ISSN: 2582-5526 www.thevoiceofcreativeresearch.com

The Voice of Creative Research

Vol. 8 & Issue 2 (April 2026)

DOI: https://doi.org/10.53032/tvcr/2026.v8n2.24

Adolescence in Transition: Identity, Media, and Digital Realities in the Netflix Series *Adolescence*

V. P. Razlin
Research Scholar,
Government Victoria College, Palakkad
(PG & Research Centre, Affiliated to University of Calicut)
&
Assistant Professor,
Department of English, MES Mampad College (Autonomous).
Email:razlinriyas@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0002-9505-2382

Abstract

The Netflix series *Adolescence* portrays the complex realities of growing up in the digital age, where identity, relationships, and behaviour are deeply influenced by social media and cultural expectations. This study applies Erik Erikson's psychosocial stage of *Identity vs. Role Confusion* to examine how adolescents struggle to reconcile offline selfhood with digitally curated identities. It also applies Albert Bandura's *Social Learning Theory* to analyse how behaviours in the series are shaped through observation, imitation, and reinforcement within peer groups and online platforms. The analysis foregrounds critical concerns such as the pressure of digital validation on self-worth, the persistence of bullying across online and offline spaces, the influence of parental modeling on emotional regulation, the widening gap between generations in negotiating digital culture, and the impact of these dynamics on adolescent mental health. By integrating Erikson's and Bandura's perspectives, the paper argues that identity formation during adolescence is shaped not only by internal psychological conflicts but also by external social influences and their consequences. The findings emphasise the need for stronger media literacy, improved parent–adolescent communication, and supportive educational practices to address the psychosocial challenges of growing up in a digitally mediated world.

Keywords: Adolescence, Identity formation, Social media, Parenting, Peer influence, Adolescent mental health, Erikson, Bandura

Introduction

Adolescence is widely recognised as one of the most formative and challenging stages of human life. It represents a transitional period marked by biological changes, heightened emotional states, and complex negotiations with peers, parents, and society. Scholars describe

it as a time when individuals grapple with fundamental questions of identity, belonging, and autonomy (Steinberg 14). As Erik Erikson explains in his psychosocial model, this is the stage of *Identity versus Role Confusion*, where the adolescent seeks to answer "Who am I?" while navigating competing pressures from family and social institutions (Erikson 128). In the contemporary digital age, these struggles are intensified by the constant presence of online communities, social media platforms, and virtual validation systems that reshape how young people construct their sense of self (Boyd 45).

The Netflix series *Adolescence* (2023) dramatises these tensions through the story of Jamie Miller, a thirteen-year-old British boy accused of murdering his classmate, Katy Leonard. The crime, while shocking, is not presented as an isolated act but as the culmination of humiliation, peer rejection, and exposure to toxic internet subcultures. Jamie's fascination with online masculinity discourses, particularly those linked to "incel" ideology illustrates how fragile self-concepts can be shaped by digital communities that reward aggression and hostility. At school, Jamie is subjected to bullying and ridicule, while at home he witnesses his father's struggles with anger and self-control. These layered influences converge, making Jamie both a victim of circumstance and a perpetrator of violence. The series is technically remarkable, filmed in a continuous one-take style that mirrors the intensity and claustrophobia of adolescent experience. Its global reception, which sparked discussion in more than seventy countries, reveals how questions of digital culture, masculinity, and adolescent mental health resonate across contexts ("Netflix Series Sparks Debate"). In Kerala, India, its release coincides with ongoing public debates about youth, social media, and the widening generation gap, giving it particular local significance.

To analyse these layered representations, this paper incorporates Erikson's psychosocial theory and Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory. Erikson's model clarifies how Jamie's crisis reflects the universal struggle of identity formation, where failure to achieve coherence may result in confusion and deviant behaviours. Bandura's framework, on the other hand, highlights the external dimension: adolescents learn behaviours through observation, imitation, and reinforcement (Bandura 22). Jamie's exposure to online influencers who glorify aggression, combined with peer validation or rejection in both physical and digital spaces, demonstrates how social learning contributes to the escalation of violence. These frameworks offer a nuanced lens for understanding Jamie's descent, framing his actions not merely as personal failings but as reflections of broader psychosocial and cultural processes."

The objective of this article is to analyse how *Adolescence* reflects the psychosocial challenges of contemporary youth, particularly in relation to identity, social media, and parenting. By situating the series within broader cultural debates, the paper argues that it functions not only as a fictional narrative of teenage turmoil but also as a mirror of urgent social realities. The analysis engages with themes of bullying, toxic masculinity, digital validation, and parental modeling, linking them to global research on adolescent well-being. This relevance is underscored by international concern over cyberbullying, the rise of

adolescent mental health crises, and the negotiation of digital identities in a rapidly changing cultural landscape (WHO).

