks. Corrie would not move, and we could not move until she did” (Marsden 117).

Besides the division into either primary or secondary groups, there are other factors important for understanding the group dynamics that differentiate the two novels. One aspect is the social backgrounds of the characters. In Tomorrow, several social classes are represented. Ellie and Homer live in a rural area, and their families are farmers. One girl belongs to the upper class – her parents are lawyers – and she lives in a big house in town, which she is sometimes teased about. Unlike Golding, who only has “a homogeneous group of middle-class white children [where there] is no racial tension, no sexual tension, no tension
of cultural difference” (Woodward 91), Marsden writes about a multi-cultural group. Nevertheless, Catriona Ross criticises Marsden for using stereotypes when associating Homer, the boy of Greek heritage, with oily hair, and the Asian boy with “sexual exoticism” (93).

The gender aspect is another important factor not only when one analyses the group dynamics but also when one observes how Marsden reinvents the adventure story genre. His choice of writing about both girls and boys challenges traditional gender roles. Rather than the expected male, a girl, Ellie, is the protagonist and narrator in Tomorrow. Ellie is strong, inventive and daring, and she takes on dangerous assignments such as driving different kinds of vehicles into the enemy zones in order to rescue friends, or cause trouble for the enemies. Homer is also aware of the gender aspect and at one point when the group has to split up, he says it is not “fair to have an all girls group and an all guys group” (Marsden 115). When the boys and girls live close together in Hell it generates sexual tension, and in between the raids the teenagers experience love.

Like Marsden, Golding challenges the adventure story genre. What will a group of boys do when no adults are there to set the boundary between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour? Where they cannot sit down at a laid table and eat a cooked meal or be consoled by parents when they are afraid. When Golding’s boys first arrive on the island they do know about assemblies, rules and the need for leadership. In the new unfamiliar surroundings they imitate the familiar structure of an adult society. Therefore, they easily adjust to the situation; that is, they sit down on the beach after Ralph, the self-appointed leader, has blown the conch – the symbol of order – and wait for him to talk. Supported by Piggy, Ralph has now taken the first steps toward becoming the leader of the group. When it is time to vote the younger children are impressed by “his size, and attractive appearance” (Golding 19), but most of all they see the conch in his lap and they know that he was the one who summoned them. Ralph shows that he wants to be democratic and fair by making sure that the boys are allowed to vote for either him or Jack before the leader is finally appointed.

From the very beginning Ralph “assumes primary responsibility for the group’s tasks” (Leader”) when he starts organising their living, because he realises that not doing so will result in “savagery and moral chaos” (Hynes 59). When one observes Ralph’s actions, it becomes obvious that he is not only a task-motivated leader, but also a democratic leader. Evidence to support the former is that he leads an expedition through the forest in order to find out if the island is deserted or not. Ralph also wants shelters to be built where they can sleep, branches to be collected for a signal fire and a specific place beyond the bathing-pool to be used as a lavatory. Furthermore, Ralph introduces rules when he tells the boys that they
have to have “‘Hands up’ like at school” (Golding 31) and that only the person holding the conch is allowed to speak. These are wise decisions, because “Hands up” is a familiar ritual that is supposed to bring order to the assemblies. In addition, the conch makes the boys feel they participate; when holding it they get a chance to speak their mind and the others must listen. It is a significant trait for a democratic leader to aim for an environment of equality.

Without a doubt, Ralph is also a relationship-motivated leader. He is compassionate and caring when he tries to comfort “‘the littluns’” (Golding 61) by saying there is no beast to be afraid of. Ralph is interested in what the other boys think, and he listens to them and what they have to say before he makes decisions. His closest follower, Piggy, thinks a great deal about what has to be done and how they can do it, and Ralph brings up Piggy’s ideas at the assemblies. In brief, these are all examples that support the fact that Ralph is a complex leadership figure. He wants to be a sympathetic and egalitarian leader who does not avoid his responsibilities, but he is only twelve years old and has neither the experience needed for the task nor the support from the other boys as I will show later in the essay.

