International Journal of Asian Social Science Research; Vol.3, No.2; 2026
E-ISSN: 3006-2179 P-ISSN：3006-754X
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70267/ijassr.260302.5159
Published by: Zeus Press

An Adolescent Murder Shaped by Toxic Masculinity: A Case Study of Adolescence (2025)

Yuhui Ying*

Beijing Foreign Studies University, Beijing, China

**Corresponding author: Yuhui Ying*

Abstract

This paper examines how male adolescents are shaped by the culture of toxic masculinity embedded in family upbringing, peer culture, and social media, using the British television drama Adolescence (2025) as a case study. It centres on Jamie Miller, a thirteen-year-old boy accused of murdering a female classmate after she responds with contempt to his romantic confession. Rather than attributing Jamie's crime solely to his personality flaws, the study interprets it as a product from the widespread culture of toxic masculinity in today's society. Within the framework, the family serves as the root of the problem, reflected in the presence of an inadequate father figure, while distorted peer culture and social media act as powerful catalysts. At the same time, the failure of institutional oversight by the family, school, and wider society prevents the formation of an effective protective network that might otherwise have shielded thousands of "Jamies" from the influence of toxic masculine norms. By tracing these mechanisms, the paper contributes to ongoing debates about toxic masculinity in contemporary youth culture.

Keywords

toxic masculinity, adolescent, British TV drama, parent-child relationship, peer culture, social media

1. Introduction

On 25 July 2025, Relationships, Sex and Health Education guidance [1], a long-waited statutory government guidance was released by the Department for Education and became mandatory for all secondary schools in England. This guidance serves to strengthen schools' role in protecting children and young people from harmful gender concepts, including, and especially, incel culture. Before the guidance was released, notions related to "toxic masculinity" have already circulated widely in contemporary British youth culture and have produced large-scale impacts on British society, particularly on children and young people. Newly published data from the Department for Education show that more than half of pupils aged 11 to 19 (54%) said they had heard comments they would describe as misogynistic, and more than a third (37%) reported hearing comments that made them concerned about girls' safety [2].

To draw public attention to this increasingly visible phenomenon of toxic masculinity, Adolescence (2025), a four-part television drama, premiered on Netflix on 13 March 2025. Created and written by Jack Thorne and Stephen Graham, directed by Philip Barantini, and starring Owen Cooper as Jamie Miller—a 13-year-old boy accused of killing a female classmate, the series presents how family, school, and society

"combine" to shape a teenager influenced by toxic masculinity culture, while also reveals deeper anxieties in contemporary British society.

Three months after the series was released, educational policy-makers in the UK, Netherlands and France approved it for use as part of efforts to teach teenagers about toxic masculinity and online harms [3], which not only indicates the success of the drama from an official perspective, but also highlights the urgency for governments and societies around the world, rather than European countries mentioned above, to take gender issues—especially "toxic masculinity"-related issues—seriously in teenage education.

2. Deriving Toxic Masculinity from Hegemonic Masculinity

The concept of "toxic masculinity" originated in the 1980s within the mythopoetic men's movement (MMM), which was introduced by Shepherd Bliss to describe efforts to "preserve essential but perceived as declining masculine traits" that were considered threatened by so-called toxic masculinity, with characteristics such as independence, emotional restraint, aggression, and competitiveness [4]. Over the following two decades, this idea spread beyond the men's movement into broader literature, including self-help books and policy research [4]. Since 2013, alongside the rapid development of contemporary feminism, the concept expanded further to the field of the opposition between two major genders, with feminists linking such notions as misogyny and homophobia which were amplified by social media to it [5]. In the following years, particularly after 2016, it became more and more popular in feminist academia, with a sharp rise in academic studies, especially within the neoliberal post-feminist context [5], demonstrating that the term "toxic masculinity" has genuine academic value rather than solely as popular social discourse.

However, in recent years, most studies have solely been limited to examining the characteristics of toxic masculinity, although there is still no acknowledged definition of the term. Scholars in this filed tend to attribute traits such as emotional suppression, violence, domination, aggression, objectification of women, misogyny, homophobia, resistance to psychotherapy and the like to this term (for example [5-7]). By contrast, apart from this aspect, far fewer of studies have delved into its formation process in depth, particularly into how the "toxic masculinity" derives from and is shaped by the "hegemonic masculinity" through the "combined" influences of family, school, and wider society, which is explicitly depicted in the TV series Adolescence, and will be discussed in later sections.

