

PALLIATIVE IDEOLOGY: THE ROLE OF THE JUSTIFYING BELIEF SYSTEM, BELIEF IN A JUST WORLD AND IDEOLOGY CONSERVATIVE TO SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING OF WORKERS OUTSOURCING

*Istiqomah

Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Mercu Buana

*Corresponding e-mail: istiqomah@mercubuana.ac.id

Received date: 16 September 2022; Accepted date: 8 Dec 2022

Abstract: Someone adopts an ideology because ideology will help psychological needs, interpret and regulate the social world around him. In other words, ideology will help shape the right attitudes, values and societal goals and how to achieve them, so that individuals will be able to understand, predict and even rationalize the rules of society. This study examines the relationship between the system of justifying belief, belief in a just world and conservative ideology on subjective well-being in outsourced workers. A total of 321 outsourced workers currently employed at the company participated in this study. The results showed that the system of justifying belief, belief in a just world and conservative ideology correlated positively and significantly to cognitive subjective well-being aspects. While the affective aspects of subjective well-being were not found to be correlated. This is because the measurement of the affective aspect is more influenced by individual personality. This research indirectly illustrates the palliative function of ideology in helping disadvantaged groups (low economic status) in the face of inequality so that those who are disadvantaged by the system continue to recognize that socio-economic differences are legitimate and fair (support the status quo).

Keywords: System Justifying Belief, Belief in a Just World, Conservative Ideology and Subjective Well-Being

INTRODUCTION

The outsourcing work system makes the status of labor relations unclear. Outsourcing results in a weaker position of workers in the company. By having outsourcing, the form of labor relations is temporary with a specified working period for a certain period of time (1 year, 2 years,

some even only around 3-4 months). Erratic income then makes workers part of society with low economic status (disadvantaged groups). Under these conditions, it is natural that workers do not experience satisfaction in their lives so that it can be predicted that workers may have low subjective well-being. However, Berg's research (2010) found no correlation between income inequality and a person's subjective well-being and is more related to a person's socio-emotionality, such as with friends, family and groups. Meanwhile, money (as a tool to achieve goals) is not linearly related to well-being (Diener et al., in Farid & Lazarus, 2007) but has a negative correlation with well-being (Sirgy, 1998 in Farid & Lazarus, 2007).

In a social system, workers are categorized into disadvantaged groups and often face inequality. The implication of inequality is the emergence of group hierarchies, namely groups that get something more than other groups (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Individuals from fortunate groups (high economic status) will receive a larger portion of money, food, social goods (such as political-economic authority and power) than individuals from disadvantaged groups (low economic status). The advantaged group has a vested interest in believing that such a distribution is legitimate (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost & Hunyady, 2002). In other words, this situation is understandable because the fortunate group is generally in a position to benefit from the existence of the status quo. Jost et al., (2003) defines the status quo as the existing social order or prevailing social level or differences in social levels that occur in society.

Based on social identity theory and social domination theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979 and Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), it is known that individuals who have high social identity and high social domination orientation (SDO) values will tend to maintain the status quo by legitimizing myths and supports ideologies that function to perpetuate inequality (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). On the other hand, research by Jost et al. (2003) found that disadvantaged groups also support the status quo and acknowledge differences in social status, henceforth known as the system justification theory. Proof of the system justification theory is often carried out in developed countries with well-established economic and social systems. Research in developing countries (Malaysia and Bolivia) proves that disadvantaged groups also justify the system (Henry & Saul, 2006).

Meanwhile, Meutia's research (2006) in Indonesia proves that disadvantaged groups (women) also justify the system, but only on the religious dimension, not on the economic dimension.

There are several reasons that can explain why disadvantaged groups also support the status quo and recognize differences in social status. Based on cognitive dissonance theory, Jost et al. (2003) proposed the concept of ideological dissonance as a motive to justify the status quo. The assumption is that in the context of social injustice, members of disadvantaged groups experience dissonance. On the one hand they believe that the system puts themselves (and their group) in an unfavorable condition, on the other hand they think that themselves and their group contribute to the stability of the system. To reduce the dissonance, it is assumed that they will defend the existing system and at the same time justify it as a good, fair and legitimate system (Jost, Banaji & Nosek, 2004).

