

FORUM ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Is There a Sociology of Suicide?

Enrique Fernández-Vilas^{1,2}  | Juan José Labora González³ | Juan R. Coca^{1,2}

¹Department of Sociology and Social Work, University of Valladolid, Soria, Spain | ²Social Research Unit on Health and Rare Diseases, Soria, Spain | ³Department of Political Science and Sociology, University of Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, Spain

Correspondence: Enrique Fernández-Vilas (enrique.fvilas@uva.es)

Received: 25 April 2026 | **Revised:** 3 May 2026 | **Accepted:** 5 May 2026

Keywords: Durkheim | social theory | sociology of suicide | suicide | suicidologycritical suicidology

ABSTRACT

A sociology of suicide plainly exists in a historical sense. Since Durkheim, sociologists have shown that suicide varies with integration, regulation, inequality, relational embeddedness, institutional arrangements, and cultural repertoires of meaning. The stronger question concerns the conditions under which this work coheres as a field. This essay argues that a specifically sociological explanation of suicide locates suicidal trajectories within patterned inequalities and institutional settings, identifies the meso-level arrangements through which these conditions are enacted, and situates action within available vocabularies, scripts, and moral classifications. Reconsidering structural, interpretive, cultural, relational, critical, intersectional, and digital contributions through this lens shows that the field's strongest insights arise when structure, relation, and meaning are treated as mutually constitutive. The essay contends that sociology's contribution weakens when social variables become residual risk markers inside clinical and epidemiological models. A coherent sociology of suicide requires a mechanism-based account of how social worlds distribute vulnerability, organize recognition, shape interpretation, and channel access to support.

1 | The Question at Stake

A sociology of suicide exists in a weak and undeniable sense. Since *Le Suicide*, sociologists have shown that suicide varies across religious traditions, family arrangements, economic conjunctures, social statuses, communities, and symbolic environments. These patterns gave suicide a privileged place in sociology because they made an apparently private act visible as a socially patterned phenomenon (Durkheim 1897 [1951]). Subsequent work extended that insight across the Chicago tradition, French social theory, network analysis, media sociology, cultural sociology, and critical suicidology (Cavan 1928; Giddens 1965; Pescosolido and Georgianna 1989; Stack 2003; White et al. 2015; Wray et al. 2011).

The stronger question is more demanding. It asks what makes sociological work on suicide cohere as a field. A field requires

more than evidence that social variables correlate with suicide rates. It requires a shared explanatory commitment. A specifically sociological explanation locates suicidal trajectories within patterned inequalities and institutional arrangements, identifies the meso-level configurations through which those arrangements are enacted, and situates action within available repertoires of meaning. Networks, organizations, communities, media ecologies, classification systems, and moral vocabularies become central to explanation because they mediate between broad conditions and lived trajectories.

This formulation gives sociology a clearer task. It can show how social structures distribute vulnerability, how relational environments organize exposure and support, and how cultural meanings make some forms of suffering communicable, recognizable, or legitimate. Durkheim's language of integration and regulation remains foundational, yet later critiques showed

The goal of the Forum is to stimulate a robust exchange of ideas. Your insights and commentary are invaluable to fostering scholarly dialogue. We invite you to submit responses to this and other Forum essays at <https://submission.wiley.com/submission/dashboard?siteName=SOCF> (select "forum reply" from the dropdown menu for manuscript type). Forum replies will be published in future issues of the journal.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2026 The Author(s). *Sociological Forum* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of Eastern Sociological Society.

that rates, classifications, and meanings are themselves socially organized. Douglas (1967) and Atkinson (1978) made classification practices part of the object. Media research showed that public representations can alter short-term patterns of suicide and prevention (Niederkröthaler et al. 2010; Phillips 1974). Network research translated integration into concrete patterns of ties and influence (Bearman and Moody 2004; Pescosolido and Georgianna 1989). These traditions point toward a field organized around mechanisms linking structure, relation, and meaning.

2 | What Sociology Has Contributed

The structural tradition gave sociology its original claim on suicide. Durkheim treated suicide as an index of integration and regulation, and Halbwachs (1930) later refined the analysis through collective life, social morphology, and group belonging. Gibbs and Martin (1964) developed the idea of status integration, while Henry and Short (1954) connected suicide and homicide to economic strain and aggression. This tradition established that suicide rates have social regularities. Its limits appear when macro categories do too much explanatory work. Religious affiliation, marital status, employment, and economic change need intermediate processes that show how large-scale arrangements become vulnerability, isolation, obligation, despair, or restraint.

The interpretive tradition supplied that missing attention to meaning. Douglas (1967) treated suicide as a meaningful social act shaped by available vocabularies of escape, accusation, protest, transformation, and communication. Atkinson (1978) turned the classification of suicide into a sociological object, showing how coroners, institutions, evidence, and moral assumptions shape what becomes officially knowable. This tradition remains essential because suicide is never encountered as brute fact alone. It is named, classified, narrated, disputed, hidden, and moralized.