The way the leader is chosen is one of the differences between the novels. As has been noted, the group in Lord elects Ralph, so one can say that he is given the responsibility, whereas in Tomorrow there is no formal election and the individuals share the responsibility of leading the group when they are still just out camping. However, when they realise that the situation has changed, that is, when they have to hide from the invaders and later decide to fight back, Homer rises to the occasion when he takes on the role of a task-motivated leader. He shows qualities that nobody in the group knew he possessed, probably not even himself. The metamorphosis from a troublemaker at school into a skilful leader of his peers is remarkable and baffles his friends since he usually does not even want to be part of a team. Ellie is amazed: “It was getting hard to remember that this fast-thinking guy, who’d just spent fifteen minutes getting us laughing and talking and feeling good again, wasn’t even trusted to hand out the books at school” (Marsden 101).

As a leader, Homer decides what they need to do and what measures have to be taken in order to succeed. He realises for example that they need to know what has happened to their families so he sends away a small group to gather information in town, while others are told to fetch “food, clothes, petrol, rifles, tools” (Marsden 107) for their base camp in Hell. Logical and tactical decisions are made when Homer carefully makes plans to avoid unnecessary risks. He makes up a “roundabout route” (Marsden 146) when they are being chased by soldiers, and he leads the discussion where they agree on the importance of setting
up “a fake camp […] to give the cover story credibility” (Marsden 172), to give a few examples.

In addition to defining goals for the group, Homer also specifies different roles and what responsibilities come with these functions, which further illustrates that he is a task-motivated leader. He delegates the task of being on sentry duty and the others take turns carrying out his orders. Homer possesses another strength, which is that he selects the best suited person for each mission. Since Ellie is one of two good drivers, she is hand-picked to participate in dangerous raids that involve driving a larger motor vehicle of some sort.

According to Tora Skodvin and Steinar Andresen, a “leader is supposed to look beyond his or her own interests and concerns, to the interests of a wider group” (16), and by doing just that Homer makes some tough decisions. He suggests that they “toughen up” (Marsden 106) and one way of doing that is to split into smaller units, because:

two people can move more quietly than seven. And […] if there are soldiers here and anyone’s caught…well, again, two’s better than seven. I hate to mention the fact, but five people free and two people locked up is a better equation than no people free and seven locked up. (Marsden 74)

This time the others agree with him and they divide the group. However, when Homer recommends that one person drive the wounded Corrie and leave her outside the hospital while the driver runs for his or her life, they object. Since Homer is not striving to be an autocratic leader, he does not force his suggestion onto his followers but accepts that they find another way of solving the task. This results in Kevin driving away with Corrie, his girlfriend, and staying with her even if it puts himself at risk.

Like Ralph, Homer does not represent only one leadership style. He combines different traits: he is task-motivated and democratic but also relationship-motivated. His democratic viewpoint is illustrated both when he votes for a Council of War and when he proposes what the group should do, but at the same time is open for what the other members might want to do: “I’ll tell you what I think. If there’s any major holes in it, tell me. Otherwise, let’s just do it, OK? We haven’t got time for long debates” (Marsden 114). As a relationship-motivated leader, Homer tries to make his followers feel better and lift their morale.

In my discussion of the democratic leaders, Ralph in *Lord* and Homer in *Tomorrow*, I find both differences and similarities between them. From the start it seems like Ralph’s leadership works well on the island. As we have seen, he organises the conditions under which they live, divides the work among the boys, makes up rules, comforts the young boys when they feel homesick, and has a strategy for how they are going to be rescued. However, Ralph soon
starts questioning his own leadership skills. He wonders what is expected of him and also how he is going to keep the power (Olsen 8). He repeats over and over again how important it is to have a signal fire up on the mountain, and he delegates the responsibility when he selects some boys to keep it burning, but unlike Homer, Ralph chooses the wrong people to carry out a specific task. Kathleen Woodward claims that Ralph makes a momentous mistake when he puts Jack in charge of the fire (91), because when Ralph finally observes a ship, Jack and his gang are hunting instead of sending a smoke signal for rescue. It becomes obvious to Ralph that the other boys “work for five minutes then wander off or go hunting” (Golding 51), regardless of what they have decided at the meetings.

Homer, on the other hand, trusts his capability of being a leader throughout the novel, which is the first of three factors for successful leadership according to the Tannenbaum-Schmidt continuum. One reason why Homer succeeds is because he uses empirical knowledge from his mischievous days, for instance when he constructs a flame-thrower. Furthermore, Homer has “the capacity to inspire, to encourage, [and] to invigorate” (Simpson, Homer Yannos), which is another reason why he manages to get his message through to his followers. The teenagers all work together to put his plans into practice.