Based on the system justification theory, there is a belief that supports the status quo and justifies differences in socio-economic status in society (system justifying belief). The researchers consider this belief as one of the statuses of legitimizing ideologies, namely ideologies that justify hierarchy and inequality between groups in society. In addition to the justifying belief system, there is also a Protestant ethic work, meritocracy, belief in a just world and conservative ideology (O'Brien & Major, 2005).

As an ideology that legitimizes status, the justifying belief system contains an ideological drive to recognize differences in social and economic status and to maintain the status quo. For the privileged, rationalizing inequality means rationalizing their position as the privileged group in the system. Whereas for disadvantaged groups, rationalizing inequality means internalizing inequality, justifying the system and blaming their misfortune on the system (Jost & Hunyady, 2002).

Another ideological legitimizing status is belief in a just world, namely the belief that one gets something that one deserves and the world is a fair place. With this belief, individuals believe that there is compatibility between what a person does and what happens to him. As a result,

individuals will recognize that hard work, ability and motivation will bring success (meritocracy). Adherents of this ideology believe that people deserve whatever their circumstances are because they are the ones who make them happen. By believing that the world is fair, they will see misfortune as a consequence of the actions in question. Increased perceptions of justice in individuals who believe in a belief in a just world can result in actions justifying the situation and supporting the status quo (Ditmar & Ditkinson, 1993).

Conservative ideology is also a status legitimizing ideology because conservative individuals tend to be intolerant of differences of opinion and anti-change. They tend to show an attitude of resistance to change (defending against the status quo) and justify injustice (Jost et al. , 2003). This is in accordance with the system justification theory which recognizes legitimate and just socio-economic differences. Research by Jost et al. (2004) concluded that conservative ideology has a significant relationship with forms of system justification such as maintaining the status quo, surviving change, rationalizing social existence and economic inequality in society.

In subsequent developments, social researchers place the role of ideology as a special point in maintaining the existence of the system. Someone adopts an ideology because ideology will help psychological needs, interpret and regulate the social world around him. In other words, ideology will help shape the right attitudes, values and societal goals and how to achieve them, so that individuals will be able to understand, predict, and even rationalize the rules of society (Tedin, 1987 in Jost, 2009). This ideology will justify and rationalize inequality and recognize that people deserve results according to what they do (Jackman, 1994; Lane, 1962; Major, 1994; Sidanius & Prato, 1999 in Jost, 2002). This ideology can function adaptively and has a positive relationship with psychological well-being (Lerner, 1980; Dalbert, 2001).

Furthermore, Jost et al. (2009) argue that adhering to an ideology can strengthen the legitimacy of social, cultural and economic systems. When faced with a condition that threatens system legitimacy, individuals will spontaneously, maybe even unconsciously, use their stereotypes and beliefs to justify the system. Through cognitive processes, individuals will rationalize that the world is fair and proper so that legitimacy for

systems is important and legitimate. In other words, attitudes, behavior, and even individual political expression, will be guided by ideology which is activated through situational signs that appear.

Some ideologies legitimize existing status in society (status legitimizing ideologies). These ideologies justify hierarchy and inequality among groups in a society. For example, the justifying belief system, belief in a just world, individual mobility, conservative ideology and Protestant work ethics. Based on research, these ideologies function adaptively and are positively related to well-being (O'Brien & Major, 2005). This is because these ideologies have a role as a palliative ideology that helps relieve individuals in the face of inequality. In the end, individuals will justify inequality and be able to deal with the negative consequences of inequality. In the Big Dictionary of Indonesian, palliative means "alleviating effort". Ideology in the palliative function will assist individuals in maintaining their perception of a just and proper world so that it will help individuals feel better in dealing with inequality and its consequences (Wakslak et al., 2007).