Analysis

Identity Formation and Role Confusion

Jamie's search for identity in *Adolescence* unfolds under conditions that sharpen Erik Erikson's classic formulation of adolescence as the stage of Identity versus Role Confusion. Erikson argues that the central task of this stage is to answer the question, *"Who am I?"* by experimenting with roles and developing a coherent self-concept (Erikson 128). The series situates Jamie within environments—school, home, and online platforms that deny him stable recognition. At school, he faces humiliation and exclusion; at home, he witnesses his father struggling with anger while attempting to model restraint. Online, he crafts an older and tougher persona in pursuit of digital validation. This split between a fragile offline self and a curated online self exemplifies the dissonance Erikson describes, where conflicting signals from different social spheres make coherence difficult (Boyd 45).

The series emphasises how humiliation and peer ridicule intensify Jamie's confusion. In the classroom, he is mocked through coded emojis and slang languages that adults, including teachers and police officers, often fail to interpret. The disconnect between adolescent communication systems and adult oversight leaves Jamie vulnerable to peer judgment without mediation. Social media becomes the site where visibility is measured through likes, comments, and shares. These metrics, while offering short-term affirmation, also expose him to harsher ridicule, creating what scholars describe as the "trap of digital validation" (Livingstone 62). Instead of broadening his identity exploration, this context funnels him toward rigid scripts of masculinity and control.

A turning point occurs when Jamie encounters the label "incel" in his online spaces. Initially rejecting the term, he gradually internalizes its logic: that female rejection is not personal but structural, and that masculinity must be performed through contempt, hardness, and control. This adoption of a grievance-based identity reflects what Erikson describes as premature foreclosure, where adolescents close off exploration by clinging to a narrow, brittle role (Erikson 130). Jamie's raised voice, frequent profanity, and attempts to dominate conversations even with the psychologist function as defensive strategies, masking insecurity behind an exaggerated performance of toughness. His oscillation between hyper-confidence and deep shame demonstrates the instability of an identity built on fragile foundations.

Importantly, the series embeds these struggles within intergenerational and cultural contexts. Jamie's father, Eddie, attempts to break from his own father's violent legacy but nevertheless models anger as a way of coping with frustration. Such modeling confirms Albert Bandura's insight that children learn behaviours through observation and reinforcement (Bandura 22). Jamie observes that anger commands attention, and he imitates this posture in both domestic and digital interactions. Similarly, the police officer investigating Katy's murder only understands the depth of adolescent communication when his own son explains the meaning of emojis. This scene underscores how adults' inability to

"read" adolescent codes widens the generational gap, leaving young people like Jamie to interpret rejection and humiliation on their own. Without constructive guidance, identity formation stalls, and confusion hardens into grievance.

The crime that frames the series is not portrayed as a sudden deviation but as the culmination of Jamie's fractured identity work. Rather than integrating multiple roles into a coherent self, Jamie consolidates a violent persona that promises control and coherence. Viewed through Erikson's framework, the murder symbolises a catastrophic failure of identity synthesis, where the need for belonging and recognition collapses into domination. *Adolescence* thereby dramatises the high stakes of identity formation in the digital era: when validation is immediate, public, and punitive, the search for selfhood can be re-routed into destructive scripts of power and aggression (*Adolescence*, ep. 3).

Social Learning and Digital Influence

Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory emphasises that human behaviour is not simply a product of internal drives but is acquired through observation, imitation, and reinforcement (Bandura 22). In *Adolescence*, Jamie's descent into hostility illustrates this process with disturbing clarity. His home, his school, and especially his online world provide models of behaviour that he absorbs and enacts. At school, the bullying he endures from classmates, spitting in his plate to mocking him with coded emojis teaches him that humiliation is a social currency. At home, he witnesses his father struggling with rage, despite the father's conscious effort not to repeat the violence of his own upbringing. These repeated exposures communicate to Jamie that anger is a legitimate, even inevitable, form of expression.

The digital sphere further amplifies this learning process. Online forums and influencers, particularly those linked with toxic masculinity and "incel" discourse, supply Jamie with ready-made narratives: that male worth is proven by control, toughness, and sexual dominance, and that female rejection is not a personal setback but a systemic injustice (Ging 653). When peers flood his comment box with the word "incel," Jamie resists at first, but gradually internalises its logic. This is precisely how Bandura's framework operates: the observed script of grievance, imitated through Jamie's posture and profanity, is reinforced by the attention it commands. Even negative reinforcement mockery, rejection feeds the cycle by making hostility a visible and memorable performance.