In a word, toxic masculinity can be understood as the outcome of men's attempts to achieve hegemonic masculinity when such attempts fail. More specifically, hegemonic masculinity refers to a culturally dominant form of masculinity that is positioned as superior to other masculinities as well as femininity, thereby legitimising gender inequality that continues to exist today [8]. This form of masculinity is associated with power, physical strength and dominance [9], and requires males to "demonstrate this kind of masculinity and to defend their claim to the status it bestows" [10]. When male adolescents are educated—either directly or implicitly—by male family members or by so-called "instructors" on social media to embrace hegemonic masculinity, those with still-developing cognitive and emotional capacities, and who are in the meantime eager for respect or even adore, particularly from the opposite sex, would involuntarily indulge in a fanatical pursuit of this ideal. However, it is impossible for every teenage boy, regardless of whether such exertion of masculinity accords with principles of gender equality, to successfully achieve their expectations for it. At this moment, the sense of unachievement may unfortunately trigger intense anxiety and sense of unsafety, which can in turn lead some young men to resort to violence as a means of asserting their existence and dominance—especially dominance over women, particularly those who have given a cold eye on them (for example [11]).

In this process, frustrations in attracting females shift to anger, resentment and even hostility against women. In today's society, this tendency is further exacerbated by social media, where such misogynistic men get together online, forming manosphere groups and incel culture. Within these spaces, this mindset is amplified by the clustering effects, leading men to attribute their lack of romantic or sexual success to "their inferior physical attributes, the influence of feminism, and women's biologically prescribed desire for alpha males" [12], thereby reinforcing toxic masculinity.

According to logical path discussed above, we conclude that the underlying desires of toxic masculinity can be traced back to the hegemonic masculinity; however, owing to structural and social constraints, not all

men are able to achieve the status and rewards they desire. When such disillusionment happens, some men turn to reject this culturally dominated hegemonic masculinity, believing that it is this set of social principles that exclude them from the "popular" kind, and in the meantime direct their resentment towards women, whom they perceive as responsible for this exclusion. But in essence, the use of violence does not represent a rejection of hegemonic masculinity; rather, it reflects an extreme enactment of it, since violence is a core trait of hegemonic masculine norms. Therefore, toxic masculinity can be understood as a radicalised outcome of attempts to practise hegemonic masculinity [4].

3. Jamie's Descent into a Murder: Mechanism Under the Culture of Toxic Masculinity

Jamie Miller, an ordinary 13-year-old boy, might have lived a peaceful life with his beloved parents and sister had he not killed his classmates Katie, a girl he appears to admire but who reciprocates scone rather than equal adoration nor at least respect he desires. Under normal circumstances, such a failure in mutual admiration might at most lead to frustration. However, when family problems form as root, peer culture and social media act as catalysts, and insufficient supervision by families, schools, and society allows harmful dynamics to go unchecked, this frustration can ultimately escalate into a tragedy like the one that occurred with Jamie and Katie, both of whom should have had bright futures.

3.1 Family as Root: Nurtured by a Father Still One Step from Being Qualified

Eddie Miller, father of Jamie Miller, grew up with a violent father. According to research data, a great number of boys who raised in a violent family would later become men who consciously try to avoid using violence when raising their own children [13]. However, even when they succeed in restraining physical violence, it is often difficult for them to escape other, more implicit traits of toxic masculinity, such as emotional repression, acquiescence in males' dominance (this is especially true for boys who witnessed their mothers or siblings being abused and grew up eager to become "strong" enough to protect them) [14], resistance to failure, extreme desire for other's recognition, and objectification of women. Eddie is portrayed as a typical example of this pattern.

Shaped by his traumatic childhood experience, Eddie genuinely tries his best to be a good father. He never beats his children, holding firmly to what he believes to be the most important rule of being a qualified father. However, the tragedy of intergenerational trauma lies precisely here: an abused boy grows up, becomes a father, and does his best—yet still falls short, because he has never learned what truly constitutes good parenting. Eddie overcomes physical violence, but he remains emotionally repressed, fearful of failure, dominant within the family, and distant from women friends, which exerts a subtle influence on his son and ultimately contribute to Jamie's tragedy.