Supporting an ideology will help someone feel better because the ideology or belief can help alleviate (palliative) in dealing with inequality and its consequences (Jost, 2002). This ideology will become a filter and is adaptive so that it will positively relate to one's well-being (O'Brien & Major, 2005). In disadvantaged groups, believing in an ideology can help ease them in dealing with the inequalities they experience. Research by Jost et al. (2003) found that justification for a system can "help" disadvantaged groups reduce cognitive dissonance and gain satisfaction in the existing system. These ideologies will protect their personal well-being so that they think that their misfortune is deserved (Cosley & McCoy, 2008). Individuals who believe in a belief in a just world will be more confident and more resistant to positive moods and have a happier life (Dalbert, Tomaka & Blascovic, 1994 in Dalbert et al., 2001).

Likewise, the research by Napier and Jost (2008) found that there is a happiness gap between individuals with liberal and conservative ideologies because individuals with conservative ideologies place their ideology more as a buffer in dealing with the negative effects of economic inequality. Liberal individuals tend to be less happy than conservative individuals because they are ideologically less prepared for

rationalization in seeing inequality in society. On the other hand, conservative ideology accepts and justifies differences in income and sees it as something just and legitimate.

Among the several status legitimizing ideologies that have a palliative function is the justifying belief system. The system justifying belief is a belief that supports the status quo. Jost et al. (2003) define the status quo as the existing social order or prevailing social level, or differences in social levels that occur in society. Individuals who believe in a justifying belief system will justify the system and recognize that social differences are legitimate and fair. On the other hand, research by Jost et al. (2003) found that disadvantaged groups (low economic status) also support the status quo and differences in social status that exist in society are legitimate and just so they survive in the status quo. This is because they tend to fail to perceive their injustice and misfortune, victim-blaming (blaming the victim) for their misfortune, justifying social roles and trying to survive change (Jost, 1995).

Apart from the system of justifying belief, belief in a just world is also part of the status of legitimizing ideologies. Belief in a just world is a belief that the world is a fair place where a person gets what he deserves. "A just world is one in which people get what they deserve" (Lerner, 1980). In belief in a just world it is believed that there is a match between what a person does and what will happen to him. This belief will help individuals to be committed to their life goals and to behave on a daily basis in accordance with existing social rules (Dalbert, 2001). According to Lerner (1980), the perception of other people is the most important part of belief in a just world (BJW). Individuals who strongly support a belief in a just world will have a more positive perception of other people than individuals with a weak belief in a just world.

In its palliative function, belief in a just world is believed to be able to help individuals understand inequality and its consequences. Taylor and Brown's research, 1988 (in Dalbert et al. 2001) found that believing in a just world can be seen as a positive illusion that supports psychological well-being. Several studies have also found a relationship between belief in a just a world and indicators of well-being such as satisfaction and positive mood. Individuals who support belief in just a world will be more confident and more resistant to stressful situations so they can

easily adapt.

The next explanation for the legitimizing status of ideologies is conservative ideology. Huntington sees conservative as an ideology and attitude that is resistant to change (Korys, 1999). While the definition of conservative according to McDonald (2004) is the value and attitude towards change in order to maintain the rules. In looking at inequality, conservative ideology places more emphasis on order (level), stability, income differences and maintaining the status quo. Meanwhile, liberal ideology is often described as ideas that support equality, help the weak, tolerance and social reform. This relates to the rationalization of inequality as a core component of conservative ideology (Jost, 2006). In the process of rationalizing this inequality, conservative ideology will help alleviate the negative consequences of inequality (palliative and buffer functions).

Conversely, liberal ideology is less able to help alleviate because it emphasizes equality and rejects inequality. As a result, liberal individuals tend to be less happy than conservative individuals because they are ideologically less prepared for rationalization in seeing inequality in society. Conversely, conservative individuals accept and justify differences in outcomes and see this as something fair and legitimate, so conservative individuals tend to be happier because they place their ideology as a buffer in dealing with the inequalities they experience (Napier & Jost, 2008).