In this context, social media platforms function simultaneously as a classroom, where adolescents absorb scripts of behaviour from peers and online communities and as a stage, where they perform curated versions of themselves before an audience (boyd 45). The quantifiable system of likes, shares, and comments transforms adolescent identity work into a feedback loop where aggression is rewarded and vulnerability is punished. Each time Jamie raises his voice, bangs a table, or hurls insults, he is not merely reacting but rehearsing a role that the digital audience recognises and amplifies. Bandura's insight that "most human behaviour is learned observationally through modeling" (Bandura 47) is evident here: Jamie models himself after both his father's unresolved anger and the digital influencers who glorify dominance.

The series also reveals how adults misread the codes of adolescent communication, leaving Jamie's learning environment unchecked. For instance, the police officer investigating Katy's murder misinterprets the emoji-laden exchanges between teenagers, relying on his own son to decode their meanings. This moment underscores a widening generational gap: adults, unable to read the semiotics of digital youth culture, cannot intervene effectively. The result is that Jamie's reinforcement structures remain intact, with no corrective feedback from authority figures.

Through Bandura's lens, Jamie's violent act emerges not as an inexplicable rupture but as the logical extension of learned scripts. He has observed hostility, imitated its postures, and been reinforced by both peers and platforms. The tragedy lies not only in his actions but in the collective modelling failures of the environments that surrounded him—family, school, and society. *Adolescence* thus makes visible how digital culture accelerates the social learning of violence, forcing us to confront the unsettling reality that what adolescents watch, imitate, and are rewarded for can shape them as profoundly as any internal psychological conflict.

Parenting and the Generational Gap

While Jamie's identity crisis is shaped by peers and digital subcultures, the series underscores the decisive role of parenting and intergenerational disconnect in escalating his turmoil. His father, Eddie, is portrayed as loving and determined not to replicate the abuse he suffered from his own father. Yet despite this resolve, Eddie models anger as the dominant response to frustration. He lashes out verbally, struggles to regulate his emotions, and unintentionally communicates to Jamie that masculinity is expressed through control and intimidation. Bandura's concept of modeling is starkly visible here: even when Eddie consciously resists physical violence, his son imitates the emotional patterns he witnesses, absorbing rage as a learned behavioural script (Bandura 47).

The generational gap further compounds this crisis. Adults in *Adolescence* consistently fail to read the semiotics of teenage communication. The authority figures are alienated from digital youth culture, leaving adolescents to face their identity struggles without meaningful adult guidance .Scholars have noted that such disconnect widens the vulnerability of adolescents, as miscommunication prevents effective support or timely intervention (boyd 53).

The series also critiques the broader societal tendency to assign blame narrowly. When Jamie commits murder, suspicion and hostility fall not only on him but also on his father, while the wider community absolves itself of responsibility. This pattern reflects what cultural critics describe as the "individualisation of blame," where systemic failures such as bullying, toxic subcultures, and the absence of digital literacy are ignored in favour of condemning the family (Jenkins 214)." In doing so, *Adolescence* insists that adolescent violence cannot be understood apart from the intergenerational environments that shape behaviour.

By situating Jamie within these family and societal dynamics, the series highlights the urgent need for parents and adults to grow alongside children in the digital age. It suggests

that to counteract the pull of online validation and toxic modeling, parents must cultivate emotional openness, digital literacy, and communication practices that bridge rather than widen the generational divide. Otherwise, as the series makes clear, adolescents like Jamie are left to learn manhood from peers and platforms that equate masculinity with control, leaving little room for empathy or vulnerability.

Mental Health and Digital Validation

Beyond questions of identity and parental influence, *Adolescence* highlights the profound mental health struggles faced by young people in the digital era. Jamie's story is framed not only as an individual descent into violence but as a case study of how humiliation, isolation, and online scrutiny intensify adolescent vulnerability. The series repeatedly situates him in environments of confinement, whether in classrooms, his bedroom, or digital forums, emphasising the claustrophobia of a life lived under constant surveillance. The one-take cinematography mirrors this sense of entrapment: there are no breaks, no escape, only an unrelenting exposure to the gaze of peers and the digital crowd.

Central to this crisis is the logic of digital validation. Traditional forms of recognition, such as a teacher's praise or family approval, have been displaced by quantifiable metrics: likes, comments, and shares. For Jamie, whose offline life is marked by rejection and ridicule, these metrics become an alternative system of worth. Yet the very platforms that promise recognition also amplify rejection. Negative comments, mocking emojis, and the viral spread of humiliation become inescapable. Scholars note that such digital validation systems "magnify adolescent insecurities by making social approval visible, measurable, and comparative" (boyd 45). In Jamie's case, moments of vulnerability are met with ridicule, while displays of aggression earn attention, creating a cycle in which hostility seems like the only path to recognition.