In episode three, Jamie tells the female therapist Briony Ariston that his father was "hardly ever" in violent rage, a feature which is generally seen as masculine [15]. However, this emotional repression also means an absence of emotional communication, a factor that has been proved to contribute to young men's violence [16]. As his father, Eddie unknowingly taught Jamie that it is normal for men not to express their emotions openly. This is deeply harmful to young boys' psychological development, as they are left to manage their emotions alone. When these emotions develop beyond their control, things would quietly shift into the worst possible outcome—such as the violence that leads to Katie's death.

Moreover, emotional repression does not bring comfort to family members. On the contrary, a silent and emotionally closed father or husband can be more frightening than an openly angry one. In episode four, when Eddie discovers the insulting word "NONCE" painted on his car, his suppressed reaction creates a heavy and tense atmosphere at home. His wife and daughter become extremely cautious around him, as if living beside a bomb that might explode at any moment. This situation is unlikely to have happened only once. Throughout Jamie's childhood, he must have felt this kind of discomfort for thousands of times. It not only teaches him to repress his own feelings, but also creates emotional distance between him and his father—the person who might have been most able to pull him back from the edge of becoming a murderer.

Apart from emotional repression, Eddie's unwillingness to accept failure also contributes to one of Jamie's most significant character flaws—extreme desire for others' recognition. This desire first focuses on

his father and, after he enters adolescence, shifts toward female peers. When this need for recognition is not met, Jamie becomes deeply unsettled and his behaviour begins to spiral out of control.

In episode three and four, the father and son both refer to the same incident from Jamie's childhood: Eddie's reaction to Jamie's poor performance on the football pitch. From Jamie's account, it is clear that he was deeply hurt by his father turning away and scratching his face while Jamie stood there, embarrassed and mocked by others, the same reaction he gives after seeing the CCTV footage which shows Jamie's attacks in the interrogation room when Jamie turns to him, hoping to say something. "He'd just look away. Maybe he just didn't want me to see him looking… sorry, ashamed," Jamie says, breathing heavily, as if reliving a painful memory. From a child's perspective, when he is frustrated and exposed to ridicule, what he needs from his father is reassurance that failure is not frightening and can be faced bravely, as well as, above all, the assurance that as his father, "he wasn't ashamed", a saying Jamie himself uses to express what he longed to hear. However, owing to Eddie his own incapability of accepting failure, a trait shaped by his own upbringing, this unresolved flaw is ultimately passed on to Jamie, and becomes part of the fatal character flaws for his later tragedy.

When Eddie's inability to accept his son's failure is perceived by Jamie, Jamie's desire for recognition begins to grow uncontrollably. This is reflected in his especial attention to his father's attitudes toward him and, later, in his intense concern about how women judge him—most clearly in his fixation on Katie, but also in his sensitivity to any woman who appears without recognition for him, such as the female therapist.

At the beginning of the series, when police officers enter Jamie's bedroom to arrest him, his first response is not denial of the act itself but a plea for moral recognition from his father, "Dad! I haven't done anything!" This moment reveals how deeply Jamie equates being recognised with being "good". Later, in his conversation with the lawyer, Jamie names Brunel as his favourite historical figure because "he did stuff no one else did… he just did it". Brunel functions as an ideal figure for Jamie—someone who gains attention and admiration through achievement, something Jamie himself feels unable to secure. This distorted understanding of recognition becomes most visible in episode three. After repeatedly asking for the female therapist's evaluation of him and failing to receive a clear response, Jamie becomes increasingly agitated, and when the therapist abruptly ends the session, he breaks down and asks, "Do you like me?" and "What did you think about me?" Taken together with Katie's death, which follows her indifference and rejection of Jamie, these moments clearly reveal Jamie's distorted view of others' recognition, in which emotional validation from others becomes a matter of his psychological survival. This distorted mindset can be traced back to Eddie's failure to teach Jamie how to accept imperfection and how to cope with failure, leaving recognition as the only measure through which Jamie understands his own worth.