Returning to the labor case, research on subjective well-being among outsourced workers still attracts attention, considering that workers as a disadvantaged group (low socioeconomic status) often experience inequality both socially and economically. As a disadvantaged group, outsourced workers are predicted to still have high subjective well-being because subjective well-being is not correlated with income inequality (Berg, 2006). In addition, several studies have also found that several ideologies can function as palliative for workers in the face of inequality so that they are more prepared to accept the negative consequences of inequality (Jost, 2002). In the end, this ideology will become a filter and be adaptive so that it will positively relate to one's well-being (O'Brien & Major, 2005).

Research on subjective well-being still attracts the attention of

psychologists, sociologists and economists from several countries to further examine the problems and factors that influence subjective well-being. Researching subjective well-being in labor groups is also very interesting because of the position of laborers as a disadvantaged group in a system, but on the other hand laborers are a major component in the industrial economy and have an important role for a country. Citizens (workers) with high subjective well-being will help improve the welfare of the country because they will be healthier, have higher life expectancies, be more productive and have more pleasant social relationships (Eid, 2008).

This study aims to test whether ideology or belief can function palliatively towards subjective well-being in the face of existing inequalities. In detail, the goal to be achieved in this study is to find out empirically how the relationship between the system of justifying belief, belief in a just world and conservative ideology can predict the emergence of subjective well-being in disadvantaged groups (workers).

METHOD

Research Design

This research is a non-experimental study that aims to find a relationship or correlation between various research variables consisting of a justifying belief system (SJB), belief in a just world (BJW), conservative ideology, and subjective well-being (SWB). The research was carried out through one-time data collection at a certain time on the selected respondents. Subjective well-being (SWB) is a person's assessment of his life as a whole which is related to physiological, psychological and social aspects by involving cognitive and affective components. To measure subjective well-being, two sub-scales are used, namely the cognitive well-being sub-scale and the affective well-being sub-scale. For the cognitive sub-scale (KW) using an adaptation of the satisfaction with life style (SWLS) scale compiled by Diener et al. (1985). Meanwhile, the affective sub-scale (AF) uses an adaptation of the positive and negative affect schedule (PANAS) compiled by Watson et al. (1988) consisting of 10 positive affect and 10 negative affect.

The system justifying belief (SJB) is an attitude of justifying and

maintaining the status quo by recognizing that differences in social and economic status are fair and legitimate. To measure confidence in the justifying belief system, an adaptation of the economic system justification scale (ESJS) compiled by Jost and Thompson (2000) was used.

Belief in a just world (BJW) is an attitude of acknowledging that the world is an adit place and a person will get what he should get according to the effort that has been made. To measure belief in belief in a just world, an adaptation of the belief in a just world scale compiled by Dalbert et al. (2001) was used.

Conservative ideology (IK) is an attitude that is resistant to change in order to maintain rules. To measure belief in conservative ideology, a translation and adaptation of the Classical Conservatism Scale compiled by McClosky (1958) was used (Bahr & Stauss, 1972).

Instrument

Measuring instrument trial (pilot study). After being translated into Indonesian and going through an adaptation process, all of these scales were tested on 36 contract workers who had similar criteria to the study participants. Trials are needed to test the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. After analyzing all the scales used showed good reliability (SJB, $\alpha = .619$; BJW, $\alpha = .614$, IK, $\alpha = .616$, AF $\alpha = .779$ and KW, $\alpha = .841$). Although the reliability obtained from the scale of the justifying belief system, belief in a just world and conservative ideology ($a = 0.61$) is not greater than .7, according to Thorndike, Cunningham and Hagen (1991), a scale with low reliability can still be used with the condition that the research data were obtained from a large group (ie $N > 100$). The number of respondents in this study was 321, thus this scale can still be used.

The population in this study are contract workers (outsourcing). Determination of the sample was carried out through a non-probability sampling method by means of accidental sampling. The sample in this study were contract workers who at the time of the study were still registered as employees of a company. The selection of workers was carried out because so far workers were considered to represent groups of low economic status (disadvantaged groups).