The psychological toll of these dynamics aligns with global concerns about youth mental health. According to the World Health Organization, depression and anxiety are among the leading causes of illness and disability in adolescents worldwide, with social media use increasingly linked to rising levels of self-harm, loneliness, and suicidal ideation (WHO). *Adolescence* translates these statistics into narrative form: Jamie's mood swings, verbal outbursts, and eventual collapse into violence are not presented as isolated traits but as symptoms of cumulative psychological strain. His inability to process rejection safely, coupled with the absence of effective adult mediation, illustrates how digital culture can accelerate latent vulnerabilities into crises.

At home, Jamie's reliance on his phone during moments of isolation underscores how technology functions simultaneously as a coping mechanism and a source of harm. For parents, this creates a paradox: the device that keeps their child physically safe indoors also exposes him to emotional dangers beyond their comprehension. This paradox is made explicit in the series through generational misunderstanding, as adults struggle to interpret emojis or online slang, further alienating them from the very spaces where their children's mental health is most at risk.

By foregrounding these struggles, *Adolescence* raises a crucial question: how can

societies equip adolescents to navigate digital environments without collapsing under the weight of public visibility? The series suggests that mental health interventions must extend beyond clinical spaces to include media literacy, parental guidance, and cultural awareness. Without such support, the cycle of humiliation and validation risks producing more adolescents like Jamie, young people who confuse digital recognition with identity and who, when rejected, lash out with destructive force.

Conclusion

The Netflix series *Adolescence* presents with unsettling clarity the psychosocial vulnerabilities of growing up in the digital age. At its center is Jamie, a thirteen-year-old whose search for identity collapses under the weight of humiliation, peer rejection, toxic online subcultures, and inadequate adult intervention. Erik Erikson's model of Identity versus Role Confusion helps to show how Jamie's development narrows too quickly into rigid and fragile roles, leaving little space for exploration or growth. Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory makes clear that Jamie's behaviours are not simply spontaneous reactions but patterns absorbed through watching, imitating, and receiving reinforcement from his social environment. His violent act is not portrayed as a sudden deviation but as the consequence of repeated learning, reinforcement, and the absence of corrective feedback.

Yet the series insists that responsibility cannot rest solely on the individual or his family. It critiques systemic failures: the persistence of bullying that institutions ignore, the radicalizing potential of digital subcultures, and the inability of adults to mediate adolescent struggles. Particularly striking is the generational gap symbolised by the police officer who must rely on his son to decode emojis. This scene exposes a larger truth: when adults cannot read the semiotics of youth culture, adolescents are left to navigate humiliation and desire for recognition alone, often turning to platforms that reward aggression and punish vulnerability.

The narrative also underscores how digital validation reshapes adolescent mental health. Likes, shares, and comments become a currency of worth, amplifying insecurity when ridicule spreads virally. For Jamie, recognition is achieved only through hostility, reinforcing a destructive feedback loop. This mirrors global findings that link social media use with rising rates of depression, anxiety, and self-harm among adolescents (WHO). By translating such statistics into lived experience, *Adolescence* underscores the urgency of addressing digital environments as central to adolescent well-being.

What, then, is to be done? The series points implicitly toward a collective responsibility. Parents must move beyond traditional roles and grow alongside their children in digital literacy. Awareness of online languages, codes, and subcultures is not optional; it is essential for meaningful guidance. Educators and institutions must treat bullying—both offline and online as structural, not incidental. Societies must cultivate spaces where vulnerability is not punished but supported, where adolescents can express anger, sadness, or fear without fear of ridicule.

In the end, *Adolescence* is not only a story of a boy who becomes a murderer but also a cautionary tale about the environments that produce such violence. It compels viewers and readers alike to ask whether we, as families, schools, and societies, are equipping

young people to face rejection and humiliation with resilience rather than hostility. If parents, educators, and policymakers take seriously the responsibility to bridge generational divides, to read and engage with the languages of digital youth, and to foster empathy over aggression, then tragedies like Jamie's may be prevented. The challenge of adolescence in the digital era is not merely individual but collective, demanding shared accountability and proactive adaptation.

References

Bandura, Albert. *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1977.

Boyd, danah. *It's Complicated: The Social Lives of Networked Teens*. Yale University Press, 2014.

Erikson, Erik H. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. W. W. Norton, 1968.

Ging, Debbie. "Alphas, Betas, and Incels: Theorizing the Masculinities of the Manosphere." *Men and Masculinities*, vol. 22, no. 4, 2019, pp. 638–657.

Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York University Press, 2006.

Steinberg, Laurence. *Adolescence*. 11th ed., McGraw-Hill Education, 2016.

World Health Organization. *Adolescent Mental Health*. WHO, 2021, www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/adolescent-mental-health.

Adolescence. Created by Stephen Graf, performance by Ewan Cooper and Stephen Graf, Netflix, 2023.

"Netflix Series Sparks Debate on Teen Violence and Digital Culture." *The Guardian*, 2023.