



Living in a State of Erosion of Honesty: Lying as the Dominant Policy

Jamal Mohammadi¹ Zahra Jalali²

1. Corresponding Author, Professor of Sociology, Department of Sociology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran. E-mail: m.jamal8@gmail.com.
2. Ph.D Student of Sociology, Department of Sociology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran. E-mail: Zahra.jalali1985@gmail.com.

Article Info	Extended Abstract
<p>Article type: Research Article</p> <p>Article history: Received: 7 - 9 - 2024 Received in revised form: 20 - 10 - 2024 Accepted: 4 - 7 - 2025 Published online: 23 - 8 - 2025</p> <p>Keywords: <i>Lying, the decline of honesty, a lying society, Grounded Theory.</i></p>	<p>Objective: Despite common views on lying as a moral abomination, lying is a part of social life and is rooted in the fabric of society. In all societies, people are taught that lying is considered immoral; However, lying is a communication tactic that is often seen in everyday life. In our society, there are various types of lying, from compliments and considerations, to lies that are told to the people around them as expedient lies. In fact, despite the fact that lying has always been condemned in Iranian culture and Islam, it is seriously common in our society. The vast majority of studies in the humanities on lying have been conducted in philosophy, where it appears mainly as a problem for philosophers of ethics and language. In philosophy, lying is considered almost morally bad. In contemporary accounts, philosophers continue to find ways in which liars can be accused of lacking morality, and tend to view lying as something that goes against social norms of honesty. And the truth is to understand. In contrast, sociologists have been less willing to view lying as merely bad, and there is not much sociological work on this. It is in the work of Georg Simmel that the first developed account of lying as a social phenomenon can be found. Simmel explores lying as a changing social form that is linked to various other social forms and is transformed by the changes that occur in modernity. But, his analysis of lying is too broad for social change, and he gets confused when he tries to develop his exploration of lying with respect to other social forms. In Iran, there has been limited research on lies and lying. In research that was conducted under the title of a <i>survey of the people of Tehran about the characteristics of Iranians</i>, about the most important negative characteristics of Iranians, lying is on the first place and 12% of the respondents considered lying to be the most important negative characteristic of Iranians. In fact, from the point of view of the Iranian society, there is a gap between the ideal Iranian-Islamic culture and the existing culture in the society, which makes lying important and an issue to be considered. Cultural acceptance of dishonesty has broader implications for interpersonal relationships and community cohesion. Perpetuation of lies, whether in personal or public contexts, destroys the basic trust necessary for social cohesion. As integrity decreases, the moral fabric of society weakens and leads to feelings of hopelessness and indifference among people. Consequently, the exploration of lying as a dominant politics in modern life underscores the urgent need for a</p>



recommitment to honesty and transparency. Based on this, the current research seeks a qualitative study to express the basic processes in which lies and deceptions are experienced in everyday life. By addressing the nature of deception, this research aims to foster critical dialogue and encourage the cultivation of integrity, thereby increasing the quality of community trust in an increasingly complex world.

Method: This research was conducted with the grounded theory qualitative method. In this method, findings are obtained by methods other than statistical methods or any quantification. The statistical population of this research is people aged 18 to 50 in Isfahan city, who were selected using available sampling. The data of this research was collected based on in-depth conversations with 20 residents of Isfahan city randomly and in public places, parks and educational centers, and then their understanding and interpretation of lies and lying. It was the basis of data analysis. Also, the process of data analysis has been done through three stages of open coding, central coding and selective coding. In these steps, first, the conducted interviews are analyzed and coded line by line, and in the open coding format, a label is attached to each concept in the interview, and based on the characteristics and dimensions of each concept, a large number of open codes are created. And they appear raw. After the process of breaking the interviews into codes and subcategories in open coding, in the axial coding stage, they are related and categorized around the main topic. Selective coding is also followed by choosing concepts and topics that seem effective in extracting the main theme of the research.