Hypothesis testing is done through statistical analysis, namely the regression method. Multiple regression itself is a fairly reliable and most widely used method for statistical analysis, especially in survey research models. the scores of the independent variables (predictors) are regressed to see the effect (change in variance) that each independent variable raises on the dependent variable (criterion). The effect of each predictor is indicated by a significant change in the value of the coefficient of determinant/variance (squared multiple correlation change = R^2).

Analysis of total variance was carried out to find out how much the total variance of subjective well-being contributed by all research variables together. This analysis was carried out by including all independent variables into the regression calculation with subjective well-being as the dependent variable.

RESULTS

Of the 321 respondents, 196 (60.1%) were male and 125 (38.9) were female. Respondents' ages ranged from 18-26 years, 182 (56.69%); 98 respondents (30.54%) were 27-35 years old and 41 respondents (12.77%) were 36-45 years. On the education level of respondents, 59 respondents are junior high school level (SMP) were (18.38%); 253 respondents (78.81%) were senior high school (SMA), and 9 respondents (2.81%) had diploma.

Table 1: Correlation Between Variables

	Mean	SD	SJB	BJW	I	KW	AFP	AFN
SJB	3.82	0.829	-					
BJW	4.14	0.706	0.029	-				
I	4.76	0.665	.198**	0.104	-			
KW	4.12	1.083	.112*	.228**	.224**	-		
AFP	3.27	0.638	0.095	.120*	.149**	0.108	-	
AFN	2.78	0.717	-0.023	-0.035	-0.086	-0.109	.200**	-

*Correlation significant at the level of 0.05 (2-tailed).

**Correlation significant at the level of 0.01 (2-tailed).

Correlation between variables is done to prove the existence of a

relationship between variables. As can be seen in Table 1, the system of justifying belief has a significant positive correlation with conservative ideology ($r = .198$; $p < .01$) and a significant positive correlation with subjective well-being in cognitive aspects ($r = -.112$; $p < .05$). In addition, belief in a just world also has a positive correlation with subjective well-being in the cognitive aspect ($r = .228$; $p < .01$) and conservative ideology which has a significant positive correlation with subjective cognitive well-being ($r = .224$; $p < .01$). Another correlation was found in belief in a just world which had a significant positive correlation with positive affect on subjective well-being ($r = .120$; $p < .05$), conservative ideology had a significant positive correlation with positive affect on subjective well-being ($r = .149$; $p < .01$).

Table 2: Regression on the aspect cognitive *subjective well-being*

Variable	R ²	β	p
SJB	.013	.11	.044*
BJWs	.052	.23	.000*
IK	.050	.22	.000*

*Significant at $p = .01$

The regression results in table 2 show that the system justifying belief has a significantly positive effect on cognitive aspects of subjective well-being ($F(1,319) = 4.070$; $R^2 = .013$; $\beta = .11$; $p < .05$). That is, the higher a person's belief in the justifying belief system, the higher the cognitive subjective well-being.

Belief in a just world has a significant positive effect on subjective cognitive aspects of well-being ($F(1,319) = 17.527$; $R^2 = .052$; $\beta = .23$; $p < .01$). This means that the higher a person's belief in a just world, the higher his cognitive subjective well-being.

Likewise, conservative ideology has a significant positive effect on cognitive subjective well-being ($F(1,319) = 16.842$; $R^2 = .050$; $\beta = .22$; $p < .01$). This means that the higher a person's conservative ideology, the higher his cognitive subjective well-being.

Table 3: Regression on the positive affect of *subjective well-being*

Variable	R ²	β	p
SJB	.009	.095	.090
BJWs	.014	.12	.032**
IK	.022	.15	.008*

* significant at $p = .01$

** significant at $p = .05$

The regression results in table 3 show that the justifying belief system has no significant effect on positive subjective well-being ($p = .090$).

Belief in a just world has a significantly positive effect on positive subjective well-being ($F(1,319) = 4.632$; $R^2=.014$; $\beta = .12$; $p < .05$). This means that the higher a person's belief in a just world, the higher the positive affect subjective well-being.