Another factor that determines if the leader becomes successful or not depends on the “complexity of the problem” (“Tannenbaum-Schmidt continuum”) the group faces. On the island in Lord the boys imitate an adult society with assemblies, a voting process and the conch as a symbol of free speech, but “they are playing a waiting game, and they invent dangerous games to pass the time” (Woodward 91). It is only Ralph and Piggy who express a wish to be rescued, and therefore continue to nag about the importance of the fire. In Tomorrow, the problems the group face are taken seriously: they want to save their families, and they want to make the continuing invasion more difficult for the enemies. They do not play games to pass time, because this group has “things to do, positive definite things” (Marsden 108), and Homer says that they need to plan for a long-time stay in Hell.

Yet another factor of a successful leadership is making the followers assume responsibility. The teenagers, in contrast to the schoolboys, are easier to lead because they form a primary group, are older and strive towards the same goal. There is no rivalry between them because they know that everyone plays an important part in the team. The group supports the individuals to do things that are unfamiliar to them but necessary in order to survive. In addition, they are mature enough to discuss different options and follow through the decisions that are made. Unlike Ralph, Homer is not constantly under attack from any of his peers. Ellie, who is said to be “bossy” (Marsden 51) and “a know-all” (Marsden 47), is a
possible leader candidate, but she never really challenges Homer in the first book. In that perspective she acts in accordance with traditional gender roles letting a man be in charge of her situation, but on other occasions she acts differently and leads risky raids which is not a typical female behaviour. However, one could say that Ellie is only allowed to be the leader under specific conditions, and Homer is always the overall leader of the group. At one point, though, Ellie decides she is “no longer bound by majority vote” (Marsden 139) since the circumstances are not the same as when they made the plans. The result of her breaking their agreement is that they can safely return to Hell, and Ellie does not have to defend her action since nobody questions her decision. This episode proves my viewpoint that Ellie does not challenge Homer, rather it is an example of her sharing the responsibility for the group’s welfare.

When moving on to the authoritarian leader, represented by Jack in *Lord*, we find a character who starts his advance for the role of leader at the very first assembly when he states that he is the rightful leader of the schoolboys since he is the head boy in the choir. He is arrogant and disrespectful when he yells at his choir and bullies Piggy by screaming “Shut up, Fatty” (Golding 17). Jack is mortified when Ralph is elected. Although he temporarily gives in, Jack soon starts using different strategies to undermine Ralph’s authority, and at the same time making himself more powerful. He stirs up the assembly by lying about Ralph having said that the hunters are bad at hunting. And even though Jack is the one who suggests that they need rules, and is quick to point out that the one who breaks them will be punished, he soon breaks them himself when he for instance speaks without holding the conch or makes himself heard above the other speakers (Olsen 13). These actions are unopposed and weaken Ralph’s leadership, and according to Kirsten Olsen it is the breaking of “old rules and making his own” (14) that paves the way for Jack coming to power.

After being publicly humiliated when his attempt to have Ralph unseated fails, Jack decides to leave the group and have a fort of his own. Cunningly he tries to win people over from Ralph’s camp by accusing him of being a coward and a bad hunter. Jack also offers the hungry boys meat if they leave Ralph and join his group instead. Olsen calls this approach “offering something for nothing – meat and fun with no fire-tending” (170). Not surprisingly most boys rather eat pork and play than pick berries and do tiresome chores under Ralph’s command.

As a result of Jack’s behaviour, one notices how Ralph’s leadership style gradually changes into a laissez-faire leader. At one point he wonders what is going on: “Things are breaking up. I don’t understand why. We began well; we were happy” (Golding 87). Later he
talks to the assembled boys and asks: “Which is better, law and rescue, or hunting and breaking things up?” (Golding 200). According to Ralph the first alternative is the only possible one, but the others do not seem to agree with him. Olsen explains why Ralph fails to maintain the authority, claiming it is due to the fact that he is not an adult, and therefore “has no rewards to offer for good behaviour and no punishments to threaten for disobedience” (11). Another sign of Ralph’s resignation is when he does not dare “to blow the conch in case it should be disobeyed” (Kinkead-Weekes and Gregor 21). At this point, Ralph has become a bystander, who sees what is happening without doing anything about it.