Results: Through the lens of contextual theory, the researcher has studied the motivations, strategies and consequences of lies. By conducting in-depth interviews and observing and analyzing real-world situations, the researcher was able to develop a deeper understanding of the contextual factors that shape the decision to lie. By adopting the grounded theory approach, the researcher has been able to identify different types of lies, underlying factors that affect its prevalence, and strategies used by people to participate and detect lies. In what the respondents said about truth and lies, the phenomenon of lying has causes that originate from the social and individual life of a person. The main reasons obtained are deception, malice or beneficence. That is, the cause of any lie may be included in this category. These reasons include boasting (exaggeration), showing off, laziness and complacency, envy, revenge, malice, hypocrisy and enmity, avoiding punishment, fear of scandal and disgrace, fear of loss of benefit and fear of loss. is a position So people do this either to deceive others, or because of their bad nature, or because the lie is useful at the moment. Favorable platforms for lying include the three dimensions of time, the individual's experiential context, and the satisfaction of an unknown desire in the individual. These cases are classified into the more detailed categories of life history (past), the possibility of discovering a lie in the future, the current situation, the history of hearing lies, the history of telling lies, the history of contact



with liars, deficiencies, feelings and emotions, and the sense of ambition. Three main categories are also the interfering factors in this field. Position in the moment, position of the other person and withdrawal from the interaction. At the moment when a person is in a situation, does the situation require him to tell a lie or not? This situation also has dimensions that depend on the location (the location of the person), the demographic situation (the number of people present in that situation), the structural situation (formal or informal situation) and the cultural situation (the culture existing in that situation). People's strategies for using lies include non-illegality, non-injury, and removal of obstacles that they use to convince themselves to lie. The most important consequence of lying in society is the creation of a society of liars. A process that leads to hiding the truth, mistrust and the normalization of lies in the society. The act of lying, although it seems harmless at the moment, can have far-reaching and deep consequences that reverberate in a person's personal and professional life. A lie, whether motivated by self-interest or malicious intent, destroys the foundation of trust upon which healthy relationships and social structures are built. By opening the web of lies, the perpetrator often finds himself immersed in a complex network of deception, loses credibility, has dark interpersonal relationships, and faces possible legal or professional consequences. Ultimately, the decision to lie, no matter how tempting, represents a profound betrayal of one's own integrity and the trust of others, the consequences of which can be both emotionally and practically devastating.

Conclusion: From the previous discussion, it was clear that lies and deception are the opposite of truth. A lie is a shaky and unstable fortress that a person takes refuge in to ward off harm and danger. When it collapses, the danger and harm doubles. The results showed that the main category in this research is the deterioration of honesty. In general, in the field of human interactions, the concepts of honesty and dishonesty have a significant influence in the context of society. From a sociological perspective, these concepts have profound implications and shape the norms, values and expectations governing our collective existence. Honesty as a basic social virtue is the cornerstone of trust and social cohesion. Fluency facilitates interpersonal relationships and enables people to engage in meaningful exchanges and foster a sense of mutual understanding. When honesty prevails, people feel safe in their interactions and create an environment of openness and transparency. On the contrary, dishonesty in the form of deception, manipulation and lies can have destructive effects on social dynamics. Therefore, honesty and truthfulness should be institutionalized in the society through culture building, social internalization and finding the roots of lies. This institutionalization is affected by the relationships within the family, the relationships in the school and, on a larger scale, the relationships in the society; Therefore, it cannot be expected that a person who lives in an atmosphere full of lies will tend to tell the truth. Consequently, a comprehensive strategy to combat fraud in society



must include education, accountability, and transparency. By fostering an environment that values honesty and provides people with the tools to behave rightly, societies can foster a culture resistant to the divisive effects of deception.

Cite this article: Mohammadi, M., & Jalali, Z. (2025). Living in a State of Erosion of Honesty: Lying as the Dominant Policy. *Biopolitics and Development*, 1 (2), 63-79. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.22034/jbpd.2025.142091.1015>



© The Author(s).

Publisher: University of Kurdistan Press.

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.22034/jbpd.2025.142091.1015>