The cultural tradition extended this insight to scripts, narratives, and representational environments. Historical and anthropological work showed that self-killing can be framed through honor, sacrifice, shame, duty, or moral repair. Media research then demonstrated that public representations matter for incidence as well as interpretation. Sensationalist or romanticized portrayals can contribute to short-term increases, while depictions of coping and help-seeking can support protective effects (Niederkröthaler et al. 2010; Phillips 1974; Stack 2003). Digital platforms have intensified these questions because visibility, imitation, support, and harm can be organized through algorithmic circulation (Bridge et al. 2020).

The relational tradition made Durkheim empirically portable. Pescosolido and Georgianna (1989) showed how religious and community integration operate through interaction, influence, and informal control. Bearman and Moody (2004) demonstrated that adolescent suicide is embedded in friendship networks and that network structure can shape diffusion and clustering. This work gives sociology a meso-level apparatus. It explains how vulnerability travels through ties, how isolation becomes consequential, and how support depends on concrete relational infrastructure.

Critical, intersectional, and decolonial approaches widened the field's moral and analytical range. Critical suicidology challenged the dominance of psychiatric frameworks and drew attention to stigma, power, and the politics of prevention (White et al. 2015). Research on LGBTQ populations showed how stigma, minority stress, and constrained help-seeking shape suicide risk (Haas et al. 2011). Chandler and Lalonde (1998) showed that Indigenous youth suicide varies with cultural continuity and collective self-government. These contributions make inequality internal to explanation. They also show that integration can protect, discipline, exclude, or silence depending on the group, institution, and historical context.

Taken together, these traditions show that sociology has never offered a single theory of suicide. Its strength lies elsewhere. It has built a set of explanatory lenses for tracing how macro conditions, relational ecologies, institutional classifications, and cultural meanings combine in concrete settings. The field becomes coherent when these lenses are connected.

3 | Toward a More Articulated Field

A coherent sociology of suicide should organize itself around three linked questions. First, how are vulnerabilities socially distributed? Second, how do relational and institutional settings channel those vulnerabilities into trajectories? Third, how do meanings shape what distress becomes, how it is recognized, and which forms of action appear available?

The first question anchors suicide in patterned inequality. Economic crises, labor market precarity, welfare regimes, family structures, racism, colonial disruption, gender norms, and sexuality-based stigma shape exposure to harm and access to protection. Cross-national and historical studies remain indispensable here, especially when they show how the same shock produces different outcomes across institutional contexts (Chang et al. 2013; Pirkis et al. 2021).

The second question moves explanation to the meso level. Families, schools, workplaces, religious communities, peer networks, digital spaces, and health systems organize recognition, surveillance, obligation, support, and abandonment. These settings mediate between structural conditions and personal trajectories. They also explain why similar vulnerabilities generate different outcomes across groups and places.

The third question brings meaning into the center of explanation. People act within cultural vocabularies that make distress intelligible or unspeakable, honorable or shameful, treatable or fatal, private or public. Institutions classify deaths through evidentiary and moral conventions. Media and platforms circulate narratives that can intensify identification, normalize help-seeking, or restrict available interpretations. Meaning therefore operates as a mechanism. It shapes perception, recognition, communication, and response.

This articulation has methodological consequences. Quantitative analyses of rates and trends gain explanatory depth when tied to institutional contexts and cultural environments. Network studies gain force when they examine how actors interpret

obligation, intimacy, belonging, and crisis. Ethnographic and interpretive studies become more cumulative when they connect local meanings to stratification, organizations, and policy regimes. Classification practices deserve continuing attention because administrative categories record institutional judgment as well as behavioral reality.

The same articulation matters when sociological findings enter public debate. Suicide prevention often borrows sociological language while translating social conditions into lists of risk factors. That translation can weaken sociology's contribution. Social class, gender, sexuality, race, coloniality, religion, and media exposure become analytically thin when treated as background variables. A sociological account gives them mechanistic force. It asks how they organize recognition, constrain action, distribute support, and shape the pathways through which distress escalates or becomes containable.

4 | Conclusion

The sociology of suicide exists as a tradition. Durkheimian, structural, interpretive, cultural, relational, critical, intersectional, and digital approaches have shown that suicide is shaped by the organization of social life, by the meanings through which distress is interpreted, and by the networks and institutions through which influence, recognition, and support circulate. This tradition has produced more than a set of empirical findings. It has produced a way of seeing suicide as an event whose conditions of possibility are social as well as biographical.

The stronger question concerns coherence. A sociology of suicide worthy of the name needs a clear account of how structure, relation, and meaning interact. Structure distributes vulnerability through institutions, inequalities, and historically sedimented forms of exclusion. Relational settings channel exposure, recognition, obligation, abandonment, and support. Cultural repertoires shape what suffering can mean, how distress can be voiced, and which forms of action appear imaginable. These elements form the core of a sociological explanation when they are treated as connected mechanisms.