3.2 Peer Culture and Social Media as Catalysts: Pushing Jamie to the Edge of the Cliff

Nurtured in a family rooting emotional repression and distorted desire for recognition, Jamie becomes highly susceptible to the widely spread "manosphere culture", which attributes males' loss of power and authority to the rise of feminism [17]. In the era of social media, men who embrace this worldview can gather more easily and express extreme views more openly under the virtual ID numbers [17]. In the meantime, young girls can also be drawn into this polarised gender discourse with the aim of keeping up with the trend rather than safeguarding their own rights, namely those who are initially neutral or unfamiliar with gender debates may also join so-called feminist groups without fully understanding their core aim—not hatred toward men, but the pursuit of gender equality.

At the same time, the algorithm-driven system of social media further deteriorates this phenomenon. Online platforms tend to recommend its users contents that could provoke strong emotional reactions, which often includes sensational interpretations of gender conflicts. For adolescents whose rational faculties are still developing, repeated exposure to such narratives can gradually disappoint them in their understandings of relationships between men and women. Instead of viewing rejection, romantic frustration, or social competition as common experiences of adolescence, boys influenced by this manosphere discourse are encouraged to interpret these situations through a rigid hierarchy in which male value is definitely measured by dominance and sexual success. In this framework, girls are no longer perceived as individuals but as symbols of validation or humiliation. Consequently, everyday interactions in school—comments about appearance, popularity, or romantic interests—would be endlessly exaggerated with this ideological lens.

What might otherwise remain ordinary teenage conflicts can therefore become deeply personal challenges to masculine identity, producing resentment that accumulates over time.

As boys and girls live in an internet-saturated environment, further intensified by the clustering effect, schools—where they spend most of their daily lives together—become the "best place" for the enactment of gender opposition, which deteriorates boys' belief in ideas such as the "20-80 rule", alongside growing resentment toward feminism and those seen as its agents—girls and women.

In episode two, the scene in Jamie's school is unfolded through the bullying of Adam, son of the male police officer Luke Bascombe, who is in charge of Jamie's case. Adam is mocked by other students, who throw rubbish onto his lunch plate and call him "dickhead", while Adam's passive and habitual reaction shows that such treatment is not unusual for him, in which bullies are not limited to boys but also involves girls. A clear example is Katie's best friend, Jade, who tells Bascombe that his son "is off" (meaning ugly) and that "he didn't get your cheekbones". Even as a member of the so-called "victims' coalition", when speaking about someone connected to the man standing in front of her, her first and direct reaction is to shame his unsatisfying appearance.

After the fire alarm sends all students to the tennis court, Jade encounters Ryan, one of Jamie's close friends, who is also deeply influenced by toxic masculinity. She vents her anger over losing her best friend by violently beating him. At that moment, nothing cuts more sharply through the crowd than the shout: "You just got banged by a girl, you sausage." From boys' perspectives, there is no greater humiliation than being mocked for being beaten by a girl, who is assumed to be weaker and inferior, which explicitly reflects a deeply rooted belief in boys' minds that males are born to be stronger and superior than females. Later, when Ryan is sent to the medical room and questioned by the police, he is asked about "being popularity". In his view, being popularity is "of course" important, but he himself cannot achieve it, and is confused about "why they matter (beautiful teeth) so much, but…they do".

Beyond the school setting, episode four presents a similar mindset. When Eddie goes to buy paint to cover the word sprayed on his car, a male shop assistant tells him that he is on Jamie's side, for he "have seen the photos of her", which implies that from incels' views, Katie is automatically judged as sexually immoral and therefore undeserving of sympathy. Together with the school scenes, this moment serves as a small-scale reflection of the wider manosphere in both real life and online spaces.

Moving daily between these two worlds, Jamie—like millions of other teenage boys—gradually absorbs and accepts manosphere ideas such as the "20-80 rule", and then develops a strong sense of inferiority when facing girls, which in turn fuels as an extreme eager to dominate them.

Jamie's extreme desire to dominate women is revealed through his interactions with three female figures: a female model who poses photos in Instagram, his classmate Katie, and the female therapist Ariston. In the case of the female model, a woman he admires but can never reach in real life, Jamie expresses himself through "comments and innuendos which seem pretty aggressive", which reflects his one-sided attempt assert control over a woman who exists only as an image under the circumstance when he cannot dominate women in real life.