Likewise, conservative ideology has a significant positive effect on positive subjective well-being ($F(1,319) = 7.241$; $R^2=.022$; $\beta = .15$; $p < .01$). This means that the higher a person's conservative ideology, the higher the positive affect subjective well-being.

The following table shows the magnitude of the variance in cognitive subjective well-being contributed by all independent variables in the study.

Table 4: Regression on total variance analysis

Criterion	predictor	R ²	ΔR ²	p
SWB	SJB B JW IK	.10	.09	.000*

* Significant at $p = .01$

SJB=system justifying belief; B JW=belief in a just world;

IK = ideology conservative; SWB=subjective well-being

Taken together, all independent variables in this study can explain about 10% of the variance of the variation that occurs in the value of cognitive subjective well-being ($R^2 = .10$, $p < .01$). Although the contribution of this variance is not too large, because it is significant, the relationship and influence between research variables remains important.

The following table shows the magnitude of the subjective well-being positive affect variance contributed by the belief in a just world variable and the conservative ideology variable in the study.

Table 5: Regression on the total variance analysis

Criterion	predictor	R ²	ΔR ²	p
SWB	B JW IK	.033	.03	.005*

* Significant at $p = .01$

B JW=belief in a just world; IK = ideology conservative; SWB=subjective

well-being

Taken together, all independent variables in this study can explain about 3.3% of the variance of the variation that occurs in positive affect values of subjective well-being ($R^2 = .033$, $p < .01$). Although the contribution of this variance is not too large, because it is significant, the relationship and influence between research variables remains important.

DISCUSSION

The status of legitimizing ideologies (system justifying justifying, belief in a just world and conservative ideology) recognizes social and economic differences (inequality) and justifies the existing system. In their palliative function these ideologies help relieve individuals in the face of inequality, especially individuals in groups of low economic status (disadvantaged) so that they still have subjective well-being.

In this study, 321 outsourced workers (disadvantaged groups) participated by filling out a set of questionnaires regarding the system of justifying belief, belief in a just world and conservative ideology. The justifying belief system describes the attitude of justifying and maintaining the status quo by recognizing that differences in social and economic status are fair and legitimate. Whereas belief in a just world is indicated by an attitude of acknowledging that the world is a fair place and a person will get what he deserves according to the effort that has been made. And conservative ideology is an attitude that is resistant to change in order to maintain rules.

The ideological instruments (system of justifying belief, belief in a just world and conservative ideology) used in this study are adaptation measures that have only been tested once in an Indonesian cultural setting. This allows the emergence of bias caused by cultural differences, namely between Indonesian culture and other cultures from which the instrument was developed. The low value of the reliability of the ideological instruments ($\alpha = 0.6$) compared to the subjective well-being instrument ($\alpha = 0.8$) indicates that the ideological instruments have not been well adapted. The development of an ideological instrument is heavily influenced by the cultural background and economic, social and political system of a country. In accordance with the opinion of Korys (1999), in everyday life individuals actively receive external influences and ideology is used as a reference in

interpreting the outside world. Collectively, ideology is disseminated among members of society through the process of socialization. So that the condition of a society and a country will determine one's understanding of ideology.

The results of the correlation test show that the three ideologies (system justifying belief, belief in a just world and conservative ideology) have a significant correlation with cognitive subjective well-being aspects. And the results of the regression analysis also show that the three ideologies are predictors of subjective well-being (cognitive aspects). The three together contribute about 10 percent of the explanation of the variance in subjective well-being. In addition, the correlation test and the results of the regression analysis also show that belief in a just world and conservative ideology have a positive and significant correlation with positive subjective well-being. The two together contribute about 3.3 percent of the explanation of the variance in subjective well-being. In other words, these three ideologies can affect a person's subjective well-being. The higher a person's belief in the ideology, the higher the subjective well-being.

In this study, no correlation was found between the justifying belief system and the positive affect of subjective well-being. This means that belief in the justifying belief system only affects the cognitive aspects of subjective well-being. In other words, the higher a person's belief in the justifying belief system, the higher the subjective well-being, but only on the cognitive aspect and not on the positive affect.