Jack is anything but a colourless spectator. He is a charismatic leader who paints his face with clay before he goes hunting for pigs. The different colours smeared on his face become a mask and he is surprised by the transformation: “He looked in astonishment, no longer at himself but at an awesome stranger. […] and the mask was a thing on its own, behind which Jack hid, liberated from shame and self-consciousness” (Golding 66). The hunters join Jack because they feel as if the mask commands them to do so. When Jack makes the other boys paint their faces too, he creates “a sense of belonging” (Olsen 12), something that Ralph fails to do. However, as Samuel Hynes points out, this is a negative development because Jack “turns them into an anonymous mob of murderous savages” (59), that is, their masks make them feel as if they do not need to take any personal responsibility for their cruel actions (Cox 52-53). Most boys just do what the leader says, or what the majority does, without thinking in terms of right and wrong or friendship, since they are afraid to be on their own, or even worse, a target of the other boys’ aggressions. Barry H. Schneider states that “[o]pposition to a common enemy helps solidify a group that otherwise might be torn apart by disagreements within it” (147), and this is precisely Jack’s purpose when he first leads his group in the hunt for pigs, then the Beast and finally Ralph.

Compared to the democratic leaders Ralph and Homer, Jack is an authoritarian leader who yells at his peers to make his point, threatens them into obedience, makes them commit heinous crimes as well as actually hurting them physically. An example of Jack’s tactics when he finally is in power is the situation where he orders his subordinates to tie up the twins Samneric, and then turns to Ralph, saying: “See? They do what I want” (Golding 199). This suggests that Jack wants to turn the power struggle into a “personal challenge and duel” (Kinkead-Weekes and Gregor 25). Kathleen Woodward argues that Jack’s “regime is built on repression and violence” (94), illustrated when he hits the twins in order to get information out of them about where Ralph is hiding. Moreover, Jack always demands strict obedience and consequently the meetings are no longer held in the spirit of equality that Ralph
introduced on the island (Olsen 14). As an autocratic leader, Jack is not interested in democratic values. He simply wants power so he can control the other boys (Kinkead-Weekes and Gregor 26).

To be a leader one has to have followers, which is true for both authoritarian and democratic leaders. After quite a remarkable change, Roger becomes one of Jack’s most loyal followers. When Roger still belongs to the original group he is the one who suggests that they vote for a leader. He also restrains himself from throwing stones at some littluns because there is the “protection of parents and school and policemen and the law” (Golding 65) that stops him. However, when he sees Jack breaking one of the fundamental rules of only speaking when holding the conch without being punished, Roger too starts testing the limits. The choice of following a destructive leader turns him into a murderer, and Olsen even calls him “the logical product of Jack’s society” (14). Roger “proceeds from little cruelties to great ones” (Olsen 170), since nobody openly objects to his behaviour or condemns him. Roger even gets away with murdering Piggy without being punished by either the leader or the group.

As a consequence of Jack’s increasing number of followers, Ralph finds himself being the leader of only a few boys. One person, though, who never abandons him is Piggy, the representative of common sense. The latter desperately tries to adjust the situation on the island to conditions more like those at home and he asks: “What are we? Humans? Or animals? Or savages? What’s grown-ups going to think? Going off – hunting pigs – letting fires out –” (Golding 98). Piggy knows that “[c]ivilization protects the weak and different; the wilderness does not” (Olsen 6).

Compared to Jack, who leads a primary group – the choir –, Ralph, with the exception of Piggy, does not have a group of close and loyal allies. A typical example of how Ralph is betrayed by some of his followers is the actions of Samneric. They try to avoid conflicts, and therefore never openly take a stand for Ralph. The twins “lack enough moral strength and determination” (Olsen 19), which means they side with Ralph when they are near him, and with Jack when he for instance offers food. Ralph himself is partly to blame for ending up all alone. Olsen suggests that if Ralph, for instance, had supported Piggy in creating an alliance with some other marginalised boys, he might have a better chance to fight back when his authority is under pressure (9). The end of Ralph’s leadership is a fact when Jack and his band of hunters have killed Simon and Piggy, the two most devoted boys. There are no more boys to lead, and without followers Ralph can no longer be a leader.
By comparison, Homer is never abandoned or challenged by his small group of close followers. They trust him, listen to him and carry out his orders. He shoulders the responsibility in a mature way, and is not afraid of making tough decisions. None of the members of the group rebel against his authority, mainly because they are allowed to speak their mind and take part in the decision-making. Even though Ralph has the same attitude towards his followers, he is unsuccessful. One reason why Homer, unlike Ralph, triumphs is due to the fact that he is among old friends.