With Katie, who ignores and even openly despises him, Jamie's desire for control is triggered in a more personal and destructive way, even though he does not genuinely love her. In Jamie's view, Katie's willingness to send intimate photos to Fidget proves that "she fancies him", while her public humiliation of Jamie on Instagram is, with humiliating contrast, a result of his own ugliness. In this sense, he has clearly internalised the "20-80 rule", categorising Fidget as the part of the "20" and he himself of the "80", and perceives himself as inferior not only to Fidget but also, ultimately, to Katie. Therefore, when Katie becomes emotionally vulnerable due to peer accusations, Jamie feels—for the first time—that he might gain the power to dominate her. However, when this expectation fails, he is unable to understand nor accept why he still cannot control her, even when he believes her to be weaker than himself. This failure generates an overwhelming sense of shame and rage, culminating in Katie's death.

Jamie's desire for domination is displayed even more explicitly in his interaction with the therapist Ariston. When discussing about how far a boy can go in dating with a girl in his age, Jamie initially fabricates sexual experiences, claiming that girls expose their bodies to him, in an attempt to perform masculinity and assert male authority in front of a female listener. But when she goes deeper into his

emotional experience, Jamie is unable to tell concrete details and is forced to admit that these stories are only imaginary. At this moment, the fragile foundation of the masculine image he attempts to construct is collapsed. As a young desperate cornered beast, Jamie falls into endless confusion and hardship. The gap between his imagined sexual success and his actual social position further intensifies his sense of inadequacy. Later, when the therapist does not challenge Jamie's self-description as "ugly", he suddenly erupts into rage. At this moment, a male security guard approaches, but the therapist gestures for him to leave. Jamie reacts with renewed anger, unable to tolerate even a minimal instance of female authority over a male figure—even when that male is not himself—shouting, "What was that? Signalling him away like a fucking queen, yeah?" It is not simply personal frustration; rather, he perceived violation of a gender hierarchy at this moment in which male authority should not be overridden by a woman. When Jamie realises that his aggression and violent posture have frightened the therapist, he becomes visibly pleased and begins to taunt her: "You look a bit red. Did I scare you when I shouted? I mean, I'm only 13. I don't think I'm that scary. How embarrassing is that—getting scared of a 13-year-old." At this moment, Jamie finally experiences the dominance he failed to obtain from both the Instagram model and Katie. Features of toxic masculinity are fully exposed through his language and gestures. It is here that the audience sees Jamie most clearly: a deeply miserable and cornered boy, trapped in cycles of self-humiliation and resentment, enclosed within the pervasive atmosphere of toxic masculinity that surrounds him in every single moment.

3.3 Insufficient Supervision by Family, School, and Society: A Shabby Protective Net

Pushed by family and peer culture to the edge of a cliff, Jamie might still have been pulled back had there been a protective net provided by his family, school, or society. Unfortunately, none of these institutions offers such protection.

In episode one, when Jamie's parents arrive at the police station, they appear more concerned about their damaged front door than about their visibly trembling son. When Eddie tells Manda—Jamie's mother who is busy in her phone—that do not make Jamie's emergency public, but only receives the response that "I'm just texting Susie to make sure our house is okay". When the lawyer arrives to discuss the case, the parents' first reaction again focuses on the fact that "they tore the house apart" and "they smashed the door in". Even in episode four, after Jamie's guilt has been confirmed, the parents' retrospective reflection remains evasive. Eddie recalls Jamie's reluctance to communicate, rationalising it by saying, "All kids are like that these days, aren't they?" and "You can't keep an eye on them all the time, love. We just can't." While their denial and helplessness are understandable under the condition that their once well-behaved son has now been titled as a merciless murder, their attitudes nevertheless reveal a lack of effective parental engagement, which fails to shield a vulnerable child from sliding into an abyss of violence.