Belief in a just world and conservative ideology together only contribute about 3.3 percent of the explanation of the variance in positive affect on subjective well-being. The small contribution of the total variance means that there are still many other factors that influence the measurement of the affective aspects of subjective well-being.

Several studies have proven that the affective aspect is more influenced by a person's personality (Eid & Larsen, 2008). This analysis supports the results of previous studies regarding the relationship between systems justifying belief, belief in a just world and conservative ideology on personal satisfaction which is an indicator of subjective well-being. Research by O'Brien and Major (2005) found a correlation

between the justifying belief system and well-being among members of disadvantaged groups. Several studies have also found a relationship between belief in a just world and indicators of well-being such as satisfaction, positive moods and happier lives (Dalbert, 1996; Tomaka & Blascovic, 1994). And research from Napier and Jost (2008) found that individuals who adhere to conservative ideologies are happier than liberal individuals.

This refers to the palliative function of the three ideologies, that these ideologies help alleviate and become a buffer (especially for disadvantaged groups) in dealing with inequality. These ideologies will lead individuals to accept inequality as something legitimate and just. In the end, individuals will be better prepared to face the negative effects of inequality so that they still have subjective well-being even though they are in conditions that are not benefited by the system. Members of disadvantaged groups will rationalize their misfortunes; reduce the cognitive dissonance they experience and make internal attributions by blaming themselves for their misfortunes.

The results of the correlation test between variables showing no correlation between the justifying belief system and conservative ideology with belief in a just world cannot support the research of Jost et al. (2009) that individuals who have high beliefs in a just world will justify the status quo and see the change is not something important. Individuals with high belief in a just world will perceive the existing situation as something fair because everything is worth obtaining (deserve). This will ultimately encourage individuals to justify and maintain the existing system (status quo).

The contribution of the total variance of only about 10 percent to subjective well-being means that there are still many other factors that can affect the measurement of a person's subjective well-being. The results of previous research have proven that income, emotional experience, self-esteem, human rights, and so on can affect subjective well-being. Several studies have found a positive correlation between money (income) and subjective well-being and conversely, there have been studies which have found that money is not correlated with subjective well-being (Diener & Oishi, 2003; Farid & Lazarus, 2005; Eid & Larsen, 2008).

Cultural differences and the conditions of a country can also affect subjective well-being. Countries that have citizens with high subjective well-being are countries with high life expectancy, better political stability, lower divorce rates and gender equality. In individualistic countries like America, emotional experience and self-esteem are strong predictors of subjective well-being, whereas in poor countries financial satisfaction is a strong predictor of subjective well-being (Eid & Larsen, 2008).

Finally, this research supports the system justification theory in Indonesia that disadvantaged groups (outsourced workers) also support the status quo and acknowledge inequality. As well as sharpening Meuthia's research (2006) which found that disadvantaged groups (women) support the status quo in the domain of religion.

CONCLUSION

The results of the data analysis prove that the system of justifying belief, belief in a just world and conservative ideology have a positive and significant effect on the cognitive aspects of subjective well-being of outsourced workers. Meanwhile, the affective aspect (positive affect) is influenced by belief in a just world and conservative ideology and is not influenced by the justifying belief system. That is, the higher the belief in the system of justifying belief, belief in a just world and conservative ideology, the higher the subjective wellbeing of outsourced workers. The ideologies in this study were only able to explain 10% of the variance in cognitive subjective well-being and 3.3% of the variance in affective aspects. Meanwhile, another 90% explanation of the variance of subjective well-being was contributed by other variables outside the focus of this study. The existence of a correlation between the three ideologies and subjective well-being can be linked to the role of ideology in its palliative function which can help relieve individuals from facing the negative consequences of inequality so that disadvantaged groups still have high subjective well-being.