The stakes are disciplinary as well as practical. Clinical and epidemiological research offers indispensable knowledge about risk, intervention, and prevention. Sociology adds a different explanatory grammar. It clarifies how vulnerability is patterned before it becomes measurable as risk, how institutions classify and process distress, how networks amplify or contain crises, and how moral vocabularies shape recognition and response. This contribution loses force when social variables are treated as background correlates. It gains force when sociology explains how social worlds organize the pathways through which distress escalates, becomes communicable, receives support, or turns lethal.

The question "Is there a sociology of suicide?" therefore asks whether sociologists can defend the explanatory specificity of their object. The answer depends on the field's capacity to show how inequalities, institutions, relationships, and meanings become consequential for life and death. In that stronger sense, there is a sociology of suicide when sociology explains

the mechanisms through which social worlds enable, inhibit, or reshape suicidal trajectories. There is, and there ought to be, a sociology of suicide.

Funding

This research was funded by University of Valladolid-The Bank of Santander (Spain), Grant number: 2024-3608; and "Research Development Grants 2025–2026, Cátedra Cel-Caja Rural".

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

References

- Atkinson, J. M. 1978. *Discovering Suicide: Studies in the Social Organization of Sudden Death*. Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-06606-3>.
- Bearman, P. S., and J. Moody. 2004. "Suicide and Friendships Among American Adolescents." *American Journal of Public Health* 94, no. 1: 89–95. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.94.1.89>.
- Bridge, J. A., J. B. Greenhouse, D. Ruch, et al. 2020. "Association Between the Release of Netflix's 13 Reasons Why and Suicide Rates in the United States: An Interrupted Time Series Analysis." *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry* 59, no. 2: 236–243. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2019.04.020>.
- Cavan, R. S. 1928. *Suicide*. University of Chicago Press.
- Chandler, M. J., and C. Lalonde. 1998. "Cultural Continuity as a Hedge Against Suicide in Canada's First Nations." *Transcultural Psychiatry* 35, no. 2: 191–219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136346159803500202>.
- Chang, S.-S., D. Stuckler, P. Yip, and D. Gunnell. 2013. "Impact of 2008 Global Economic Crisis on Suicide: Time Trend Study in 54 Countries." *BMJ* 347: f5239. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.f5239>.
- Douglas, J. D. 1967. *The Social Meanings of Suicide*. Princeton University Press.
- Durkheim, É. 1897/1951. *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. Translated by John A. Spaulding, and George Simpson. Free Press.
- Gibbs, J. P., and W. T. Martin. 1964. *Status Integration and Suicide: A Sociological Study*. University of Oregon Books.
- Giddens, A. 1965. "The Suicide Problem in French Sociology." *British Journal of Sociology* 16, no. 1: 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.2307/588563>.
- Haas, A. P., M. Eliason, V. M. Mays, et al. 2011. "Suicide and Suicide Risk in Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Populations: Review and Recommendations." *Journal of Homosexuality* 58, no. 1: 10–51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2011.534038>.
- Halbwachs, M. 1930. *Les causes du suicide*. Félix Alcan.
- Henry, A. F., and J. F. Short. 1954. *Suicide and Homicide: Some Economic, Sociological, and Psychological Aspects of Aggression*. Free Press.
- Niederkrotenthaler, T., M. Voracek, A. Herberth, et al. 2010. "Role of Media Reports in Completed and Prevented Suicide: Werther v. Papageno Effects." *British Journal of Psychiatry* 197, no. 3: 234–243. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.109.074633>.
- Pescosolido, B. A., and S. Georgianna. 1989. "Durkheim, Suicide, and Religion: Toward a Network Theory of Suicide." *American Sociological Review* 54, no. 1: 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095660>.
- Phillips, D. P. 1974. "The Influence of Suggestion on Suicide: Substantive and Theoretical Implications of the Werther Effect." *American Sociological Review* 39, no. 3: 340–354. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2094294>.

Pirkis, J., A. John, S. Shin, et al. 2021. "Suicide Trends in the Early Months of the COVID-19 Pandemic: An Interrupted Time-Series Analysis of Preliminary Data From 21 Countries." *Lancet Psychiatry* 8, no. 7: 579–588. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(21\)00091-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(21)00091-2).

Stack, S. 2003. "Media Coverage as a Risk Factor in Suicide." *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 57, no. 4: 238–240. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.57.4.238>.

White, J., I. Marsh, M. J. Kral, and J. Morris, eds. 2015. *Critical Suicidology: Transforming Suicide Research and Prevention for the 21st Century*. University of British Columbia Press. <https://doi.org/10.59962/9780774830317>.

Wray, M., C. Colen, and B. Pescosolido. 2011. "The Sociology of Suicide." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37, 505–528. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-081309-150058>.