A similar family pattern is evident in Ryan, Jamie's close friend and accomplice. When Tommy asks about Ryan's family's response to the incident, he receives an answer strikingly similar to Jamie's parents' reaction at the police station: "No, they just… they just didn't say nothing." Silence, emotional absence, and avoidance recur as dominant responses from their parents. Such silence can be particularly dangerous for adolescents who are still in a developing stage in which young people are actively constructing their sense of self and their moral frameworks. When parents fail to address, or even notice the gradual deviation in their children's growing trajectory, adolescents may begin to rationalize their problematic behaviours without realizing it. Over time, the absence of timely intervention can foster resentment, misogyny, and aggression, especially in an era marked by an overwhelming flow of information but insufficient regulation.

In contrast, the series offers a counterexample through the relationship between the male police officer Bascombe and his son Adam, illustrating how family intervention can function well as a protective net. Initially portrayed as a rough and emotionally distant father, Bascombe becomes aware of his failure after Adam confronts him: "You don't call me 'son'. You call other people 'son'. You never call me 'son'." Realising that his son, may too, be affected by the same manosphere culture circulating among boys in his age, Bascombe responds not with denial but with immediate actions. He begins to spend more time with Adam to rebuild their emotional connection, which definitely serves as a great way to avoid such tragedies as happened to Jamie. The two contrasting pairs of father-and-son clearly demonstrate that effective parenting does not require perfection, but only attentiveness and willingness to change. Once Bascombe recognises the emotional distance between himself and his son, he actively attempts to repair the relationship, differentiating from Eddie's first reaction, which is to deny his parental responsibility. Although the series

does not show how well Adam's family and school life improve after Bascombe becomes aware of his son's difficulties, it is definitely that Adam will not follow Jamie's tragic path. This contrast implies that families still have the potential to function as a protective net—but only when parents acknowledge their responsibilities and remain emotionally engaged in their children's lives.

Apart from family neglect, the school also bears significant responsibility for Jamie's tragedy. Through the police officer Bascombe's words, the audience learns that Jamie has always achieved good academic results but has developed "some problems with his behaviour more recently". However, neither his family nor his teachers take concrete action to address these warning signs, which can be most clearly revealed when the police arrive at the school to investigate and urge staff to implement stronger protective measures, but only receives teachers' response marked by frustration and abdication of responsibility that, "Look, these kids are fucking impossible (hard to manage). I mean, what am I supposed to do?" A wider institutional problem within educational systems is explicitly displayed. Schools often prioritise academic performance and disciplinary management while paying insufficient attention to students' emotional development and social attitudes. When behavioural problems are treated merely as disciplinary issues rather than warning signals of deeper psychological or social struggles, opportunities for early intervention are lost. In Jamie's case, his declining behaviour could have served as an indicator that he was struggling with anger, rejection, and distorted gender beliefs. Yet the school's passive stance allows these issues to remain unaddressed until they culminate in irreversible violence.

Beyond family and school, however, inadequate social supervision plays the most decisive role in Jamie's tragedy. The unchecked spread of harmful online content greatly amplifies manosphere culture and normalises misogynistic ideas among teenage boys. As Eddie complains, even when he merely tries to search for exercise-related information, he is constantly exposed to content "going on about how to treat women, how men should be men, and all that shit". Today's online platforms driven by algorithmic recommendation systems tend to prioritise sensational and emotionally charged content, which often includes extreme interpretations of masculinity and hostility toward women. For adolescents who already feel socially marginalised or romantically rejected, these narratives can provide a seemingly coherent explanation for their frustrations by blaming women or feminism. Over time, repeated exposure to such content reinforces a worldview in which aggression and dominance are portrayed as legitimate responses to perceived humiliation. In such an environment, parental neglect and school inaction become far more dangerous. Without this unregulated social influence, Jamie's resentment and distorted beliefs might not have escalated into lethal violence. The series therefore presents Jamie's crime not as an isolated individual act but as the endpoint of a cumulative process in which multiple institutions fail simultaneously. Family silence, school indifference, and digital radicalisation interact with one another, gradually pushing a vulnerable teenager toward extreme behaviour. When no institution intervenes effectively, the boundary between online rhetoric and real-world violence becomes dangerously thin.

To prevent the recurrence of Jamie's tragedy, family education, school curricula, and the broader social environment must work together to encourage men to engage with feminism, which is often regarded as an antidote to the culture of toxic masculinity [17]. To be more specific, by learning to recognise and value traits traditionally associated with femininity, such as emotional openness, vulnerability, and care [18], men learn not to view failure or lack of popularity as shameful; likewise, women's success can also be accepted as normal rather than perceived as a threat to long-assumed male dominance.