The complexity of ideological issues and subjective well-being means that research still has many limitations, including in sampling the researcher only involves a sample of outsourced workers who are currently employed and does not involve outsourced workers who are

not currently employed, so this study cannot compare the results of subjective well-being measurements. when agency workers are being employed with agency workers who are not being employed. In theory, the subject's condition when measuring subjective well-being can influence the measurement results. In addition, including personality variables may provide a more perfect explanation because according to previous studies the affective aspect of subjective well-being is more influenced by personality factors.

Informed Consent Statement

All participants had granted their consent to this study.

Conflict of interest

The author declared no conflict of interest

Ethics Statement

The study was done compliance with the ethical guidelines.

Funding

No funding or payment received for the participation in this study.

Contribution authors

This article was written and completed fully by Istiqomah.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to say thank you to the Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Mercu Buana for the opportunity, support, and collaboration.

Data Availability Statement

All data is available upon request.

REFERENCES

- Berg, M. and Veenhoven, R. (2010). Income inequality and happiness in 119 nations. In: BentGreve (Ed.) '*Social Policy and Happiness in Europe*', Edgar Elgar Cheltenham UK, chapter 11, pp 174-194, 2010, ISBN 978-1-84844-574-1.
- Bahr, S.J. and Stauss, J.H (1972). Convergent and Discriminant Validity of the New Left Scale and McClosky Conservatism Scale. *Sociological Perspectives*. 15(3).

- Cosley, B.J., & McCoy, S.K., (2008)., Is ideology palliative? priming meritocracy and psychological well-being in the face of inequality. American Psychological Association, Convention Presentation.
- Dalbert, C. (2001). The justice motive as a personal resource. Dealing with challenges and critical life events. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Ditmar, H., & Ditkinson, J. (1993). The perceived relationship between the belief in a just world and sociopolitical ideology. *Social Justice Research*, 6(3), 232-254.
- Eid, L. & Larsen, Randy. (2008). *The Science of Subjective Well-Being*. New York, Guilford Press.
- Farid, M & Lazarus, H. (2008). Subjective well-being in rich and poor country. *Journal of Management Development*, 27 (10), 341-365.
- Henry, P.J., & Saul, A., (2006). The development of system justification in the developing world. *Social Justice Research*, 19(3), 365-378.
- Jost, J.T., & Banaji, M.R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 1-27.
- Jost, J.T. (1995). Negative illusion: conceptual clarification and psychological evidence concerning false consciousness. *Political Psychological*, 16, 397-424.
- Jost, J.T., & Thompson, E.P. (2000) Group-based dominance and opposition to equality as independent predictors of self-esteem, ethnocentrism, and social policy attitudes among African Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36, 209-232.
- Jost, J.T., & Hunyady, O. (2002). The psychology of system justification and the palliative function of ideology. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 13, 111-153.
- Jost, J.T., Banaji, M.R., Nosek, B.A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of status quo, *Political Psychology*, 25(6), 881-919.
- Jost, J.T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A.W., & Sulloway, F. (2003). Exceptions that prove the rule: Using a theory and political of motivated social cognition to account for ideological incongruities and political anomalies. *Psychological Bulletin*,

129, 383-393.

- Korys, P. (1999). Conservatism as an answer to liberalism in politic: The case of contemporary Poland. IWM junior visiting fellows conferences, Vol VIII/5, by the author.
- Lerner, M. J. (1980). *The Belief in a Just World: A Fundamental Delusion*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Meutia (2006). *Reduksi disonansi ideologis sebagai motif untuk menjustifikasi status quo*, Thesis Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Indonesia.
- Napier, J.L. & Jost, J.T. (2008). Why are conservatives happier than liberals? *Association for Psychological Science* Vol 19 No.6.
- O'Brien, L.T., & Major, B. (2005). Systems justifying-beliefs and psychological well-being: the roles of group status and identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(12).
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F., (1999). *Social dominance; an intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wakslak, C.J., Jost, J.T., Tyler, T.R., & Chen E.S. (2007). Moral outrage mediates the dampening effect of system justification on support redistributive social policies. *Association for Psychological Science*, 18(3), 267-274.