To conclude, in this essay I have shown that even though the external factors – a group of young people trying to survive in isolation without any adult leadership due to a war situation – at first sight seem to be the same in the two novels, the leadership and group dynamics develop quite differently. Looking at Woodward’s comment on group constellations (91), one would suspect that more confrontations would occur in Tomorrow than in Lord, since that group consist of teenagers of both sexes, and with different social and cultural backgrounds, but that is not the case. The upper-class girl is occasionally teased, while Piggy is constantly bullied and killed for being different. In Tomorrow differences are regarded as something positive, bringing various forms of useful knowledge to the group.

In my analysis of primary and secondary groups, I found that the more closely attached the characters are to each other the more likely they are to support their leader. Homer and Jack are both in charge of a primary group, but the reasons why the followers are loyal to them differ. In Homer’s case the foundation is friendship, and the members of the group have chosen to be together both before and after the invasion. The others trust Homer and he earns their respect when he plans for their short and long-time survival. The teenagers in Tomorrow want the structure their leader can offer. Part of Homer’s success is due to the fact that he only has a few followers, which for instance means fewer opinions to take into consideration before making decisions. In addition, he knows how to delegate, which means his subordinates carry out his instructions. Jack, on the other hand, is the leader of the choir prior to the island life. It is the singing, not friendship, that unites them. Like Homer, Jack too influences the actions of his group, but often the boys obey him because they are afraid of him, which becomes apparent when they do not dare to vote for Ralph at the first assembly. Moreover, it is obvious that the power Jack has exerted over the choir in the past is still there when he no longer can be a subordinate to Ralph and decides to leave, because the choir soon reunites with Jack and form the core in his new band.

Ralph, for his part, leads a secondary group, and consequently lacks the support of faithful allies. In contrast to Homer and Jack, he does not succeed with his intentions to be a leader.
Firstly, his group consists of a large number of boys of different ages who have different needs, and in his attempt to be a democratic leader he tries to please the littluns, Piggy and Jack at the same time, which is impossible. Furthermore, his delegation of necessary tasks does not work. His leadership style is rejected by Jack, who represents the authoritarian leader. As such, Jack is not interested in what other boys think or want to do. He is the leader and expects unquestioning obedience. Ralph unsuccessfully offers freedom and choices to the group, while Jack unifies the same boys when he controls them by assigning them with only one task – hunting. Secondly, Ralph’s enemy is to be found within the group, and not outside like Homer’s foreign army or Jack’s pigs or beast. Lastly, Ralph does not fully believe that he can be the leader the boys need. He is young and inexperienced, and does not know how he is going to keep the power given to him when he is being challenged. Homer is older than Ralph and he relies on his farming experience and the skills he has acquired as a creative trouble-maker at school, while Jack trusts his charismatic behaviour, as illustrated in the scene when he first starts painting his face with clay.

All three leaders undergo transformations, which also affect the people around them. Homer is the successful example. He, who usually wants to be on his own becomes their leader. He turns out to be task-motivated, democratic and relationship-motivated. More than once his skilful leadership saves the group. He builds up his own self-esteem during the invasion and the others are glad they belong to his group. On the contrary, Ralph starts out as a resourceful leader who has high hopes for the group when he is elected. He trusts the democratic values they are all used to from home. The island boys need a strong leader, and Jack repeatedly challenges Ralph, who becomes disillusioned and completely resigns from his authority. To Jack, the only one who is a leader from the start, it is not enough to be in charge of just the choir – he wants more. Unfortunately he is more interested in becoming powerful than looking at what is best for the group, and his reign of terror soon begins. The autocratic leader leads his group to Hell, when he incites young boys to hunt down and kill other boys without reprimanding them.
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