4. Conclusion

Toxic masculinity—characterised by emotional suppression, aggression, domination, the objectification of women, and an inability to accept failure—pushes Jamie, the protagonist of the British television series Adolescence (2025), into the abyss of murder when he kills his female classmate Katie after she responds with contempt to his hesitant romantic confession. Rather than an incident, Jamie's tragedy is almost an inevitable outcome for the toxic masculinity which might lead puberty children to self-destruction surrounds him from all directions: an unqualified father, the distorted peer culture which reflected in nearly all of his classmates—both boys and girls, and the all-pervasive misleading messages circulating on social media all the time. Within this triad, family education functions as the root cause, peer culture acts as a catalyst, and institutional oversight by family, school, and society fails to form an effective protective network that should

have prevented harmful masculine norms from developing into such an irreversible tragedy. To avoid similar tragedies involving Jamie and Katie, a shared recognition and understanding of feminism should be actively established and promoted from the family to the school, within peer groups, and across society as a whole; only in this way can such tragedies be effectively prevented from occurring again in the future.

References

[1] Department for Education. (2025). Relationships education, relationships and sex education (RSE) and health education.

[2] Weale, S. (14 July 2025). Secondary schools in England to tackle 'incel' culture and teach positive role models. The Guardian.

[3] Henley, J. (9 June 2025). France to use UK drama Adolescence to teach teenagers about toxic masculinity. The Guardian.

[4] Zhao, X., & Roberts, S. (2025). To hell with toxic masculinity?: a case for retaining a debated concept. Journal of Gender Studies, 1-11.

[5] Harrington, C. (2021). What is "toxic masculinity" and why does it matter? Men and Masculinities, 24(2), 345-352.

[6] Kupers, T. A. (2005). Toxic masculinity as a barrier to mental health treatment in prison. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 61(6), 713-724.

[7] Qiao, X. (2025). Deprivation and disruption: The development of narcissistic vulnerability and toxic masculinity in some Chinese contexts. Psychoanalysis, Self and Context, 20(2), 237-253.

[8] Connell, R. (2005). Masculinities (2nd ed.). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

[9] Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. Gender and Society, 19(6), 829-859.

[10] DiMuccio, S., & Knowles, E. D. (2020). The political significance of fragile masculinity. Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences, 34, 25-28.

[11] Salter, M. (2019, February 27). The problem with a fight against toxic masculinity. The Atlantic.

[12] Baker, C., Ging, D., & Andreasen, M. B. (2024). Recommending toxicity: The role of algorithmic recommender functions on YouTube shorts and TikTok in promoting male supremacist influencers. DCU Anti-Bullying Centre Dublin City University.

[13]Callaghan, J. E. M., Fellin, L. C., Mavrou, S., Alexander, J. H., Deliyianni-Kouimtzis, V., & Sixsmith, J. (2026). Managing Masculinity When Growing up With a Violent Father: A Qualitative Study of Boys' Experiences. Violence against women, 32(1), 158-188.

[14] Cole, B. P., & Patterson, T. P. (2022). Positive masculinity and fatherhood. In S. Molloy, P. Azzam, & A. Isacco (Eds.), Handbook of the psychology of fatherhood (pp. 61-71). Springer.

[15] McAllister, L., Callaghan, J. E. M., & Fellin, L. C. (2019). Masculinities and emotional expression in UK servicemen: "Big boys don't cry"? Journal of Gender Studies, 28(3), 257-270.

[16] Eberly, D. (13 May 1999). Prepared testimony by Don Eberly, founder and CEO of the National Fatherhood Initiative, before the House Judiciary Committee on youth culture and violence. Federal News Service.

[17] Whitehead, S. (2021). Toxic masculinity: Curing the virus: Making men smarter, healthier, safer. AG Books.

[18] Waling, A. (2019). Problematising 'Toxic' and 'Healthy' Masculinity for Addressing Gender Inequalities. Australian Feminist Studies, 34(101), 362-375.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgment

This paper is an output of the science project.